Chapter 2
Socialization in Sociological Perspectives

Abstract The chapter outlines the basic concepts and theories of socialization in sociology, and relates them to different arenas and agents of socialization, ranging from family and peers to modern media. The chapter examines socialization in light of social structures, social class and cultural patterns, emphasizing the strength of the culture of the taken-for-granted, as well as the child as an active subject constructing meaning in a variety of contexts. Socialization is related to development and learning as well as to children's well-being.

Keywords Sociology · Play · Primary socialization · Secondary socialisation · Childhood · Meaning · Cultural discourses

2.1 Socialization, Social Structure and Cultural Patterns

Studies of childhood have gradually come to underscore the social position of children as children (Qvortrup 2009); a child is positioned at the intersection of childhood, class, gender and ethnicity, all framed by societal formations. Socialization is influenced by the structural positions of children and by the cultural patterns related to various positions. Cultural and social phenomena can be understood as "social facts" (Durkheim 1938); norms, values and cultural beliefs are carried by individuals, but are understood to exist independently of individuals. Culture acts as an objective external "social reality"; children are born into languages, values, ideas and beliefs that socialization transforms into an inner reality (Berger and Luckmann 1966). The concepts of internalization and the unconscious, both derived from psychoanalysis, provided sociology with a theory of how culture could be translated into intrinsic motivation without touching conscious awareness. Parents transmit cultural patterns to their children, and their shadows live on

in the children as unconscious norms, beliefs and imaginations. The non-conscious transmission of cultural patterns can also be related to the fact that social arrangements as well as patterns of belief are experienced as obvious, as natural. The symbolic power of that which exists is established by *naturalisation,*[1] the taken-for-granted assumption embedded in social structures and cultural patterns.

Socialization as the internalization of a unified culture suited the dominant social understanding of the 1950s and 1960s, when Western societies, to a greater extent than earlier or later, were supposed to socialize everyone into common dominant cultural patterns. This was also the first period of consumerism and mass production; the new wealth often took the form of a standardization of products that many claimed forced everyone into the same mould, as told in the popular song "Little Boxes" popularized by Pete Seeger: "And they're all made out of ticky tacky, And they all look just the same."[2] In Marcuse's (1964) description of the "one-dimensional man," the dominant personality formation is supposed to reflect the rationality of capitalism. The same logic can be found in Adorno's (1991) understanding of mass culture, consumed by a passive, homogenized public that internalizes the values of the culture industry. In these theories, culture is primarily seen as a mechanism that ensures that the dominant cultural patterns are transformed into individual motivation and images. This functionalist perspective is also visible in the interpretation of the new teenage culture that became salient in the 1950s; the risk-oriented and oppositional behaviour of adolescents is understood as part of the development of independence that is functional for society at the macro level (Parsons and Bales 1956). Adolescence is therefore a natural risk-taking period, arising from the necessary development of autonomy. Even if the Sturm und Drang[3] was understood as "natural," the riskiness of the period was also rooted in the lack of ritualization of the transition from childhood to adulthood, entailing that young people had to create their own risky rituals (Bloch and Niederhoffer 1958).

In sociological understanding, institutions are at the core of socialization processes. Schools and preschools impart knowledge of basic historical and cultural relationships, and their institutional practises convey cultural patterns and values; they also influence socialization by relating to gender, class and ethnicity in various ways. Educational institutions also represent universalistic criteria that apply to the wider society; everyone should in principle be treated equally. Other institutions, like organizations related to culture and sports, and increasingly the media, also fulfil important functions in the socialization process. Legal frameworks and institutions that allow the enforcement of sanctions influence socialization both as formal rules and as signifiers of the existence of the social and society.

---

[1]Bourdieu (1977, p. 164): "Every established order tends to produce the naturalization of its own arbitrariness."

[2]Written by Malvina Reynolds in 1962.

[3]Sturm und Drang refers to a German movement putting stress on "free" emotional expressions; named after Friedrich Maximilian von Klinger's play, first performed in 1777.

Some texts emphasize that the primary function of socialization is the acquisition and internalization of shared morals and common normative patterns. This perspective includes the concept of "social deviance," the violation of formal or informal cultural norms. Some traditional parts of sociology saw deviance as an important characteristic of certain individuals; criminals, single mothers, homosexuals or others who broke dominant and naturalised norms belonged to deviant groups, and the study of deviance was an extensive field in sociology. The concept of "countercultures" illustrated some of the same assumptions about a common culture to which some youth were in opposition. As societies gradually have come to be understood not as culturally homogeneous but as multicultural and heterogenous, containing complex and sometimes contradictory cultural patterns, the idea of stable deviant categories has gradually dissolved.

2.2 Primary Versus Secondary Socialization[4]

Wikipedia informs us that "primary socialization occurs during childhood and is when a child learns the attitudes, values and actions appropriate to individuals as members of a particular culture. For example if a child heard his/her mother expressing a discriminatory opinion about a minority group, then that child may think this was acceptable and could continue to have that opinion about minority groups."[5] According to this statement, *primary socialization* refers to the internalization of the fundamental culture and ideas of a society; it shapes the norms, values and beliefs of the child at a time when it has little understanding of the world and its different phenomena, and the basic socialization agent moulding the child is the family. As the example also illustrates, primary socialization in the family might provide the child with understandings that are not in accord with the dominant cultural viewpoint; thus, primary socialization only mirrors the dominant norms if the family does. Some studies also indicate that family climate and forms of upbringing as such do not have a strong formative effect on the child's personality (Harris 1998; Kagan 1998), as long as we keep within the normal range of family behaviour. That siblings often are different from one another also indicates that the family does not mould children into the same form (Plomin and Daniels 1987; Hetherington et al. 1994). But the family does influence the acquisition of linguistic styles and cultural patterns which is understood as part of primary socialization.

The claim that the family and family position overshadow everything else in the lives of children is now being called into question since so many children spend

---

[4]The concept of re-socialization refers to socialization back into non-deviant cultures; that is, the return to life outside the institutions where someone has spent a long period of time; it can also mean socialization *into* organisations or institutions. Re-socialization is not part of the perspective of this book.

[5]http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Primary_socialization.

their day in pre-school, are surrounded by peers, and have access to various media; that is, even small children have sources of input other than their parents. Modern Western upbringing, which emphasizes independence and the development of the child's own voice as an ideal, also breaks with the traditional idea of the transfer of rigid norms from parents to children. In the classical theory of socialization the family represented the voice of the wider homogeneous society; in the modern heterogeneous society the primary agents in the socialization of children are likely to vary with subgroup and ethnicity. While classical sociological theories, which rested on the industrial societies, understood primary socialization as the basic culturalization (that was postulated to take place in the same way among all), the knowledge societies also emphasize the acquisition of basic competencies as part of primary socialization. The increased importance of competencies entails a need for normative assessments related to primary socialization; every child is not ensured the required level of basic competence even though primary socialization always takes place.

In sociological theorizing, primary socialization was implicitly understood as taking place in the family and during the first part of childhood. In this perspective the socialising agents in the primary process are the parents, especially the mother. *Secondary socialization* came later and was related to agents as significant others, educational institutions and the media. However, if we relate socialization agents to their function and position in the socialization processes, the categories into which they fit can be seen as more fluid, others than the parents can also be defined as filling primary functions. While general sociological theory puts the importance of peers in adolescence, particularly in relation to deviant group socialization (see, e.g., Cohen 1955), others argue that peers are at the core of primary socialization since they are at the centre of children's development of self-understanding and identity (see, e.g., Harris 1998).

Secondary socialization is usually carried out by institutions and people in specific roles and positions. For most children the teacher will be a secondary socializing agent, but for some the teacher may have primary functions, which illustrates that the borders between primary and secondary socialization are blurred. Although schools and the dissemination of their curricula in general is understood as part of secondary socialization, in the knowledge-based economies the fundamental numerical and alphabetical skills provided by the schools could also be defined as belonging to primary socialization. The "hidden curriculum"[6] of cultural codes suggests that the major educational institutions influence young people through more than just the mediation of the formal curriculum.

Secondary socialization refers to the acquisition of knowledge and conscious learning, and thus opens for critical reflection, while primary socialization points to the transmission of naturalised cultural patterns. Secondary socialization represents both an input into the wider society and a development of a reflexive capacity related to the naturalised understanding of the primary socialization of early

---

[6]The term was coined by Jackson (1968).

childhood. Some sociologists reinforced this understanding with a concept of *tertiary socialization*, emphasising the development of new understanding by the acquisition of new knowledge (see, e.g., Parsons and Bales 1956). The complex modern landscape illustrates that the distinction between primary and secondary socialization must be understood as an analytical distinction between primary and secondary mechanisms, processes and agents, more than a distinction between the family and the first years of life, and the institutions, media and friends the child faces after the toddler period.

2.3 Socialization Through Role Models and Roles

Parents act as models for their children. That the children of welfare recipients more often than others end up on the dole and that the children of university teachers more often go on to higher education illustrates that life style and social position may be passed down between generations. Although social inheritance may be rooted in genetic profiles and in positions in social structures as well as in the parents' positions as role models, parents are anyway at the core of children's social environment. Parents act not only as models that influence children's future parenting, they convey norms and cultural patterns related to a variety of other roles and contexts. The term "role model" refers to persons or figures representing behaviours or traits emulated by others, as well as to the general cultural patterns carried by the model. Celebrities, frequently cited by young people as role models, illustrate both the specific and general aspects of models: the specific refers to the choice of occupation, style or behaviour, while the general refers to the values, ideologies and attitudes associated with the role model. A term like "gender roles" does not refer to the imitation of specific models, but to gender-specific norms applying to a variety of contexts.

Role models can be near or distant figures, local or media heroes, parents, friends or neighbours. They may be directly imitated or may act as reference groups. "Good" versus "bad" role models are a familiar issue; bad company can lead children in dangerous directions, and many popular culture heroes have been accused of being bad role models. Different cultures and social classes may have different ideas about appropriate models, and the ideologies related to role models change: in the industrial society the ideal mother was the housewife; a few decades later, a mother in Scandinavia without an occupational position could be seen as a bad role model for her children.

In Goffman's perspective (1967, 1959) roles are not only linked to particular positions and contexts, they are also the dramaturgical performance as such, through which the actors seek to convey impressions of themselves and interpretations of the contexts. From the perspective of socialization, children learn to develop their social strategies relative to various contexts, which form arenas of socialization that provide learning by doing. The dynamics of age, gender, class and culture continuously provide new contexts; socialization can be seen

as a movement through a set of changing stages or positions and related roles. Transitions and role patterns are shaped through the social structuring of the life course; some transitions that may look superficial from the outside are seen as important from the inside. The child who emphasizes that there are certain "child-ish" things she no longer does, and justifies this by saying that she is now "a preschool child" (the last year before school starts), in contrast to being a "kinder-garten child", illustrates how positions, transitions and roles that may seem unim-portant to adults are important from the child's perspective. For children, age is a status position that brings norms and expectations, and institutional transitions that follow age underscore the move into new life phases. A new age phase includes new role expectations related to school, associations, sports, peers, etc.; entering new stages and contexts requires new competencies and performances. The same roles also change character with age and contexts: the roles of "friend" and "best friend" vary with age and gender. As related to friendship, socialization is not about the internalisation of general norms, but about a gradual development of val-ues and competencies through practise.

Roles and models are also disseminated through toys and the media. While tra-ditional toys often related to a gallery of factual adult roles, modern toys often point to fantasy universes. Toys and modern media are interwoven; the toy figures appear in TV series and in product lines. The discourses related to dolls and toys, and the introduction of dolls adapted to various religions and cultures, illustrate the concern about the influence of dolls as role models. Dolls represent cultural patterns and ideologies, as do styles and fashion. Simmel (1904) emphasized the ambiguity of fashion, which represents a visualization of individual style, attitudes and social position, while at the same time concealing personal traits. This "hid-ing in the light" (Hebdige 1988), is well suited for the presentation of positions as well as individuality, and carries ideologies camouflaged as taste and individu-alised styles. Studies of young people's self-presentations on Facebook illustrate variations with culture (Zhao 2011) as well as changes in representation with age: while young teens emphasise simple symbols of style, gender and attitudes, older teens underscore authenticity and individuality (Livingstone 2008).

Socialization is influenced by traditions and existing social patterns, but the challenge for modern young people is to adapt to the future; that is, to their ideas about the future. Merton (1938) called this "anticipatory socialization", illustrated by young people who imagined themselves at college and started to behave in ways they associated with the student roles they expected were waiting for them. The transition from childhood to youth—as in the move from primary to second-ary school—illustrates anticipatory socialization: children and adolescents seek to behave in ways they believe are expected of them in the next phase. This implies not only that primary school students may begin to behave in correspondence with images of youth behaviour and style, but that they are considering various future possible roles and strategies (Wærdahl 2005). New social roles do not just mirror new phases; roles and their dramaturgical repertoire are partly selected and devel-oped by the actors, favouring some roles and types of roles and shedding away from others.

   The axis in the modern version of anticipatory socialization is preparing for complexity and uncertainty, illustrating that the capacity for planning and reflection is an essential part of growing up in the knowledge economy. The capacity for anticipatory socialization is a fundamental mechanism in shaping children's life courses.

2.4 Play, Role Play and the Perspective of the Other

Roles are carriers of cultural patterns, and role performance develops skills as well as knowledge about culture: we learn by acting in roles and interacting with others in different roles. In hunting and gathering cultures, a child's skills for future tasks were acquired by observing adults, combined with playing in a multiaged playgroup with some direct instruction from adults (Frønes 1995). In more advanced societies the function of play has gradually become less related to specific role- or task-based imitations, and more related to conveying normative and social patterns and developing social skills. Mead (1999), using baseball as an example, illustrates the importance of play and games in understanding social relations. In play children learn by doing, by relating to several positions and persons simultaneously. But whether the children are playing football, or pretending to be digger drivers, parents, pilots or superheroes in role-play, play provides social learning through social interaction with other children and the roles they perform while playing. Play also represents learning at a meta-level: the structure, relations and characters, and the discourse about what and how to play, all convey cultural and social patterns.

   With Mead, we term the aspect of the person that is shaped by society and environment as the "Me". But if we see a human as only a "Me", we end up with an over-socialized person, a puppet in a web of culture and norms, without the ability to reflect and to act. Mead avoids this understanding through the concept of the "I", which constitutes the acting reflective element of the Self. The "I" may be compared to the Ego of psychoanalysis, but it stems from different theoretical grounds and involves spontaneity and energy being controlled by the Me. The Self represents a nexus emerging out of the interaction between "Me" and "I". The Self cannot appear in the consciousness directly. We are all the obvious focal point of our universe, but to appear to ourselves as a Self, we must objectify and see ourselves from the outside. This ability to self-objectify develops through social interaction; play is important for the development of the Self and for the ability to reflect on the Self. Mead illustrates the importance of play in "games", through which participants see their own position and actions in relation to others. The interaction of various roles and positions conveys understanding of social interactions and relations; taking the role and the social perspective of others facilitates children's ability to grasp that others' views may differ from their own. Role-taking helps us to understand the feelings and perspectives of others, as well as how our own actions influence others. Role-taking is most complex in role-play

contexts in which children themselves design the roles and the dynamics of the play. While the frameworks and rules of the games are fixed, in role-play there will be a parallel meta-discourse among the participants on how the roles are to be played as well as about who will play whom or what.

Role-play contributes to the development of social skills in general, and to the ability to grasp the other's perspective, both through the roles in the play and through the participants' meta-discourses on the roles and content of the play. The function of role-play is thus not to learn to perform certain roles, but to convey social and cultural competencies, the capacity for seeing things from the perspective of the other (social decentering), and the ability for self-reflection. (Corsaro's 1992, 2005) theory of "interpretive reproduction" represents the most systematic development of a theory of socialization that emphasizes children's active interpretation and reproduction of cultural patterns through re-enacting them in play. The term "interpretive reproduction" points to how children and children's culture actively contribute both to the preservation of social structures and culturalization, and to the active subject's development through self-socialization.

The "tweens phase" illustrates the relationship between life phases, play and learning; from the perspective of socialization, the 11–13 year olds' style of communication can be understood as a form of social and cultural play. Social success requires a capacity to "feel one's way" in a field of fluid and unstable symbols. The giggling and laughter of tweens emphasize that the signals and statements are serious and non-serious metaphors at the same time; vague statements can be "withdrawn" as unintended if they seem to be interpreted in unwanted ways. The tweens phase represents social learning by doing; communication about social relations and positions as well as role performances are constituted through complex playful negotiations that can take place because of the embedded understanding among the group members that this communicative style represents a kind of play. This will later be referred to as a *language game*, a cultural frame providing a set of specific social and communicative rules. In the particular language game of social play among tweens, words and gestures are vague and often floating signifiers, carrying layers of potential meaning open to negotiation, providing a context for the development of social competence through participation. That the same forms of communication are found in TV series directed towards this age group (where girls constitute the main audience) is not coincidental; media characters and narratives both reflect and inform the style of this life phase.

Although children have in common educational institutions and media and share most of the general culture, their significant others, conveying values and beliefs at the local and personal level, may represent different social classes, religions, cultures and individual characteristics. The child's interpretations of the messages from his or her significant others also have subjective dimensions; children never live in completely identical environments. Mead terms the generalizing of these values, beliefs and ideas about the world as the "generalized other". Among small children the "generalized other" is basically subjective and local; as the child grows older these generalized ideas of the world are broadened through confrontation with other environments and perspectives.

Play forms complex social fields wherein children do not learn primarily by imitation, even if imitation is a component, but through experiencing positions and relations. Play develops world-views and, in Mead's terms "generalized others", as well as differentiated images of the other. Through experiencing the other, the child finds that the other not only represents a different position but a different perspective; the other experiences and understands things differently; the other is not like myself in another position. To see the other as someone different from myself, as a person I cannot fully understand but seek to understand, is fundamental in understanding social relations. The constitution of the other is also necessary for the self-objectification that is fundamental for self-understanding; seeing myself from the perspectives of others. Buber (1958) sees this as the I-Thou relationship, where humans meet as subjects, while in what he labels I-It relations the other is viewed as an object.[7]

Through the variety of situations and relations in play, and the continuously changing scenes produced by its dynamics, play represents learning to cope with social complexity by doing. Play represents a basic mechanism in the development of a differentiated social understanding; in a world where being able to cope with social and communicative complexity and change is essential, play is essential. Play also has a dimension of innovation, and creative zones of play, where general rules and regulations are eliminated in order to try out new possibilities and new frames of understanding, are pivotal in the knowledge societies.

2.5 Cultural Discourses and Socialization; the Cultural Constitution of the Subject

The sociological perspectives focussing on institutions, roles and positions involve socialization through roles, and cultural patterns as role-related scripts. A discursive perspective emphasises the position of the dominant discourses, providing general scripts of acting and meaning. The cultural discourses call or "hail" individuals into subject positions, a process Althusser (1970)[8] termed "interpellations". The interpellations are understood as the processes by which the subjects are assigned positions and scripts by the discursive patterns and underlying ideologies. The focus in this perspective is not on institutions and functions, but on discourses and cultural patterns and their hidden or explicit ideologies. Discourses may assign specific connotations to social categories, as illustrated by connotations related to ethnicity, gender and class that influence the contexts of socialization. Discourses may change over time, as when the dominant public discourse on homosexuality in many countries changed from condemnation to rights and integration. The variety of discourses illustrates that discursive ideologies are interwoven with social practises and often represent social as well as economic interests.

---

[7]http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/I_and_Thou ; http://www.iep.utm.edu/buber/.

[8]http://www.ibiblio.org/nmediac/winter2004/gray.html.

Texts refer to coded systems of signs; architecture and films as well as printed works are studied as texts embedded in wider cultural discourses. Texts may contain different "voices" and may be read from different perspectives, but the dominant readings are understood as the interpretations that impose themselves as natural, as *doxa* (Bourdieu 1977). What is natural in one cultural context may appear unusual from another perspective: that babies in Norwegian preschools are put to sleep outdoors in down to ten degrees below zero (Celsius) was considered strange by some European visitors from more southern areas, but in Norway this was interpreted through the key narrative of healthy outdoor life and outdoor air.

In a structuralist understanding, cultural myths represent a form of underlying grammar; beneath the surface are deeper structures that influence the systems of social codification (Barthes 1972). These deeper narratives embody certain contexts of socialization, such as emphasizing what to eat, say or touch, or not. For some cultures, meat from the pig is suitable for the dinner table, for others the pig is impure. In some cultures, not just specific animals but groups of people are seen as unclean and not to be touched. Religions distinguish between those who believe and those who do not, and in some cases, between those who can marry or even interact with each other. The boundaries between the sacred and the profane, between the pure and the impure, are important distinctions and take a variety of forms. Power structures, roles, myths and social identities can be given metaphorical and emotional forms as rituals, ranging from religious ceremonies and national holidays, to local institutional events such as weddings, funerals and family gatherings.

Socialization is interwoven in the discourses in which continuous interpellations represent an important part of the processes of culturalization. Some concepts and ideas that dominate such discourses are signifiers with no physical referents, "signifiers without a signified" (Lacan see e.g. Bracher 1993)[9]; Žižek 2006[10]): concepts like freedom, love, nation, or self-actualisation point to narratives, myths and other signifiers, not to tangible phenomena. Concepts like motherhood refer to ideological configurations and discourses as well as to biologic and social relations. Through these *master signifiers*,[11] representing core ideas of social praxes, classes and status groups formulate and exercise their symbolic power. Master signifiers constitute chains of meaning, sustained by dominant institutions and ubiquitous systems of narratives and discourses, and represent an enormous symbolic power as regards socialization. These signifiers are often areas of contestation between paradigms and groups struggling for the power of definition, ideological power is rooted in the naturalisation of cultural and social patterns. The ideological contents implicit in cultural patterns are strongest when taken for grated.

Habermas's (1984–1987) concept of colonization refers to the life-world being penetrated by the instrumental rationality of bureaucracies and market forces. For social relations, colonization implies objectification, that the relations between

---

[9]http://www.iep.utm.edu/lacweb/.

[10]http://www.iep.utm.edu/zizek/.

[11]http://nosubject.com/index.php?title=Master-Signifier.

individuals and groups may take on market characteristics, transforming possible authentic relations between humans into relations between commodities. This "thingification" may be naturalised through the dominant discourses and narratives of modern media. As regards socialization, the theory of reification or "thingification" implies that relationships between humans are understood within cultural frameworks in which the other is valued as a commodity or as a position, but not fully recognised as a subject. The dominating cultural discourses may contribute to the transformation of possible authentic social relations, the relation between subjects, into relationships between objects.

2.6 The Cultural Landscape of Media and Consumption

Contemporary social discourses and myths are given visual and narrative form through media, and modern social media illustrate how the medium shapes the message (McLuhan 1964). For instance, Facebook's architecture encourages various presentations of taste, identity and popularity assessment, structuring both the form and content of the communication. The development of social media has also brought mass media closer to the users; mass media events are often among the themes on social media, and celebrities use social media to interact with their audiences. Social media provide new communication structures connecting both local and global peers and offering new tools for self-presentation and interaction, as well as for informal learning (Boyd 2008). But modern social media also structure communication and content in specific ways. Their purpose, often the accumulation of commercial value that is based on information gleaned about users through their self-presentations, like/dislikes and social profiles, is influencing the social and cultural landscapes of socialization.

The influence of the media is a much-debated topic, but their direct effects are difficult to untangle. The debated possible effects of on-screen violence range from copycat behaviour to desensitisation.[12] Different media also involve different groups in different ways: girls read more novels than boys and children of parents with higher education read more than children of parents with low education. Aggressive children more often choose to watch violent TV programming,[13] and users of different online games seem to vary by personal social and psychosocial characteristics (Brandtzæg and Heim 2009). Usage profiles vary with the amount of social and cultural capital of the users (Hargittai and Hinnant 2008), and the new panorama of interactive media may increase these differentiations further. Modern media also surround children with flagrant streams of events and narratives, where celebrities are presented as characters in intimate biographical plots

---

[12]http://www.smh.com.au/digital-life/games/screen-violence-changing-young-brains-researchers-20131004-2uzom.html.

[13]http://www.apa.org/pi/prevent-violence/resources/tv-violence.aspx.

that blur the line between reality and fiction as well as between public and private (Sennet 1977). In the perspective of socialization, these dramaturgically constructed realities provide underlying ideological messages, creating horizons of ideas about what life could or should be and contain.

Modern prosperous societies are understood as consumer societies, based on the amount of consumption and the cultural positions of the products consumed. The level of consumption is an indication of the amount of economic capital, and the symbolic profile of consumption is a signal of cultural and social capital as well. The symbolic dimensions of consumption, as presented in Bourdieu's famous *Distinction* (1984), illustrate socialization into the tastes and life styles of different social classes. Certain products belong to certain life course phases, and moving along the life course of modern childhood implies continuous changes of products that indicate social identity. In young subcultures identity is expressed through profiles of consumption, and new styles are actively generated within groups in interaction with material, cultural and social contexts. The subcultural scenery also illustrates what Douglas (1966) calls attention to; what you don't wear is as important as what you do wear, implying that symbolic silence is impossible.

Consumption not only indicates the social identity of the bearer or wearer, which is often emphasized in relation to youth; in relation to socialization consumption also constitutes the cultural identity of parents and their styles of upbringing. The highly codified consumption of modern products for children assigns the products symbolic values in the different "communities" of parenting, in which the moral economy of the family is mediated through consumer goods (Brusdal and Frønes 2013). The commercial products carried by children represent a visible indication of parental care and competence (Dedeoglue 2006), as well as ethical and ecological concerns (Carey et al. 2008), thereby putting the parents' position in the moral economy on display. Moral and cultural positions are visualised through objects of consumption, where some products are especially important because they carry information not only about what one is, but also about what one is not. The markets for symbolic consumption are based on the translation of moral values and ideologies into tangible products; the commercial market's profound influence on socialization is based on this translation: the products are carriers of cultural meaning. The cultural meaning constituted and signalled by the consumption of parents is an essential part of the social environments of the children.

2.7 Socialization and the Images of Children and Childhood

The images and narratives of children and childhood influence socialization—whether the child is seen as an innocent tabula rasa or as a malevolent creature, as an active subject or a passive object. The images of the child are rooted in the

social, economic and cultural conditions of an historical era, and in the knowledge—or the lack of it—about the nature of the child. Societies change; in the demanding knowledge-based economies, children are not seen as being at risk for lack of food, but at risk for "dropping out" of the educational system. Cultures change: not many decades ago the doll mother in a well-known Norwegian song for children emphasized the need for the rod; today corporal punishment has been relegated to the dark corners of deviance and abuse.

Children's literature and media aimed at children are part of the discourses that shape the culture of childhood as well as the understanding of the child. The classic tales of young heroes, and especially heroines, who were good by nature, illustrate how cultural narratives may influence the image of the child. Swiss Heidi[14] was so naturally good that people close to her were transformed into being good. In the great tales and stories good children are often loved by animals—little animals loved Cinderella—to be friends with nice animals indicate that you are good by nature. The intention here is not to discuss children's literature, but to illustrate that the famous narratives carry images of children that affect the ideas about children and the culture of socialization. When Sanchez, in the *Children of Sanchez* (Lewis 1963), claims that he had no childhood because it disappeared in the heavy burdens of work, he is contrasting his childhood with the image and idea of childhood as a period of play and joy.

Aries (1962) book about the history of childhood illustrates that childhood is not just a biological phenomenon; it is shaped by the cultural discourses framing the understanding of children and their development. The development of the bourgeois family and educational institutions were essential to the historical construction of childhood (Rutschky 1977). What is expected of various age groups varies with cultures and historical eras, as can be seen by the different age levels set for a minor or the legal age for marriage.[15] Various professions and theories not only present different perspectives on children's position and development, to some degree they construe different children and childhoods. The paradigm of "new the sociology of childhood" that emerged in the 1980s emphasized that the child had to be understood not primarily as a future adult, but as an acting subject to be accepted in its own right (James et al. 1998). The sociology of childhood also showed the different images of children and childhood and their possible influence on the understanding of children, a perspective that also underscored that children and childhood had to be understood as related to class, ethnicity, gender and local environments. Studies of childhood and social class often emphasis parent-child relations and the generational transfer of social and cultural capital, but childhood and social class is also analysed in terms of life styles and life rhythms anchored in social and material structures (Seabrook 1982). Historical eras create different childhoods for different groups and classes. Among aristocrats the role of

---

[14]http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Heidi.

[15]In 1823, the age at which a couple in the UK could marry was lowered to 14 for boys and 12 for girls.

a child could be overshadowed by the child's position in the social hierarchy; the Chinese emperor, even if he biologically was a child, was never a child understood as a role and position. Children's subordination in the past can be seen in the use of words like "girl," "garçon," "lad," "boy", which refer to both servants and children.

Childhood refers to both a period of life and to the set of social and cultural structures that the child moves through in that period. From the perspective of socialization (as well as from the perspective of children), children are passing through the social and symbolic structures that form their childhood. The concept of childhood refers both to the economic, social and cultural structures that frame the lives of children - *childhood as a framework,* and to the children's movement through these structures - *childhood as a process.*

2.8 Disciplination and Cultural Release

The classical sociological perspective emphasizes socialization through institutional patterns and roles; institutions represent basic mechanisms in the shaping of children, as do traditions and habits. Discursive theories emphasize that cultural and ideological patterns are a formative force, as illustrated by the Marxist-inspired theories of cultural hegemony and their understanding of how discourses are inscribed physically and mentally (Gramsci 1971; Althusser 1970) and by Foucault's (e.g. 2002). The basic symbolic patterns, representing power and ideology, are internalized through being experienced as natural and taken for granted (Bourdieu 1984). The power of symbolic patterns lies in their presumed mirroring of the natural order of things; the postulated embodied internalisation of doxa— the common belief- represents a theory of socialization as well as of *disciplination*. In the perspective of Foucault, in Habermas' postulated tension between the life world and the system, and in Adorno's understanding of mass culture and cultural industries, modern societies represent an intensification of the cultural power of dominating groups and dominating rationalities. In some theories the power structures act with a disciplinary force that finally collides with human nature; from this perspective modern societies were seen as a "disease" forced on individuals through the process of socialization (Schneider 1975).

Other sociological theories characterize (young) people in modern societies as set free from traditions and common cultural patterns. This is based on the resolution of old authority patterns and on a postulated cultural fragmentation resulting from prosperity, globalization, the growth of the information and knowledge economy, and the transition from a society dominated by production to a society focused on consumption (Bauman 2007; Ziehe 1975; Stubenrauch and Zihe 1981) described the breakdown of tradition as a "cultural release"; the general sociological term *individualization* refers to the same trend (see, e.g., Bauman 2001; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). While Marxist and Foucaultian theorists see individual actors as increasingly shaped by the rationality of dominant social and

cultural forces, the post-modern and post-structuralist understanding underscores the dissolution of traditions and common patterns, and that there are many possible interpretations of reality. The great narratives of the common truths dissolve according to Lyotard (1984); post-modern conditions represent not just heterogeneous norms, values, and lifestyles, but also a breakdown in the idea of common truths or "meta-narratives" representing a common purpose. The culture industry moves from emphasising standardization to focusing on differentiation; the markets of modern consumerism are differentiated in relation to social, ethnic and age groups and are related to a variety of life styles and individual preferences.

Ziehe argues that the "escape" from the pressure of traditions and cultural patterns, the cultural release, may entail an increased emphasis on intimate relations and a focus on aesthetics in a broad sense. The term "potentiation" Ziehe (1989, 2004) points towards a quest for meaning not in terms of wisdom but as experienced intensity, whether this refers to social relations, to semiotic expressions/art, or to specific life styles. Potentiation strategies can be seen as defence mechanisms rooted in the lack of meaning in culture and traditions, but also as fruitful attempts to constitute a new basis for meaning in a context where shared meaning is no longer embodied in traditions. The search for potentiation is influenced by culture, but the experience of meaning is understood as an individual experience based on individual actions and preferences.

2.9   Individuation and Individualization

Recent political and ideological developments in modern Western societies have underscored the position of the individual. The last century has strengthened the rights of individuals and provided women, and increasingly children, with rights, as illustrated by the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, which emphasizes the right of all children to develop their potentials "to the fullest". These increasing formal and legal rights can be termed *individuation*, which implies that everybody shall be treated according to universal criteria and socialised into subjects expecting and being able to act according to such criteria. *Individualization* refers to an emphasis on individual uniqueness and on the individual as the source of opinions, attitudes, tastes and lifestyles. Individuation emphasizes equal rights and equal treatment; individualization underscores that people are different and unique. The UN convention underlines both, as individuation implies the right to individualisation.

Individuation refers to common rights, individualization to the construction of individual identities. Marx described the experience of modernity as "all that is solid melts into air" (see Berman 1982); traditions that used to frame people's lives and identities evaporated. In all descriptions of "post-modern", "hypermodern", "late modernity" or the like, cultural freedom is depicted as a challenge related to social identity; persons must create themselves without the support or the limitations of tradition. In Erikson's theories (1968) and in the popular culture

of the 1950s–1970s, the construction of identity was understood as a challenge during adolescence; a few decades later, Giddens (1991) stressed the development of identity as an ongoing project throughout the life course. Freedom from tradition produces a world in which success is contingent on skills for social and cultural navigation.

Individualization can be understood as individuals being released from culture and traditions—but also as rooted in cultural and ideological patterns. Modern educational and psychological ideology and practice emphasize that every child is a unique individual; children learn this as they sing to the tune of "Frère Jacques" in kindergarten: "I am special, I am special, Look at me, You will see, Someone very special, Someone very special, It is me, It is me". Children also face major media stories in which the hero/heroine wins the decisive match when he or she "finds" him- or herself and the corresponding unique inner strength. Be yourself—be true to yourself—find your own way—our culture is packed with metaphors pointing to the idea of the unique individual. Individualization grows out of cultural narratives as much as out of their resolution; cultural release does not imply that there are no narratives and norms on the construction of individuality or social positions, but that traditions no longer function as stable cultural guidelines. The changing expressions of fashion and the importance of the changing symbols also underline the stability of symbolic hierarchies as such. That hierarchies are permanent while symbolic expressions are unstable implies that the interpretation of signs requires intense attention.

2.10 Socialization and Class Culture

The relationship between children's social background and their positions over the life course is fundamental to sociological studies of socialization and social mobility. In the first decades after the Second World War educational expansion was understood as an instrument for justice and equality; through success in the meritocratic[16] hierarchies of educational institutions children from all classes had a chance to fulfil their potential. But empirical studies showed that social background still influenced success in the education systems; the most famous of these was a comprehensive American report (Coleman et al. 1966) that stated that school was a mechanism that transferred social *in*equality. Studies from different regions and nations told the same story; social background, both as the resources of parents and communities and as cultural and linguistic distinctions, influenced children's achievements in school. Middle-class language and culture matched school codes better than working-class language and culture (Bernstein 1971, 1973), and middle-class upbringing cultivated educational achievement. Sociology

---

[16]The term meritocracy refers to Michael Young's (1958) combination of a science fiction novel and doctoral thesis.

changed its perspective on education from a possible source for the development of social equality to a fundamental mechanism for the reproduction of social inequality; an emblematic work in this context is Bourdieu and Passeron (1970).

Bourdieu (1984) and Bernstein (1971) underscored the distance between various class cultures and the educational systems through linguistic codes and positions in the systems of cultural distinction. Other theories focused on the various actors' choices under different conditions. Children from working-class backgrounds viewed higher education as more risky and with fewer possible dividends on their investment than did children from the middle class; children in a working-class context required better grades in order to opt for higher education (Boudon 1974). In this perspective class culture represents primarily a context that influences the calculation of the possible advantages or disadvantages of higher education; the social and cultural distance from the educational system is understood as part of that calculation. As regards socialization, the two types of theories represent divergent mechanisms: Boudon's (1981) perspective emphasizes acting subjects interpreting the social contexts differently, while theories of cultural reproduction underscore the direct impact of different culturalization.

Social class and background were eventually conceptualised as economic, cultural and social capital (Bourdieu 1986; Coleman 1988). Economic capital refers to material conditions; cultural capital in general covers the level of education and knowledge, as well as the embodied knowledge of the cultural codes of the upper classes and status groups. Social capital can be seen as the network of the individual, and as the resources of communities and groups. Coleman (1988) analyses social capital both in local community contexts and in the family, and argues that the rate of "drop out" in high school increases with the ratio of single parents in a community; single parents have less time for their children than two-parent families and represent fewer resources for the common local environment. The social capital as well as the economic capital of a community decreases with a high number of single parents. The economic and social situations for different family types also vary with political regimes; being a single mother in the U.S. represents a different situation than in Scandinavia.

Capital can be converted from one form to another; children's social and cultural capitals provide the basis for their future amount and forms of capital. While social class is primarily related to economic capital, status groups–ranging from the classical German *stände*[17] to intellectual and cultural elites–are constituted through lifestyles, consumption and social and cultural distinctions. Consumption has social consequences for children not only related to identity and social position, but because many products are necessary for social and cultural participation.

---

[17]*Stände* is translated as "status groups," which doesn't completely capture the stände as they existed: groups that based their power on position and lifestyle, restricted intercourse with other groups, certain status conventions and acces to economic positions that were denied to other groups. Stände points to medieval guilds, and in more modern versions, to groups based on certain professions and lifestyles; the status mechanisms of "stände" are alive in a new and changing landscape.

The rise of organized leisure activities implies the increased importance of equipment, fees and transportation; social media and mobile phones illustrate the social necessity of products that did not exist some years ago.

While socialization through roles and institutions emphasizes position in social structures, and discursive understanding relates to the underlying ideological patterns conveyed by the dominant discourses, the perspective of capitals focuses on the differentiation in resources. Bourdieu saw social and cultural capital primarily as part of the social heritage, while more recent studies also emphasize the family's transfer of genetic resources, as well as parents' active efforts to support their children's accumulation of cultural and social capital (see, e.g., Lareau 2003; Reynolds and Clements 2005). Cultural capital is developed by education and skills, and by acquiring the right social codes; parents seek to facilitate the development of social and cultural capital through the selection of children's activities, schools, communities and friends. The ethnic distribution of educational success in the U.S., as well as in the UK and other Western countries, illustrates that Asian immigrants with few financial resources and little relevant cultural and social capital are often winners in the educational system. This cannot be explained by the socioeconomic factors normally used to assess educational success; the success is rooted in the children's intense efforts, which in turn are anchored in the family's ability to support and push the children in their educational endeavours (Abboud and Kim 2011). Parents and children with low social and cultural capital depend on institutionalized avenues of capital accumulation; that is, the educational system. The success of certain immigrant groups indicates that although the school system favours groups with high and relevant capital and codes, the system does have a meritocratic dimension that makes it possible for groups with low levels of social and cultural capital to succeed. The school's grading system is a scourge for weak students with little capital but a support for poor talented students; the success of Asian students may indicate that the meritocratic aspects of the educational institutions have been underestimated.

The perspective of capitals emphasizes the social inheritance and the active subjects' accumulation of resources, while normative theories and discursive understanding focus on cultural patterns and social structures. Capitals can be actively accumulated: for those with little cultural and social capital, school is the arena for the accumulation of educational capital, which can later be transformed into cultural or social capital; educational skills are acquired more easily than the codes and networks of the elites. Knowledge and good grades are therefore often the weapons of children with little economic or cultural heritage, while cultural heritage and social hierarchies support the children of the elites.

2.11   Socialization and Well-Being

The efforts to measure the well-being of children (Ben-Arieh and George 2001, Ben-Arieh et al. 2001, Ben-Arieh 2008) provided perspectives important to socialization by focusing on the complex interaction between the child and its environment. Within the sociology of childhood, children's living conditions in the

present are conceptualised as "well-being", while the future development and life course of children are termed "well-becoming" (Ben-Arieh and Frønes 2011). The daily lives of children are related to both dimensions: peers, friends and leisure most often will be related to well-being in the present, while the educational system will be understood primarily as preparing children for the future. In the perspective of socialization, an identification of children's situation must include both their lives as children and the possible consequences of the present on their future development (Raghavan and Alexandrova 2014). Societal developments influence the interpretation of children's contexts: playing with friends has traditionally been understood as belonging to the well-being of the present, while the modern understanding of socialization as the accumulation of social and cultural capitals, focuses on peers as social capital and play as the development of competence.

Becoming is the essence of childhood. In the perspective of Sen (1993, 2008) well-being refers to both the children's quality of life here and now, and to the opportunity structures and resources related to their future development and life course. The child is understood not primarily as a child in the present, as in the sociology of childhood, or as a future adult, as in the traditional understanding of socialization; the present and future are linked by understanding the child as a subject interacting with the present, and the present as a framework of resources and opportunity structures directed towards the future. Opportunity structures, involving the freedom to choose and the rights that guarantee freedom of choice, are an important part of children's well-being. The child's life in the present, the opportunity structures and the child's capacities to utilize them, represents the child's *capability*. Increased wealth and opportunities may entail less subjective happiness, as illustrated by the Easterlin paradox[18] of happiness and from a more complex angle, by Maslow's (1943) hierarchies of needs, where satisfaction of needs at one level produces new motivation and higher-level needs.

The concept of capability grasps the core of the process of socialization: the child is an active subject developing its capacities in interaction with a framework of resources and structural opportunities. In modern Western societies, most children enjoy formal educational opportunities, but dropping out of educational institutions indicates that many do not develop the capacities to utilize the formal opportunities, and that the opportunity structures are not well adapted to all groups. Socialization is constituted as the processes of interaction of the child and its environment; the child's well-being is interwoven with the processes of socialization.

2.12   The Constitution of Meaning and Reflexivity

Socialization theories have primarily aimed at showing how children grow up and become motivated to fill society's roles and responsibilities, and to a small extent have been concerned with the development of critical capacities for reflection and

---

[18]http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Easterlin_paradox.

transcendence. Maslow's (1943) theory of a hierarchy of needs approaches the problem by emphasizing that the fulfilment of lower needs triggers the appearance of higher-level ones, with the hierarchy ranging from physiological needs to the need for self-actualisation. Self-actualisation, or self-realisation, requires the ability to reflect on "what I want from life"; that is, it raises the issue of meaning. Habermas's concept of communicative action (1984–1987) refers to actors who seek to coordinate their actions and their constitution of meaning through critical dialogue. Even if such communication is partly based on a culturally ingrained pre-understanding, the meeting of different validity claims and mutual criticism may lead to understandings and acts that transcend existing knowledge and norms; new meaning is constituted through dialogues between subjects. Communicative action is rooted not only in the individual's capacity for reflection, but in dialogue and intersubjectivity, involving that the actor must have the ability to grasp the perspective of the other. Communicative action not only requires the capacity for social decentering/decentration[19](Piaget 1928), it also requires self-objectification, the ability to see oneself from the perspective of the other; self-understanding is based on understanding of the other.

Social and cultural change is often understood as primarily driven by economic and technological structures; the changes in social and cultural patterns are understood as adaptations to these deeper structural changes. In this scheme, inspired by a simplified version of Marxian theory, socialization operates as a mechanism of adaptation to structural changes. But change may also be understood as driven by the internal dynamics of the social and cultural systems, termed *emergence* in modern systems theory (Sawyer 2005). A basic factor in emergence is the desires and the capacities of the actors, which are related to their socialization. The desire to change social and cultural conditions is interwoven with the subject's constitution of meaning. Desires, meaning and capacity evolve through socialization, created in interaction between the subject, contexts and other subjects, and do not just mirror cultural patterns. Emergence, the evolving of something new and the transcending of the existing, requires both the desires and the capacities of the actors. Changes in social and cultural contexts can contribute to the development of new meaning and new understanding; Heller's (1976) concept of *radical needs* illustrates how new social conditions or new ideas may create new meaning and visions, thereby producing new radical needs that can only be fulfilled through social change. Radical ideas may have profound effects; the new ideas about love spread the idea that marriage should be based on love, and that young people should have the right to select their own spouses. The ideas of free choice and love combined into radical needs. It is no coincidence that the contradiction between love and tradition is one of Bollywood's basic themes.

Inspired by Hegel, and by Whitehead's process philosophy (Mesle 2008; Whitehead 1979), the self and social identity are understood not as states but as *becoming,* as processes; identity as the idea of a stable "Me" is understood as a

---

[19]The cognitive processes of taking into account anothers perspectives are referred to both as decentering and as decentering, in the rest of the book the concept of decentering will be used.

narrative continuously constituted by the subject. My self and my biography are a continuous constitution of meaning; that I experience myself as a stable entity does not imply that I do not change. The language equips us with the "I" who acts and thinks; "I" am a constant in my life seen from my own point of view. "I" has—as "You", "She", "He" and them– a linguistic given position; "I" am the obvious stable centre of my life, but a centre that is continuously being created and re-created.

In accordance with Habermas's perspective (1984–1987), a goal of socialization is to constitute the capacity for dialogue and critical reflection, which Baumann (1976) termed emancipatory reason. Socialization as emancipation implies the development of capacities to produce something new: socialization as the foundation for transcendence. Socialization is not just about the formation of meaning, but also about the capacity for a quest for meaning.

2.13   The Social Roots of Motivation

Malinowski (1922) argued that socialization into a culture was also functional for the biological needs of individuals. But the social sciences primarily understood socialization as functional for the needs of the social structures themselves; through socialization, norms and cultural patterns are translated into individual motivation. In Berger and Luckman's (1966) phenomenological perspective, social and cultural patterns are internalised by being taken for granted; cultural patterns are transformed into individual motivation through naturalisation (see also Bourdieu 1984).

Merton (1938) distinguishes between manifest and latent functions. The *manifest functions* are intended; schools provide children with knowledge, military forces protect the country. *Latent functions* are the unintended consequences that have positive functions for the maintenance of the social structures without the participants' conscious intention. In psychoanalytic understanding unconscious motivation is a fundamental concept, and modern marketing searches for latent needs that products can be postulated to fill, be it economic status, popularity or wellness. Understanding latent functions requires a distinction between how patterns of behaviour occur and how they are maintained. Radcliffe-Brown's (1940) famous example of joking relationships—in which a jocular relationship between two positions is explained by the fact that joking acts as a damper on tensions between the positions—illustrates how the existence of certain patterns of behaviour is explained functionally. But latent functionality cannot explain how the behaviour came into being: the joking strategy may have been chosen randomly or deliberately, and after a while transformed into a naturalised cultural pattern transferred to new generations through socialization. Radcliffe-Brown argued that the social sciences should explain how and why stable patterns exist; in a functionalist understanding they continue over long periods because they are useful for the maintenance of the social structures. This maintenance of cultural patterns is

explained through latent functionally; that is, the joking relationship support the existing structures, but the actors are not joking because they want to maintain the social structures.

Structuralists (see, e.g., Lévi-Strauss 1963) understand cultural patterns as being rooted in common underlying structures; social structures do not rest on specific relations between structure and function. Socialization will then be influenced by both the variations on the cultural surface and the deeper grammar of mind and culture. Material environments also represent frameworks that influence socialization. In general the material landscapes are understood to represent a certain inertia, but newer studies and experiments illustrate how even small changes in these structures may influence behaviour. The concept of "nudging", "pushing lightly" to influence decision making in a non-forced way (Thaler and Sunstein 2008) sees social actions in light of the details of social and physical environments; this is illustrated by the famous "fly" painted on urinals (which contributes to fewer men urinating outside the urinal) or the increase in sale of fruits and vegetables when shopping carts offer a special section for "fruit and vegetables". The boundaries between conscious and non-conscious actions are fluid and vary with individuals and contexts, but the basic idea behind "nudging" is that, without the intention of the subject, the landscape we are a part of can influence actions, and by this socialization.

The landscapes of socialization can also be related to the dynamics of the various social fields, and to what we will later refer to as *language games* (Wittgenstein 1965). In his example of the nobleman who is on a first-name basis with the stable boy, Bourdieu (1984) underscores that this informal style in fact emphasizes the difference between their positions, not social closeness; communicative style has to be interpreted in context. Social divides are maintained by symbolic markers, and crossing the symbolic boundaries is made more difficult by the fact that the codes and social habitus are part of naturalised embodied systems. These cultural landscapes are essential to the processes of socialization into the hierarchies of classes and status groups.

At the core of the processes of socialization is the development of motivation. Motivation must not be confused with intention; the manifest intentions of an act and its many possible social and cultural motivational roots must not be confused. Motivation is understood as related to the constitution of meaning, rooted in a complex interplay of actors and institutional, discursive and social contexts, while intention is related to specific actions. The cultural influence and structuring of motivation is highly visible in comparative analyses, illustrating that different cultures and contexts may shape meaning and motivation in different ways (Korbin 2010).

References

Abboud, S. K., & Kim, J. (2011). *Top of the class: How asian parents raise high achievers-and how you can too*. New York: Penguin.
Adorno, T. (1991). The culture industry: Selected essays on mass culture (Ed. J. M. Bernstein). London: Routledge.

Althusser, L. (1970). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses In *Lenin and philosophy and other essays* (pp. 127–86). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Aries, P. (1962). *Centuries of childhood*. New York: Vintage Books.

Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythologies*. London: Paladin.

Bauman, Z. (1976). Towards a Critical Sociology: An essay on commonsense and emancipation. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bauman, Z. (2001). *The individualized society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bauman Z. (2007). *Consuming life*. Cambridge: Polity.

Beck, U., & Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2002). *Individualization: institutionalized individualism and its social and political consequences*. London: Sage.

Ben-Arieh, A., & Goerge, R. (2001). Beyond the numbers: How do we monitor the state of our children. *Children and Youth Service Review, 23*(8), 603–631.

Ben-Arieh, A. (2008). The child indicators movement. *Past, Present, and Future Child Indicators Research, 1*(1), 3–16.

Ben-Arieh, A., & Frønes, I. (2011). Taxonomy for child well-being indicators: A framework for the analysis of the well-being of children. *Childhood, 18*(4), 460–476.

Ben-Arieh, A., Kaufman, H. N., Andrews, B. A., George, R., Lee, B. J., & Aber, J. L. (2001). *Measuring and monitoring children's well being*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *Social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.

Berman, M. (1982). *All that is solid melts into air: The experience of modernity*. New York: Penguin.

Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, code and control: Volume 1: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bernstein, B. (1973). *Class, code and control: Volume 2: Applied studies towards a sociology of language*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bloch, H., & Niederhoffer, A. (1958). *The gang: A study of adolescent behavior*. New York: Philosophical Library.

Boudon; R. (1974). *Education, opportunity and social inequality*. New York: Wiley.

Boudon, R. (1981). *The logic of social action*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Outline of a theory of praxis Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: a social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage. (Published in French in 1970).

Boyd, D. (2008). Friendship In M Ito et al. (Eds.), *Hanging out, messing around, geeking out: Living and learning with new media*. Cambridge: MIT Press, https://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/titles/free_download/9780262013369_Hanging_Out.pdf. Accessed June 30 2015.

Bracher, M. (1993). *Lacan discourses and social change; a psychoanalytic cultural criticism*. Cornell University Press Free Ebook: http://newfreeebook.com/Bracher-Lacan-Discourse-and-Social-Change-A-Psychoanalytic-Cultural-Criticism.html. Accessed June 30 2015.

Brandtzæg, P. B., & Heim, J. (2009). Why people use social networking sites. In A. A. Ozok & P. Zaphiris (Eds.), *Proceedings of the HCI International* (pp. 143–152).. Online Communities. Berlin, Heidelberg, San Diego: Springer.

Brusdal, R., & Frønes, I. (2013). The purchase of moral positions: an essay on the markets of concerned parenting. *International Journal of Consumer Studies, 37*(2), 159–164.

Buber, M. (1958). *I and Thou*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Cohen, A. K. (1955). *Delinquent boys: The culture of the Gang*. New York: Free Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*(Supplement), 95–120.

Coleman, J. S., et al. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Corsaro, W. (1992). Interpretive reproduction in children's peer cultures. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 55*(2), 160–177.

William, Corsaro. (2005). *The sociology of childhood*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.

Dedeoglue, A. Ö. (2006). Discourses of motherhood and consumption practices of Turkish mothers. In L. Stevens & J. Borgerson (Eds.), Gender and consumer behavior. Edinburgh, Scottland: Association for Consumer Research. http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/12519/gender/v08/GCB-08. Accessed June 30 2015.

Douglas, M. (1966). *Thought styles: Critical essays on good taste*. London: Sage.

Durkheim, E. (1986). *What is a social fact? Excerpt from Robert Alun Jones. Emile Durkheim: An introduction to four major works* (pp. 60–81). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage http://durkheim.uchicago.edu/Summaries/rules.html#pgfId=2754. Accessed June 30 2015.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth and crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton Company.

Frønes, I. (1995). *Among peers*. Oslo, Stockholm: Scandinavian University Press.

Foucault, M. (2002). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. London: Psychology Press.

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and self-identity. Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Edinburgh: Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Anchor Books.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison notebooks*. New York: International Publishers Co.

Habermas, J. (1984–1987). The Theory of Communicative Action. 2 vols Boston: Beacon Press.

Hargittai, E., & Hinnant, A. (2008). Digital inequality: Differences in young adults' use of the internet. *Communication Research, 35*(5), 602–621.

Harris, J. R. (1998). *The nurture assumption: Why children turn out the way they do*. New York: Free Press.

Hebdige, D. (1988). *Hiding in the light*. London: Routledge.

Heller, A. (1976). *The theory of need in Marx*. London: Allison and Busby.

Hetherington, M., Reiss, D., & Plomin, R. (1994). *Separate social worlds of siblings: The impact of non-shared environment on development*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

James, A., Jenks, C., & Prout, A. (1998). *Theorizing childhood*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kagan, J. (1998). *Three seductive ideas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Korbin, J. (2010). Children in context. *Children and Society, 24*(6), 435–436.

Lareau, A. (2003). *Uneqal childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1963). *Structural anthropology*. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Lewis O (1963) T*he children of Sanchez*: *Autobiography of a Mexican family*. New York: Vintage books.

Livingstone, S. (2008). Taking risky opportunities in youthful content creation: teenagers' use of social networking sites for intimacy, privacy and self-expression. *New Media & Society, 10*(3), 393–411.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Malinowski, B. (1922). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An account of native enterprise and adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Marcuse, H. (1964). *One dimensional man*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370–396.

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Mead, G. H. (1999). *Play, school and society*. New York: American University Studies: Series 11, Anthropology and Sociology. Vol. 71. Peter Lang International Academic Publishers.

Merton, R. K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review, 3*(5), 672–682.

Mesle, R. (2008). *Process-relational philosophy: An introduction to Alfred North Whitehead*. West Conshohocken, Pennsylvania: Templeton Foundation Press.

Parsons, T., & Bales, R. (1956). *Family, socialization and interaction process*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Piaget, J. (1928). *Judgment and reasoning in the child*. London: Routledge.

Plomin, R., & Daniels, D. (1987). Why are children in the same family so different from each other? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 10*, 1–16.

Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. (1940). On Joking relationships. *Journal of the International African Institute, 13*(3), 195–210.

Raghavan and Alexandrova. (2014). Toward a theory of child well-being. *Social Indicators Research, 121*(3), 887–902.

Reynolds, A. J., & Clements, M. (2005). Parental involvement and children's school success. In E. Patrikakou, R. Weisberg, P. S. Redding, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *School-family partnerships for children's success* (pp. 109–127). New York: Teachers College Press.

Rutschky, K. (1977). *Schwarze Pädagogik. Quellen zur Naturgeschichte der bürgerlichen Erziehung*. Frankfurt, Berlin, Wien: Verlag Ullstein Gmbh.

Sawyer, K. (2005). *Social emergence: Societies as complex systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schneider, M. (1975). *Samhället som sjukdom. Till kritiken av den borgerliga psykologin*. Stockholm: Rabén & Sjøgren.

Seabrook, J. (1982). *Working class childhood*. London: Gollancz.

Sen, A. (1993). Capability and well-being. In M. Nussbaum & A. Sen (Eds.), *The quality of life* (pp. 31–53). New York: Oxford Clarendon Press.

Sennet, R. (1977). *The fall of public man*. New York: Knopf.

Simmel, G. (1904). Fashion. *International Quarterly*, *10*(1), 130–155. Reprinted in *American Journal of Sociology*, *62*(6), 541–558. (May 1957).

Stubenrauch, H., & Ziehe, T. (1981). Narziss - Ein neuer Sozialisationstypus? Frankfurt: päd. -Extra Buchverlag.

Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C.R. (2008). *Nudge: improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. London: Penguin.

Whitehead, A. N. (1979). Process and reality: an essay in cosmology. New York: Free Press.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. (1965). *Philosophical investigations*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Wærdahl, R. (2005). May be I'll need a pair of Levi's before junior high? Child to youth trajectories and anticipatory socialization. *Childhood, 12*(2), 201–219.

Young, M. (1958). *The rise of the meritocracy, 1870–2033: an essay on education and inequality*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Zhao, C. (2011). Cultural differences on visual self-presentation through social networking site profile images. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1129–1132). http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1979110. Accessed June 29 2015.

Ziehe, T. (1975). *Pubertät und Narzissmus Sind Jugendliche entpolitisiert?*. Frankfurt a.M.: Europäische Verlagsanstalt.

Ziehe, T. (1989). (In Danish) Ambivalens og mangfoldighed. København/Copenhagen: Politisk Revy.

Ziehe, T. (2004). Islands of intensity on a sea of routine. New articles on youth, education, and culture. Copenhagen: Politisk revy. Anthology in Danish.

Žižek, S. (2006). *How to read Lacan*. London: Granta Books.