DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 753   95   CG 010 214

AUTHOR   Josselson, Ruthellen; And Others
TITLE   Phenomenological Aspects of Psychosocial Maturity in
                Adolescence. Report No. 198.
INSTITUTION   Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md. Center for the
                Study of Social Organization of Schools.
SPONS AGENCY   National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington,
                D.C.
REPORT NO   R-198
PUB DATE   Jun 75
CONTRACT   NE-C-00-3-0113
NOTE   82p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS   *Adolescence; Case Studies; *Maturity Tests;
                Personality Assessment; *Personality Tests;
                *Psychological Patterns; Research Projects; *Self
                Esteem; Social Psychology
IDENTIFIERS   *Psychosocial Maturity (PSM) Inventory

ABSTRACT
                Forty-one subjects who score at the high and low
extremes of the Psychosocial Maturity (PSM) Inventory were
intensively interviewed. These interview data were analyzed to
contrast the phenomenological and psychodynamic forces in the lives
of these subjects that influence their current state of psychosocial
maturity. Case material is presented. Discussion focuses on the
interplay between the processes of adolescent ego development and the
traits of psychosocial maturity. The growth of impulse control,
increases in self esteem and gains in autonomy are all found to
contribute to greater maturity. Heterosexual behavior, by contrast,
bears a more complex relationship to psychosocial maturity in
adolescence. Implications for theory are discussed with respect to
psychoanalytic and Eriksonian literature. (Author)

PHENOMENOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF PSYCHOSOCIAL MATURITY IN ADOLESCENCE

CONTRACT NO. NE-C-00-3-0113

WORK UNIT NO. 3, MILESTONES E and G

RUTHELLEN JOSSELSON

ELLEN GREENBERGER

DANIEL McCONOCHIE

Report No. 198

June 1975

Center for Social Organization of Schools

Report No. 198

June, 1975

PHENOMENOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF PSYCHOSOCIAL MATURITY IN ADOLESCENCE

Ruthellen Josselson, Ellen Greenberger and Daniel McConochie

2A

STAFF

John L. Holland, Director

James M. McPartland, Associate Director

Karl Alexander	Nancy L. Karweit
Denise C. Daiger	Marie Makurath
David L. DeVries	Daniel D. McConochie
Joyce L. Epstein	Donna H. McCulloch
Stephanie G. Freeman	Edward McDill
Gary D. Gottfredson	James W. Michaels
Ellen Greenberger	James M. Richards
Edward J. Harsch	Susan L. Shackman
Rosemary Hollick	Rebecca H. Sherman
John H. Hollifield	Julian C. Stanley
Ruthellen Josselson	

Introductory Statement

The Center for Social Organization of Schools has two primary objectives: to develop a scientific knowledge of how schools affect their students, and to use this knowledge to develop better school practices and organization.

The Center works through three programs to achieve its objectives. The Schools and Maturity program is studying the effects of School, family, and peer group experiences on the development of attitudes consistent with psychosocial maturity. The objectives are to formulate, assess, and research important educational goals other than traditional academic achievement. The School Organization program is currently concerned with authority-control structures, task structures, reward systems, and peer group processes in schools. The Careers program (formerly Careers and Curricula) bases its work upon a theory of career development. It has developed a self-administered vocational guidance device and a self-directed career program to promote vocational development and to foster satisfying curricular decisions for high school, college, and adult populations.

This report, prepared by the Schools and Maturity Program, uses intensive interview data to examine how phenomenological and psychodynamic forces influence adolescent psychosocial maturity.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, educators have begun giving more serious attention to the non-academic outcomes of the socialization of youth. Schools have begun to acknowledge their inevitable role in shaping people as well as imparting information. While families have always been charged with the role of socializers, few guidelines have been available for promoting optimal psychosocial growth in their offspring. Observers of youth have noted the different capacities of young people to effectively deal with themselves, with others, and with their societies. But the lack of a careful conceptionalization of non-academic outcomes of development and the concomitant lack of adequate measurement tools has made it difficult to understand these disparities in the self and social attitudes of young people.

The concept of psychosocial maturity is an attempt to formulate the ideal end-points of growth, socialization and development.[1] It incorporates biological, psychological and sociological schemata of maturity, and postulates three dimensions of this attribute: Individual Adequacy -- the capacity to function effectively on one's own; Interpersonal Adequacy -- the capacity to interact satisfactorily with others; and Social Adequacy -- the capacity to contribute to social cohesion. The specific traits subsumed under each of these capacities, and brief definitions of these traits, are listed in Table 1.

The psychosocial maturity model has been operationalized by a self-report attitude inventory which has been shown to have adequate levels of reliability and validity (Greenberger et al., 1975) with groups aged 10-18 years. Such measurement has enabled a variety of investigations to explore

---

For a complete discussion, see Greenberger and Sørensen (1975).

the determinants of psychosocial maturity. Demographic and background variables such as race, sex, family socioeconomic status, and academic achievement level have all been shown to bear complex relationships to psychosocial maturity (Greenberger et al., 1974; McConochie et al., 1974).

While the survey analysis approach has allowed for the discovery of interlocking relationships among complex variables, the rigors of the regression equation require the subordination of the individual, within whom psychosocial maturity ultimately resides. , Without a phenomenological framework phrased in individual terms, between-group variance is difficult to fully interpret.

This study employs intensive interviewing to contrast the experiential and psychodynamic realities of youngsters who score at the two extremes of the psychosocial maturity (PSM) scales. It attempts to look across 41 well-studied 17-year-olds for developmental paradigms which seem to predispose to the presence or absence of the traits of psychosocial maturity.

Using the techniques of clinical psychology, this study attempts to link psychometric measurement with both phenomenological realities and psychodynamic understanding. Previous research informs us that the traits central to our concept of psychosocial maturity are by no means the conscious focus of adolescents' concerns. While adolescents may learn geometry in high school, they take no course in identity formation or social commitment. Yet, the development of these and other aspects of psychosocial maturity proceeds, albeit silently and often secretly, through adolescence. What is so troublesome about even the best statistical data is the lack of richness of detail about the specifics of people's lives. We do not know enough about the particular theatres in which development takes place.

6

2

In addition, we need to examine how the development of psychosocial maturity coincides with the theoretically derived stages of adolescent development. One might expect, for example, that the individual low in psychosocial maturity would appear to be struggling with the early and middle adolescent issues of impulse control, sexual identity and autonomy. Similarly, the more psychosocially mature adolescent might be expected to emerge, on intensive study, as more invested in late adolescent issues of social role choices and true independence.

7

Table 1

Detailed Model of Psychosocial Maturity[a]

Individual Adequacy:

Self-Reliance

absence of excessive need for social validation
sense of control
initiative

Work Orientation

general work skills
standards of competence
pleasure in work

Identity

clarity of self-concept
consideration of life goals
self-esteem
internalized values

Interpersonal Adequacy:

Communication Skills

ability to encode messages
ability to decode messages
empathy

Enlightened Trust

rational dependence
rejection of simplistic views of human nature
awareness of constraints on trustworthiness

Knowledge of Major Roles

role-appropriate behavior
management of role conflict

Social Adequacy:

Social Commitment

feelings of community
willingness to modify personal goals in favor of social goals
readiness to form alliances
interest in long-term social goals

Openness to Socio-political Change

general openness to change
recognition of costs of status quo
recognition of costs of change

Tolerance of Individual and Cultural Differences

willingness to interact with people who differ from the norm
sensitivity to the rights of people who differ from the norm
awareness of costs and benefits of tolerance

[a]Reprinted from Greenberger et.al. (1974).

8   4

The Psychosocial Maturity (PSM) Inventory was administered to 192 11th grade students at a relatively small public junior-senior high school. The original intent was to choose the 25 highest and 25 lowest scores for further data collection. "High" and "low" were determined by absolute scores on the combined indices of Individual and Social Adequacy.[1] This approach was modified when it became clear that the highest scorers were greatly over-represented by girls while the lowest scorers were almost all boys. As a result, the sex difference would have been confounded with any independent differences in psychosocial maturity.

Therefore, the interview sample was chosen separately for each sex. The twelve highest boys were selected for comparison with the twelve lowest boys; similarly the twelve highest girls were chosen to be compared with the twelve lowest girls. The final sample, because of tape recorder failure and other mechanical problems, consisted of 9 high boys, 11 low boys, 11 high girls

Table 2

Individual and Social Adequacy Scores for the Interview Sample

	Individual Adequacy	Social Adequacy
High PSM Boys	10.30	10.07
Low PSM Boys	7.34	7.52
High PSM Girls	10.66	11.05
Low PSM Girls	7.65	8.39

[1]See Greenberger et al. 1975, for a discussion of the computation of these scores.

9

and 10 low girls. Table 2 presents overall PSM scores for each of the four groups. Differences between high and low subjects are significant within each sex.

Subjects in the four groups were interviewed for an hour by one of four interviewers.[1] The interview schedule is presented in Appendix A. All interviews were recorded and later transcribed for analysis. Although the transcribed interviews were coded question by question, it became clear that the richness of the data lay in the spontaneous material elicited by the open-endedness of questions and in the patterns of thematic concerns characteristic of each individual. A developmental-phenomenological portrait was written for each subject. These individual portraits were then sorted into groups and each group was analyzed in terms of the common themes which emerged from the portraits.

Because each sex confronts somewhat different developmental tasks at adolescence, comparisons and contrasts were constructed within each sex.

While this paper is primarily devoted to a discussion of the qualitative differences between high and low maturity young people, results of some of the coding analyses and background data are also presented.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

The forty-one young people in this sample are offspring of white, working class families. Their parents appear to be upwardly mobile and hope to realize their own frustrated economic goals through the achievements of their children. These are children who have grown up to be impressed by the merits of financial security. While not poor, they have at least lived with enough scarcity and job insecurity to make economic considerations an important part of their lives.

The neighborhood where these students grew up was described by several administrators and teachers in the school as "redneck" and "hardhat." The impression that one gains from the students is that it is a place where concern with material success predominates -- everyone is worried about having enough money for ever-increasing material wants. Fathers of these young people have jobs, not professions. Retirement benefits, pay rates, and job security outweigh the noneconomic rewards of these jobs. Few subjects even know exactly what it is that their father does, but the boys at least, feel pressure from their families to do better than he has. There are many mothers of our subjects who work, but they appear to do this to add to the family income, or, in some cases, "to get out of the house."

Almost all of the families in this sample are intact. This is a relatively stable community where extended family ties are prominent. Family size varied in the sample from an only child to a child who is one of nine siblings. Several of our youngsters have siblings who are 10 - 15 years older than they are.

11

...because going to college is a kind of ideal among the parents of these ... our subjects report their awareness of their parents' wish for them to do not what they did, but what they did not do. Some subjects, for example, are third or fourth in a line of siblings who did not go to college and feel the pressure mounting as the ball bounces down the line. One interesting family dynamic that emerges is the sense among sibs that someone has to be "chosen" to embody parental dreams.

Nearly all the subjects in the sample have at some time themselves had a job. Many work after school or weekends; some who find it too difficult to keep up with schoolwork and hold a job at the same time work only in the summer. Most of these teenagers place value on being as financially indepen- dent of their parents as possible. This, however, appears to be more a community ethic than a developmental phenomenon. Having a car is extremely important to these youngsters. Often, their parents help them in purchasing a car but then insist that they pay their own upkeep and insurance. This is a kind of <u>rite de passage</u> to financial responsibility and our subjects often sound just like one could envision their parents as they worry over getting the money together to meet the next payment. Girls who are not interested in cars experience a similar transition with respect to buying clothes.

At this point in their development, none of these young people foresee a life for themselves far different from that of their parents. When asked if they want to have the same kind of life as their same sex parent, however, nearly all of them say no. When this is explored, it becomes clear that they wish for a different life in terms of quantity, not structure. That is, they want more money or a better job or more happiness or fewer problems. But the

12

a

structure is essentially the same.   Boys and girls both see themselves as either working or going to college, marrying in their early 20's and starting a family.   Many of the girls speak of a wish to return to work after their children are old enough to be somewhat independent of them; they are not ideological about it, but it is all they can imagine for themselves.

In religious composition, the sample is approximately 2/3 Protestant and 1/3 Catholic.   Half of our subjects are regular churchgoers and a few are extremely involved in church, generally through youth groups.

Politically, one can only say that these young people are apolitical, uninterested in ideology and, in large measure, uninformed.   Interviews took place during the time when the Energy Crisis and the Watergate phenomena were both prominent nationally.   A few subjects mentioned these as issues they had opinions about and some complained about inflation.   Even those few who did express some opinion on something political were striking in their lack of any real though or insight into the dialectics of the larger society.

QUANTITATIVE ASPECTS OF THE SAMPLE

Mean grade point averages and mean father's education level for each of the four groups are presented in Table 3. Low maturity boys do considerably more poorly in school than do the other groups. High boys do not differ from low boys in the level of their father's education, but high girls come from homes where fathers are better educated than the fathers of the low girls.

Table 3

Characteristics of the Sample

	High PSM Boys	Low PSM Boys	High PSM Girls	Low PSM Girls
A. Mean Grade Point Average	3.0	2.3	2.9	2.9
B. Mean level of father's education	3.0	3.0	3.4	2.3

The groups do not significantly differ in their choice of high school program. Each group is fairly evenly composed of academic and vocational students except for the high maturity boys where a greater proportion are in an academic program.

It was also of interest to gain some perspective on these students by exploring how they are viewed by other people. For another study[1], each

---

[1]For details of the methodology of this data collection, see Josselson et al., 1975.

14

10

student in the 11th grade had been asked to "nominate" three students from the entire 11th grade who fit a variety of descriptions ranging from "a good leader" to "well-liked." Fourteen 11th grade teachers had been asked to complete a similar form. Therefore, we were able to gain some information on how the high and low extreme groups were seen by peers and teachers. These data are presented in Table 4.

The distribution of these nominations indicates that girls and boys at different levels of psychosocial maturity are viewed and valued differently by their teachers and peers. The teachers' nominations include half of the low maturity boys among the poor workers, but recognize only two of the high maturity boys as outstandingly good workers. The teachers do, however, include one-third of the high maturity boys in the category "self-reliant." High and low maturity girls are generally not sharply differentiated in the teachers' nominations except that the high maturity girls appear to be the students whom teachers like best.

The peer's nominations are most striking in the degree to which the high maturity boys are overlooked. It is the low maturity boys who are valued as leaders, who are well-liked and admired. Conversely, the high maturity girls get nominated more often by their peers as good leaders and as getting along well with others. These data provide some suggestion that low maturity among boys is more highly valued in this subculture whereas higher maturity brings girls more social rewards.

These quantitative data are intended to serve as a context in which to place the qualitative findings which follow. Two case studies for each of the four sex-PSM types will be presented and followed by a discussion of the themes characteristic of all the subjects in that particular category.

15

Table 4

Teachers' and Peers' Nominations of Interview Sample

A. Teachers' nominations of students: number of subjects nominated by at least one teacher as:

	High PSM Boys (n=9)	Low PSM Boys (n=11)	High PSM Girls (n=11)	Low PSM Girls (n=10)
Good Worker	2	0	6	5
Poor Worker	0	5	1	0
Self-reliant	3	1	7	4
Low in self-reliance	1	4	1	1
Well-liked	0	2	4	0

B. Peers' nominations of students: number of subjects nominated by at least two peers as:

	High PSM Boys	Low PSM Boys	High PSM Girls	Low PSM Girls
Good leader	1	4	3	0
Says what they think	1	6	5	1
Gets along well with people who are different from them	0	1	7	2
Well-liked	1	5	4	3
Goes out of their way to help others	2	2	4	3
Person you most admire	1	3	4	3

16

12

The Case of Larry

Larry was striking in the unusualness of his appearance. Unlike most of the other students in the high school, he had wildly unkempt long hair and self-consciously "dude"-type clothes. He was extremely anxious at the beginning of the interview, could barely answer questions or look at the interviewer. As the interview progressed, however, he relaxed and opened up almost to the point of too much intimacy, trying to make the interview into a quasi-counseling session.

In the framework of Larry's life, school has little place. He is taking a general course and is trying to pick up enough credits to graduate as soon as possible. The subjects he likes are ones where he can work with his hands and "enjoy seeing the finished product." He has no close relationships with teachers and participates in no clubs or groups.

Larry's time and emotional energy is primarily directed towards his motorcycles and his girlfriend. He has, however, not been able to make his interest in motorcycles a gratifying activity. Three times he blew up his cycles racing them, and in telling about this, he seems to express in his tone the frustration, helplessness and self-blame of someone enmeshed in self-defeating behavior.

Since the loss of his cycles, he has spent nearly all of his free time with his girlfriend. He tells us little about this relationship, however, beyond the fact that she is a "nice girl" and they spend most of their time at her house. He no longer maintains close friendships with other boys. Asked to describe his peers in the school, Larry replies, "They're all the same -- drink, have a good time, smoke a little pot."

Probing further, one finds that Larry's object world is differentiated primarily into aggressive, hypermasculine bad objects and nurturant, hyper-feminine good objects. His own identity seems split between these two object representations. For example, when asked what are the most important things a friend should be, Larry begins talking about how a friend should be someone who helps you when you get into trouble. Then he immediately begins relating an experience of being beaten up by a gang, speaks scornfully of guys who act "too tough," then says, "I don't go around bragging, but I can handle

17

myself." Recurring throughout the interview are these themes of aggression and passivity, and his concerns about his own masculinity.

Some of Larry's internal conflicts are traceable to a highly ambivalent relationship with his father. On the one hand, he idealizes his father: "I'm used to having things. I'm not the kind of kid who wants and wants. I'm happy with what I got, but he always gives and I don't think I'll be able to do that for my kids because I'm so used to him doing it for me and I know I'm never going to be able to do it." On the other hand, there is suppressed rage at his father for expecting too much of him and giving too little of himself. Despite Larry's gratitude for the things his father gives him, he also feels his father spends too little time at home. Larry's father had wanted him to go to college, but Larry wants to get a job to make money to get married. He sees his future centered on having two kids, a boy and a girl, and buying things for them. Asked how his father feels about his plans, Larry says sadly, "He says I'm a fool."

Larry feels support from his mother who tells him that he has the right to make his own decisions for his life. But this does not seem to mitigate Larry's complex struggle over identification with and rebellion against his father. It is particularly interesting, in light of how conflicted Larry is with respect to his parents, that he declares, "I got the greatest parents in the world" and emphatically denies that he would like them to be different in any way at all. He feels that his family and his girlfriend have been "my whole life" because "they treat me good and I wouldn't want anything to happen to them."

In a more diffused way, however, Larry expresses his conviction that adults don't really understand teenagers, particularly in terms of drugs and sex. What also comes through here is Larry's tremendous need for adult approval, and his difficulty in giving up his dependency on them.

In general, Larry seems to be barely managing to maintain himself in the face of deep, perhaps longstanding conflicts over aggression, dependency and resultant guilt. Most of these emotional crises are projected outward, leaving him feeling depressed, anxious and often helpless. He has little self-esteem and relies almost exclusively on others' approval for any sense of self-worth. While on the surface, Larry appears to be a teenager involved in "usual" teenage concerns about motorcycles, girls and drugs, it is clear that on a deeper level these activities are used in the service of countering regressive wishes. His needs to be taken care of, while he is trying to transform them into a wish to take care of others, overshadow his development.

The Case of Leonard

Leonard approached the interview with much anxiety, but warmed up quickly when he found the interviewer to be non-critical. Since he is not very fluent verbally, he sometimes had difficulty expressing himself, but he was, on the whole, straightforward about his experiences and feelings.

Although taking a college preparatory course, Leonard has given no thought to where he might like to go to college or what he might like to study. One gets little sense of why Leonard is taking the college course until he explains later that his father wants him to go to college so he can get a good job. Reflecting on this, Leonard says, "I don't know how he's going to afford college ...." and his tone implies that he hopes these financial concerns will let him off the hook. Leonard explains further, sounding a bit depressed, "I'm not that smart in school, so   ." It is clear that he fears not meeting his father's expectations.

Leonard seems to feel pessimistic about his own future. His older brother took the same kind of skilled labor job as their father, and Leonard fears that he is inevitably headed for the same thing. He sees them working ten hours a day six days a week and does not find this an appealing prospect for himself. Sadly he says, "Life is fun now, but I guess sooner or later, you're going to have to work."

Leonard's current investments are centered on sports, each season bringing a different one for him to play. His friends are those who share his enthusiasm for sports, people who "like to do what I like to do." These friends are clearly important to him; they all just "hang around" together or go to dances. Leonard says later on that having friends and fitting in with the gang are the most important problems a teenager faces, a clue to just how central having friends has been in his life. He used to go steady, but now goes out with several different girls; he feels that if he has just one girl, she makes demands on him and he gets too tied down. Primarily, he finds that a girlfriend inter- feres with the time he can spend with his friends.

Throughout the interview, Leonard returns to the theme of people, primarily authority figures, making demands on him and his need to struggle against them. The teachers he likes, for example, are the ones who "are not strict and let you say what you want as long as you don't cuss." He sees his parents as restrictive in insisting that he be in at a certain time and avoid drugs and alcohol. At the same time, Leonard is ambivalent about these authorities; he is not merely

19

rebellious. He says of his football coach, "He'll yell at you in the field, but then you understand why he did it . . . I figure they're yelling to help you." Or of his father, "Last time I got caught drinking beer, my father whacked me in the mouth. I guess I had it coming cause he warned me."

Leonard describes his mother as both understanding and firm, but he doesn't feel that either of his parents really trust him. They won't let him drive because his brother once got drunk and wrecked the car; he feels his parents think he would do the same thing. He spends as little time at home as possible, feeling that "there's nothing to do around there." His anger at his parents remains buried or expressed in impulsive action.

In his part-time job, Leonard is able to earn some of his own money. He dislikes his boss who he feels yells at him a lot, but he stays on for the money. Most of Leonard's dreams for himself are couched in material things—having a home, a car and lots of money.

Overall, Leonard appears to be masking a lot of depressive feelings with controlled indifference. Beneath his apparent "live for today and have fun" attitude, he seems to fear his lack of goals and his inability to gain control of his life. He consciously worries about falling into the same life pattern as his father; at the same time, he doubts his ability to do otherwise. Since he feels his parents' approval to be a lost cause, his self-esteem is lodged in his peers' liking for him. Part of his fear of the future may derive from his wish to maintain what affection he does receive from his peer activities; he does not yet have a good substitute for "the gang".

20

Discussion

Larry and Leonard are at the extremes of the variance of the low maturity
boys: they are probably more different from each other than are any other two
boys in the low group. Their cases were presented individually in order to
suggest the network of psychosocial dynamics from which the themes discussed
below are drawn. As the reader will discover, not all of the themes in the
composite portrait can be applied in each case. Instead, this discussion
is intended to highlight recurrent themes, developmental and characterological
phenomena which are restated among the subjects often enough to be candidates
for the composite sketch.

A number of themes predominate in the phenomenological world of the 11
low-maturity boys. In general, they are non-introspective and not terribly
self aware. Their focus is on the here and now, in current life problems
and on developmental tasks which they seem to view as continuing indefinitely.

Their world is one filled with concern about sports, cars and motorcycles,
girls and their vicissitudes, adults who yell at you, friends who like you or
put you down hard, the complexities of staying out of trouble and the con-
comitant temptations of drink, dope and reckless driving which, for them, are
the main paths to trouble.

These low boys are not an ambitious group, although some do plan to attend
college. In most cases, even college attendance, a year in the future, tends
to be a decision made by others. Their energy and enthusiasm are more
focused in the present, in, as one boy put it "staying in shape and having a
good season." If one were to pick a theme which best characterizes this group it
would probably be the developmental problem of activity-passivity which is
itself related to the problem of formulating an identity as a man.

21

In their overt behavior and in the way they speak of themselves, these low mature boys exhibit great reliance on external forces to guide their lives. They look to others to get jobs for them or to get them into college. When there is no important other person ready to take the controls, they simply trust, as Leonard does, that sooner or later, somehow or other, their future will be decided. In their free time, they often merely wait "for something to happen," again an indication of their disinclination to actively decide. This passivity stands in marked contrast to their preoccupation with hypermasculine activity -- sports, cycles and in one case, guns.

Impulses, primarily aggressive impulses, are a problem for these boys. Their interviews abound with allusions to fights, being tough and the dangers of getting too mad. In their code, acting too tough or fighting is disapproved of, yet it is important to these boys to reassure themselves that they are tested and tough enough for whatever situation may arise. Self-control is valued and, although they speak of it only obliquely, they are grateful for external controlling agents -- parents, teachers and friends -- who help keep their impulses in check.

Surprisingly, this group of boys whose composite ego-ideal is the hard, self-assured athletic star, is uniformly very preoccupied with interpersonal success. Their self-esteem is primarily lodged in being liked by others. Sports are fun, they are an important sublimation of aggressive energy, but above all, people like you if you are an athlete. Activities like sports are also a source of making friends, of having an interest to share. Above all, these boys emphasize the making and maintenance of friendships as one

22

of the major problems a teenager faces. This great need for approval has the attendant effect of making these boys very susceptible to group pressure. One boy, for example, defines immaturity as

"not drinking or pulling pranks -- not going along with the rest of the group."

To him, maturity is being like the gang.

Having a girlfriend combines the need for interpersonal approval and masculine self-definition. It is striking that the majority of boys in this group either are currently going steady or have recently gone steady. Their girlfriends loom as very important in their lives -- the boys romanticize them, and spend a lot of time with them. One gets, however, little sense of these girlfriends as people -- they appear in the scenery of these boys' lives more as props. Sometimes they are props which are too demanding, a problem which, as we shall see later, echoes a struggle with their parents. Sometimes the girlfriends act as additional authorities to set limits and keep them in line -- as in "I stopped drinking because my girlfriend doesn't like it." At other times girlfriends are merely a badge -- a way of saying "I'm a big boy now" or "See, somebody does like me" -- which is why the notion of going steady -- of the quasi-ownership of this symbol seems so important. At no time does a low mature boy describe a relationship with his girl which sounds intimate and mutual.

The family constellations of these boys vary, but several consistent patterns emerge. The first is that most of these boys feel a strong sense of not living up to parental expectations, of having woefully disappointed at least one parent by not being up to what they had hoped for. In some cases, parents wished for grand achievement from these sons. But these

23

19

boys, often realistically testing their capabilities, become aware that they cannot be doctors or engineers, and they must come to terms with the resultant quilt. For example:

"My father wanted me to go to the Naval Academy ... (Q -- how does he feel about your plans now?) "He doesn't like them too good."

"[My father] tries to make me go to Johns Hopkins and I don't have the brains to go there, but he says, "If you can't get the best, don't get it at all."

These boys must, then, give up some of their parents' approval in order to know themselves, yet in saying no to the hopes of their parents, they face a vacuum -- if they cannot be what their parents wanted, what then, should they be? If they cannot embody their parents dreams, they fear they aren't much good for anything. In light of this dilemma, it is understandable why so many of them appear to lack ambition. The narcissistic wound incurred in this struggle is reflected in an underlying depressed tone for many of them and in a great unconscious mass of inferiority feelings. The boys vary in how they do respond to this dilemma. Some, like Larry, flee into heterosexual involvement; others, like Leonard, become engrossed in social activities with male peers. Still others search for a parental surrogate whom they can satisfy. Here, the underlying conflict unifies this group psychologically even though the psychosocial objects chosen for defensive purposes differ.

24

The sense of failing the parents complicates the problem of autonomy.
Most of these boys perceive their parents as demanding, but ambivalently
concede that parental rules are mainly justifiable ones.   To some
extent, many of these boys experience parental demands as parental concern.
One boy, for example, thinks that the best thing about his mother is that
"she's always worrying about everybody;" another says that the best thing
about his father is that "he enjoys hollering."   Consequently, it appears
that one meaning of the tug of war with their parents is that the pull
from the parents lets the boys know they are there.   On the whole, they want
to please their parents, but this becomes difficult when a parental rule
about a time to come in conflicts with their need to stay out with and be
liked by their peers.

Psychologically, the low boys are deeply embedded in their family
relationships. .Although they may rebel, their acting out often has the
quality of fighting their own dependency and regressive needs to be taken
care of while at the same time reassuring themselves that their parents are
there and in charge.

As one boy expresses it, "My mother is always yelling at me.
If my father takes up for me, she yells at him. But if I get
in trouble here at school, she will always come up and defend
me.   Even though she's always yelling at me."
It is striking how many of these boys worry about their parents growing
older and dying and how many verbalize a wish for their parents to be
happy or secure in their old age.   These boys are unconsciously both
fearful and guilty about relinquishing familial ties.

25

For nearly all of these boys, their fathers are seen as either weak or tyrants. The developmental problem is most difficult when the father appears weak and under the domination of the mother. These boys may wish to assert themselves against overprotective, demanding mothers but how, they seem to ask, are they to do it when their fathers can't.

On the whole, these boys like and need their parents. They struggle only mildly for autonomy. They need their parents' love and approval, their limits and guidance and they want to maintain these supplies without getting completely tied down. It is this interpersonal paradigm that tends to get repeated in their relationships with their girlfriends. They want the security of a steady girl but don't want to be obligated to call her every night or not to look at other girls, too.

These boys talk a lot about people getting mad at them and the problems of avoiding such a situation. School, for example, seems to be an experience in sidestepping the agents of wrath. Teachers are valued for leniency or for intervening when trouble does arise.

These are not boys who are much invested in school, except perhaps, in sports teams. They tend, however, to be uncritical of their school, to feel that its authority is justified even when they have broken a rule, and to see its policing functions as being in their own interests.

Objects in the world of these boys are most valued to the extent that they help you. Friends, for example, are most important because they "help you out." It is unclear just what kind of help this is, but the emphasis on the help theme is a clue to the underlying dependency of these boys. They feel needy, they need others for support, narcissistic supplies, advice and limits. They feel they can't make it alone and, rather than

focussing on gaining autonomy they seem instead to concentrate on main-taining dependable objects.

Their goal in life, if one may abstract a composite goal, is to have a good job, a family, a house, a car and lots of money. They define themselves, then, by what they can amass around them. They are little concerned with what to become themselves.

27

The Case of Henry

Henry is a somewhat shy, sensitive and studious young man. He is taking a college preparatory course, likes physics and math, and is clearly excited about school and what he is learning. He doesn't feel particularly close to any of his teachers, feeling that most of them are strict and sometimes arbitrary and distant. Through his participation in varsity sports, however, he has gotten to know his coach well and feels he can talk to him.

Outside of school, Henry works 20 - 30 hours as a clerk and is saving his money for college. His dream is to be accepted by a good university so he can study engineering.

Henry's father is a mechanic -- and an alcoholic. Henry feels little relationship with his father and portrays him as a man who, when he is home, "cusses and yells" and makes everyone's life difficult. With some sympathy for his father, however, Henry reports that his father "had a hard life," having to quit school and go out to work when his father died. Henry describes his mother as overwhelmed by the problems posed by his father and unavailable emotionally to him. He feels that when his father starts drinking his mother starts screaming and in general "goes wild whenever I try to talk to her." Henry says of his parents, "My parents and I don't really sit down and talk. They just tell me I should do what I want, but I know deep down it does matter to them."

It is Henry's older brother who has mainly filled the guiding parental role for him. This brother is an engineer, 9 years older than Henry and, Henry tells us, he would like his life to be like this brother's. He spoke to his brother at length before choosing a career to pursue, and he chose engineering because it was a very highly paid job and because he likes math and science.

Another older brother played an important part in encouraging Henry to compete successfully in sports. This brother taught him to play soccer and, "he figured if he wasn't going to make it, then I was." Henry feels closest to this brother who is 5 years older than he and responds warmly to his investment and concern about him.

28

Henry has little time for involvement with peers, but he has several close friends with whom he shares his sports activities. He feels that, above all, a friend should be "a helping hand -- when someone's in trouble, help them out the best you can." But he emphasizes how no one can tell someone else what to do with his life. Although curious about girls, Henry has not yet begun dating. Asked why, he says with some embarrassment, "I'm just shy -- in other words, I'm an introvert."

In response to a question about what has been most important in his life during the past 3 years, Henry says, "In the last 3 years, I've been buckling down in my studies -- mostly thinking about how I was going to further myself in life." He also talks of having opened up emotionally in the past few years and learning to talk to other people. It is clear that participating in our interview was an important experience for him and at its close, he expressed pleasure that he had been able to share his feelings. Henry spoke of learning what other people are like and how to get along with them as another outstanding growth experience of recent years.

Overall, Henry impressed us as a serious and thoughtful youth. He talked openly of his internal struggle to overcome his shyness and make friends. He also allowed some glimpses into the questions he was silently pondering: his feeling that worry about making money leads people not to enjoy their lives; his puzzlement about all the conflict that people both close to home and in the world have with one another; his attempt to reconcile his wish to be independent and handle problems on his own with his need for guidance from his brothers; his fears over how he will do in college. He presented himself as ambitious and concerned about his own development, as striving for a realistic appraisal of himself, his abilities and his values.

The Case of Harold

Harold presents himself as articulate, friendly and serious. Although he is taking a college preparatory course and planning to attend college, he has not yet decided whether to become a veterinarian or an oceanographer. He began thinking about becoming a veterinarian after his German shepherd died a few years ago, but he feels that oceanography would be a good second choice if, for some unspecified reason, he can't become a veterinarian.

While he keeps up in his studies, sports has dominated his emotional investments: "I just live, eat and sleep whichever of my sports is in season." He is hoping for a sports scholarship to college.

Harold's life is filled with activities. He plays varsity sports, performs in the school band and takes driver's education -- all of which occupy his free time. In what time remains, he does homework, watches television and listens to music. For several months, he had had a part-time job but got fired for not taking on duties which he considered not to be part of the job he was hired to do. He talks easily, without embarrassment or anger, about this incident and implies that he has become aware of the existence of exploitation in the world. Nevertheless, he plans to get another job during the summer.

One of the most striking aspects of Harold's character is his humanistic perspective, his almost philosophical reflectiveness and acceptance of the world he finds. For example, in describing the teacher he feels closest to, he says, "You can talk to him sometimes, and sometimes you can't. He has his moods, he's human." Later in discussing his experiences in the band, he says, "You're supposed to get graded on the basis of the number of times you come to practice and concerts. You can't really grade kids on their abilities, because they have certain limits." There is a balance and a complexity to Harold's worldview -- he can appreciate several sides of people and situations without his own needs overwhelming his perceptions.

Harold, while he has some friends, seems to be pretty much of a loner. He is particularly close to one other boy with whom he shares his thoughts on everything from records to death. Asked what he looks for in a friend, Harold emphasizes that it should be someone you can rely on for help and someone who doesn't "mooch" from you, i.e. take without giving in return. In talking generally about his peers, he paints them with complexity and compassion. He says, for example, "It's hard to put a label on people here. I don't know what their personal lives are like." Or, in describing a boy everyone likes, he says, "Bill is quiet, he's himself. That's something.

30

He doesn't put on an act -- stays to himself pretty much of the time." There is a hint that this is an image of the kind of person Harold would like to be.

Despite the fact that Harold has begun dating, he shows a certain timidity and inhibition in his approach to girls. The traits he values in them are cleanliness, nice dresses, honesty and "someone who doesn't show off." His emphasis is on the controlled virtues and one might infer that he fears too open manifestations of sexuality.

Harold describes his father as "bull-headed" and his mother as "too easy." He feels he has some of his father's stubborn tendencies in himself, and, as a result, he and his father argue a lot. While he wishes his father would listen to him, he seems to have accepted his father for what he is, and feels it unlikely that they could get along well. Closer to his mother, he views her as understanding and not restrictive. He speaks little of fighting them over rules and feels his parents trust him not to behave unreasonably. Although his father disapproves of his drinking, he gives Harold a beer "once in a great while," and tells him that drinking is his choice to make.

Above all, Harold's parents want him to finish school and go to college. Both of Harold's parents work at fairly low prestige jobs and Harold wants to have "more opportunity" for himself. He feels that his mother has been the most important person in his life because she insisted he stay in school when he felt disillusioned and wanted to quit.

Harold has done some thinking about both religious and political issues. He expresses some outrage over history's holy wars and some worry about incipient political chaos. His ideas, in their tone, reflect the sense of ambiguity, complexity and sensitivity to humanity he evinces in other areas of his life. In their content, his ideas echo his personal developmental concerns: his conflict over authority with his father; his need to structure impulsivity out of his life; and his growing appreciation of the individual's right to make his own choices.

31

Discussion

In contrast to the low boys, boys highest in psychosocial maturity can best be characterized as oriented toward personal success and greater self-differentiation.

The "set" -- that is, the psychosocial world -- for these boys is essentially the same as for the low boys, but the components differ in their importance. Most of them are active in sports. Cars and girls are still there, although diminished in importance. School is relatively more emphasized as are individual hobbies and religious interests.

In general, the group of high mature boys is more varied, more complicated and more resistant to categorization. This seems to result mainly from their own greater diversification: that is, they are active, growing youths who are exploring a variety of possibilities. Unlike the low boys, they are not as stuck on hypermasculine pursuits or as interested in swinging with the crowd.

The central thread that links the high mature boys phenomenologically is their orientation to the future, their concern with what they will become. They are an ambitious group -- not, perhaps, in the sense that their aspirations are so high -- but in the sense that their lives are dominated by their sense of their personal future. Many, like Henry, have committed themselves to pursuing particular occupations; others more broadly commit themselves to "becoming worthwhile" or "finding a job I will like to do." In their occupational choice, these boys express the spirit of what they would like "to be" -- a veterinarian or an electrical engineer -- rather than what they want "to have" -- i.e. "a good job" as the low mature boys put it. This commitment to their future selves makes these boys more serious about the present. They are concerned about good grades, about saving money for college, about staying out of any

32

28

trouble that might interfere with their goal.

Self-esteem for these boys derives primarily from what they do and what they hope to do. They have friends and value their friendships but do not seem to rely on their peers' approval to value themselves. Because of their ambitions, they are also more open to self-doubts -- and they appear to have enough ego strength to tolerate some uncertainty about themselves. One boy, for example, wants to become a lawyer but is not sure he knows how to study well enough. Another recognizes that he will need a contingency plan in the event he does not get into the Coast Guard Academy. What is striking is the realistic quality to these boys' self-appraisal. Spontaneously, they admit misgivings about their ability to live up to their own ideals and they are able to pursue their goals with perhaps renewed vigor. Because they have confidence in themselves, they can take the risk of failure.

These boys also gain self-esteem from their sense of being an individual. Their object world is complex and differentiated. "There are all kinds of people," they say, "Kids are all different." Their recognition and tolerance of variation among people seems to allow them greater freedom to resist group pressures and to allow themselves to grow in their own direction. Their friendships tend to be of the more intimate variety -- a friend is someone to talk to, to understand you, to help you out emotionally as well as in action. Girls remain fairly mysterious for this group of boys. Few of them have gone steady or dated seriously. They are, for the most part, curious about girls, a little romantic about them at times, but not deeply invested in relationships with them.

There is far less concern about impulses in this group than in the low group. For the most part, the boys in this category are "good" boys -- they

33

are straight, obedient, purposeful and somewhat condescending toward kids who run wild, take dope or goof off in class. They don't, however, seem square or overly inhibited. Their impulses seem to be sublimated in goal-oriented activity and they are carefully kept under control. Several of the boys in this group do speak of past struggles over impulse control. One particularly confident, ambitious boy spoke of having gotten into trouble over drinking and then having "learned from my mistakes." Another had an intense struggle to extricate himself from a fairly wild gang which was vandalizing and flirting with crime. Now this boy sees his main goals as "keeping myself out of danger-ous situations and to be an individual." Whether through direct or vicarious experience, the high boys are aware of the costs of impulsive action and take pains to keep themselves in check.

One is struck by the perceptiveness and self-awareness of most of the boys in this group. They are attuned to their own development as people, see them-selves changing and, in particular, exercising increasingly more control over their feelings and decisions. Harold's reflectiveness serves to illustrate this point, as does the following spontaneous observation from another subject:

"[My father] keeps everything inside of him. He lets things that get on his nerves build up inside, then when it gets too much, he lets it all out -- I'm the same way . . . If someone says something [derogatory] to me, I may say something back, but then I'll cut it off."

The high boys' views of maturity reflect their sensitivity to their own growth. In response to a question about what makes a person mature, one said, "knowing the difference between right and wrong for yourself. And if what's right for you is wrong toward the society or something, then you yourself have to change because you can't go against the society . . ." From another comes

34

"If a serious problem comes up, you can handle it by yourself without getting a lot of help from outside."

The family constellations of this group are quite varied. There are boys in this group with intensely close relationships to both parents; others have extremely ambivalent relationships. Two themes are of interest here. First of all, as their own sense of self has grown, these boys show an empathic, differentiated conception of their parents as people. Witness the following observations:

"She [mother] has problems with my older brother who [does as] he likes. My mother takes it out on me. She's bringing all her anxiety from my brother in on me. I keep telling her she's doing it, but she won't listen, so I don't listen to her anymore."

"My father and I don't get along too well. We always get in arguments. It might be his father. His mother died when he was young and his father never listened to him. Used to beat him up all the time. That might be one reason."

These are comments which one never hears from the low mature boys. The high boys are able to put themselves in their parents place and, perhaps, are able to forgive them.

Secondly, the dynamics of the problem of rules and expectations are fairly consistent for these boys. Their parents seem to have set broad expectations and to have supportively encouraged their sons to make their own choices. For example, in response to a question about what parents wished for their sons' future, the following comments are typical:

"My parents and I don't really sit down and talk -- they just tell me I should do what I want, but I know deep down it does matter to them."

"My father advised me to go to college, but he's not pushing me."

"They just want me to get out of school, get a good education so I can get a good job."

35.

In general, parents expectations seem to have been internalized, so that the boy can feel he is making his own choices and pleasing his parents while maintaining the sense that his parents are leaving the choices up to him.

The situation with regard to rules is similar. These parents are seen as granting autonomy but within well-defined limits. Like the low boys, this group appreciates the limits; however, they treat limits with respect and show little need to test them. For example:

> "My parents don't set a rule about what time I should be home and yet I'm usually home around 11 o'clock. I guess if it was 4 or 5, they'd start noticing and set rules."

> "My parents are not too strict. I know what they [the rules] are and I obey them."

> "They've always let me make my own decisions. They're strict if I'd do anything that was bad for me -- I'd be too scared to get caught with dope or anything."

There is far less of a sense of battle in these families. Where ambivalence and anger toward the parents exists, it takes the form of a wish for more closeness, more understanding from them. Specific rules, on the whole, are less important to these boys than their parents' recognition and approval of the kind of people they are becoming.

One is impressed by a feeling of balance in the lives of most of these high mature boys. Family, school, friends, work, fun, intimacy, doubt and resentment all are in evidence, but none overwhelms the personality or life space. These boys are outward-directed; they are beginning to sense the possibilities of the world beyond their immediate sphere and are moving, with some trepidation, to explore it. They are less preoccupied by security than the low boys and more ready, perhaps, to fall flat on their face if necessary.

36

The relative lack of rebellion in this group is a bit perplexing -- one cannot but wonder if it is yet to come. There is also an inhibited quality to some of these boys; at times, their sense of control borders on impulse constriction. And much of the control they do possess seems to reside in the superego; they are still a bit too much focused on the moralistic values of being good. Genuine ego autonomy is just beginning for these boys, although some are further along than others.

The Case of Linda

Linda was an attractive, talkative and friendly girl. She impressed the interviewer as an embodiment of the "American Girl" image -- healthy, lively, warm, energetic and unserious. One question put to all interviewees asked them to describe "a girl that everyone likes" and Linda was chosen and described by several of our subjects. This is what one of our other subjects said of Linda:

> "She's a cheerleader, but she's down to earth
> and friendly and goofy, kids around a lot. She's
> always thoughtful and talks to you about things
> you like. She's a pleasure to be around. She
> has no airs -- doesn't put herself above you."

Our brief contact with Linda bore out her classmates' description. There is a humility and sincerity about Linda that makes her instantly likeable; at the same time, however, there is a naiveté that makes one wonder how she will fare outside of the high school environment.

Linda is taking a business curriculum. Her favorite class is acting arts, which she particularly enjoys because there is little homework and lots of opportunity to "perform and get feedback". Her future goals are centered on realizing material wants. She thinks she'd like to get some sort of office job after high school; any one will do as long as it pays well and has some variety. She says of her plans, "I enjoy working because I want to have things like furniture and a down payment on a house before I have kids." At present, Linda has a weekend job and is saving money to buy a car.

Most of Linda's current life is centered on her activities as a cheer-leader. She talks about "cheering" with great enthusiasm, emphasizing how hard they practice and how dedicated the group is to performing well and winning awards.

Linda is particularly close to two teachers, both of whom she values as people who go out of their way to help her. One she particularly likes tries hard "to improve us" but Linda feels that this teacher is "very straight" and that she cannot talk to her about things she might not approve of. The other teacher also helps her a lot and Linda can talk to her about everything.

Because Linda describes her parents in such concrete terms, it is

difficult to get a feel for what they mean to her. Just as with the teachers, she seems to experience them only in terms of their direct relationship to herself, ignoring any qualities they may have independent of that relationship. She says of her mother:

> "She's always there. She has supper ready, gives me money, helps me when I'm down, loves housework and I don't have to do any. If I need anything, she'll do it."

Linda feels that neither of her parents push her. They go along with what she wants "as long as its to their standards." She describes her father as "real easygoing -- he doesn't set restrictions and lets me judge how late I stay out." Overall, she feels satisfied with her parents, but she often wishes her mother could decide things on her own without having to ask Linda's father first. Sometimes she regrets that her parents are not like parents who buy their kids new cars and pay their way through college, but then she feels glad they don't do these things "because if you have everything handed to you, you never know what its like to work for something."

Linda has a number of good friends, mostly other cheerleaders, with whom she shares activities and secrets. She believes that to be liked one must be friendly, able to keep secrets, helpful to others and that one must not cut others down or get jealous over little things. Like the adults in her life, Linda's friends sound two-dimensional and it is unclear what forms the basis of her emotional investment in them. The same is true of her steady boyfriend. She described him by showing the interviewer the ring he gave her and declaring that she's not ready to get married yet. When asked what qualities she desires in a husband, she replies, "He has to be the special one. He has to be someone willing to go out to work and not loaf around."

Over the last three years, Linda feels that the two most important things in her life have been cheerleading and being on her own. Cheerleading has provided her with a goal important enough to renounce temptations for: it has given her a reason to keep her grades up and not get into trouble. From other unelaborated comments in the interview, one gathers that at some point Linda was tempted to drop out of school and that "trouble" to her means getting pregnant. As for being on her own, she feels that since she has been able to drive, she can go where she wants, but it is unclear what she has done with this new independence.

In defining "mature" and "immature", Linda focuses on how one acts. Acting silly and giggling is immature. Knowing how to handle oneself is mature. Linda clearly knows how to handle herself.

39

It is the well-polished surface of Linda that is most puzzling. She expresses no sense of conflict, either internal or external, throughout the interview. She doesn't appear to be frustrated by anything or angry at anyone. Nor does she appear to be growing. She is reaching out for material things, but has no goals for trying to "be" anything other than what she is now.

The only evidence she gives of any internal life at all is revealed in an odd wish. She uses one of her "three wishes" to wish for "people not to ever die." She goes on then to talk about a worry about death that she has had since the age of 10 when her grandmother died. She begins talking about this in a preoccupied way and ends up in a quite morbid image, "Dying really scares me ... being in a coffin, bugs getting in, where the body's going to go -- I couldn't picture myself dead and in a coffin." With the limited data available, it is impossible to trace the psychodynamic roots of this issue for Linda. One thing interesting to note, however, is that again her focus is on how she will appear in death, not on how she would experience it.

Linda's concern with appearances, with being approved of, with tangible goals -- these are her outstanding characteristics. She is reliant on others to help her, do things for her and she orients herself to keeping others pleased with her so that they will continue to proffer what she wants from them. She is unaware of and uninterested in life beyond her enclosed world. She does not think very deeply about things, preferring to direct her charm and energy in somewhat limited external ventures. She is willing to work hard, but for goals set by others.

40

The Case of Lucy

Lucy presents both striking similarities to and sharp contrasts with Linda. Fundamentally, they seem to long for and value the same things. Yet, where Linda is successful in her pursuit of these goals, Lucy must cope with her failures.

Like Linda, Lucy is attractive and personable. By contrast, however, she is obviously depressed, discouraged and bordering on hopelessness. Lucy's entire world and much of her self-esteem had been centered on being a cheerleader. In the school from which our subjects were drawn, cheerleading is clearly both a symbol of status and a form of prestigious, ready-made identity. It goes beyond mere activity. Being a cheerleader entails certain behaviors outside of the sports arena, makes the girls automatically desirable and envied and allows them privileges denied to others. To Lucy, as to Linda, all of these fringe benefits were terribly important.

It was, therefore, an identity-shaking trauma when Lucy was, a year ago, expelled from the cheerleaders. The interview material from Lucy is saturated by this event; it is as though nothing else matters in her life -- all questions are answered in terms of fantasies of regaining it. Lucy feels she was dealt with unfairly when she was asked to leave the cheerleader group. Although she admits to having broken a rule, she feels that she "really" got "kicked out" because the teacher-leader of the cheerleaders disliked her. Thinking back to the time before her world collapsed, Lucy remembers that, as a cheerleader, "I felt proud, special." Since then, however, she has been disinterested in school, feels estranged from her peers, and experiences herself as adrift in a meaningless world. The only time she seems even remotely hopeful is when she talks of her wish to go to college so that she can be a cheerleader there.

Life was more structured for Lucy in cheerleading days. Then, she felt she couldn't cut classes because that could endanger her position as a cheerleader. Now that the worst has occurred, she cuts frequently but wishes there were still something to keep her from breaking rules.

For her future, Lucy hopes to be rich. She expects to realize this goal through her steady boyfriend who is "real smart" and who she imagines will be able to provide all of her material wants. He has little other meaning in the interview, and although Lucy says she has a lot of friends, none of them take on real presence either, except to the extent that they disappoint her.

When she does speak of people in her life, she describes them in negative ways. She sees her peers as gossipy and hurtful ("everybody looks at the bad

41

points of everyone"). She feels that her mother is stupid and does dumb things, that her father yells and won't allow her to think for herself. In particular, she conflicts with her parents over the issue of drugs. It is, however, unclear how involved with drugs Lucy is, if, indeed, she is involved at all. There is a rebellious side of Lucy. Although it is unclear as to origin, she presents herself as stubborn and defiant. She says, for example, of rules, "...if I don't believe something they say, I'm going to do it and if they don't like it (shrugs shoulders)..."

Lucy is aware that she is looking for some sense of direction in her life and she looks to others to provide it for her. She tells the interviewer that the biggest problem in her life has been making decisions. "I'd rather have someone make them all for me." She is, however, unable to make use of her parents in this way. She mistrusts the other girls at school because she fears that they are laughing at her. But she does tend to rely on boys "to have someone to lean on and to keep me from doing things I shouldn't be doing." For these purposes, she always tries to keep at least two boys interested in her to make sure she always has one.

What is most striking about Lucy is her desperate need for people to bolster her self-esteem. Yet this occurs in a context of repeated real or imagined disappointments in people, disappointments which are the theme of her life even in her earliest memories. Although Lucy did suffer from a major narcissistic wound, her preoccupation with it and her inability to cope effectively with it suggest that her experience with the cheerleaders has become the focus of a plethora of earlier disappointments and frustrations. Beneath the depression, one suspects, is massive rage which is expressed in self-destructive behavior and which itself seems to express the wish for someone to care enough about her to stop her. Her quest is for some sort of security and invulnerability. She sees herself as a girl who just "loves to have a good time." The sense of specialness and privilege that was hers when she was a cheerleader seems to have been an effective defense against the anger and guilt pressing on her unconsciously. Having lost that, Lucy has become paralyzed, unable to take positive action for herself, unable to find positive realistic models for identification, retreating instead into fantasies of narcissistic salvation while toying with self-destructive behavior.

42

Discussion

The world of the low maturity girls is dominated by two concerns: having fun and having things. In terms of both their future and their present lives, these girls most want to own and to enjoy. While they are unanimous in pursuit of these goals, the girls in this low maturity group are best divided into two subgroups: those who, like Linda, are successful in these pursuits and those who, like Lucy, feel thwarted in them.

The former group -- the girls who are having fun and are happy with themselves -- irresistibly call to mind the stereotype of a teenage girl. Several of them, like Linda, are even cheerleaders. They are pretty, socially polished, popular, peer-oriented and, on the whole, packaged. By and large, they are enjoying life and they experience an almost enviable sense of contentment with themselves. Theirs is a world of girlfriends to tell -- and who had better keep secret -- about the vagaries of boyfriends and romantic intrigue, a world of dances and going shopping, a world of working hard and playing hard. As one girl put it, "I like doing something every minute -- I hate being bored." Most of them have, as they say in their culture, "a good personality" -- that is, they are friendly, warm, fun-loving and have a sense of humor. Their aspirations are to get a good job and buy things and then think about starting a family. They recognize marriage and motherhood to be serious responsibilities. Interestingly enough, they don't romanticize these roles. Rather, they treat them as inevitabilities which will come after they've had their share of fun. For example:

> "I want to do things. My mother got out of school,
> worked, got married and had kids. I want to do things
> exciting before I get married. I want to have fun before
> I settle down -- maybe take a trip around the world. I
> probably won't be able to do that though because I
> probably couldn't save my money."

43

"I don't want to get married for a long time -- I want
different experiences and to travel. I want to meet a
whole lot of people -- people fascinate me -- I want to
meet everybody."

"I want clothes and cars and a home."

Optimistic about the things to be had in the future, these girls do look

to their own efforts to realize them. None of them are merely hoping to marry a

rich man. They value an education because they believe it will get them a

better job and some are attracted by the status inherent in a high school diploma

or a college degree. On the whole, however, they are not very cognitively

oriented; they don't think very much about serious things nor do they question

their values or their goals. If they know there is a larger world out there,

they don't concern themselves with it much. Although a few express wishes to

travel, one senses that this is on the order of an unrealizable fantasy or else

has the meaning of interminable fun without responsibilities.

These girls strike one as uncomplicated, unambiguous. While they are

energetic, they lack subtlety and reflectiveness. Despite their outgoing

nature, a rather deep self-centeredness appears. They don't seem to care much

about other people except insofar as they impinge on them. Their relationships

with girls tend to be dominated by the sharing of activities and secrets. They

don't worry about having friends or mention it as important to them. They take

their friends, as well, one might add, as themselves, for granted. With boys,

their relationships sound ritualized and without depth.

These girls' concept of their parents is no more differentiated than their

concept of themselves. On the whole, their parents are people who are "always

there," people to trust, who protect you, who sometimes overprotect you, but

people to lean on. Few of them can even name something they dislike about

their parents; they simply "never thought about it before."

44

Adults for these girls are people who are trying to improve and help them and they are valued for this. The girls are, or try to be, good girls, although they often engage in the obligatory battles with their parents about staying out later. Because they are so invested in doing what everyone else is doing, they do run into situations where they must choose between the crowd and the consequences. The choice often seems to be made without coherent rationale. The importance of external restraint is predominant for these girls -- and they admit it. They need someone to stop them from doing whatever it is -- drugs, sex or cutting class. Over and over again, they say:

> "(Cheerleading) ... gives me something to do and keeps me from getting mixed up in other things -- it keeps my grades up because if they get too low, you get suspended."

> "I had to convince my parents to let me go out in a car with a boy ... I guess waiting did me good -- my friends have gotten in trouble and had to get married and I'm glad they held me back .. if I had my own way, I'd probably be in a lot of trouble."

> "I'm kind of glad my parents make me come home -- at least I know they want me home and not running around."

The responsibility for control of their lives -- and their impulses -- generally lies outside of themselves. Sometimes they express a kind of wonder that they have avoided real trouble; they tell anecdotes about friends where the theme is a sense of "there but for fortune go I." They want to feel protected from their own temptations. These girls mention problems of impulsivity as a major problem teenagers face more frequently than any group -- including the low boys. Being without either a strong sense of self and without experience in handling conflict, these low maturity girls recognize their vulnerability to self-destructive forms of fun.

What of the other girls in this group -- the five who are not having much

45

fun? One has a child; another is fleeing from a difficult home situation into marriage. The remaining three, including Lucy, are struggling with deep inferiority feelings and generally don't like themselves very much. Like the girls already described, they have little sense of control of their lives -- they want the guideposts of rules and restrictions and they want to avoid making their own decisions. They desperately want to be like everyone else, but they fall short. Their failure to lose themselves in the crowd costs them more loss of self-esteem and they become preoccupied with wishing that they were different or that their lives were different. As a result, they, too, remain self-absorbed, eager for the easy, fun-loving life the other low maturity girls exemplify.

It is interesting to speculate about whether these two subgroups of low maturity girls are indeed psychological kin or whether they are instead a varied assortment of girls with dissimilar forms of developmental arrest. If anything unites them, it is their dependence on their environment for support, goals and restraint, even for self-definition. For those, like Lucy, in the second subgroup, fortune seems to have treated them badly. Either they lack valued attributes of the culture and reel from the rejection or else they were unlucky enough not to have had external control of their impulses at the critical moment. The successful low maturity girls appear to be just as vulnerable to the environment's evaluation of them as are the unsuccessful girls. But the successful ones are untested; should fortune betray their privileged position, one wonders whether they would have any more internal resources to cope with frustration than those we see currently in that state.

The lack of real self-awareness among these girls and their concrete descriptions of their lives make it extremely difficult to abstract the psychodynamic threads of their development. One gains little meaningful

46

information from them about relationship paradigms in their families or about personally-relevant growth experiences. Because of their external focus, they attribute the style and content of their existence to fate and reveal (or experience) too little of their inner selves for us to go much deeper into the enigma of their psychological development.

The Case of Hilary

Hilary was an attractive, vibrant girl who had an unself-conscious charm which made her very likeable. She spoke freely about herself and it was clear that introspection and reflection were styles of thought which came easily to her.

Enrolled in a business course, she hopes to be able to get a good secretarial job similar to the one her mother has. She enjoys school, particularly her English courses and playing in the Band. Hilary is also very active in sports. Earlier she considered being a gym teacher, but decided that she didn't want to go to college and take "all those science courses". Somewhat wistfully, she says, "I took the easy way out." Her mother had strongly encouraged her to go to college. After none of her older siblings had gone to college, Hilary's mother told her that she was the "last hope" for meeting this goal. Despite this pressure, Hilary has made her own choice.

The focus of Hilary's life is on her relationships with others, on being close to people. The quality of these relationships varies, but there is a sense of her striving for mutuality with other people. In the way she describes the important others in her life, Hilary evinces complexity and depth of feeling. She does not merely collect friends as medals or use them for her own interests; rather, she is struggling with the intricacies of needing others and at the same time meeting their needs.

Hilary describes her favorite teacher as follows: "He's really nice -- kind of like a big brother. I talk to him about what I want to do with my life, about problems. He notices when I'm down and asks me to talk". Here, as elsewhere, she demonstrates affective linkages to others; feelings, rather than behaviors, connect her to people.

Her face brightens when she talks about her two best friends. These are long-term relationships and again Hilary stresses the "helping" quality of them. In particular, these girlfriends are people she can confide in and who can help lift her spirits. Although Hilary is about to become engaged to a boy somewhat older than she, she shows relatively less enthusiasm about this relationship. She spends a lot of time with him and particularly values him

48

because he "doesn't order me around ... leaves me free to do what I want." He is, however, just about the only person in her life who she does not seem to lean on for emotional support. Part of his attraction for her seems to lie in the fact that he frequently travels in his work. It is likely that she sees in him a vehicle for exploring new parts of the world and in escaping weighty family problems.

The recurrent references to "being down" and "feeling low" are matched by occasional depressed affect which appears in the interview. One of the reasons that Hilary depends so much on others for sharing sad feelings is that her family life is troubled and burdensome to her. The sixth of nine children, Hilary has much to cope with at home. Her father is a disabled, alcoholic, her mother works full-time and her younger sister recently got pregnant. She sees her home as filled with conflict and tension and views her own role as one of peace-maker and mediator.

Hilary feels she takes after her father, in his temper and his attitudes. She also feels closest to him because he understands her and can cheer her up "just by being him." She wishes her father would stop drinking since they fight when he's drunk, but she speaks of him non-judgmentally and with compassion. With her mother, Hilary has many clashes. She feels her mother has very definite opinions about things and is intolerant of her views. Because her mother will not give any money to her younger sister, Hilary buys things for her sister with her own money. This also leads to conflict with her mother. She feels that her mother wants her "to feel the same as her about everything" and that her mother fears that "I'm getting like my father." Hilary turns to her father to soothe her after arguments with her mother. She feels he is "helping me learn to control my temper and not blow up." It is evident that Hilary, who cares about the people in her family, must negotiate through tangled and divided loyalties among them.

At the same time, she values her parents for encouraging her to use freedom and take responsibility. Her mother had stressed to all of her children that they should take care of themselves as soon as they were able. Hilary feels that the most important things her parents expect of her are "to have a good job, to be able to make it on my own and to keep a good head on and not to do stupid things." Her parents do have some rules for her, however. They insist that she be in at a certain time and Hilary is glad of this. She fears that if they didn't, "I'd stay out too late and not be able to get up for school." One sees, therefore a measure of independence in Hilary she acknowledges that she still needs her parents for some guidance.

49

Hilary, in reflecting on herself, feels she has changed a lot in the last three years. She feels that she has become more aware of things, primarily through being around older people. Three years ago, she says, "I couldn't care less about things - now I care a lot." Here she is referring to issues relating to the school, the community and the country. Having a brother in Viet Nam increased her sense of the world outside of her immediate one. She feels that most of the other students in her high school are "immature;" their concerns seem childish to her and she prefers the company of older, more serious people. Similarly, she finds many of the school rules infantilizing and often challenges the administration when it demands that she obey what she considers to be pointless regulations.

In general, Hilary can be characterized not as an achiever but as a basically sensitive, sensible and giving young woman. She is striving for self-sufficiency through emotional interaction with others. She is warm, compassionate and outstanding as a person in her genuine concern for other people.

The Case of Harriet

Harriet was eager to be interviewed. She seemed enchanted with the idea of talking about herself and excitedly volunteered personal anecdotes in an almost manic way. There was a histrionic quality about her and her desire to impress the interviewer was obvious.

A somewhat plain but not unattractive girl, Harriet is clearly a doer. She presents a long list of activities, many of them in which she is a leader, and she seems to feed on success. She does well in school, although she is probably not as bright as she likes to have others think. Young for an eleventh grader, (15), Harriet has some sense of being behind her classmates in that she is not yet eligible to drive or hold a job. She makes up for this by being hyper-adult in other ways. She has taken on adult-type responsibilities in her Church and in her Junior Achievement group. In addition, she is a respectably good pianist, is planning a Bible course for the Church and writes stories on her own.

For her future, Harriet plans a career as a high school chorus director. She enjoys her participation in the chorus and thinks this is something she'd like to bring to others. However, directing things and taking charge of things clearly has other meanings to her and is an important source of her self esteem. As she says of herself late in the interview, "I'm the sort of person who likes to be in the center of things - have people say 'Oh look at that' and I like to be a leader and the authority."

Harriet's major interpersonal investments are in her family. She is extremely close to her mother and feels that they are almost exactly alike. She feels that her mother is almost always right about things and Harriet looks to her for guidance and advice. There is a hint in the interview of the deeper relationship that exists between mother and daughter. Frequent allusions to the mother's philosophies of life suggest that her mother is attempting, through Harriet, to relive her own life without making the same mistakes. She has, for example, impressed upon Harriet the importance of having a career (so one is not tied to a house) and the necessities of being wary of disappointments from men. Much of Harriet's own view of life seems to derive more from her mother's experience than from her own.

At the same time, Harriet has learned some things about life on her own. In particular, she had a history of difficulties making friends. She described a painful time in the 9th grade when she tried desperately to befriend a particular group of girls who continually snubbed her. Her failure

51

to fit in with this group hurt her deeply. Now, as she looks back and reflects on it, she says "but I'm happier now because I have my own group of friends and I'm more or less the center of that and I'm happier here. It's just as well because the other girls do things I don't approve of like smoke and drink."

Although Harriet presents herself as a very good girl, she did have a time, also around the ninth grade, when she felt rebellious and went out of her way to disobey her mother. During this time, she ceased caring about school and got poor grades and she also wished to leave home so that she could have "everything my own way." Harriet is not explicit about how she outgrew this rebelliousness, but she experiences a sense of relief that she has.

Another important learning experience for Harriet was losing a boyfriend who mattered a great deal to her. She credits him with having "taught me a lot about life and how easily things go." Both her disappointment in girl-friends and in this boyfriend seem to have forced her to rely on her own resources and accomplishments for self-esteem.

While Harriet has no particular boyfriend at present, she likes to think of herself as a popular social butterfly. She talks about how she's learned to be successful with boys -- "by building their ego and smiling a lot." But she's also come to terms with the internal standards that are important to her and which she refuses to compromise. "I don't like to act the helpless female because I'm not helpless. And boys don't like the girls who are in bed with everybody." She wants to be on her own for awhile before getting married so she can have time "to do what I want without having to please other people."

Because of her competitiveness, Harriet still struggles with interpersonal strains between herself and her peers. The one place she seems free of this is in her involvement in Church and the Church youth group. This is a place where her self-serving qualities are transformed and she expends great energies working for the Church charities and even donates her own money to the Church.

There is an absence of current conflict between Harriet and her parents. She trusts them to support the decisions she makes for her life and she, in turn, trusts that the rules they make for her are good ones. She feels that they primarily expect her to be responsible and that this is something she also values for herself. A harder goal is "being nice to everyone" and often her mother reprimands her for being tactless. Harriet is less close to her father and he comes through as being far less important to her. She sees him as quiet, feels that he loves her, but wishes he'd show more affection. All in all, she feels satisfied with the parents she has.

52

Despite the studied self-assurance with which Harriet presents herself, she betrays hints of growing pains underneath. She is still struggling to understand and get along with other people; she is ambivalently growing away from her mother's direction while holding on to it for stability; and she is trying to develop emotional equanimity. She says that she sees her biggest problem as learning to "take things as they come -- not get upset at things and think its the end of the world." At the same time, she is trying to maintain her fiercely held sense of control of her own life.

On the whole, Harriet is an ambitious girl. Where others express the wish for a "happy" life, Harriet wants her own life to be "happy and productive."

Discussion

The group of girls highest in psychosocial maturity is composed of some of the most complex, multifaceted and, in some ways, most fully human young people in the sample. For one thing, they are the most articulate. Their interviews are the richest in data and the least self-conscious. Most of the girls in this group had clearly given prior thought to many of the more probing questions -- some replied to our queries with the comment, "I ask myself that, too."

Unlike the low maturity girls, these girls underemphasize material things and pleasure, which is not to say that they never have a good time or go shopping. On the whole, these are serious girls -- or, more precisely, girls who take themselves seriously. They are in the habit of thinking about their lives, reflecting on where they are going and where they have come from.

Unlike the high maturity boys, they are less focused on occupational goals as a source of self-esteem. Rather, they are engaged in a process of valuing themselves for the kind of people they are. They are, in a word, identity-seekers, attempting to discover who they are and who they want to be in relation to the significant others in their lives, in relation to their aspirations for themselves and in relation to their own sometimes ambivalent feelings. There is an abundance of budding individualism in the lives of these girls. They frequently make statements which begin, "I am the kind of person who ..." In this simple phrase lies the product of enormous developmental change: the ability to conceptualize and reflect on the self; the ability to accept the self as different from others and retain the capacity to value both the self and the other; and the ability to commit oneself to certain aspects of the

54

self and renounce others. In short, again, this is the groundwork for the formation of ego identity.

Specifically, their overt lives are not very different from the lives of the low girls. They go to school, many go to work, they have girlfriends and boyfriends. They do, however, mention spending a lot more time on individual activities, such as reading or playing a musical instrument, than the low girls. Most have serious career plans, often based on a particular talent or long term interest. Most see themselves as working for several years before starting a family, then returning to work after children are of school age. Their girlfriends matter to them as people, not as a crowd. Friends are to listen to you, to share things with and, in general, to be partners in identity testing. These girls stress feeling "out of" the high school life and atmosphere -- they speak of it as being childish and they sardonically mock the girls who can't see past whether they have a Saturday night date. As one girl states the conclusion of many in this group, "I don't think most high school kids are really into life." Or from another: "I used to hang around in their clans. I'd rather be by myself and do what I want to do rather than go around and do what everyone else wants me to do -- drive-ins, drink, smoke, etc."

One striking commonality among these girls is that they primarily date older boys. This puts them in contact with peers older than themselves and many girls attribute their greater awareness of extra-high school concerns to these contacts; e.g. "I like older people. I like someone more experienced than me to talk to." At the same time, their boyfriends tend to be only a part of their lives and generally they play a less important role than girlfriends. Their psychological world extends beyond their high school and community. Some express a feeling of boredom with "the routine" and have

55

fantasies of traveling, living in other places and finding new experiences. One senses that, unlike the low girls, these girls are serious about following through on these wishes.

There is little concern about peer pressure among this group. These girls express fairly objective views of people, can see others as individuals with their own needs. Where the low girls have an egocentric view of others -- that is, see others only as in relationship to themselves, the high girls are striving for mutuality based on empathy. They don't "have" friends; they instead struggle with the dilemma of caring and being cared about. They are in the process of learning how to need people without being dependent on them.

Another theme that is consistent among these girls is the presence of conscious internal conflict. These are girls who have been "through" something and learned to cope with it. Conflicts, in their content, revolve around anything from family problems to romantic tangles to career choice, but there is the evidence of growth in progress. One girl, for example, whose family suffered from several major problems in the past few years, says, "I had to become more responsible. I had to look at things and see what they were about." What makes these girls different from their low maturity peers is that they seem to have the resources to confront whatever dilemma they have to deal with head on, without the need to deny it and run to hide in the uniformity of a crowd. They can bear some psychic pain and, as a result, experience something of what we are accustomed to labelling "adolescence."

Many of them speak of earlier struggles -- of having had to fight impulsivity, of a stage of rebelliousness. Others describe a previous period of "not really caring about anything, but now caring a lot." It is unclear

56

what exactly this means developmentally. Perhaps they are referring to
their struggle to separate themselves from others, an exaggerated period of
being vociferously different in order to become individuals. As Harriet
describes it:

> "(When I was 11 - 13) I didn't get along with my mother
> because I felt she was always putting me down and I felt
> she was trying to keep me from doing things. There's
> that thing about the apple never rolling too far from the
> tree and I think that's probably true because I've come
> back now to a lot the way I used to be and I respect her
> and I found out that just about all the time, they're
> right."

Or from others:

> "I used to dislike my family, felt they were restricting
> me, but now I understand why."

> "I used to smoke (pot) and I stopped. I was really hung
> up, but got myself out of it ... got to the point where
> I was getting pretty sick of myself. My parents knew
> and that hurt me the most."

There is much less fuss about rules and restrictions in this group than
in the others. Their parents seem to encourage and grant them some measure of
independence while maintaining limits which their daughters appreciate. The
girls, for the most part, see their parents as having trust in them and as
maintaining general standards which define the outer limits of acceptability.
For example:

> "My parents let us go on our own, but won't let us do
> something foolish."

> "They don't push me, and when they do, its for my own good."

> "I always have to tell them where I'm going -- they're just
> concerned."

> "My parents never stop me from doing something -- they've
> let me make my own mistakes."

57

Independence is the key issue for these girls and they are moving slowly, not dramatically, towards it. Often, they speak of their growing autonomy as an internal struggle. Aware of their own regressive dependency wishes, they seem to be able to deal with the problem internally without setting up the familiar "I want to but they won't let me" battle of the low maturity groups. Or, perhaps, they've already been through that and have moved on to the harder task. These girls are, however, most likely to express irritation with school rules, mostly on the grounds that they feel they are being infantilized. This may partly be because they are developmentally beyond testing limits to be sure they are there.

Superego values often predominate among these girls. They speak of learning to be responsible, to be trustworthy. By and large, they wish to please their parents and have internalized their parents' expectations.

Most of these girls report a particularly close relationship with one parent, often, but not necessarily, their father. This relationship provides an important source of support, values and identifications. Pleasing this favored parent is frequently identical with pleasing oneself. On the whole these girls appear to be staying fairly close to their (internalized) parents while they test their own capacities and limitations in the world of school and peers.

With respect to the larger society, these girls are more connected to it than those in the other groups. They are most likely to have some, if embryonic, political opinions. Many mention the growth of empathy and tolerance as important learning experiences for them:

> "I don't like to judge people. Maturity depends on
> how wide their eyes are open, how much they (other
> teenagers) see. They want it all to be good and won't
> face the bad. .I try not to walk away from things."

> "(I have learned) to accept other things I don't believe
> in."

Others speak of a developing sense of enlightened trust in the realization

that not everyone is to be trusted. They have been disappointed and learned

from it.

Lest these high maturity girls sound too sugar-coated, it is important to

mention that some also show signs of nascent psychopathology. While they are

overtly struggling with issues of identity and autonomy, there are indications

that for some there are deep characterological problems which may forestall any

resolution. Hilary, for example, is battling a depression which may not be

readily assuageable and Harriet's deep narcissistic needs make her extremely

vulnerable to failure. One cannot, then, merely equate psychosocial maturity

and mental health.

THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

Until recently, the psychology of adolescence has been dominated by theory
and observation of pathological adolescent development. It had been widely
assumed that adolescence was, almost by definition, an unpredictable and tumultuous
process, a time when even psychotic-like symptoms were to be expected, a develop-
mental epoch of extreme reshuffling of the dynamic appositions of the personality
structure (Freud, 1958; Spiegel, 1961; Jacobson, 1961; and Ackerman, 1962.)

Two major studies of the 1960's addressed themselves to the question of
whether normal adolescent development was qualitatively different from the process
of adolescence which was observed clinically. Both Masterson (1967) and Offer
(1969), after intensively studying normal adolescents, answered this question in
the affirmative -- that is, they concluded that the Sturm and Drang theories of
adolescence do not apply to modal, asymptomatic adolescents. Similarly, Douvan
and Adelson (1966), after a large-scale intensive study of a non-clinical sample
of adolescents, summed up their findings as follows.

> "we were impressed by the general placidity of tone, by the absence
> of preoccupation with drives and their control that we had expected
> to find."

These three studies all served to illuminate, in a descriptive manner, the
normal process of adolescent growth. Inherent in their approach was the search
for the "typical" normal adolescent in order to differentiate the normal from
the pathological. To date, little has been done to explicate different pathways
through "normal" adolescence or to find a viable classification for distinct
normal developmental types.

60

Ironically, perhaps, it was the earliest work to be done on adolescent psychology, Bernfeld's (1938) "Types of Adolescence", which approached the subject in a categorical manner. Bernfeld classified adolescents on two dimensions, rebellion and compliance, and then sought to explicate the developmental process characteristic of each type.

Since Bernfeld, most work on adolescence has focused on the search for a single theory and has obscured rather than highlighted individual differences at adolescence. Offer's work, the richest and most ambitious of the recent studies, concerns itself only with a modal group of adolescent boys and does not treat those who were extremely high or extremely low on the Self-Image measure.[1]

The present study provides complementary information to the ones cited above. In selecting only very high and very low maturity subjects, two very different modes of adolescent experience are uncovered. One may, borrowing from Bernfeld's approach, view these groups as adolescent "types," as quite distinct developmental paradigms which, in attempting to deal with different developmental problems, manifest themselves phenomenologically in observably distinct ways.

Adolescence has traditionally been discussed by theorists as a phase dominated by two developmental tasks: sexual identity and autonomy. Theorists have consequently addressed themselves to the psychosexual change that underlies the epigenesis of these phenomena. Difference among theorists has ensued not so much from the nature of the psychodynamic rearrangements seen as necessary for adolescent growth, but from the emphasis each writer gives to the particular psychic shift. Most theorists agree, for example, that the libidinal economy is shaken by the resurgence of sexual drives at puberty and must, during adoles-

---

[1] Subjects in this study consisted of 100 boys who scored within one standard deviation of the mean on a Self-Image questionnaire.

cence, reorganize itself to include an irreversible sexual identity. Similarly, most theorists concur that the defensive pattern and superego system must change to allow for adult sexual and social roles and that the ego assumes increasing control of functions that were previously in the province of the superego.

Analyses of adolescent development are commonly replete with the observation that pre-adolescent psychodynamic forces determine the unique manner in which the individual confronts his adolescent tasks and the style in which he phrases its problems. Thus, a child who had only poorly accomplished an earlier phase of individuation will find the task of autonomy in adolescence to be weighted down by pre-Oedipal issues which complicate his attempt to separate from his parents.

Current thinking about adolescence emphasizes the developmental increase in ego control: the ego is seen to grow free of undue pressure from both the id and the archaic superego; the ego ideal increasingly replaces the superego as the ego's guide, a step which marks the shift from childhood authoritarianism to adult ethicality. The process by which these ego changes take place are a function of the pre-adolescent ego organization. We know that ego development does not take place in all adolescents in the same way, just as clinical experience has taught us that the same behavior may have quite different meanings to different individuals.

The late adolescent ego organization that results from the work of the adolescent process is much like that described by our concept of psychosocial maturity. In defining specific ego skills presumed to be increasing during adolescence, the concept assumes that, in the healthy person, the ego is gaining in its generalized capacity to direct the organism. It assumes that as commitment to the reality principle overtakes both impulse discharge and blind moralism, the individual will begin to display the traits central to the maturity concept. Because our concept of psychosocial maturity defines the

62

same end-products of adolescent growth as do the process theories of adolescence, one can postulate a necessary coincidence of psychosexual development and the growth of psychosocial maturity. One must expect that the developmental vicissitudes of psychosexual growth underlie the ego organization which defines psychosocial maturity. Therefore, one would expect the most mature adolescents (as defined by our scale) at any given age to be more advanced along the continuum of theoretically-derived psychosexual development. (See Blos [1962], Sullivan [1953] and Erikson [1968].)

The traits of Individual Adequacy -- work orientation, self-reliance and identity -- are probably tied most closely to how the individual ego resolves internal conflict. As Oedipal and pre-Oedipal dilemmas are resolved once again during adolescence, the conflict-free sphere of the ego is enlarged and extends its directive functions in growth-promoting areas. The adolescent who remains overwhelmed by archaic issues will be least likely to experience the self-esteem and inner-directedness inherent in the Individual Adequacy traits. Similarly, those adolescents who successfully forge an unconflicted sexual identity and whose struggle for autonomy is not overwhelmed by earlier conflicts should experience an enhancement of their self esteem and a gain in Individual Adequacy.

The traits of Social Adequacy -- social commitment, tolerance and openness to change -- are probably less intertwined with psychodynamic forces. These are concerns that go beyond the interests of the individual and, therefore, are generally less highly cathected. Many have attempted to graft psychodynamic principles onto the study of social membership; only in the areas where social behavior or social attitudes are employed in the service of neurotic

63

conflict resolution has this approach met with much success (see Adorno et al., 1950). At present, psychodynamic theory is mostly silent on the subject of healthy prosocial behavior. Abstracting from the theory, one ends up with much the same expectations of the Social Adequacy traits as for the Individual Adequacy traits. Energy freed from defensive purposes is at least available for investment in extra-individual areas. The specific nature of social attitudes (as distinguished from their cathexis) is probably more tied to purely socializing factors -- the attitudes of the family and the community and the individual's social (i.e. class) position in the larger culture.

The contrast between the high and low maturity "types" demonstrates the phenomenological differences that result from varying degrees of maturity at adolescence. Because the adolescent experience is so different for girls and boys, this discussion will consider the sexes separately.

Whereas the high maturity boys derive self esteem from what they do and from the approval of internalized objects, the low boys rely on the approval of their friends to gain a sense of self-worth. Similarly, the high maturity boys demonstrate a struggle for self-definition and self-knowledge in focusing on what they are to become while the low boys remain present-oriented and express themselves primarily in action which serves immediate needs. The lives of these boys, considered in this contrasting manner, demonstrate the manifestation of the psychosocial maturity traits. That is, the psychological world of the high boys, with its occupational focus and self-directed orientation, reflects the Individual Adequacy traits measured by our scales.

Yet to fully understand these adolescent "types", it is necessary to search for the psychodynamic underpinnings of the discrepancies in psychosocial maturity. The advanced developmental state of the high maturity boys should also show relative advancement of mastery of the more psychosexual adolescent tasks, namely, heterosexual identity and autonomy.

64

60

The high and low maturity boys in the present study do show distinctly different patterns of heterosexual involvement. The low boys show far greater heterosexual activity and most of them go steady; i.e. have settled (for the time being) on a single heterosexual object. The high maturity boys, on the other hand, tend to be only tentatively approaching relationships with girls; none have gone steady and several have never dated. It seems puzzling, from the point of view of the theory, that those boys more advanced in psychosocial maturity are retarded in psychosexual growth. Offer (1969), making a similar observation, reported that the non-daters among his male high-school subjects tended to be among the better students.

There are several possible explanations for this apparently inverse pattern of development. First of all, as mentioned previously, there is a lack of any real intimacy in the relationships the low maturity boys describe. Beyond this, the low boys display little emotional intimacy even with their same-sex peers. There is little to indicate that their relationships with others transpire at a complex level; rather, they appear to collect objects for ego-building ends. For the low boys, peers serve to bolster self-esteem ("people approve of me") or to provide identity ("being one of the guys"). Girlfriends seem to extend these functions of the male peers, in addition to functioning periodically as auxiliary superegos. This is, then, far from the kind of internal growth which accompanies the early phases of heterosexuality. It is, perhaps, the behavior without the substance. While the boys are probably learning something about relationships from their contact with girls, it is likely that the lessons are external ones, social skills rather than self-knowledge. Their dating has the same stereotyped quality commented on by Douvan and Adelson (1966), who, in studying a random sample of 3000 adolescents, found dating to be an institution

65

designed for the avoidance of intimacy. They found their subjects to be using dating as an arena for trying out social identity and measuring self esteem.

The high boys, although less active with girls, do not seem greatly troubled by their relative reticence. That they express some conscious worry about their hesitance with girls indicates that attempts at mastery of anxieties about girls are taking place and, most importantly, taking place internally. Although our data do not go deep enough to tell us, it is probable that fantasy is very important to these boys. They are most likely, engaged in the autoplastic reshapings that will get them ready for heterosexual activity. Deutsch (1967) taking issue with traditional theory, suggests that in normal adolescence sexuality is sublimated and emerges later when the character structure is more prepared for it. The high boys appear to support her interpretation.

Other studies (Westley and Epstein, 1969 and Offer, 1969) of normal adolescents have also documented a restraint and conservatism among adolescents in regard to sexual behavior. Growth of heterosexuality, where it is optimally developing, appears to occur gradually and without turmoil.

A second approach to understanding this phenomenon utilizes the Eriksonian stages. The high maturity boys are quite clearly enmeshed in early phases of the identity stage: they are concerned with who they want to become; they are testing their personal skills and talents against the potential demands of the world; they are turning inward and asking themselves about meaning, about their capacities and limitations. They do not appear to be troubled by problems of sexual identity; they are sure they are boys about to become men and their developmental question is "what kind of man shall I be?" They seem to have resolved the sexual identity problem without extensive real world heterosexual contact; their resolution of sexual identity rests more on solid identifications with masculine objects. Their current problem is one of working out a psycho-

social identity.   Developmentally, they are following the Eriksonian progres-

sion, resolving issues of personal identity before proceeding to the dilemmas

of intimacy.

The low boys, however, are less focused on the task of identity formation;

some attempt to avoid this problem altogether.   At the same time that they

disown the quest for psychosocial identity, they betray lingering concerns

about sexual identity.   The low boys' investment in toughness and their

readiness to fight belie residual conflict over who is really a man.   This

concern is fundamentally different from the problem of psychosocial identity,

and it is a conflict which occurs developmentally earlier.   The low boys may

be somewhat fixated here and prematurely entering into pseudo-intimacy with

girls as a way of bolstering their feeling of masculinity.

The high and low boys, therefore, display two quite distinct modes of

dealing with the problem of heterosexuality at adolescence.   Where other

research has attempted to uncover a single typical pattern of adolescent

development, this study indicates that there are at least two "types" of

developmental configurations that may occur during this stage.   These data

do not indicate that meaningful heterosexual experience is characteristic of

either end of the maturity continuum.   Nor do they show that overt heterosex-

ual activity is conducive to or reflective of psychosocial maturity.   Instead,

it appears that heterosexual behavior may be used for a variety of developmental

needs and that psychosexual growth may take place internally with only limited

and tentative experience with the opposite sex.

A second task of development emphasized by nearly all theorists is the

growth of autonomy and the decline of dependence on the parents.   In general,

researchers have observed theory-predicted decline in the need for parental ego

support, and have observed this increase in independence to occur gradually over

67

the adolescent years. Douvan and Adelson found the concept of autonomy central to describing growth at adolescence. They viewed the boys they studied as moving toward independence by first relying on the judgment of their peers, then increasingly relying on their own judgment. Westley and Epstein (1969), studying a sample of male college freshmen, found the development of autonomy to be most highly related to the attitudes of the family. Autonomy was most often achieved by adolescents whose families were most able to allow them to experience themselves as separate people.

As expected, our high and low maturity boys do differ in their patterns of autonomy. The low boys reach out for independence through rebellion and negativism, testing the limits their parents set while, paradoxically, hoping that these limits are enforced. By contrast, the high boys show more internalization of parental expectations. They need not, therefore, be quite so enmeshed in the specifics of the external demands (i.e. being home at 12 o'clock versus 1 o'clock); they are free to make their own decisions because in all likelihood, their decision will not be so deviant from parental wishes that the parents will object.

It is interesting, however, that so many of the high maturity boys describe earlier instances of the authority conflicts currently typical of the low boys. Offer (1969) reported that the modal teenagers he studied also remembered themselves to be rebellious when they were younger (ages 10-13). It may be that the fact of adolescent-parent struggle is less noteworthy than when it occurs. For the high boys, rebellion during early adolescence seems to be a forerunner of relative self-assurance and self-direction during these later years. The movement away from the negativistic variety of autonomy may be predictive of greater psychosocial maturity. What remains unclear, however, is whether the low maturity boys are simply experiencing a developmental sequence later than normal, whether they are stuck in a stage which they are unable to resolve or whether their earlier

histories of development of internal control structures not only necessitates a different pattern of adolescence but also foreshadows adult problems in self-direction.

Perhaps a more impressive distinction between the high and low boys rests on their autonomy vis-à-vis the peer group. The low boys are entrenched with their peers, while the high boys are more distant, more judicious in their involvement. What seems to have occurred developmentally is that for the low boys, the parents were never much of a resource for self-esteem and the peer group has taken over that function. Because these boys do not have solid internalized positive self-images, they must continually replenish self-esteem supplies through experiences with their friends. By contrast, the high boys have internalized earlier positive self-feeling derived from parental approval; for them, peers are an additional source of ego support but one on which they need not be wholly reliant. Rosenberg (1965), studying 5000 high school juniors and seniors, found boys who report close relationships with their fathers to have higher self-esteem and a more stable self-image than those who described these relationships as more distant. While it is not characteristic of our high maturity boys to be close to their fathers in particular, it is characteristic for them to be close to someone in their family who, at very least, they trust to approve of them. It is this fundamental, historically important, source of self-esteem that allows peer relationships to be auxiliary and to be experienced in perspective. The lack of such a relationship, which is at least the way the low boys perceive their families, leads to a sense of inferiority and a hunger for objects which will mitigate that hurt.

Having contrasted the high and low groups in light of both theory and empirical research, it is clear that these boys are confronting different constellations of forces at adolescence and hence, must proceed through it along different pathways. In Eriksonian terms, the high maturity boys are

69

developmentally on target -- they are tackling the intricacies of identity formation, living the present with an eye to the future -- in a word, becoming. The low maturity boys, however, are dealing with identity concerns only to the extent that the society foists it upon them; such growth does not spring from their own internal necessity. This is, perhaps, where intensive research has its greatest value. If one asks these boys superficially about their plans for the future, it is likely that their responses will sound the same. However when one talks in depth to them, it becomes clear how different the meaning of the future is for the high and low boys. It is the difference between meeting a challenge with exuberance and getting through it with relief.

The low boys' psychological center seems to lie in mastering their feelings of inferiority, a sense which, again in Eriksonian terms, is the negative outcome of the industry stage. Having failed to consolidate a sense of self-esteem through either skill mastery or approving introjects, the low boys can only dread the more complex task of the next stage, identity formation. As a result, these boys employ various maneuvers to avoid it - ignoring the problem, getting others to decide or retreating into activity.

All of this has far-reaching effects on the other behaviors and attitudes subsumed by our concept of maturity. Traits central to Individual Adequacy (work orientation, self-reliance and identity) are obvious derivatives of the different strategies utilized by the two groups for dealing with the pscychosexual-psychosocial crises already discussed. It is less clear how the Social Adequacy traits relate to the ongoing developmental process. One postulate is that as growth through the stages of adolescence proceeds, egocentrism declines. The theory of adolescence presupposes that as the internal conflicts of middle adolescence subside, the ego's focus widens to include all of society or, at least, a larger share of it. This applies,

.70

66

with some qualification, to the high maturity boys.   Because they are not pre-
occupied with conflicts over dependency needs, they are more ready to experience
interdependence;   i.e. they have become sensitive to the necessity for reciprocity
in social organization.   At the same time, because they have more confidence in
themselves, they are probably more able than the low boys to accept the different-
ness of others and the possibilities of future social change.   Their outlook is
expansive rather than defensive.

The qualification mentioned above is related to the lack of ideals or even
genuine social consciousness among any of these boys.   What social values they
may have are clearly not of any dominant importance to them;   they all, for the
most part, leave social decision-making to others.   In their attitudes, perhaps,
the high boys are more sensitive and accepting of social necessity, but these
concerns have little real place in their lives.   It is possible that the tests
of social adequacy, the real confrontations of social membership, are yet to come
for these boys;   as a result, at this stage of their lives, we can only measure
the precursors of later development.

Female Development

Understanding of female development in adolescence is a far more complicated
task. Female development is quieter, subtler.   And because the end points of
female development are ambiguous, it is harder to identify significant markers
along the way.

Most theorists (including Deutsch, 1944; and Blos, 1962) have stressed
the development of sexual identity as the central task of female adolescence.

71

The growth of "femininity," the suppression of "masculinity," and the prepara-
tion for wifehood and motherhood -- these are emphasized as the foci of the
young girl's struggles during this phase.   The social change in women's roles
has, however, rendered these terms somewhat inscrutable.   As girls are in-
creasingly permitted more active components in their identities, as the
cultural ideal for women increasingly is transmuted into an integration of
care-taking and career, the nature of "femininity" becomes more difficult to
define.

Despite the increasing overlap between male and female roles, it remains a
simple task to "discover" and discuss the differences that exist between boys
and girls.   The more perplexing problem is the assessment of meaningful dimen-
sions on which to compare girls to each other.   We know, from past research,
that whereas boys gain status and prestige from activities, girls concentrate
on popularity (Coleman, 1961) and that while boys orient their adolescence to
making identity decisions, girls tend to postpone these life decisions until a
husband is found (Douvan and Adelson, 1966).   The single most predominant and
recurrent difference found between girls and boys at this age is that girls have
a far greater interpersonal focus while the boy's identity rests more directly
on his development of autonomy.   Douvan and Adelson stress that "the adolescent
crisis for boys and girls differs in almost every regard (p.346)."   They found
the interpersonal sphere of girls to be superordinate to the development of both
eroticism and identity.   Interpersonal ties serve not only as a vehicle for
exploration of the girl's emerging sexual nature but also as a means of defining
her individuality and goals for herself. ,

The girls in the present study demonstrate such a difference from the boys
in their greater sensitivity to interpersonal nuance.   They use interpersonal

72

ties to sharpen their sense of human differentiation and, consequently, they

gain a more articulated representation of themselves.   Interpersonal rela-

tionships, then, are the currency with which female adolescent transactions and

development take place.   But within this highly complex arena, the relationships

serve a variety of functions, some of which will be explored later.

The girls in this study differ from each other less in terms of their

overt behavior than in their styles of regarding themselves and others.   Where

one could find apparent real world differences in activities and goals between

the high and low boys, the high and low girls are on the one hand, observably

more similar to one another, and, on the other hand, internally more distinct.

A major difference between the high and low girls can be subsumed under

the framework of psychological complexity.   Where the high girls can reflect-

ively consider themselves and their own growth, the low girls find self

examination too threatening.   Perhaps as a result of this, the low maturity

girls are focused on what is most immediate and most concrete.   They want

what everyone else wants.   They exemplify the stages of ego development that

Loevinger and Wessler (1970) describe as Self-Protective and Conformist.

Lucy and the other low maturity girls in the second subtype orient themselves

to their world in what Loevinger and Wessler term a Self-Protective manner.

The central concerns of these girls are to manipulate others for their own

needs and to act to keep themselves out of trouble.   Because they experience

themselves as vulnerable and somewhat inadequate, they tend to externalize

blame, to be wary of others and to be consciously preoccupied with maintaining

some sense of control of the things and people in their lives.   Linda and

the other girls in her subtype have a Conformist orientation.   In accepting

social norms without question and depending, above all, on social approval,

they rely on simple conceptualizations of themselves and the world.   One feels,

in speaking to these girls, that they are trying to erase their individuality

73

rather than explore it.   Banality characterizes their psychological world,
a world where tension -- and growth -- have been abolished.

The high maturity girls, on the other hand, strive for abstract goals,
are more able to delay gratification and are more concerned with discovering
a manner of being that is uniquely satisfying to themselves.   They typify
what Loevinger and Wessler term a Conscientious orientation, a higher level of
ego development.   Their world is complex and they view their lives as in their
own control and subject to evaluation by their own standards.   Because these
girls have achieved a measure of self-differentiation, they can experience
others objectively and complexly and can use their interactions with others to
increase their own self-definition.

The psychodynamic forces that underlie the greater ego development of the
high maturity girls remain unclear.   There are no overt differences in family
constellations' or early developmental paradigms.   The girls do differ, however,
in their experience of anxiety and tension.   Where the high maturity girls can
tolerate internal conflict, the low maturity girls seem to rid themselves of
any internal tension.   Each of the high maturity girls presented some problem
with which she was actively struggling; each seemed able to discuss an important
issue for which she did not have a ready solution.   One suspects that the
defensive system in these girls is adequate and flexible enough to allow for the
experience of the anxieties that accompany growth.   The low girls, by contrast,
lack this capacity.   Conflicts must be immediately solved and wishes directly
gratified or disowned.   These girls act to maintain equilibrium with the en-
vironment by ridding themselves of whatever feelings or impulses may cause
anxiety.   It is their inability to tolerate tension that seems to underlie their
emotional stagnation.

74

A second major difference between the high and low maturity girls lies in their degree of autonomy-individuation. Although the high girls cannot be said to be truly _independent_, they are _less_ dependent for direction and limits on either their peers or parents than are the low maturity girls. The high girls' greater sense of autonomy coincides with their greater confidence in their ability to control their impulses. Within limits, the high girls trust themselves to be their own parents; they have internalized parental ego and superego supports enough to make some of their own decisions. The low girls, however, show less of this internalization. In experiencing a lack of internal controls, the low girls must maintain the external objects to keep them in line. While they may exhibit a certain amount of rebelliousness from time to time, the low maturity girls seem not to be striving for independence.

It is far more difficult to place these girls on a developmental continuum than it is for boys. Because the Eriksonian stages of identity and intimacy are probably merged for girls (Douvan and Adelson, 1966; Josselson, 1972), identity development proceeds at a deeper and less tangible level. Identity for these girls is largely not occupational; both high and low girls are most highly invested in the interpersonal sphere. Yet it is clear that the high and low maturity girls use these interpersonal relationships to meet different needs. For the low girls, friends serve primarily skill-learning and self-esteem building functions. Friendship circles are used to practice the vicissitudes of interpersonal loyalty and betrayal, to dispel anxiety, particularly anxieties about sexuality, and to provide a reservoir of social approval. Above all, the low maturity girls use their friends in an identif-icatory manner; they want to be just like their friends who they want to be just like them. The high maturity girls, while they, too, use friendships in

75

the above ways, also rely on their friendships to provide self-differentiating experiences. They choose -- and value -- some friends who are different from them; this provides them with an arena to explore and test their own identities and to practice mutuality.

It is of interest that there is so little difference in the way the high and low girls make use of heterosexual relationships. Neither group exhibits any real intimacy with boys; both groups primarily experience boys in terms of the status and prestige value the boys have in the eyes of other girls. One gets the feeling, in talking to these girls, that discussing their boyfriends with other girls is emotionally more meaningful to them than the experience with the boyfriend itself. This would suggest that boys are adjunctive to the girlfriend relationships which themselves are employed in the service of skill-learning or identity testing. To that extent, these girls are preparing for the experience of intimacy, using quasi-intimate relationships to enhance identity-testing which is the developmental task at hand.

The themes discussed above illuminate the distinction evidenced by the psychosocial maturity scores. The seriousness and self-awareness of the high girls as well as their relative immunity to group pressure seem to underlie their high Individual Adequacy scores. The low girls, on the other hand, who respond to the givens of a situation, retreat into conformity and have little interest in their own individuality, score low in Individual Adequacy. With respect to Social Adequacy, the girls who score high also appear on interview to have greater empathy, greater ability to tolerate differentness in others and greater appreciation for the intricacies of the larger society. The low girls, with their fundamentally ego-centric orientation, seem relatively unable to consider issues beyond what immediately impinges on them.

76

SUMMARY

This paper has explored the phenomenological and psychodynamic differences
between adolescents who score at the high and low extremes of the Psychosocial
Maturity Inventory. The development of psychosocial maturity has been viewed
against the background of adolescent ego development. The freedom from impulse,
the gains in self esteem, the resolution of sexual identity and the growth of
autonomy that are the outcomes of the adolescent process all contribute to a
higher degree of individual and social adequacy. The growth of heterosexuality,
however, has been shown to have a complex and nonlinear relationship to psycho-
social maturity.

77

References

Ackerman, N.W. Adolescent problems: a symptom of family disorder. *Family Process*, 1962, 1, 202-13.

Adorno, T., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J. and Sanford, N. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper, 1950.

Bernfeld, S. Types of adolescence. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 1938, 7, 243-53.

Blos, P. *On adolescence: a psychoanalytic interpretation.* New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Coleman, J.S. *The adolescent society.* New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

Deutsch, H. *Psychology of women, Volume I.* New York: Grune and Stratton, 1944.

Deutsch, H. *Selected problems of adolescence.* New York: International Universities Press, 1967.

Douvan, E. and Adelson, J. *The adolescent experience.* New York: Wiley, 1966.

Erikson, E. *Young man Luther.* New York: Norton Press, 1958.

Freud, A. Adolescence. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, Volume XIII, 255-78, New York: International Universities Press, 1958.

Greenberger, E., Hollick, R., Josselson, R., Makurath, M. & McConochie, D. Measuring psychosocial maturity: a status report. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University, 1974.

Greenberger, E., Josselson, R., Knerr, C. and Knerr, B. The measurement and structure of psychosocial maturity. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. In press.

Greenberger, E. & Sørensen, Aa. B. Toward a concept of psychosocial maturity. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 1974, 3, 229-258.

Jacobson, E. Adolescent moods and the remodeling of psychic structures in adolescence. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, Volume XVI. 164-183,

Josselson, R. Psychodynamic aspects of identity formation in college women. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. Vol. 2, No. 1, 1973.

Josselson, R., Greenberger, E. & McConochie, D. On the validity of the psychosocial Maturity Inventory: Relationship to teacher nominations. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University, in press.

Loevinger, J. and Wessler, R. *Measuring ego development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

$\int 78$

Masterson, J. F.   The psychiatric dilemma of adolescence.   Boston: Little,
    Brown and Company, 1967.

McConochie, D., Greenberger, E. & Josselson, R.   An exploratory examination
    of individual, family, and school influences on psychosocial maturity.
    Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns
    Hopkins University, 1974.

Offer, D.   The psychological world of the teenager, New. York: Basic Books,
    1969.

Spiegel, L.A.   Disorder and consolidation.   Journal of the American Psycho-
    analytic Association, 1961, 9.

Sullivan, H. S.   The interpersonal theory of psychiatry.   New York: Norton
    1953.

Westley, W. A. and Epstein, N. B.   The silent majority.   San Francisco:
    Jossey-Bass Incorporated, 1969.

Appendix A

Schedule of Questions for Structured Interview

What program are you taking here at school?

What subjects do you particularly enjoy?

What subjects do you not enjoy?

Are there any subjects you're particularly good at? Any you particularly have difficulty with?

Is there a teacher here at this school you feel particularly close to? Who? Why? Others?

What clubs or groups do you belong to? What do you do in your free time? Do you spend it alone or with friends?

Do you have a job for which you are paid? Doing what? What do you like best about it? What do you like least?

What do you use your own money for?

What are your parents' ideas about how you spend your money?

What occupation does your father have? Does he like his work? How about your mother?

Do you want to have the same kind of life as (same-sex parent)?

How do you expect your future life to be different?

What plans do you have for the future? When did you decide on this? How? Do you feel there are any alternatives? How do you plan to implement your choice?

How willing would you be to change your mind if something better were to come along?

Most parents have plans for their children -- things they would like them to go into or do. Have your parents had plans like that for you?

How do they feel about your plans now?

What are the kids at this school like?

Do you have one or two very close friends -- people you spend most of your time with? Who? How long have you known them? How did you meet them? What do you do together? What do you talk about together?

What are the most important things a friend should be?

80

A-1

Think of a boy (girl) that everyone likes.   What do you think they like about
    him (her)?

What makes a girl (boy) popular with boys (girls)?

What do you think are the reasons that some boys (girls) are not liked?

Do you go out on dates?   Have a particular boy (girl) friend?

Do you plan to marry?   When?   What qualities would you look for in someone
    to marry?

Who lives in your home?

Who do you take after -- father or mother?   In what way?

What would you say is your mother's best trait (best thing about her)?

How would you most like her to be different?

What would you say is your father's best trait?

How would you most like him to be different?

Would you say your parents have some old-fashioned ideas or ideas about which
    you disagree?   Do you ever discuss politics with them?   Do you mostly
    agree or disagree?   About what?

Are there ways that you wish that your parents were more like some of your
    friends' parents?

Most parents have some ideas about how they want their children to be?   What
    are the most important things your parents expect of you?

What do you think would happen if parents did not make rules?

What would be the reason that a teenager might break a rule?

During the last three years, what has been most important in your life?   What
    have you learned in this time?   What is most important in your life now?

Who are the people who have been most important to you in the last three years?
    Who are most important now?   Anyone we haven't discussed?

In retrospect, what is the most important thing your high school has done for
    you?   Out of all things, how has it changed you?   How do you wish it
    it were different?

What are the three major problems a teenager has to master during the high school years?

Suppose a girl (boy) tells someone that she (he) thinks a friend is immature? What do you think he (she) means by that? What does it mean to be mature?

What religion are you? What religion are your parents?

How frequently do you go to church? Is your religion important to you? Have you ever seriously questioned any of your religious beliefs? Do you ever engage in long discussions about religion with your friends?

Do you have any strong political beliefs? Where did you get these ideas? How do you want to see our country change? What changes are important?

If you had three wishes what would you wish for?

What is your earliest memory? Just on the spur of the moment, what is the earliest thing you can remember? Next earliest?

Now I'm going to ask you about some problems that girls (boys) your age might face.

Jane (John) was told by a close friend of her (his) that someone had said unkind things about her (him). What does she (he) do about it?

A boy (girl) is engaged to a girl (boy) who wanted him to change certain habits and manners. What does he do? How does he (she) feel?

While she is giving your class a test, your teacher is called out of the room. She asks you to take over the class and to make sure that nobody cheats. You see a close friend of yours copying from someone else's paper. What would you do? How about if it was someone you didn't know?