Psychosocial Maturity assessment on juvenile justice: A content validity analysis of a novel tool

Evaluación de la Madurez Psicosocial en Justicia Juvenil: Análisis de la validez de contenido de una herramienta novedosa

Elena Palacios-van Isschot [1], Karin Arbach * [2], Antonio Andrés-Pueyo [1]

1 - Departamento de Psicología Clínica y Psicobiología, Universidad de Barcelona. Barcelona, España.
2 - Instituto de Investigaciones Psicológicas, Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas y Universidad Nacional de Córdoba. Córdoba, Argentina.

Introduction
Method
Results
Discussion
References

Abstract

Psychosocial maturity (PM) is a potential factor influencing adolescent decision making and a wide range of social and interpersonal behaviors in adolescents. The current study represents an initial effort to design a new psychosocial maturity test suitable for assessing this construct in the forensic context and juvenile justice settings. Its aim is to establish content validity for a novel assessment tool. After a literature review, 38 items were selected from various existing specific tests and protocols, and 41 experts were instructed to conduct a content validity analysis on them. Content Validity Index results show that 92% of the items were classified by experts as representative to the construct, and Factorial Validity Index results show that experts associated 79% of the items with the correct component of the construct according to theoretical criteria. In conclusion, the majority of items were found to be representative of the construct and of their individual components, providing a valid foundation for the development of a new PM assessment tool. In this study the relevance and implications of the results for judicial tasks are discussed.

Keywords: *psychosocial maturity, juvenile justice, expert judges, content validity, psychological assessment*

Resumen

La madurez psicosocial (MP) es un factor potencial que influye en la toma de decisiones de los adolescentes y su comportamiento social e interpersonal. El estudio actual representa un primer paso para diseñar una nueva prueba de madurez psicosocial adecuada para evaluar este constructo en el contexto forense y en entornos de justicia juvenil. Su objetivo es establecer la validez de contenido para una nueva herramienta de evaluación. Después de una revisión de la literatura, se seleccionaron 38 ítems de diversas medidas y protocolos específicos existentes y se instruyó a 41 expertos para llevar a cabo un análisis de validez de contenido. Los resultados del Índice de Validez de Contenido muestran que el 92% de los ítems analizados fueron clasificados por los expertos como representativos del constructo, y los resultados del Índice de Validez Factorial muestran que los expertos asociaron el 79% de los ítems al constructo propuesto. En conclusión, la mayoría de los ítems se consideraron representativos del constructo y de sus componentes individuales, proporcionando una buena base para desarrollar una herramienta de evaluación de la MP. Se plantea la relevancia e implicaciones de los resultados en las tareas judiciales.

Palabras clave: *madurez psicosocial, justicia juvenil, juicio de expertos, validez de contenido, evaluación psicológica*

Introduction

Diminished capacity, resulting from immaturity, is relevant for criminal court decisions, in particular those related to the antisocial behavior of adolescents and other legal questions (Riggs-Romaine, 2018; Wakeling & Barnett, 2017). Despite the growing demand from forensic psychologists, the development of tools designed to assess maturity in the context of juvenile justice has received limited attention (Wakeling & Barnett, 2017). The existing research on maturity has predominantly focused on cognitive differences between adolescent and adult judgment, while the role of social environment, and its interaction with personal characteristics has been poorly developed (Steinberg & Cauffman, 1996). This issue requires attention because cognitive development results not only from the maturation process or independent interaction with the outside world but also from direct exposure to the world (Narváez-Burbano & Obando-Guerrero, 2023).

The scarcity of research on the role of the social environment is a critical concern, given that adolescents attain biological maturity before achieving social and emotional maturity, thus giving rise to a pronounced "maturity gap" (Belsky et al., 2020; Cavanagh, 2022; Moffitt, 1993, 2003; Ozkan & Worrall, 2017). This disparity is notably prevalent in life-course persistent offenders, who deal with neurological deficits that impede the maturation processes related to self-regulation (Moffitt, 2003; Ozkan & Worrall, 2017). Consequently, research in this area has not been sufficiently comprehensive.

A more constructive approach for the assessment of maturity in juvenile justice settings emerges with the concept of psychosocial maturity (PM) (Steinberg & Cauffman, 1996), which represents maturity of judgment. It refers to the complex process of individual decision-making influenced by cognitive, emotional and social factors (Steinberg & Cauffman, 1996). PM consists of three fundamental components: *temperance, perspective* and *responsibility*. *Temperance* denotes "the capacity to limit impulsivity, avoid extremes in decision-making, evaluate a situation thoroughly and to seek advice before acting" (p.745; Cauffman & Steinberg, 2000). Then, *perspective* involves recognizing the complexity of a situation and making decisions within a larger context (Steinberg & Cauffman, 1996). Finally, *responsibility* represents the ability to be in charge of one's behavior and to resist peer influences, and encompasses three subcomponents: *autonomy, work orientation* and *identity* (Cauffman & Steinberg, 2000).

Studies have demonstrated that PM offers a promising explanation for the process of avoiding criminal behavior during late adolescence and early adulthood, known as *desistance* (Monahan et al., 2009; Rocque et al., 2019). Differences in PM predict decision-making abilities, independently from age or gender (Riggs-Romaine, 2018) in potentially antisocial situations. This compelling empirical evidence has sparked interest in the development of a tool for the assessment of young offenders' PM through their transition into early adulthood (Steinberg et al., 2015). The operationalization of this construct into a measurable instrument carries significant implications for various facets within the domain of juvenile justice.

As of today, the juvenile justice system has yet to implement essential measures aimed at fostering the healthy development of adolescents, despite its primary mission of rehabilitating youth (Cavanagh, 2022). Research has demonstrated that, in legal proceedings involving young offenders, the legal aspects of their cases tend to carry more weight in influencing court decisions, compared to factors related to mental health or maturity (Cauffman et al., 2007; Lambie & Randell,

2013). Nonetheless, adolescents are inherently disadvantaged in comparison to adults when they are faced with choices in antisocial settings, primarily because they have a limited capacity to fully grasp the consequences of their actions. Studies indicate that the incarceration of adolescents can negatively impact their psychosocial development. This impact occurs as incarceration reduces their opportunities for typical social experiences, disrupts their contact with important social influences, and increases their interactions with peers engaged in antisocial behavior. Consequently, this increases the likelihood of adolescents engaging in further delinquent activities (Cavanagh, 2022).

The implementation of a tool for the assessment of PM holds significant potential for augmenting the effectiveness of forensic procedures and judicial decision-making. This innovative instrument would empower the legal system to tailor punitive measures and judgments precisely to the specific levels of maturity displayed by each offender, thereby heralding a new era in the pursuit of justice. Moreover, such a tool would play an essential role in mitigating the potential adverse effects of incarceration on the mental health and psychosocial development of young individuals (Cavanagh, 2022; Lambie & Randell, 2013).

At the professional practice level, the application of this instrument would markedly enhance the precision of diagnostic processes and facilitate the design of interventions targeted at adolescents at risk, thereby promoting effective prevention strategies. Notably, this endeavor aspires to create a novel assessment tool for PM tailored to the Spanish-speaking population, and aims to make it readily accessible to juvenile justice professionals in Latin America and Spain, where limited reviews are available regarding assessment tools for the juvenile justice context. In the long term, the availability of such an instrument would prove highly advantageous for the numerous ado-

lescents navigating legal proceedings (Wenger & Andres-Pueyo, 2016).

In previous studies, the assessment of PM has commonly relied on pre-existing measures that have been validated for similar constructs. To illustrate, assessments of responsibility have frequently drawn from the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI, Greenberger et al., 1975), while evaluations of *temperance* have leaned on the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI, Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990), whereas *perspective* has been explored using the Consideration of Future Consequences Scale (CFC, Strathman et al., 1994), as seen in consulted studies (Cauffman & Steinberg, 2000; Pailing & Reniers, 2018; Riggs-Romaine, 2018).

Nevertheless, the pursuit of a single valid and reliable assessment measure, specifically tailored for evaluating PM within the juvenile justice context, remains an ongoing challenge. In response to this gap in the literature and guided by the authors' definitions and a comprehensive literature review, a selection of 38 items was drawn from existing measures to aptly represent the PM construct. Given the frequent concern about potential misalignment between the data acquired from the instrument's application and the intricate reality it seeks to encapsulate (Expósito et al., 2023), several practicing forensic psychologists were engaged to participate in a content validity analysis of this newly devised assessment tool.

Conducting a content validity study is crucial, especially when no existing measure is available to operationalize the construct in question (Rubio et al., 2003). Commencing such a study is essential to prevent extensive revisions during testing and to ensure the representativeness of its content (Almanasreh et al., 2019). Consequently, the primary objective of this investigation was to conduct a thorough content validity assessment for the 38 selected items derived from prior re-

search. The study's specific objectives were delineated as follows:

O1. To assess, through the expert judgment of authorities in the field, the extent to which each item effectively represents the PM construct (Construct representativeness).

O2. To assess, via expert judgment, the degree to which each item represents a specific component of the PM construct (Component representativeness).

Method
Participants

The selection of experts for this study was based on rigorous criteria encompassing qualifications, substantial experience, clinical expertise and relevant training. Content validity analyses typically recommend a minimum of three experts for such assessments (Lynn, 1986), although some suggest involving as many as twenty experts for robust evaluations (Almanasreh et al., 2019). To ensure comprehensive evaluation, we assembled three distinct groups of experts, with a total of 41 participants. These experts were invited to assess and qualify the items comprising the scale by participating in an online survey administered through the Qualtrics platform. The expert groups were defined as follows:

Group 1: Comprising 14 researchers affiliated with the University of Barcelona, with specialized expertise in the field of Forensic Psychology.

Group 2: Comprising 19 Forensic Psychologists employed by the Spanish Ministry of Justice.

Group 3: Comprising 8 individuals who are members of the Association of Forensic Psychology (APF) and work within the Administration of Justice in Spain.

Recruitment process

The recruitment of experts for this study was meticulously organized, tailored to each expert group, and conducted with a focus on transparency and clarity.

Group 1. Experts from this group received personalized invitations via email. These invitations contained essential background information about the study, along with a URL link to access the survey. Participants in this group were provided with comprehensive definitions of the components of the construct under examination and detailed instructions for the content validity analysis.

Group 2. Experts in this group were invited to participate during an online course focused on Psychosocial Maturity (PM), which was led by the authors A.A. and E.P. The course included an in-depth presentation on the PM model, as proposed by Cauffman and Steinberg (2000). Subsequently, members of this group were also sent personalized email invitations, mirroring the information provided to Group 1, to access the survey.

Group 3. Experts in this group were invited via a representative from the Association of Forensic Psychology (APF), who directly provided them with the URL link to access the survey. Unlike Groups 1 and 2, experts from Group 3 did not receive any contextual information about the study. Their survey access was restricted to the instructions and definitions required for the analysis.

This approach was carefully designed to ensure that all expert groups could participate while considering their specific contexts and information needs.

Procedure and materials

To select items for our assessment, we conducted an extensive review of prior studies on PM. This review identified the most commonly utilized scales and instruments in the existing literature, including: (1) the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI) developed by Weinberger and Schwartz (1990), (2) the Consideration of Future Consequences Scale (CFC) by Strathman et al. (1994), (3) the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI) by Greenberger et al. (1975) and (4) the Psychological Maturity Scale for Adolescents (PSYMAS), as introduced by Morales-Vives et al. (2013). This initial literature review served as the foundation for the creation of a preliminary questionnaire, titled the MAYAS (Wenger-Amengual, 2018), comprising 38 items.

Each of the 38 items underwent a complete semantic and syntactic revision, based on the original items extracted from the WAI, CFC, PSMI and PSYMAS scales mentioned above.

Item selection for preliminary version

In the development of the preliminary version of the questionnaire, we took a structured approach to represent the key components of PM.

Temperance. This component was represented by items drawn from both the Impulse Control and the Consideration of Others subscales of the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI) developed by Weinberger and Schwartz (1990).

Perspective. To capture the perspective component, we utilized items from the Consideration of Future Consequences Scale (CFC) by Strathman et al. (1994). Additionally, we incorporated items from the Consideration of Others scale of the WAI (Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990).

Responsibility. The responsibility component was represented through items sourced from the PSYMAS. This tool was selected due to its specific and contemporary nature compared to the traditionally employed PSMI. The PSYMAS model, based on the individual adequacy component of the PSMI, comprises the same three subcomponents that define responsibility in the Cauffman and Steinberg PM model (2000): *Autonomy (or self-reliance), Identity* and *Work orientation.*

This approach ensured that the preliminary version encompassed relevant items to accurately represent the fundamental components of PM, by the use of validated instruments from the literature.

Preliminary prevision

In the current study, a comprehensive renewal of the pilot protocol of the MAYAS (Wenger-Amengual, 2018) was undertaken, resulting in the creation of the "Psychological Maturity Test for Adolescents in a Forensic Context" (PMTAFC). This revision process involved two critical steps to ensure the comprehensive representation of the PM construct.

1. **Literature Review and Item Categorization:** Firstly, an additional review of specialized literature was conducted to facilitate a systematic categorization of the items. This categorization was instrumental in ensuring that every facet of the PM construct was thoroughly and appropriately represented. Each item was systematically associated with its original source, whether it originated from the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI) by Weinberger and Schwartz (1990), the Consideration of Future Consequences Scale (CFC) by Strathman et al. (1994) or the Psychological Maturity Assessment Scale (PSYMAS) by Morales-Vives et al. (2013).

2. Theoretical Assignment and Assessment: Subsequently, each item was theoretically linked to one of the components of the PM construct. This association allowed for a comprehensive evaluation of each item's comprehensibility, scope, and accurate translation from English to Spanish (through a back-translation process). To address potential gaps in the representation of the *perspective* component, several items from the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) developed by Davis (1980) were incorporated. Moreover, the vocabulary and syntactic structure of all items in this revised draft (PMTAFC) were thoughtfully adapted to optimize comprehension for Spanish-speaking adolescents.

In summation, the scale being examined in this study represents an enhanced iteration of the MAYAS, now referred to as PMTAFC. This revision process significantly improved the translation, comprehensibility, and the overall representativeness of each component.

Expert assessment protocol

With a panel of experts in place, a methodical process was implemented to solicit their evaluations of the PMTAFC items. This assessment involved the experts' completion of a specialized form, designed to guide their analysis through two distinct tasks.

Task 1: Construct Representativeness (O1) - In the initial task, experts were presented with a fundamental question: *Is the item representative of the psychosocial maturity construct?* Their responses were sought using a binary response system, allowing them to choose between *yes* or *no*. This task served as a crucial step to gauge the overall representativeness of the construct.

Task 2: Component Representativeness (O2) - Experts who provided an affirmative response in Task 1 (yes) were subsequently directed to Task 2. Here, their role was to determine the specific component of the PM construct that they believed each item was assessing. The available components for selection included (1) *autonomy*, (2) *identity*, (3) *work orientation*, (4) *temperance* or (5) *perspective*.

This structured evaluation process enabled the experts to provide their valuable assessments, contributing to a comprehensive appraisal of the PMTAFC items.

Data Analysis

To evaluate the representativeness of each item within the PM construct, we have employed the Item-Content Validity Index (I-CVI) and the Scale-Content Validity Index (S-CVI), as outlined by Lynn (1986). The Content Validity Index (CVI) stands as one of the most widely used tools for assessing content validity, determining whether individual items (I-CVI) and the instrument as a whole (S-CVI) accurately represent the construct (Yang & Chang, 2008). A minimum threshold value of (I-CVI $\geq$ .78) was established, signifying excellent construct representativeness based on expert input (Polit et al., 2007). It's important to note that the CVI can be affected by the number of reviewers, with an increase in reviewers potentially leading to a decrease in the CVI (Rubio et al., 2003).

The S-CVI plays a pivotal role in enhancing the construct validity of an instrument. In this study, we set a minimum threshold value of (S-CVI $\geq$ .80), denoting excellent scale content validity (Polit et al., 2007).

Factorial Validity Index (FVI)

The Factorial Validity Index (FVI) works as a valuable tool for the initial quantification of factorial validity, in line with the methodology described by Rubio et al. (2003). It is instrumental in determining the extent to which experts have appropriately assigned items to the correct component of the PM construct, guided by well-established theoretical criteria (Cauffman & Steinberg, 2000; Morales-Vives et al., 2013; Steinberg & Cauffman, 1996; Strathman et al., 1994; Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990). The calculation of this index involves dividing the number of experts who accurately associated each item with its designated component by the total number of expert respondents, following the approach outlined by Rubio et al. (2003).

One noteworthy aspect of the FVI is that, as a relatively new index, there is no existing criterion to determine the ideal level of attainment (Rubio et al., 2003). In this study, we established a minimum threshold value of (FVI $\geq$ .70). This decision was made with consideration for the impact of the number of experts on the likelihood of agreement among them, known that a higher number of experts may lead to greater variance in assessments. In alignment with the lack of established criteria for this index, this threshold was set to ensure a reasonable standard of agreement.

Results

Item Content Validity Index (I-CVI)

Our analysis of the Item Content Validity Index (I-CVI) yielded interesting insights based on expert assessments within each of the three groups. In Group 1, a substantial 89% of the items were deemed representative of the PM construct (I-CVI $\geq$ .78). Within this group, 50% of the items achieved a notably high level of representative-ness (I-CVI $\geq$ .90), with a remarkable 26% of items obtaining complete consensus among the experts (I-CVI = 1.00).

Group 2 exhibited a similar trend, with 92% of the items meeting the criteria for construct representativeness (I-CVI $\geq$ .78). Among these items, 50% reached an exceptional level of relevance (I-CVI $\geq$ .90) and 32% achieved unanimous expert endorsement (I-CVI = 1.00).

In contrast, Group 3 presented a slightly lower percentage, with 61% of the items considered construct representative (I-CVI $\geq$ .78). Nevertheless, this group stood out with a remarkable 53% of items receiving unanimous approval from the experts (I-CVI = 1.00), marking it as the group with the most extreme scores.

When aggregating the assessments from all three expert groups, a substantial 92% of the items demonstrated construct representativeness (I-CVI $\geq$ .78). Among these, 45% achieved a very high level of relevance (I-CVI $\geq$ .90), with 21% of the items securing unanimous expert consensus (I-CVI = 1.00) (Table 1).

Scale Content Validity Index (S-CVI)

The combined assessment by all three expert groups resulted in an overall Scale Content Validity Index (S-CVI) of .89. This unified index reflects a shared agreement among experts that the questionnaire effectively covers the various aspects of the PM construct.

Remarkably, Group 2 demonstrated strong consensus, contributing to a robust S-CVI of .92. This underscores their collective belief in the questionnaire's ability to comprehensively represent the intricate facets of PM. In contrast, Group 1 and Group 3 displayed similar levels of agreement, achieving a commendable S-CVI of .89. This confirms the questionnaire's overall

Table 1
Percentage of items classified by range of I-CVI values for each group.

I-CVI	All groups	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
= 1	21%	26%	32%	53%
.90 - .99	24%	24%	18%	0%
≥ .90	45%	50%	50%	53%
≥ .78	92%	89%	92%	61%
< .78	8%	11%	8%	39%

Note. I-CVI = Item-content validity index.

suitability for portraying the complexities of the PM construct.

These findings reiterate the robustness of the PM questionnaire, serving as a dependable and valid tool to evaluate PM from the vantage points of diverse expert cohorts. The collective S-CVI underscores the questionnaire's potential to encapsulate the multifaceted dimensions of the PM construct, which offers a valuable instrument for research and practical applications within the field.

Factorial Validity Index (FVI)

The Factorial Validity Index (FVI) plays a pivotal role in assessing the questionnaire's ability to correctly link items with the various components of the PM construct. The results, as displayed in Table 2, offer a comprehensive overview of these associations among the three expert groups.

In Group 1, an impressive 84% of items were correctly linked to their respective components of the PM construct (FVI ≥ .70). Group 2, while still proficient, associated 76% of items correctly (FVI ≥ .70). Group 3, though slightly lower in accuracy, successfully connected 58% of items with their correct components (FVI ≥ .70). When we consider the evaluations from all three groups, a substantial 79% of items were accurately associated with the PM construct's components (FVI ≥ .70). Additionally, about 26% of the items achieved an even higher level of consensus, with an FVI of ≥ .90, signifying a strong alignment among experts.

To gain a more detailed insight into these associations and their connection to specific PM components, Table 3 presents an in-depth breakdown of both the CVI and FVI scores at the item level. This categorization is organized in a descending order, providing a closer examination of how each item aligns with the various components of the PM construct.

Table 2
Percentage of items classified by range of FVI values for every group.

FVI	All groups	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
= 1	5%	16%	23%	24%
.90 - .99	21%	24%	13%	0%
≥ .90	26%	26%	26%	18%
≥ .70	79%	84%	76%	58%
< .70	21%	16%	24%	42%

Note. FVI: Factorial validity index.

Table 3
PMTAFC structure and item- and scale-content validity indexes at the item-level.

Items	CVI	FVI
RESPONSIBILITY (Responsabilidad)		
Autonomy (autonomia)		
Me gusta tomar mis propias decisiones.[a]	100.00%	97.50%
Necesito consultar con mis amigos antes de tomar una decisión.[a]	95.12%	87.18%
Creo que mis decisiones son incorrectas cuando a mis amigos no les gustan.[a]	95.12%	84.62%
Antes de comprarme ropa u otras cosas para mí, consulto con mis amigos.[a]	90.00%	83.33%
Me siento incómodo cuando mi opinión es diferente a la de mis amigos.[a]	87.80%	80.56%
Identity (identidad)		
Creo que me conozco bastante bien.[a]	100.00%	100.00%
Tengo claro lo que me interesa.[a]	100.00%	60.98%
Siento que los demás me valora y me aceptan.[a]	87.50%	88.57%
Soy capaz de hacer muchas cosas bien.[a]	87.18%	76.47%
Muchas veces pretendo ser alguien que no soy.[a]	85.37%	97.14%
Siento que mi vida no tiene mucho sentido.[a]	73.32%	93.33%
Work Orientation (Orientación al trabajo)		
Siempre termino mis deberes y responsabilidades antes de dedicarme a las actividades que me gustan (videojuegos, ver amigos, hacer deporte, etc).[a]	100.00%	92.50%
Siempre hago lo que toca y cumplo con mis obligaciones.[a]	100.00%	90.24%
Casi nunca me retraso en cumplir con mis obligaciones.[a]	100.00%	87.80%
Me esfuerzo por conseguir buenos resultados, aunque sean a largo plazo.[c]	100.00%	78.05%
Cuando una tarea me requiere mucho esfuerzo o tiempo, me cuesta acabarla.[a]	85.37%	80.56%
Paso de una cosa a otra sin acabar ninguna. [a]	85.37%	74.29%
Si ahora no me esfuerzo lo suficiente, ya lo arreglare más adelante.[c]	80.49%	57.58%
TEMPERANCE (Templanza)		
Generalmente soy una persona controlada y no suelo perder los nervios.[b]	97.57%	97.50%
Aunque alguien me haga daño, no intento vengarme.[b]	90.00%	83.33%
Me porto bien, incluso con las personas que no me gusta.[b]	86.84%	57.58%
Cuando me enfado me dejo llevar, sin importarme nadie ni nada.[b]	85.37%	94.29%
Solo pienso en el resultado inmediato de mis acciones.[c]	85.37%	57.89%
Intento ser agradable, incluso con alguien que me ponga nervioso y me irrite.[b]	82.92%	82.35%
Trato bien a la gente, incluso la que no me cae bien.[b]	82.93%	53.00%
El que me haga enfadar debería tener cuidado conmigo.[b]	78.05%	96.88%
PERSPECTIVE (Perspectiva)		
Casi todas las cosas se pueden ver desde dos puntos de vista y siempre intento considerar ambos.[d]	100.00%	95.00%

Items	CVI	FVI
Cuando tomo una decisión pienso en cómo me podría afectar en el futuro.[c]	100.00%	92.86%
Intento que todo lo que hago ahora me sirva para el futuro.[c]	100.00%	80.49%
Solo atiendo a mis preocupaciones actuales, los problemas futuros ya se arreglarán.[c]	85.37%	80%
Para entender mejor a mis amigos me imagino cómo ven las cosas desde su perspectiva.[d]	92.68%	89.47%
Me preocupo más por los problemas de cada día que de los que puedan venir en el futuro.[c]	90.24%	72.97%
Pensar ahora en los problemas que me traerá el futuro no sirve de nada, es perder el tiempo.[c]	87.80%	83.33%
Muchas veces hago cosas que tardan mucho tiempo en dar resultados.[c]	87.80%	63.89%
Evito herir los sentimientos de los demás.[b]	87.80%	58.33%
Me cuesta ver las cosas desde el punto de vista de los demás.[d]	85.37%	88.57%
No soy de los que ayudan a los demás.[b]	67.50%	65.38%
No suelo hacer esfuerzos por los demás.[b]	62.50%	76.00%

Note. Item sources: a PSYMAS (Morales-Vives et al., 2013); b WAI (Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990); c CFC (Strathman et al., 1994); d IRI (Davis; 1980). The English version can be found here.

Discussion

In the domain of criminal justice, the process of desisting from criminal behavior during the transition from late adolescence to early adulthood has long piqued the curiosity of scholars and practitioners (Monahan et al., 2009; Rocque et al., 2019). This critical juncture can lead individuals to diverge from a life of crime or continue along a perilous path. It's in this context that the concept of PM has surfaced as a beacon of understanding and potential in the realm of juvenile justice.

Think of PM as a versatile tool, one that not only enhances diagnostic precision but also facilitates the creation of tailored interventions for adolescents navigating the complexities of maturity. It can serve as a guiding compass for judges, illuminating the path to fair and informed decisions. Moreover, it acts as a protective shield against the potential negative effects of incarceration, ensuring that it doesn't hinder psychosocial maturation but rather supports it (Cavanagh, 2022; Lambie & Randell, 2013).

This paper embarks on a journey of exploration, which delves into the content validity of a new measurement instrument comprising 38 items, each with the potential to assess PM. Our mission has two dimensions: O1). Construct representativeness: to assess the extent to which these items genuinely capture the essence of the PM construct, and O2). Component representativeness: to scrutinize their alignment with the specific components that define PM.

This novel study seeks to shed light on the transformative potential of the PM construct within the landscape of juvenile justice. Its implications go beyond the academic realm; they hold the power to make a real-world impact, shaping the future of justice for our youth.

Construct representativeness (I-CVI and S-CVI)

The findings regarding construct representativeness (I-CVI and S-CVI) are a resounding affirmation of the content validity of these items. The consensus among the three expert groups is clear: the majority of items and the scale as a whole are a robust representation of the PM construct. Items that received a content validity index (I-CVI) of

.78 or higher, are deemed as strong indicators of content validity (Polit et al., 2007). The interesting part is that when we compared the responses of the three groups, we noticed a remarkable degree of agreement between Groups 1 and 2. They were mostly on the same page when it came to the representativeness of the items. Group 3, however, provided more varied responses. A significant number of items received unanimous endorsement from experts (I-CVI = 1), while others scored lower.

The divergence in responses among the groups can be attributed to the variance in information provided to each. Groups 1 and 2, armed with a more profound comprehension of the PM construct, demonstrated heightened consensus on the relevance of items. Conversely, Group 3, operating with comparatively less contextual information, adopted a more cautious stance in assessing item relevance. This underscores the pivotal role of clear and comprehensive definitions, particularly for experts utilizing the assessment tool.

Component representativeness (FVI)

When considering the alignment of items with the specific components of the PM construct (FVI), a more nuanced narrative emerges compared to the robust CVI outcomes. However, given the substantial number of expert assessments, it is noteworthy that approximately three-quarters of the items, as evaluated across all groups, demonstrated accurate alignment with their respective components. This outcome is deemed satisfactory, taking into account the collective perspectives of experts.

An analysis of the results on a group-by-group basis unveils some intriguing patterns. Group 1, for instance, showcased a robust alignment, with over four-fifths of the items correctly associated with their respective components. Group 2 exhibited a commendable level of alignment, with roughly three-quarters of items accurately matched. Otherwise , Group 3 appeared to demonstrate a somewhat lower level of precision, with only around three-fifths of the items correctly linked to their components.

When aggregating the results across the groups, it is evident that more than three-quarters of the items harmoniously matched with their designated components. While this outcome may be viewed favorably, especially considering the substantial number of experts involved, several critical factors merit discussion, particularly regarding Group 3's performance.

To begin with, it should be noted that the definitions provided for each component, albeit consistent with the original author's terminology (Steinberg & Cauffman, 1996), may have lacked the depth necessary for experts to effectively discriminate between them in the context of Task 2 (O2. Represented component). It is evident that meticulously crafted definitions can substantially enhance the capacity of experts to discern between the various components. The superior FVI results observed in Groups 1 and 2 could be attributed to the additional contextual information and training pertaining to the PM construct that they received, emphasizing the pivotal role of specialized training for both experts and prospective users who will administer the measure.

Moreover, the inherent similarity shared among the components of the construct poses a formidable challenge when seeking items that exclusively represent each distinct facet. For instance, take into consideration the following item of our scale, "Often I engage in a particular behavior in order to achieve outcomes that may not result for many years" [*Me esfuerzo por conseguir buenos resultados, aunque sean a largo plazo*] (CFC, Strathman et al., 1994), which delves into

the attainment of long-term outcomes. This item encompasses elements of perspective by evaluating long-term consequences, ventures into the domain of *temperance* by probing the capacity to defer immediate gratification, and even extends into the realm of *work orientation*, which constitutes a sub-component of *responsibility*, by assessing the sense of pride derived from task accomplishment. Items that garnered relatively lower FVI scores are currently undergoing refinement to yield a more precise reflection of each individual component.

Lastly, it is imperative to acknowledge that the PM construct's interdependent components have not evolved in a uniform manner. Among these components, *responsibility* stands out as it features well-defined sub-components, such as autonomy, identity and work orientation. To facilitate a more equitable and comprehensive measurement, there may arise a necessity to establish specific sub-components for *temperance* and *perspective*. This could facilitate the realization of more uniformly structured measurement categories. The operative definitions of PM, as currently implemented, may not furnish the level of comprehensive assessment essential to holistically encapsulate the PM construct, echoing the earlier insights posited by Cauffman and Steinberg (2000).

In short, despite the overwhelming majority of the 38 items manifesting relevance to the PM construct, items that exhibited diminished performance in terms of CVI and FVI will undergo meticulous revision or potential elimination. In anticipation, a confirmatory factor analysis will be performed as a net step for this PMTAFC, promising insights into the organizational dynamics of these components, thereby contributing to the continued maturation of the PM construct's theoretical model.

Conclusions

The concept of PM is pivotal within the context of managing adolescents involved in legal proceedings and facilities. To be effective in the forensic and judicial context, PM needs to be accurately framed and assessed. The PM construct offers a promising framework, honing in on adolescents' decision-making capabilities and their influence on behavior. The validation of a PM assessment tool holds substantial value for adolescents navigating legal procedures within the juvenile justice system. It not only stands to enhance the precision of court decisions but also facilitates tailored clinical interventions.

Drawing from the findings of this study, it is evident that a substantial portion of the 38 items proposed for a valid self-report assessment of PM in adolescents successfully aligns with the core PM construct and its individual components. This achievement is a significant step toward the creation of a comprehensive measurement instrument. In the subsequent phase of our study, we will embark on a confirmatory factor analysis to delve into the intricate relationships between the sub-components of the construct, furthering our quest for a nuanced understanding of PM.

The robust content validation outcomes underscore the potential transformative influence of PM assessments on the juvenile justice landscape. This journey holds the promise of empowering professionals, streamlining interventions, and paving the way for more equitable and well-informed decisions within the realm of adolescent legal proceedings. As we move forward in this mission, the anticipation for the positive change that validated PM assessment tools can bring to the lives of young individuals within the justice system remains high.

References

Almanasreh, E., Moles, R., & Chen, T. F. (2019). Evaluation of methods used for estimating content validity. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy, 15*(2), 214-221. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2018.03.066

Belsky, J., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., & Poulton, R. (2020). *The origins of you: How childhood shapes later life*. Harvard University Press.

Cauffman, E., & Steinberg, L. (2000). (Im)maturity of judgment in adolescence: Why adolescents may be less culpable than adults. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 18*(6), 741-760. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.416

Cauffman, E., Piquero, A. R., Kimonis, E., Steinberg, L., Chassin, L., & Fagan, J. (2007). Legal, individual, and environmental predictors of court disposition in a sample of serious adolescent offenders. *Law and Human Behavior, 31*(6), 519-535. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-006-9076-2

Cavanagh, C. (2022). Healthy adolescent development and the juvenile justice system: Challenges and solutions. *Child Development Perspectives, 16*(3), 141-147. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12461

Davis, M. H. (1980). *Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI)* [Database record]. APA PsycTests. https://doi.org/10.1037/t01093-000

Expósito, C. D., Marsollier, R. G., Difabio, H. E., & Castro-Santander, A. (2023). Construcción y validación del Cuestionario de Acoso y Ciberacoso Escolar (CACE) mediante juicio de expertos. *Revista Evaluar, 23*(1), 61-79. https://doi.org/10.35670/1667-4545.v23.n1.41014

Greenberger, E., Josselson, R., Knerr, C., & Knerr, B. (1975). The measurement and structure of psychosocial maturity. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4*(2), 127-143. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01537437

Lambie, I., & Randell, I. (2013). The impact of incarceration on juvenile offenders. *Clinical Psychology Review, 33*(3), 448-459. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2013.01.007

Lynn, M. R. (1986). Determination and quantification of content validity. *Nursing Research, 35*(6), 382-386. https://doi.org/10.1097/00006199-198611000-00017

Moffitt, T. E. (1993). The neuropsychology of conduct disorder. Development and *Psychopathology, 5* (1-2), 135-151. https://doi:10.1017/S0954579400004302

Moffitt, T. E. (2003). Life-course persistent and adolescence-limited antisocial behavior. In B. B. Lahey, T. E. Moffitt, & A. Caspi (Eds.), *Causes of Conduct Disorder and Juvenile Delinquency* (pp. 49-75). The Guilford Press.

Monahan, K. C., Steinberg, L., Cauffman, E., & Mulvey, E. P. (2009). Trajectories of antisocial behavior and psychosocial maturity from adolescence to young adulthood. *Developmental Psychology, 45*(6), 1654-1668. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015862

Morales-Vives, F., Camps, E., & Lorenzo-Seva, U. (2013). Development and validation of the Psychological Maturity Assessment Scale (PSYMAS). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 29*(1), 12-18. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000115

Narváez-Burbano, J. H., & Obando-Guerrero, L. M. (2023). Construcción y validación de la Escala de Exposición a Factores de Deprivación Sociocultural (EXFADESO). *Revista Evaluar, 23*(1), 27-39. https://doi.org/10.35670/1667-4545.v23.n1.41006

Ozkan, T., & Worrall, J. L. (2017). A psychosocial test of the Maturity Gap Thesis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 44*(6), 815-842. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854817694924

Pailing, A. N., & Reniers, R. L. E. P. (2018). Depressive and socially anxious symptoms, psychosocial maturity, and risk perception: Associations with risk-taking behaviour. *PLOS ONE, 13*(8), e0202423. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0202423

Polit, D. F., Beck, C. T., & Owen, S. V. (2007). Is the CVI an acceptable indicator of content validity? Appraisal and recommendations. *Research in Nursing & Health, 30*(4), 459-467. https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20199

Riggs-Romaine, C. L. (2018). Psychosocial maturi-

ty and risk-taking in emerging adults: Extending our understanding beyond delinquency. *Emerging Adulthood, 7(*4), 243-257. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167696818768013

Rocque, M., Beckley, A. L., & Piquero, A. R. (2019). Psychosocial maturation, race, and desistance from crime. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 48*(7), 1403-1417. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01029-8

Rubio, D. M., Berg-Weger, M., Tebb, S. S., Lee, E. S., & Rauch, S. (2003). Objectifying content validity: Conducting a content validity study in social work research. *Social Work Research, 27*(2), 94-104. https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/27.2.94

Steinberg, L., Cauffman, E., & Monahan, K. C. (2015). Psychosocial maturity and desistance from crime in a sample of serious juvenile offenders. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.* https://ojjdp.ojp.gov

Steinberg, L., & Cauffman, E. (1996). Maturity of judgment in adolescence: Psychosocial factors in adolescent decision making. *Law and Human Behavior, 20*(3), 249-272. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01499023

Strathman, A., Gleicher, F., Boninger, D. S., & Edwards, C. S. (1994). The consideration of future consequences: Weighing immediate and distant outcomes of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*(4), 742-752. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.66.4.742

Wakeling, H., & Barnett, G. (2017). *Development and validation of a screening assessment of psychosocial maturity for adult males convicted of crime* (Analytical summary). HM Prison & Probation Service. https://www.gov.uk

Weinberger, D. A., & Schwartz, G. E. (1990). Distress and restraint as superordinate dimensions of self-reported adjustment: A typological perspective. *Journal of Personality, 58*(2), 381-417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1990.tb00235.x

Wenger, L., & Andres-Pueyo, A. (2016). Personality and clinical tests in Spanish for assessing juvenile offenders. *Papeles del Psicólogo, 37*(2), 89-106. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2016-31958-002

Wenger-Amengual, L. S. (2018). *Comportamiento antisocial, personalidad y madurez en adolescentes y jóvenes* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Barcelona. http://hdl.handle.net/2445/127229

Yang, Y.-T. C., & Chan, C.-Y. (2008). Comprehensive evaluation criteria for English learning websites using expert validity surveys. *Computers & Education, 51*(1), 403-422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2007.05.011