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ABSTRACT

The problem is how young people of high school age orient themselves to the future in the light of the theoretical presupposition that such an orientation is a crucial one to the development of identity during adolescence. Fourteen students in a Vancouver high school are interviewed in considerable depth to ascertain primarily how they are so oriented and, more generally, other aspects of their overall outlook. A comparison is made between these findings and those of several earlier studies of approximately ten years ago. While the reasons why the two sets of data may not be exactly comparable are stated, certain conclusions from the data about social change during this period are put forward. The claim is made that a new ideology has developed in this time that did not exist at all among young people previously, and an attempt is made to explicate this ideology as much as possible -- drawing on the data of the tape-recorded interviews. A model of cultural change whereby new ideologies are adopted in society is suggested, and the prediction is put forward that the new ideology will spread more among high school students in the near future with significant consequences for the wider society. Finally the effect of all this on the process of adolescent development in society is discussed. It is suggested that this process is crucially linked to social conditions and that at the present time, and because of the above, in contrast to a decade ago it is now much more possible to undergo the full process of adolescence.
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INTRODUCTION

This thesis started as a vague interest in what adolescents, for want of a better word, thought about their future, how this affected what they were going to do, and why it was that they thought as they did about it. I was not able at first to give myself articulate reasons as to why this interested me -- I just knew that it did; but subsequent extensive reading and some very interesting empirical work, to be described below, led me to believe that the subject was very important indeed, and it has now blossomed into other things too.

It remains primarily concerned with: 1) young people's orientation to the future, but is also crucially connected with: 2) contemporary social change, and 3) discursive or critical thought about "adolescence" -- or at least a few aspects of it. The first of these three topics is primarily descriptive, and all the things I say about it are derived, in quite straightforward ways, from the data of the empirical work I did. The second and third topics are somewhat more tricky. In principle the aspects of social change discussed here could be dealt with in the same direct empirical way. By asking the same questions and so on under the same conditions at different time periods to comparable groups of adolescents, for instance, one might obtain reasonably good empirical foundations from which to make justifiable generalizations about certain social changes. Unfortunately I was not able to do this and therefore it is important to notice here that the
sets of data, distanced by time, from which I derive statements about social change may not be comparable in certain aspects. I shall discuss this problem in more detail later, but this fact must be borne in mind from the beginning. The final of my three topics -- concerning "adolescence" -- will suffer in the discussion from the same defects in data as the second, and will in addition be much more speculative -- though nonetheless interesting or important for that, I hope.

The general context in which to see this work, then, is that it delineates certain features of a group of adolescents in a particular social milieu, and relates the nature of adolescent development to cultural and ideological changes.

I was lucky enough to become involved in a high school in Vancouver for about six months and got to know, in a completely unofficial capacity, quite a lot of the students. During March, 1971, I asked fourteen of them (separately) if they would be prepared to help me out and do interviews related to what I was doing for my M.A. thesis. They all agreed, and were all interviewed. I was careful beforehand neither to let them know too much about my own views (which was at times a somewhat difficult and rather distastefully alienating thing for me -- I've tried to make up for it since), nor exactly what the interview was about.

The questions were either taken from the questionnaires of other earlier studies on adolescents, which I shall be describing, and utilizing, or were formulated or derived myself from things I wanted to know in relation to what I was doing. About half and half. All the
questions -- even some that might seem at first sight gratuitous -- had very definite reasons behind them. There were two types of question: those that asked for specific facts or the articulation of certain conceptions held; and those that were indirect, projective, or open-ended. The purpose of these was to gain some insight into the person's subjective or tacit ways of defining reality -- and in many ways these were the most interesting. They were of various types, and gleaned from various sources. For instance, from Keniston I got the idea of seeking out their non-verbalised or implicit goals and values "by inferring from what they dislike and seek to avoid." From Douvan and Adelson I adopted the approach of attempting to get at "the less formulated and intellectual aspects of the youngster's image of the future, the visual and emotional qualities of that image," by asking questions dealing with "hopes and dreams rather than expectations, and...visual and concrete references rather than intellectual and abstract ones. They approach the child's future concept in a context of fantasy rather than asking him to discuss it realistically."

Some of these indirect questions were attempts to provoke anything interesting that might be thrown up (and this proved very fruitful), and some of them were trying to root out specific assumptions -- for example, whether the necessity of having a "career" was an unquestioned assumption. Many assumptions like this, though they may be there, are very difficult to get out. And of course, when I have not guessed them in the first place, they may remain completely invisible to me. I'm sure this probably happened with some quite crucial ones. This was where the provocative, casting-in-the-dark questions were aimed, of course.
In addition to the planned questions, I did as Keniston said he did in *Young Radicals* (the implicit methodology of which was extremely influential on my own) — "from then on, I had no particular plan other than to try to understand this particular individual." The interview situation was not therefore impersonal — and I felt that the advantages of this overwhelmingly outweighed the disadvantages. The questions were not asked in the same order, but rather followed from what intuitively felt like the natural flow of the conversation, and the questions were not always asked in the same way — the style of pitching it again dependent on the "feel" of the situation. On this point it may be objected that it was not therefore the "same" question to each person. In answer to this, I am quite certain that an identically phrased and expressed question, unless it be very simple, does not necessarily "mean" the same thing to different people anyway, and the reader must take it on faith that I was acutely and continuously aware of the difficulties here, and made every effort to ensure that neither the phrasing nor the way questions were expressed, encouraged the interviewee to favour one sort of answer over another.

Each interview lasted from 1 1/2 - 2 hours, depending partly on how talkative the other person was, and partly on how much we got on to other topics, besides those planned. These digressions were often fascinating, and played a large part in helping me "make sense" of the person. The advantage of having a very open informal structure and such long sessions (though I always found it much more exhausting than they did -- through having to participate consciously at two levels -- a) as
a person in a serious conversation, and b) as a sociologist "outside" the interaction and continually looking for insights, new key questions, and so on). -- the advantage, was twofold.

Firstly, I felt that I could get fairly accurate pictures of certain things that might lend themselves to distortion in much shorter and more structured interviews. By perseverance on certain points we often came up with things that seemed inaccessible or absent initially. Cliche answers, or stock opinions, often broke down (I don't mean this in a bad sense) under more detailed questioning. For example, an apparently clear conception of future occupation and life-style soon became the very opposite once elaborated on in enough detail, and someone, for example, who seemed to be very definite about their values, when pressed came up with: "I'm really definite about... (pause) -- um... uh... (laugh) What am I really definite about?... (pause) My musical tastes!", and nothing else came up under subsequent questioning on the subject. Further, on certain topics, it is pretty meaningless to ask someone -- "Do you have a conception of X?" -- because if he doesn't, he won't necessarily know that he doesn't; and when he does know, he does have that conception. By asking questions from varying angles on a particular topic I could often abstract or infer an answer to a question that by its very nature cannot be asked (or rather, answered) directly. This will be seen in the section of the questionnaire, to be dealt with below, relating to the interviewee's consciousness of "young people" as a group he identifies with (or not). This is not as complicated as it might sound.
Secondly, I made what I considered to be a serious attempt to understand something of how each of these individuals saw the world, their future, and so on. That is, initially at least, I was concerned with "understanding" each one separately. Most interviews very definitely do not do this, partly because they are too shallow anyway, and more importantly, because by cross-tabulation and other such procedures they "lose" the structure, and hence the overall gestalt, of each one. Now, if one achieves any sort of overall understanding of whole interviews, this gestalt necessarily contains tacit elements and relationships that have to be lost as soon as the data is recast, as in cross-tabulation. The open informal structure of the interviews helped me gain tacit knowledge that I could not have possibly anticipated and therefore planned for in a totally pre-structured set of questions. I hope in the section on Ideologies, later on in this thesis, that by the use of whole interviews or relating large differing chunks of the same interview, it will become clear that certain things can be seen which would not be, either if no "understanding" of each were achieved in the first place, or if each of those gestalts were "lost" by solely performing operations across the interviews.

And finally, here, an initial note on those who were interviewed. There were seven boys, seven girls, all in Grades 11 and 12, and all between sixteen and eighteen years of age. They were chosen for very haphazard reasons. In general, they got to know me; I was just "around" in classes, etc., and some of them talked to me, wondered why I was there, and so on. On the whole it would not be unfair to say they chose themselves. I just kept asking students I knew until I felt I'd completed
enough interviews, and the only consistent conscious criterion I used was that we liked each other enough for me to feel that a successful interview situation was possible and would be enjoyable. They were not a group in any sense except that they all went to the same school. They were scattered in different classes, some didn't know some of the others at all, most were at least acquainted with most of the others, and the only two who were close friends I interviewed one immediately after the other.

I felt on completing the interviews that I had a collection of very individual, very different people, about whom it was impossible to make a single significant generalization that held across all fourteen of them. Certain rough trends and observations were fairly obvious immediately, but it is only after "living with" my tape recordings of the interviews continually for a few months, and generally immersing myself in them that some interesting and coherent structures have begun to crystallize about them in the sediment that settled in my mind. Although I can in no sense claim that they were a random sample from the school, they were not a particular "type" either. As will be seen below they were very varied and different -- but none of them was a likely dropout from school, none were the "radicals" and/or "freaks" of the school, and perhaps most significantly of all, none were apathetic, totally uninterested, totally silent. Although, as I say, they were not a homogeneous group, they did perhaps have certain particular characteristics or "biases" that were not irrelevant. They were intelligent (some of them very), they were articulate, not too shy, middle class, and in
general, inquisitive. The very fact that they were these things is, I shall be claiming, in view of what the interviews showed, very important.
BACKGROUND

I said at the beginning that because the empirical work I did was at one time period I cannot from this prove anything about social change. What I shall do, however, is present the findings of certain earlier studies on adolescents, all carried out at roughly the same time, which jointly should be viewed as a background against which to see the analysis of my own empirical work. This method is very similar to that employed by historians who similarly only have imperfect data, and cannot set up sufficient controls to claim that they have "proved" their conclusions.

The sources of earlier data to be referred to here are The Adolescent Experience by Douvan and Adelson, The Quiet Rebellion by Douglas, Alienation and the Decline of Utopia by Keniston, Growing Up Absurd by Goodman, The Adolescent Society by Coleman, and The Vanishing Adolescent by Friedenberg. (See bibliography for full references.) These all contain empirical observations on the situation of adolescents in North America about ten years ago -- give or take a year or two. Throughout this thesis I will be using the phrase "a decade ago" and this should always be seen as a form of shorthand. When used it will be in the context of making some remark about social changes amongst adolescents between now (1971) and an earlier period stretching from the middle 1950s to perhaps only a few years ago. When I use the expression, then, I will be assuming that which is described in the literature above.
One obvious possible drawback of this literature is that it is primarily American. *Growing Up Absurd* quotes some attitudes of Canadian youngsters, and from the way it is written Goodman obviously assumes that the situation that obtained for adolescents in Canada was the same as in the United States at this time. I don't think this is unreasonable. *The Quiet Rebellion* is wholly Canadian, and dealt in fact with a sample of first-year U.B.C. students in 1961. This is obviously getting much nearer to good comparative data, but even for this there may be reasons to suppose that it cannot be strictly compared to my data. Why this is so will be discussed later. I was able to talk to two students who graduated from the particular high school I was concerned with; one had left five years ago, and one four years ago. From the basis of these conversations I would judge that my conclusions about adolescents at this particular school and in this particular area, and hence of social change between then and now— are not unreasonable.

In addition to the above mentioned works, the following were, from amongst a larger number, the most important in helping me formulate the conceptual or theoretical framework of what I have done:

*Identity: Youth and Crisis* by Erikson, *Experiencing Youth* by Goethals and Klos, *Adolescence and Beyond* by Bennett Berger, and *Young Radicals* by Keniston. (See bibliography again.) This last mentioned book was the most crucial, almost seminal, influence -- in its methodology, in giving me ideas, and in helping me understand the changes that have taken place and which I am concerned with in this thesis.
So, finally, before I deal with my own empirical work, let me briefly sketch out a summary of some of this earlier work, against which the contrasts in the contemporary situation can be more sharply seen.

Douvan and Adelson state that "adolescent adaptation depends directly on the ability to integrate the future to their present life and current self-concept." "The future enters adolescent identity like a crucial piece omitted from a picture puzzle....If the piece is really crucial -- as the future is in adolescent identity, the whole puzzle depends for its interpretation and meaning on what the piece will look like."

They found that "for the boy, identity revolves around the questions, 'Who am I? What do I do?' The nature of his occupation plays a crucial role in defining a man's identity. The girl, on the other hand, depends on marriage for her critical defining element; she will take her self-definition, by and large, from the man she marries and the children she raises."

Boys had in general had high mobility aspirations and planned concretely and realistically around their occupational aspirations. Only one in thirteen, out of the 14-16 year old age group they dealt with, did not know what he was going to do, and of the great majority who did know, most had a work model -- an uncle, a brother, etc., who had this occupation. Of a list of reasons for choosing a job presented to them (I utilized this same list), "interesting work" and "security" were the two main ones for choosing particular careers. Almost half of them wanted to go to college, and they usually wanted college training geared to
job aspirations -- dental school, agriculture school, engineering school, etc. There was a high congruence between their fantasies and their reality striving, such that, for example, when asked what they would like to change about themselves if they had a free hand, most of the changes concerned being better able to perform the future work role.

"To summarize, boys orient to the future primarily in terms of an occupational identity. They plan concretely for this future, and their plans are marked by an active striving for achievement and by a relatively realistic assessment of the job world and their own capabilities."

Girls: Douvan and Adelson comment on the overwhelming pressure from the culture to get married -- "our culture recognizes only one path to feminine fulfillment" -- to be married and have children. "At this period the girl's interest centres on being chosen by boys -- as a date, a steady girl, or a future wife." "Girls clearly invest less in an image of their future work than boys do...they choose jobs [e.g., secretary, nurse, teacher] that permit expression of traditional feminine themes, and jobs that provide a pleasant social setting in which they can make friends and meet young men to marry." "Although girls do not have as intense motivation for individual achievement as boys do, they nevertheless want and expect their share of social rewards. They desire social mobility, indeed, their mobility aspirations are more pervasive and intense than boys." Ninety-six percent of them (11-18 years of age group) express a desire to marry, and "the desire for social status and for a middle-class life-style is a key to understanding the
girls' picture of married life....They want to attain middle-class jobs for themselves, they want their husbands to have high status jobs...and apparently...will not be troubled by the problem of yielding to romantic, princely fantasies in favor of choosing a real man." But "to questions requiring fantasy production, girls give more responses than boys. They seem more familiar with the fantasy world and apparently find the path from reality to fantasy a well-worn, easy route." "An interesting sex difference appears here in the fact that girls almost universally can think of some way in which they would like to change, whereas a sizeable group of boys (38%) say there is no way in which they wish to be different." "A boy must have a clear picture of how he will get to his goals; he must reach them, by and large, through his own skills and talents....The girl on the other hand, will reach her goal primarily through marriage....Achievement is the major worry of boys, personal attractiveness, physical appearance, and popularity are the centre of girls' concerns."

This hardly does justice to the richness of their study, and because it is partial, is somewhat distorted, but it provides a striking picture of what many adolescents were like in the United States in the late 1950s, and thus enabled me to see very clearly some of the characteristics of the high school students I interviewed -- characteristics that might have remained hidden because taken-for-granted, had I not this particularly good background against which to see them. In their final chapter, by the way, Douvan and Adelson make no secret of the fact that they don't at all like what they found.
In case this should be thought not applicable to Canadian youngsters at the same time, Douglas' study of first year U.B.C. students, in no way contradicts the above, and describes interesting additional perspectives that are outlined below. I must make it clear however, that I am aware that first year U.B.C. students a decade ago were not necessarily the same as students of the same period at the high school I was concerned with; or that students at this high school now are necessarily the same as a representative sample of first year U.B.C. students now.

Douglas found that: Boys value most about their future jobs, independence and security, and a career is regarded as much more important than marriage. They may be critical about the structure of society they have to face, and the prospects it offers them, but "if you can't lick 'em, join 'em," and "you can't buck the system" is their attitude to what confronts them. "They therefore plump for security and money, and abandon their ideals, and lower their goals, in the face of what they perceive as reality." "Ritualism" is their attitude to the public world; public and private world are compartmentalized and self-respect, interest, and commitment, are focused in the latter. They tend to classify girls into two broad categories -- those with whom they "have fun", and those with whom they "get serious" and marry -- though early marriage is seen as a threat to plans of achievement in a career.

Girls think that marriage is the most important thing, but feel that they should do something else too. Boys focus on economic security and girls on emotional security, and marriage is seen by girls
as a sort of career and which provides this emotional security. Politically, where they see what is wrong both sexes tend to be content merely to point out what ought to be done, since they feel powerless to effect the necessary changes. Their own stance thus differs little from the conservatism for which they blame their elders, and they confine themselves to those systems of politico-philosophical ideas which have earned popular approval. They 'prefer to take a practical view' and 'face the facts of life'... as it is defined by the adult culture." Boys seem to want regular income, predictable advancement, and tenure of position; and girls primarily want marriage, and only those careers (for example, nursing, and teaching) that can be combined with it.

One could go on, adding to the picture -- with the data from Coleman's book, the anecdotes from Goodman, and so on -- but this will suffice for the time being. What follows should be seen, as I have said, against the background of what has been presented above. The extent to which, observing differences between the two, we can go on to make inferences about social change, I shall discuss later.
THE INTERVIEWS

I will deal with the interviews under subject topics. These should not however be seen as very definite divisions — they are only approximate, and several questions spill over into other sections. I have one section entitled *Attitudes Towards the Future*, for example, whereas in fact several other sections, notably the first, might also be described under this heading. The questions were not asked in a definite order, only following from what "felt" like the natural flow of the conversation, but they tended to follow in the order they are presented here, and the first section here did always in fact come first. The reason why I have split the questions up into sections to deal with is that it is easier both for myself and for the reader to grasp it all conceptually in this way. A few questions were not asked in the later interviews; none of them were particularly important ones, and they will be indicated as we come to them. In discussing the responses, direct quotes will always be in quotation marks and remarks or clarifications by myself within these will always be included in brackets in capital letters. There are a few minor alternations of specific facts that might identify particular people.

I gave the following instructions casually before each interview, usually while I was setting up and turning on the tape recorder, and then chatted my way gradually into the interview. There was rarely any clear point at which "chatting" finished and "the interview" started, however, and this was intentional.
"-- Some of the questions are quite personal -- if there's any you feel you'd rather not answer -- that's fine -- just say so.

-- I have a slight problem here in that you know me already to some extent, but try, if possible, not to let what you think my opinions might be influence the way you want to say something.

Let me give you an extreme example: [RELATED LIGHTLY] if you thought all black people ought to be shipped on the first boat back to Africa -- I know you don't think this, and you know I don't think it, but if you did -- it would best, from my point of view, for you to say it. You know what I mean?

-- There's nothing particularly difficult about the questions, and on the whole there are no "right" answers to them -- it's just your opinions, what you think, that I'm interested in.

-- I want to use a tape recorder, but no-one else will hear the tape -- not here at school, not at the university -- only me -- and you if you want to. It just makes it easier for me than writing it all down. I will take notes from them and eventually erase them.

-- Feel free to say whatever you want on any particular topic we're on. I'm not allowed to ask you about -- and anyway they're not what I'm mainly interested in here -- certain topics like religion, sex, or race -- but if you feel at any particular point that some piece of information might be helpful and you want to volunteer it -- please do! [THE PRINCIPAL OF THE SCHOOL HAD EXPRESSLY ASKED ME NOT TO ASK ABOUT THESE TOPICS DIRECTLY]
I'll explain at the end, what I'm trying to do with all this, and I'll let you get your own back and ask me any questions you want then!"

Work, and the Immediate Future

"-- You're in Grade (_) now, what are you going to do when you're finished here at school, do you know?


-- Job? Why, what reason?

-- When did you decide? What made you decide?

-- Are there any other things you feel you may have to decide or make your mind up about in the next few years?

-- People sometimes say, or feel, that two important choices have to be faced by young people: work, and marriage. What do you feel about this?

[ADJUST, IF NECESSARY, FOR A GIRL. CAREFUL NOT TO GIVE EXPECTATION THAT ONE SHOULD HAVE JOB PLANS, ETC. -- OR, THAT ONE SHOULD NOT]

-- Assuming you have no, what kind of work would you like to do as an adult?

-- Are you pretty sure about this, or do you think you're just as likely to do something else?

-- O.K., you mention [OCCUPATION] -- Why do you think you might go into it?
-- What would you like about being a (_____)?
-- Do you know anyone who is a (_____)?
-- How would you go about becoming a (_____)? what training do you think you might need?
-- What things about a good job would be important to you?
-- This is a list of reasons people sometimes give for choosing jobs; are there any that strike you as the main reason or reasons you might? What about the ones that you feel wouldn't be relevant to you. [I HANDED THEM A CARD WITH THE FOLLOWING LISTED ONE BELOW THE OTHER: High pay, status, security, interest in the work itself, outdoor work, independence, meeting people, easy work, travel.]
-- Do you think there are plenty of satisfying jobs around for people such as yourself, soon leaving school, to choose from?
-- [IF NOT] What's wrong with the jobs available? [PURSUE]
-- Do you think it's important to have a definite job or career?
-- Why's that? [OR] -- Why not?
-- Do you think it's important to know what you're going to do?
-- Why's that?
-- Do you think it's important to get on in life? In what way? Why?"

I will be dealing later on with selected individuals on their responses to whole topic sections. As I have already stated, they were by no means a homogeneous group, and so they rarely responded in uniform ways. Rather there were certain constellations or sets of attitudes and world views, and I will try to delineate these in a section on Ideologies,
using whole chunks of various interviews and thus preserving some of their overall structure. For the moment however, I will make generalizations across the interviews and give illustrative examples.

Although they were all getting near the end of high school, most did not have an especially clear conception of what lay ahead after that. Even some of those who were in Grade 12 (7 out of the 14), and who would thus be leaving within three or four months, were not definitely decided. It was not that they did not have plans, but that the plans were not definite, were fairly open-ended even when they were definite, and it was the exception for them to be directly related to a job or a career. So insofar as I had obviously constructed this section with the expectation of getting a lot of detailed information about the work they were going to do, I was not particularly successful. But the very fact that it didn't elicit the detail and clarity of conception about work future that I had assumed I would get, implies something very interesting. Rather more than half of these questions were derived from Douvan and Adelson's questionnaire, and having read their data had obviously affected my assumption about the sort of responses I would be getting. From the fact that they obtained more concrete and more detailed information about work futures from, on average, younger high school students, it would not be unreasonable to make the generalization of my respondents that they had a rather "open" -- or not a very clear (whichever way you want to look at it) -- conception of their work future. There was very little difference between the boys and the girls here either.
Let me give some examples. Two of the boys in Grade 12 (quite separately, hardly even knowing each other) were going off to Europe on graduating. One had been working at a part-time job for two years to save up enough money to do this, and was hoping to spend "a year or two" in Europe. He said he might go to U.B.C. in a few year's time and study agriculture, and then start a farming commune -- "I just can't see working for the rest of my life." The other would be getting $100 a month from his parents for his first year in Europe, after which he thought he "might take a job as a courier or something, and then see what happens." He would eventually like to come back and study languages at university, "in a few years perhaps," and he would like a job eventually to do with languages -- though he wasn't sure what.

One of the boys and two of the girls wanted to be teachers. These were the only ones (apart from two who I will call Wayne and Judy and who I want to discuss in detail later) who had a definite career in mind. The boy was intending to go to Simon Fraser, and afterwards would probably become a teacher, although he was also considering being a social worker, or a dental technician (which is what his sister was). He wanted principally to deal with people, and whichever job he chose, he knew how to get there for each one. "I figure that everything'll work out when I get to it."

One of the two girls who wanted to teach (they both wanted to teach very young children) could not see any interesting prospects but teaching. She was going to start off in Arts I at U.B.C. and take it from there. She thought she would probably spend several years
in university. "Older people are coming to realize that the younger people are fast becoming more educated than them. Because there's nothing else to do [I.E., NO INTERESTING OR WORTHWHILE JOBS]...it's kind of ridiculous, but that's the way it is." The other girl was going to start at Vancouver City College and then perhaps transfer to U.B.C. later. She had always wanted to teach, "ever since Grade 3 -- because I remember thinking I liked my teacher so much then," and had not considered any other alternatives. All three prospective teachers stated that one of the reasons they had chosen teaching was that it was the only career they could see to which a measure of freedom was attached, was interesting, involved people, etc.

Two others mentioned various forms of social work as possibilities -- usually not involving university, and the rest were "sundries" -- one wanting to be an actress and was thinking of applying to drama school; one girl going on to Arts I and considering vaguely an eventual career in law or psychology (she was very intelligent), though she stipulated it would have to leave her free to do other things -- travelling in foreign countries, for example; one wanting to go to Art School, with no ideas beyond that -- "a career would be a restriction"; one boy wanting to "work outdoors," though not knowing at what; and one boy finishing Grade 12 in three months and not knowing at all what he was going to do -- beyond perhaps going to live for a while on the farm his father had just acquired -- his father having recently sort of "dropped out". With the two, Wayne and Judy, who both had much much closer to a "traditional" or "conventional" view
of careers and work, and whose extremely interesting cases I will deal with later, this makes the fourteen.

I take to be one of the main points of Paul Goodman's *Growing Up Absurd*, the following: "There is 'nearly full employment', but there get to be fewer jobs that are necessary or unquestionably useful; that require energy and draw on one's best capacities; and that can be done keeping one's honour and dignity. In explaining the widespread troubles of adolescents and young men, this simple objective factor is not much mentioned." Bennett Berger in a review of Goodman says that while this is true, he sees no evidence that adolescents see this, or are troubled by it.

In asking whether they thought there were plenty of satisfying jobs around, I found out that the majority of them felt, often very strongly indeed, that there were not. On contemplating their work futures one said resignedly: "No matter how you go about it, work is going to be a drag"; another said she was going into teaching because "what else is there?"; another said he had "a bad image of the business world", and that that was where most jobs were; another said: "No, there are hardly any interesting jobs around"; another said: "Yes there are some interesting jobs, for example being a doctor, but in general, most jobs, like being a secretary, aren't." On the whole, then -- and I was careful to state the question as neutrally as possible -- there was some pretty strong feeling about this matter. So much for Bennett Berger.

However, it wasn't quite as simple as this. There were a couple of people who simply did not know, just had not ever thought
about it, and there were a few who gave answers that slightly puzzled me at first -- like: "Well, it depends on the person," or "Anybody can make a go of anything, if they try." In particular, several people seemed to have difficulty relating to the question: "What's wrong with the jobs available?" (i.e., if they'd said that there weren't enough interesting jobs). It was not until I was about halfway through my interviews that I realized what had been happening. I had been asking these particular questions from the taken-for-granted perspective that it is the type of society and economy that makes the types and nature of the jobs available. That jobs are made available, and are not simply just there, is a perspective that more than half these youngsters did not have. This was something that in retrospect I felt I should have realized. Once I'd worked out this "explanation", I watched at this point carefully in subsequent interviews, and I was persuaded that it was correct.

All those who did not say there were not any interesting jobs, and some of those who did say this (and this was the majority), seemed not to have the, I suppose, quite sophisticated perspective that the society makes certain types and numbers of jobs available. A few quite clearly did see this, but for most, jobs in society were simply there. So when Goodman says "there are not enough worthy jobs in our economy for average boys and adolescents to grow up towards," I think he is quite right, and in one way (the main way, I think) my interviewees were on the whole very well aware of this. But it was only a few of them who were able to conceive that this state of affairs could possibly be otherwise.
With the list of possible reasons for choosing a job, that was handed to them (the list being the same as used by Douvan and Adelson), most of them, like Douvan and Adelson's respondents, cited "Interest in the work itself" as being the most important reason. However, whereas "Security" was the next most frequently cited reason in Douvan and Adelson's data -- and also figured very prominently as a major concern among Douglas' respondents -- my interviewees hardly mentioned it at all. By far the next most frequently mentioned was "Meeting people", followed, somewhat to my surprise, by "Travel". The idea of travel seemed to be particularly important to these young people, and I will deal with it in more detail later. When asked specifically what reasons they thought would not be those that would be relevant to them in choosing a job, "Security" was very often mentioned, several of them seemingly unable to relate to it at all, and perplexed that it was even there. This is a not unrepresentative quote: [LOOKING AT THE CARD] "Hmm....I'm not worried about the 'High Pay', 'Status', 'Security'. [PAUSE] -- 'Interest in the work' is what I'd rate highest. And 'Meeting people' -- although I think you rarely meet people that are interesting in the business world -- they don't open up." This was the boy who wants to be a teacher. The fact that economic security seems to be taken for granted by most of them is of great importance I think, and something that will enter crucially into my argument later.

The attitude towards going to university, among those planning to, was either fairly casual or strictly instrumental. The two who were going off to Europe for an indeterminate time period said that
they would "probably end up" at U.B.C. "in a few year's time." There was nothing inevitable about university for them -- although they were both very talented boys. Among all the others but one who were going, university was seen solely as a means of getting the job -- usually teaching -- they wanted. I could elicit no positive statement from them about the value of university education as an end in itself. I suspect this is because a very large university like U.B.C., which is what they would be most acquainted with, does, I'm afraid, foster this "image" -- partly because it does have a lot of "vocational" schools -- medical, agricultural, engineering, etc. -- and partly by virtue of its vast size. However, this is purely speculative. The attitude is expressed by one of them, like this: "University is mostly to secure your future -- that's the only reason that people go there. Primarily I'm going to university to get a job in teaching." The one person who did value education as an end in itself -- the very intelligent girl who was considering a career in law or psychology -- I shall call her Linda -- was perhaps able to see this because of a rather remarkable Aunt she had, who was at the very top of her particular field in the whole of Canada, and who was obviously quite an influence on Linda. She read a great deal, worked very hard at school, and talked (already!) about wanting to do a Ph.D. She said she wanted education "for the love of learning itself," and obviously the whole idea very much grabbed her.

While Linda had, at least to some extent, a "model" of what she wanted to become, in her Aunt, most did not. This contrasts
strongly with the Douvan and Adelson data, where among the boys at least, most of them knew someone -- an Uncle, or neighbour, or someone -- who was in the particular career or job they were planning on. Funny enough, the only boy who looked like he might be doing the same thing as his father, was the one whose father had "dropped out" and lived on a farm!

On the whole, they were acutely aware, like Douglas' respondents only more so, of the unappealing aspects of the adult world that confronted them. But rather than adopt the attitude of "ritualism" that his did (i.e., compartmentalizing public and private world, with self-respect, interest, and commitment focused in the private world) -- rather than this, they seemed to be trying to avoid this public world of conventional jobs, careers and so on. The attitude was not "if you can't beat 'em, join 'em" (except Wayne -- on whom, of course, more later), the attitude was closer to -- if you can't beat them, don't have anything to do with them. The three that were going to become teachers were distinctly aware that teaching was in a sense a special case in that it was a recognized and attainable "career", but without many of the disadvantages they saw most careers that were available to them as having. The jobs that the others were thinking about, or at least mentioned, were not really what one would think of as "conventional" careers -- a forest ranger, an actress, an international courier, a communal farmer, and certain sorts of social work. Two did not really know at all, but felt that "I'll manage", or "something will come up." Linda was the only one really to talk about the positive
advantages of a "traditional" career -- but she had a very sophisticated awareness of the situation.

The reason why "ritualism" to the public world was not on the cards as far as they were concerned, seemed to be a very strong feeling that they were not prepared to make compromises. This seemed to be connected to Keniston's idea of "psychological inclusiveness" in "post-modern youth" -- that is, the belief that one must never deny, repress, or compartmentalize any part of one's self, personality, or life. Examples of statements seemingly allied to this came up time and time again: "I'm going to do what I want to do, and not what somebody else tells me"; "I want to enjoy myself and I want to be myself"; "I just want to do something that's creative"; "I want something stimulating -- where you can feel you're accomplishing something."

These are all from different people and there were many more examples of this. The feeling seemed to be that most jobs would threaten this. "A career would be a restriction" -- or at least, those jobs that are commonly understood by most people to be a "career". Such possible work futures were thus avoided wherever possible, either in favour of slightly novel work ideas, or for a greater feeling of openness and non-deciding about one's work future. The general desire of Douglas' male respondents for "regular income, predictable advancement, and tenure of position," seemed to be the very last thing that my respondents wanted. In general they did not take the necessity of having a "career" as an unquestioned assumption, and, very importantly, their sense of self-respect or worth was not dependent upon getting a "good
job" or having a "career". I want to try and claim later that this is quite a novel and important contemporary social change.

**Marriage and Personal Relations**

"— Do you think you'll get married someday?
— [IF NOT] I see, why not, why's that, do you think?
— At what sort of age, or at what sort of stage in your life, do you feel you'd like to?
— For what reasons do you feel you'd like to get married?
— Could you tell me a little about the kind of person you'd like to marry? Characteristics?
— [GIRLS] What kind of work would you like your husband to do?
— [BOYS] What kind of role do you feel she ought to perform, e.g., have a job, or concentrate on children, or support you, or what?
— How do you feel about marriage? Do you feel the role of marriage has changed at all in contemporary society? In what way?
— Is this a good thing, do you think, or not?
— Do you think all this talk about the population explosion has had any effect here?
— How, if possible, would you describe "the ideal man"? -- "the ideal woman"?

* — Do you think young people -- other people here in the same grade at school, for example, have dates -- or don't like the idea of dates -- or do boys and girls just go around in a crowd
together -- or go steady -- or what? Can you describe for me what you think the situation is here?

* -- Do you think most of them want to get married?
* -- For what reasons? At what sort of age?
* -- Why do you think that marriage is seen to be more important by girls, on the whole?"

(* These questions were cut out after I'd completed about half of the interviews. Everybody seemed to be agreed on what the picture at the school was, the three final questions did not stimulate anything other than "stock" answers or reasons, and I came to feel they were rather foolish or naive questions.)

The overwhelmingly noticeable fact about this section, and one which very much surprised me, is the markedly ambivalent attitude towards marriage on the part of the girls. Not one of them didn't have at least some doubts, and several of them had very pessimistic views on the viability of marriage and whether they wanted to be involved in it. This sort of attitude seems to be totally lacking in the earlier works I've been citing. Douglas, for example, concluded that boys wanted economic security in the form of regular income, predictable advancement, and tenure of position; and that girls wanted primarily emotional security in the form of marriage, and only those careers that can be combined with this. I have already said in the previous section that the boys I interviewed were very different from this, and in this section I must conclude that the girls were every bit as different from Douglas' too.
The boys on the whole tended to be fairly relaxed and open about the idea of getting married. None desired it strongly, but most supposed that they would — but that it didn't matter if they didn't. They all felt that marriage had changed in society, and that it was not as important now. For those that expressed the most positive views about it, it was still obviously a very distant prospect — "five years or so" — which was well beyond the horizon for which they made plans. "I don't know — it just depends how it works out, I guess," and "Yes, I'll probably get married. But it doesn't matter when. Perhaps when kids come along," are two views that express the "tone" of their attitude here. Two of them mentioned "Common Law" as being in many ways better. One said: "If you don't like it, you can walk out," and the other: "Perhaps that's what I'll do. In a way it's a stronger bond — because there's no obligation to stay; so if you do, it means you really want to." Both of them, interestingly enough, mentioned that they had sisters living Common Law.

The reasons they gave for wanting to get married, if they did, were quite commonplace (perhaps it was a stupid question) — security, companionship, "someone to share problems with", sex, "psychological balance," and so on. They had what I would call a "permissive" attitude (I don't mean in the sexual sense) to the role of the woman in marriage — most saying she could do what she wanted, and several stipulating that she'd have to have interests outside the marriage too. None had an "ideal woman", but the qualities they did want were always personal — for example: "a woman who's confident --
has a strong-willed personality"; "a woman who's perceptive, who I can talk to and be relaxed with. Someone who's real to me, expresses what she feels, is honest" (this was, by the way, the talented boy, who is going off to Europe, and later on wants to start a communal farm. We'll call him John); and "someone who's interested in people, and who can discuss things." One boy said marriage is seen to be more important by girls partly because of children, and partly because then they don't have to plan on any occupation and "it's an easy way out." The criticism by another of marriage as it was in much of our society was extremely interesting: he said the trouble is, all the man does is make money, and all the real work is done for him by other people -- his wife makes his home, his mechanic mends his car, and so on. I was very impressed by that.

The attitude of the girls was much more critical. Three did not really want to get married, and four did -- but with reservations, or at least awareness of what they saw as dangers. Here are the ones who did not much want to: "I don't really know what marriage is"; "I can't really think about marriage -- it's such a final thing. I think Common Law is better because it's only love holding you together, instead of a marriage contract. Though I suppose I would get married for the children's sake"; and -- marriage is "a piece of paper", attitudes to marriage are changing "because of a growing up, a realizing...but of course then you go on to Common Law -- and that isn't a solution because you're still bound to one another," and communal marriages "are out -- that's just really bad for your head."
The four who did want to, wanted to "when I'm 25 or so", "not until I'm in my thirties" (Linda), "at 20" (Judy), and another who did not stipulate when, but said "most likely" she would in time. This last girl was very interesting because she knew she very much wanted to believe in marriage, yet was assailed by doubts from all sides. "I'm well aware of all the dangers of marriage, and I've got several friends who think Common Law is better -- but I want to believe it will work." When, sometime after the interview, it came up in the conversation that I was separated myself, she buried her head in her hands and almost cried.

Linda felt she wanted "to make something of my life first," and was obviously influenced here, once again, by her aunt, who was middle-aged, and now thinking about entering a Common Law marriage. Judy had far and away the most "conventional" view of marriage, and said the sort of things I had expected at first from most of them. She wanted to get married at 20 (three year's time), though she did not have a particular person in mind at the moment. She wants to marry because she likes "company" and doesn't like being by herself, and "I feel I won't have fulfilled my place in life unless I get married." The personal characteristics of her husband would be important: he "must be masculine", "someone to lean on," decisive, and pleasant to look at. She wouldn't want any drop in economic status, but no rise would be necessary either. "He must be the final word...because I'm not for Women's Lib at all when it comes to that sort of thing." This is very close to the sorts of things Douvan and Adelson's girl respondents said,
and in the context of the sort of social change I'm talking about in this thesis, I want to call this sort of way of looking at things: "traditional". I will examine the whole ideology of this later.

However, at this point, and quite without any prompting from me, she started qualifying the above, and said that "marriage does tie you down, though." She said up till quite recently she did not think so but she now thinks "Common Law marriage isn't all that bad a deal." After all "marriage isn't really anything when you really think about it -- it's just a little ceremony and so on." She said she used to be shocked at friends who "had -- I don't know how to say it -- 'relationships'. But I'm not so sure now. I'm thinking it might not be such a bad deal after all." The trouble is, though, "girls don't feel that they're really women -- until they're married."

She was from a happy secure home and had taken her morals and values, as she said herself, directly from her parents. It is very interesting to see here that she has presumably been recently exposed to some very different ideas because of the behaviour of some of her friends, and was having to re-examine, or perhaps examine for the first time, some of the values that she had taken for granted. Perhaps in a few years she will have very different views indeed from her parents in this regard, and here, in miniature will be represented one of the cultural changes that have taken place between a decade ago and now. At no time did I ever bring up or even hint at, the subject of Common Law marriage, and yet again and again interviewees brought it up of their own accord and showed it was something they were obviously
very much thinking about. As I've made quite clear already, I can't, strictly speaking, prove that there's been social change here, from the evidence I have, but it's not exactly a wholly unreasonable inference.

Something that is interesting is that the boys here do not have anything like as emotionally charged and ambivalent attitudes as the girls. Whereas among Douvan and Adelson's respondents the girls were clearly the more committed and positive about the idea of marriage (amongst Douglas' too), the girls here are much more negative and critical about it than the boys. This is pure speculation, but it may be that because it was not such a central concern of boys ten years ago, their response to the critical discussion of marriage in the mass media, in movies, and (to some extent) in pop music, has not been such a strong reaction against as it has been among these few girls here. Or putting it another way, perhaps ten years ago most adolescent girls had all their eggs in one basket, now maybe they are coming to believe that this basket is not as strong as had been assumed -- and no wonder they are so strongly ambivalent about it.

It may be objected here that what they say here may be very different from what they eventually do. In other words they may say that they are not going to get married, but in a few years they may in fact do so. I think this is quite possibly correct -- but beside the point. Throughout this study I am interested not in what they actually will do in the future, but rather how they conceive of it. If reality turns out different from their conceptions of it, this does not matter. To state what may seem like the sociologically obvious for a moment --
society does not so much determine how one thinks, as make conceptions 
available. The attitudes or conceived alternatives that one can see 
around, therefore, since they are societally derived, tell one some­
thing about that society. I am interested throughout this in what 
people are thinking, rather than their actual behaviour in the future, 
and since, as seems to be the case, high school students are now think­
ing things they weren't thinking a decade ago, this says something 
interesting about the way society has changed. (Society here being the 
social provider of available ways of thinking.) This is how my data 
on conceptions of the future is related to contemporary social change.

On the question about the effect of all the talk about the 
population explosion, most quite strongly seemed to feel that this had 
effected views on marriage -- or at least on the raising of children. 
A couple said they did not know, a couple said no it had not had any 
effect, one said the effect was only among "educated people", but 
all the rest showed evidence of having thought about this quite a bit 
and were very concerned about it. Several of them said, without my 
asking them at all, that they had already decided to limit their future 
families to two children. The "population explosion" elicited responses 
such as: "Now that's one of my pet peeves -- it's the balance of the 
whole equation" (John); "Yes, I know I think about the population thing. 
I'm quite determined only to have two children, and then adopt some if 
I want more"; "I think younger people are concerned about the population 
extlosion. I know lots of my friends are going to limit their families 
to two"; "Yes, I'm very concerned about it. I'm not going to have more
than two children" (Linda); and "I don't like the way the world is shaping up -- and that's the only thing that really bothers me" (Judy). I found the consistent way that they had seen the general problem and then followed through to the individual moral conclusion quite remarkable. This was especially so amongst the girls. There were several other incidents, later, that showed evidence of quite surprisingly developed social consciences.

The only other difference between the boys and the girls on these matters was that the girls were consistently less able to state any requirements at all for their future partners. The boys, as I have shown, did not seem to have images of "the ideal woman", but were not inarticulate in several instances on some of the qualities they did want. I was hardly able to get anything out of the girls on this count at all. Judy said, as quoted above, that she wanted someone masculine, decisive, and so on, and one other girl wanted "a man who is gentle -- who doesn't have this 'masculinity' thing -- you know, shut out, and cold, and not showing emotions", but from the others, I could get very little indeed. Whether this was because they did not mind, or whether (and see the previous sentence) they were not sure what does constitute a desirable man now -- I do not know. It could be that the change between, say, Rock Hudson as a "pin-up", and Mick Jagger, in one decade, is somewhat disorienting -- but I don't really know why the girls were so inarticulate on what they wanted in men.

One of the key features of the "young radicals" Keniston studied was, he said, that they were not, as it were, "plugged in" to
the institutional structures of established society -- principally, of course, on the dimensions of jobs and marriage. From this section on marriage, and the previous one on work, I think we can see this same tendency among the people I studied. I think the reasons may be very different than those for Keniston's interviewees, but I will go into this in more detail later.

Finally, in this section, I want to deal fairly briefly with the responses to the few, and not very fruitful questions, on their views of the boy-girl relationships in the school. The best background against which to see this -- though I think it may not be a particularly fair one -- is Coleman's thoroughly dislikeable book, *The Adolescent Society*. This describes the "sub-culture" of high schools in Illinois in the late 1950s. He states quite revealingly that "the major thesis of this book is that it is possible to...learn how to control the adolescent community...and use it to further the ends of education," -- those ends that are defined by American high school administrators, he should have added. As a matter of fact, I think Bennett Berger's criticism that everything Coleman describes -- the search for status and popularity, academic achievement counting little, the importance of athletic prowess, beauty, dating, etc. -- does not count as a subculture at all because they are the very preoccupations of much of the wider adult society -- is fatal. "To Coleman, adolescent romanticism seems like a nasty bit of arbitrary trivia obstructing the kind of accomplishments that really count, like As in maths, physics, and cooking...." However, it is not my intention
here to get involved in criticism of Coleman's book, merely to state that the descriptive part of it may be taken as an interesting background against which to see the school in which my interviewees were involved. The whole ethos of this is the interesting little unintentional vignette to be found on page 42 of Coleman's book that "the girl's role is to sit there and look pretty, waiting for the athletic star to come and pick her up."

The school, because of the area it is in perhaps, had until recently at least a very "academic" reputation and, I was told, used to get more scholarships to U.B.C. than any other high school in the province. All of them felt it had changed the last few years ("the way it was, it just had to", one explained), and under a new-ish principal is fairly relaxed, though still, from the most usual points of view, one of the "best" high schools in Vancouver. Most of those I interviewed, however, seemed very irked at still being at school, and were dying to get out. Linda was the only one who seemed unequivocally to enjoy it.

Everybody who was asked was unanimous in stating that there were lots of "cliques" in the school. Whether this was any more so than in any other high school in Vancouver, I don't know, but it seemed almost to be part of the "ideology" of the school that it was very "cliquey" -- no one disagreed. The idea seemed to be that once a clique had formed that was it -- the people within it mingled with no one else, and it was virtually impossible for anyone else to get in to the clique. I doubt very much whether in reality it can have been as
exclusive as this. The group might be held together by friendship alone, or there might be a common element -- "for instance, there's the Band, the athletic types, the drop-out types, and so on." "There are a lot of cliques here -- and there's only going out with girls inside the clique. I myself usually go out with girls outside the school." "The cliques are more of a gang-thing....The couples go around together in the gangs. Some of them -- I call them 'ultra-too-too-cute couples -- have been going around together for three or four years. They're so sweet!" "In Grade 8 there are parties, in Grade 9 there are dates, and boyfriends you go around with and hold hands, in Grade 10 things start getting kind of serious, and by Grade 11 it's really surprising what people are doing!....I'm in a clique and my clique is extremely strong -- there's no mingling outside." (Judy)

It seemed that one either went around in one of the cliques, though most of my respondents said they did not -- and one may or may not have a boyfriend or girlfriend in that clique; or one had a boyfriend or girlfriend in the school who occupied most of one's social life to the virtual exclusion of other friends; or one mixed with a person or people completely outside the school. Most of those I interviewed did not really take part in what was considered to be the "main" social life of the school -- the cliques. Though it is important to notice that the "main" social life of the school did not include the majority -- rather it was the social activity of certain elites. Nearly all of them felt that "dating" was "out"; "the dating idea is not so much now"; "I don't like the concept of dating at all."
The term 'date' is not used -- it went out a long time ago." I'm not sure how true this was of the whole school, because Judy at least, still used the word, and she was definitely part of the "main" social life of the school -- she was in one of the most important and visible cliques. She felt "the most worrisome thing for girls is not being asked out...you feel terribly rejected, you really do."

**Attitudes Towards the Future**

"— Do you think it's important to know how the future's going to work out, e.g., to know that you're going to go into such and such a career, or that in so many year's time you should be married, or whatever -- or doesn't it matter to you, not knowing?

— Do you think it's better not to know it -- for the future to be open and undetermined?

— Do you ever feel -- "well, things change so much -- there's no point in planning ahead too much -- it's too unpredictable"?

— Would you say that in general you're optimistic or pessimistic about how your life's going to work out -- or a bit of both?

— Suppose you could now see yourself in ten years' time or so -- when you're, say, between 25 and thirty -- do you have any picture of what you'll be doing, what your life will be like? Could you describe it?

— What ideas do you have about the way you'd like things to work out for you?

— What do you think might happen in between? (False starts, various jobs, travel, university, tragedy, strokes of luck, etc.)."
The most important point to come out of this section is a distinction between how they conceived of the future and how they saw their future. This was a distinction that I did not have any awareness of at all when I thought up the questions and while I was doing the interviews. It only became clear to me afterwards, on reflecting upon some of the things they had said.

A few did not really think anything at all about the future, but most were very concerned about it indeed. In general, they were worried about what was going to happen to the world. There was a very acutely felt sense of crisis, and this affected how they felt about their own futures. "Something's gonna happen within the next ten years" -- either because of pollution or population or "perhaps a war with Russia and America against the Chinese" -- "the human race has to be kicked in the ass before it does something." John said he was very worried about the future: the population explosion in particular was "one of my pet peeves -- the balance of the entire equation." He said growth had to be decreased, and it might have to be by compulsory measures. "Although what I want to do is create for myself, and a few others, an environment that would be self-sufficient, and keep going if the rest of the world were destroyed." "I don't think the whole picture looks too good." Another said he was very pessimistic about the world future -- "I'm practically sure something will happen." Another (Judy): "I don't like the way the world is shaping up, and that's the only thing that really bothers me." World war, pollution, population -- "everything's coming to a head -- and it sure doesn't look too good." She mentioned seeing a movie called No Blade of Grass
which dealt with some of these things: "I felt -- now, everybody should be made to see that movie."

But, almost paradoxically, this obviously very strongly felt sense of crisis about the future was coupled with an optimistic view about how one's own life was going to work out. Nobody was actually pessimistic about their own future, though two or three felt they were a bit of both, but for the most part boundless optimism about one's own future. With John it was because his personal plans for a communal farm were some insurance against the envisaged "crisis" (his plans were not at all unrealistic, by the way. He had spent every summer since he was a child living on a farm on Vancouver Island, and obviously knew a lot about farming), but for most it was simply a basic confidence that whatever might happen, they could nevertheless weather it. Perhaps it was the very fact that they were not "plugged in" to the institutional structure of society and its style of life, that gave them this sense of invulnerability. "I'll manage", "I can always make a living", "I'll find something." This is very reminiscent of Keniston's remark about his interviewees: "Personal future is open, fluid, undefined and indeterminate, Immersion into [CERTAIN LIFE STYLES] is clearly rejected, but in its place he often finds it difficult to define clearly an alternative role, style, way of life. Partly they manage to tolerate the uncertainty and ambiguity of the future because they have a basic self-confidence that assures them they can respond as needed to whatever is needed in the future."

So, on the whole, though they sometimes said they worried about the future at times, they were quite willing to live with open-
ness and uncertainty. This openness was by some regarded as simply necessary because of the unpredictable nature of things, and by others as a value in itself: "I don't want to have too many plans for the future -- I want to have nothing definite"; "I have plans, but they're open to change. It would be very monotonous if things were too planned out."

Allied to this, in several cases, was the knowledge that such an attitude is viable. Just as several of them knew of people -- older brothers and sisters in particular -- who lived Common Law, so several also knew, or knew of, people who were successfully not living a planned, "conventional", life-style. In both cases, to see concrete instances of something is to see that it is possible, and from seeing that it is possible, it is but a small conceptual leap to consider the feasibility of it for oneself. For instance, one boy said his sister's boyfriend, who he obviously admired, was at the moment hitch-hiking right round the world, and another, Linda, said she knew some friends of her family who managed to get by just travelling around. Although, as I've mentioned, she was one of the few who had very positive feelings about having a career, "I'm questioning at the moment whether it's necessary to have a career. I'm hoping new things will suggest themselves, but I know it's possible to goof off round the world and enjoy yourself just as much as someone who's working."

In contrast to those in Douglas' study, clearly these young people are not unduly worried about security and money, and can live with openness and uncertainty. Either they have so many plans and can
see so many possibilities that they are quite confident that they'll manage somehow, or they have no plans at all and still are not worried about it -- they have confidence that they can adapt to whatever presents itself. On the whole they are not very clear about what they want to become, but are quite relaxed about this uncertainty. They were in general very optimistic about how their future would work out, though in two cases there seemed to be the implication that the optimism was a moral or strategic decision: "Sometimes I can feel very pessimistic, but thinking like that is just a cop-out", and: "I really am an optimist -- because I think I have to be. There's really a lot to get you down if you let it."

Douvan and Adelson said that their respondents, when asked for concrete references tended "to retreat into stereotyped notions of the future, imagining a life of suburban idyll." Although my interviewees were often not able to be specific here on how they thought their lives would work out, it was clear for most of them that the stereotype of suburban idyll was what they did not want. "I think I don't want to strive my whole life for a house; because, you know, that's what a lot of people have got to show for their lives -- and I think 'no, there's no way' -- and the thought of that sort of security -- no -- I don't want to get into that, you know, financial...[THING?]", was how one girl put it.

Their notions of what their life would be like "between, say, 25 and 30" were often not very clear -- they only seemed to know how they didn't want to be -- but there were one or two interesting things.
The girl who wanted to be an actress (perfectly realistically — she'd already appeared in two productions at the Playhouse) said, "At 30 I'll probably be — not married, very poor, living in a little one room flat, doing a bit of acting and music, maybe writing a little -- and drawing welfare! (Laugh)." (I'll call her Mary from now on). John thought he would be "probably married, living somewhere in B.C. on a farm." Linda thought she would be "unmarried, working, with enough leisure time to do what I wanted -- like travel, for instance -- and still be learning. I know just from now that I'm going to be the type that keeps on, you know, in education." And Judy said: "I think I'll be like my mother. I think I'll just be an average everyday person. I don't know if I want it -- but I think that's what'll happen."

If there's any difference between the boys and the girls in all this, it seems to be only that the boys definitely seemed to think more about the future. At any rate they had more to say -- both on the general future and on their own future. Douvan and Adelson reported that boys tend to construct their identities around vocational choice -- "for most boys the question of 'what to be' begins with work and the job, and he is likely to define himself and be identified by his occupation." Girls -- so they say -- "tend to keep their identity diffuse and misty...and identity formation (so far as it depends on an anchorage in the future) is likely to remain incomplete." If this is correct it may explain to some extent why my boys had more to say on the future than the girls. For the most part they definitely do
not construct their identities around a vocational choice, but it may be that the cultural precept that one should generates enough thought in them about the future to account for this difference. I don't know, though.

Finally, unlike Douglas' respondents, they are not "resigned" to a future they don't really want. Most of them do not seem to be prepared to "abandon their ideals...and 'face the facts of life', as defined by adult culture." They seem to be unwilling to accept any compromise between what they want of the future, and what they feel they will get. Far from a likely attitude of "ritualism" to the public world, their attitude to the future which faces them seems much more like undifferentiated commitment.

Desires, Fantasy, Imagination

"-- Suppose money were no object -- that you had as much as you wanted from some source or other -- What would you do (anything you want)? Would you still work?

-- What would you change about yourself if you could -- about your appearance, your personality, your life, anything?

-- [GIRLS] Do you ever wish you were a boy? Why?

-- [BOYS] Do you think girls have it easier than boys?

-- What things do you thin':, do boys/girls at your particular stage of life worry about most?

-- What kind of things do you like doing in your spare time?

-- Are there any other things you'd like to do if you had a chance?
When they're alone, some people like to spend their time daydreaming. Some people like to spend it in other ways. Do you ever daydream or pretend?

[YES] Would you tell me about the sort of daydreams you have?

[NO] What do you do when you're alone? [TRY AND GET TO THE DAYDREAMS]

Why do you think you -- or anybody -- daydreams?

Given your abilities as they are now, what would you really like to do, to be, etc., in, say, 10 years' time? What would your ideal or really perfect life-style be?

What do you think the most wonderful thing that could ever happen to you would be?

What's the worst thing, or at least some very bad thing, that you could imagine could happen to you?

It seemed clear from Douglas' study that his respondents were embarking on futures they weren't necessarily very enthusiastic about, for two reasons. Firstly they wanted the money that went with it, and secondly they wanted the social status and approval that went with a "respectable" work future or career. When Douglas asked them what they would do "if money were no object, if you were independently wealthy", the general response of considerable altered plans seemed to indicate that money was seen as a very large limiting factor on what they did. That is, most of them quoted things they would like to do and would do, if they had independent money, that were very different from the plans they were engaged upon in reality. Clearly, they felt that money would radically change their future.
With only one or two exceptions the responses of my interviewees to the same situation was that money would not very much change what they were already planning to do. This was the opposite of what I had expected. There were, to be sure, some things they would do differently, but they were what I would call peripheral activities—they were not things that would change their central life plans or activities. Only one, Wayne (who has been consistently different from nearly everybody else on nearly every section of the questions, and who I'm going to deal with in full later), would totally ditch his work plans if he were independently wealthy. He was planning to be an engineer in order to get the money, and if he already had the money, there was no way he was going to be an engineer. All the others would essentially carry on doing the same things, with the money only making large differences in peripheral matters. John would still go to Europe, perhaps do a bit of agriculture at U.B.C., and then start his communal farm; the money would just make all this easier. He would put a lot of it into "something like S.P.E.C.--to educate people--change...things", but it would not change his personal plans much. The boy who was planning to be a school teacher would "buy a 750 Norton, and go across Canada--meeting people, and things"--but he would still be a school teacher. Mary would "buy the empty lot at 8th and Tolmie and build a foam house on it" (she went into elaborate detail on how to build them)--and she would still be an actress. A girl who I will call Heather, who was also one of the ones who wanted to be a teacher, would still be a teacher, but the money would enable
her to travel a lot. Nearly everybody, in point of fact, at one point or another mentioned "travel" and it seemed to be an important facet of their outlook. One boy thought that with money he would perhaps go into politics and change things, put the world right — or he might become a hermit — he wasn't quite sure. The rest were all peripheral: "buy a summer house in Ireland", "buy one of those big houses on 53rd and Granville", "buy a Ferrari", "ski a lot", and so on.

From the fact that money would change the plans of few of them, and from additional (and presumably related) facts such as that of their very carefree and open attitude toward the future, I think it is fair to say that the need for money was not seen as too much of a problem by them. They had all grown up in affluence, they had never seen any different, so they took it for granted. They would "get by", "manage", "everything'11 work out ok". And in fact their attitude to affluence is not unrealistic, in a sense. Although there are complex and specific and by no means irreversible sets of social conditions without which this affluence could not exist, and although it is unlikely that they really understood the nature of this, whatever happens to these fourteen youngsters, it is extremely unlikely that any of them will starve or in any other way literally "suffer" from poverty. So although taking affluence totally for granted may be naive, it is not for them unrealistic — they almost certainly always will have enough to live on no matter what they do.

Importantly related to this is the fact that it is now possible, at least among young people, to be what Goodman calls "decently
poor". He says in *Growing Up Absurd* (which in many ways now reads like an amazingly prophetic book) that society had become (by the 1950's) such that "merely" to make an honest living and support one's family was not regarded as enough of an achievement to be respected by the community. The pressure was always to achieve a higher and higher standard of living. Douglas' respondents, we remember, were doing that about which they were less than enthusiastic, partly to make the money and partly to achieve that "respect" of the community (i.e., established society). Goodman writes: "Some way will have to be found, again, for a man to be decently poor, to work for a subsistence without necessarily choosing to involve himself in the total high-standard economy."

As came out time and time again in my interviews, their criteria of respectability, success, status, and so on, were in general not those generally recognized by "established" society. To anyone who lives in Vancouver at the moment it must be perfectly obvious that among a very large number of young people at least, it is possible to be respectably poor. My argument here then is that money is not on the whole seen as a very important consideration or worry, partly because affluence is largely taken for granted, and partly because it is now possible to be decently poor anyway.

Figuring largely among the things nearly all of them wanted was, as I have said, travel. Only one person, Mary, the girl who wanted to be an actress, after she had not mentioned it at all and after I had then specifically asked her, said that she did not have any particular desire to travel. Everybody else was extremely positive
about it, and it cropped up by itself in numerous contexts. To an extent that quite surprised me, they had actually already travelled outside Canada quite a lot. Nearly all of them had been somewhere -- Japan, Europe, Ireland, Mexico, or around the United States. These were all very consciously aware from their own concrete experiences of the value of travelling in foreign countries: it "gives you strength", "give you perspective", "broadens you", "opens your eyes a lot", "completes your education." Heather, for example, now an ex-Catholic, went to Europe with her mother a couple of years ago. She said that Ireland and Spain "turned us off Catholicism". This, and Europe generally "made my mind more open". She felt that many of her contemporaries were "extremely -- bleah! -- uninteresting. Like sheep -- no personality." This was because the parents are "bleah" too, and because school "fills you with mindless activities." "But the trip to Europe stopped me getting into that kind of thing."

Travel, the attraction of and desire to, is, I suggest, a crucial component on the way they see the world, and if they do more, the ways they will come to see the world. By seeing other cultures, social arrangements, taken-for-granted assumptions, one comes to see one's own in a new light, from a different perspective. The more you travel, the more you see that different things are possible, and the more you question assumptions about your own culture that you never even noticed before. These young people I interviewed were very well aware of these things. Anyone who lives in Vancouver -- particularly -- cannot help but see that more and more young people are travelling
around more and more. Travel is seen as an extremely positive and desirable activity and the amount of travel, among young Canadians, is increasing the whole time. This is not the place to go into it here, but I suggest that, on the whole, having done a lot of travelling in foreign countries is inconsistent with certain ways of seeing the world and tends to encourage certain other ways.

On the question about changing any aspects of self if it were possible, there was nothing like the response I had expected. Douvan and Adelson's boys often would, if they could have done, have changed aspects of their personalities and abilities that related to their chosen work occupation and that would have enabled them to do it better. I did not get any response of this sort at all. Among the girls, a large number wanted to change things that would improve their popularity and attractiveness. Of the girls I talked to here, four said they were perfectly happy with the way they were, two said they wanted only their noses different (because they were self-conscious about them), but only one, Judy, really responded here in a way similar to Douvan and Adelson's girls. She had quite definite things she would like changed to look more attractive, and added, "90% of girls would improve their appearance." Now I suspect this may be true. If so, why did the others not say this? It could be (though this is very tentative) that there is now a cultural precept to look and accept the way you are. The loss of favor of make-up and bras among young girls may be related to this.

Hardly anybody wanted to change their personalities or character, except in very minor details, and in general they seemed
very happy with the way they were. There were a few things -- like wanting to be a little less shy, or more intelligent, or calmer, or more energetic -- but nobody was radically dissatisfied with the sort of person they were. One theme did crop up on several occasions, when I was encouraging them to be as unrealistic as they liked about this, and that was the desire for knowledge. "I'd like to be able to press a button and know everything", was the way one put it. "I'd like to be more aware -- understanding of other people and cultures -- more knowledgeable", said another. "I want to be aware -- awareness is the great thing", said Heather. Another theme that four or five people touched on had to do with music. "If I could change anything about myself, I'd like to be more artistic and have musical talent."
"I'd like to have a much better feeling for harmony in music." "Often I dream I'm a really exceptional bass player -- with a really good group -- up there on the stage...." 'Yeah, sometimes I have fantasies about being a rock singer -- being another Janis Joplin," said Heather. And being a "travelling musician" would be her ideal life style. (Notice how two desireable elements music and travel are combined here in one ideal model.) Although again this is somewhat off the point of my thesis here, I think a study of the influence of and reasons for contemporary pop music might prove very helpful in understanding changes among Western youth. I think the music as good music may be causing or perhaps just be related to a tendency towards more artistic and emotional concerns among young people, and I think the actual messages of the songs have vastly increased in importance in the past decade. In
Coleman's study, Pat Boone and Elvis Presley were the two most popular singers. If you compare the lyrics of any of their songs with those around today, you cannot but notice that much contemporary music is actually saying something. And what it says about sex, drugs, "politics", and so on, is not without influence. The words of pop songs were actually quoted once or twice in the interviews in illustration of points. Even the most "conventional" of young people cannot help being "exposed" to some of the things pop music says. And I'm sure it is not without some effect either.

The daydreams or fantasies were absolutely fascinating, though not all relevant here. Lots of them, not surprisingly, touched on sex and love. Here are a few of them, not related at all, except to illustrate a general point that I think these were quite openly imaginative kids on the whole. "I'd like to be like Ava Gardner in *Night of the Iguana* -- wild, beautiful, sexy, earthy!" "I'd like to be like Jacques Cousteau, I think that would be my ideal lifestyle." "Half-bohemian, half-gypsy" (Mary). "I've always liked to be an Indian princess that lived with the animals in the woods -- I've had that sort of dream ever since I was little." "I like speed -- I like going fast. I'd like to get a big bike and go -- fshool -- all over the place. The ultimate would be in a Ferrari on the Utah Salt Flats and just opening the son of a bitch up! Oh wow! Just going about a 150 miles an hour -- that'd be the ultimate!" "Ever since I was a little girl, I've always wanted to be some lady in a long dress, floating down the stairway -- gracious, beautiful" (Judy). "Often I think about
a conversation I've had, then I think up a fantastic argument, and I just wish they were there! (Laugh)." Linda had a continuing fantasy about a private jet airliner that she would turn her mind to at times and elaborately decorate the inside, travel the world, and so on. The most interesting of all, and it took up about a third of the whole interview, was with Mary, who had lived for about six years in an elaborate and all-involving fantasy world. It was not until the first time she had taken acid (LSD) that she realized she was in a fantasy world. She used the drug on subsequent occasions to work her way out of it, and had been totally free of it for over a year now.

**Personal Life and Parents**

— Can you think, what's the best thing that's ever happened to you in your life so far?

— What's the biggest disappointment you've ever had, or the thing that's made you most unhappy?

— Do you have one, or a few, close friends or best friends, who you spend a lot of time with, or talk to a lot (about personal things perhaps); or not?

— What do you think are the most important things that a friend should be like?

— How do you get on with your parents? (Well enough, very well, not too well, etc.?)

— Do you ever have disagreements with your family about what you do, or, for example, over something in the newspaper or on television? What?
— Do you ever see your parents' views as being a little out-of-date ever; or not? Examples?
— Do you feel lonely at times -- ever kept a diary -- imaginary friends, etc.? 
— How do you feel that you personally have changed in the past few years? In what way?
— Are you reasonably satisfied with your life at the moment?

The aim of this section was partly to unearth any relevant details about the lives of each that would help me understand some of the other things they said in some sort of context, and partly to attempt to discover to what extent they were experiencing what is called "adolescence". This is an extremely complex question, which I will deal with centrally and in detail in the final part of this thesis, but a section from Keniston will suffice to paint in the background here.

He says that the European-influenced literature on adolescence deals with it as a time of turmoil, the onrush of sexuality, "sturm und drang", and so on. But that the most common adolescent pattern in (North) America involves what Peter Blos terms "uniformism": a turning away from the family to a peer group culture, acceptance of its norms as infallible and regulatory, and using this as a means of regulating one's impulses. Erikson calls this "ego restriction". Keniston agrees here and says that most commonly the problems of early adolescence are dealt with by submersion into the teenage culture. Compared with their more "typical" American contemporaries, Keniston's
radicals seemed to have undergone an unusually "European" adolescence. At the same time they did have an adolescence, with all the anguish and the possibilities for growth that this entails.

Douvan and Adelson start from a similar perspective to Blos', and come up with only slightly modified conclusions. "The traditional idea of the adolescent experience has it that the youngster becomes involved in an intense concern with ethics, political ideology, religious beliefs (etc.)... This pattern can be found -- but in a bold, sometimes stubborn, often unhappy minority. Our interviews confirm that American adolescents are on the whole not deeply involved in ideology, nor are they prepared to do much individual thinking on value issues of any generality." Where they would differ from Blos is in their claim that there are in fact two quite distinct ways of coping with this period, in that girls do it rather differently. "The sexual drive is so successfully excluded from consciousness by a large majority of girls that they do not in adolescence in any relevant psychological sense confront an impulse problem comparable to boys.... We question the traditional concept of adolescence as a time of turbulent instinctual struggle as far as the girl is concerned."

On the evidence of this section of questions, the next section of questions, and general remarks made by each scattered throughout each interview, I felt that eight of my fourteen respondents -- three of the boys and five of the girls -- were unquestionably having (in Friedenberg's phrase) "a real adolescence". I shall be justifying this of course, but if I am right this would seem to be a suspiciously high number in the light of the above. Given the general soundness of
the framework above (i.e., Blos, etc.), there might be two factors to account for my having come across so many apparently "real" adolescents. One is that the group of people I interviewed was unrepresentative of the majority, and the second is that social change has reversed the process in society toward the "vanishing adolescent" (the title of Friedenberg's book of course). I think in fact both factors are operative here but I'm going to try and claim towards the end that the second is the most crucial one.

I'm afraid I did not -- and I think now perhaps I should have done -- attempt to measure the presence of "real adolescence". What I might have done is construct certain "dimensions" of adolescence that could be measured as empirical indicators. As it was, some of my criteria were explicit, and some of them implicit (and still remain so to me), and were not unconnected with the total "gestalt" I had of each person in my head, afterwards. Anyway, in some, not fully specifiable way, it seemed perfectly clear to me who had and was having a real adolescence, and who was not. One of my criteria was something I called to myself "self-reflection" -- that is the extent to which a youngster thought about himself. Another was to what extent he spent time by himself. Another was whether he was able to articulate answers on certain questions (more on this later). Another was whether he was aware of any substantial changes in himself over the past few years. And another was to what extent he merely adopted a particular ideology more or less wholesale, or whether he was wrestling and trying to construct one from "pieces".
"What was the worst thing that ever happened to me? (Pause) I wasn't socially accepted for sixteen years. It's only in the last two years that I started to mix and make friends. I was a complete social outcast. I tried too hard. I finally said to hell with it -- look, I've gotta stop trying to make friends. I didn't try to make friends, or impress anybody, or anything. I changed completely in one week. It was something I decided myself. I suddenly saw myself as other people saw me." This sort of thing, from a boy we'll call Bob, is what I saw as "self-reflection". Because of this, and other things (which I'll quote in the next section), and my overall impression of him, he was quite unquestionably, to my mind, going through a "real adolescence". Another boy, who I'll call Paul, who again I'll quote in the next section, was very sensitive, and took a long time to say the following. "I like walking along by the beach in my spare time. I was by myself a lot when I was little. I would play by myself, or with dogs, and talk to trains. In my family you're regarded as weird now if you talk to yourself. You can't show any emotion around the house. Somehow I think there's something blocking my brain -- because I have a lot of trouble communicating -- I feel my tongue sort of -- twisted back, trying to get out the right words....I started to read about semantics from a book I got out of the library, but I got very confused, and had to stop. I think people can only 50% communicate something. People interpret what they hear in their own way. I dunno -- you're probably doing this to what I'm saying now." A very palpable hit.
One thing that seemed to greatly increase the likelihood of a real adolescence was an unusual home or family situation. To my utter amazement as I completed one interview after another, half of the fourteen came from one parent homes -- either, mainly, because of separation and divorce, or because of death. Now I'm sure this says something significant, but I don't quite know what. It may say as much about me as about them -- since, as I have said, they were "chosen" in a very casual way -- but neither they nor I knew anything at all about the other's life in this detail. It may be that this particular well-to-do area of Vancouver has a very high number of divorced people of the sort of age to have 16 to 18 year old children, in fact I think there may be something in this -- but I do not think it can be half. Anyway, whatever the significance, that so many had divorced parents should be borne in mind.

Of those who did have so-called "normal" families, the actual nature of the situation was often more important than its structure. That is, several were from two-parent homes that were obviously far from ideal and which generated a lot of tension. Only four came from what seemed like reasonably happy home situations. We may like to think that such families are "the normal" or "the average", but I would tend to think myself that four out of fourteen is perhaps not a wildly unrepresentative proportion of such families in our society. I must make it clear that nearly all those now only with one parent got on very very well indeed with that one, being much closer to them, etc. -- but they had all been through a bad time with the family situ-
ation before or during or just after the break-up or whatever. Several of them specifically pointed to this as crucially important to their own subsequent development.

Linda: "The best thing that ever happened was when my mother got divorced. Because that meant my father was no longer going to be around...The situation with my father was really bad....But the whole thing made me much more sensitive, less self-centred, and more concerned with other people." Heather: "During the divorce....suddenly my Dad was all sweet and sugary, and bought us presents and took us out to dinner. And that was something I couldn't understand. I see now why he did it, because he's only human and he thinks material things can make up for a loss like that. But you just can't do it." Later she said: "When my mother and father broke up, I had to look at them as people -- and they were human....I can look at other people now -- and see that people are human -- teachers are human -- bus drivers are human -- [ETC.]." And another girl, who I'll call Diana, said, "the separation of my parents was the thing that made me most unhappy. It was instantaneous unhappiness. And what made it worse was that my father lied to us about what he was doing at first." And in another context: "my parents splitting up affected a lot of my views on marriage and things." She now gets on extremely well with both her mother and her father and says fondly, "I've got especially nice parents."

I think that "unusual" backgrounds predispose one to question some of the assumptions and values that one would not otherwise see,
and perhaps it predisposes one to have a "non-conventional" outlook, self, set of values, and even adolescence. It gets a person thinking. This is the same sort of process in which we said foreign travel may lead to change in outlook and so on. However, I am definitely not claiming that an unusual home background is the only thing that precipitates a real adolescence, nor that it is sufficient in itself either. Two of those I regarded as unquestionably having a real adolescence came from "normal" homes — one was Bob, who "wasn't socially accepted for 16 years", and this, and a year spent living in Europe, and a few other things, might be pointed to as factors in causing his development — and the other was a remarkable girl who I think in retrospect I regarded as the nicest, most warm person of all, and about whom the only factor that I could seem to see that helped her have a real adolescence, was that her parents were clearly happy, thoughtful, sensitive, good people.

That an "unusual" home background was not a sufficient condition for full adolescence either was obvious to me from the case of the boy whose father had "dropped out". While his father was a child his father had had to be away from home quite a lot, and the family had been cared for by a Communist who lived nearby and who had his own wife and children to support and care for too. This man was later put in jail, for reasons not unrelated to his political beliefs, and as my interviewee said, "this sort of made my father think about things." He was obviously very influenced by his father and greatly looked up to him — "my Dad is very...he can understand anything."
This boy was an extraordinarily likeable, easy-going person, and all the values he expressed, I would not find hard to subscribe to myself -- but he was not having an adolescence. He had no great ideals, no feelings on what really mattered in life, no consuming interests, and could think of no way he had changed in years. Everything he believed in were because his father did. His father put no pressure on him, and he put no pressure on himself. "I guess I don't feel motivated enough to do anything." "I wish I was able to apply myself more." Best of all he liked being with girls. He reminded me of nothing so much as someone out of Margaret Mead's Coming of Age in Samoa: a very likeable happy person, but as Friedenberg puts it: "from our point of view, insufficiently characterized" -- because no real process of adolescence is taking or has taken place. None of this is intended in the slightest bit critically; it is merely to illustrate a point.

Another feature of their parents that may have been unusual was that there seemed to be very little pressure from them for their sons and daughters to decide what they were going to do with their futures. The boy who wanted to be a teacher said that it was "expected" of him at home that he go to university. Everybody else seemed to indicate that their parents just assumed that they would find what they wanted to do in time and they were not prepared to press them at all in the meanwhile. If anything, the school put on more pressure here in what are called "guidance" classes -- but these students did not tend to take them too seriously (and with good reason, if some of the things I heard were anything like true). These factors may go some of the way to explaining one of the differences between my respondents
and those of Douvan and Adelson. They say on pages 192-3 that the
girls in their study had been socialized to sensitivity to personal
relations, and the boys to activity and achievement. The boys I
talked to did not seem to have much of a "thing" about achievement
and were not in any noticeable way different from the girls here. I
think maybe parents being more relaxed (or lax -- depending upon how
you view it) about their offsprings' futures may be a relevant factor
here. The casual conversations I've had about how things were at this
school some years ago, with people who were there, seems to indicate
that parents did react differently to this situation at that time.
The boys I interviewed seemed no less sensitive to personal relations
than the girls -- indeed I would say both sexes showed a very high de-
gree of sincere and open concern about such matters.

Most seemed to have a best friend, or a boyfriend or girl-
friend, or a varied group of friends -- or a combination of all three.
Although three or four of them obviously had been pretty isolated at
certain times during the past, none of them was really so now. Only
two of them seemed to resemble anything like Blos' model of "uniform-
ism" -- and they were very close to it indeed. Both belonged to a
distinct group of friends who spent a lot of time together and in
whom there was obviously a lot of personal investment. Judy said:
"Right now, my friends are the most important things in my life --
and if they all said 'Forget it' -- I'd (laugh) kill myself -- I
really would. Because there's nothing else I have that's worth
living for." She said it was a group of about ten people who were so
important to her. Wayne similarly spent a lot of his spare time
"hanging around" with a group of about six other boys, and when asked what was the most important thing in his life right now, he said: "If I didn't have friends, I don't know what I'd do."

There is an enormous number of other details about their personal lives which is interesting, and which I feel helped me understand each one of them a bit more. I will just restrict myself, in concluding this section, to three however. One is that, as has been reported in other high schools in Vancouver, a lot of kids take or have taken drugs. I never asked about the subject, but it came up of its own accord on several occasions. Not all of them, but probably rather more than half of them smoked or had smoked grass (marijuana), and what was quite interesting was that some of the more liberal parents seemed very permissive on this score. John said, for example, he gets on extremely well with his mother and (as illustration) "She doesn't mind me toking in my room." Diana said her mother "would rather see us get stoned than watch T.V.", when I was asking her how much she watched television. A handful of them had also dropped acid (LSD) on one or several occasions. Nobody at all did it at all regularly. The most interesting encounter with acid was, of course, Mary's use of it to get out of her fantasy world.

The second remark here is an extremely tentative observation that may be completely wrong. It seemed to me, however, that in most cases there was an inverse relationship between a real adolescence, and the number of "hobbies" a person had. This was particularly true of boys. Some of them crammed their lives so full of stereos, radios,
guitars, sailing, skiing, woodwork, motorcycles, and sports of various kinds that they did not have time to (or did not have to) think about "things" too much. There were a couple of energetic and talented people for whom this relationship obviously did not hold, but on the whole I got the distinct impression it did. I may be completely wrong on this, however.

The third and final remark has to do with Douvan and Adelson's conclusion that the sexual drive seemed to be almost totally excluded from consciousness by a large majority of the girls they dealt with, and that therefore adolescence for their girls was a distinctively different process than it was for their boys. Although I did not raise the subject, either directly or indirectly, it seemed fairly clear from numerous casual comments that sex was anything but excluded from the consciousness of the girls I talked to. Because, I think, of cultural change that is at last coming to accept the sexuality of girls, it was a matter which most of them gave evidence of being concerned with. Among my interviewees there was no noticeable difference between boys and girls here, and neither did there seem to be any difference between the sexes in the process of going through adolescence.

Models and Values

"-- What do you think the most wonderful thing that could happen to you would be?

-- What's the worst thing, or at least some very bad thing, that you could imagine that could happen to you?
— This is sort of difficult to put, but people sometimes get a feeling of great wonder, or excitement, or awe, at something that seems inspiring or impressive or really important. What things would give you the greatest feelings like this -- could you say?

— What things about your life as it is now are important to you -- or looking at it the other way, what would you miss most if it were taken away?

— Will you always want them? Is there any danger or possibility that you will have to drop them in the adult world?

— Can you think of any things you definitely don't want in life?

— Perhaps this is too vague a question -- but do you have any strong feelings about what really matters in life, what's really important?

— Can you think of any adult you admire -- either someone you know personally, or someone famous, or that you've read about perhaps, or seen on the television? What is it about them you admire?

— Can you think of anyone either who you'd like to be, or whose life you'd like to lead? For what reasons?

— Can you think of anyone, or type of person, you would definitely not like to become like?

— What would you say are some of the reasons why you like or dislike a person?"

This was in many ways the most important and revealing section of questions in the whole interview. It was here that it stood
out most clearly which youngsters were, as Friedenberg put it, "merely undergoing puberty and simulating maturity" (though that is perhaps slightly exaggerated language), and which were actually thinking about things -- themselves, their values, their identities -- and having a real adolescence. The very vagueness of the questions was what showed up the difference most clearly: some immediately or with encouragement talked about the things that most deeply concerned them and showed that they had obviously thought a great deal about these matters, others, with all the encouragement in the world could not really relate to some of the questions -- and I either drew a blank or very "stock" opinions that did not seem to me to be evidence of any level of intense thought on the subject.

In addition to this, and at least as importantly, it was here that it became most clear what their ideologies or weltanschauungs were. Here it became most clear to me that I was not dealing with anything like a homogeneous group; there were a couple of reasonably distinct ideologies, a few almost totally unique and personal ones, and many of the interviewees had only very distinct components of certain ideologies. For instance, although as I have said, this group were definitely not from among the "freaks" ("long hairs", "hippies", call them what you will) of the school, and for the most part looked "straight", nearly all of them had some of the components of what one would normally understand to be those clusters of values that constitute its ideology. I will deal with the varying ideologies found here in a later section.

These are some of the examples of things people said in answer to these questions. Bob, who had described himself as "a com-
plete social outcast" up till two years ago, was very concerned, and very perceptive too, about "understanding" people. When asked about the things that moved him, he said: "I think egotism and greed are what move the world, but I think what matters is understanding someone....It's very difficult to achieve fully, but it can be done. And I've thought about this, so I'm not just saying it off...[THE CUFF?]...
Also being able to have helped someone without your even having been aware of it is very moving. I just wish that people could have understood me two years ago -- nobody did. I think suffering -- when you suffer it helps you understand other people suffering."

This is Paul, who was very sensitive, and who had trouble communicating. He had to struggle getting his thoughts out, but when he did they were often beautiful. "Where Nature's at it's fullest it's really awesome. It really hits you to see how big it is, how small man is....I think that solitude is spiritually rewarding....Of course, there's some days you can go into the woods and you don't notice anything, you're so -- you know -- civilized. But if you're left by yourself in the woods for two weeks, or a week, or even overnight -- you develop, you know, canine characteristics...your hearing really gets attuned -- not as well as a dog's or anything -- but you can be sitting at some places in the woods and you can't hear anything except the blood running through your ears, and it's going right through you, and you can hear your heart beating it's so quiet -- and then you can walk by a river, a little stream...(Pause) I dunno, I really like it....Some of my friends think I'm nuts -- but they don't see."
"I don't really have any materialistic, you know, values.... You have to go through life realizing what life is...if you don't realize life, you're sort of waiting for death....Watching birds flying...I like it...because it's simple...I don't know, it's just really nice. I don't like the idea of stepping on other people -- you know, striving to get ahead. The way things are now you pretty well have to, you know, step on somebody...this is what I don't like. You feel oppressed, you know -- you have to do this, and you have to do that...

I would admire the life of a prospector -- or even a game warden -- there's not really any getting ahead in it....Everybody seems to keep wanting more and more...I wouldn't really want to be settled at that age [TEN YEAR'S TIME], but you pretty well have to be...I admire a person with firm beliefs -- who really believes that what they're doing is for the good. I'd say I would really admire somebody like Kennedy or Lincoln."

Paul was in some ways an exceptional person, but many of the ideas he expressed in the second paragraph here were themes which, as we shall see, many others touched on too.

This is John, who's father had died some years previously. "I admire adults who don't give you any shit -- who don't try and stand on their adult status. I guess I admire Trudeau too -- basically because he's kind of cool -- he doesn't surrender his personality -- he's him and that's what I admire. I don't think I've ever worshipped anybody -- except maybe my father -- he was somebody....I don't like my girlfriend's brother -- he sort of stomps on people -- he's not
I don't like Nixon. I can say I dislike some Americans -- the general middle-class pig who drives his Cadillac and throws his cigarette butts... there's nothing there that's creative -- they don't try to do anything -- they won't state their principles and stand by them."

"I wouldn't want to work under any system where I couldn't fully express myself -- most people have very frustrating jobs... I would admire farming, and creative life-styles.... Being satisfied is what matters -- even if it involves sadness too; being creative; being able to accept death, to be able to comprehend it, understand it -- that's important.... Good books move me. If I'm in a receptive mood, even if I see, sort of, a little kid walking down the street crying, I'll be very moved by that... I really get a charge out of making something, creating something out of nothing. [IDEAL LIFE STYLE] -- I'd be a farmer, who writes poetry, who does sculpturing -- and with real people around me. Close relationships are really important to me.... The best thing that could happen to me would be lots of travel -- travelling makes you feel independent, free, good."

I could quote large chunks from many of the interviews, but this for the moment will suffice. One of the points I want to draw attention to is that these have all obviously given some serious thought to these matters and are genuinely struggling to work out their values. As Bob added as an afterthought-- he had thought about these things, and was not just saying them off the cuff. To those who were having a "real" adolescence, this was the case. To those who were not, I was not able to get responses in this section that really got to grips
with the questions. Some of them had obviously never stopped to con-
sider questions of this nature before. As Wayne said, as an after-
thought at this point: "All these things you're asking about — if I
were asking myself, it'd be sort of something I'd have to think about
before I'd answer, sort of thing." The point is that some of them
had thought about these things before, and with encouragement could
articulate them. It is possible that a few had worked on their own
identities and values in this way inside their own heads but because,
for example, of a restricted linguistic code, could not articulate
them — but I do not think so. They were all very definitely middle-
class kids, the person who seemed to have most trouble with articu-
lation, Paul, was able to, when given sufficient sympathy and encour-
agement, and some of those who clearly were not having a full adoles-
cence were very articulate indeed. It may take experience, insight,
maturity, and intelligence to have actually thought about these things
and be able to articulate them. Those that did, seemed to me to be
undergoing a full process of adolescence; and for those that did not,
it was often possible to see specific things in their social environ-
ment that were either holding them back or not encouraging them in
this direction when they could have done.

The second paragraph of Paul's quotation above was not un-
typical from the things a great many others said when revealing their
values. First, Paul said he did not have any materialistic values
and many others said the same or similar. Diana: "I don't want to
chase money, be materialistic, live in the Shaughnessy area." Ano-
ther girl, who I will call Wendy, said: "I don't want a life style
where your house, and the money you have, and the clothes you wear, and
the way you wear your hair -- that is more important than any type of
eotional or mental... -- I've seen people who, you know, that's their
whole life." The boy whose father had dropped out said: "Ideally I'd
live with someone I like, out in the country. I wouldn't need that much
money -- you can exist on very little -- and that can give you a good
feeling." (This is, interestingly enough, strikingly similar to some­
thing one of Keniston's interviewees said: "One of the things I've
learned in the past two years is that you don't need very much to live
on....It gives me a completely different perspective on what it is
that I decide to get into....I sort of feel myself to be open and I
feel very happy. It is like I have built a whole new world." ) And
another of my boy interviewees, the one who wanted to be a teacher,
said: "I don't consider making $200,000 and sitting out on Marine
Drive a success. I mean, personally I think it's a kind of failure --
because you've accumulated $200,000 that other people will never get."
This non-materialistic theme was one of the most persistent across all
the interviews. (There was one definite exception -- Wayne -- which
I'll deal with separately.)

Paul said, "You have to go through life realizing what life
is", and this emphasis on livingness, if I may call it that, was ano-
ther theme many others dealt with too. Another way of looking at it
is that it is an emphasis on being rather than doing. (Erikson, in-
terestingly, commented thus on the situation of young people in Ameri-
can culture some years ago: "Young people find themselves involved
in a doing into which they were forced by a compulsion to excel fast before enough of a sense of being was secured to give to naked ambition a style of individuality or a compelling communal spirit." This is another thing I think is changing.) Diana said: "I think too many people set themselves too many goals, and I think that's really restricting themselves. I want to enjoy myself and I want to be myself." Heather said: "To be serene within myself -- my inner peace -- is the most important thing that I'm reaching for....I want to be aware -- awareness is the great thing." And Wendy (poetically): "I want to know that where I am is where I want to be."

Appreciation of Nature was something that many paid at least token respect to, but three of them seemed to have a very profound feel for nature and it was obviously very important for them. They talked extensively, as Paul does above, about how much and in what way they value and love it, and I noticed afterwards that at one point they all say a very similar thing -- not because they would have ever talked to each other about it -- in fact these three did not even know each other, I don't think -- but because they had all obviously had the same experience. Paul said: "Where Nature's at it's fullest it's really awesome. It really hits you how big it is, how small man is ...." Mary talked about "sitting by a river, watching it move, hearing the wind -- just sort of the noise and the feeling you get off that -- really incredible -- makes you feel insignificant, but not in a negative way." And Wendy said: "At the beach last summer...just the water, and the moon on it...and all of a sudden it all just came in on
me -- what I felt was kind of my place....I can't pinpoint an idea -- but I remember feeling kind of like I knew -- kind of like I felt reassured."

Such experiences in another time would probably have been called (and quite rightly, I think) religious. That some people are at the present time on "nature trips" would, I suppose, be regarded as a not unknown fact by young people living in Vancouver in 1971. A "nature trip", however, is usually something that you get "into" and I don't think these particular three people value Nature because it is in any sense a "thing to do" at the present time. What I do think is of sociological interest, however, in that because of the now socially available concept of being on a nature "trip" -- that is, to be sensitive to Nature is now culturally acceptable and even desirable ("ecology", etc.) -- it was possibly easy for these people to accept how they were anyway and furthermore express these feelings to another person. I think this may not have been as easy, say, ten years ago. One cannot imagine anyone in the schools Coleman describes, for instance, readily expressing such sensibilities. I think this may also be true of John's obvious concern with creativeness and self-expression. He did not have to be encouraged to talk about these things -- he did anyway. But I really do think that the cultural climate a decade ago would have made him much more wary about using such terminology. Partly at least because of, as Friedenberg points out, the absolute paranoid fear of homosexuality, which would have made someone who wanted to be "creative" and "write poetry" very suspicious indeed. I don't
say attitudes to homosexuality are much better now, but at least it
seems to be getting culturally "o.k." for a man to have emotions and
sensitivity again. (John is absolutely not a homosexual, in case it's
still necessary to say this.)

To return to the main thread of the discussion, which was
Paul's second paragraph above, the next thing he talks about is his
distaste for "stepping on other people" and "striving to get ahead".
This again, as from quotations already given, and to be given, in other
contexts make clear, was an often repeated sentiment. Here is how a
girl expressed her own distaste here: "Everybody's in such a big race
to get on top of everybody else -- it just makes me sick -- people
that can't make it just get pushed out....Everybody's trying to show
up the other person, and they hurt people -- though they don't really
mean to...I wish everybody could lead their own lives and do what they
like -- but the trouble is too many people get hurt all the time."

This might be called the "anti-rat race" sentiment, and not
unconnected with it is the next thing that Paul mentions -- a strong
dislike at having to do things you do not want to do. The emphasis
here is upon personal freedom. This is a strong (and in my opinion,
very healthy) belief that the individual should do what he wants to do
and not have to make compromises. Furthermore it is anti-authoritarian.
One boy whose family had moved up from the United States a few years
ago was concerned with the draft problem there, although it would not
now affect him. He said that the worst thing that could possibly hap­
pen to him would be to be forced to do something he did not want to
do, for instance, "I would not want to go on a war that I haven't got any belief in." Heather, as I think I've already quoted in another context, said: "I'm gonna do what I want to do and not what somebody else tells me." Even Wayne, who reminded me of Douglas' respondents somewhat, in that he was obviously planning things for his future that he was not wildly enthusiastic about, expressed the general view that you should not have to do things you do not want to, and that everybody should be able to do their "own thing".

The final point of Paul's paragraph echoes a value that very nearly everybody expressed, and expressed very strongly -- that is admiring people with principles. Some of these examples may be unusual, but it is this same thing -- principledness -- which is valued. "I admire Link Hayes in the 'Mod Squad', not because he's a good actor, but because he'll defend what he believes in." "I don't like Jerry Rubin -- I don't like people without a sense of responsibility, or morals, or scruples." "Dr. McClure -- he's the head of the United Church -- he wants to go to the Far East and work in hospitals there free. He used to work in China as a missionary...he hasn't sold out -- he still believes in the same things he believed in when he was a young man....Bennett's sold out everything just to stay in power. I've actually met him, and talked to him, and I guess he's the one guy I could say who I really hate. I don't like people who don't tell the truth." "Gene McCarthy, Dr. Spock, I really admire people who would give up everything for what they believe in." "One person who I really admire is Abbie Hoffman -- in a way he's an asshole -- but he goes
through with his ideas. Angela Davis too, whether she's right or not. She goes through with what she believes."

Illustrating exactly the same point were, of course, all the people they could think of who they did not like. Nixon came in a comfortable winner here, followed by Spiro Agnew, followed by Bennett. "I don't like most politicians -- they don't have integrity and honesty." "Politicians are two faced." "They're manipulated by other people."
The total scorn with which the vast majority of politicians were regarded is very interesting indeed. That the leaders of established society, and in real terms, the guardians of its values, provided the instantaneous and most obvious source of adult models who were despised is, to say the least, not without significance. Another interesting thing here is the way several people answered this. For example: "I have a hard time hating anyone, but I guess I'd have to say I don't like Richard Nixon. Or the people who started the War -- because what they did was wrong." Several people similarly prefaced this with an apologetic qualification -- which seemed to indicate an implicit value belief that: hatred is wrong. The unstated assumptions behind the above quotation seem to be: hatred is wrong, I know -- but what these people have done is immoral -- therefore I have to hate them.

On the qualities of people that are valued, the attributes that are admired, the most widely mentioned was, as we have said, principledness. These are some of the more personal qualities that were mentioned as being good. Mary: "I like gentleness, sensitivity, a good sense of humour. I don't like people who are loud, and pushy,
who brag a lot. I don't like people who are always playing games."

Linda: "I admire people who are intelligent, knowledgeable -- and who can impart that knowledge, who can communicate....I don't like superficial people. I know that underneath they're really nice, but with other people they're too frivolous...they act dumb when they're not...they won't be serious." A boy: "I don't like looking down on people just because they're not intelligent." Another boy: "I value honesty in personal relationships. I don't like two-faced people."

A girl: "I like sincerity in friends. I don't like two-faced people. I like people who care, and who think of other people." Wendy: "I don't like insincere people. I don't like phoniness. I don't like people who act differently to different people....I like my father -- because he's gentle....I can talk to my mother about anything....My mum missed so much -- not that she's dreadfully unhappy or anything -- by marrying so early and putting herself into the role of devoting herself to her life and children -- you shouldn't live in the shadow of your partner. I'm starting to think about relationships in that light -- 'cos there's one thing I don't want to do -- that's when you start getting bitter -- 'cos, like, nobody's perfect, you know."

The main concerns here seem to be sincerity, equality, honesty, and people who care. The girls seemed particularly sensitive to the importance of equality -- especially of valuing yourself equally. As Wendy did above, some of them seemed to see in their own mothers the consequences of not doing so. "Dependent relationships are no good. That's what's wrong with the family," said Diana. A further
quality which nobody actually stated, but which struck me as very apparent was an emotional openness. This was both a willingness to admit emotion to oneself, and a willingness to express deep concerns and feelings to another person -- in this case me. It was only with two of the boys and one of the girls that I felt that there was any amount of emotional reserve; all the others surprised me (and delighted me) with their honesty and their willingness to open themselves. Emotions, both among the girls and the boys, seemed to be something which in principle should be admitted and not repressed. Of course in everyday life this is not often done -- but their belief seemed to be that one should be able to, and at certain times willing to. One person, who's father was a psychiatrist and who they saw infrequently, said that when he starts "playing psychiatrist...it bothers me. I'm perfectly willing to drop my mask for people -- but I don't want having it pried off."

Although, in general, they seemed to have some very strong, and in most cases well thought out and articulated values, very few seemed to have "models" of what they wanted to become. This would stand in very strong contrast to the Douvan and Adelson study, in which most had very distinct models of what they wanted to become. This puzzled me at first -- to have strong values and yet not know what you want to be. They did however have models of what they did not want -- and most could name people or lifestyles that they did not like. A great many examples of these have been quoted already. It may be that there are no positive models for them at the moment, or at least, only very
vague ones. Perhaps they will be going through an analogous process to that which Keniston's interviewees felt they went through. That is they did not set out to become (in their case) "radicals", they just went about doing what they did, and ended up finding themselves regarded by others, and then by themselves, as "young radicals".

Thus in effect they created the model -- themselves. Once that was done of course, everybody else could take short cuts and become "radicals" quickly -- because they had a model to follow. At the moment, and for the kids I'm talking about, there are no long-term or "life" models. Perhaps these are still being forged by the "generation" ahead of them -- which now has perhaps no more than a five year start.

There exist, to be sure, components of possible models -- these are the values I've been talking about in this section -- what remains to be done (if it can be done at all) is to tie these components together in a new, viable, long-term life style.

A process in some way related to that of finding models, such that by seeing them one can change oneself, is the much smaller scale one of coming across new concepts which are seen as relevant to oneself, and which can thus be used to change oneself or further one's (self-) knowledge. A very good example is Mary's when she read a certain book: "The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test was really fascinating to read because it showed me a way of life I'd never even dreamed of." Because someone else had, in a sense, dreamed it up for her, she was now able to see that new things were possible -- and her subsequent self-changes were not unaffected by this. In a similar sort of way
Diana saw something new was possible, and "at fourteen I came out from being straight." Previously, "I was very straight and did whatever Seventeen magazine said," but something (unfortunately I never got round to finding out what) gave her a new set of concepts -- and she changed herself. Heather was at some stage given a new (for her) synthesizing concept which "made sense" of certain things and by which she was able to change herself. "I used to be hyper-tense, and I didn't like myself....Someone finally told me -- 'slow down, you're too speedy' -- I'd never grasped, thought of this concept before....It's a matter of creating your own kind of order -- you have to learn to shut certain things out." As a result of this she felt she had been able, quite considerably and very suddenly, to change herself. Linda, certainly the most intellectual of all those I talked to, talked about how thrilling it was on occasions reading a book and "coming across some new enlightening concept I'd never thought of before."

In concluding this long and difficult section -- two ad hoc observations on the sources of many of the models, values, ideas, and so on that occurred here. The first is that the field of music provided a great deal. A great many pop musicians were quoted as admired people -- Elton John, James Taylor, Phil Ochs, John Hartford, Paul McCartney, Mick Jagger, Janis Joplin, etc. I've made a claim already for the crucial importance of pop music to young people (including, I emphasize again, "straight" kids), and I take this as further evidence of this. One of the reasons for its enormous influence is that it obviously has great emotional power -- several when asked what things really moved them cited music -- certain musicians, certain songs.
Certain parts of pop music were clearly able to crystallize, represent, and express, a great many of their own strongly felt emotions and ideals. Furthermore the "ideas" of certain songs were sometimes quoted and obviously used to "make sense" of things. "I'm a great believer in the Circle Game -- it'll all happen, it'll all work out. People die, things are lost, and the circle just keeps going and life goes on", said Heather. She did not make it clear that she was referring to a song called 'The Circle Game' by Joni Mitchell -- she just assumed, without thinking about it that I knew the song and its lyrics and fully understood what she was talking about. Being not too old myself of course -- I did.

The second ad-hoc observation on the sources of things cited here is that an extraordinary amount of it was American -- that is, from the United States. The language some of them used -- and which is used in places in some of this thesis, is something that spread up from, mainly, California a few years ago -- "straight", "trip", "heavy", "far out", etc., etc. The ideas many people expressed -- similarly I think. And the people that were admired, or otherwise, were perhaps 90% of them American too. Whereas the influence of pop music on ideas and so on would be something that is quite distinctly different from the established or wider society, receiving influences from the United States, is, I think, something that is shared with the wider society. Whether they are the same shared American influences is, of course, entirely another matter.
Can I ask you now a few questions on what are generally called the mass media.

How much would you guess you watch television? Every night? For how many hours? Only at weekends? Or what?

Do you watch only when it happens to be on, or are there specific things that you try not to miss? Favorite programs?

What do you think of television in general?

Do you get a newspaper in your house, or get to see one now and again? Which?

Do you ever read the Ann Landers/Dear Abby column? What do you think of that?

[IF "THE SUN"] Do you ever read Bob Hunter at all? What do you think of him?

Do you ever read the Georgia Straight? What do you think of that? What do your parents think of it?

How much would most young people your age read, or sympathize with, say, the Georgia Straight, do you think?

Do you think most young people get their opinions, or ways of looking at things, from the television, newspapers, etc.?

The purpose of this section was to get some idea of how they related to the mass media, what parts of it were likely to be most influential on them, how they reacted to certain opinions (e.g., those of Bob Hunter), and so on. I think now I was not really explicit enough in
what I wanted to find out, and this section only really skims over the surface of a very complicated subject. Trying to understand the complex cross-causal effects, relationships, influences, images, etc., of the mass media is a very tricky undertaking, and I have not really attempted it here. All this section is really then, is a partial description of what they were exposed to, some of their opinions on it, and a few observations.

First of all everybody watched television. Even those that claimed they did not -- when they were questioned more closely it was clear they did sometimes. The most common amount of time that they seemed to watch was, when we worked it out, between 1 1/2 and 2 hours a day. Some watched more at weekends, the very active ones watched less, and those in Grade 12 seemed to feel that they had watched television quite a lot less during this final year because of work pressures.

Interestingly they nearly all thought, to varying degrees, that the standard of television was in general pretty bad. They watched it -- but they were almost apologetic about it. "Yeah, I watch television -- even though I know there are better things to do. I find myself watching the junkiest programs, and not knowing why I'm doing it. I guess I watch about 2 to 3 hours a day. (Pause). I feel myself quite sort of hemmed in by it." Most of them watched either because it was just part of their "routine", or just "to relax". To my surprise they could quote very few favorite programs -- and without my even asking there were more programs cited that they thought were lousy.
Diana: "I rarely watch. Don't have any favorite programs. Television is ridiculous -- programs like 'The Flying Nun' -- idiot things like that." Documentaries, especially the Tuesday night documentary, were the only programs that several people mentioned as being their favorites.

However there was quite a distinct current of the very opposite opinion among three others. Bob who had been giving me some extraordinarily intelligent and perceptive things earlier in the interview, said: "I watch T.V. for entertainment...I guess about 1 to 2 hours a day, in the evening. I don't watch things like the news. I like movies best -- but I can't see the point of making movies with sad endings -- movies are for entertainment....Documentaries, I can't stand." Wayne: "Yeah, quite a bit, I watch it. About 2 hours a day. I like movies, but I don't have any favorite programs....It's a good past-time. Television should just be for enjoyment -- I don't like documentaries and stuff." And Gerie: "I don't watch T.V. much -- I'm never at home -- I watch it to calm down from school [HOW MUCH?] Oh, I watch it for about 3 hours a day...I don't have any favorite programs -- I like things that aren't too heavy -- nothing you have to concentrate on....In general I think it's made for a 4 year old -- I don't think it's terribly good. (Pause) But I think it should be just to relax."

In general, though, they watched television and knew at the same time that a lot of it was bad and did not have to be. Essentially, they seemed to watch it because it was there. They did not have favorite
programs -- more often quite the opposite -- and seemed to watch because it held their attention enough to stop them having to think about structuring some other activity. "I watch T.V. just to relax, I suppose. Though some of it makes me sick -- it's so ridiculous, so dumb ....I like the news best, but no, I don't have any favorite programs."

Paul, because I think it helped get him away from his oppressive home life, was one of the few who could state his favorite programs: "I like U.F.O. -- because it doesn't have any bearing on life today. I kind of like to associate myself with Steed, in the Avengers, too....I like cartoons -- because they're a fantasy world."

Most watched, because it was on, because everybody else that they had any knowledge of at all, watched. They took it for granted that I watched too. Somebody said, in explanation of a point: "I watch Dark Shadows, you know (Laugh)." Unfortunately the significance of this was completely lost on me. Without undue exaggeration it seemed very much as if their television watching was a form of alienation -- an activity done for several hours a day which they felt somewhat ambivalent about. Heather seems to have thought about television. "I don't watch T.V. Only when I'm babysitting. It's dangerous. It sucks me in too easily."

They all got newspapers in the house -- eleven of them The Sun, and three The Province. This was lucky, because I happen to be much more familiar with The Sun. A few of them also got periodicals -- Punch, National Geographic, Psychology Today, Star Weekly. In the newspaper
everybody read the comics — and usually a few other sections or pages, depending on what their main interest was. For instance, people who did a lot of sports — the sports page. Mary — the arts section, and Linda — virtually everything. Only a couple anything like tried to cover all of it.

I suppose I had seen Ann Landers and Bob Hunter as representing two very contrasting ideologies, and I was interested to see what their reactions to these two columns were. In fact, it was not much. Ann Landers was "interesting" and in addition for some also "inane", "ridiculous", "old-fashioned", but I do not really think most saw her as representing a particular ideology. (I am not implying here that they should have done.) Bob Hunter was read by far fewer; some thought he was very good, and some thought he was interesting, but "goes overboard sometimes". Heather said of his column: "I try, but he's heavy — like he's eternally heavy — he depresses me." (Which, Bob Hunter might say, is exactly the point of some of the things he writes about.) Unfortunately (for me) none of those who might have disagreed with his general viewpoint read him at all.

The Georgia Straight was rather more interesting. Everybody had looked at it at one time or another, though only a couple did so now regularly. A few thought it was merely amusing (the classified ads, and the cartoons), a few did not like it at all, but the most generally expressed opinion was that it "used to be good", but that it had "gone downhill", "deteriorated", "got too extremist". Now as I understand the Georgia Straight from my own reading of it over the past two years,
two processes have taken place: one is that it has indeed deteriorated -- it has lost some of its freshness and the integrity of its reporting is not what it used to be; secondly, and by no means necessarily related to this, is that the balance of the paper has changed from a predominantly drop-out, commune-building, peace-and-love, "hippie" trip, to a predominantly hard-line political revolutionary, and if necessary violent, trip. Both may have always been present, but the balance has changed I think. My interviewees either did not relate to the "revolutionary" philosophy at all, or they did not like it. At any rate, in general they did not like the Georgia Straight any more. This attitude seemed to be entirely in line with their general orientation, which was that of not being very enamoured with the institutional structure of established society, and in some instances being very articulately critical of it. For themselves, however, what it seemed they wanted to do was not confront this head on and try and change it -- but rather avoid it almost altogether and try somehow to carve out one's own niche in the interstices. This, in my opinion, is what most of the data on these high school students' orientation to the future has been showing.

I think it is beyond dispute that the mass media are very influential on people's attitudes, values, and so on -- and they all seemed to be pretty well aware of this. What the exact nature of this relationship is, is, as I said at the beginning of this section, something I feel I cannot cope with here. What is certain is that it is not straightforward, causal influence. Although I did not ask it (I could
think of no way to phrase it without it being a leading question), several people in just generally talking about the media showed that they saw quite clearly that it was not "objective". That is, although they were highly exposed to television, newspapers, etc., they knew enough not to take them at face value. One boy, for instance, mentioned that he'd noticed a couple of years ago that Canadian reporting of the Vietnam war was distorted to give it a pro-American bias. A girl, with relatives in the Middle East, saw that the Arab/Israeli War was dealt with one-sidedly by the media, and said that "people are only given information from one side of it -- so they don't make fair judgements." Another criticized the Sun for pretending to be "objective", by dishing up "facts" -- whereas in fact "it's just trying to influence you".

I think, then, that although probably a good deal "soaked in" that they were not aware of, they did have a reasonably sophisticated appreciation of the media. In a sense, television especially, gave them images of what they did not want. An extremely large amount of Canadian television and newspaper content is primarily American. The television in particular has countless programs and series, which are watched a great deal, which seem to be made in and around Los Angeles and which are riddled with the images and assumptions of the suburban middle-class life-style. Many of the advertisements similarly emphasize the same ideal. As will be clear from the next section, to be American was what they did not want, and as I hope has been clear from preceding sections, the suburban middle-class life style was what they did not want either. To a large extent I think it is not unfair to say that the
situation in Vancouver is that there is very little culturally rich mass media available here. You can pick at the fringes and find some excellent things, but the general offering is rather impoverished. In some way most of these kids seem to be at least vaguely aware of this, and although, as I say, they almost certainly are influenced here in ways they do not realize, they have an essentially dismissive attitude towards the mass media. They are subjected to it, alright — but they do not like it.

Two little points that cannot be fitted into the main flow of the argument: one is that many of them were aware from recent articles in the newspapers that university graduates are finding it very hard to get suitable employment — and because they had picked up on this fact, and mentioned it, I am sure it was not without influence on their thinking about their own future and position in society; two is that someone from the Interior told me recently that because of the reporting of Simon Fraser University in the small town papers all the high school kids who wanted to go to university were definitely aiming at U.B.C. — because they regarded Simon Fraser as being populated entirely by "revolutionaries" and "hippies".

Cultural Images

"— Now I'd like to ask you what you think about the meanings of certain words or phrases — quite straightforward ones. Try and describe them, tell me what they convey to you.
— O.K. — "Science and Technology" — how do you think of that?

— What words would you use to describe and contrast "Child" and "Adult"?

— What does the word "Adolescence" mean to you? What is an "adolescent"?

— What about the word "Career" — what does that convey to you?

— What about the word "Success" — what does it mean "to be a success"?

* — What do you see the difference as being between a Canadian high school student and an American high school student — or an American and a Canadian in general, if you like?

(* This question tended to drop the "high school student" specification in the later interviews, because it was not getting anywhere.)

This is a strange little section, admittedly. The idea of it grew out of something Keniston said in 1960. He said that one of the reasons "why young people are increasingly unwilling to accept what their culture offers them" and why "the youth who does accept adult roles with enthusiasm and without hesitation is now the exception", is because of the gap between the cultural images of a child (immediate, spontaneous, genuine) and an adult (abstract, specialized, conformist). In other words he is saying that the image of adulthood is so humanly unappealing compared to that of childhood. I thought it would be interesting, and not irrelevant to my main concerns, to try and find out whether the empirical assertion he makes is true. The idea of "cultural
Images also tempted me to throw in a few more I thought might be interesting. Hence this section.

It seemed to me, though it is something I have no empirical proof of, that the cultural image of "science and technology" had changed in a very few years from something that fostered feelings of approval (to say the least), to something that causes feelings of great ambivalence. The responses I got ranged from neutral, through wary, to outrightly hostile. Glenn: "I think of laboratories, a bunch of test tubes... neither a bad or a good feeling to it." Bob: "Men in white coats, test tubes -- something I don't want to do. It's productive, but it's got to be curbed." John: "People experimenting -- kind of cut off from everything else." Another boy: "In a way bad -- slightly threatening." Diana: "Bad. I don't like the idea of 'progress' at all." And Judy: "Ugh! -- I don't like those words, I really don't. It sounds too educated and hard -- it sounds...I...I wouldn't wanna do it. I think of 'academic', 'technical' -- it sounds dead -- I don't like it. It sounds bad." (What a beautiful response!)

Two people immediately split up the phrase. Heather: "The 'science' part strikes me as very important, but the 'technology' part I turn down. I associate it too much with pollution." Linda: "Well I think 'science' is good -- pure research and so on -- but technology is doubtful, dangerous even. It produces problems. It's rather frightening." Nobody was positive about the expression. I strongly suspect that if the same question were asked only five years ago, it would have
produced very different responses indeed. I may be wrong, but I sup-
port that this is one area where there has been a big upheaval of
social attitudes during the 1960s.

The Adult-Child question sometimes drew a blank, and sometimes
merely a neutral response, that indicated preference for neither.
Linda: "An adult is simply what a child becomes." Two people refused
to admit the distinction -- Diana: "I don't like the labels 'adult'
and 'child'." Wayne was the only one who saw "adult" as being "better"
than child, and only three people anything like conformed to Keniston's
belief here. One girl said: "Probably the happiest people are just
little kids." John: "The contrast is in age and power. 'Child' is
kind of less aware -- even happier. 'Adult' is a fear of awareness,
yet wanting to be aware -- maybe confusion." And Heather: "'Child'
represents all that's simple and innocent -- 'Adult' kind of taints it.
I can dig the word 'child' more." Interestingly, these last three were
on the other end of the scale from "straight" (whatever the word for
that is -- and if it is a scale). I would guess that Keniston's point
-- not a very important one in actual fact -- is wrong here. Among
these students it was those who were closest to the "counter-culture"
who bore Keniston out -- and of course, the "counter-culture" did not
really exist in 1960 when Keniston said it.

"Adolescent" produced more definite, and uniform, reactions.
Either they did not like the things they associated as going with it,
or they did not like the word at all and tended not to want to be asso-
ciated with it. Paul: "An adolescent is someone who is old enough to
get into adult troubles, but not old enough to enjoy adult pleasures. Sex is a big source of frustration for adolescents. I'd like to see the ideas on sex change." Wayne: "It's a confused teenager. I think the word would bother me if somebody called me an adolescent." Linda: "A time of not really knowing, in between, not really sure of what you're doing or where you're going, or anything -- like me, right now." Diana: "I hate that word -- like 'teenager' too -- it makes me feel cut in half." Judy: "The most horrible time in a person's life -- because it's when they have to decide everything, and it's a big pressure....It's the worse thing that could ever happen to anyone." And Heather: "Ohh! I hate that word -- I just hate it -- Ohh! It makes me think of 'gawky' -- dirty fingernails -- greasy hair. If anybody calls me an adolescent I just cringe."

"Career" was interesting. On the whole it drew negative or blank reactions, and most did not want to be associated with it. For example, Bob: "I don't view my own future in these terms", and another boy: "It sounds like a job -- something you have to do." There have been many examples on this already quoted in other contexts. Three of them, however, did have some positive feelings about it: Linda, who was nevertheless questioning it, and the boy and girl who had much closer to what I have called a "traditional" ideology. Linda: "I have a good image of it. It's something to work for, and that can be very enjoyable...(but) a career can get to be too much....I'm questioning at the moment whether it's necessary to have a career." Wayne: "Sort
of positive." And Judy: "For boys, it's their whole life's work."

I had been trying throughout the interviews to establish whether the necessity of having a career was an unquestioned assumption. To a degree that really surprised me, it was clearly not. For the most part they did not -- and the boys are particularly relevant here, of course -- see their future as necessarily including a "career".

"Success" was similarly something that had been thought about. Judy, once again, different from most of the others in the way she talked about this; for her, "a job, marriage, and a family, equals 'success'." Nearly all the others were either negative about the word, or immediately made it clear that there were different criteria for "success". Heather: "It doesn't do anything to me." Diana: "There isn't really any such thing." And John: "Well, I think it is important to make something of yourself -- but not necessarily by other people's standards. If you're satisfied in yourself, I think that's enough." And another boy, the one who is going to be a teacher, and who I'll call Terry, said: "It depends what you mean by success. I don't consider making $200,000 and sitting out on Marine Drive a success -- I mean, personally, I think it's a kind of failure -- because you've accumulated 200,000 that other people will never get....I want something stimulating, where you can feel you're accomplishing something." For most of them then, their ideas of what constituted a successful life had been thought about and were perhaps rather different from those of established society. I think they were probably different
from those of high school students a decade ago as well. Certainly one of the noticeable features of the U.B.C. students Douglas interviewed was that they were going to "face the facts of life...as defined in the adult culture." One of the most crucial things about most of the students I dealt with was that they did not automatically accept many of the definitions of the adult culture.

From the final question of this section came the very distinct general negative image they had of Americans. Although when asked to be specific, the things they did not like about America were very often exactly the same things they did not like about some parts of Canadian society, most of them definitely had a generalized attitude that it would not be at all unfair to call anti-American. John: "I don't like Americans too much. They're more loyal to their country than Canadians -- maybe more propagandized (phew!), conditioned.

Heather: "Canadians are more individuals. They're not as patriotic. [IS THAT GOOD?] -- Yes. They're less uptight than Americans too." A boy: "Things are much tenser in the States -- the police are bad -- everybody feels they have to do everything so fast." Judy: "Canadians are much more friendly than Americans -- more relaxed. Americans are sadistic, aggressive, too material, too unfriendly."

The boy who had originally moved up from the States with his parents saw it differently, however. "There are no differences between Americans and Canadians -- but most Canadians don't want to admit it. They'd like to think there are differences, but there aren't." One
other boy expressed a similar opinion with more precision: "The difference between Canadians and Americans is that most Canadians don't like Americans." Wendy was the only other one who did not seem to have any edge of anti-Americanism: "I don't have any different images of Americans and Canadians -- though I did used to be terribly prejudiced against Americans when I was much younger."

The anti-American attitude that most of them had seemed to be a mixture of several things. Partly it was an attitude shared with the wider society; partly it was a generalized hostility to that country for specific things which, in fact, they also criticized their own society for; and partly it seemed to be affected by the recent growing feeling of the importance of Canadianism, and the crucial necessity of defining one's national identity by emphasizing the precious differences that made one distinct from such a powerful and proximate other.

"Young People", Change in Society, and Conclusion

"-- Do you think that adults, older people, think about things as much as young people?

-- Do they get upset about things as much?

-- Do you think they're happier/unhappier?

-- Would you say that in general older people practise what they preach -- that is, act according to the things they say they believe in? Examples? All adults?

-- Are young people different in this respect do you think?
Do you feel that when you're 25-30, say, you'll be happier, etc.?

Why (not)? In what way?

Are you reasonably satisfied with life -- the world around you -- society?

Are there things that should be changed? Can they be? How?

What?

Do you feel powerless to change things? Or do you feel that young people can eventually change things for the better? How?

This is kind of difficult, but some of the things we've been talking about...what things do you think have influenced your views, or been important in forming them? -- parents, T.V., school, friends, you yourself, etc.?

I've been asking you all these questions, do you want to turn the tables and ask me about anything now?"

The aim here was to get some idea of how they saw themselves in relation to the rest of society. Several of the questions aim indirectly at whether they have any consciousness of belonging to "young people" as a group. That is, whether they see any sense of specialness about themselves together in their relationship to the rest of society. I anticipated, with ideas like "the counter culture" in my head, that at least for those kids who leaned in this direction, this would in fact be the case. In addition I tried to get at least a rough idea about whether they saw the necessity for any social changes, and whether they saw "young people" as being possibly a hopeful producer
of such change. The last two questions here were what I wound the
interview up with, though in fact all of them went on a bit longer
than this -- some by a few minutes, some by quite a long time.

These are some of the things Terry said that were relevant
here. "I think that nowadays things are changing...the whole generation,
I think, has changed. It was a real rut in the 1950s -- a really stag­
nant society...I think our generation are actually thinking about some­
thing. It's rather like a new Romantic Age...it's pretty well the whole
generation -- a really profound change....The Beatles were very impor­
tant here....One result of it all has been a trend away from sciences
among young people....This change among young people may be corrupted,
of course -- I mean the big record companies cashing in on music --
it's just a big sellout -- we're being used, and our views are being
used....We need a revival of thinking in our society -- even the young
people want to tear everything down and don't want to be constructive
-- they're either destructive or isolationist -- you know, the 'living
off the land' trip....We need a revitalization of everything."

Heather also obviously had a similar sort of paradigm here,
talking about the "new awareness fostered by drugs" and so on, and
Wayne seemed to have some diffuse feeling for this too: "Well, if older
people are happier they don't seem to show it....Younger people are
more apt to do the sort of things they enjoy. Older people are con­
cerned about status, and younger people are just doing their own sort
of thing...[IS THAT BETTER?] Yes, I think so."
Apart from these three cases where there seemed to be a definite consciousness of young people as being "together", there was not, however, this feeling among the rest. Indeed I was surprised at how strongly most of them did not want to be identified with "young people", and how many hostile remarks they made about them. There were two types of derogatory remarks, however: one was aimed by some at those young people who were "like sheep" and "just like their parents", and the other was aimed by (usually) others at those young people who thought they were special and so on, but in fact were not. Diana said: "Most students are so damn docile." Heather said: "Most people in my own age group are extremely — bleah! — uninteresting — like sheep — no personality." Linda said it was depressing how many young Americans admired Spiro Agnew. And a boy said: "Too many young people are gonna be just like their fathers."

This same boy, however, said: "I think a lot of long haired people are just greasy punks — and very few that are really, you know, doing what they say." Bob said: "Older people have had a lot of experience, they know what will work, and they're much more realistic than young people. The trend among young people is to be idealistic about everything, and I'm not. Most of them don't really believe what they say they believe....A lot of people here at school are extremely phony. They say things that sound impressive — you know, hippie, radical, anti-American — they like to think of themselves as radicals, but they aren't really." John was also quite cynical here: "A lot of kids sometimes
think about things and say things just so people will say -- 'Oh! You're thinking about things!'." Bob should be distinguished from the other two in this paragraph, by the way, in that he says he is not idealistic (and indeed many of his beliefs were quite conservative), and the other two certainly were concerned with ideals, and were anything but conservative.

So, in general, the view most of them had of the situation was thus: most young people are a large, "straight", undifferentiated mass; another segment think they are special, different, principled, etc. -- but in reality are not; and some -- relatively few -- young people (including oneself, of course) are principled, different, etc. Now this is an idealized picture because a couple of them did see young people as being a special group, a couple were what might be called "conventional" and did not think about any of this in any of these terms, and a couple were such completely original people that they could not categorize anyone else or be so categorized themselves. Given this generalized picture though (which is that of over half of them), what are the implications?

Well, I would have to admit some measure of agreement with this picture. In other words, there are a lot of average, nice, ordinary, conventional high school students; there are also many who have the "trappings" of something else -- very long hair, dope-smoking, etc.; and I think many of those I interviewed were not of the ordinary in intelligence, home background, personality, etc. But this does not mean
that they were all totally unique. In fact, far from it; I have been trying throughout this thesis to show that to quite a large extent, most of them had markedly common concerns, beliefs, values, outlooks — and I have been trying to specify them. Moreover, I do not think those I talked to were so special; from knowing a great deal more than just these 14 I would say that a very large number shared, or were strongly influenced by, this ideology. These values, etc., were certainly in a sense "counter" to the main culture — but did they constitute themselves a culture — a "counter-culture"? Especially in view of the fact that most of them did not wish to be identified with a distinct social group, such as "young people" — could it possibly be called a culture?

Now the interesting thing about this set or constellation of beliefs is that it does contain a very definite prescription to be individualistic, be yourself, realize your own uniqueness, and "do your own thing." In other words, there is a rule in this set of rules which says: do not be bound by rules. If one accepts this rule, one must deny being like, or being influenced by other "young people". The tendency would obviously therefore be not to see oneself as conforming to a particular social group. There were many unique things about each of the people I talked to, but most of them also had a lot of common values and attitudes. What is more, these values were common to a lot of others in the school, I think. The fact that because of this they also had the "be individualistic" prescription explains, I think,
why so many of them did not want to be identified with a particular group. To what extent all this can be called a "counter-culture", I will deal with in the next section.

I have been generalizing here about whether and in what way they had a conception of young people as being somehow "together". These are a sample of answers to the specific questions that were asked. "Older people are a lot more two-faced than younger -- especially over sex, for example. They put things out of their mind more....You can't generalize about whether they're happier or not."

Heather: "Young people aren't unhappier -- just angrier -- over Vietnam, for instance." Diana: "I think sex is a big problem for young people. At this age you're really hung-up about your body....but I don't think older or younger people are happier -- they've both got different kinds of problems....I don't know whether I'll be happier when I'm older, or not." Wendy: "I feel a lot of older people don't -- think about things -- but I don't like to say it because, you know, the generation gap..."

Paul: "Older people are just as sensitive -- they're probably unhappier -- because they have more worries and less pleasure." And Judy: "It's not as important to have close friends later in life, because the pressures then are enjoyable pressures...I hope I'll be happier when I'm older."

On the necessity of changes, Bob was the only one who said outright that nothing need to be: "Social unrest will iron itself out -- just peter out, just disappear." Nearly everybody else could think of something they'd like changed, especially schools -- which
came in for a lot of criticism. Most of them did not know how social change could be brought about though, and felt more or less powerless. Nobody felt that young people by themselves could actually bring about any effective changes. Two of them, John and Terry, had some sort of faith in education as a means of causing change, and two of them, Paul and Linda, mentioned political means. Linda had faith in institutional change and put her trust in organizations like the Company of Young Canadians, and C.U.S.O., and Paul it was who felt that "the human race has to be kicked in the ass before it does something" and who if he had unlimited money might go into politics to put the world right (or become a hermit -- he was not quite sure).

I think this general feeling of powerlessness in the face of marked awareness of things wrong (either because of having no ideas on how to make change, or no hope of being able to) might be an important factor in explaining their already mentioned, attitude of avoidance, with respect to established society. Clearly Keniston's young radicals in 1967 had very distinct, and by no means outrageous, ideas on how to bring about change. The Vietnam War (among a whole host of other things -- but I actually think this was the single most important factor in social change in North America in the 1960s) -- the Vietnam War in 1971 still goes on, in spite of years of earnest and whole-hearted attempts to stop it, and the reaction seems to have been in some ways forked. Some have become more militantly revolutionary (the Georgia Straight, for example), and some, while disliking almost the same things, have
opted for avoidance: if you can't lick 'em, don't have anything to do with them.

The wind-up of each interview often had some interesting little things. Their enthusiasm often reminded me of a sentence that stuck in my head from somewhere, to the effect that adolescents these days are starved of sensible adult conversation. Certainly their readiness to respond to and with serious discussion was very apparent -- and very gratifying. One of Keniston's interviewees had said to him: "You were received as you were because you were seen immediately as an honest man with good questions." I tried to keep this in mind.

Diana: "I really enjoyed this. All these thoughts are whizzing round in your head -- but it's not often you have a chance to sit down and talk about them."

John: "Are you getting enough of the sort of quiet people? The majority are the ones who don't ever say anything, you know."

Wendy: "I'm really grateful to my parents, you know -- because they didn't impose values. You know they just -- kind of let you work it out. So many kids don't know how to think about things. I'm trying to work my own values out myself."

Heather: "Anyone that comes here with long hair has got it made...."
I now want to take two whole interviews and show how they represent two very different ideologies. The first is with Wayne, who to me very much has a "traditional" ideology; and the second is with Heather, who has what I will call the "new" ideology. I then want to claim that the direction of cultural change among young people is from the first to the second. They should both be read with the earlier descriptions of the works of Douglas, Douvan and Adelson, Goodman, Keniston (1960), and to some extent, Coleman, in mind. These are not total transcripts -- two hours of conversation for each would be far too long in transcript form -- but they are accurate notes taken from the tape recordings of each.

If necessary this paragraph here can be skipped at first, since it contains implicit "instructions" on how to read the notes. Wayne was in a sense a "deviant" from the group of students I interviewed, though he was almost certainly not so from perhaps the majority of high school students in the province. Most of the main generalizations and conclusions I have been drawing throughout the sections on the interviews did not in fact apply to him. He was consistently different from much of it. The only other person who resembled his attitudes at all, was Judy -- who was also I think in the "traditional" mould. Wayne had intelligence, but it had never been allowed to blossom
fully. A stalemate situation at home had denied him an environment for growth there and had made him rather much withdraw into himself. He had not become involved in sufficiently strong other social environments which might have provided him with the encouragement and stimulation that could have produced real personal development. He was not skillfully articulate, but he certainly tried. Of all the interviewees I knew him least well when I asked him if he would help me out, but he was inquisitive, asked questions, and was interested.

Wayne

He is going to do engineering at U.B.C. "It's just that if I had to stay in a job a long time, it's just that engineering's the sort of thing I wouldn't mind staying with...I couldn't sit in an office just writing all day." He does not know any adult who is an engineer. He is very interested in it. He says there are good jobs available with it. He's "never given too much thought" to exactly what job he will do afterwards. Builds radios and stereos as a hobby. [IMPORTANT TO PLAN THE FUTURE OUT?] -- "It sort of seems so -- everyone keeps telling me it is." But it is better "not to be pushed too much -- or you might go into something you might not like." "High pay" and "Interest in the work itself" -- most important reasons for choosing a job. "Status" unimportant. "'Meeting people' and 'Travel' might appeal to me, but I don't see that my job has got anything to do with them." He does not know whether there are plenty of satisfying jobs around -- "it depends on the person."
(He was one of the only ones who rated "High pay" as one of his reasons for choosing a job. His idea of a job is such that "Meeting people" and "Travel" -- both mentioned a lot by other people -- cannot be related to it. He does not seem to have any conception of the society creating the sorts of jobs.)

He'd like to move out of home but it would be too expensive. "I imagine I will get married, but I've never really given it any thought." No image of an ideal woman -- "just so long as she really liked me." "As far as I'm concerned I figure it's my job to support my wife, and if we have kids, it's her job to look after them." Attitudes to marriage are "more sort of carefree nowadays" -- for example, divorces are easier. Doesn't think the "population" talk has had any effect. Is not interested in it himself.

(Rather vague about marriage -- obviously not of great concern to him. Conventional view of his own role as husband -- markedly different from the way many others talked here. One of the few who had little or nothing to say about the "population explosion".)

"I wish I didn't have to make something of my life but with my way of thinking I think I do have to....I mean, no matter how you go about it, work is sort of going to be a drag. It would be nicer to do what you wanted all day -- but to do what you want you sort of need money -- and have to work for it." He likes sailing and skiing and woodwork. "It would be nice to know how things are going to work out, but there's no way of knowing....I find I do worry about that quite a bit now." Money for university is his main worry
now. "I sort of don't associate with my parents as much as possible -- I don't like asking them for anything." Possesses radio equipment worth thousands of dollars. Does commercial fishing in the summer, which is very lucrative -- earned over $4000 one summer.

[OPTIMISTIC OR PESSIMISTIC?] -- "a bit of both....I'd like to think I'm really going to make it, but it all depends." If he had independent money -- "I'd still go to school -- just for something to do -- but I wouldn't have a job. A job to me is sort of something you're working in to get money, so that you can do the things you enjoy. And if you already have the money...." If he could change anything about himself that he wanted -- "Oh, a little bit more intelligence would be nice -- and to be fantastically attractive to girls. And I'd live by myself -- it bugs me living at home." His ideal life-style would be "exploring the ocean like Jacques Cousteau." He'd like to travel.

(Notice the attitude to work -- that it is inevitably "a drag", and that money is its main raison d'etre. He worries somewhat about his future -- in contrast to most of the others. Obviously the home situation is not too good.)

In his spare time he hangs about with his friends quite a bit, and when he is by himself messes about with electrical equipment or watches T.V. "I don't read at all." "I don't daydream much -- though every now and then I imagine I'm the prime minister of this country and the things I would like to do to change this country." [LIKE WHAT SORT OF THINGS?] "Well there's things that really bother
me, like -- I don't see why we give foreign aid when there's people in our country that are in trouble. And things like income tax --
I think it should be a set figure -- say, 10%. I mean, you're going
to be making 2 1/2 million, and they're taking over half of it --
I don't think that's right at all." More welfare is needed for
"the people that really can't make out." He has no personal exper­
ience of poverty. "I mean, if I'm earning my 2 1/2 million, I've
worked to where I've got, and if they haven't tried to get farther
up, then that's their own fault, I feel -- because it seems that
everyone has an opportunity to get somewhere now. I mean, there's
grants, and things." [OTHER THINGS HE'D LIKE TO CHANGE?] Favors
euthanasia, or rather, just letting people who are really sick, just
die -- rather than wasting money keeping them alive like vegetables.

(Lots of hobbies. Fairly conservative political views --
unlike nearly everybody else. The "tax" thing was obviously related to
the fact that he had had so much taken away from his gross earnings
during summer fishing.)

In 10 years' time or so, "I'll just be going to a 9-5 job,
sort of -- if I got through university in engineering, sort of thing
-- making some money." And, yes, probably married with children.
Realizes it is possible to marry and make a mistake, but he hopes not.
Best thing that has ever happened in his life -- getting the fishing
job and all the money, and a girlfriend he had two years ago. Feels
that big companies can write things off to income tax, and indivi-
duals cannot, and that this is not fair. "Things like General Mo-
tors and stuff -- I think it would be better if the government con-
trolled them. I think it would be better if everybody worked for
everybody, sort of thing." "They should change the provincial Prime
Minister every couple of years instead of having Bennett up there
for 18 years." The best thing that could ever happen to him -- "some
fantastic chick coming along who, like, was my ideal." "The worst
thing in general is my association with my parents -- I don't make
out too well with them or enjoy living at home. They're sort of in
an old path, sort of thing. I happen to think there's nothing wrong
with, like, drinking or grass or that sort of thing -- and they're
sort of 'if you get caught what will the neighbours think?', sort
of thing." The worst thing that could happen would be "if I was
maimed in some way, and couldn't work and make money, and wasn't
appealing to girls, sort of thing."

(Sees his parents as being old-fashioned. Smokes grass with
his friends, in exactly the same sort of social situation as boys beer-
drinking together. Enjoys girls, but goes around in a group of boys
mainly.)

[DO YOU HAVE ANY STRONG FEELINGS ABOUT WHAT REALLY MATTERS IN
LIFE, WHAT'S REALLY IMPORTANT?] -- "Money seems to be the important
thing in life -- it seems to matter. That apart, just sexual drives,
I guess. [WHAT'S THE MOST IMPORTANT THING TO YOU IN YOUR LIFE AS IT
IS NOW?] -- A group of about six friends -- "If I didn't have friends
I don't know what I'd do." He was really upset about a girl once for two months or so. "All these things you're asking about -- if I were asking myself it'd be sort of something I'd have to think about before I'd answer, sort of thing."

(Everybody else to whom this first question was asked came up with abstracts or emotions -- "human understanding", "love", etc. He obviously did not relate to it in terms of values or ideals, because he rarely seemed to think about such things -- and came up with "money". The great importance of the group of friends follows Bloé's model of "uniformism". Judy was the only other one who similarly was so strongly attached to a peer group. It is clear from this last quote that he usually does not think about these things. Most of the others were thinking about such things and were familiar with them.)

Television -- "Yeah, quite a bit, I watch it. About 2 hours a day. I like movies, but I don't have any favorite programs.... It's a good past-time. Television should be just for enjoyment -- I don't like documentaries and stuff." Family gets The Sun -- he reads the front page and the comics. The Georgia Straight: "I think it's a really good paper. It's the other half -- my parents other half." He likes the fact that it's not against drugs, and has local things in it, and people's opinions. "Most people here in school don't read the Straight." He would like to be somebody famous -- but not anybody in particular. There is no-one he really admires. "Although I didn't like Clay, for instance. His conceit, sort of
thing, really bothered me." Another thing that really bugs him -- "A lot of chicks that are really sensational and sort of know it and are really snobbish about it."

(Seems to watch television mainly as a time-filler. Very positive about the Georgia Straight, but it's mainly the drug thing he identifies with and cannot seem to relate to or see any other aspect of its philosophy. I tried asking here, but we did not get very far. He seems to resent people who have talent -- or at least, those who flaunt it.)

'Science and Technology': "I think of laboratories, a bunch of test tubes...neither a good or a bad feeling to it." 'Career': "sort of positive." "'Adult' seems better than 'Child'." 'Adolescent: "A confused teenager. I think the word would bother me if somebody called me an adolescent." "Well if older people are happier they don't seem to show it. Younger people are more apt to do the sort of things they enjoy. Older people are concerned about status, and younger people are just doing their own sort of thing. [IS THAT BETTER?] "Yes, I think so." "Though it sort of seems that younger people change when they get older, and there's no difference." He thinks there will be "mild changes all the way" in society, but not any big ones. "I think all status lines and things like this are gradually going to drop -- they're not going to exist." "I'd like to see school change -- but I don't have a better idea." "You shouldn't do things you shouldn't want to." Would not want a farmer
life-style -- "he doesn't have the comforts that I like." Thinks that there is a danger that in adult life things that are important now will have to be given up. "My attitude to my parents, for sure, has changed the past few years -- I'm much more critical now. I've got more realistic about chicks too. I'm coming to realize that perfect looks aren't everything." "Well, my parents are probably the biggest influence -- but they're either going to shape me for it, or against it -- but positive or negative, theirs is the biggest influence."

(Paradoxically, although he was definitely a "straight" kid, and will blend in easily with engineering students at U.B.C., he seemed to have a definite consciousness of young people as being different, in a new, and homogeneous, sort of way. To him, young people enjoyed themselves, smoked grass, and did their own thing, and old people were uptight and forever worried about status. Unlike many of them, he found the lifestyle of a farmer distinctly unattractive -- for material reasons. Sees the adult life ahead of him as slightly threatening, in contrast to the optimism of most of them. We continued talking for a long time after I had run out of these questions and he questioned me closely on what I was doing with my own life and my own future. My own -- genuine -- inability to be as specific as he wanted puzzled him. "I can't see the point of spending all that money and all those years on your education if you don't know what you're going to do with it afterwards." We liked each other, but I did not seem to fit any model he
had in his own head of the sort of things a 25 year-old does. He was very interested, but puzzled.)

Compared to the interview that follows, Wayne is very close to those adolescents that Douvan and Adelson, Douglas, etc., talk about ten years ago. He has what is in the context of this thesis a "traditional" ideology. For him a career is an unquestioned assumption about his future and he is beginning to construct his identity round this. His attitude towards his future is not wholly enthusiastic, however, and he is more or less resigned to the fact that much work is going to be less than fascinating. He does not have an orientation of optimistic openness to it all, and is adopting an attitude of "ritualism" already. His attitudes to marriage are "conventional", and his political beliefs are fairly conservative and individualistic — everybody has an opportunity to get ahead. The general orientation to life is secular, non-idealistic, and materialistic. He has lots of activities and hobbies to fill up time and energy, spends a lot of time with a peer group of boys, who are obviously very important to him, and he is not used to reflecting too much about himself.

In almost all these things he is closer to the "typical" high school students of "a decade ago" and closer to the values of established society, than most of the rest of those I interviewed. (Bear in mind, though, that at this school now at a very, very rough guess, half the students are also of this "traditional" ideology.) He tends much more than these others to what Keniston characterized in 1960 as "alienation
and apathy." However there are some things here that almost certainly would not have been found ten years ago — the casual use of drugs, a conception of young people as being different and essentially doing their own thing, and the reading of an underground newspaper.

(I'd better make it quite clear, very briefly, that in case it appears as if I have presented him too unsympathetically, this is very far from what I felt. His general situation reminded me very forcefully of my own at the same stage of life: disliking school, unhappy at home, no attachments to any other social groups that offered alternative enthusiastic weltanschauung, and mainly because of the home situation, similarly rather "turned off" from myself and others. As luck had it other things switched me on later — I only hoped that somewhere along the line Wayne would have the same opportunities.)

Heather, of the same age and in the same grade, was very different. Along with Diana and John, she represented the "new" ideology in its most clear form. Nearly all the others were far, far closer to and more influenced by this ideology than the "traditional" one. The claim I shall be making is that among young people, and specifically here, high school students, the direction of cultural change is from the "traditional" to the "new" ideology. (I use the neutral word "new", because the alternatives, such as "alternative", "hip", "freak", etc., have too many overtones which I do not necessarily want to imply. On the whole, words like "hippie" have been totally distorted and mangled by the mass media.)
Heather

She is going to U.B.C. and starting in Arts I. She says it is interesting because "all knowledge holds together anyway", and the students on it "seem very together." She wants to be a kindergarten teacher. She has only recently decided this, having before wanted to go into the country and farm, etc. "I find most kids here at school uninteresting." "I'm gonna do what I want to do, and not what somebody else tells me." There are not many satisfying jobs around. There is no pressure from her family on what to do. Her parents are divorced, and she lives with her mother. "I can't see anything else interesting apart from teaching." "I feel I've wasted 12 years at school....I'm just turning on to learning now...discovering literature and so on." Low opinion of the teachers here at school. 'Interest in the work itself' -- the main reason for choosing a job. "Kids are the only neat people left around here pretty well. They haven't been sucked into the system...so free." You cannot plan carefully because things change so much -- "what's going to happen, is going to happen." Office work "turns you into a machine." "Most kids here at school are conformist" -- attached to cars, skis, T.V. sets, etc.

(She believes in the "unity of knowledge" -- something Keniston pointed out for his young radicals. Notice "hip" language throughout this -- e.g., she values students being "together". She is determined to do what she wants to do. Does not feel established society
offers much interesting. There is an implicit belief that runs right through this interview that man is innocent as a child until society corrupts him. "Fatalistic" attitude to what will happen -- but not in a negative way. "Conformist" is a bad word for her.)

"I'm too busy living to plan ahead too much." "I can't really think about marriage now -- it's such a final thing. I think Common Law is better because it's only love holding you together, instead of a marriage contract. Though I suppose I would get married for the children's sake." Believes that a wife should have an independent life, outside the family. She has two sisters living with boyfriends. Her mother is 50, "but more like 17," and is doing a B.A. at Simon Fraser at the moment. Thinks that attitudes to marriage are changing among young people. Would not really want to change anything about herself. Does not have any specifications for a husband -- "there are some pretty neat accountants around -- you can't go by generalizations." She does not care about a "fantastic financial position" in marriage. "Marriage has been an escape for so long." Younger people are concerned about the population explosion, and she is determined to limit her family to two.

(Emphasis on living in the "now". Clear ambivalence to marriage. Has knowledge of people living Common Law. Obviously her family situation is a big influence. The statement about Common Law seems to imply a belief in the value of spontaneous genuine emotion as against social duties and constraints. Very tolerant about other people, e.g., even a person as "straight" as an accountant may well be "neat". Applies the logic of the population explosion to herself.)
"Older people are coming to realize that the younger people are fast becoming more educated than them. Because there's nothing else to do [I.E., NO INTERESTING JOBS]...it's kind of ridiculous, but that's the way it is." She is an ex-Catholic. There are cliques at school, which are "more of a gang-thing." She doesn't like the concept of dating at all. "The term 'date' is not used any more -- it went out a long time ago." Couples go around in the gangs. "Some of them -- I call them 'ultra-too-too-cute couples' -- have been going around together for three or four years. They're so sweet!" Her family was originally Irish Catholic. She went to Europe with her mother a couple of years ago. "Ireland turned us off Catholicism." This, and Europe generally, "made my mind more open." "I've developed a form of thinking where I try to take everything in and analyze it, and pick out what I want." "When my mother and father broke up, I had to look at them as people -- and they were human. I was twelve at the time. I can look at other people now -- and see that people are human -- teachers are human -- bus drivers are human -- and so on." "Growing up is really an insane trip -- really strange." "People in my own age group are extremely -- bleah! -- uninteresting. They're like sheep -- no personality....It's because their parents are 'bleah!' too -- and school only fills you with mindless activities." "The trip to Europe stopped me getting into that kind of thing." Travel is very important -- "it gives you strength, and perspective, and it opened my eyes a lot, and I appreciated home a
lot more when I got back." "The big thing now is independence.... I'm looking forward to looking after myself." Optimistic and relaxed about her future. Her parents care -- but don't push her at all.

(Again, the belief that established society has not much to offer. She does not want to identify herself with the sort of people who use the term "date". Travel was obviously of enormous importance in seeing herself in perspective and learning new things. She thinks about things, and thinks about the fact that she thinks. Her parents' divorce gave her a new and influential perspective. She can see what got her out of being 'bleah'. Clearly from this, she values people who are individualistic, unique. She's looking forward to her future with confidence.)

Unlimited money would not change things all that much -- she'd travel more, and buy a motorcycle, but would still be a kindergarten teacher and go to U.B.C. She would not change anything about herself, her life, etc. -- "nothing can make me change before my time" -- but she does not feel hemmed in or bad about this. She has an "it's their trip" attitude towards other people who are different. "I'm a great believer in the Circle Game -- it all happens, it'll all work itself out....People die, things are lost, and the circle just keeps going and life goes on." "There's nothing you can do to stop what's going to happen anyway...I may not like it, but it's going to make me a better person." She's satisfied, happy,
with herself. "There are lots of motorcycle freaks here...it's like a status symbol, makes you feel tough, makes you feel like a movie star." "I don't like 'hanging around' with friends -- because I get into ruts really easily. I'm what people would call a 'quiet' person....I like thinking, playing my guitar, watching my cats play. I like riding my bike a lot. The best time for daydreaming is on a bicycle on a nice day -- you just let your mind wander." "I don't feel I need a group of friends, or a whole bunch of possessions, to feel secure." Never had an imaginary friend, and does not have really wild fantasies. She has them sometimes about being a rock singer though -- "being another Janis Joplin." "Mick Jagger is pure sex -- oozing it from every pore!" To be a "travelling musician" would be her "ideal life-style".

(Money obviously is not crucial to her. She quotes a pop song as part of her explicit ideology. It is what might be called an "oriental" philosophy of life; or if one were unsympathetic to it -- which I am not -- one might call it Panglossian. Her security seems to be firmly anchored in her own head, and not in externals too much. Rock singers seem to be the 'folk heroes' of a great many young people.)

[IN 10 YEARS' TIME] -- "I haven't really thought about it much ....I try to live for the present a lot....I'd like to be -- nice to know, I guess....I'll probably be living in Vancouver -- or up the coast." "Falling in love -- that's got to be the best thing that ever happened to me...it changes your whole perspective -- that's just
about the best thing that can happen to you." "The best thing that could happen to me is finding my own peace -- within myself, or with someone else. I really figure I'll have it made then -- when I can be happy within myself." "I've never had any terrific traumas or tragedies. During the divorce...suddenly my dad was all sweet and sugar, and bought us presents and took us out to dinner. And that was something I couldn't understand. I see now why he did it, because he's only human and he thinks material things can make up for a loss like that. But you just can't do it." "The death of somebody really close would be the worst thing that could happen. My cat had a miscarriage all over my geography book last night...." "People all being 'together' makes me feel really good." Her boyfriend is the most important thing in her life right now. "To be serene within myself -- my inner peace -- is the most important thing that I'm reaching for. And it's hard." "There's all these things going on around me, and all these things going on in my mind...and I have to compile it, and file it, and finally put it to use." "I used to be really speedy -- I'm not half as much now as I was before. It used to be really showing off." "I want to be aware -- awareness is the great thing. I wouldn't want to be like Spiro Agnew." "I wouldn't want to be speedy. I used to be hyper-tense, and I didn't like myself....Someone finally told me 'slow down, you're too speedy' -- I'd never grasped, thought of, this concept before. It's a matter of creating your own kind of order -- you have to learn to shut certain things out." "You can be excited
without playing a lot of stupid 'games'.' She really admires Elton John, Judy Collins -- "for their power, for the emotions, the tears, they can stir up", in their music. "Inner Peace is the most important thing in life -- that's what matters." [HOW WOULD YOU DEFINE 'INNER PEACE'?] -- "To be able to live alone, without being lonely; to be able to live with yourself, without hating yourself." She knows one person like this. A friend is "somebody you don't feel uncomfortable with." Inner peace -- "it's the thing that people have been striving for for thousands of years without realizing it. The very fact that our parents have surrounded themselves with material wealth -- in reality they're searching for peace. They're trying to assuage their, their feelings -- in television sets."

She only became aware of this in the last year -- because of one particular person -- "it took a lot of thinking to get round to it."

She can talk with her mother about anything. "She has erased all the taboos most parents have, and now there's nothing to be subversive about." Does not get on too well with her father.

(Lots here. Places a very high value on love. She has done a lot of serious thinking about "inner peace", and can articulate these thoughts very well -- she has a nice way with words at times. The orientation to life here is essentially a religious one, I think. Apparently she has had very influential exposure to this sort of ideology. She has a sensitive understanding of some of the past acts of her parents in perspective. She makes several anti-materialist statements. She sees
the previous generation, or rather her own generation in contrast to it, as extremely different. She values the idea of 'community'. She is thoughtful about her own thoughts and is trying consciously to direct her mind — to be aware, and not speedy. She knows what she wants, and what threatens it. She seems to place a high value on emotions, and is very open about it. She realizes that she has a particularly good mother and — in connection with earlier quotes too — that many people don't.)

"The 'Science' part strikes me as important, but the 'Technology' part I turn down — I associate it too much with pollution. It's a very dry phrase." ['SUCCESS'] — "doesn't do anything to me." "'Child' represents all that's simple, innocent — 'Adult' kind of taints it. I can dig the word 'Child' more." ['ADELESCENT'] — "Ohh! I hate that word — I just hate it. — Ohh! It makes me think of 'gawky' — dirty fingernails — greasy hair. If anybody calls me an adolescent I just cringe." She kept a diary once — but found she could not really express in words, experiences — "my words were so awkward, it kind of took away from the things I felt." She talked about "the new awareness, fostered by drugs, and because things have got so bad they can't be ignored any more." She is very conscious about "pollution". Acid: "gives you a false sense of knowing everything." "It took falling in love to make me realize that, that living is just — fine! — is good enough! (Laugh) — because living alone is a trip — you don't need drugs."
She's very accepting of other people's 'trips'. "Young people aren't unhappy -- just angrier. Over Vietnam, for instance." "From what I've heard of high schools in the States, it's not too good. Canadians are more individuals. They're not as patriotic. [IS THAT GOOD?] -- Yes. They're less uptight than Americans too." She's not very hopeful about the feasibility of changing things in society. "Most of the time I try to be rational. It's hard." "I don't watch T.V. Only when I'm babysitting. It's dangerous. It sucks me in too easily." The CBS Tuesday night documentary at 10 o'clock is the best program. She gets The Sun in her house. Bob Hunter: "I try, but he's heavy -- like he's eternally heavy -- he depresses me." Ann Landers: "I think she's really inane." The Georgia Straight: "I find that a bit heavy too. I used to read it all the time -- but it's deteriorated."

(Ambivalence about science and technology. Implicit belief that experiences are inexpressible in words. A realization of the importance of drugs. An assumption that previously people ignored things that were there, but now young people are different because they're aware of these things -- because they've got so bad, and because of drugs. Young people are thus seen as more explicitly principled now. An emphasis on 'livingness'. Anti-American sentiment. No faith in rational means (or irrational means, for that matter) of changing society. Perceptive about television. In line with changes I've outlined in the Georgia Straight, she used to like it, but now no longer does because it is too heavy, i.e., political.)
Overall the tacit assumption that seems to underly this ideology, is that life, the world, is good, whole, beautiful -- and that one must get in harmony with certain simple elemental things and exist in union with them. It is against the institutional structure of society, which is seen as corrupting, and which it seeks to avoid, and is essentially an introspective trip -- a going within, to find out what you want and where you're "at". Heather is relaxed, mature, intelligent -- she knows what "space" she wants to be in, and knows what endangers that.

Now, it is not the case her whole Weltanschauung, as presented here, is exactly the same as all of the others interviewed or that precisely this is the "new" ideology. One or two of the others were very close to her in outlook but in general she was more explicitly "religious" and introspective than most. So she had "bits" which were not common to all, but in general and with minor variations this is representative of the orientation and philosophy of most of those I interviewed. She was only at a more extreme end of the same ideology that the majority of the others had incorporated into their way of experiencing the world and seeing their future.

When I talk about this "new" ideology it is in fact an idealization -- no two thought alike or subscribed to exactly the same views. The elements below are taken from the data, they are common to most of them, in some they are more explicit than others, they miss out certain important unique elements in each person, but they do in my opinion constitute a common, coherent, influential, and "new" ideology. It is
of course extremely difficult to explicate an ideology, partly because it is almost impossible to be completely exhaustive about all the tacit assumptions that underly it, and partly the elements "hang together" in a way that cannot be verbally described -- and either, after seeing them all, you intuitively "understand" them, or you don't. An active process on the part of the reader is therefore necessary here, in addition to the writer's explication, if comprehension is to be achieved. As well as I am able I have put the elements in three categories, and in descending order of concreteness. They are values, social derivations, and concrete referents. Within the categories they are rather complexly connected and are not here arranged hierarchically. The values are simply what is a priori valued, without further justification.

Values

1) Livingness: the value of existence, of being fully alive, of "being" rather than "doing".

2) At-oneness with Nature: of living in harmony with the miraculous complexity of Nature, and not trying to control it. Connected with (1).

3) Acceptance of sexuality: as a positive good. Connected with (1) and (2).

4) Hedonism: living joyfully and to the full. Connected with (1), (2) and (3).
5) **Accepting What Is**: what is about life -- but not necessarily the contingent arrangements of what society tries to make of life.

"Going with the flow." Connected with (2), mainly.

6) **Be yourself, accept yourself. Personal freedom**: the value of personal uniqueness. Everybody's differentness is precious.

Connected with (1), (3), and (5).

7) **Personal qualities**: the value of other people's personal, internal qualities, not their society-connected, external qualities -- such as status, money. Sensitivity to personal relations.

Connected with (6).

8) **Authenticity and honesty**: the qualities one should strive for oneself and value in others -- sincerity, honesty, care, equality. Authenticity versus: duty, expectations, "games", roles.

Connected with (6) and (7).

9) **Emotions**: the value of, acceptance of, honesty with. Most important of which is love. A belief in self-expression -- artistic expression one form. (Sometimes, but not always, an accompanying belief that such things are essentially ineffable -- not expressable in words.) Connected with (1), (3), (6) and (8).

10) **Awareness and knowledge**: striving for the enlargement of both.

Consciousness. Essentially, a "religious" outlook. Connected with (1), (2) and (9), mainly.

11) **Ideals**: concern with principles, morality, ends. Commitment and enthusiasm to beliefs. No compromises acceptable. Thus includes
a precept to the effect: Take all the above seriously. Connected with all the above.

Social Derivations (i.e., justified by the above)

a) Established society has little to offer: because of transgressing much of the above, notably (2), (3), (6), (8), (9), (11). It cannot be changed, and/or is not worth trying to change.

b) Avoidance: of the structures of established society — e.g., career, marriage. Because of (a) and aspects of (2) — i.e., letting be rather than attempting to control.

c) Anti-rat race: striving in competition with others for material rewards is valueless and harmful. Because of (4), (6) and (8). Connected also with (b).

d) Non-materialism: it is possible to be "decently poor" — (although a certain level of affluence is taken for granted). Material things do not essentially matter. Because of (1), (2), (6), (7), (8) and (10). Connected with (b) and (c).

e) Experience your life as a unity: do not compartmentalize, deny or repress parts. Because of (6), (8), (9), and (11).

f) "Open" attitude towards the future: Because the general future may be very bad because of all that (a) contains, and because of (5) and (6).

g) Against Technology: because it transgresses (2) and threatens, e.g. (6). Also connected with (a), (c), and (d).
h) **Anti-Americanism:** because the United States is *seen as* transgressing (2), (6), (8), and (11). It thus *represents* many of the things they do not want.

i) **Hatred is wrong. Tolerance in general:** because of (2), (5), and (11). But, there are over-riding elements in (11) which may invalidate this on specific occasions.

j) **Social concern and conscience:** because of (2), (7), (8), (9), and (11).

k) **Community:** the value of. *Because of* (2), (7), (8), (9) and (11). Connected with (c), (d), (e), and (j).

l) **Social equality:** against divisions between people. *Because of* (2), (7), (8), (9), and (11). Connected with (e), (i), (j), and (k).

**Concrete Referents** (i.e., behaviour, etc., following from the above)

**Travel:** because it increases awareness and knowledge (10), and is enjoyable (4).

**Music:** because it is expressive of emotions (9), is enjoyable (4), is sometimes sexual (3), and may increase awareness (10).

**Drugs:** because they are enjoyable (4), may increase awareness (10), and may foster community (k).

**Creative lifestyles and/or to do with people:** because of (6), (7), (8) and (9).

**Suspicion of the mass media:** because it represents established society -- see (a) and (b).
Clothes: Dress as an individual (6); dress to express yourself (9); do not dress expensively (d); do not dress in such a way as to represent any supposed "age group" (1). (It is now almost impossible to tell the age of anyone under 30 who is part of this "new" ideology by their style of dressing alone. The differentiation of clothing has brought about a less strict differentiation of "ages").

I do not claim that this is completely exhaustive, but it is as much as I am able to derive from my understanding of the data. Heather had one or two "bits" (such as an expressed belief in the unity of knowledge) which I could not see even implicitly in the others, and which I have not therefore included. All that is included is common to many of them in greater or lesser degrees of explicitness. A couple of them had such idiosyncratic or unique ways of seeing the world that I could not claim that their ideology was that which is presented above -- but they were certainly very influenced by it and had distinct components of it.

A very interesting thing to note from the above, of course, is that the concrete referents are relatively few in number. As I have said before, they knew life-styles, futures, models, and so on that they did not want, but only to a much, much lesser extent did they know the concrete things that they did want. They had values allright, but these values have not been tied down in a life model yet. There are only short-term models, and they have not been shown to be viable
for a whole lifetime yet. The concrete referents are thus so few because models that contain them are still in the process of creation, I think.
The main single point I am claiming about social change is that the direction of it among older high school students in Vancouver in the last decade has been from roughly what Keniston described in his *Alienation and the Decline of Utopia* essay in 1960 -- and what I have called a "traditional" ideology -- to what I have described above and called a "new" ideology. I do not claim that all such students ten years ago had this same ideology, nor that all of them now have the "new" ideology, only that the direction of cultural change has been from one to the other. Furthermore, I think that in the next few years, say, the numbers of those adopting the new ideology will increase.

Keniston said that in 1960 the direction of cultural change was from commitment and enthusiasm to alienation and apathy; that many young people were doing what Riesman called "inner emigration" -- becoming inwardly silent, apathetic, bored, uncommitted. He says: "The gap between aspirations and actualities is one of the chief sources of alienation...a discrepancy between what is, and what he dimly, almost unconsciously, senses might be... (There has been) a long-term decline of positive morality, which has not only left men unable to visualize a better future, but has deprived them of articulate bases on which to judge the present.... There is a relative absence of concepts appropriate to, adequate for, or expressive of, either the felt evils of the
contemporary world or the vague aspirations for a better world.... Our deepest need is not to propose specific reforms, but rather to create an intellectual and cultural atmosphere in which it is possible for men to attempt affirmation...."

Goodman felt that this situation made growing up in such a cultural environment absurd. Douvan and Adelson described what high school students were thinking at this time and were somewhat depressed by it. Douglas described first year university students' ritualistic and uncommitted engagement with established society and termed it a "quiet rebellion". And from conversations I have had with a couple of students who were in the early 1960s at the same high school I have been talking about throughout this, the picture seems pretty much the same. One of these people actually taught at the school as a substitute teacher briefly this year and was very struck by the changes that had taken place among the students.

The claim I am making is that the direction of cultural change has now reversed, that it is now away from alienation and apathy towards commitment and enthusiasm, that there is now a positive morality, that there are now concepts with which to judge the present world and possible future ones, and that the cultural atmosphere is such that affirmation is possible. From the basis of about twenty-five hours of taped discussion with high school students I have attempted to explicate what I think this new ideology is. If it is correct it means that something like a moral reaffirmation has taken place here,
that by making new conceptions available, has effected the not incon­
siderable achievement of actually making life more meaningful to such 
young people. I think this is a cultural change of the utmost impor­
tance.

Now one possible objection to all this is that the data from 
which I am making assertions about the direction of cultural change is 
far from ideal. This is fair. I have not been able to subject it 
to all sorts of controls, and it certainly is not "scientific". The 
most comparable data I have is Douglas' thesis on first year U.B.C. 
students in 1960 and my interviews with fourteen Vancouver high school 
students in 1971. These are not necessarily similar groups of people. 
In fact it may well be that a random sample of first year U.B.C. stu­
dents in 1971 are closer in outlook, ideology and so on to the 1960 
students than to the 1971 Vancouver high school students. That is to 
say, I think the majority of new U.B.C. students at the moment have 
something like the "traditional" ideology outlined above. This is 
because U.B.C. is the university of the province, and a great propor­
tion of its intake comes from outside Vancouver. Social change is much 
slower in the Interior (urban social change almost always is more rapid 
than rural or that of less major urban areas), and thus the proportion 
of young people with a "traditional" ideology is, I think, higher there 
than in Vancouver. In addition, there may be a selection process where­
by those from the rest of the province closer to the "new" ideology go 
to Simon Fraser anyway, resulting in an even bigger number of "tradi-
I think, however, that Douglas' description would have fitted most middle-class young people ten years ago still involved in the upper ends of the educational system, and that there were not any at that time with this "new" ideology — socially, it just did not exist then. So the fact that, without trying to do so, I have found about ten 16-18 year olds, who are thinking things that virtually nobody was thinking ten years ago, is significant in itself. Now in addition, I do not think this group was all that unusual. Their particular characteristics that are relevant here are that they were middle-class, from Vancouver, with quite a lot of divorced parents, and of above average intelligence. Taking the school population as a whole, they were neither the most "freaky" (none had particularly long hair, or exceptionally bizarre dress, or took drugs all that much, compared with some groups in the school); nor were they the most "radical" (I did actually try, unsuccessfully, to get the most prominent Women's Lib activist involved in this); nor were they from among the more apathetic, turned off (or "bleah"), students in the school. But because they came from the biggest city on the West Coast of Canada, because they were intelligent, and perhaps because their unusual home backgrounds had been particularly conducive to their having to re-examine what is usually taken for granted, they were, I think, highly susceptible to new and attractive cultural changes. The very things that might be pointed to as making them "unrepresentative" of young people
in general, are the very things that make them a particularly good weather-vane for gauging the direction of social and cultural change.

I do not myself, however, think they are so out of the ordinary. I think it is fair to say that they said some pretty original and impressive things at times. But this does not make them exceptional. Sociologists often tend to make general assumptions and conclusions about this group of people and that group of people based on the data of, quite honestly, fairly superficial questionnaires. They ask shallow questions, in an impersonal, highly structured situation, and get surface answers — the things that spring to people's minds, which are obviously more likely to be cliches and "stock" opinions — rather than giving them an opportunity to think about and articulate what they really do think — which is hard, for anyone. So the sociologist takes the scanty fruits of his superficial digging (if he has done a lot of work it is because he has dug in hundreds of places hastily, rather than in a few places deeply), juggles about with them, makes conclusions from what is in effect the lowest common denominator, and thinks this is what people are like. They are not. People do think about things, they do have strong feelings and profound and unique ideas — but not surprisingly, they do not reveal them very easily. People are not as stupid as many sociologists seem to think. And if these fourteen said some interesting things, I do not think that this necessarily makes them so unusual.

So there are two points about the validity of the data from which I make conclusions: one is that my sets of data ten years apart
are not strictly comparable, and the other is that the data I use for
the present time is not proven to be representative. On the first
point, I can only say that from conversations with two people who knew
the school then and now, what I have said seems perfectly fair; and on
the second point, my own judgment from the basis of casual acquaintance
with several dozen other students at the school is that these fourteen,
while not necessarily matching the ideological composition of the rest
of the school, were neither so extraordinary that they were representa-
tive of nothing. What I believe is the case is that they were representa-
tive of those who were reasonably quickly affected by this new
cultural change of climate. They were middle-of-the-road vanguard, if
you like, and perhaps at a very rough guess, a quarter to a third of
the school was similarly influenced.

Of great importance for those sharing this new ideology is
that others have gone before and broken the ground. This means that
to some extent a youngster has a model of what he wants to become and
can take short cuts and save a lot of wasted effort and pain, and in
addition that other people, parents in particular, can also see that
he is following a model (even if they do not wholly approve of it),
and that what he is doing is not totally idiosyncratic and leading no-
where. Because someone's been there before a path is visible.

I think that on the whole ten years ago there was no such
path. Either a young person could wholeheartedly accept his social
position and future, as defined by adult culture (as most did); or he
could accept it only nominally and, because he could not articulate or know any socially acceptable criticisms of his situation, experience alienation and apathy (this seemed to be coming increasingly common); or he could drop out of the main culture into a pre-existent subculture such as that of the Beatniks (but this was a big jump to do, because he automatically became a "deviant" by the prevailing definitions); or he could become, either alone or with a handful of others, a complete outsider (which is psychologically a very difficult and dangerous thing to do). Not a very appetizing hierarchy of possibilities.

Then, somewhere along the line, and out of the last two groups (or collections of individuals), another -- perhaps two other -- new possibilities grew. I do not propose to deal in any detail with this because the thesis is concerned primarily with the fact that it happened, rather than the much more difficult, and indeed possibly intractable, problem of how it happened. Perhaps the two best books on this are Tom Wolfe's *Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test*, and Kenneth Keniston's *Young Radicals*. Both show, to some extent, how new models were created. Keniston shows how these first radicals were special people who had gone through profound identity crises in the course, over a few years, of becoming that which they had no way of knowing until they got there -- because there was no path. Once this was done, and in conjunction with a few other things, a model of being a "radical" was established and many more were able to follow it. Wolfe sees LSD as an incredibly important catalyst through which another group of very unusual people forged another model -- that, roughly, of
"hippie". The mass media were also extremely influential in setting up for public availability these two models -- and also, to some extent, of compounding them. Especially in the "hippie" case, what young person with any imagination and restlessness could not but find the stereotype the media presented attractive?

These models were to start with (and still are to many people, of course) "deviant" identities or life-styles. But the more they were publicized (which probably amounted to the more they were glamourized), the more young people adopted them, and the more young people adopted them, the more other, less marginal, young people were likely to adopt them. So we have something like an epidemiological model of social change here: the initial colony of values, etc., is difficult to establish (which is why the first people, like Keniston's, had to be exceptional people), but once it is established (i.e., has found an "ecological niche"), it blooms and spreads rapidly -- assuming a potentially favorable or fertile environment, of course. So the subsequent people do not have to be special people (and if they are it probably means they are just all the more likely to adopt the new cultural form) -- all they have to be is fertile ground -- which, due to the documented disenchantment with what the adult culture had to offer, they obviously were. The first people had to be special because they had to generate a coherent new ideology and lifestyle out of "nothing" -- or at least floating, unconnected bits of "matter"; and they had to nurture it initially when there was no outside social support whatsoever.
The more it spreads after that, however, the less and less "special" new "hosts" have to be. And this fits in with my earlier assertion that those I interviewed were not all that unusual.

All this however, while it is an interesting model, does not explain where the change comes from and why it takes the form it does. The fact of the matter is, we simply do not know how new ideas, new ideologies, originate. We know that most social change does not result from the deliberate actions of men to bring it about, and sometimes, once a change is under way, we can say something about the course of its development. But we do not know how such things begin. Because we do not even have the glimmerings of an answer to this, this is usually, of course, not even seen as a question. Because it is not seen as a problem all sorts of people have made claims to have produced a "theory" of social change — but all they are in fact is models because they have not explained social change. There is no theory of social change, and this is why my only claims about it in the context of the subject matter this thesis deals with are descriptive — and at times (as here) a little discursive.

It is important to assert that this new ideology is not in any sense an "expected" or "natural" or "obvious" development over time of the "traditional" ideology. One cannot see its seeds in the earlier ideology. Although it is almost certainly in some degree a reaction to it, it does not attempt to argue with the earlier ideology. It rejects it and by-passes it, and in effect "assumes" that it is at a higher level.
Related to this is the interesting fact that all the projections for the future of adolescents in North America that were made a decade ago are now out of date. That is to say, Coleman, Goodman, Friedenberg, Douvan, and Adelson, and so on, and with varying degrees of accompanying dismay, assumed, roughly, that the future would merely consist of more of the same thing. But this is what has not happened; certain things really have changed -- and in a discrete or qualitative, rather than a linear or quantitative way. One cannot help getting the feeling (however teleological it may be) in reading Douglas, Douvan and Adelson, etc., in the light of what has subsequently happened, that the time was somehow becoming "ripe" for some such change as we have had. No theory of social change could possibly have predicted what has happened, and while sensitive social observers (and distinctly not within the mainstream of sociological thought -- as it was then, or now -- for example, Goodman, Keniston, Friedenberg) could see that things were in an "unsatisfactory" state, and wanted them changed -- even they could not have predicted the content of the change.

In actual fact of course, the contents of the new cultural forms that have arisen among young people in the last few years are very varied indeed, ranging from extreme political radicalism to all-out, other-worldly mysticism, with many and varied forms in between. I have been concerned in this thesis only with the form found among some high school students in Vancouver. This new ideology I have been talking about is, I think, a somewhat modified form of slightly earlier ones. To use the epidemiological analogy, as it "bloomed" a new
"strain", slightly modified from the original, has come about, and as a matter of fact, I think it is a particularly resilient one.

Attempts have been made to impose upon all these new cultural proliferations a homogeneity which does not actually exist. The most notable of these is perhaps Roszak's notion of the "counter-culture". That there have been cultural changes is beyond doubt, and that they have also all been in one way or another reactions against the established culture is also almost certainly true; but these changes do not necessarily (and in many cases definitely do not) cohere among themselves in any way. It may be that their only common defining feature is the rather negative one that they are all, in their own ways, against the established culture. Since the very notion of the word "culture" surely implies linkages and coherence between the parts that in any instance comprise it, the justification for calling all these varied forms "a counter-culture" is not very good. Rather they are a variety of ideologies, of which what I have attempted to explicate above is one.

One of the ways in which the strain has modified is a result of the fact that after the initial stage of a viable colony of "special" people establishing it, successive hosts do not have to be so special. The changes mainly originated among younger people and eventually, though almost certainly not initially, they reached down to the high school level. But by this time the influences have got diffuse and do not seem to rely, as I think they once did, on those young people being affected by the changes feeling a sense of "special-
ness" or "togetherness" among themselves. In other words, to have been influenced by these changes, to have taken up the new conceptions that have been made available, it is at least by now not necessary to identify oneself with a "special" group, as perhaps it was at first. Thus many of my interviewees, although strongly influenced by or adopting the new ideology, did not have any consciousness of "young people" as a special group. The explanation for this may be partly the "rule" within the ideology to "be individual", and partly that the ideology is becoming so increasingly widespread, and hence available, that those who adopt it are no longer "special". This is one of the ways, then, in which the "strain" seems to have changed. What has happened is that certain previously deviant identities or lifestyles -- such as "radical" or "hippie" have become much more likely to be accepted as models for "normal" adolescents. This has now become so widespread and diffuse that the values can now be incorporated by someone without taking up the whole identity model. People like Linda, in the above, were clearly in this position.

The overall importance of all this to the average high school student in Vancouver is in fact an opening up of new possibilities. Certain values and ideas that previously one had to be an outsider or misfit to adopt (which is emotionally difficult, and for the average person sociologically highly unlikely) are now socially available. Since almost all conceptions are socially derived, social change that has spread new ones has now made it more or less socially "o.k." for a youngster to adopt new and interesting ways of thinking that he
would not only not have dreamed of adopting some years ago, but would also not have dreamed of. He no longer has to "choose" the adult world, or be alienated and apathetic, or be a socially frowned upon deviant; there is a new cultural alternative.

Given the analysis of Keniston's 1960 essay, then, there is now a positive morality available. And given that it's attractive, and that that which established society offers seems to provoke most frequently only alienation and apathy, it is not surprising that an increasing number of youngsters are adopting it. The fact that it has clearly reached the high school level in Vancouver seems to indicate its strength and the likelihood that Vancouver will act as a diffusion centre for the rest of the province in time, such that high school students elsewhere in it will be similarly affected (if they are not being so already). An ideology that is positive, emphasizes personal relationships, encourages a person to be more relaxed and open about things, to be happy, and to do what he wants to do, cannot fail to hold some measure of attraction to someone who is thinking about his situation, what he should believe in, what he should do when he finishes school, and so on. So, it seems we have the position where a modern industrial society (in fact many) is now producing -- albeit inadvertently -- new members who are seeing that not working very hard, and essentially enjoying yourself, is possible. And the more people opt for this possibility, the more "acceptable" it becomes, and the more likely young people are to do it. I think that this represents a social development for industrial society of the utmost significance.
Goodman said that "the development of a full-blown adolescent sub-culture is not normal but reactive. It signifies that the adult culture is hostile to adolescent interests, or is not to be trusted." Since he wrote this the situation has bloomed dramatically and the youth cultures are far stronger and elaborated and different from the adult culture than at that time. There is now what Keniston said in 1960 there needed to be: "a cultural atmosphere in which it is possible...to attempt affirmation." This has not however been the result of an intellectual movement -- which is more or less what Keniston urged -- but has been a sudden social movement (which as one consequence has had an effect on intellectuals, rather than the other way around). New cultural forms and ideologies associated with youth now exist of such attraction to young people that the possibility arises that "youth culture" (if we can call it that, loosely) may no longer be something to go through, but remain as a viable alternative to the "adult culture". That is, the "adolescent sub-culture" Goodman refers to was nevertheless something that it was assumed a person came out of after a certain age and then got down to the serious business of participating in established society -- even though often alienated and apathetic about what he was doing here. The possibility now is that "youth culture" has got off the ground sufficiently for it to represent a non-transitory escape from established society. This mainly depends, I think, on whether the generation ahead of present-day high school students, that is, five to ten years older, are able
to create out of their lives viable life-long "models". If this is successful then we may truly be able to call this a culture in its own right, (which it is not really at the moment), and it will clearly have enormous consequences on the culture of established society.
In this final section I want to deal with certain aspects of adolescence and show specifically how they are related to the social environment. Much of the literature on adolescence deals with it in a social vacuum and does not seem to allow that its arguments and conclusions could be specific only to certain social milieux. As will be obvious from what follows, I do not agree with this perspective and believe that the social conditions that confront a person at the time of adolescence are crucial in determining what happens to him. Most of the works quoted below take a similar perspective. This is not an exhaustive discussion of adolescence — only of those aspects of it that pertain to what has already been talked about in this thesis.

There seems to be some measure of agreement about the task of adolescence: Goethals and Kbs are in accord with Erikson that adolescence deals with the formation of identity. "Identity is the capacity to see oneself as having continuity and sameness....It is the consistent organization of experience." And identity formation is required when one comes to an age when childhood identifications are no longer sufficient for shaping one's behaviour and one's place in the world." Erikson's well-known concept of the "psycho-social moratorium" is often used to describe that period of time when choice may be deferred and experimentation permitted in the furtherance of the establishment of an identity.
Friedenberg's very important book, *The Vanishing Adolescent*, states that "the task of the adolescent is to define himself in dialectical combat with society....When there is no conflict, there is no strong sense of individual character and personality....Adolescent conflict is the instrument by which an individual learns the complex, subtle, and precious difference between himself and his environment....(The conflict is) dialectical, and leads to a higher synthesis, to the youth's own adulthood and to critical participation in society as an adult."

The trouble is, according to Friedenberg, modern society is not allowing this to happen and thus "real adolescence" is vanishing. "All the contemporary institutions that bear on the young, diverse as they seem to be, are united in their insistence on cultivating sensitivity and pliability to the demands and expectations of other persons...other-direction, adaptability, adjustment, conformity -- call it what you will." "The emphasis on co-operation and group adjustment characteristic of modern life interferes specifically with the central development task of adolescence itself....It is the time during which he differentiates himself from the culture, though on the culture's terms....It is precisely this sense of individuality which develops only feebly in most primitive societies....A successful initiation leads to group solidarity and a warm sense of belonging; a successful adolescence adds to these a profound sense of self -- of one's own personality."
Though he views the direction of change of the whole society for this stifling of the opportunity to have a real adolescence (and it is important to notice here that this book was published in 1959), he criticizes schools in particular for what they are doing here. "School should have an obligation to clarify for its students the meaning of their experience of life in their society. This does not mean propagating similar views, or social attitudes and beliefs as such."

"School today is like a blender -- what comes out, when it is functioning effectively, is not merely uniform but bland and creamy; by its very nature it is inimical to clarity, yet retaining in a form difficult to detect all the hostile or toxic ingredients present in the original mixture."

"Society is making clear self-definition increasingly difficult....Those worse off never form a clear conception of themselves and what they stand for. They take no stands and fight no battles. He is like Ortega y Gasset's mass-man, who sets no value on himself -- good or ill -- based on specific grounds, but who feels himself 'just like everybody', and is nevertheless not concerned about it." (Compare this statement by Judy: "I think I'll just be an average, everyday person. I don't know if I want it -- but I think that's what'll happen....I don't think I'll make any big mistakes -- because I never do anything really big.")

Douvan and Adelson specifically agree with Friedenberg's analysis in that "nowadays the youngster merely undergoes puberty and
simulates maturity." They do not feel that the socialization of their adolescents led to solutions of intrapsychic or psychosexual problems -- rather that they learned to cover them up (most importantly -- from themselves) by "external" devices, presentations of the self, and merely simulated maturity. By constructing identity so early around, say, proposed occupation, "the precocious choice may produce a narrow, over-defined personality, impoverished through a premature foreclosure on experiment and experience. It may hinder the full development of personal qualities or simply postpone the identity crisis until a later and more inappropriate moment."  

"The traditional idea of the adolescent experience has it that the youngster becomes involved in an intense concern with ethics, political ideology, religious beliefs, etc. This pattern can be found -- but in a bold, sometimes stubborn, often unhappy minority. Our interviews confirm that American adolescents are on the whole not deeply involved in ideology, nor are they prepared to do much individual thinking on value issues of any generality." "It takes an unusual personality in unusual circumstances successfully to challenge more than modestly the value commitments of the milieu. Yet some do manage it....They develop the ideological tone of that generation."  

Again, of course, it is important to note that this was written about the situation ten years or so ago. What is interesting about the last sentence of theirs is that it is precisely some of these "unusual" people who became Keniston's "young radicals". Douvan and Adelson's research was done at a time when they could not have known
about the subsequent developments dealt with in this thesis, but they
do seem to be aware of the process, or at least, some of it, by which
change of the situation can come about. It was during the early 1960s
that Keniston's interviewees, talented people in unusual circumstances,
were going through the personal changes that led to their finding them­selves eventually having become radicals. What is not quite accurate
about what Douvan and Adelson say is, I believe, not that these people
develop the ideological tone of that generation, but more the next one.
It was because they became the first models that the subsequent gener­
ation (if it makes sense to talk of generations in terms of a few years
-- and I think here it does) were able to follow. The ideological tone
of the present generation was determined some years ago by the "bold,
sometimes stubborn, often unhappy minority" that would not accept the
direction in which the pressures of society that Friedenberg was writing
about seemed to be pushing them.

Douvan and Adelson's finding that adolescents "are on the
whole not deeply involved in ideology, nor are they prepared to do much
thinking on value issues of any generality" clearly does not apply to
Keniston's interviewees -- and more importantly for the central concern
of this thesis, it does not apply to most of my interviewees either.
Not because mine are so unusual, but because others went before and set
the tone in which value issues were to be thought about. Keniston
claims that his radicals' values were not so terribly exceptional --
what was exceptional was that they were insisting on taking the formal
values that society had come to pay only lip-service to, seriously.

This is what I meant when I said in the previous section that the social change that has taken place, amounts to a moral reaffirmation -- the tone of the new ideology is explicitly moral. This of course has important consequences for the process of adolescence as it is in society.

Erikson is unusual among psychoanalytically oriented writers on adolescence in that he does not treat it in a social vacuum or pay merely lip service to social considerations. He centrally locates the social environment in the process of adolescence. "It is in adolescence that the ideological structure of the environment becomes essential for the ego....We cannot separate personal growth and communal change."

He then goes on to introduce the very important concept of "cultural consolidation":

"In every technology and historical period there are types of individuals who ('properly' brought up) can combine the dominant techniques with their identity development, and become what they do. Independently of minor superiorities and inferiorities, they can settle on that cultural consolidation which secures them what joint verification and what transitory salvation lies in doing things together and in doing them right -- a rightness proven by the fact that they 'work'.

Only such consolidation offers the co-ordinates for the range of a period’s identity formations and their necessary relation to a sense of inspired activity, although many or most do so only by creating compartments of pronounced narrowness, of enforced service, and of limited status. But how such consolidation permits a man at the same time to limit his horizon so as not to see what might destroy the new won familiarity of the world and expose him to all manner of strangeness... all this is hardly approached from the point of view of depth psychology.

The history of cultures, civilizations, and technologies is the history of such consolidations, while it is only in per-
iods of such transition that the innovators appear: those too privileged in outlook to remain bound to the prevailing system; too honest or too conflicted not to see the simple truths of existence hidden behind the complexity of daily 'necessities'; and too full of pity to overlook 'the poor' who have been left out."

"...Adolescence is least 'stormy' in that segment which is gifted and well-trained in the pursuit of expanding technological trends, and thus able to identify with new roles of competency and invention and thus able to accept a more implicit ideological outlook. Where this is not given, the adolescent mind becomes a more explicitly ideological one, by which we mean one searching for some inspiring unification of tradition or anticipated techniques, ideas, and ideals."\(^{43}\)

"...It is through their ideology that social systems enter into the fibre of the next generation and attempt to absorb into their lifehood the rejuvenative power of youth. Youth can offer its loyalties and energies both to the conservation of that which continues to feel true and to the revolutionary correction of that which has lost its regenerative significance."\(^{44}\)

"...The sense of identity becomes more necessary and more problematic whenever a wide range of possible ideologies is envisaged."\(^{45}\)

I have quoted Erikson at length because he very eloquently ties up social change and adolescence and because through these selected passages he deals with a great many of the things this thesis has touched upon. The "cultural consolidation" applies most closely to those of what I have called the "traditional" ideology -- among those I talked to Judy and Wayne, with their particular views about work and marriage and so on. Judy saw success as a job, marriage, and a family, and seemed not unduly perturbed at becoming "an average everyday person", and Wayne was able to identify with a particular branch of the technology of society and construct his identity around being an engineer and making lots of money. In comparison to nearly all of the others, they had "a more implicit ideological outlook".
They both had some doubts about their chosen means to "transitory salvation" however. They were not unaware of or unaffected by new developments taking place around them, however -- Judy, for example, having to cope with the recently acquired knowledge that some of her friends "had relationships". Even better examples of this cultural consolidation would seem to be many of those youngsters described in Douvan and Adelson and in Coleman, who most successfully seemed to limit their horizons so as not to see what might threaten their consolidation achievement. Perhaps if I had found a student with the prospects of a brilliant career in computing science, we might have seen this in the most perfect form in the particular technological society that we have.

The "innovators" Erikson talks about are obviously exemplified in Keniston's young radicals -- privileged, honest, conflicted, full of pity. Through them and other innovators having gone before, alternative ideologies have developed and the young person going through adolescence now, unless he screens out these alternatives altogether, finds identity formation a problem. He can see conflicting models of what he can become, and limiting his horizon so as to settle on conventional consolidation and not see certain things, becomes very difficult.

I claimed earlier that eight of my fourteen interviewees were in my opinion unequivocally having a "real" adolescence, and that if Friedenberg's analysis were correct, this would be a suspiciously high number. I think his analysis is correct -- but only for that particular time; my claim here is that social change is such that adolescence is
no longer vanishing but becoming increasingly possible. Friedenberg believed that society was producing a new model of man to fit the ever increasing bureaucratic organization of society. He believed this was rendering men increasingly other-directed and that the humanizing potentialities of adolescent growth were being subverted in the interest of early socialization.

One of the most evident aspects of any ideology that has grown up among young people in the last decade is that there is a rejection of the increasing bureaucratic organization of society. This is true for any of the new orientations — anarchist, revolutionary, religious, communal, or whatever. Thus the "new model of man" Friedenberg talks about is not at all being accepted by a lot of young people, and there is a more explicit concern with ideology. I think that so many of those I talked to were having a real adolescence not because they were the "innovators" (Erikson) or the "unhappy minority" (Douvan and Adelson) but because a genuine adolescence is now much more likely. This is partly because the attractive (to them) new ideology is explicitly concerned with morality and value questions, and partly because there is so obviously now more than one ideology to choose from anyway. And as Erikson says, the sense of identity becomes more necessary and more problematic whenever several ideologies are seen.

The interesting thing about Douglas' respondents is that potentially they might have broken away from the cultural consolidation of the time — if that had been able to see that other things were possible. In different circumstances the fact that they were less than
whole-hearted about what they were doing would surely have meant that some of them at least would have broken away to new things. Douglas said: "they confine themselves only to those systems of politico-philosophical ideas which have earned popular approval," -- which is to say they had little choice but to settle on a consolidation of identity around the dominant techniques of society. The point about the present situation is that there are more "politico-philosophical systems" having popular approval -- not "popular" in the sense that all the people support them, but that enough people support each such that one can reasonably consider the "acceptability" of adopting them oneself. Once again Douglas' students were the not exceptional who, once the exceptional had broken through to new things and shown new possibilities, might have (or at least some of whom might have) embarked upon what had been shown to be feasible. And once a person either starts considering a variety of possible ideologies or chooses one which is explicitly concerned with value questions anyway, a real developmental process of adolescence is much more likely.

I want to go further and perhaps suggest that the opportunity to have and likelihood of having a real adolescence have not only increased within the last decade, but will now remain and not be subject to reversal. Friedenberg believed we were reverting back to the situation of primitive societies which usually have no room to tolerate the "psychosocial moratorium" -- that is, a period of identity play in which the adolescent can find out who and what he is. Ironically, for
Friedenberg, although it is only in relatively advanced societies that genuine adolescence is possible, this possibility was, in his opinion, being increasingly denied. I think the position is such that this is not the case now — and for the two reasons already cited: because the new ideology is explicitly concerned with values, and because there is so evidently now more than one ideology to choose from. I think that the future is such that even if an ideology attractive to young people arises that has absolutely no concern with values and thus tending not to encourage real adolescence — even if this happened, the rate of social change is now such that homogeneous cultural consolidation on one ideology and sort of identity is now impossible in Western nations.

In many ways the 1950s were exceptional — most especially in America — in that although there was very fast social change, there somehow did not seem to be. Engaging in a bit of historical speculation for a moment, it seems to me that it was believed at that time that some endpoint had been reached — the golden age, the triumph of the American way of life, the elimination of all poverty in the affluent society, and the end of ideology — there was nothing left to argue about. Not unconnected with this was an increasing "psychologization" (if I may call it that) that had been going on for decades in America. (I am equating the cultural climate of Canada with that of the United States for this time — because I think it is justified.) Ever since Freud, and perhaps because of the "individualistic" ethos of the country anyway, popular culture had come to see human behaviour in more and more
psychological terms. Some of the movies of Alfred Hitchcock suffused with pop-psychoanalysis illustrate this beautifully. The result was that perception of behaviour was "psychologized" and seen in "inner" terms -- to the exclusion of any possible social factors bearing on it. People smoked marijuana because they had had inadequate father-figures, and so on. All social problems -- unemployment, unhappy marriages, non-conventional political beliefs -- were because the individual was "maladjusted". Any perception of the possible importance of social factors seemed to be quite lacking. An example from Friedenberg illustrates this: "When something goes wrong between the student and the school, it is usually assumed that it is the youngster, rather than the relationship or the school itself that needs to be adjusted." The result for adolescence was as Bennett Berger described it. "Adolescents are naturally preoccupied with their developing capacities for intimacy and tenderness and intense subjective experiences, and by their need for self-esteem and the clarification of experience. But the school subverts all this -- it confuses, humiliates, hands out guilt and anxiety (especially over sex), and the result is that maturity becomes redefined as 'adjustment'."

If I may play the historian for just one more paragraph -- I think the events of the 1960s were such as to bring about an increasing "sociologization" in society towards the way behaviour is perceived. Almost rapidly, and especially in the mass media, the way of looking at particular human events has switched from a primarily psychological to a primarily sociological perspective. Whereas before it was the
social background that was taken-for-granted and the individual who was the "explanatory" device -- because he was "maladjusted", etc., now it is much closer to being the individual who is put in brackets and the society which is cited in explanation. Perhaps an extreme example of this was the reaction to an American soldier who a few years ago murdered at least 22 women and children in Vietnam -- an incredible number of people would not believe that it was "really" his fault -- it was the fault of "the Army" or "the politicians" or "war itself" -- anything, in fact, other than the individual moral responsibility of he who did the murdering. Less extreme, and perhaps fairer examples of this sociologization of society can be seen, again, in the sort of movies that are commonly produced now criticizing social conditions and aspects of society that one cannot imagine being even noticed by American cinema ten years ago.

Now I am prepared to admit that this sociologization of perception is more pervasive in the mass media than among the population in general, but to my mind it definitely represents the societal trend. And the (as already stated) complex position of the mass media is such that what it presents is influenced by developments in society and reciprocally influences the developments themselves. The fact that there is no longer the fair degree of cultural homogeneity there seemed ten years ago is picked up and magnified by the mass media such as to increase that cultural differentiation. One of the reasons for this "sociologization" of perspective in society is that there so clearly are differing and widespread weltanschauungs in society. The media,
in spite of one tendency to distort information in a particular and uniform way by virtue of the fact that it is controlled by those with vested interests, has an even stronger tendency to give maximum exposure (which usually results, inadvertently perhaps, in a romanticization) to the differences and cleavages and conflicts in society. This means that the differences in ideology and so on are magnified even more, and the sociologization of perspective is reinforced.

The majority of those I interviewed unquestionably did not see the rules of society as being, let us say, "out there". They did not take the definitions of reality of the media, or adults, or the school, at face value. They had a conception of the relativization of social rules that I believe was not held by those adolescents dealt with by Douvan and Adelson, Coleman, Douglas, and so on. Now this obviously has enormous consequences for the process of adolescence. If this sociologization of perception is a feature of rapidly changing society subject to very high exposure to mass media -- and I believe this is now a necessary feature of such a society -- then Erikson's cultural consolidation becomes very unstable. It can be achieved, and obviously for an enormous number it still is, but there is an ever increasing amount of things that people must "not see" in order to do this. If this is not achieved then identity formation during adolescence becomes something that will necessarily involve personal struggle. The main point I am making about adolescence, then, is a claim that real adolescence is becoming empirically more common now, and that this situation is likely to be maintained in the foreseeable future.
It is important to make a distinction between being affected by or adopting the new ideology and having a real adolescence. They are not the same thing. Among the fourteen I interviewed there were a few who were having an adolescence and who were not of the new ideology; and there were two who were of the new ideology and were not having a real adolescence. Of the former Bob is an example -- someone who was clearly thinking about things and personally growing but who wanted nothing to do with people he regarded as "idealistic". He did however, interestingly enough, show components of the new ideology in his attitudes to work, marriage, travel, music, and so on. Of the latter I have already commented on the boy who was very influenced by his "drop-out" father and who very much had the new ideology -- but was not having a real adolescence. In general however, and particularly because this new ideology is concerned with morals and principles, there was a relationship between adopting it or being strongly influenced by it, and having a full adolescence. But it is important to keep the distinction in mind.

As a final observation, it is of note that something all writers on adolescence seem to avoid like the plague is its relationship to intelligence -- that is, whether the likelihood of real adolescence varies with intelligence. It was certainly not the case among those I interviewed that those not having an adolescence were less intelligent and vice versa, but intuitively it does not seem unlikely that there would be a relationship here. I do not think Friedenberg's ideal, "sturm und drang", dialectical heroic conflict against society is really
on for a great many youngsters. It is all very well to deal with very intelligent people like Keniston's radicals and their true adolescences (and in fact I believe those I interviewed were of distinctly above average intelligence) -- but for everyone of these there is a corresponding person of that amount below average in intelligence. We may be able to point to factors which hold back the development of intelligence, and we may not be able to measure intelligence well, but it does conform to a normal curve of distribution -- as all attributes of populations of human beings do. What the adolescent process is or can be for these, nobody cares to find out in personal detail it seems. I do not know what the position is here, but I think it is dishonest to ignore it and pretend it does not exist.

This is not an exhaustive theoretical discussion of the problem of adolescence -- I have only used selected works that are germane to the central concerns of the thesis. What I hope I have done overall is, by an initial concern with high school students' orientation to the future, to have delineated certain features of a group of adolescents in a particular social environment, and related the nature of adolescent development to cultural and ideological change.
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