

UDC: 159.922.8

**Ruslana Bilous,**  
*PhD (Candidate of Psychological Sciences), associate professor,  
 Department of Psychology, Pedagogy and Philosophy,  
 Daria Pysarenko,*  
*5th year student, Faculty of Psychology,  
 Kremenchuk Mykhailo Ostrohradskyi National University,  
 20, Pershotravneva Str., Kremenchuk, Ukraine*

## PSYCHOLOGICAL PECULIARITIES OF STUDENTS' SOCIAL MATURITY

*The article deals with psychological peculiarities of the main components of modern students' social maturity. The relevance of verifying the levels of social maturity is explained by the non-stable conditions of the country's development. The theoretical review of both domestic and foreign scientific sources on the problem of social maturity is performed. This made it possible to define "social maturity" as a certain level of forming the values, knowledge, skills and ethical qualities, which are enough for voluntary, skilful and responsible performing of all social roles formed as a result of personality development. The results of the empirical research aimed at studying the main components of social maturity (such as activity, independence; respect for others, optimism) are presented.*

**Keywords:** social maturity, socialization, activity, independence; respect for others, optimism.

**Problem statement.** Unstable socio-economic conditions in modern Ukraine demand the activation of concerned citizens able to take part in the process of the country's development. This requires instilling stable and relevant for the society ways of behaviour, critical thinking, and the high level of social maturity in young people. The main condition for personality development is his/her own social activity, oriented at learning important behaviour patterns and values, forming relations with the surrounding people. The fact of the ambiguousness of social skills acquisition by people with different levels of the development of such characteristics as activity, independence, responsibility, respect for others, optimism makes the research of social maturity of young people under the modern crisis conditions especially urgent.

**Review of recent researches and publications.** The theoretical basis of this research is the psychological concepts of socialization and individualization of a personality (by G. Andreeva, E. Erikson, I. Kon, A. Petrovsky, D. Feldstein and others); social determinations and value relations (V. Miasyshchev, V. Yadov and others); ideas of social development of a personality (L. Bozhovich, L. Vygotsky, V. Zinkiski, S. Rubinstein and others); research of individual psychological qualities of the development of teenagers (B. Ananiev, G. Kreig, V. Mukhina, M. Obozov).

**The aim of the article** is the overview of main approaches to the concept of social maturity in modern psychology and the allocation of its psychological peculiarities through the example of students.

The main task of the article is to perform the theoretical review of the issue of social maturity and to define the influence of the level of the development of activity, independence, responsibility, respect to others, and optimism on the social maturity in studentship.

**Major content.** The issue of social maturity was the subject of researches of such scholars as Plato, A. Adler, A.

Balitski, V. Behterev, F. Hegel, A. Gydzovski, M. Draganov, V. Kuzmin, A. Rean, C. Rogers, C. Jung and others. The main criterion of social maturity, according to Plato, is the learning of specific social rituals of the royalty of that time, which appreciated art and the mastering of its different types. R. Descartes considered its development through all customs and laws of the country. I. Kant has formed the basis of social maturity of a personality within the concept of "transcendental apperception", i.e. the principle of stability and systematic organisation of actions of general categories of empirical ego, providing internal unity of experience, science and nature [2]. F. Hegel considered social maturity to be a subjective notion that depends not only on the developed personality properties. It is the subjective evaluation which allows to unlock the potential of one's social maturity, which cannot be revealed because of the low self-esteem.

Let us highlight the main scientific approaches of defining the social maturity: culture-based, axiological, activity-based, and systemic. In the culture-based approach social maturity of a personality is first of all associated with comprehension, acceptance and interiorization of the other society by a person: the higher the level of mastering the culture in a specific society is, the higher the level of the development of social maturity is [1]. A. Rean highlights the issue of social maturity mentioning the dependence of its content on the specific culture [6].

According to the axiological approach, social maturity of a personality can be considered as encouraging a person to comprehend the spiritual and moral values, their interiorization that allows him/her to be an active subject of social relations. The ideas about the society values, their influence on the social culture and personality' social position are being formed during this process. In view of this the main criterion of the development of social maturity must be the level of mastering the system of spiritual and moral values common for the society. Such

an approach does not conflict with the cultural one because the system of spiritual and moral values is an obligatory part of culture and is defined by characteristic peculiarities of a specific society-historical formation [3].

The activity-based approach involves the analysis of social maturity from the point of view of person's readiness and the ability to perform socially useful activity. The study of the works of the representatives of this approach (V. Zinchenko, O. Leontieva) allows to single out the features of fully involved active subject (responsibility, independence) and determine social activity as a main indicator of personality's social maturity.

According to the systemic approach, social maturity is considered as a systemic quality. V. Behterev defines this notion basing on the following components of social maturity: political, labour, family-household, moral, etc. Social maturity of a personality is studied from the point of view of a subject, being not a set of objective characteristics in an area of diagnostic variables, but a person with a certain worldview as a precise microspace of individual meanings during internally determined behaviour.

A. Balitski, A. Gudzovski, M. Draganov, V. Kuzmin single out the subjective part of social maturity that depends on the aspects based on which a person considers himself/herself to be a self-determining subject, taking the responsibility, being an active subject of his/her own and social development [4].

The process of personality's social maturity development is revealed due to using the continuous approach which proves the non-finished, stable and continuous character of the process of development. By means of it one can explain such features of the development of social maturity as non-linearity and multidimensionality. In this regard G. Aleksandrova, L. Antsiferova, E. Kameleva, M. Lukichova distinguish such characteristics of the process of social maturity development as continuity. L. Antsiferova mentioned that a difficult and controversial process of personality formation includes three main aspects of maturity (physical, social and moral-psychological) and is not limited by the specific intervals of time.

Therefore the main philosophical approaches make it possible to define social maturity of a personality as a subjective phenomenon that depends on the historical and cultural levels of society development and is not limited by time.

In psychology the notion of social maturity is studied firstly by the representatives of behaviourism, cognitive and humanitarian schools. In behaviourism (according to D. Watson and E. Tolmen) social maturity is a set of programmed socially accepted behavioural reactions organized by a stable system of social habits [5]. According to the cognitive approach social maturity is a quite high level of the development of an ability of social understanding, content-creativity, forming of relevant and non-contradictive worldview based on constructs [1].

Within the humanitarian approach the phenomenon under research is understood as achieving a certain level

of realization of the necessity for self-improvement, self-actualization, as well as finding one's place in the society [14]. A. Adler, C. Rogers, C. Jung consider maturity from the standpoint of the description of intra-psychological conditions of subjective feelings of a person satisfied with his/her life and himself/herself. That is why in the context of the humanitarian psychology the research of social maturity is associated with such personality properties as independence, self-acceptance and self-determination. However A. Maslow and V. Frankl think that the determination of social maturity involves not only subjective, but socially relevant features of a personality. A socially mature person must comprehend him/herself as «a part of the world», specific society, maintaining individuality at the same time (G. Allport, V. Frankl, E. Fromm), improving, self-actualizing, positively influencing the society (A. Adler, E. Erikson, A. Maslow).

B. Ananiev, S. Rubinstein, V. Slobodchikov, A. Rean and V. Muhina consider the conditions of the development, qualities, processes, values of social maturity when dealing with its interpretation. Particularly, A. Rean suggests regarding self-development and self-actualization together with the phenomenon of self-transcendence (going beyond the limits, focusing on surrounding people, on one's social activity) [2].

Sharing the opinion of L. Kogan, E. Golovakha, O. Poznakov, M. Lukichev, S. Vishnakov, P. Yakobson, A. Rean, A. Gudzovski, we understand social maturity not only from the standpoint of formal markers of socialization, but considering interpersonal development, the distinguished qualities of a person that provide his/her conscious, active and creative life. The result of personality formation is maturity achievement as the ability for the independent and responsible choice taking into account one's capabilities and social necessities [6].

The basic nature of social maturity is fully revealed by its structural components. Basing on the review of the works of E. Dotsenko, N. Leonov we can distinguish the main components of the phenomenon under research: activity, independence, responsibility, respect for others, and optimism [4].

Activity involves proactive approach to life, implementation of personal and social aims, ability to make a conscious choice; assertiveness, i.e. person's ability to justify his/her rights, without breaking the rights of others; straightforward and open behaviour in relations with other people; active position in communication.

Independence is responsible for the formed identity, ability to be independent of external influences and evaluations, regulation of own behaviour taking into account social situations, autonomy; it includes the comprehension of social roles, ability to perceive other's points of view, tolerance.

Responsibility involves revealing one's identity and consequences of one's actions according to other people's views and situations, ability to bear responsibility for one's actions to other people, the society, and oneself.

Socially oriented indicator of this component is social responsibility for the implementation of joint goals, social consequences of behaviour.

Respect means esteem for oneself and others through self-acceptance and tolerance, reasonable self-esteem, real level of ambitions.

Optimism includes the positive approach to life, conscious vision of the future evaluated from the standpoint of the desired achievements and capabilities; self-belief, trust to others and positive attitude towards them.

Hereby social maturity is a certain level of formed values, knowledge, skills and ethical qualities, sufficient for the voluntary, skilful and responsible performing of all social roles in the process of personality development.

Under the conditions of political, economic and social changes in Ukraine many young people face social difficulties and barriers. Some time is required to get adapted to the new conditions, overcome the fears, to form a new type of thinking, etc. So the distinguishing of the levels of social maturity of modern young people, especially among students, is an important task in the context of further socialization of a personality.

The empirical research involved 60 first- and second-year students of Kremenchuk Mykhailo Ostrohradskyi National University, majoring in Psychology (30 students) and Computer sciences (30 students). The research was performed in February-March, 2016.

The following methods have been used in order to study the influence of the levels of the development of social maturity components on social maturity: test "Levels of personality socialization" by R. Mokshantsev, "Survey of life positioning" by E. Bern, survey of communicative tolerance by V. Boiko, methodology of distinguishing general self-esteem by G. Kazantsev, methodology of distinguishing the level of responsibility by M. Savchin and methodology "Career anchors" by E. Schein.

The research results according to the methodology of R. Mokshantsev have shown that 53% of students majoring in Psychology have a low level of social maturity, 40% of them have a high level of social maturity. We start with the overview of the components of the high level of social maturity. Besides the low self-esteem is observed in 80% of students with the formed level of maturity; 70% of students have the main life position "Good-Good" (a person has an equal positive attitude both towards oneself and others); 80% of students are tolerant and 60% of them are responsible. The low level of social maturity is characterized by the low self-esteem (87% of students), life attitude "Good-Good" (54% of students) and tolerance (60% of students). The indicator of responsibility is 87% which is higher compared to the students with the high level of social maturity. Based on the methodology "Anchors of career" by E. Stein we note the non-dependence of anchors of career on the levels of social maturity: job security and

place of living are not relevant for 88% of students, working for people and integration of life styles are considered to be relevant for 56% of them.

Based on the results of the methodology by R. Mokshantsev it has been discovered that 67% of students majoring in computer sciences have the low level of social maturity, and only 30% have the high one. First the components of the high level of social maturity should be considered. The low self-esteem prevails among students majoring in computer sciences (65%). It has been discovered that 80% of these students have the main life position "Good-Good"; 55% are characterised by tolerance and 60% are responsible. The students with the low level of socialization have equal life attitudes: "Good-Good" (33% of them), "Good-Bad" (33% of them) and "Bad-Good" (33% of them). Along with this 89% of them are characterized by the medium level of tolerance, 97% - by responsibility and 66% - by low self-esteem. Regardless of the level of socialization the main anchor of career among students majoring in computer sciences is job security (for 55% of students), place of living is not so relevant for 56% of them.

Thus, the research results allow to state that most of students majoring in Psychology have the low level of social maturity (53%), but 67% of students majoring in computer sciences have the high one. At the same time 85% of students regardless of the major have the low level of self-esteem, 65% of them have a positive attitude towards themselves and others, and 72% of the surveyed have medium level of responsibility. 68% of students majoring in Psychology regardless of the level of social maturity are characterized by the high level of tolerance, while another group of students with the low level of socialization is characterized by the medium level of tolerance. The students do not pay attention to the stability of the place of living. However, the students majoring in psychology do not consider the place of work as a relevant one, while it is considered to be important for the students majoring in computer sciences.

**Conclusions and prospects for the further research.** As a result of the carried out research the following correlations have been justified: 1) humanities-minded students have the lower level of socialization compared to the students majoring in computer sciences; 2) the leading life position of students regardless of their major is the positive attitude towards themselves and others; low self-esteem; medium responsibility; 3) working for people and integration of lifestyles are important for the students majoring in Psychology, and the place of employment is relevant for students majoring in computer sciences.

The prospects for the further research involve defining the conditions of increasing the levels of students' self-esteem and creation of training programs to improve their level of social maturity.

## ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Андреева Г. М. Соціальна психологія: підручник / Г. М. Андреева. – М. : Аспект Пресс, 1999. – 375 с.
2. Гудзовская А. А. Социально-психологическое исследование становления социальной зрелости / А. А. Гудзовская. – Самара : АСТ, 1998. – 230 с.
3. Каменская Е. Н. Социальная психология : конспект лекций: учебное пособие / Е. Н. Каменская. – Ростов н/Д. : Феникс, 2009. – 186 с.

## ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Andreeva, G. M. (1999). *Sotsialna psikhologhiia: pidruchnyk [Social Psychology: a textbook]*. Moscow: Aspekt Press [in Ukrainian].
2. Gudzovskaya, A. A. (1998). *Sotsialno-psikhologicheskoe issledovanie stanovleniya sotsialnoy zrelosti [Psychosocial research of social maturity formation]*. Samara: AST [in Russian].
3. Kamenskaya, E. N. (2009). *Sotsialnaya psikhologiya : konspekt lektsiy: uchebnoe posobie [Social Psychology: lectures: tutorial]*. Rostov n/D.: Feniks [in Russian].

4. Орбан-Лембрик Л. Е. Соціальна психологія: підручник / Л. Е. Орбан-Лембрик. – К. : Либідь, 2004. – Кн. 1. – 576 с.
5. Поликанова И. Е. Социализация личности / И. Е. Поликанова // *Философия и общество*. – СПб. : Питер, 2003. – № 2. – С. 84-107.
6. Столяренко Л. Д. Социальная психология / Л. Д. Столяренко, С. И. Самыгин. – Ростов н/Д. : Феникс, 2009. – 476 с.

4. Orban-Lembrik, L. E. (2004). *Sotsialna psikhologhiia: pidruchnyk [Social Psychology: textbook]*. Kuiv: Libid [in Ukrainian].
5. Polikanova, I. E. (2003). *Sotsializatsiya lichnosti [Socialization of a person]*. *Filosofiya i obshchestvo – Philosophy and Society*, 2, 84-107 [in Russian].
6. Stolyarenko, L. D. & Samygin, S. I. (2009). *Sotsialnaya psikhologiya [Social Psychology]*. Rostov n/D. : Feniks [in Russian].

*Руслана Миколаївна Білоус,*

*кандидат психологічних наук, доцент кафедри психології, педагогіки і філософії.*

*Дар'я Олегівна Писаренко,*

*студентка 5 курсу з напрямку «Психологія»,*

*Кременчуцький національний університет імені М. Остроградського,*

*вул. Першотравнева, 20, м. Кременчук, Україна*

## ПСИХОЛОГІЧНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ ЗРІЛОСТІ СТУДЕНТІВ

Нестабільність соціально-економічних умов у сучасній Україні посилює можливість виникнення ситуацій, пов'язаних зі стресами, конфліктами та зміною соціальних ролей, що потребує від особистості негайного прийняття рішень, планування свого життя, вміння володіти собою, будувати відносини з оточуючими, а також мати якості, що дозволяють ефективно реалізовувати себе в професійних та соціальних сферах. Метою статті є розгляд основних підходів до поняття соціальної зрілості у сучасній психології та виявлення її психологічних особливостей у студентів. У статті систематизовано погляди провідних науковців щодо визначення поняття соціальної зрілості, що дозволило конкретизувати соціальну зрілість особистості як певний рівень сформованості установок, знань, умінь і етичних якостей, достатній для добровільного, умілого та відповідального виконання усієї сукупності соціальних ролей, що сформувався у результаті становлення особистості. Розглянуто основні компоненти соціальної зрілості та встановлено вплив рівня розвитку активності, самостійності, відповідальності, поваги до інших, оптимізму на соціальну зрілість у студентському віці. Наголошено на актуальності з'ясування рівнів соціальної зрілості в умовах сучасного розвитку країни. В експерименті брали участь студенти першого та другого курсів Кременчуцького національного університету ім. Михайла Остроградського за напрямками підготовки «Психологія» та «Інформатика». Всього було опитано 60 студентів (30 психологів і 30 інформатиків). У дослідженні, яке проводилося в лютому-березні 2016 року, було використано такі методики: тест «Рівні соціалізації особистості» Р. І. Мокшанцева, «Опитувальник життєвої позиції» за Е. Берном, опитувальник комунікативної толерантності В. В. Бойко, методика визначення загальної самооцінки Г. М. Казанцевої, методика визначення рівня відповідальності за М. В. Савчиним та методика «Якорі кар'єри» Е. Штейна. За результатами дослідження встановлено: гуманітарії мають нижчий рівень соціалізації на відміну від студентів технічного напрямку підготовки; незалежно від профілю підготовки: провідною життєвою позицією студентів є позитивна орієнтація до себе та до інших; низька самооцінка; середня відповідальність; для психологів актуальними є служіння людям та інтеграція стилів життя, а для інформатиків – місце роботи.

**Ключові слова:** соціальна зрілість, соціалізація, активність, самостійність, відповідальність, повага до інших, оптимізм.

*Руслана Николаевна Белоус,  
кандидат психологических наук, доцент кафедры психологии, педагогики и философии,  
Дарья Олеговна Писаренко,  
студентка 5 курса, специальность «Психология»,  
Кременчугский национальный университет имени М. Остроградского,  
ул. Первомайская, 20, м. Кременчук, Украина*

### **ПСИХОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ ЗРЕЛОСТИ СТУДЕНТОВ**

Нестабильность социально-экономических условий в современной Украине усиливает возможность возникновения ситуаций, связанных со стрессами, конфликтами и изменением социальных ролей, что требует от личности немедленного принятия решений, планирования своей жизни, умения владеть собой, строить отношения с окружающими, а также обладать качествами, позволяющими эффективно реализовывать себя в профессиональных и социальных сферах. Целью статьи является рассмотрение основных подходов к понятию социальной зрелости в современной психологии и выявления ее психологических особенностей у студентов. В статье систематизированы взгляды ведущих ученых относительно определения понятия социальной зрелости, что позволило конкретизировать социальную зрелость личности как определенный уровень сформированности установок, знаний, умений и этических качеств, достаточный для добровольного, умелого и ответственного выполнения всей совокупности социальных ролей, сформировавшийся в результате становления личности. Рассмотрены основные компоненты социальной зрелости и установлено влияние уровня развития активности, самостоятельности, ответственности, уважения к другим, оптимизма на социальную зрелость в студенческом возрасте. Отмечена актуальность выяснения уровней социальной зрелости в условиях современного развития страны. В эксперименте принимали участие студенты первого и второго курсов Кременчугского национального университета им. Михаила Остроградского по направлениям подготовки «Психология» и «Информатика». Всего опрошено 60 человек (30 психологов и 30 информатиков). В исследовании, которое проводилось в феврале-марте 2016 года, были использованы следующие методики: тест «Уровни социализации личности» Р. И. Мокшанцева, «Опросник жизненной позиции» по Э. Берну, опросник коммуникативной толерантности В. В. Бойко, методика определения общей самооценки Г. Н. Казанцевой, методика определения уровня ответственности по М. В. Савчину и методика «Якоря карьеры» Э. Штейна. По результатам исследования установлено: гуманитарии имеют более низкий уровень социализации в отличие от студентов технического направления; независимо от профиля подготовки: ведущей жизненной позицией студентов является положительное отношение к себе и другим; низкая самооценка; средний уровень ответственности; для психологов актуальны служение людям и интеграция стилей жизни, а для информатиков – место работы.

**Ключевые слова:** социальная зрелость, социализация, активность, ответственность, самостоятельность, уважение к другим, оптимизм.

*Подано до редакції 01.03.2016*

*Рецензент: д. пед. н., проф. Л. В. Герасименко*