4th century B.C., that we witness some diminution of this respect and some potential disruptions and unresolved strains in the relations between generations.

The only partial exception to this law are tribes in which there exists a very strong emphasis on military valor, which by necessity diminishes with advanced age. Here, as among the Nandi, Masai, etc., we find a much stronger emphasis on the warrior age grade, and not on elder age and seniority in general, and it is this age grade which commands the greatest authority and prestige. Here also the criterion of age serves as a basic criterion of allocation of roles; but because of the special emphasis on warriorship, there is a shift in the relative evaluation of different age grades.

The situation in the more differentiated, particularistic, specialized and achievement-oriented societies is somewhat more complicated. On the one hand, to the extent that achievement and specialization prevail, the importance of the criterion and value of age necessarily diminishes. In the sectors governed by these orientations, roles are allocated according to principles differing from those of age. And yet age—especially relative age, or seniority—does not lose all of its significance. If we look either at classical China, with its patrimonial bureaucracy, or at the various ecclesiastical hierarchies of Europe and Asia, or generally at feudal and guild societies, we see that seniority plays a very important role in social relations, commands authority and respect, and usually has a strong, even if not always fully articulated, influence on the allocation of roles and on the patterns of behavior within many social spheres. While the general hierarchical principles of a stratified society cut across the criterion of age, at the same time they uphold its importance within each of the strata, and in a general way uphold the value of age—of wisdom and experience—and the respect due it in their value systems and ideology. This is due to the preponderance of the particularistic criteria within them. As we have already seen, these criteria set a definite limit to the scope of achievement and specialization. They encompass, then, the total, diffuse style of living of a given particularistic group, and uphold this traditionalistic style. Hence their strong emphasis on experience, on knowledge

of and penetration into the framework of this style of living—all of which tends to emphasize the importance of age and seniority, even if not all roles are allocated on this basis. But even in this way the basic continuous and complementary relations between generations are vigorously upheld.

It seems that our general supposition as to the types of societies in which age is an important criterion of allocation of roles is verified by this analysis. In so far as a diffuse and ascriptive value orientation is maintained, the importance of the age criterion is relatively great. It is necessarily greater in particularistic than in universalistic societies. In the former, even when the basic units of the society are built not on blood ties, but on various hierarchical principles, the importance of age and seniority is maintained in detail within each stratum, and also as a general value of the society. If some achievement- and specificity-oriented activities exist in these societies, they are usually kept within the bounds of traditionalistic units within which seniority is again maintained, even if many roles are not directly related to it. It is only when achievement and specificity orientations take place within the framework of an overall universalistic society— as occurs in most modern societies—that the relative importance of the age criterion changes greatly.

XI   Turning now to the whole complex of modern societies, we find more intensive specialization and achievement orientation than in any other society hitherto analyzed. As in the preceding chapter, we shall have to describe this complex in an "ideal type," necessarily cursory, way, which may, however, suffice for our purposes. The intensity of specialization and achievement orientation in modern society is threefold. First, there exists a great segregation and differentiation between the various social spheres, and the number of "specialties" and "alternatives" becomes very great, especially in the economic field. Most of the economic processes are enacted in specialized agencies and groups distinguished from one another according to their specialized functions. The economic division of labor is based on separation between units of production and consumption, and among the former (and to some extent also among the latter)

there is a high degree of internal specialization. The same applies in a somewhat different manner to political, ritual and intellectual activities. Most roles incumbent on members of modern societies, outside the field of family and kinship, are also highly specialized. These roles usually necessitate a long period of preparation and learning, are mostly nonascribed, i.e., must be achieved, and their performance is judged by standards of both specificity and achievement.[51] Secondly, not only are the criteria of role allocation based on specificity, specializaztion and achievement; we find the same standards predominant in the field of value orientations as well. Thirdly, within most modern societies there is also a strong individualistic orientation in the sphere of value orientations; i.e., the sphere in which roles and awards are allocated with respect to individualistic gratification only is larger and stronger than in any other hitherto-discussed type of society. We find here a basic difference from primitive and past historical societies, among which, as has been shown, the various achievement-oriented and specialized principles of allocation of roles were to different degrees bound within the limits of diffuse, ascriptive and sometimes even particularistic value orientations. In modern societies the development of a universalistic society has been historically connected with the development of specific achievement value orientations. Historically, this interconnection goes back to the development of puritanism, modern capitalism and the liberal modern state based on universal citizenship.[52] It should of course be clear, as has already been shown in the preceding chapter, that this has been a gradual development unevenly spread in various sectors of Western societies, and to this day unevenly distributed among them.

This type of social organization, which is prevalent in modern societies, limits the scope and number of roles allocated on the basis of age alone. There exist very few organizations and groups in which roles are allocated expressly on the basis of age. Some organizations—the more achievement-oriented and competitive ones—are to a very large extent opposed to any specific recognition of age or seniority as an important element in their structure. Moreover, in many of these fields middle or advanced ages are looked down upon and feared. Within them there exists

potentially strong competition between various age grades and generations, and relations between them are strained. In other organizations there may be somewhat less antagonism towards considerations of age and seniority, although only rarely do they become explicit criteria of role allocation. Considerations of seniority—and sometimes rules of seniority—exist within many formal, bureaucratic organizations like the army, church, universities, etc., although seniority is not always identical here with relative age. Age is also of some value in those spheres which have a more diffuse and collective orientation, and in which considerations of experience and "accumulated" wisdom are of importance. Outstanding examples in the occupational fields are country or family doctors and lawyers; in politics, "elder statesmen." In all these cases considerations of age are of some general importance in social relations, although even then they are not immune from more achievement-oriented criteria, which give greater importance to younger people. In general it may be said that the great emphasis on achievement and specialization limits to a very great extent the importance of age as an explicit criterion of allocation of roles. It does not, however, negate it altogether, nor does it diminish the importance of organizing relations between generations. Its importance becomes perhaps even greater, as in these cases there exist many inherent strains between various generations, and their smooth interaction and continuity may, to some extent, be impaired. It will be one of the most important tasks of our analysis to see how youth and age groups in modern societies affect relations between generations.

We shall now turn to an analysis of the impact of specialization and achievement orientation in modern societies on the structure of their age groups. One of the main outcomes of the process has already been analyzed, namely, the long period of preparation for which special institutional devices—the schools—have been developed. Contrary to the particularistic societies analyzed in the preceding section, this preparation is strongly bound to universalistic and achievement-oriented values which, as has been shown, determine the strong development of "age groups" and of identity based on age criteria.[53]

The preparatory period in school is not, here, usually a transitory period from one particularistic group (or position) to another, but is oriented towards the attainment of specialized roles, the contents of which are usually to some extent both universalistic and achievement-oriented. The modern school system with its strong emphasis on preparatory age grading is strongly related to the high extent of specialization existing within modern societies. However, as has been shown in the preceding chapter, this school system, with its emphasis on instrumental achievements, does not provide an adequate goal for all the needs of the youths and adolescents, and it is this that gives rise to various spontaneous youth groups. In modern societies these youth groups share, together with the school, the "preparatory" sphere; the effects of intensive specialization may also be clearly discerned in the composition and activities of these various age and youth groups, youth agencies, etc. Several of these characteristics are similar to those of age groups in specialized primitive societies, but in these cases they are much more pronounced. We shall present these characteristics as they apply in the most general way to most modern societies.

The first of these characteristics is that limitation of the life span in which youth groups operate is very pronounced in these societies. In most modern youth groups (with the partial exception of the German youth movement), activities are clearly confined to the adolescent and very early adult span, and never extend beyond it. It is of course true that in many youth organizations we find older people performing various directive tasks (e.g., recreation directors, sponsors, semi-official instructors, etc.). However, these people are clearly representatives of adult society, who deal with the young people and guide them, and not "original" members of the group. Original membership is clearly confined to the adolescent and very early adult stage, i.e., the stage before specialization and achievement-oriented activities take up most of the individual's life and energy (and clearly before the establishment of a new family unit). The internal solidarity of the youth group is quickly disrupted, and the group's cohesion and attraction for its members is weakened with the onset of social maturity, preparation for marriage and

the need to find a job.[*] This is as true of the loosely organized groups of "peers" of the United States as of the more formalized youth organizations of Israel and the highly formalized ones of Russia.[54]

The only partial exception to this limitation of the age span may be found among some of the German youth movements, in which, owing to their sectarian and uninstitutionalized character, attempts—mostly unsuccessful—were made to prolong the existence of the movement and its influence beyond the adolescent span. However, this could be attempted only in so far as these movements lacked legitimization and institutionalization, and attempted to be revolutionary movements.

In no other cases are there definite activities or clearly defined mutual rights of youth group members beyond the span of adolescence; although many life-long friendships are established during that period and a general spirit of comradeship is instilled. However, this spirit is not bound to any definite roles or obligations.

Secondly, we find in all modern youth groups, movements and organizations an exceptionally strong emphasis on the internal activities of the group, and an almost complete lack of regulation of the general behavior of members of the society. Even when the youth organization is completely directed and organized by adults, it does not perform any regulative function with regard to the overall behavior of either its own members or other members of the society. The center of its interest and activities is in the internal affairs of the group or organization, and not outside its boundaries.

This very strong emphasis on internal relations also explains one of the most common characteristics of modern youth groups —the great importance of a small, autonomous, primary group as a nucleus of all of these organizations.[55] It has already been shown that such small groups are the basic nuclei of all types of age groups, but in most primitive organizations this nucleus is firmly interwoven with the larger organization and bears its sym-

* This accounts for the fact that youth movements and organizations among working class youth usually cover a shorter period of life, and begin early to engage in purely technical, vocational activities.

bols of identification and values. Within modern youth groups such a nucleus enjoys much greater internal autonomy, and between its members there tends to develop a very strong emotional interdependence and intensive mutual identification.[56] This intensity is based mainly on emotional links, which attain a special importance because of the "preparatory," segregated nature of the roles allocated to adolescents, and because of the serious emotional problems connected with the period of adolescence and the reformulation of adolescent ego identity in modern societies.[57] This strong emotional relation may or may not be fully integrated into broader, formalized structures; but it is this emotional strength that makes it possible for these groups to become cnuclei of various rebellious and deviant movements and activities.[58]

XII   Thus we see that the general characteristics of age groups in specialized societies are accentuated and intensified in modern youth groups, but are not structurally dissimilar to those of primitive societies. But the picture of specialization and achievement orientation and their repercussions on the structure of youth groups is not uniform in all sectors of modern societies. There exists here a great differentiation between various strata within modern societies, which is strongly connected with the nature and extent of specialization and achievement orientation within them. One of the most important indices of specialization and achievement orientation is the nature and scope of occupational choice within a given sector, and its relation to the general value system of the society and of this sector. The first important variable is, of course, the extent of specialized knowledge and skill that a given occupation or group of occupations demands. This obviously determines to a large extent the length of preparatory education necessary, and also the age at which the young adolescent or adult enters occupational life. But the technical necessities of preparation are not the only factor which determines the length of preparation and education. Many aspects of the educational system are focused on symbolic and intellectual knowledge. Thus a second variable which influences the length of education and the nature of preparation is a given

group's attitude towards the various symbolic and intellectual values embodied in the school system.

Thus we find that in most of the lower classes of certain societies the period of organized preparation and education is very short, and corresponds to both the occupational and value patterns of these strata. The occupations of these groups do not demand a very large extent of preparation and education, and no great value is set on such preparation and education. The youngster begins to work relatively early in life (12-16), and little skilled knowledge is required. There is a latent opposition to the demands of the school and its value, and usually only slight supervision by the parents of their children's education. The occupation choices given these children are very limited, and the family does not usually direct them actively towards any definite occupation. It does restrict the possibilities and horizon of choices and aspirations, but does not in itself constitute an effective economic or educational unit. Hence the special characteristics of youth groups within these strata—characteristics which are largely similar in many modern countries. The early beginning of occupational life limits the life span of youth groups; although some of them tend to persist until marriage, and may then develop into informal groups of adults. Thus the discontinuity between family and youth in most modern societies is of shorter duration in these strata than in others. Youth groups, mostly of an unorganized type—"crowds," "gangs," "street corner groups," etc.—lead a very intensive life at a certain period of life, and then gradually develop into formal groups of adults. The pattern of activities and values of these groups and those of the adults of their class are to a great extent similar; although the demarcation line between various age grades is rather strong, and there is little mixing between them. To some extent this pattern is not unlike that found in many peasant societies, to be described in the following chapter. This similarity of values is most clearly seen in the negative attitude towards school and formal education, and in the total dissociation of the youth groups from school life. Thus, in these cases the small extent of specialization shortens the life span of the youth groups, while their attitude towards some of the main values of the society gives

rise to some extent of association with adult-sponsored youth agencies. This is especially true of the attitude towards the school, but also to some extent as regards various youth clubs, organizations, etc. The most outstanding exceptions from this point of view are the various types of working-youth movements and organizations. These have been very influential in Continental countries, in Israel, etc.; but even there their greatest influence has been among skilled workers or as far as they served as channels of mobility towards better occupational strata. Here we find attempts to inculcate within the adolescents a feeling of pride in their work, and a strong identification with its values and orientations, which is not the case with youth groups recruited among the lower-class, unskilled groups. But here also we find that the age span which the youth movement or organization covers is rather limited, as the working age is relatively low.

A totally different picture can be found in the various upper classes of modern society—the English and Continental aristocracy and upper business and professional classes, the American "upper-upper" classes and plutocracy, etc. There the extent of specialization, on the one hand, and identification with the various symbolic values of the society, on the other, is very great. The various occupations in which the members of these classes engage demand a long period of preparation, as does their value system. Hence the very long period of preparation in schools and universities. This specialization and achievement orientation in the occupational sphere is, however, of a very special character. It has—especially in England and in some Continental groups—a very strong ascriptive and diffuse bias. Although the individual members of this group are not restricted in their choice of occupation, the choice is relatively limited. This limitation stems from the attitudes as to what the proper occupations are, e.g., business, the professions, academic careers; and the occupational choice is strongly influenced by the values and style of living of these families, with which the young people usually tend to identify themselves. Thus the specialization and achievement orientation of these groups and their concomitant occupational choices are to a very large extent set within the framework of ascriptive and diffuse patterns of their total style of living.

This pattern of specialization has its repercussions on the structure of youth groups recruited within these strata. Formal education is very prolonged, but, unlike among the lower classes, there exists a very strong connection between it and the spontaneous group life of youth. In some cases the spontaneous youth groups find almost full expression within the framework of the schools. Outstanding examples of this are the English public schools, especially in the form they have taken from the first half of the 19th century. They have been aptly described by the French historian, E. Halévy:

The masters taught their classes, and in cases of serious insubordination they interfered and flogged the offenders. Otherwise they left the boys to themselves. There were no masters like the French *maîtres d'études*, whose province was the continual maintenance of discipline. Discipline was left in the hands of the older boys, the members of the sixth form, which constituted the senate, the ruling aristocracy of the public school. Servants were few or none. The boys, therefore, had to provide their own service. The younger boys, the members of the lower forms, were the fags of the older boys, waxing their shoes, boiling the water for their tea, carrying their cricket balls and bats. An enormous society of boys between the ages of eight and eighteen governed by an unwritten code of its own making, an almost free republic of 100, 200 or 500 members, a club where even before adolescence a boy was imbued with the spirit of an aristocratic nation: such was the English public school.[59]

The extent to which they molded the activities and characters of the young people is amply illustrated in the numerous autobiographies of members of the English aristocracy.[60] To some extent they resemble the various types of schools in particularistic societies described above, although some aspects of the curriculum and general value orientations had a much more universalistic connotation. But the strongly ascriptive basis of their orientation was fully evident in the close relation between the official school system and spontaneous youth activities. This connection can also be found in participation in various officially sponsored youth agencies—the Scouts, youth clubs, etc.—which are sometimes very prominent among the members of their groups and classes. It is only in some specific cases, as for instance among the very authoritarian families of American plutocracy, that we find some sort of youth rebellion among the children.[61]

The difference between these and lower-class children has been clearly summarized in a recent English study by S. M. Spinley:[62]

Slum Experience	Public School Experience
Broken home with much overt conflict	Stable home with little overt conflict
Unplanned child	Planned child
Large family of siblings	Small family
Sibling relations close and rough	Sibling relations less close and more supervised
Father's occupation manual	Father's occupation business or professional
Mother works after birth of child	Mother does not work after birth of child
Young parents	Older parents
Childhood and adolescence spent at home among siblings and with companions of both sexes	Greater part of childhood and adolescence spent away from home in an age-sex group
School standards and ideals conflict with behavior in the home	School standards and ideals largely congruent with behavior in the home
Taught in school by people who believe themselves of higher social status	Taught in school by people who believe themselves of equal or lower social status

Various middle classes of modern societies show some specific patterns. In some European countries the picture is not entirely dissimilar from that of the upper classes, in so far as a strong connection between occupational patterns and a somewhat traditionalistic, diffuse pattern of life and culture are concerned. This seems to be the case in England; even more so in France, with its more traditionalistic bourgeoisie with strong family values; and to a smaller extent in the United States. Obviously the extent of occupational choice and mobility would usually be greater here than in the upper classes, and emphasis on achievement much stronger. Hence also a somewhat greater extent of separation of family life from the occupational and political spheres, and a somewhat greater differentiation in the structure of youth groups. The period of preparation is relatively long (much longer, of course, than in the lower classes, and some-

times as long as in the upper class); but education may be somewhat more specialized (according to the various occupational exigencies)—especially in the later stages—and less oriented to a diffuse pattern of values and to character development. Hence there may be a somewhat greater scope for spontaneous youth groups; but even these groups are usually closely connected either with the school (e.g., in sports activities) or with various adult-sponsored youth agencies and organizations (e.g., the YMCA, Scouts, youth clubs, various political parties and religious organizations, etc.). Spontaneous youth groups may in these cases develop various convivial and sporting activities, leading to the establishment of close friendships between a small number of young people, etc., but not evolving any marked opposition to the adult world.

The situation is somewhat more complex among those sectors of the middle classes in which achievement orientation is more pronounced, and only weakly related to diffuse and collective patterns of life. This is the case in some parts of the American middle class, and generally in many sectors in which very marked individual mobility prevails. Here the extent of specialization and the emphasis on specificity orientations and achievement is very marked, as is also, consequently, the length of preparation demanded from children and adolescents. The school serves as one of the main channels of preparation and mobility, and its preparatory and instrumental aspects are stressed to a very large extent. Consequently, we find here a rather strong dissociation between the formal organization of the school, the various adult-sponsored youth agencies, and spontaneous youth groups. This dissociation may be expressed in non participation in the various agencies and similar organizations organized by the schools, and/or the development of a somewhat subversive "youth culture" with an ambivalent attitude towards the adult world. Thus we see that although all sectors of modern societies are characterized by a separation between family and occupational life, the exact structure of this separation and of the concomitant specialization and achievement orientations differs greatly in various strata of the society, thus affecting the structure of youth groups in various ways.

XIII

In all the major structural characteristics hitherto described, there exists, as we have already pointed out, some similarity between the structure of modern youth agencies and groups and that of primitive and historical societies in which specialization and achievement orientation prevail. In spite of these similarities, however, there are within modern youth groups several characteristics which differentiate them from age groups of primitive specialized societies. The first major difference lies in the fact that modern youth groups are entirely segregated within the preparatory sphere, and consequently no fully institutionalized roles are allocated to them. In other words, modern youth groups do not engage in fully institutionalized instrumental relations or in the performance of institutional tasks in the society. There are, indeed, many instrumental activities within the school, but these activities are clearly of a preparatory and training character. The extent of preparatory instrumental activities in youth groups is much smaller. Thus modern youth groups lay a stronger emphasis on solidary and expressive activities. Consequently no fully recognized instrumental activities are regulated by the solidarity of the youth groups, and there are, as we have seen, few definite relations between age mates after adolescence. This segregation of solidary orientation emphasizes the preparatory nature of modern youth groups.

The type of preparation and the content of preparatory activities vary, of course, from one type of youth group to another. In the loose peer groups of American "youth culture" this preparation manifests itself in a somewhat subversive imitation of "strong" adult behavior, in an attempt to behave like adults, etc. In the more organized and formalized movements, such as the various youth organizations affiliated to political parties, it is manifested in the inculcation of civic virtues, of a common ideology and political indoctrination, to prepare the members for full, active participation in the political life of their respective communities. In some of these organizations, and particularly in the *kibbutz*, there are "children's republics" (directed by adults) in which the children lead a community life of their own, patterned after that of the adult society and preparing them for

it by means of daily precepts.[63] In all of these cases, however, the activities of the youth groups emphasize the preparatory aspect and segregate the world of the children from that of the adults, even if in this way they stress the autonomy of the children's world. Thus we see once more that the ways in which specialization and achievement orientations affect the structure of youth groups and organizations differ in various sectors and strata of modern societies. But in all of them the basic structural difference from most primitive and historical societies—namely, the confinement of age groups to the preparatory and training sphere—is evident.

Besides these structural differences between modern youth groups and the age groups of specialized primitive and historical societies, there is an even deeper difference. Contrary to primitive societies, in modern societies there does not usually exist full harmony between the value orientations of the age and youth groups and those of the total society. It has been shown that the value orientations of modern societies tend to be, in different degrees, achievement- and specificity-oriented. This entails some potential lack of harmony with the ascriptive and diffuse imagery of age and youth. The emphasis on instrumental relations and goals is very much stronger in modern societies, and these are not fully integrated into systems of expressive gratification and solidary relations. The continuity and harmony of value orientations found in primitive and historical societies do not exist here. Because of this and of the strong emphasis on preparatory activities, there is a certain difference and discontinuity between the self-image and identity of the youth and those of the adult.

We have already seen that the intensity of this difference varies from place to place. The points of difference, however, are usually rather similar. The first difference is that between the diffuse imagery of the youth and adolescent and the stronger emphasis on occupational specialization necessarily existing among adults. This difference may be found everywhere—in the emphasis on sports and general social conviviality of the American youth culture,[64] in the aspirations towards a new type of man in direct communion with nature and folk of the German youth movement,[65] and in the pioneer image of the Israeli youth

movement, etc. In the latter it has been found that one of the main emphases, both in the official literature and among the members themselves, is the possibility and the need to develop a fuller personality, not tied to occupational limitations or to economic troubles and exigencies.[66]

The second difference is that between the ascriptive nature of this human image and the necessity to strive towards individual achievement in later life. The full acceptance of a "comrade" or "pal" because of his being a "good fellow," and not just because of some specific achievement, is also stressed in all youth groups. In this respect there is also usually a great difference between the official value system of the school and that of the youth group.

These differences between the ascriptive and collective orientation of the age (youth) group and the individualistic achievement orientation of adult society have been very clearly shown in our investigations of youth movements in Israel. It has been demonstrated that there is a negative correlation between strong aspirations to achievement roles (economic and occupational) and strong identification with youth movements. Those adolescents who set themselves ideals of occupational and vocational advancement either do not join a youth movement or are among the most indifferent members. Similar occurrences are known in other countries.[67]

The third point of difference is in the individual's relation towards the group, his attitude towards the internal solidarity and mutual identification of members of his group. As we have seen, very strong emphasis is laid on such collective group identification in all modern youth groups, and the cohesion, solidarity and loyalty of the group are stressed as constituting one of the main virtues of youth as distinguished from adult society. Even in the formalized collectivity-oriented youth organizations, the broader solidarity and identification inculcated in the members lack the spontaneity and vitality of those of the youth group. In the German youth movements this internal loyalty has always been extolled; in the Israeli movements it has been emphasized as one of the main "educational" values of the movement.[68] This strong emphasis on collectivity orientation

and identification differs, of course, from the more individualistic emphases in the value orientations of adults in most modern societies.

All these differences, inherent in modern youth groups, make the integration of these groups within the social system difficult, and never complete. The full harmony between the individual's aspirations and the official allocation of roles to adolescents, characteristic of most primitive and historical societies, is absent here.

Although the groups satisfy many of the young person's developmental needs, the transition to adulthood involves some emotional change and disruption, which may or may not be overcome later.

This transition usually involves several stresses and anxieties. First, the bodily development of the adolescent constitutes a constant problem to him (or her). Since social maturity lags behind biological maturity, the bodily changes of puberty are not integrated with legitimate cultural values, and their evaluation is one of the adolescent's main concerns and problems. The difficulty inherent in attaining legitimate sexual outlets and relations at this period of growth makes the adolescent's problem more acute. Consequently the exploration of bodily changes in himself and among peers, exhibition of bodily prowess, and attempts to establish heterosexual relations, are among the main activities of his group.[69]

Secondly, the adolescent's orientation towards the main values of his society is also beset with difficulties. Owing to the long period of preparation, and segregation of the children's world from that of the adults, the main values of the society are necessarily presented to the child and adolescent in a highly selective way, with "idealistic" emphasis (i.e., usually with emphasis on the common values and on community orientation), and without a realistic relation to actual mechanisms of role allocation according to which they will have to achieve their status within society. The relative unreality of these values as presented to them becomes a focus of awareness among adolescents, and the exploration of the actual meaning of these values and of the reality of the social world becomes one of the adolescent's main problems.[70] This exploration may lead in many directions—

cynicism, idealistic youth rebellion, deviant ideology and behavior, or a gradual development of a balanced identity[71]—and we shall still have to investigate the conditions under which each of these reactions takes place. But exploration in this direction is almost universal in the youth groups of modern societies.[72]

Thirdly, the establishment of stable social relations and performance of stable roles is also problematic for youth and adolescents. The main difficulty here is that whatever temporary balance they achieve between instrumental and expressive activities and relations does not enable them to attain stable, recognized roles, relations and recognition from the adults.

This incomplete institutionalization is seen most clearly in its relation to and communication with the adult world. In the various kinds of spontaneous youth groups there exists an "ambivalent" attitude towards the adult world: on the one hand, a striving to communicate with it and receive its recognition; on the other hand, certain dispositions to accentuate the differences between them and the adults, and necessarily also their opposition to the various roles allocated to them by the adults. While they orient themselves to full participation in this world and its values, there are always some attempts to "communicate" with these values in the distinct, special way common to youth.

The various manifestations of lack of full institutionalization of youth groups in modern society have their parallels in the ideology of youth groups. As was shown in the preceding chapter, age grouping usually entails a strong ideological element, and the main focus of this ideology is the problem of the complementariness and continuity of different age groups. Most modern youth groups create an ideology which emphasizes the discontinuity of youth-adult periods and the uniqueness of the youth period in opposition to other age spans. The main differences between the orientations of youth groups and those of adult society, mentioned above, constitute the main foci of this ideology; although the extent of its explicitness varies from one sector of modern society to another, its basic elements are present everywhere. It should be emphasized, however, that some such discrepancy exists even in those modern societies where the various youth groups are highly organized into corporate,

formalized structures. We have noted the existence of such a discrepancy in the Israeli youth movements,[73] and it has also been reported in connection with youth organizations in Nazi Germany and in the U.S.S.R. Thus in all these cases we find no such smooth and organized transition between generations as we found in the primitive societies; there always exists some potentially unresolved opposition between them.

On the other hand, the existence of this discrepancy does not necessarily entail the development of deviant behavior and ideology on the part of the youth groups. In most cases it is gradually resolved through the process of social maturation, in which peer and youth groups fulfill a very important function, although mostly one of "secondary institutionalization." Despite all these differences between youth groups and the structure of adult society, and the incomplete institutinoalization of the former, it would be erroneous to conclude that they do not perform any functions within the society. Although they perform no tasks within the institutional spheres of society, they may fulfill certain functions similar to those of age groups in specialized primitive and historical societies. First, they—both the school and other types of age groups—inculcate the first dispositions to identification with the society, its general values and norms of behavior and collective symbols. Secondly, they serve also as reservoirs of solidarity which can be reactivated in later life. Although no occasions or duties (except for various types of "occasions") are prescribed for such activities, they very often serve as important factors in social life, in maintaining a definite style of living, and in various convivial activities and groups. Thus the solidarity of youth groups may, even in these societies, overflow into broader channels of adult life and counterbalance the exigencies of various instrumental activities in various informal and mostly unstructured ways. Thirdly, there is the fact, strongly connected with the former one, that in most modern societies the various youth groups—with the exception of the explicitly deviant ones—tend to emphasize the attitude of respect towards elders. This is so despite the latent opposition to the adult world. Many of them emphasize the respect due to the diffuse imagery of older people, and not to their daily activities in the occupa-

tional, etc., spheres. The various prescriptions which exist in this regard among the Scouts and similar organizations are well known. In this way they attempt—even if rather feebly—to overcome to some extent the discontinuity between the human images of different ages and the strains between different generations inherent in modern societies. Still, these functions are not fully articulated in all modern youth groups, which differ greatly in these respects; some do not perform them at all. This, as well as the general comparison between primitive, historical and modern societies, focuses our attention on a basic difference between various age groups—namely, the extent to which they perform fully integrative tasks in the society. Before we turn to the analysis of this aspect of our problem, we must explain certain structural differences between various types of age groups. There is an additional element in the structure of the various universalistic societies which is of great importance for the understanding of certain variations in the structure of age groups. This is the extent of individualistic, as opposed to collective, orientations and principles of integration. We must see how the differences in these orientations affect the structure of age groups.

XIV   Within the scope of primitive societies this problem has not arisen in a clear-cut way. In so far as our knowledge goes, the value systems and integrative principles of stable primitive societies[74] are largely community-oriented, and the scope of individual gratification is kept well within definite collective limits.[75] It is only within the scope of modern societies (in which not only is allocation of roles performed according to universalistic principles, but value orientations are universalistic and specific as well) that the problem arises in an acute form. Within modern societies we find both individualistically and collectively oriented value orientations; although the difference is not always clear-cut (as, for instance, in several European countries, where strong traditional collectivity orientation and identification persist), it can usually be discerned and evaluated. As each of these value orientations entails a different principle of identification and integration, the influence on the structure of age groups varies accordingly. We suggest that the

extent of institutionalization and formalization of age groups (i.e., the extent of their corporateness and corporative performance of roles and tasks), the main variable of age group structure not yet accounted for, is a function of the extent of collectivity orientation of the social system to which they belong.

We shall first present the data validating this hypothesis, and then attempt to explain them. The main distinction here lies between what may be called the more or less "loose," informal peer groups, and the formalized, corporate age grades and youth movements of various types. As has already been mentioned, information about primitive tribes seems to confirm this hypothesis, but is insufficient as it cannot offer a direct comparison. However, an interesting case is provided by situations of "culture contact." It has been remarked by ethnologists and anthropologists that the age groups are the first to disintegrate under the impact of Western civilization. This has usually been attributed to the weakening of the common goals and the emergence of more individualistic values. It is interesting to note, however, that in these situations the formal, organized age sets and regiments of old give way to formal, unorganized, loose juvenile groups of various types. This has been demonstrated among both the Swazi[76] and the Tswana.[77] A parallel development can be found among German youth after the breakdown of the Nazi Reich.[77a]

In modern societies the data seem to validate our hypothesis to the full. The most organized and institutionalized age groups may be found in Soviet Russia and in the Israeli *kibbutz* (and formerly in Germany and Italy)—all of them societies with a very explicit community orientation in their value systems.[78] In comparison with them, the peer and adolescent groups of Western Europe and the United States, societies in which individualistic orientation is stronger, are looser in their composition and less institutionalized. It is interesting to note that in Europe a greater extent of formalization and institutionalization exists in youth movements which are definitely affiliated with various political parties and social movements, such as various Catholic youth organizations, youth organizations affiliated with Social Democratic parties, etc., and in the United States among those

organizations whose goal is to develop the "civic spirit" in general, such as various community organizations, scout movements, etc.[79] It seems that even in these cases the extent of formalization is much larger in the European movements, in which the element of collectivity orientation has always been stronger. An additional support for this hypothesis may be found in the fact that in most modern societies a specific age group (usually 18-21) is organized for the performance of one of the most important collective tasks of the society—the maintenance of a security force—the army. In most modern societies in which a compulsory military service exists, it is necessarily organized on the basis of age grading, which here becomes thoroughly formalized and organized.[80]

Our investigations in Israel also seem to bear out the hypothesis. It has been found that the highest degree of formalization of youth groups exists in the more collectivity-oriented sectors of the community, such as the *kibbutz* and other sectors with a very strong identification with the pioneering values. In the more individualistic ("private") sectors, loosely organized peer groups are more frequent.[81]

A partial exception may perhaps be found in the "free" German youth movements,[82] in which there was a strong element of internal, corporate formalization and organization, which was not, however, fully institutionalized within the social structure. But it seems that this does not invalidate our hypothesis; the corporate organization of the German youth movements derived its character from the very strong collectivity orientation of their ideology, but as this orientation and ideology were of a rebellious, deviant character in relation to the existing society, they could not have been fully institutionalized.

Our material also shows that the formalization of youth groups in collectivity-oriented sectors (or societies) gives rise to wide, unified organizations, and that the formalized, corporate youth groups are not limited to single, local groups, but are usually organized on a country-wide basis and linked in different ways to various fully institutionalized, adult agencies.

This hypothesis also finds full support in the comparison between Spartan and Athenian age groups. Those of Sparta

were fully formalized and organized, and closely connected with the strong collective spirit and orientation of Spartan society, performing some of the most important collective tasks. This was not the case in Athens, where a much more individualistic spirit prevailed. Here the age groups were not so organized, were dispersed among many schools, and only at the *ephebic* stage became thoroughly formalized. This formalization was fully oriented to the performance of collective duties, mainly in the military field. It is therefore also characteristic that with the decline of the city-state and its common patriotic spirit and identification, this formalized organization of the *epheboi* gave place to the more "academic-cultural," and less organized and formalized, variety.

How can this hypothesis be explained? As a starting point we should analyze the meaning of formalization and corporate activity, both for the individual and for the social system. For the individual (adolescent), participation in a formalized and corporate group entails a high degree of identification with it, of merging his own identity with that of the group and its symbols of identification. In the "looser" groups there may also be a strong mutual identification between the members, between the "peers," and with the standards set up by the group. Such identification, however, is mostly of the personal, face-to-face type, based on primary personal relations, and usually does not include strong identification with specific symbols of the group or with its collective identity. In the "looser" groups the mutual identification and attachment of the members is of a more individualistic type, the group as such not functioning as a somewhat "super-personal" body. The corporate and formalized group, however, has an identity of its own with which that of the members must be merged.

The formalized groups of the *Komsomol*, the *kibbutz*, etc., always have some strong common symbols of identification—common names, corporate activities, organization, etc.—symbols which to a smaller extent exist in looser groups as well.

The corporate youth group serves also as a selective agency for potential members in various institutionalized groups within the adult sector of society. This selection is effected mainly

through the group's strong connections with various organized, official agencies by which it is sponsored and directed.

It is these characteristics that explain the relationship between the corporateness and formalization of the age groups and collectivity orientation, especially in modern, industrial societies with a high degree of specialization and of individualistic achievement geared to this specialization. In so far as individualistc orientation persists, the child's (adolescent's) identification with his parents (particularly the father) and their occupational and economic roles may provide for him a basis for identification with the ultimate values of the society. In these cases the problem of transfer of identification from the family to the wider institutional spheres and to the total social structure is not as acute as in other types of "nonfamilial" modern societies. In the latter societies, too, the necessity for such a transition exists, and the family does not encompass the most important roles of the society. Yet the child's identification with his particular parent-image may constitute a certain, though by no means complete, basis for the role dispositions which are necessary for full membership and social maturity; this is so because, first, the general image of the parent with which the child identifies himself includes from the outset some aspects of extra-familial, achievement-oriented roles; and secondly, because these individualistic role dispositions constitute important—if not the only —manifestations of the ultimate values of the society.[33]

In collectivity-oriented modern industrial societies the picture is different. Among these societies the parent (father) does not appear in his specialized, achieved roles as a full bearer of the ultimate values of the society. Therefore full identification with the individual parent's position and achievement-oriented activities is inadequate, as this position must itself be evaluated through its relation to the common, shared values. Any strong individualistic orientation or role disposition which is to some extent inherent in every modern achievement system is potentially disruptive from the point of view of such a social system. A wider, more inclusive type of identification and role disposition for collectivity orientation must be developed by the child (or adolescent) to enable him to become a full member of society.

These different types of general role dispositions are related to the extent of formalization and corporateness of youth groups. In so far as individualistic value orientations prevail, the adolescent's relation to his peer group and its members, although important for the gratification of various need dispositions and for the practical learning of various patterns of behavior, is not the only one which influences the development of his identity. The attainment of full identity and maturity entails the ultimate leaving of the youth group; the group itself is also valued in so far as it leads beyond itself, making possible the fuller achievement of individualistic status. That is why under these conditions corporate, formalized groups do not serve as proper objects of the individual's need dispositions, and only looser groups succeed in gratifying them.

However, in so far as collectivity orientation exists, the attainment of full social maturity and membership entails the development of a fuller communal identification, which must be accomplished during the period of transition from the family of orientation to the wider society. Hence in these cases the disposition to participate in groups which incorporate and symbolize the common values of the society is stronger, and the individual may, to some extent, merge his identity in them. This does not, of course, mean that all adolescents in such a society have strong dispositions to participate in such more closely knit groups. This is not the case, of course, especially because in such societies there is a tendency to develop many structural inconsistencies which breed potential deviancy and disaffection.[34] This analysis assumes only that in collectivity oriented societies the disposition of most individuals to participate in such groups is usually stronger than in individuallistically oriented communities.

The fact that any strong ideology of "age" or "youth" is, as we have seen throughout this book, collectivity-oriented, and therefore cannot be fully institutionalized in individualistically oriented societies, may also help to clarify this correlation between corporate age groups and community orientation in the sphere of values.

From the point of view of the social system, the corporate,

formalized age (youth) group also performs an important function in collectivity-oriented, specialized societies. First, it constitutes an excellent strategical position through which the solidarity of a small, primary group may overflow onto the larger system, emphasizing collective value orientation. Secondly, the age group makes possible a strong inculcation with common values during the period of preparation, in this way ensuring some limitation of the tendency towards individualistic achievement inherent in any specialized society. Thirdly, and perhaps most important of all, the formalized age group or youth organization constitutes one of the most important agencies for selection of membership to the elite positions, and therefore for a distribution of rewards. Through this process of selection social mobility and individual achievement are closely connected with performance of community-bound roles; in this way an institutional counterbalance to individualistic orientations is found. The special importance of the youth organization in this respect is manifested in the fact that it can control the transition from the purely preparatory period to that of full adult specialization.[85] These characteristics of formalized youth groups also throw some light on a structural characteristic touched upon earlier—namely, the extent of age group autonomy. It has been shown that a more or less complete age group autonomy exists either when age groups are the main integrative agencies within the social system or, conversely, to the extent that they are segregated from such agencies. Accordingly, the extent of autonomy should be relatively high in modern societies; but it is in inverse ratio to the extent of collectivity orientation and formalization of age groups. As has been shown, such formalization involves some degree of direction by adults—sometimes even complete regimentation.

It may be asked why, if this analysis is correct, do we find, even within the framework of individualistically oriented societies, some degree of formalization in youth organizations (as evinced in the various above-mentioned community organizations in the United States, etc.). It seems that the explanation should be sought in the fact that, as we have already seen and shall see in greater detail below, even in the most individualis-

tically oriented societies some extent of community orientation must be institutionalized in order to maintain the solidarity of the social system.

The inculcation of this collectivity orientaion is especially important during the period of preparation for adult roles; the various youth groups and youth agencies are, as we have seen, used for this purpose, and various definite tasks which symbolize these attitudes are allocated to them in the preparatory sphere. Since such an element of collectivity orientation is inherent even in individualistic societies, it accounts for the permanent tendency towards some formalization in all youth groups, and particularly in youth agencies and organizations.