

Youth Socialization: Context and Environments

**Professor Dr. Kamel Mohammed Omran,
Deputy Dean for Scientific Affairs, Faculty of Letters,
University of Damascus**

Nov., 2007

Synopsis

This study deals with the relation between school class levels, the sense of frustration , the social behavior of youth and their perception of three main determiners of social upbringing ,namely, relations with important figures , behavior regulation and psychological independence .The study has tested youth in four social environments ,namely, the family ,school, neighbours and peers. The random sample that was divided to strata consisted of 1500 male and female youths from the 9th and 12th years in the schools of Damascus .The study included a quantitative description of the youth experience within these contexts .This was measured against various models indicating independence and the interactive impacts of these contexts on the functions of youth .The conclusions have shown that relations ,regulation and the independence trend had meaningful dimensions in the experience of social upbringing in the four environments .The family dominated the process of social upbringing .The separate views of youth functions were associated with certain specific environments .There were also some indications that the lack of experience in one context could be compensated with experience in another .

The Problem of the Research:

Social upbringing researches often focus on analyzing patterns of parental behavior described or observed in a natural way. The patterns are then classified in groups linked with certain youth characteristics. The study is constantly based on defining the main connections between the family and the growth of youth. The research designs and programs have resulted that the youth situation can be better when:

- 1) They pass through experiences that results in having relations of positive emotional links with other important people like parents and teachers.
- 2) They have constant and appropriate limits of regulating their conduct.
- 3) They have psychological independence leading to the growth of a firm, constant sense of themselves and their identity through experiencing assessment and expression of their ideas and feelings (Martin Maccoby, 1983; Barber, 1997; Steinberg, 1990; and Thomas Rollins, 1979). The structure of parental domination is viewed as the complex of parental conduct that includes these three rules.

This study stems from these three rules whose results have shown that experience in the fields of relations, regulation and independence are functionally significant for youth, in order to provide the basic requirements of their healthy growth. Therefore, the social content of the family, with its elements affecting parental domination, does not necessarily always constitute an obstacle hindering the growth of youth.

It is natural to focus on the structure of the family, since it is the first social environment where youth live and typically spend their time. At any rate, the family is the key of social relations for youth; but there are also results which show that the social setting beyond the family can also provide us with main experiences in social upbringing as well.

Researches in the issues of relations, regulation and psychological independence dealt with most aspects of social upbringing; yet, there were no fruitful, regular efforts to define the unique nature of such researches, for two reasons:

- 1) The issues concerning the family have often made the distinction between these dimensions unclear, because they were converged in models or confined to the study of paternal patterns.
- 2) Researches providing the youth with such experiences in social-upbringing environments beyond the family setting have been rare.

Therefore, the next logical step of research can be the accurate exploration of the extent of the special impacts of these dimensions on the separate phenomena of youth functions, and testing the interaction between the parents .There are abundant conclusions in the social-upbringing research about interactions in parental changes .So, this study aspires to become an initial attempt to understand the best means of youth experience on the basis of encouraging youth development within common social contexts .

Previous Studies:

Through the theoretical study of social upbringing of youth, the social setting can facilitate at least three models of decisive experience in the sound growth of youth, namely connection, regulation and psychological independence .These models have been measured by using different terms, such as acceptance , full domination and psychological control, and even the current concepts of violence, cruelty and interrogation (Martin Maccoby,1983) .Regardless of the names of these and other concepts, they refer harmoniously to the three above-mentioned models .

Connection:

There is a key and principal research that has documented the importance of personal relations for the youth with prominent figures with whom they could be emotionally connected (Repinski Collins,1994).It studied in particular the connections of youth to their parents, and measured them in several ways (Ainsworth Blehar, Waters Wall,1978;Bowlby,1969;Sroufe Flesson,1988).As for the relations of support, warmth, nurture or love between the youth and their parents (Martin Macooby,1992;Macooby 1993;Thomas Rollins,1979),the constant, stable and positive connections with other figures as important as the parents seem to provide youth with important social skills , such as realizing that the world is safe, secure and predictable, i.e. that it is not unknown.

discussions about the role of peers indicate that connections with peers of the same age can do a lot to the individual, providing him with emotional support and chances to test his worth and acceptance by the others. They also enable him to choose mutual connections facilitating the definition of his own identity (Hartup, 1996; Youniss Smollar, 1985). There is also an evidence that the experience in an irregular setting of peers, such as perverted and delinquent friends is a dangerous risk factor leading to difficulties (Griesler, Patterson, Dishion, 1994; Patterson, Reid, Dishion,1992).

The studies of the influence of neighbours focused initially on the latent regulation in this social setting, where the active social regulation with neighbours, which contains formal and informal connections between parents and other groups can observe and discipline the youth of the neighborhood, and discourage irregular behaviour

(Sampson 1992; Furstenburg, 1993). Previous studies also dealt with the nature of connections between youth and adults beyond the family limits, where the active social regulation -which includes formal and informal relations between parents and other groups- could notice the neighbors' youth and adjust their behaviors, and discourage the abnormal behaviors, (Darling, Hamilton, Niego, 1994), and the importance of the role of the social context outside the family in securing the necessary requirements of the growth of youth, in order to understand the experience of the social upbringing of youth in different contexts.

Regulation:

The researches made it clear that regulation is a critical condition in the social environment. One of the most reliable conclusions of such researches is the importance of appropriate regulation of youth, in terms of supervision monitoring, control of the social setting and other forms of conduct control (Barbar, Olsen, Shagle, 1994). It became clear that children and youth do not learn personal regulation without an appropriate regulation that stems from their social setting, and acts as a good example. Therefore, youth tend to be rash, hasty and subject to dangerous things, because they are more susceptible to be influenced by other forces. Youth may be attracted to several types of socially non-conform behaviour.

Autonomy:

Autonomy is considered a main, key element in the sound growth of youth (Schaefer, 1965). It is not forcibly introduced in the growth of the child, but through the sense of independent identity, effectiveness and efficiency. The studies of this issue addressed the question of exaggerated parental protection (Levy, 1966), and the integrated or intertwined family relations (Bowen, 1978; Minuchin, 1974). The previous studies focused on the youth and their families in terms of diagnosis and separation (Cooper Grotevant, 1996; Hauser, 1991). Efforts have been recently exerted to include psychological autonomy in relations between youth and parents (Barbar 1996; Barbar, 1994; Forehand Fauber, Thomas Wierson, 1990). The proof of this first comes from the unanimous assertion that parental intervention in the growth of psychological growth of the youth is a serious factor in the question of behaviour. Eccles and others (1993) made clear that youth have only a few chances to make decisions and options, and to have the ability to manage themselves. Eccles also explained the nature of moving from primary to intermediate schools and its effects on youth. His study showed the undesirable psychological changes that befall youth due to this transfer from one stage of education to the next.

The researches dealing with the role of the family in social upbringing do not often make accurate distinction among these elements. They rather choose a typical theory combining them in one subject (Baumrind, 1967, 1971, 1991; Dombusch Ritter, Liederman Roberts, Fraleigh, 1987; Steinberg, 1989). Thus, the individual family was

considered the optimal example. The definitions of the individual family largely include the three basic conditions of social upbringing. For example, the work of Baumrind contains constant conclusions concerning connections (love, warmth, upbringing), as well as regulation (control, limitation, restriction) and psychological autonomy (independence, being opinionated or sticking to one's opinion, the trend of self-expression). Steinberg and his colleagues also use the measures of acceptance, behavior discipline and psychological autonomy to establish the criteria of individualism. These family phenomena have been well distinguished in a basic manner, in order to understand the theories of studying family character, since it is essential in assuring the legitimacy of the process of prediction (Steinberg, Darling, 1993).

The measures in general do not allow the discovery of the essence of independent effects that may exist in the definite structures of the science of the study of character types. It is not easy to understand the mechanisms which constitute the base of effect in family complexes. To what extent could the positive connections and impacts of the individual family be responsible for the efficiency of the child? On the other hand, are appropriate conduct levels and psychological control more responsible for strong connections between the individual family and the existence of a good child?

The studies focused on distinguishing those three dimensions which appear within the family context. The following studies (Garber, Robinson, Valentiner; Herman Dornbusch, Herron Herting; Otto Atkinson, Hauser Best, Allen) examined two or three of family conditions related to various forms of youth work. Regardless of minor differences in their programs, the unique or independent roles of the changes in the individual family were clear in every case. Each family condition had meaningful associations with the youth experience. Two of these studies (Best et al, Garber) also provided insight into the inherent links between the family and the growth of youth. They showed that psychological processes (self esteem and ego deficiency) intervene significantly between connections and youth happiness, and between autonomy and youth happiness as well. These conclusions encourage additional attention to the qualities that characterize youth, particularly those relevant to psychological growth, in an attempt to understand the role of the family in social upbringing, in order to enable youth to face the problems of life.

Most available researches which study the differences between the two sexes in social upbringing have focused on the variety of social behaviour of the parents and its patterns. Those researches targeted females, as compared to males. As for school graduates, there were some relative differences (Romney Lytton, 1991). The study by Conger and Scaramella is a timely addition to the research on family social-upbringing. This study confirms the relevance of psychological autonomy to the parents' relation with the child, and the important role of psychological control by (a brother or a sister). There is an important clarification of the multilateral nature of the processes of family social-upbringing, which should suggest more detailed attention to role of relatives (brothers or sisters) in the development of youth. The study by

Grotevant offers an enjoyable discussion of the large role of connection, regulation and autonomy in giving the child a high status. Grotevant explains the dimensions of social upbringing in the family as a complex and highly sensitive matter.

The outcome of these studies provides a basic proof that these conditions of family compounds should not be integrated. It seems that these compounds have an independent impact on several phenomena of youth work. Like most studies of social upbringing, the studies of this question have not utilized the examples which clearly examine the special impacts of the process of social upbringing. The researches of youth development show that youth respond differently to the presence, or absence, of the elements of social upbringing. For example, inappropriate connections are associated with deficiency in social skills; and inappropriate regulation is associated with failure to control motives and to have a sense of social responsibility, while the absence of autonomy is associated with the failure of self-reliance and efficiency (Martin, Maccoby, 1983).

These conclusions depend mainly on comparing independent studies that do not use suitable typical examples to test the special effects. But at least they provide important information that can be used to produce theoretically specialized models. Recent studies have confirmed the special effects of connections, regulation and autonomy through their association with internal and external problems at the stage of adolescence (Barbar, 1996; Barbar et al 1994).

Another study also examined a specialized model including connections, regulation and autonomy (Thomas, Barbar, 1996). It concluded that connections were mainly related to the youth's love to mingle with others. As for regulation, it was for protection from devious behaviour, while psychological control (contrary to psychological autonomy) was related to showing both depression and devious conduct. At any rate, it is rare to find actual studies about the above-mentioned interactions; and there is no strong evidence of interactive impacts (Thomas, Barbar, 1996; Thomas, Rollins, 1979).

Knowledge based upon the social upbringing of youth within the family can constantly consolidate the efforts towards accuracy in understanding the processes of social upbringing. The previous studies have already shed light on some methods to attain such accuracy.

Research Questions:

This research tries to answer a set of questions concerning social upbringing and its several contexts and settings, as well as the role of such contexts and settings in providing a balanced social upbringing of youth:

1. How do youth deal with the experiences of social upbringing in their contexts (connections, regulation and autonomy) in the four settings of social upbringing?

2. How do youth respond to the experiences of social upbringing in the environments of (the family, the school, the peers and the neighbours), and what experiences have they gained?
3. Are there links among the four environments of social upbringing?
4. What are the mutual effects among these three contexts and four social environments?
5. What the extent of interrelations among the three experiences of social upbringing on the one hand, and with the social settings, on the other hand?
6. What is the impact of the variables of age, school class, gender, and economic condition on the experiences of the social upbringing of youth?

Methodology:

The study has utilized the descriptive –analytical method to attain its defined objectives, because this method is capable of providing a large analytical view through the large data obtained.

The community and the Sample:

The community of the study was the city of Damascus. A random cluster sample was drawn from schools .It consisted of 1500 persons from the students of the ninth and eleventh years, equally divided between males and females .The sample of ninth year students consisted of 400 boys and 400 girls, while the sample of the 12th year students consisted of 350 boys and 350 girls.

The Tool of Data Collection:

The data of this study came initially from a longitudinal study over one year (2006) of thirty five Damascene families which contained youth with the qualities of the above-mentioned sample. Fifteen families were dropped due to the lack of some data. A survey focused on family and personal connections, youth behaviour, peers, the school and neighbours' experiences. A number of measures were designed to asses the variables addressed by the study, utilizing some measures used in the previous studies, in addition to new measures that were developed to deal with variables in this study .

Measures:

Analysis: A series of factor analysis in an irregular way led the selected measures concerning connections, regulation and psychological autonomy, in order to ensure equal independence for each concept dealt with in this study .The concepts used to measure connections, regulation and psychological autonomy were common in the analysis of one factor. Then all the actions of analysis and assessment were repeated in each one of the four social settings; and phrases incapable of distinguishing the

different variables under study were excluded. Table (1) shows the most important measures used in the study.

Connections:

The family : The subsidiary test of admission, consisting of ten clauses, was used as an indicator of family connections, derived from a study which is a testimony from the child and a statement about parental conduct (Schaefer,1965; Schludermann,1988). This measure consists of three degrees, from (1) which means "not like him or her at all", to (3), which means "exactly like him or her", taking into consideration the necessity of adding a clause describing the typical samples , such as : "that makes me feel better when I overcome my problems with him or her". The youth testified that the sources of the father and the mother were common in forming one degree of family connection, and that it was difficult to show differences between the two parents.

Peers: Two clauses were used to refer to relations with peers .The youth were asked, according to the relationship of each with his/her male or female friend:"How much does this person like or admire you?".The reply ladder moved gradually from degree (1), which means "very much", to degree (4),which means "very little". High degrees indicated strong connections.

The School : Four sentences were used to measure connections within the school . A measure of five degrees was used to gauge the youth`s assessment of their teachers, starting from degree (1), which means "utter rejection" or absolute rejection to degree (5), which means "full acceptance". The clauses used in the question were meant to classify the capabilities of teachers through answers to questions like : " Is the teacher able to assist you if you need help in your school work ?",and " Does he really listen to what you have to say?".

Neighbours : Connections were estimated by using a measure of four degrees to asses the way in which the youth spent their time over the past six months with their neighbours, parents of their friends and leaders of the local community in their quarter .The answers were serialized from No.(1),which meant " not at all", to No.(7), which meant "everything".

Regulation :

The family : Regulation within the family was gauged with a measure of control consisting of five clauses to asses what parents really knew about their children . These clauses were often used in family research concerning youth (Lamborn Steinberg, Brown Mounts,1993).The responses were divided to three degrees, ranging from (1),which means " I know nothing ", to (3),which means "I know a great deal". The five key questions were :

- a) : Where do you go in the evening ?
- b) : Where do you spend most of the time after school ?
- c) : How do you spend your money ?
- d) : What do you do during leisure time?
- e) : Who are your friends ?

Peers : A measure consisting of ten clauses was used to gauge peer delinquency .These were taken from Iliot, Huizinga and Ageton,1985.In order to measure regulation among peers, the youth were asked :

"How many times did your friends smash what you or they possess ?".

"Do your friends run away from home ?".

The responses ranged from (1),which means "very often" to (5)which means "not at all ".The students assessed their school on the basis of whether it needs more rules and laws to stop trouble makers, the phenomenon of smoking in the school courtyard, and violent bullying of students by certain gangs.

The School : A measure consisting of three clauses was used to asses the degree of order prevailing in the school setting, according to a five-degree criterion, ranging from (1), which means "strictly available " to (5),which means "not available at all".

Students assessed their school on the basis of how much it needs more rules and laws to stop trouble makers, the phenomenon of smoking in the school courtyards, and violent bullying of students by certain gangs .

Neighbours : Students were asked how many times they have heard, within the last month, of differences or assaults in their quarter.

- Was there a violent argument among neighbours ?
- Were there fights among youth in which weapons were used ?
- Have you seen or heard about people pursued by the police?
- Have you seen or heard about a person who was greatly injured?

The measure of responses ranged from (1),which means "often", to (3),which means "never".

Psychological Autonomy :

The Family : A psychological measure consisting of eight clauses, derived from a psychological report about the youth (Barber, 1996), was used to gauge autonomy .

Students assessed their parents according to a measure ranging from (1), which means "there has never been anybody like him, or her " to (3), which means "many people are very much like him, or her" This was according to the eight clauses of the parents, a sample of which was : (Can you tell me how he/she feels about things all the time ?).The measure showed that those who got higher marks had more psychological autonomy, and consequently less psychological control .

Peers : To gauge peer autonomy, two clauses were used , with terms of reference concerning a male or female friend separately .The youth were asked : " How often does this friend try to control what you do, say, or think of ?".The measure ranged from (1), which means "very often ", to (4),which means "very rarely".

The response criterion indicated that high marks reflected youth autonomy.

The school: autonomy at school was defined by the total marks obtained by the responding youth of the sample. The measure ranged from (1), which means "yes", to (2), which means "no". For example: can students define the laws of the class or school? Can they define school activities, or where to sit in the classroom, and so on? The basic mark amounted to 4.6, with a standard deviation gauging 22.1.

Neighbours: It was not possible to gauge youth autonomy with neighbours.

Variables of the criterion of youth credibility

This study tries to address most youth functions. The class was used as a independent variable to classify the functional youth efficiency in knowing the law or social norm. The feeling of depression was used as a measure of mental health, and anti-social conduct to measure social expectations.

The class: The students recorded their responses according to a criterion consisting of nine clauses, ranging from (1), which equals D-, i.e. "weak", to (9) which equals A, i.e. "full mark". The average mark was (7), which equals B+, with a quarterly interval of 7.4.

Feeling of depression: Depression was gauged with 27 clauses in case of children (Kovacs, 1992). The response to each clause appeared in the range of three degrees,

and the student was asked to tick one of them, to give a description of his/her feelings during the past fortnight. Examples:

- a) "I felt depressed for a period of
- b) "I felt depressed for several times."
- c) "I am depressed most of the time."

Antisocial behaviour: The subsidiary measure of the list of testing the child's behaviour (Edelbrock, Achenbach, 1987; YSR) was used to gauge antisocial behaviour. It consists of eleven clauses. Replies on it were graded from 5, which equals nil, i.e. untrue, to 2, which means "very true" or "often true". Examples:

"I smash other people's possessions".

"I ran away from home".

Controlling variables:

Economic deprivation was measured with one single clause, namely, "How rich do you believe your family is, compared to the families of your peers?" (Meneghan Mullan, Pearlin Liberman, 1981).

The answers were graded from (1), which meant "poorer than the majority", to (5), which meant "much richer than others". The answers fell into three categories. The first contained replies to questions (1 and 2), indicating that 18% suffered economic deprivation. The second contained replies to questions (3 and 4), indicating that 66% had medium income, while the third category contained the fifth answer, which indicated that 16% had high income.

Conclusions:

The descriptive analysis:

Table (2) present simple percentages of high marks of social-upbringing concepts according to four social settings. These values represent the percentages of students who registered the highest level of experience in the concept given to them. For example, the clauses referring to family connections were evaluated by the use of a measure consisting of three variables, graded from (1), which meant "weak connections", to (3) which meant "intensive connections". Some 93% of male and female ninth year students equally registered intensive family connections. The variable factor of (connections with neighbours) referred recurrently to what the youth mentioned about spending time with adults in the neighbourhood setting. Since very few youth spent time daily with such adults, these connections were relegated to level (5), i.e. weakly connections. A few students in this measure also said that they used to intervene in decision-making in other classes.

The study showed that it was more important for the youth of this sample to attain very positive experiences of social upbringing within their families. The youth showed a lack of connection with their parents, who showed, in turn, a lack of regulation. Yet, a remarkable rate of youth registered functional experiences at home. There was no lack of psychological autonomy enjoyed by the group of 12th- year students. The percentage of the family experience was lower. A large group of youth registered positive experiences with their peers. Connections with peers were rather similar in the two groups of the two different school years, and different age categories. It was noted that the percentage of 12th-year female students regulating connections with peers was lower than those of their 9th year counterparts. This meant that older girls were more inclined to befriend antisocial individuals. Age differences in peer connections among males showed higher levels of psychological autonomy. Moreover, few youth registered positive, high-level experiences in the school setting, compared to what they had registered in the family or peer settings. It was noted that the older group of students registered less positive experiences in the school setting. The types of low-level experience in the field of connection and social regulation in the twelfth year sample, as compared to the ninth year sample, were similar to the results of the study of Eccles (1993).

The most exciting variables in such data were those related to regulation. Less than 20% of 12th-year students testified that their school environment regulated the wrong behaviour. The registered levels of autonomy showed no essential differences related to age or gender among members of the sample. The percentage was low, indicating the decline of the experiences of autonomy that were tested in the two groups, related to what they were allowed to do, i.e. to take part in decisions concerning class conduct.

Less than 25.1% of the ninth year students admitted that they spent sometime every week with non-family adults in the neighbourhood, while only 8.1% of the twelfth year students registered weakly connections with adults within the setting of the neighbours.

The results suggest that the higher ratio of the youth of this sample registered very positive experiences within their families, and with their peers, while school experiences seemed more difficult, or of lower levels concerning connections and regulation during the stage of transition to secondary schools. The experiences of autonomy within the classroom were of low levels. Most students lived with neighbours who were relatively less socially-torn. There were also connections out of the home. Some age-related differences appeared, particularly in the social setting of the school. No differences related to gender were registered in the types of social upbringing within or among social environments.

An important deserves attention in interpreting percentages. No measures similar to social concepts were used like those applied within social contexts. For example, connections in the family setting were measured according to the accuracy of the

statements about spending time with adults from outside the family. Therefore, some differences among contexts may be due to deviations in the measurement. At any rate, the percentages within each social context provided an overview of the extent of the positive experience of the youth in various social contexts.

Correlations:

The coefficients of all the variables of the males and females in this study were separately calculated. Table (3) shows those coefficients of the ninth-year students, while table (4) shows those of the twelfth-year students. This correlation may be viewed through two points. The first was tested by the extent of consistency used by the youth to express experiences related to connections, regulation and autonomy in their various social contexts. As for connections, with the exception of association of the males' family and neighbourly relations, all the correlations were both positive and important. Some youth were inclined to test their connections constantly through their social contexts. As for regulations, the types were similar, except for the lack of the association of school regulation with the experiences in other social contexts. As for autonomy, social experiences have shown again that they are not correlated with the experiences of other social contexts. (The correlation was negative between family and school in the sample of ninth-year students. The experiences of autonomy within the family were positively correlated with the autonomy experience within the peer environment.

As for the second point of view, it sees correlations within the contexts of most social-upbringing variables. There was positive and important evidence of correlations among connections, regulation and autonomy in the family setting. This model was applied to groups whose age and gender belonged to both categories. As for the context of peers, connections and autonomy were negatively correlated in males of both classes. There were no correlations in the cases of females because of some tension in the experiences of social upbringing in the context of relations among peers. Regulation and autonomy were positively correlated in all groups, except the twelfth-year male students. In general, correlations in school contexts were feeble, or unclear, with some positive correlations, for example, in regulation and autonomy in cases of the ninth-year girls, as well as autonomy and connections in the cases of the twelfth year girls. No clear evidence appeared in any group to show the existence of correlations between neighbourly connections and regulation.

Correlations through concepts and contexts were a primary clue to family variables. For example, the three social upbringing variables within the family context were positively correlated with regulation among peers, autonomy among peers and connections among peers. These correlations were also positive between school connections and regulation among neighbours. The correlations among other contexts were weaker. The positive correlations between peer regulation and school

connection, and between peer regulation and neighbourly regulation remained constantly typical in all groups. In fact, such types may suggest a test effect, such as having better peers, as well as better schools, resulted from a well regulated quarter.

In general, correlations among the standard variables moved in the expected direction and had the same significance and indication in all groups. Those correlations showed that marks were negatively connected with the feelings of depression and antisocial behaviour. This also applied to the correlations between the variables of social upbringing and the standard variables. Practically, the results were in the expected trend (positive in classes and negative in the cases of depression and antisocial behaviour). The three family variables were constantly associated with feelings of depression and antisocial behaviour. Experiences among peers, particularly regulation and autonomy, were generally linked with the conclusions. School connections were also linked with three conclusions and outcome. As for connections and regulation among peers, they were clear from the conclusions, mainly in the cases of female students from both classes.

Multiple regression analyses:

In the case of the family, the types of specific concepts within the defined contexts were tested by Multiple regression analyses, separately, according to youth class and gender in all three subsidiary variables. The predictive variables were the eleven elements of social upbringing, i.e. (connections, regulation and autonomy), together with the variables of (family, school, peers and neighbours). There was also a set of controlling variables (economic deprivation and gender). Antisocial behavior was also used as a controlling variable with depression as a function variable. This was constant in the present work on standard variables (Barber, 1996). It was separated in order to control the high levels among these types of behaviour. A test was carried out to examine the internal nature of depression and the external nature (phenomena) of antisocial conduct (Cicchetti, Toth, 1991). Table (5) shows the results of the analysis of an alternative sample of the ninth-year students. Table (6) shows the results of an alternative sample of 12th-year students.

Controlling variables:

Demographic variables are not usually linked to standard variables in the sample of the ninth year students. They were more suitable for the sample of the 12th-year students. The richer males registered higher marks, while the rich males and females registered less level of the feelings of depression.

The family primacy model:

This model affirms that the experiences of social upbringing in the family will control those in other social contexts in the field of youth functions, due to the essential, long range connection concerning the nature of family relations. The results have shown that the predicting standard variable in the family is the sense of depression. This was

the case in the 9th year students (concerning autonomy within the family) and the 12th-year students (concerning family connections and autonomy). The male and female 9th year students who registered high levels of psychological autonomy from their parents, and male and female 12th-years students who registered high level of autonomy and connection with their parents, all had low levels of depression. The only factor that gave an important clue in predicting depression was the school connections of the male 12th-year students. So, the control of demographic factors of social conduct and experience of social upbringing in schools, with peers and family experience, gives rise to indicative factors of predicting depression. That is because some family experiences are associated with antisocial behaviour.

The results showed no controlling family effect on these critical variables. On the contrary, it became clear that family experiences have special links with the youth feelings of depression. Such experiences, in fact, contribute to the explanation of antisocial conduct.

The domain-specific model:

Compared to the family primacy model, the domain-specific model assumes that the differences of social environment have special links to various aspects of youth experience. This was noted in the results of the multiple regression test of school performance. The school experiences of the 12th-year youth were enough to predict their performance; (yet, the equations of regression in the social performance of the 9th year students gave no clues). With the exception of the school autonomy of males, the experiences of the 12th-year students in the fields of connections, regulation and autonomy in the school setting were all indicators of the predictability of the school performance of both sexes. The youth who registered positive relations with their teachers, and the girls that enjoyed the experience of autonomy in their school setting obtained the highest marks. As for the males and females who registered high levels of regulation in their school (no need for more laws against bad behaviors), they got low marks. Students who were not good at school may have had a different view of the need for regulation at school.

So far, the results support the domain-specific model. (The family social-upbringing in the school alone was linked to school performance). The models indicating antisocial behavior were more complex. For the male and female students of the 9th year, autonomy in the family and in the regulated neighbourhood was negatively linked with antisocial behavior. In addition, regulation among peers and psychological autonomy at schools for girls were negatively linked to antisocial behavior. So, in the case of 9th-year students, the experiences of social upbringing in all contexts were linked to antisocial behavior. As for the male 12th-year students, regulation among peers was the indicator of antisocial behavior. As for girls, besides regulation among peers, all the variables of the family social upbringing had clues, if less powerful; and there was a positive (not negative) link between relations with the parents and antisocial behavior.

The construct-specific model:

This model affirms that there are special links among the separate structures of social upbringing (connections, regulation and autonomy), according to the social environment of those structures, and to the qualities of youth in performing their functions. The strength of this model is directed towards the construction of regulation. For 9th-year students, regulation with peer and in the neighbourhood quarter was linked with antisocial behaviour. As for female 12th-year students, regulation in the family and peer connections were linked with such behaviour. Connections, regulation and autonomy were all indicative of youth functions in some spheres (for the girls of the 12th-year). Besides this association between regulation and antisocial behaviour, there were no fixed types of such association.

Multiple regression analysis indicates that the experiences of the social upbringing of youth functions differ essentially, and are influenced by the social context, the type of social-upbringing experience, the age and gender of youth. Experiences in the family were uniquely indicative of the sense of depression, while school experiences were good indicators of the school performance of mature youth. Experience in several different social settings leads to antisocial behaviour, especially by females. The functional impacts of the variables of social upbringing appear on 12th-year students, as compared to their 9th-year fellow students (Eccles, Fraiser, Belansky, McCarthy, 1997).

The contingent model:

This model examined the degree of social upbringing experience in a certain social context, conditioned on experience in another social context. The analysis showed, for example, that the experience of social upbringing within the family setting are more notable and more linked with feelings of depression. In this case, the conditional question is whether non-family experiences of social upbringing become more or less relevant on the basis of how positive the family experiences have been. The same question may be applied to all four contexts. To test this, each social context has a grade of a set of Z-scores. The grade (Z) equals the difference between the crude grade and the average standard deviation of certain social concepts within every context. Thus, the variable within the family setting, for example, was the total of the Z-scores concerning family connections, family regulation and family autonomy. The grades were rationed because we didn't use the same measures to assess all the responses. A single grade only was given to the social upbringing experience beyond the setting under examination. This grade was set up in the same way. For example, the non-family grade is the total Z-scores of connection, regulation and autonomy within the setting of peers, the school setting and the neighbourhood setting. This process was repeated so that each social context had an internal local grade and an external non-inherent grade, such as (family and non-family, peers and non-peers, school and non-school, neighbours and non-neighbours). Overlapping clauses were introduced as independent factors in the regression analysis, directly with a grade,

within the context, or beyond the context. This was repeated separately for all the standard variables, and also measuring the age and gender of the youth. For example, the regression analysis gauges the importance of experiences not related to peers, and their association with antisocial behaviour, and how far they hinged on the level of peer experience, which have been considered independent factor within the peer variable. The variable of the non- peer setting and the overlapping clauses were the results of the two variables. The co-efficient of the degree of such overlapping may indicate the impact of the non-peer variable contingent on the variable level (within the peer setting).

Out of 48 tests (four of which were age and gender indicators x 4 within the social context x three standard variables), seven indicators had significant clues at the level of 0.05, and six of these seven concerned females, five of whom were 9th year girls, and four out of the six girls had shown antisocial behaviour. Therefore, there were conditional or contingent relations inside the context for girls of the ninth year and between the level of the class beyond the setting for all social contexts, when it came to predicting antisocial behaviour (within the family x non family B= 0.17, T= 2 980, P> 0.01; among peers x beyond peers B= 0.25, T= 4.54, P>0.001, within the school setting x beyond school setting B= 0.11, T= 1.96, P>0.05; within the quarter x beyond the quarter B= 1.7, T= 0.94, P>0.01). similarly, between variables inside and outside family, school performance B= 0.11, T= 2.51, P>0.01) during the prediction of antisocial behaviour by the 9th year males.

The nature of these internal reaction was the prop supporting the use of an analysis of a simple deviation involving two constant factors of prediction (peer x non-peer, Family x non-family, and others). A simple deviation was calculated between grades beyond the context, each with its own standard variables; and with each one standard deviation, this was calculated one grade above average inside the setting, and also at an average grade inside the setting, as well as at one standard deviation grade below the average inside the setting. The results of these calculations appear in table (7).

The results were similar in each case of class performance. They indicated that the experiences of social upbringing beyond the setting became automatically stronger, while such experiences inside the setting became weaker. For example, the first line of table (7) indicates that, when predicting the antisocial behaviour of the 9th year girls, the experiences of social upbringing suggest that in the cases of the girls who have registered higher levels of good social relations within the family. (B= -16, ns). By contrast, the experiences of social upbringing outside the family were significantly linked with antisocial conduct in the cases of girls who had registered medium levels of such experiences inside the family setting (B= -0.33., P> 0.001). There was a stronger link in the cases of the girls who had registered lower levels of social upbringing experiences within the family setting (B= 0.51., P> 0.001).

The results were similar in the indicators inside and outside the peer setting concerning the social conduct the 9th year, as well as the 12th-year girls, with the

existence of a weaker co-efficient in the case of the former group (the 9th-year girls). The model of the case inside and outside the school, as well as inside and outside the quarter and their interactions indicated a considerable increase of experience beyond the same context, with a decline of the experience quality within the same context. At any rate, in the field of predicting the concepts of the family and peer contexts, even in the cases of males who had registered higher positive relations in the school and the quarter, there were yet other contexts making such predictions as well.

The results had two implicit meanings. First: the family (parents) and peers were basic, primary settings in the social-upbringing process, in as much as the positive experiences in both contexts were strongly related with antisocial behaviour. That naturally affects the other contexts. At the same time, social upbringing experiences in the settings of the school and peers, regardless of the strength of their relations with antisocial behaviour, showed no effects on the other social contexts. As for the second meaning implicit in the results, it was that experiences beyond social upbringing seemed to equal the difficulties in any other social context. The impacts of the other contexts were regularly more dependent on the scale of the absence of positive social upbringing within the family and peer settings. In this case, the positive experiences in non-peer settings have not indicated the antisocial behaviour of the youth who registered the lowest levels of positive social-upbringing experiences with peers.

Finally, there was one exception to this general model which showed an increase in the importance of experience beyond the context, in comparison with the low experiences within the same context. It indicated the predictability of the intertwined relations between the family and non-family settings in the field of the school performance of the 9th year girls. In this situation, the model was upside down. Non-family experiences gave more indications to school performance among girls. The girls registered the most positive family experiences ($B = 0.34, P > 0.001$). As for the males who had registered medium levels of family and non-family experiences, predictability was weaker ($B = 0.18, P > 0.001$). As for the girls who had registered low family and non-family experiences, that had no link with school performance ($B = 3ns$).

The Argument

The analysis began with two descriptive examples of the experience of youth. First, defining the rate of youth who have experiences in the fields of connections, regulation and autonomy in each one of those four settings. Secondly, description of the correlations of the experience of youth that developed within the four settings. The results allowed the realization of the correlations of the three experiences of social upbringing among themselves on the one hand, and with all the other social contexts on the other hand. The results also allowed us to realize how much a certain experience in a certain context was correlated to another experience in another

context. Expectations in both cases were that there were positive correlations. In the analysis of one context, the expectation noted in the study showed that parental experiences tended to converge together in one group (Baumrind, 1971, 1991). Peer relations can provide the several requirements of youths' development (Hartup, 1996). The expectation of mutual, positive correlations in one context can be initially defined by an act indicating the transfer of active models from one social context to another (Sroufe, Fleseson, 1988).

Four models that gave different descriptions of relations within the experience of youth in the four social settings have been tested and analyzed. There are three main opinions of the psychological and social functions of youth, namely, school performance, feelings of depression, and antisocial behavior. The first model, called the Family Primacy Model, asserts that the experience of social upbringing inside the family has a pre-emptive, dominating impact on the growth of children. In this model, it is argued that the family guides, or strongly leads, the psychological and social functions of youth, because the mutual social relations within the family are exemplary and contain the strongest essential connections. In order to confirm this model, the data must show the experiences of connections, regulation and autonomy that have been tested within the authority of the family or the data must show naturally any correlations among these factors, which grew in non-family contexts, in order to achieve the functions of youth. An alternative model was called the Domain-Specific Model. This model assumes that social contexts have social effects on the opinions of youth functions. For example, the prior family experience of youth towards social contexts may be psychological, because self-realization and the chances to discover self-expression is constantly a process provided with far-reaching, early relations in a strong, intensive manner. So far, it may be equally true that a certain social context is more effective in facilitating, or suppressing, the growth of children. Consequently, the experiences of the social upbringing of children in a school setting may be the best indication of school performance, or the youth behavior outside the family or school; but within the scope of peers, the experiences of social upbringing may be more intensively linked to the powers of social upbringing inside the peer relations.

The third model is the Construct-Specific Model, which considers it likely that the special domination of the positive experience of social upbringing itself is linked to fixed opinions of the functions of youth. This model believes that the elements of social upbringing have a general effect on the opinions concerning the growth of youth, regardless of the social context where the experience has been attained, for example, therefore, the regulation made inside or outside the family in other social contexts or in both, will be more protected from the outer problems of behavior. Consequently, the autonomy created to protect youth from outer type of the difficulties they face, when it is tested within the family setting (Barber, 1996) will have the same effect when this autonomy is tested in a non-family social setting.

Finally the fourth model, called the Contingent Model, shows the extent of the impact of the experience of social upbringing within one context. These impacts are in line with the experiences in another social setting. Instead of independently contributing to the development of youth functions, the experiences of social upbringing within the social contexts may jointly and interactively facilitate the growth, or suppression, of youth. Positive experience within one context may provide youth with more experience in other contexts. Conversely, experience in certain social contexts may compensate for the deficiency or difficulties in other social contexts.

The data used in this study allows the testing of these four models on youth at various age categories or stages. The group of 9th year students (of the average age of 14 years) did not carry the important physical and social changes which take place during the transition to the stage of adolescence, but the 12th year group (at the average age of 17), that lived and experienced the stage of critical transition, entered the stage of almost full adulthood (Simmons, Burgesson, Carlton-Ford, Blyth, 1987; Eccles et al, 1993). Members of this latter group were expanding the net of their social connections. The age difference between the two groups may produce quite a difference in the results when the members of each group behave separately in their own category, since their experience in the field of connections are still recent and primitive. It is not clear what results to expect within the scope of individual experiences. At any rate, there are many extensive researches about the transition to the stage of adolescence and changes related to it (Younniss, Smoller, 1985; Steinberg, 1990; Collins, Repinski, 1994). These researches expect the older category to register less-positive (but not negative) connections with parents, more than what will be registered by members of the younger group. The peer experience will begin to rival the family experience at a later stage of growth and development. Once more, and because of the preliminary nature of this study, members of the sample were separately tested according to gender (males and females). There is not enough knowledge of the extent of the different male and female responses to the same social-upbringing experiences which they undergo. The differences in the responses between the two sexes were not apparent. In this study, it was certain that experiences which appeared through (connections, regulation and autonomy) were necessary, basic, critical and very vital for the sound growth of a human being.

This study began with the exploration of youth experiences in the four social settings, namely: the family, the school, the neighbors and the peers. Three main principles (contexts) of social upbringing were studied, namely, connections, regulation and autonomy, in addition to the mutual influences among these three social contexts and four social settings. The analysis of the data provided by the study gave an understanding of the impact of the three contexts of social upbringing within the four social settings, and an understanding with three types of youth functions, namely: the class, the feelings of depression and antisocial behavior, through a sample of male and female students of the 9th and 12th years.

The youth recorded all the required data; and it was important to obtain information from others (like the parents and teachers) in testing the targeted models. There are many variables that are influenced by the researcher's own view of youth, such as the kind of personal connections and the extent of the autonomy experience tested in these connections. The greatest limitations stemmed from the lack of measures harmonized with the measures of social concepts within the four settings. Therefore, some results may be attributed to the difference in measurement more than to the essential and actual differences. But it cannot be assumed that the differences among results are all due to the differences in measures.

The analysis has shown at several levels that there is a pyramidal chain among the four social settings. It became clear that the family and peer settings are the most effective in the lives of youth in each age group or category under study. The school and quarter (the neighborhood) settings were less effective in the social upbringing of youth. Many scholars have written about the importance of family and peer connections for youth; but this study has proved the importance of family and peer connections in the growth of youth. The proof was based on empirical evidence through the analysis of the data collected from the sample in the various social settings.

The importance of family experiences in the lives of the youth appears through several results, including the large groups of youth who registered such positive experiences of high quality within the family setting. These were correlated with positive experiences in the other social settings addressed by this study, and the large role of family connections affecting the mental health of youth, and in the field of predicting antisocial behavior. The gender and education were noted in members of the sample, and their cross-reference with the general results.

It became clear that the experiences of youth with their peers were similar to those registered in the family setting. Yet, some positive social experiences were registered in the youth connections with their peers. It is also not surprising to see a close link between such experiences and antisocial behavior. This also applied to family experiences. Positive relations among peers also reveal antisocial conduct among girls in an exceptional way. It was important to note that peer connections and psychological autonomy were not negatively related. So, it seemed likely that parents could establish positive connections with their kids and allow them autonomy at the same time. The youth have showed less ability to attain these two experiences together in their relations with peers and persons of their age. As for growth, the issues of loyalty, membership of a group, and social understanding during adolescence may not necessarily provide the youth with balanced, successful friendships. (See Collins, Laursen, Mortensen, Luebker and Ferreira, 1997)

It was noted that school experiences were less positive in the youth sample. With great difficulty, a small ratio of the sample recorded positive relations with their teacher. Some 1.5 % of the sample of 6th year pupils and 20 % of the sample of 10th

year students indicated that their schools had special regulation against antisocial behavior. These results suggest that social experience in the school setting has a nature full of problems. It was constantly not compatible with the modern interest in the nature of the school experiences of adolescent students. Example: (Eccles, 1993)

The analysis showed these school experiences resulting from the functions of youth. The issues of connections, regulation and autonomy of 12th year students in the school setting showed that it was possible to predict class performance. These results showed the importance of the efforts we need to improve the school experiences of the adolescents.

It is important to note that some of the youth of the sample to spend time weekly with individuals who are much older than they are. It is difficult to interpret these results without relying on comparative information from other sources. The results have shown the low importance of the experience of the quarter in the ability of standard variables in analyzing this decline. This gives a significant indication in this sample, to the effect that non-family adults play an important role in the social upbringing of youth.

The design of multi-lateral settings and contexts in this study has made it possible to see the various internal relations within those settings and in their contexts. It has also shown the relative importance of different social settings in defining the functions of youth. In general, there were positive correlations among the various settings. The results have been affected by some issues. For example, some families may have chosen to live in certain quarters that have certain qualities, or certain types of schools. Thus, the experiences may also be in one context, yet the family may specially provide the youth with some capacities and interests that would facilitate gaining similar experiences in other social contexts. For example, 'the model of making friends' (Otto Atkinson, 1979), where youth learn about the type of social connections in their families, and carry such types of connections with them when they establish other social relations outside the family, if possible. At any rate, it was necessary to utilize more similar measures.

As for the several models that have been tested or analyzed, the Domain-Specific receives more support, because it considers that understanding specific aspects of youth functions requires looking into separate and definite social context. This would enable the current information about school experiences concerning connections, regulation and autonomy to predict school marks or grades. On the other hand, school experiences about the feelings of depression predict mental health. In order to define the social contents with precision, together with their important correlations with other aspects of the functions of youth, a meaningful step must be taken. This step is to regulate the difficulties of social experiences. It would be useful to establish theoretical visions and a work program to deal with this issue.

The contingent analysis provides us with important information concerning the internal correlations among the four settings. In general, the analysis has shown that the social settings have relatively independent correlations with the functions of youth, as was indicated by the lack of interactions among these settings. The link between social experiences on the school setting on the one hand, and the feelings of depression and antisocial behavior on the other hand, is not related to the type of experiences in other social settings. The analysis has shown that young girls have high sensitivities to the various social contexts when those contexts were connected to antisocial conduct. If the experience is not positive in certain social settings, experiences in other settings will be beset by low-level experiences.

Conclusions

The empirical study in general shows the following results:

1. The differences in responding to the experiences of the social upbringing of the youth in the four social settings have not emerged according to gender.
2. Connections, regulation and psychological autonomy are basic principles in the social upbringing of youth, linked to the functions of youth in various social settings.
3. There have always been positive correlations among the conditions of social upbringing in these different social settings.
4. The various aspects of the functions of youth (the class, the feelings of depression) are associated with the different social contexts.
5. The family and peers are two main definite settings of the social upbringing of youth.
6. The family is the most important setting to provide the youth with positive experiences of social upbringing and large functional experiences.
7. The family has achieved an important, positive indication of the correlations among connections, regulation and autonomy for the youth.
8. The three variables of social upbringing in the family setting are positively correlated with the three variables of social upbringing in the peer setting.
9. The variables of social upbringing are negatively and constantly correlated with the feelings of depression and antisocial behavior.
10. The family experiences are constantly correlated with the other positive social experiences that emerged in other social settings.
11. Family experiences play a large role in the mental health of youth, and in predicting antisocial behavior.

12. The unregulated intervention of parents in their kids' affairs constitutes a dangerous factor in forming the antisocial behavior of youth.
13. The peer setting is rated directly after the family setting in providing youth with positive social experience. This means there is a close link between the experience of the youth with their peers and the antisocial behavior.
14. The experiences of peers are all set to rival those of the family, at a later stage of the growth and development of youth.
15. The influence of the peer environment on the youth is almost the same, regardless of age or gender.
16. The experiences of social upbringing in the peer setting showed no impact on the other social settings.
17. The school environment did not give the youth positive experiences of high standards.
18. There was a decline in the level of experiences given to the youth by schools in the fields of connection, regulation and autonomy.
19. Correlations among the three elements of social upbringing were weak in the school setting and other social settings as well.
20. In the process of the social upbringing of youth, the role of the school setting is less important than the roles of the family and peer settings.
21. School experiences in the field of autonomy are not related to other social settings.
22. The experience of social upbringing at school showed no influences on the other social settings.
23. There were no clear correlations among the elements of social upbringing in the neighbor setting and the other settings of social upbringing.
24. Non-family adults play an important role in the social upbringing of youth.
25. The four social settings are alike in the field of regulating experiences, with the exception that school experiences of regulation are not correlated to such experiences in other social settings.
26. Regulation must be compatible to the characteristics of youth, taking into account the psychological aspects in supervision, monitoring and control.
27. The good example is important in the four social settings, particularly in the family and peer settings.
28. The youth are inclined to test their connections through their various social contexts.

29. Important positive correlations emerged in the experiences of the youth in establishing connections in all four social settings.
30. Antisocial behavior has a very complex model.
31. Young girls are capable of utilizing the positive experiences of social upbringing in various contexts, and that is when experiences in other contexts are positive.

The similarity of many of these results to those of other studies, such as (Eccles et al, 1997) gives great importance to issues of context and the social environments of social upbringing. It also provides a basis to crystallize joint results with other studies of the topics of social upbringing. The results give a glimpse of the various methodologies in contexts related to the development of the functions of youth. Of course, there were other methods whose main attention was focused on the impacts within the social contexts. The logical step that should be added is to examine the ways and methods with which the experiences of youth in one social setting influence other social settings. Such analysis would add an urgent need to pay attention to the complexities of the fields of social upbringing.

Recommendations

The study has shown a set of results that can be useful in developing a project of social upbringing built on scientific foundations dealing with the qualities of the social settings studied here, together with their contexts and the socio-psychological characteristics of youth

1. The gender variable should not be taken as an independent variable in the projects of the social upbringing of youth.
2. The programs of the social upbringing of youth should focus on the principles of connections, regulation and autonomy, due to their importance and correlations in various social settings or environments like the family, the school, the neighborhood and the peers.
3. Great attention should be paid to the circumstances of social upbringing in which the youth live, and the different social contexts.
4. Suitable social conditions must be provided in the different social contexts, due to their importance to enable the youth to excel in their studies, and to build a balanced personality, away from various types of frustration.
5. Great attention should be paid to the family, in terms of the level of parents' education, the social relations among family members, and the methods of social upbringing used by the family.

6. It is necessary to focus on the correct choice of peers for the kids. There should be a sort of continuous, but indirect supervision and guidance, and the peers should be made to abide by the sound principles of the community.
7. Suitable programs should be set up to enable the family to provide the youth with positive experiences of social upbringing, and a variety of functional experiences.
8. The principles of connections, regulation and autonomy in the scope of the family should be addressed in a sound, precise manner, due to their great impact on the behavior and psychological condition of the youth.
9. Positive correlations should be consolidated among the social experiences of the family, the school, the peers and the neighbors.
10. Parents should desist from unregulated interference in the affairs of their children, because this would reflect negatively upon the formation of their behavior.
11. Attention should be paid to the school setting in all its aspects, in order to enable it to contribute positively to the formation of the experience of the youth.
12. School education methods should be reviewed in order to enable the school to deal positively with the issues of connections, regulation and autonomy, and to provide the youth with large, positive experiences in these issues.
13. Correlations should be consolidated among the three elements of social upbringing in the school setting on the one hand, and with the other social environments on the other hand.
14. More attention should be paid to the social setting of the school, so that it may play an important role in the process of social upbringing.
15. Regulation should be appropriate to the qualities and characteristics of youth, taking into account the psychological aspects in the process of supervision, monitoring and control.
16. There should be concentration on offering good examples OF WHAT? in all four social settings, due to its importance in the social upbringing of the youth.
17. Young people should be given enough freedom to choose their own connection through their different social contexts.

REFERENCES

- Arendt, Hannah (2002): Vita activa oder Vom tätigen Leben . München : Piper / TB .
- Bauer , Ullrich (2002) : Selbst -und / oder Fremdsozialstation . Zur
Theoriedebatte in der Sozialisationsforschung . Eine Entgegnung auf
Jürgen Zinnecker . Zeitschrift für Soziologie der Erziehung und
Sozialisation , 22 , 2 , 118 – 142 .
- Berger , Peter L., Huntington Samuel P. (2002) : Mang Globalization . Cultural
diversity in the contemporary World . Oxford etc. : Oxford University
Press .
- Baumann , Zygmunt (2003) : Flüchtige Moderne . Frankfurt : Fischer .
- Bachmair , Ben (2002) : Kulturelle Ressourcen . Teil 1 : Medien und
Lesekompetenz nach PISA . In : Medien praktisch , H.4 , 17-21 .
- Buckingham , David u.a., (hrsg.) (2003) : Video Kulthure . Video und
interkulturelle Kommunikation . München : kopaed.
- Balke , Friedrich , Schwering , Gregor , Stäheli , Urs (Hrsg.) (2000) : Big
Brother Beobachtungen . Bielefeld : transcript Verlag .
- Barthelmes , Jürgen , Sander ; Ekkehard (2001) : Erst die Freunde , dann die
Medien . Medien als Begleiter in Pubertät und Adoleszenz . Medianer
Fahrungen von Jugendlichen , Band 2. München : DJI .
- Boehnke, Klaus, Ittel, Angela, Baier, Dirk (2002) : Value Transmission and
,Zeitgeist‘ : An underresearched relationship . Sociale Wetenschappen ,
45,28-43.
- Böhnisch , Lothar , Schroer , Wolfgang (2002) : Entgrenzung von Jugend. Das
Modellprojekt „Netzwerk Jugendliche an der zweiten Schwelle „ . In :
Quem Bulletin , 6-2002 . Berlin : BMWF.
- Böhnisch , Lothar , Schroer , Wolfgang (2001) : Pädagogik und Arbeitsgesell-
schaft . Weinheim, München : Juventa. Bundesministerium für Arbeit
Sozialordnung (Hrsg.) (2002) : Sozialbericht 2001 . Bonn : BMA.
- Chodorow , Nancy J. (2001) : Die Macht der Gefühle . Subjekt und Bedeutung
in Psychoanalyse , Geschlecht und Kultur . Stuttgart , Berlin, Köln :
Kohlhammer.
- Chisholm , Lynne (2002) : Mannheim revisited . Youth , Generation and

- lifecourse . Paper presented at the ISA XV World Congress of Sociology ,
July 7-13 , 2002 , Brisbane , Australia .
- Dekker , Paul, Ester , Peter , Vinken , Henk (2003) : Civil society , social trust
and democratic involvement. Leiden etc.: Brill .
- Deutsche , Shell (2002) : Jugend 2002 . Zwischen pragmatischem Idealismus
und robustem Materialismus. Frankfurt / M . : Fischer .
- Ebringhoff , Julia , Kleemann , Frank , Matuschek , Ingo, Voß , Günter (2003) :
Subjektivierung von Arbeit . Arbeitsbericht des INAG. Chemnitz ,
München .
- Feierabend , Sabina , Klinger , Walter (2002) : Medien und Themeninteressen
Jugendlicher . Ergebnisse der JIM- Studio 2001 zum Medienumgang
Zwölf bis 19 – Jähriger . In : Media Perspektiven , 1 /2002 , 9 – 21 .
- Groeben , Norbert , Hurrelmann , Bettina (Hrsg.) (2002) : Medienkompetenz.
Voraussetzungen , Dimensionen , Funktionen . Weinheim und München :
Juventa .
- Griese , Hartmut M. , Mansel , Jürgen (2003) : Sozialwissenschaftliche
Jugendforschung . Jugend , Jugendforschung und Jugenddiskurse. Ein
Problemaufriss . Soziologie , 23 – 54 .
- Grundmann , Matthias (2002) : Sozialisation und die Genese von
Handlungsbefähigung . Stuttgart : Lucius & Lucius , 37 – 56 .
- Geulen , Dieter , Zinnecker , Jürgen (2002) : Quo vadio Sozialisation ?
Einführung in eine kontroverse Ortsbestimmung . In : Zeitschrift für
Sozialisationsforschung und Erziehungssoziologie , Jg. 22, H.2, 115– 117.
- Geulen , Dieter (2002) : Subjekt , Sozialisation , „ Selbstsozialisation „ . Einige
kritische und einige persönliche Bemerkungen . In : Zeitschrift für
Soziologie der Erziehung und Sozialisation , 22 , H.2, 188 – 196 .
- Götz , Maya (Hrsg.) (2002) : Alles Seifenblasen ? Die Bedeutung von Daily
Soaps im Alltag von Kindern und Jugendlichen . München : kopaed .
- Hoffmann , Dagmar (2003) : Jugend und Medien – eine Übersicht . In : J.
Zinnecker , H. Merckens (Hrsg.) : Jahrbuch Jugendforschung 3/2002 .
Opladen : Leske + Budrich, 355 – 381 .
- Hoffmann , Dagmar , Merckens , Hans (Hrsg.) (2004) : Jugendsoziologische
Sozialisationstheorie . Weinheim , München : Juventa.
- Hurrelmann, Klaus (2002) : Einführung in die Sozialisationstheorie . 8. Auf.

- Weinheim , Basel : Beltz .
- Maihofer ; Andrea (2002) : Geschlecht und Sozialisation . Eine Problemskizze.
In : Erwägen Wissen Ethik (13) . Stuttgart : Lucius & Lucius , 13 – 26 .
- Mikos , Lothar (2003) : Amok in der Mediengesellschaft. In : Archiv der
Jugendkulturen (Hrsg.) : Der Amoklauf von Erfurt . Berlin : Archiv der
Jugendkulturen, Tilsner , 46 – 74 .
- Popp , Ulrike (2002) : „Sozialisation „ - substantieller Begriff oder
anachronistische Metapher ? In : Zeitschrift für Pädagogik (48) , 898 –
917 .
- Reinders , Heinz (2003) : Inerthnische Freundschaften Jugendlicher 2002 .
Ergebnisse einer Pilotstudie bei Hauptschülern . Hamburg : Kovac.
- Scherr , Albert (2003) : Konturen einer genuin soziologischen
Jugendforschung. In : J. Mansel, H.-M. Griese , A. Scherr (Hrsg.) :
Theoriedefizite der Jugendforschung . Weinheim , München : Juventa ,
49-66.