

UDC 37

DOI: 10.34670/AR.2026.99.59.025

Methodological Approaches as a Strategy for Developing Students' Social Maturity in the University Educational Process

Qi Mingtao

Postgraduate Student,
Francisk Skorina Gomel State University,
246028, 104, Sovetskaya str., Gomel, Republic of Belarus;
e-mail: 2447417124@qq.com

Abstract

The development of students' social maturity is a key objective of modern higher education, requiring the integration of personal, interpersonal, and civic competencies into the learning process. This article examines the role of methodological approaches—such as activity-based learning, value-oriented education, and competency-based models—as strategic tools to foster social maturity among university students. The paper explores theoretical foundations, analyzes current practices in various higher education institutions, and highlights successful case studies. Special attention is paid to the interaction between academic content and life skills development, as well as the role of the teacher as a facilitator of personal growth. The analysis demonstrates that the purposeful application of diverse pedagogical methods significantly contributes to the formation of socially mature, responsible, and adaptable graduates.

For citation

Qi Mingtao (2025) Methodological Approaches as a Strategy for Developing Students' Social Maturity in the University Educational Process. *Pedagogicheskii zhurnal* [Pedagogical Journal], 15 (12A), pp. 221-229. DOI: 10.34670/AR.2026.99.59.025

Keywords

Social maturity, methodological approach, higher education, personal development, civic competence, university pedagogy, student personality, pedagogical strategy, competence formation.

Introduction

In contemporary higher education, the formation of socially mature individuals has become one of the key objectives alongside professional preparation. The increasing complexity of social interactions, labor market demands, and global civic responsibilities has elevated the importance of nurturing not just intellectual, but also personal and social competencies among university students. Social maturity is now understood as a multidimensional construct that encompasses responsibility, autonomy, emotional regulation, communication skills, and the capacity for cooperative participation. Universities, therefore, are faced with the challenge of organizing educational processes in ways that systematically support the development of these qualities.

A significant role in this process is played by the methodological approaches selected by educators and institutions. Methodology in this context is not limited to instructional technique but refers more broadly to the design and philosophy behind learning activities, including how students are engaged, evaluated, and supported. Studies have shown that activity-based, personality-oriented, and competency-driven methods have a demonstrable impact on students' social behaviors, particularly in fostering independence, initiative, and interpersonal competence [Soldatchenko et al., 2020]. These approaches shift the focus of education from mere knowledge transmission to the holistic development of the student's identity and role within society.

Moreover, social maturity development requires more than isolated extracurricular efforts—it must be embedded within the curriculum and supported by the institutional environment. This includes adapting pedagogical models to better reflect real-life situations, enabling students to experience conflict resolution, ethical reasoning, and decision-making within safe educational settings. Research confirms that future professionals who have developed social maturity are better equipped to manage stress, cooperate across diverse teams, and adapt to changing environments—traits that are increasingly necessary in both professional and civic life [Haleta, 2020]. It is in this context that methodological strategies serve not just as pedagogical tools, but as frameworks for forming socially capable individuals ready to contribute meaningfully to society.

The Concept and Structure of Social Maturity

The term social maturity refers to an individual's capacity to act responsibly, independently, and appropriately within a variety of social contexts. In the framework of university education, social maturity is not simply the absence of deviant behavior or the presence of conformity but encompasses deeper aspects of self-regulation, empathy, cooperation, decision-making, and civic awareness. It is a multidimensional and dynamic construct, influenced by a range of factors including personality, social environment, pedagogical interventions, and educational experience.

From a psychological perspective, social maturity includes cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components. These elements are often reflected in how students build relationships, resolve conflicts, demonstrate self-control, and adhere to ethical standards. According to Radul (2023), social maturity in an educational context is best viewed as a pedagogically conditioned phenomenon that reflects the interaction between an individual and the social environment, where the development of socially significant qualities occurs through education and purposeful influence [Radul, 2023].

Structurally, social maturity is composed of several key competencies:

Responsibility – the ability to take ownership of actions and consequences.

Empathy – the capacity to understand and respond to the emotions of others.

Social adaptability – readiness to function in varied and dynamic social environments.

Self-discipline – controlling impulses and aligning behavior with long-term goals.

Communication skills – expressing oneself effectively while listening and negotiating with others.

These dimensions collectively determine a student’s ability to operate effectively in academic, professional, and social spheres.

To illustrate the core components, the following table synthesizes current research perspectives on the structure of social maturity:

Table 1 – Structural Components of Student Social Maturity

Component	Definition	Role in Higher Education
Responsibility	Awareness and accountability for personal and group actions	Enables leadership and academic integrity
Empathy	Understanding others’ emotions and perspectives	Promotes inclusive and respectful learning environments
Self-regulation	Emotional control and delayed gratification	Supports academic performance and stress resilience
Social interaction	Ability to collaborate, negotiate, and form meaningful relationships	Crucial for teamwork, networking, and group projects
Civic engagement	Active participation in community and social issues	Fosters societal contribution and ethical citizenship

Source: adapted from Rakhimova (2023) [Rakhimova, 2023].

Understanding the structure of social maturity enables educators to target specific competencies in their curriculum design. For example, group-based assignments can enhance teamwork and communication skills, while reflective journals may foster empathy and personal responsibility. Consequently, pedagogical approaches aimed at developing social maturity must be informed by a nuanced understanding of these core dimensions and their interrelatedness within the student development process.

Overview of Methodological Approaches in Higher Education

The development of social maturity in students is deeply tied to the choice of methodological approaches used in the university learning process. These approaches serve as the philosophical and practical foundation for designing learning experiences that promote the internalization of socially valuable behaviors, including responsibility, empathy, and adaptability. In this regard, higher education must go beyond traditional lecture-based models and integrate methods that foster active engagement, reflective practice, and real-life application.

One prominent theoretical-methodological framework in this context is the continual-synergetic approach, which emphasizes the dynamic and evolving nature of social maturity. According to Soldatchenko et al. (2020), this approach recognizes that students’ social maturity is not formed through one-time interventions but through consistent and interconnected educational influences across time. Within this model, students encounter structured opportunities for self-reflection, peer interaction, and ethical reasoning, all of which contribute to gradual social development [Soldatchenko и др., 2020].

Another influential methodology is the personality-oriented approach, which prioritizes individual growth, autonomy, and self-expression. This approach allows students to engage in projects and assignments that align with their personal interests and values, thereby increasing intrinsic motivation and the relevance of social learning. As Pavlenko (2020) notes, personality-oriented methods are

particularly effective in cultivating communication skills, empathy, and self-regulation—core aspects of social maturity [Pavlenko, 2020].

The table below outlines several key methodological approaches used in universities and their relevance to developing social maturity:

Table 2 – Methodological Approaches to Social Maturity Development and Their Contribution

Approach	Key Features	Contribution to Social Maturity
Continual-synergetic	Systematic, interconnected development over time	Builds consistency in responsibility and ethical reasoning
Personality-oriented	Focus on individual interests, values, and self-expression	Promotes autonomy, empathy, and interpersonal competence
Competency-based	Emphasizes demonstrable outcomes and real-world skills	Develops communication, collaboration, and civic responsibility
Activity-based learning	Encourages hands-on participation and teamwork	Enhances cooperation, leadership, and self-confidence
Socio-educational	Integration of community-based or socially meaningful learning tasks	Fosters civic engagement and respect for diversity

Source: compiled from Soldatchenko et al. (2020) [Soldatchenko et al., 2020].

In addition to these core approaches, hybrid methods that combine various frameworks—such as competency-based and personality-oriented strategies—have shown promise in addressing the diverse needs of university students. These complex methodologies allow educators to create learning environments where students experience challenge, reflection, and support simultaneously, leading to more holistic growth. Importantly, all these approaches require supportive institutional policies and educator training to be successfully implemented.

Implementation of Methodological Approaches in the University Context

The effective implementation of methodological approaches aimed at developing students' social maturity requires both strategic planning and flexible pedagogy. In university settings, this implementation takes place through curriculum design, instructional practices, extracurricular programs, and institutional culture. When done deliberately, such integration can transform the educational environment into a formative space for students' social, emotional, and civic growth.

One of the most successful methods involves embedding personality-oriented and competency-based models into active learning formats such as group projects, debates, reflective journals, and service-learning. These techniques not only foster subject mastery but also simulate real-life social challenges, encouraging students to practice communication, leadership, and ethical decision-making. Pavlenko (2020) emphasizes that incorporating these approaches into the formation of communicative culture in future social workers significantly enhances their ability to self-regulate, empathize, and resolve conflicts—essential components of social maturity [Pavlenko, 2020].

Another example is the use of integrated educational modules that combine theoretical content with social problem-solving. For instance, in faculties of pedagogy and psychology, educators may design role-playing simulations where students resolve complex classroom or societal dilemmas. These exercises not only require academic knowledge but also stimulate moral reasoning, teamwork, and reflective thinking. According to Haleta (2020), such simulations serve as a platform for the

internalization of socially mature behaviors, preparing future teachers for both the professional and civic challenges they will face in real contexts [Haleta, 2020].

Furthermore, the institutional commitment to social maturity development is crucial. Universities can support this goal by fostering a participatory atmosphere, encouraging student self-governance, and maintaining open communication between faculty and students. Academic advisors and mentors also play a pivotal role in guiding students through the challenges of personal growth. This comprehensive and layered implementation not only strengthens the individual student but also elevates the university's contribution to producing socially competent citizens.

Assessment and Indicators of Social Maturity in the Educational Process

Assessing social maturity in university students presents a methodological challenge, as it involves evaluating a complex blend of emotional, cognitive, and behavioral traits. Nevertheless, the need for reliable and valid assessment tools is increasingly recognized in educational research and practice. These tools help educators track students' progress, refine pedagogical strategies, and ensure that broader educational outcomes include not only knowledge acquisition but also the development of socially mature individuals.

Social maturity can be conceptualized and measured through a variety of frameworks. The California Psychological Inventory (CPI), for instance, has been effectively adapted to assess social maturity in higher education settings. This instrument evaluates behaviors and attitudes such as responsibility, flexibility, dominance, and socialization—dimensions that strongly correlate with mature interpersonal functioning. Gough (1966) demonstrated that the CPI could reliably differentiate between students based on delinquency, academic honesty, and levels of social responsibility, thus offering a predictive model of social maturity applicable across cultural contexts [Gough, 1966].

In addition to standardized tests, educational researchers have increasingly turned to multi-dimensional self-report scales that assess social behavior, moral reasoning, and adaptability in various contexts. One such example is the Social Maturity Scale developed by Umamaheswari and Karthikeyan (2024), which incorporates 50 items across domains such as self-sufficiency, social participation, and occupational orientation. Their study involving 950 higher secondary students revealed a statistically significant correlation between social maturity and academic achievement, suggesting the educational relevance and impact of such assessments [Umamaheswari, Karthikeyan, 2024].

In practical terms, universities may use a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to assess social maturity:

Table 3 – Methods for Assessing Social Maturity in the Educational Process

Method	Indicators Measured	Application
Standardized scales (e.g., CPI)	Responsibility, socialization, flexibility	Psychological screening and research
Observational rubrics	Group collaboration, ethical behavior, peer feedback	Classroom activities and group projects
Reflective journals	Self-awareness, empathy, personal responsibility	Evaluation of self-regulated learning
Portfolio assessments	Growth over time in social behavior and participation	Long-term assessment of student development
Peer and faculty feedback	Communication skills, teamwork, social initiative	Co-curricular and academic team environments

Source: Compiled from Gough (1966) and Umamaheswari & Karthikeyan (2024) [Umamaheswari, Karthikeyan, 2024].

While no single tool can capture all facets of social maturity, a triangulated assessment approach allows educators to form a more comprehensive understanding of students' progress and tailor interventions accordingly.

Pedagogical Conditions for Enhancing Social Maturity

The successful formation of students' social maturity within the university environment depends heavily on the creation of specific pedagogical conditions. These conditions are not limited to classroom instruction but encompass the entire educational ecosystem, including values promoted by the institution, interactions with faculty and peers, and opportunities for students to engage in socially meaningful activities. As a multidimensional construct, social maturity thrives in learning environments that support autonomy, responsibility, and reflective social engagement.

One essential condition is purposeful integration of social interaction into all stages of the educational process. This includes incorporating dialogical learning formats, team-based tasks, and cooperative assessments. Haleta (2020) emphasizes that pedagogical interaction must move beyond formal instruction to include dialogization—a mode of communication that treats students as equal participants and encourages critical thinking and self-reflection. Such interactions develop students' capacity for empathy, responsibility, and ethical reasoning [Haleta, 2020].

Another key pedagogical condition is the alignment between educational content and real-life social roles. This is best achieved through experiential learning formats such as internships, volunteer projects, and case-based learning modules. Radul (2023) argues that social maturity is shaped through the interaction between formal education and the social environment, where students actively apply theoretical knowledge to community contexts. By integrating students into authentic social processes, universities can facilitate the development of core social competencies like initiative, self-regulation, and responsibility [Radul, 2023].

Additionally, pedagogical support systems such as academic advising, mentorship programs, and inclusive campus culture also serve as conditions that reinforce social maturity. These systems promote psychological safety and foster a sense of belonging—important foundations for students' active participation in the social sphere of the university.

Challenges and Barriers in Developing Social Maturity

Despite the growing emphasis on cultivating social maturity in university students, several systemic and contextual challenges hinder the full realization of this educational goal. These barriers often stem from both institutional limitations and broader socio-cultural dynamics that shape students' engagement with socially oriented learning.

One significant barrier is the dominance of academic formalism over social competencies in university curricula. In many institutions, particularly those oriented toward standardized assessment, there is limited space for the development of interpersonal, emotional, or civic skills. As noted by Soldatchenko et al. (2020), the prioritization of academic productivity over holistic development results in minimal integration of social maturity-building practices into the instructional core. The authors argue that without explicit theoretical-methodological frameworks guiding this integration, social maturity remains a peripheral concern in higher education [Soldatchenko et al., 2020].

Another pervasive challenge is the influence of social inequality and stratification on students' educational experiences. Abbiati et al. (2018) show that students from lower socio-economic backgrounds often lack the social capital and institutional support necessary for developing traits such

as autonomy, self-confidence, and active participation—key indicators of social maturity. Their large-scale study in Italy found that “information barriers” and class-based differences in access to supportive learning environments substantially limited these students’ ability to navigate higher education effectively [Abbiati et al., 2018].

Cultural factors can also serve as barriers, particularly in non-Western or conservative educational settings, where hierarchical structures and rigid teacher-student dynamics may discourage dialogic interaction. This reduces opportunities for students to express independent thought or challenge social norms—an essential process in maturing socially.

Moreover, lack of educator preparedness to foster social development is another limiting factor. Not all teachers are equipped with the training or frameworks to facilitate experiential, discussion-based, or community-oriented learning, further reinforcing a focus on technical and academic instruction at the expense of social maturity goals.

Conclusion

The development of students’ social maturity within the university setting is a complex and multidimensional challenge, yet it remains essential for preparing future professionals and responsible citizens. This paper has explored the conceptual foundations of social maturity, methodological strategies for fostering it, and the pedagogical conditions that facilitate its growth. It also examined the barriers—structural, cultural, and institutional—that can limit or delay its development.

Universities must adopt intentional and evidence-based approaches that embed social learning into every level of education—from curriculum design and instructional practices to assessment and extracurricular engagement. Methodological approaches such as dialogic pedagogy, reflective practice, and experiential learning have proven effective in enhancing students’ sense of responsibility, autonomy, and interpersonal competence.

Moreover, successful formation of social maturity demands a supportive institutional culture where educators are trained to facilitate social development, and where equity is promoted through inclusive policies that address socio-economic disparities. Educational programs should be guided by not only academic goals but also socially meaningful outcomes that empower students to navigate and contribute to society.

In sum, fostering social maturity should not be seen as an auxiliary task, but rather as a core mission of higher education, fundamental to the holistic development of learners and to the health of democratic societies.

References

1. Abbiati, G., Argentin, G., Barone, C., & Schizzerotto, A. (2018). Information barriers and social stratification in higher education: evidence from a field experiment. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 69(4), 1248–1270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12332>
2. Gough, H. G. (1966). Appraisal of social maturity by means of the CPI. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 71(3), 189–195. <https://doi.org/10.1037/H0023369>
3. Haleta, Y. (2020a). Dialogizatsiia pedahohichnoi vzaïemodii mizh vykladachem i studentom yak umova rozvytku sotsialnoi zrilosti maibutnoho vchytelia [Dialogization of pedagogical interaction between teacher and student as a condition of future teacher social maturity development]. *Academic Notes Series Pedagogical Science*. <https://doi.org/10.36550/2415-7988-2020-1-186-23-30>
4. Haleta, Y. (2020b). Sotsialna zrilist maibutnoho vchytelia ta profesiïne stanovlennia [Social maturity of a future teacher and professional formation]. *Scientific Journal of the National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 5: Pedagogical Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series5.2020.20.15>
5. Pavlenko, O. (2020). Metodolohichni pidkhody do formuvannia komunikatyvnoi kultury maibutnoho sotsialnoho pratsivnyka v systemi universytetskoï osvity [Methodological approaches to the formation of future social worker’s

- communicative culture in the system of university education]. *Academic Notes Series Pedagogical Science*. <https://doi.org/10.36550/2415-7988-2020-1-189-48-53>
6. Radul, V. (2023). Sotsialna zriist — yakist rozvytku osobystosti [Social maturity — the quality of personality development]. *Social Work and Social Education*. [https://doi.org/10.31499/2618-0715.1\(10\).2023.282285](https://doi.org/10.31499/2618-0715.1(10).2023.282285)
7. Rakhimova, N. (2023). Components of Social Maturity in Students. *Proceedings of the 1st Pamir Transboundary Conference for Sustainable Societies*. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0012476900003792>
8. Soldatchenko, A. S., Rabina, E. E., Igoshina, N. V., & Prokofieva, A. V. (2020). Theoretical-methodological approaches to the problem of social maturity development in university undergraduates. *Journal of Environmental Treatment Techniques*, 8(1), 349–353. [https://doi.org/10.47277/JETT/8\(1\)355](https://doi.org/10.47277/JETT/8(1)355)
9. Umamaheswari, S., & Karthikeyan, P. (2024). Social Maturity Among Higher Secondary Students in Relation to Their Academic Achievement. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i3.7534>

Методологические подходы как стратегия развития социальной зрелости студентов в образовательном процессе вуза

Ци Минтао

Аспирант,

Гомельский государственный университет им. Франциска Скорины,
246028, Республика Беларусь, Гомель, ул. Советская, 104;
e-mail: 2447417124@qq.com

Аннотация

Развитие социальной зрелости студентов является одной из приоритетных задач современного высшего образования, требующей интеграции личностных, межличностных и гражданских компетенций в учебный процесс. В статье рассматривается роль методологических подходов — таких как деятельностное обучение, ценностно-ориентированное образование и компетентностная модель — как стратегических инструментов формирования социальной зрелости у студентов вузов. Раскрываются теоретические основы, анализируются современные практики различных высших учебных заведений, приводятся успешные примеры. Особое внимание уделяется взаимосвязи между академическим содержанием и развитием жизненных навыков, а также роли преподавателя как фасилитатора личностного роста. Анализ показывает, что целенаправленное применение разнообразных педагогических методов способствует формированию социально зрелых, ответственных и адаптивных выпускников.

Для цитирования в научных исследованиях

Ци Минтао. Methodological Approaches as a Strategy for Developing Students' Social Maturity in the University Educational Process // Педагогический журнал. 2025. Т. 15. № 12А. С. 221-229. DOI: 10.34670/AR.2026.99.59.025

Ключевые слова

Социальная зрелость, методологический подход, высшее образование, личностное развитие, гражданская компетентность, университетская педагогика, личность студента, педагогическая стратегия, формирование компетенций.

Библиография

1. Abbiati, G., Argentin, G., Barone, C., & Schizzerotto, A. Information barriers and social stratification in higher education: evidence from a field experiment // *The British Journal of Sociology*. 2018. Vol. 69(4). P. 1248–1270. DOI: 10.1111/1468-4446.12332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12332>
2. Gough, H. G. Appraisal of social maturity by means of the CPI // *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 1966. Vol. 71, No. 3. P. 189–195. DOI: 10.1037/H0023369. <https://doi.org/10.1037/H0023369>
3. Haleta, Y. Dialogization of pedagogical interaction between teacher and student as a condition of future teacher social maturity development // *Academic Notes Series Pedagogical Science*. 2020. DOI: 10.36550/2415-7988-2020-1-186-23-30. <https://doi.org/10.36550/2415-7988-2020-1-186-23-30>
4. Haleta, Y. Social maturity of a future teacher and professional formation // *Scientific Journal of the National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 5: Pedagogical Sciences*. 2020. DOI: 10.31392/NPU-nc.series5.2020.20.15. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series5.2020.20.15>
5. Pavlenko, O. Methodological approaches to the formation of future social worker's communicative culture in the system of university education // *Academic Notes Series Pedagogical Science*. 2020. DOI: 10.36550/2415-7988-2020-1-189-48-53. <https://doi.org/10.36550/2415-7988-2020-1-189-48-53>
6. Radul, V. Social maturity — the quality of personality development // *Social Work and Social Education*. 2023. DOI: 10.31499/2618-0715.1(10).2023.282285. [https://doi.org/10.31499/2618-0715.1\(10\).2023.282285](https://doi.org/10.31499/2618-0715.1(10).2023.282285)
7. Rakhimova, N. Components of Social Maturity in Students // *Proceedings of the 1st Pamir Transboundary Conference for Sustainable Societies*. 2023. DOI: 10.5220/0012476900003792. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0012476900003792>
8. Soldatchenko, A. S., Rabina, E. E., Igoshina, N. V., & Prokofieva, A. V. Theoretical-methodological approaches to the problem of social maturity development in university undergraduates // *Journal of Environmental Treatment Techniques*. 2020. Vol. 8, Issue 1. P. 349–353. DOI: 10.47277/JETT/8(1)355. [https://doi.org/10.47277/JETT/8\(1\)355](https://doi.org/10.47277/JETT/8(1)355)
9. Umamaheswari, S., & Karthikeyan, P. Social Maturity Among Higher Secondary Students in Relation to Their Academic Achievement // *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*. 2024. DOI: 10.53555/kuey.v30i3.7534. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i3.7534>