Kubíčková, Miluše

Emergence of the youth phenomenon in modern society and the sociology of youth

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. G, Řada sociálněvědná. 1970, vol. 19, iss. G14, pp. 123-134

SBORNÍK PRACÍ
FILOSOFICKÉ FAKULTY BRNĚNSKÉ UNIVERSITY
1970, G 14

MILUŠE KUBÍČKOVÁ

EMERGENCE OF THE YOUTH PHENOMENON IN MODERN SOCIETY AND THE SOCIOLOGY OF YOUTH

University of Prague

In recent twenty years scientific, social and political institutions throughout the world have been devoting conspicuous attention to the problems of youth. The scientific hypothesis as formulated by the sociology of youth — that in modern society youth constitutes a specific age and social group — obviously has its objective roots.

On the most general level it is possible to state that the discovery of the new social phenomenon and of a hitherto unknown social entity of "Youth" can be traced back to the fundamental demographic and social changes which have been taking place in recent years in connection with the scientific and technological revolution.

The first significant source of the emergence of the Youth phenomenon is the change in the proportion of young people in the total of human population. Even at present the enormous growth of population as a whole is determined to a substantial degree by the numbers of its youngest component. For the whole world there arises a danger of a conflict — not easily to be handled in future — of two trends: the growing numbers of youth with its ever more asserted aspirations to play an independent active role in society, and the trend towards longevity. It is becoming evident even now that once the innovating tendencies of youth find themselves in contradiction with the possibilities afforded by the existing social system, they tend to turn into their opposite — into a tendency to a resigning flight from social norms and values, into scepticism, unrest of mind, or even towards an anarchist romanticism. There sets in a period of various forms of disapproval, criticism and resistance on the part of youth against everything and everyone representing the reppressive force of the functional but dehumanized society.

It appears that not only the existing concern of society for youth and about youth but also the portent of new increasing conflicts of tomorrow may occasionally bring about a certain dramatization and overestimation of the Youth phenomenon. Particularly in relation to the smaller amount of attention hitherto paid to the aged whose numbers have also been steadily growing, the interest accorded to the young generation may appear rather onesided or even exaggerated.

Of course, youth has not become the centre of attention for modern society merely as an increasing age group. Youth is not merely a manifestation of a biological phase of life, it is not exclusively a period of the process of achieving psychological maturity. Neither is it only a transient human provisional makeshift, a kind of imperfect existence that the society designs to take into account only as a temporary evil. The concept of youth is primarily loaded with a social, historical and cultural content. Youth's position in society circumscribed by age, finds actual expression, above all, in the part they take in the various activities in which they prepare themselves for independent social life. In addition, it is particularized as to their specific reactions and responses to social and historical connections of reality experienced by them simultaneously. These are the factors that tend to mould young people into one group with a characteristic social and generational syndrome, into a social system of youth, and, at the same time, into the young generation. The social system of youth is distinguished by specific juvenile activities making up in their total the subculture of youth. The concept of youth possesses, above all, a social content, becoming a social value solely in relation to society as a whole. Without relating the problems of youth to the problems of the system of the entire society, any deliberations on youth are devoid of sense. That is why only a bilateral view of the sociology of education and the sociology of youth, as a double-aspect discipline proceeding in one case from the relation of "society towards youth" and in the other from the relation of "youth towards society", is able to decipher the complicated structure represented by the category of youth.

Another, though a far more significant, source of the emergence of the youth phenomenon in the modern world thus appears to be the changes in its social status. In trying to explain the problems connected with youth we are not likely to do with the current psychological answer to the effect that its bias to a critical attitude to the existing social system and to radical actions is an expression merely of a heightened state of unrest and tension in the psychological set-up of young people, as the process of the psychobiological and sociopolitical growing is a contradictory and a discontinuous one. To set down and encompass all conclusions is a difficult task. While endeavouring to describe the most significant changes we shall not be able to speak — even on the general level — of the world youth in general. Thus we will apply our general conclusions, at the most, to the youth in economically advanced countries where the determining factor of social growth is to be sought for in the tendencies to a general industrialization, technization, to making labouring processes gradually more scientific but also more standardized, to a rationalization and even formalization of all social processes. Though these processes assert themselves unevenly and in contradictory ways inside the respective actual communities, it is in their entirety that they determine more or less universally the social reality and processes not excepting social activities of youth.

A serious attendant phenomenon of the present civilization changes appears to be the general embarrassment about the model of contemporary young man or woman that has never been fully solved yet; especially not with regard to the relationship between the autonomous, creative and individualizing aspects of his personality and the conforming, adaptable, passive, sociable aspect. The excessive increase in the number of stimuli for a non-authentic orientation of people in the economically advanced countries, including the intensifying process

of education making for adaptation, even for blind conformity, impedes actual social changes, and has been the source of the main contradictions and tensions in modern society.

It appears that the jointly shared feature which seems to have prevailed in present-day society — whether in its socialistic or capitalistic variant — is the fact that individual and group interests are being gradually suppressed, sometimes even to an unbearable minimum. It looks as if society were persistently being reduced to one dimension: to the dimension of institutional claims, of external control and manipulation of man, unfree in one way or another, who is either passive and accordingly irresponsible, or wages an open struggle against the sources of alienation and manipulation (cf. e. g. the New Students' Left becoming active in the last few years).

In an effort to make it possible to compare and make use of everything that is socially identical, or similar, in youth, sociology takes into account the general social conditioning of phenomena. The universal social conditions, and thus also analogical features in youth, have been on the increase, particularly in consequence of the gradual linking of formerly isolated and remote parts of the world through modern communication media. It is in this sense that the sociological method referred to as the "globalizing" approach to youth appears to be justified and substantiated.[1] This approach represents a view that is very general, and thus also extremely sketchy, mediated, and relatively remote from actual youth. At the same time, however, it is a view that is most profound, most penetrating, and most substantial, one which is capable of encompassing more than mere isolated particularities in the lives of young people, especially the relationships between the individual subgroups of youth and youth as a structural part of the society as a whole. It is capable of identifying the trends and tendencies, the possibilities of youth as a global social group. After all, we are not able to speak about having apprehended anything except after having incorporated it into some kind of connection, after having confined it by some kind of relationship (J. L. Fischer).[2]

Of course, to limit one's efforts in theory and practice to applying this much too generalizing approach while disregarding the inner multiple differentiation of youth would mean to remain — on the surface of things, and to jeopardize the possibility of utilizing the results of science for the benefit of actual very differentiated youth as well as for the benefit of a harmonious relationship between youth and society. If it is to acquire a thorough knowledge of the extremely varied activities and value orientations of youth, their actual working conditions, their conditions for study, for life, their genuine possibilities of participating in public and political life, etc., sociology cannot do merely with discovering and considering the universal aspects in the lives of youth people. Nevertheless, a large part of sociological statements have hitherto submitted what amounted rather to findings on youth in general as though the latter were

---

[1] Kubíčková, M.: *Typologie hodnotových, zvláště politických orientací vysokoškolských studentů* (A Typology of Value, Particularly of Political Orientations of University Students), a Thesis for the Degree of Candidate of Sociological Sciences (Institute of Marxism-Leninism, Charles University) 1968, pp. 26—31.
Kubíčková, M.: "Dva přístupy k řešení problematiky mládeže" (Two Approaches to the Solution of Problems of Youth), *Mládež a společnost*, 1969, No. 2.

[2] Fischer, J. L.: *Filosofické studie* (Studies in Philosophy), Prague, 1968, p. 15.

not in fact differentiated and varied in quality. There have been cases when empirical findings obtained only about one part of youth have been generalized in an inadmissible way to include the entire youth. A partial experience in its generalized form can begin to play the role of a new pattern of behaviour, of new social factors, and regulatives. However, in the case of an "unauthorized" generalization of an individual finding, this may give rise to a false consciousness concerning youth and, at the same time, to a wrong pattern in youth's behaviour. These, in their turn, tend to retard the process of getting acquainted with the problems of the actual youth in a concrete society in all its multiple variety, thus making it difficult to create an effective set of conditions for giving scope and creating development prerequisites for young people as well as for subgroups of youth.

Particularly after World War II, there has been a tremendous increase (to begin with primarily in the Western world) in scientific attempts to throw light on the social maturing of youth, on the creation of their social functions, social attitudes, as well as the specific juvenile subcultures. In addition, a period of most varied general theories of youth, sometimes even of an excessively simplified "labelling", has set in. Reference has been made to generations labelled sceptical, angry, beat, silent, generations of uncommitted and alienated young people, others being dubbed a "cool generation", or the psychodelic flower generation of "hippies", and so on. One single manifest feature, or an aggregate of analogical features, coming to the fore in one part of youth has been generalized to include the whole of youth, thus fulfilling the role of an artificially created generational syndrome which in its turn feeds back on the entire youth and in a certain sense tends to integrate it in a derived way.

Unless this "globalizing" view of sociology on youth is supplemented and verified by ever new empirical findings on actual subgroups of youth as well as on individual young people, it might give rise to a kind of myth of unreal youth instead of a scientifically grounded analysis. Provided the sociologist takes an account of other social and psychological factors that determine the status and behaviour of youth in society, and not merely of the age and generation affiliation or of the general share in the preparatory activities, he transcends the "globalizing" approach, for in that case he is applying a method referred to in sociology as the differential approach to youth.[2a]

What are the most general conclusions drawn from the method of a "globalizing" approach to youth?

(1) Sociologists often speak of a change in the status of youth in modern society particularly in connection with changes in the family structure and in the functions of the family. Children in the family are being brought up in an ever more democratic spirit of mutual partnership relations, and very soon they tend to develop the need for independence of their parents and of any kind of authority. The democratic need for partnership relations becomes transferred and extended to spheres outside school, to school itself, and to other contacts with adults, sometimes leading even to an exaggerated devaluation of the value of authority.

(2) What has often been pointed out is the limited degree of preparedness of

---

[2a] Kubíčková, M., *op. cit.*

the traditional institutions to cope with the growing demands of a technicized and purposefully oriented social machinery; this applies in particular to schools,[3] but also to other institutions provided for youth. Generally, social institutions and organizations are not capable to filtrate, let alone to paralyze, all society contradictions percolating — sometimes with an absolute ruthlessness — to young people. It appears that for instance, the growing restlessness of students in most industrialized countries is due, above all, to contradictions and conflicts of the global society transferred to the universities and their entire living environment. As a rule, radical groups of university students are opposed to authoritarianism and bureaucratism of institutions, to a situation in which the individual and the group are powerless vis-à-vis the dehumanized institutions (e. g. to mamoth universities, the so-called multiversities), to a situation of a powerless position of social groups vis-à-vis the ruling groups, etc. Another source of dissatisfaction of the students is the way in which modern society overlooks the fact they are grown-up people who through their studies extend in an ever more significant way the economic and cultural wealth of the whole society, and who have a right to be heard on essential social matters. They are dissatisfied because the objectively altered position of higher educational establishments in modern society has practically failed to improve their study conditions, having rather made their lives more difficult and complicated.

In consequence of the above circumstances all groups of youth have developed a powerful urge for associating with their co-evals[4] outside social institutions and organizations, a need to assert themselves in specific activities, the total of which constitutes particular, relatively independent, subcultures of youth and of their subgroups. A special place appears to be taken by the specific inclination to music, the contemporary musical genres being an important social factor integrating the youth throughout the world.

(3) When compared with preceding generations young people now, on the average, start working, or being economically independent, later. Particularly in the economically advanced countries most young people tend to study at secondary schools, and an ever increasing proportion continue their studies at colleges and universities. This positive tendency has recently been counteracted by an entirely opposite tendency, e. g. in the United States the number of those young people who drop out of their studies has tended to increase. The drop-outs then solve the problem of independence in a specific way by taking refuge in special communities of hippies, etc.

The deferred entry of growing numbers of young people into professional life can be regarded as progress, yet, at the same time, it does prolong the economic and social dependence on the parents and society. The ever longer waiting for complete independence leads to isolation of the young inside society, and keeps them in a situation where they may feel they are being charged with duties properly belonging to adults, while being at the same time denied those rights and responsibilities attached to such duties. A particularly high degree

---

[3] Macháček, L.: "Mládež a demokratizácia vzdelania v socialistickej spoločnosti" (Youth and the Democratization of Education in Socialist Society), in: *Sociológia mládeže* (Sociology of Youth), Bratislava, 1969.

[4] Čečetka, J.: "K otázke mládeže ako spoločenskej skupiny" (On the Problem of Youth as a Social Group), in: *Sociológia mládeže* (Sociology of Youth), Bratislava, 1969.

of social tension is caused by the unbalanced relation between psychological maturity and social dependence of university students.

(4) The contradictory nature of the psychological and social process of maturing in young people nowadays is also due to the fact that they tend to participate ever more immediately in all the acts and actions of the adult world, both private (including intimate and sexual) and public. At the same time, they do not possess enough rational knowledge either of themselves or of the relationship between each other as individuals and the group, they are not capable of estimating, in an abstract way, the contradictory and complex character of relationships which permeate them internally and in which they live. Nor have they as yet evolved a capacity for disciplined self-control, or even for selective and purposeful behaviour. It is chiefly due to the mass communication media and to the excessive yet unclassified flow of information that youth in the modern world is constantly confronted with situations which it is not able to master either rationally or emotionally.

Modern society seems to be successful in everything but shaping the best that exists potentially in youth as a regenerating social force and a reserve of progress. If one proceeds from the sociological definition of education in a relatively stabilized society (I. A. Bláha),[5] then to educate means to create optimal conditions for giving scope to releasing the possibilities of development in youth, their guidance and moulding under the social norm. Education is a system of conscious and methodical activities that correlate with social norms and objectives. Of course, education in modern society is a sum total of ever more numerous and more contradictory currents — education at school, in the family, the influence of the work environments, of mass communication media, of the youth subculture and of other factors. The complexity of the situation results from the fact that all these educational and formative currents in their totality often work at cross purposes and combat one another, that it is only rarely that they make up a structurized system of purposeful activities. This is aggravated by the constant objective increase of scientific discoveries and findings, and by the intensification of yet hard to be defined claims of the social apparatus. Subjectively, education is made more difficult as "an orderly functioning under the norm" (I. A. Bláha)[5] by the grave circumstance that the bearers of education as well as the creators of the conceptions have themselves passed through a number of stages of the devaluation of all values. Several times in their active life social norms, and the intire social ethos, have changed. This is why it has hardly been possible to reckon with not even relatively stable systems of values and systems of norms under which as though under a rationally substantiated, but at the same time internalized, order it would be possible to educate people. In spite of all the complexity and contradictoriness in the position of youth in modern society[6] both empirical and scientifically verified experience gained over the

[5] Bláha, I. A.: *Sociologie,* Prague 1969, pp. 290—293.

[5a] I. A. Bláha, *op. cit.*

[6] The contradictions in the social position of youth have unfortunately not been solved even by societies with socialistic production relations. The originally assumed, almost automatic predomination of value orientation to activities in favour of the collectivity has proved utopian. In addition, a man who is merely bound to be responsible to the collectivity without having decided himself to bear this responsibility, generally rejects this responsibility as being a burden on him. (On this subject see Jodl, M.: "Svoboda a odpovědnost" [Freedom and Responsibility], in: *Literární listy,* Nr. 6, 1967.)

last sixty years has recorded an increase in the social activity of youth, frequently assuming the form of social unrest and spontaneous discontent. Youth has actually become an enlivening, revitalizing, sometimes even alarming, force of social dynamism.

It is our belief that youth has ever been a reserve of social dynamics, but in itself, merely thanks to its biological age, youth need not necessarily be progressively dynamic. Josef Čapek once wrote that youth bears within itself the impulse for changing things, and by its reforming acts wished to shift history forward, and to sweep away their fathers" mistakes: "There have always been such in whom the revolt turns into a creative act though in many others who, in addition, cannot cope with their tasks, it reverts into mere hatred... Youth is not to be indifferent, I should say that in its conquering advance it is always right... And it is its fate that it never has the whole of truth... It is youth's lot that while being right it should always be wrong in its pride..."[7]

Thus youth is only a potential factor of rebirth in social life. What matters is the type of society and the set of conditions that the society is capable to create for giving scope to, encouraging, guiding and creatively shaping, the latent social energy of youth. It depends primarily on the society itself whether its social institutions and the people in charge of them manage to discover the development potential of youth both as individuals and as groups, to evaluate it correctly, and to mobilize and mould it into a new social value; or wether this potential will remain hidden and neutralized, or will even be suppressed, wasted, destroyed or falsified. It is in the interest of a dynamic development of each society to acquire the art of listening to youth, to create democratic conditions for young people in which they would not only be permitted to formulate their needs and desires, but also capable of doing so. When in a society there have been no possibilities for people's democratic participation for a long time, then not even the most democratic institutions will be utilized immediately and to the full. One cannot learn democracy overnight, democracy cannot be given as a present, democracy must be wished for, it must become a value. It depends on the structure of political and educational institutions whether society succeeds in directing its attention to those qualities, needs, and social activities of youth that correlate with the objective trend of social progress. This is in harmony with the general thesis that the historical alternative of modern society shall be the outcome of the releasing and liberating of all internal potentialities and of the forces of participating individuals and groups.[8] No doubt, youth is one of these latent sources of social dynamics which are inherent in every society. It is often in the tense social situations that the possibility of further development of a social system depends on its ability to free and mobilize all its latent reserves.[9]

One can make the general observation that the behaviour of youth is affected by the degree of tension resulting from the relationship between the measure of

---

[7] Čapek, J.: *Kulhavý poutník* (The Limping Pilgrim), Prague, 1937, p. 124, quoted from Sindelář, J.: *Co řeší filosofická antropologie* (What Problems Are Solved by Philosophical Anthropology), Prague, 1966, p. 107.

[8] Marcuse, H.: *One-Dimensional Man*, Boston, 1966, p. 265.

[9] Mannheim, K.: "The Problem of Youth in Our Society", in: *Diagnosis of Our Time*, London, 1943, p. 32.

adaptability on the part of the social system and the volume of the innovating endeavours and expectations on the part of youth.[10] A youth replete with innovating endeavours can be a socially undesirable and dysfunctional element that is bound to evoke concern in a society with a system endowed only with a limited capacity for absorbing the demands and suggestions for social changes and innovations. As a rule, critical youth in its efforts aimed at improving the given social conditions in a society of a static, inadaptable type is not understood, being neutralized or even suppressed. It is no wonder then that it turns to a permanent source of unrest, or that it tends to adopt radical means, or else it turns away from the system and creates its own world of alienated youth.

On the other hand, a similarly critical youth in a society possessing an essentialy dynamic social order, capable of absorbing a series of social changes without impairing its substance, is generally regarded as a socially eufunctional element, as one of the outstanding elements making for social progress. In this sociological conception of the so-called reciprocal relationship between youth and society,[11] youth is taken into account as an adequately self-governing social subject whose social involvement is conceived as a kind of correlative of the dynamics and openness of the social system. Perhaps the greatest art, pedagogical as well as statesmanlike, of the present times would be to create such a set of conditions which would manage not only to give scope to the developmental possibilities of individual young men and women, but which would be capable of multiplying and heightening this new energy and of raising it to a new order of things. It is only then that the same set of social conditions, objectivized into a system of upbringing and education, would be in a position to guide young people in a purposeful way, and to shape them into personalities and groups of a higher type; under these conditions alone it would be possible to speak of a deliberate, methodical and, above all, effective education of youth.

As already mentioned, in sociology problems of youth can be examined on the most general level either in the terms of youth's status as a global age group that is determined by the activities serving to prepare it for independent life in society and characterized by a common generational syndrome. Or it is possible to base one's deliberations on the differentiated position of youth in society given primarily by the specific nature of its share in the structure of social activities: in the first, i. e. the globalizing approach, we were working with a category of youth that had a relatively wide extent and a narrow content, while when applying the second, i. e. the differentiating approach, we were working with less general categories of subgroups of youth — e. g. of young students, young workers, etc. — which had a relatively wide content and a narrow extent.

The question to be asked here is what further substantial sociological criteria there are, apart from the feature of age, of generation, and of general preparatory activities. These can be seen, above all, in the activity performed by members of the group in the given social structure. A system of activities always has a specific and differentiated structure. The group-forming factor of the first order is just the very specific character of the structure of activities which

---

[10] Baumann, Z.: "The Polish Youth and Politics", the *IPSA Conference,* Geneva, 1964, p. 4.
[11] Mannheim, K.: *Ibid.*, p. 44.
Kubíčková, M.: *Op. cit.*, p. 38.

differentiate youth into a whole series of concrete subgroups. It is obvious how difficult it is to ensure the operation of this group-forming feature, and to maintain a structurized approach to youth, if it is known to us merely as a global social macrogroup, affected by all the universal social changes. As a matter of fact, not infrequently the differentiating factors tend to modify all general features and manifestations of youth in a very pronounced way, and stratify the global set into numerous subgroups. In particular for the purpose of a practical application of the achievements of science for the benefit of youth a useful purpose is served by taking account of the basic differentiating features, for problems of young people who are still students and of those who are already working are different in quality; besides there is also a difference between problems confronting girls and those confronting boys, and those facing youth in large cities and in small localities, etc.

Nevertheless, the weight and significance of these differentiating factors of social character are not constant, they grow in proportion to the degree of maturity achieved in the adolescent process; they are altered also according to the concrete social and political situation.

The older the young people are, the more do biological and psychological motivations associated with them tend to recede into the background, while stimuli of social nature tend to increase. By entering the structure of professions, or of corresponding preparatory institutions (specialized and vocational schools) young people find themselves in new social positions, acquire new social statuses which largely modifies the general social situation. This is why in the sociology of youth a growing importance is being acquired by those forms of approach and methods which involve youth with a concrete social determination, differentiated analyses of subsets of youth, in order to furnish — after being supplemented with a "globalizing" incorporation into a system of relationship — as profound and comprehensive picture as possible of present-day youth, of its status in society, of its activities, value orientations, needs, interests, etc.

*

It is necessary also to point out the changes in the structure of the sociological discipline itself which originally dealt with the problems of youth in society. Until quite recently it was only the discipline referred to as the sociology of education, or pedagogical sociology, that used to appear in the classification of the components of sociology connected with problems of youth.[12] The concept of sociology of youth is quite a recent one, and the theoretical relationship between the contents of research undertaken by the sociology of education and that one done by sociology of youth has not yet been satisfactorily solved. We believe these two internally linked disciplines to express but two structural aspects of one and the same problem. The isolation and relative autonomy

---

[12] G a l l a, K.: *Úvod do sociologie výchovy* (Introduction to the Sociology of Education), Prague, 1967, p. 99.
K a h u d a, F.: "Problémy marxistické sociologie mládeže" (Problems of a Marxist Sociology of Youth), in: *Výchovný poradce* (The Educational Advisor), 1965, p. 4: F. Kahuda is the first of the Czech sociologists of the older generation to speak also of the sociology of Youth, though classifying it as one of the scientific branches of "pedagogical sociology, i. e. the sociology of the education of children, youth as well as adults . . .".

acquired by the scientific discipline of the sociology of youth represents a modified reflection of the objective shifts in the points of view with regard to youth. In the sociology of education youth is expected primarily to play the role of the object of education and of the shaping, moulding processes.

What the sociology of education deals with is the analysis of the set of social conditions — both objective and subjective — and of processes that lead both spontaneously and in a deliberate way to discovering, to releasing, encouraging, guiding and shaping the development possibilities of a young individual as well as of groups of young people. I. A. Bláha[13] regards education as a segment of a complex system of external stimuli which are particularized by the feature of planned, purposeful, deliberate and methodical actions; it operates in the direction from an older, adult and more highly developed individual (father, mother, teacher, master) to an individual that is younger, immature, less developed, i. e. from a guiding individual to an individual in need of guidance. Howerer, not even Bláha's conception of education excludes the approach to youth as being a co-participant in its own education; even in his conception the acknowledgement of youth as also a subject of education is implied. Even the individual — says Bláha — while subject to external influence can affect himself in a conscious and deliberate way in the sense of a definite notion of a higher development of his existing ego that requires this kind of selfguidance aspiring to a higher stage of development.[14] Yet not even Bláha — like most of the other sociologists of the older generation[15] — used explicity the frame of reference represented by a sociology of youth beside the frame of reference of the sociology of education.[16]

Nevertheless, in characterizing the education as a complex social process this activity is apprehended as a multidimensional structure, as a correlation between the set of the formative conditions and the set of the youth being formed. There is a possibility of coming to conceive both the dimensions of one complex structure as a starting-point and foundation of two relatively independent sociological disciplines, as two kinds of approach to the same social reality: once from the point of view of education aimed from society to youth as an object to be educated and shaped; the second time, from the point of view of youth as a subject of education also capable of self-guidance, self-regulation and self-formation, moreover, one making ever more determined efforts at an adequate and acknowledged participation in the structure of social activities. The fact that the sociology of youth has constituted iself as yet another relatively independent sociological discipline corresponds with the objective emergence of the social phenomenon of Youth in the advanced industrial societies of the sixties. It is a reflection of one structural feature of modern society represented by the manifest aspirations of practically all subgroups of youth to play a more useful and recognized role in society.

---

[13] Bláha, I. A.: *op. cit.*, p. 296.
[14] Bláha, I. A.: *op. cit.*, p. 291.
[15] Galla, K.: *op. cit.*
[16] Čečetka, J.: *op. cit.*: "He is actually the first of the generation of Slovak sociologists to recognize sociology of youth as an independent discipline which merely overlaps with the sociology of education without being engulfed by it. He does not restrict sociology of youth only to education but to the life of youth in its entirety."

The relation between the scientific objectives of the two sociological disciplines — the sociology of education and the sociology of youth — which though linked within the system are virtually independent, is a modified expression of the reciprocal relation between the global system of society and the subsystem of youth. To take a due account of both the structural interdependence[17] and the structural differentiation of both the sociology of youth and the sociology of education forms a basic methodological starting-point for the investigation of the problems of youth as well as to a successful solution of practical questions of young people's lives. This statement is to be applied to the theoretical front which has not as yet become united by any structural relationship and which has been dealing with the problems of youth from most varied aspects, but also to the activities of all institutions desirous of solving the problems of youth in a practical way without being sufficiently interconnected to form a structure that would accord with the objective structurization of youth and of its problems in society.[18]

EMERGENCE JEVU MLÁDEŽE V MODERNÍ SPOLEČNOSTI A SOCIOLOGIE MLÁDEŽE

Hypotéza zformulovaná sociologií, že v moderní společnosti se mládež seskupuje ve specifickou věkovou a sociální skupinu, vychází z objektivních danností: z danności demografické, neboť nyní ohromný růst lidské populace je podstatně určen narůstáním její nejmladší složky; především pak z danností sociologických, souvisejících se sociálními a ekonomickými změnami novodobé společnosti. Mládež se nestala středem pozornosti společenských institucí a společenské vědy pouze jako rostoucí sociální seskupení, neboť její pozice ohraničená věkem, je konkretizována především podílem na různých činnostech, v nichž se připravuje na samostatný společenský život. Mládež v sociologickém pojetí je složitou strukturou s převážně společenským obsahem, včleněnou do dominantní struktury celospolečenské.

Změny v sociálně ekonomických procesech vyvolaly v industriální společnosti (kapitalistického i socialistického typu) posuny ve společenském postavení mládeže i v jejich hodnotových orientacích. Obecně lze konstatovat, že společnost zvyšuje nároky na přizpůsobivé složky člověka a dostává se do konfliktu s rostoucími aspiracemi mládeže — zvláště jejich vzdělanějších a informovanějších podskupin — po samostatných společensky uznaných společenských činnostech.

Všestranné poznání složité struktury mládeže je podmíněno vyvážením příliš zevšeobecňujícího globalizujícího sociologického přístupu přístupem v sociologii nazvaným diferencujícím, který respektuje sociální a psychologickou rozrůzněnost mládeže. Bez doplňování konkrétními poznatky z empirických studií diferencovaných podskupin mládeže by mohla být vědecká analýza konkrétní mládeže nahrazena mýtem o nepravé mládeži. Zdá se, že nové společnosti se v žádné její konkrétní variantě doposud nepodařilo realizovat podmínky k uvolnění latentních možností mládeže. Definice I. A. Bláhy o výchovné činnosti jako o vytváření optimálních podmínek pro uvolňování vývojových možností mládeže, pro jejich vedení a utváření pod společenskou normou, hraje i v současných poměrech roli axiologického postulátu. S Bláhovým pojetím výchovy jako řádového fungování pod normou a s J. L. Fischerovým konceptem skladebné školy uvnitř skladebného systému — školy přesahující dosavadní kumulativnost výchovy a výuky — ostře kontrastují strukturálně nesčleněné a mimo jakýkoli řád či skladebný souvztah se prosazující proudy vnějšího působení. Tato skutečnost společně se stále složitějším společenským postavením mládeže 60. let způsobuje vzestup aktivity

[17] Fischer, J. L.: *Pedagogické stati* (Studies in Pedagogy), Prague, 1969, p. 35.

[18] Kubíčková, M.: "Mládež a dnešní společnost" (Youth and Present-Day Society), in: *Nová mysl*, N. 3, 1969. (This article was the original broader basis to be altered and modified with aggreement of the editor into the issue here presented.

motivované nespokojeností, berouci na sebe podobu společenského neklidu a spontánního nesouhlasu mladých lidí. Záleží na mechanismech daného typu společnosti, zda je schopna vytvořit soubor podmínek nejen pro uvolnění, ale i tvořivé utváření latentní společenské energie mládeže. Je v zájmu rozvoje harmonicky sčleněné společnosti umět naslouchat mládeži a vytvořit podmínky, v nichž by nejen směla, ale i uměla své potřeby a tužby formulovat. Jednání mládeže je ovlivňováno stupněm napětí plynoucím ze vztahu míry adaptability společenského systému a objemu inovačních snah a nároků mládeže. Největším pedagogickým a státnickým uměním je vytvořit předpoklady ke zmnožení uvolněné energie jednotlivých podskupin mládeže a k jejímu povýšení na aktivity vyššího řádu.

Změny v postavení mládeže jako celku i jejích podskupin jako skladebných složek a stále zřetelnější nároky na možnosti sebeuplatnění vyvolaly strukturální přeměny samostatné sociologické disciplíny zabývající se výchovou mládeže. Sociologie výchovy se zabývá výchovou jako — dle I. A. Bláhy — výsekem složité soustavy vnějších podnětů, které jsou ozvláštněny znakem plánovitosti, cílevědomosti, úmyslnosti i metodičnosti, tj. působením společenských podmínek a výtvorů na mladého člověka jako objekt výchovy. Jakmile však mládež začala působit výrazněji i jako subjekt společenského pohybu a nositel sebevýchovy (což je možné jen proto, že se prodloužilo rozpětí "mladých let" v důsledku nároků nové společnosti na dlouhodobější činnostní přípravu), vyjevila se i potřeba nové sociologické disciplíny, sociologie mládeže. Jestliže sociologie výchovy sleduje působení na mládež jako na utvářený objekt, sociologie mládeže sleduje mládež jako subjekt výchovy a jiných společenských činností. Konstituování sociologie mládeže jako disciplíny souvztažné k sociologii výchovy odpovídá emergenci nového fenoménu 60. let — fenoménu sociální, vnitřně diferencované skupiny mládeže.