_____

Nature and Culture, Individual and Society: The Institutional Impact of Conceptual Antithesis in Theories of American Social Sciences on Adolescence

Kostas Spiridakis

University of Crete, School of Philosophy, Rethimno, GREECE
Department of Philosophical and Social Studies

Abstract

This article presents a sociological analysis, dealing with the matter of how theories of social sciences about adolescence have contributed to the formation of adolescent behavior. In particular, we examine how adolescence as a social category was constituted and transformed along with the modification of social sciences' (psychology's and sociology's mostly) relevant concepts in the USA, from the late 19th century until the early 21st century. Around socialization, two opposite theoretical foundations of human condition were reproduced, the "socio-cultural" and the "individual-natural". The dominance of some theories on others was related to the institutional consolidation of various social control forms (e.g., symbolic control, surveillance) depending on the kind of behavior that is being rationalized, naturalized and legitimized. The historical reconstruction of three phases in the development of the social sciences' field of symbolic control enables us to focus on the importance of a renewed naturalism in the explanation of adolescent behavior, from the 1980s onwards.

Keywords: symbolic control, adolescence, social sciences, psychology, sociology, social categories.

1. Introduction

In 1904, a two volume study on adolescence by G. S. Hall, president of Clark University and professor of Psychology and Education, was published in the USA (Hall, 1904), constituting a breakthrough in the history of adolescence. Although the idea of adolescence as a distinct phase in life was not new, Hall's work was a breakthrough since it registered adolescence to the inventory of social sciences' (mainly of Psychology) objects of study. In Hall's theory adolescence is described as a period of inherent crisis, characterized by "storm and stress". Adolescent behavior was subsumed in a universal stage of individual development, preassigned by human nature. In contrast to this individualist-naturalist explanation of adolescent behavior, socio-cultural approaches were articulated, mostly after World War II. Later, in the 1990's, the idea of "risk behavior" has been the source of a renewed naturalism to approaches of adolescence. The subject of how and why different theoretical approaches emerge, obviously concerns the history of ideas, theories and sciences. This article presents a sociological analysis, dealing with the matter of how theories of social sciences about adolescence have contributed to the formation of adolescent behavior. In particular, we examine how adolescence as a social category was constituted and

Correspondence: Kostas Spiridakis, PhD University of Crete, School of Philosophy, Department of Philosophical and Social Studies, Eirinis 17, Kalamaki Chania, 73100 Crete, GREECE. E-mail: spyridokostis@hotmail.com.

transformed along with the modification of social sciences' (psychology's and sociology's mostly) relevant concepts in the USA, from the late 19th century until the early 21st century. This historical reconstruction of the three phases in the adolescence's social category transformations enables us to focus on the importance a renewed naturalism in the explanation of adolescent behavior.

What does the term "social category" (Durkheim & Mauss, 2001) means in reference to adolescence? In adolescence's social category the biological dimension of this age group is causally connected to its socialization. A social reality is added to the biological reality of this age group, a reality constituted by rules and institutions that regulate behavior accordingly to the socio-cultural context (see Ariès, 1990; Mead, 1954). Thus, the conceptual content of the term "adolescence" not only signifies a theoretical point of view in a specific phase of human physical and psychological development, but also becomes a point of reference for its institutional organization and regulation of behaviors. It defines a social category through which physiology and social control, or the biological substratum with behavior's symbolic dimension, are connected. In other words, a social category is a category of thought, a powerful idea through which reality and the intellect are interconnected. What remains to be examined is how social sciences contributed to the formation of this social category.

Institutions, legal arrangements, organizations and professions that regulate various aspects of behavior, mediate between scientific concepts and perceptions that constitute common sense. In the case of adolescence, those were education, medicine, psychiatry, psychotherapy, counseling, social work and the penal system. Scientific concepts facilitate the definition of "natural", "normal" or permitted behavior for a category of people, while institutions' interventions on them acquire a rational character and become legitimate. At the same time, agents of this specialized knowledge, scientists, public servants and professionals, acquire an enhanced jurisdiction on problems of this category. Access to material and symbolic resources that they gain allows further expansion of that knowledge, as well as of those professional specializations (Abbot, 1988; Lenoir, 2004).

This interaction between social sciences and their objects of study does not take place in a social void. Symbolic systems have a political aspect. Symbols contribute to the reproduction of a common perception about reality. A common perception that combines knowledge and moral rules, therefore judgement for the correct or legitimate arrangement of social relations are entailed. Ideology, to wit, a sum of representations that reflect class interests while they appear to represent universal interests, is one of the symbolic systems available. Thus, a competition for symbolic domination takes place between social groups, a competition for the power by which the sense of obviousness, of self-evidence about things, is being established (Bourdieu, 1991). The struggle for symbolic domination is imprinted at the nexus of laws and institutions that constitutes the state. Therefore, while forms of thought, ideas, concepts, theories that social sciences produce in a given historical phase occupy various possible positions at the specter of approaches about human behavior, only some of them are favored by the wider ideological-political context.

Social sciences have entered the field of an already formed antithesis between nature and culture or between sciences of nature and sciences of culture, and produced explanations or interpretations of behavior with theoretical forms that place them closer to the one or the other pole of this antithesis, or to combinations of those different modes of organizing representations. Having established as agents of legitimate and valid knowledge, the symbolic antagonisms have been transferred at the inside of the field of social sciences. Concepts deriving from social sciences, whether related to socialization or individual behavior, have a common core of ideas about edification, shaping and transformation of the human creature from a biological to a social subject. Around socialization, two opposite theoretical foundations of human condition are reproduced, the "socio-cultural" and the "individual-natural". The dominance of some theories on others is related to the institutional consolidation of various social control forms (e.g., symbolic control, surveillance) depending on the kind of behavior that is being rationalized, naturalized and

_____

legitimized. This is a field of counterbalancing forces on the struggle for symbolic domination in which social sciences' concepts face each other and become stronger or weaker, depending on streams of mental forms, ideological or scientific, that run through the sum of spaces where symbolic control is exercised. The field of symbolic control (Bernstein, 2003) can be conceptualized as a social field of interdependencies, encompassing a distinctive logic and tensions, acquiring meaning at certain conditions of structural relevance.

The appearance and establishment of adolescence as a social category is related to the expansion of educational institutions, from childhood to adolescence, and the establishment of social sciences in academia. It is related to the emergence of adolescent behavior's most important institution, the school of secondary education ("high-school") and the recognition of social sciences as agents of symbolic control. The outcome of proceedings mentioned above was that adolescence was transformed from a mental representation that related adolescent physiology with various social meanings, to a clearly demarcated by institutional arrangements, and social groups. The modification of adolescence from physical to social category can be conceived as an outcome of institutional accommodation of younger generations' problem of social control. Scientific concepts were the foundations of practical disciplines and professions, of specialists holding knowledge to deal with the problems of adolescence. Theories of social sciences have not only contributed to the institutional consolidation of adolescence but to the institutionalization of specialists on adolescence as well. In other words, they have constituted "institutionalizing theories" that have modified institutionalized practices (Georgoulas, 2017).

2. The establishment of social sciences and the public appeal for social control of adolescence

Hall's theory on adolescence can be considered as such an institutionalizing theory since it launched a field of forces between social sciences and institutions that has given birth to new theories, new professional jurisdictions and has consolidated new terms for adolescence's social regulation. The problem of young generation's institutions of education and social control emerged in a specific historical juncture: in the context of developing capitalist economy and institutional reorganization of the late 19th century, citizenship and rights deriving from it were at the center of antagonism between various social groups in the USA (Marshall, 1950; Turner, 1990: 189-227; Nakano-Glenn, 2002: 19-30, 55-60; Sklar, 1992: 51-92; Bowles & Gintis, 1979: 23). At that point in time, consideration for social arrangement of adolescent behavior that exceeded family's and education's abilities to manage was imprinted at institutional level (Rodgers, 1980; Schnell, 1979; Zimring, 1978). The coming of progressivism, at the early 20th century, has advanced the idea that social problems such as poverty, criminality and alcoholism could be tackled by the improvement of living conditions of unprivileged social groups (the working class, racial and ethnic minorities, etc.) (Meyer et al., 1979; Drake, 1961).

Psychology and sociology have constructed their discourse at the conceptual context of evolutionary theories of their era. Theories by which human behavior was explained according to laws that supposedly govern the evolution of natural kinds, that is, processes by which man, as a kind and as individual organisms, adopt to external conditions of life. These theories held that innate forces of the individual, or accordingly of groups as an aggregation of commensurate individuals, consist the basis of differentiation and classification, while the place of every individual or group in social world's hierarchy was justified as an outcome of natural selection. Spencer's theory has been the main point of reference of American social scientists for the conceptual connection between human biology and culture. However, it was limited to a teleological, historical comparative frame of studying different modes of adaptation based on instincts and emotions. It has not been able to provide criteria of validity for the observations

about the interaction between individual's symbolic ability and the environment (Georgoulas, 2014: 53-99; Greenwood, 2009: 243-265; Ross, 1993: 87).

What has permitted social sciences to focus on the relation between behavior and cognition by providing a theory of how knowledge and morality is connected, was the philosophy of pragmatism. The term derives from Charles Pierce (1839-1914), who claimed that the motive for knowledge is lifting the doubt in order to return to the calm state that the certainty provides. Idea seeks its confirmation to action and confirmed ideas constitute habits. However, Pierce did not specify truth, but only a way of acquiring knowledge at the level of physiology (Durkheim, 1983). James (1890), Dewey (1916:160-173), Baldwin (1902: 260-267), Mead, Cooley and others (Calhoun, 2007: 5) extended his observation to the level of behavior. Despite their differences, they held in common this distinct stance towards knowledge: knowledge about reality cannot reside outside the individual and its purposes. Pragmatism, as Durkheim puts it, has been a "…*philosophy of people, to wit, a collective consciousness that incorporates scientific truths in unified whole*", and it can be epitomized by the phrase: "….*true is what has been established or prevailed as such and whatever is true is ethical also"* (Durkheim, 1983: 54).

Social sciences shifted interest from inherited traits of behavior to their social formation, thus moving the guidelines of social control. This closer connection of behavior to symbolic ability and culture enabled the formation of a field of intervention for symbolic control, since it meant that behavior could be modified by institutions that use discourse as mean of guidance. Nevertheless they reproduced social world's hierarchical grading by maintaining utility as the final yardstick of their categories. Thus, social sciences held an individualist-naturalist approach that was limited to control of the individual by its immediate environment.

2.1 *Hall's impact*

Hall's biography is indicative of his pivotal role in the establishment of adolescence as a scientific concept in the midst of academic field's rearrangements and in the wider cognitive context of sciences' development. In 1878 he became the first to obtain a PhD in psychology in the USA at Harvard, under the supervision of William James. In 1884 he occupied the first psychology chair in the USA, at Johns Hopkins University. Later he established the first journal of psychology in the USA. He has also been the first president of American Psychological Association. Four years later he took over presidency of Clark University which, at the time, was delivering most of PhD's in psychology (Arnett & Cravens, 2006; 165-171).

The term "adolescence" was unknown in the USA before the late 19th century. There was nearly no usage of the word and interest for that which would be later called "stage of development" was limited in the field of physiology (Kett, 1971: 283-298; Demos & Demos, 1969: 632-638; Dornbush, 1989: 233-259; Fustenberg, 2000: 896-910). Hall emphasized bodily changes, which he related to a group of personality traits, independently of a person's social origin. The adolescent, according to Hall, reveals outstanding potential for development, but also contradictive impulses at the same time: hyperactivity and indolence, happiness and depression, egoism and altruism, radicalism and conservatism. Within so much change and conflict, the adolescent tends to experience "storm and stress". Hall has reshaped widespread perception about youth of his times, combining them with the idea of evolution, collecting data in a large scale (questionnaires from parents) and presenting them in a convincing manner.

Hall suggested that adolescent sexuality should be put under control, channeled to manifestations of "natural" adolescent idealism since love for the opposite sex, nature, homeland and God, is awaking. He advocated a pragmatic stance towards adolescent nature, centered on the quest for an "authentic" identity beneath artificial conventions. In contrast to moralist's texts of his age, who expressed protestant, individualist values of American society encouraging

_____

youngsters to assume adult responsibilities, Hall suggested a moratorium of responsibilities. He encouraged a relaxing of pressures for adult activities and preparation for adulthood, since adolescents need rest instead of excitement, while sexual awakening brings them to conflict with civilization (Hall, 1904a: 13, 384). Efforts to understand adolescents and dialogue should be used, according to Hall, as means of guidance instead of blind obedience and punishment. He stressed that the natural process of development and the moratorium of responsibilities conceded to adolescents were not enough to bring the desirable outcomes, since parents and teachers cannot provide the right guidance by themselves. Specialized institutions and organizations should take control of this process (Hall, 1904b: 86-87, 429-432).

Thus, Hall validates, in the most formal, organized and analytical manner, the appeal for a social policy for control of adolescence and encompasses it with the status drawn by his position in the scientific field. At the same time this appeal concerns the institutionalization of symbolic control of adolescence directed by social sciences. Social sciences were given the responsibility of organizing specialized institutions for adolescents and of discovering the right proportions between discipline, guidance and encouragement of initiatives. Hall "discovered" that a specific pattern of adolescent development existed in nature and, according to it, suggested a process that ensured a successful completion of this development. He was the protagonist in the construction of the scientific concept of adolescence. Ever since, empirical knowledge of social sciences have contributed to the creation of new institutions for adolescence or the modification of the preexisting ones. The appeal for a public recognition of adolescence as a distinctive age category – hence for its connection with special privileges – was articulated, advanced and produced institutional outcomes approximately at the two last decades of the 19th century and the first of the 20th century. This distinction was validated by social sciences. Socialization acquired characteristics that lean on the individualist-naturalist version of human condition's theoretical founding, albeit having its practical implementation in relation to "social control" (education, correctional system, voluntarily organizations such as Boy Scouts). Since human nature, by which adolescent behavior was explained, was taken for granted, the question was how to develop institutions according to its operation principles, in order to tune the individual with the social level within their interaction. Against this naturalist theoretical founding of adolescence, social and/or cultural accounts of human condition were developed. However, the constitution of "symbolic control" as a field of opposing forces had to be preceded by a political breakthrough: the "New Deal".

3. The establishment of the social sciences' field of social control
   and of adolescence as a social category

The consolidation of the welfare state and the reinforcement of federal government's intervention have multiplied social sciences' potential to effect social reality (Schaffer, 1991; Kennedy, 2001: 376). This meant that only when their material and ideological-political bases came into being, were they able to effect the institutional context of social life's organization. Thus, the symbolic control of social sciences became stronger and wider. Their theories fed specialized knowledge used by professional to address social needs and at the same time to legitimize their authority on social problems. Psychologists have claimed the acknowledgement of their jurisdiction on the sector of "personal problems" (Abbot, 1988: 459-462; Baker & Benjamin, 2014: 33-36). Sociology and social work in the USA have not developed, initially, as discrete objects of knowledge but as parts of progressivism, a wider movement of institutional reform, with often overlapping fields of intervention (Abbot, 1999: 80-86, 101-105; Lengermann & Nierbrugge, 2007). By the 1940s, sciences specialized in institutions, sociology and anthropology, have added a new perspective of adolescence's problem, claiming, at the same time, their jurisdiction on its management (Parsons, 1942; Parsons, 1959; Mead, 1954; Benedict, 1934: 36).

At the second period, after World War II, due to secondary education's legal establishment and expansion, the appeal for a socially managed age of adolescence has been satisfied. When the majority of adolescents were included in secondary education, adolescence has been placed under the auspices of the state and formal institutions (Goldin & Katz, 2011). At the same time, symbolic control of adolescence gets complicated as a new form of social control strengthens: the "Mass Media". Those are responsible for the establishment of the term "teenager", in the 1940's, that signifies chronologically those between the first and the second decade of their lives. Adolescents acquire considerable purchasing power and became a target group for the advertisement. The expansion of secondary education has opened their perspectives for inclusion to professional hierarchy by criteria connected to achievement instead of ancestry (see Coleman, 1961). Differentiation and specialization for the professional structure of an advanced division of labor without endangering discipline and standardization of behavior, was the aim of education and symbolic control of adolescents under those new conditions.

The symbolic control of social sciences, which until then had been based exclusively on educational institutions, was held by an entire field, including counseling and psychotherapy services for adolescents (Capshew, 1999: 15; Pickren & Rutheford, 2010: 214-218; Tomes, 2008: 667). Sociologists' professional role as specialists-advisors on social problems has been enhanced (Janowitz, 1977). At the same time, a strong trend of critical approaches to symbolic control has been developed, uncovering group interests or identity issues concealed to the notion of an equivocal normality[1]. Theories about adolescence in Psychology during that period reflected a drive towards renegotiation of rights connected with this age group, of the anticipated behaviors and of institutions' desirable actions. Despite of its one-sided approach of culture (civilization) as source of oppression of an individuality focused on instincts, Freudian accounts (Freud, 1958; Blos, 1962; Erikson, 1968) contributed to a cultural understanding of adolescence. This side of Freud's theory was explored especially by Erikson, who has suggested that adolescence is created on the basis of social expectations and is a period in which the individual is allowed to postpone decisions regarding its identity and experiment with roles in order to discover itself. His approach conceives the interaction between the biological, the psychological and the sociological dimension of identity as a civilizing process. Bronfenbrenner's approach followed the same direction. He has processed a "bio-ecological model of human development", emphasizing the interaction between the biologically and psychological developing individual and people, objects and symbols that surround it, on the micro, middle and macro social level (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2007).

Adolescence became an object of social policy while sociology and psychology were leading the institutionalizations. The socio-cultural pole of symbolic control's field of adolescence strengthens and prevails as the official version of adolescence. The understanding of the socio-cultural, to wit of the time and space specificity of adult behavior, was presupposition for the understanding of adolescent behavior's particularity. The guidance of adolescent behavior became a matter of transmitting common cognitive and moral elements that contribute to the formation of a self-controlled individuality. Theories of sociology and psychology indicated the possibility of conciliation of demands made by youth for larger margins of freedom with the need for orienting their behavior towards social spaces, where the adolescent, as a developing biological and psycho-social entity, could acquire an identity. Thus, except from the group context of activities for adolescents controlled by adults (e.g., education, sports) symbolic control was enriched by the interpersonal communication of individualized interventions. Through practices of psychotherapy and counseling the adolescent could be faced- and face himself or herself- as individuality, a product of a particular family history, of a certain social background and not a just a member of a group in a school class. Professionals of the practices mentioned above had the knowledge and the

_____

[1] Derived or influenced by the so-called "Frankfurt School" and of constructivism, mainly in the form of "labeling theory" (Wallerstein, 2007; Abbot 2001: 67-69).

moral commitment to facilitate the connection of individuality with collective aims and identities, in cases that family and education had difficulties in handling. Except from psychanalytical approaches that had a pure clinical orientation, theories about adolescence were enunciated as a contribution to the knowledge about adolescent development to be used by society through public institutions and professionals.

Yet still, because of social state's deconstruction, conditions providing autonomy to the field of symbolic control were disturbed. A larger share in the exercise of social control was conceded, in part, to the individualist version, because of the connection of adolescence to a self-referential quest for identity, independent from forms of collective identity, and in part to the naturalist version, because of the turn from symbolic control to surveillance and to therapeutic standardization of adolescence.

4. The turn from symbolic control to surveillance and repression, and the transformation of adolescence as a social category

The third period, from 1980s and on, is dominated by neoliberal policies (Harvey, 2005; Foucault, 2008). The state withdrew from the field of economy but exerted greater control on social policies that normalize behavior, attempting to lower their cost at the same time. This was pursued by changing the criteria of their function. In education, managers were put in charge and new tools of social control, new goals and efficiency criteria, like standardized teaching methods and teachers' evaluation, were imported. Equivalent processes took place at the field of psychotherapy and counseling. Instead of the field's normalization function, that could ensure that the outcomes of the social division of labor would be humane, the function of surveillance and of "unnatural" behavior's repression is reinforced.

This transformation of social control is connected with a triple ideological erosion of social policy at the level of knowledge and its practical implementations: first, a renewed biologicalism based on neurosciences is the source of definitions about normality and deviance based on a group of observed behaviors, without reference to causes attributed to society or consciousness. Second, the introduction of effectivity criteria, mostly in education, where conceptual constructions are based on the externality and accountability of observable behavior and the concomitant devaluation of any professional activity's aspect that escapes from that short of evaluation (Sloan, 2008). Third, the demand for knowledge that can be used in risk management through implementation of techniques of repression through surveillance, drugs or through stricter penalties for offenders.

Politics that push forward standardized testing, procedures of quantified evaluation, competition and emphasis on the "right" of school choice by the parents, as well as various shorts of privatization of schools are developed in public, elementary and secondary education (Hursh, 2007; Friedman, 1955). The matter of youth criminality and appeals to stricter laws and means of repression are becoming the supplement of politics for management of the disadvantaged social groups. The emphasis on disciplinary treatment of adolescents is evident in the adoption of "zero tolerance" or "broken windows" policies by schools (Teske, 2011; Wilson & Kelling, 1982). The philosophy underlying those policies was that the establishment of preordered strict penalties even for the less serious offences, regardless of the circumstances in which they took place or of the offender's situation, prevents the consolidation of an impunity climate.

A series of events concerning students shooting, their classmates and teachers inside the school has created a sense of insecurity to school community and the wider public opinion. Those events have also elicited the matter of school intimidation ("bulling"), that has been connected with later manifestations of violence, as victims of bulling accumulate anger and become perpetrators themselves. In 2008, Congress has passed a law according to which, among

other measures, schools were to be shut down if proved unable to offer a secure environment. Thus, schools took a number or measures, like installing metal detectors, having police or private security at school, establishing a dress code to make class differences non visible, initiatives for students arbitrating disputes, etc. (Owen, 2011).

In psychiatry and clinical psychology the role of DSM has been enhanced from the 1980's and on in the USA. A model of psychiatry based on drug therapy prevails, practiced through a taxonomy of symptoms of various behavioral patterns. In the 1980 version of DSM (III) a new section is introduced, containing disorders that usually appear in infancy, childhood and adolescence. There, one can find a category of diagnosis called "conduct disorder" that includes a series of symptoms: a repetitive and persistent pattern of behavior in which the basic rights of others or major age-appropriate norms are violated, like risk sexual behavior, premature smoking, alcohol and drugs consumption, low self-esteem, cruelty, anger outbursts, provocative recklessness, etc. Complications of this disorder includes expulsions from school, delinquency, venereal diseases, high percentage of injury from accident, fights and suicidal behavior. Damage inflicted by this disorder is classified from mild to severe, which can possibly need incarceration to some institution.

DSM's role to psychotherapy and counseling has gotten wider than just a scientific manual. It constitutes the institutional consolidation of a scientific discourse about mental illness, disorder or whatever is considered as such at the time. Nevertheless, it is a scientific discourse influenced or directed by extra-scientific interests, since scientists, professionals, insurance companies and pressure groups of parents and teachers along with drug industries transact using the classification in the official manual of the America Psychiatric Society as "currency". From 1980, research's turn to cerebral biochemical malfunctions or deviances is reducing subject's role as a rational being to completing questionnaires, matching symptoms to illnesses and occasionally drugs. Thus, psychotherapy and counseling, instead of being enriched by social sciences knowledge, incorporating them to intrapersonal communication aiming to a mutual understanding of socially defined symbols, is being degraded to an automated process of classifying information (Chodoff, 2005; Shorter, 2013; Papadopoulos, 2017: 139-146).

This ideological mutation of social policy is also evident in the field of symbolic control of adolescent behavior and it is reflected on new theoretical advances of social sciences regarding adolescence as well. Those theoretical advances contribute to modifications of adolescence as a social category, a process that takes place within new conditions of the division of labor and a new arrangement of relations between social classes and between generations.

In the early 21st century structural changes in work, education and family are accompanied by changes of the life circle, to wit, the socially defined succession of a person's affiliation to roles and institutions. During the last decades of the 20th century, age indexes of facts that signify the inclusion of a person to adulthood, marriage, completion of education and labor market entrance, exhibit upward trends, except from the age of first sexual intercourse, which is becomes lower. Quite so, whereas in the early industrial society, adolescence was related to the separation of learning process from production, during the last decades of the 20th century the none-productive period in a person's life is prolonged, due to academic demands of labor market, dictated by fast devaluation of knowledge in economy and by the growing work insecurity. Therefore, a growing number of people in their 18 to 30 years of age postpone their commitments and prolong their education or their economic dependence by their parents or the state (Larson, 2002; Mortimer & Larson, 2002; Fustenberg, 2000).

As limits between work, education (Kerckhoff, 2002: 64; Shanahan, 2000) recreation, play or even between private and public life (Crogan & Kinsley, 2012; Côté, 2014) become more permeable, behavior anticipated by adults converges with that of the adolescents. At the same time, through a "postmodern" perspective, the standard of the adult person, which is the

_____

developmental goal of adolescence, is questioned or redefined along with the content of concepts that describe but also orientate individuality. "Self", "subject", "identity" are located in the center of the discussion about "post-modernity" or "late modernity" (Jameson, 1991; Harvey, 1990; Baumaister, 1987; Harter, 1999: 59-88).

Rights and obligations connected with age categories are renegotiated. New theoretical advances, institutionalizations and collective representations for adolescence do not expel older ones. However, they contribute to new directions in the treatment of adolescents that move away from the direction followed during the previous phase of social control field's development. This decomposition of the division of labor and of the institutional complex that tuned adolescents' experience is reflected in efforts of re-conceptualizing adolescence in social sciences. On the one hand, multiplication of specialized fields of study of adolescence (Crosnoe & Kirkpatrick-Johnson, 2011; Smetana et al., 2006; Steinberg & Morris, 2001) is an outcome of division of labor advancement within that field, which results to enrichment of knowledge. On the other hand, this knowledge is difficult to be reformulated as different aspects of the same object. Adolescence is no longer considered a problem to be dealt with by a total social management but a source of a series of problems for which piecemeal solutions are requested.

Those changes are recorded in social scientific approaches already from the 1970 decade. The extension of education, of economic dependence by the parents and marriage postponement were considered by sociological perspectives as signs of a "nearly endless adolescence" (Gunter & Moore, 1975: 63). On the other hand, and while classical definitions of clinical and developmental psychology set 22 years old as higher limit of adolescence, approaches based on neuronal changes of the brain that effect impulses control, emotions and rational ability, move that limit to the age of 25. Coming from a brain neurobiological perspective, Arnett (2000) has proposed a new term, "emerging adulthood", as a discrete developmental stage between adolescence and adulthood in order to describe traits of behavior of the space between 20 and 20 years of age.

Meanwhile, since 1990's politicians and pressure groups were promoting the idea that adolescent suicide, pregnancy, violence and risk behavior are the fundamental problems of American society. Political campaigns were organized incited by fear of a youth that increasingly includes ethnic minorities. Naturalism, in defining adolescence, was renewed by a "science of adolescence", providing arguments in favor of legislating legal measures. Centered on the idea of biologically determined adolescent incapability, pressure groups promoted various policies, from curfew on youngsters to the abolishment of death penalty for adolescents, and pushed for founding of projects about youth management (Males, 2011).

4.1 *The resurgence of naturalism in the explanation of adolescent behavior*

Indicative of biologically founded approaches is the association of adolescence with risk behavior made by Arnett (1999) and Steinberg (2007). Risk behavior includes, among other things, driving in high speed or intoxicated, sex without contraception or with strangers, commission of crimes due to usage of illegal substances. Behaviors mentioned above are attributed to psycho-physical traits of adolescence: adolescent's tendency to seek intense experiences and emotions. Arnett connects aggressiveness with increasing level of testosterone. Steinberg attributes risk taking to changes in developmental changes of the dopaminergic system that regulates emotions and rewards. This is making adolescences prone to sensation seeking behaviors especially at the presence of peers, until the development of cognitive control system in late adolescence and adulthood.

Techniques for neuro-imagining and evaluation of behavior have focused on behaviors that are consider typical of adolescence in all cultures, even in the animal kingdom: new

experience seeking, risk taking and peer-directed sociality. Those behaviors characterize efforts made by individuals to become independent from adult care, self-sufficient members of their society (Munakata et al., 2004). Data on brain structural and functional development are subject to processing and explanation prior to their connection with behavior. Molecular genetic biology, modeling through computer, chemical testing and other techniques have also contributed to data collection and processing. Thus, a new scientific field of knowledge has been formed, drawing methods and explanatory models from psychology and social sciences in general, as well as from neuroscience and genetics. This new field of knowledge constitutes a "neurobiological complex", a scientific discipline, consisted of theories, practices and technologies that has been developed from the 1960's onwards (Rose & Abi-Rached, 2010).

Yet still, the initial programmatic ambition of neuroscience, the subsumption to mind's materiality of every explanation about phenomena related to human symbolic ability, cognition and sentiments, has abated. In general, neuroscientists confess their inability to cover the gap between data coming from imaging techniques, laboratory, experimental, clinical studies and the complexity of interaction between the individual, the social and the natural environment that determines human behavior. Inside this gap there is a space for social sciences and humanities also, besides biological determinism. In any case, motives and pressure from state and market to scientists, through research programs founding, publications, and academic positions, are leading neuroscience to fields of result implementation. Corresponding theoriticalizations are requested for government policies, focusing on detection, prevention and repression in matters concerning deviant/delinquent behavior of "high risk" groups. At the same time, neurosciences respond to demand for medicine, therapies, techniques and practices of self-improvement that target, not only the body but the brain as well (Pitts-Taylor, 2010).

5. Conclusion

We have summarized the formation process of a field of forces, the field of symbolic control of adolescence through social sciences that produces theory and social policy. This took place in conditions of power fluctuation between social classes, incorporating appeals of various social groups while establishing the jurisdiction of professional groups. The individualist/naturalist pole of the field has strengthen over the social/cultural not only because of the resurgence of naturalism. This happened also because of the encouragement of new forms of sociality that hold the enterprise as a standard and the ability of the individual to reshape reality according to the goal of self-fulfillment as a ruling principle (Boltanski & Chiapelo, 2007). Control of behavior does not only proceeds by surveillance and forcing of rules to defend security, but with the construction of niches of creativity and sociality inside a universe of mechanistic labor and isolation in private life (Deleuze, 1992).

However, naturalistically founded theoretical approaches to adolescence became one of the sources of legitimation for techniques of control through surveillance, repression and standardized criteria of behavior, to wit, forms of control that become effective regardless of the degree to which rules are internalized. In addition, those forms of control restrict subject's ability to participate in the formation of such rules. On the contrary, in social control through language and communication in education, complemented by counseling and psychotherapy, though it runs through uneven relations of domination between social classes and groups, conformity to rules depends on accession to values and devotion to collective goals. Institutions that formed the field of symbolic control were not just instruments for the imposition of arbitrary power, but a part of the social state, the institutional expression of solidarity relations between members of the lower classes and of the dependence of the higher classes from them. In spaces created by those institutions, resistance to control was developed as much as struggle for the rules of control.

_____

References

Abbot, A. (1999). *Department and discipline: Chicago sociology at one hundred*. Chicago: UCP.

Abbot, A. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ariès, P., (1962). *Centuries of childhood: A social history of family life* (R. Baldick, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.

Arnett, J., & Cravens, H. (2006). G. Stanley's Hall adolescence: A centennial reappraisal introduction. *History of Psychology*, *9*(3), 165-171.

Arnett, J., (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, *55*(5), 469-480.

Arnett, J., (1999). Storm and stress reconsidered. *American Psychologist*, *54*(5) (317-326).

Baker, D., & Benjamin, L. (2014). *From séance to science: A history of the profession of psychology in America*. Akron: University of Acron Press.

Baldwin, M. (1902). *Development and evolution, including psychophysical evolution, evolution by orthoplasy, and the theory of genetic modes*. London: McMillan.

Baumaister, R. (1987). How the self became a problem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*(1), 163-176

Benedict, R. (1934). *Patterns of culture*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Riverside UP.

Bernstein, B. (2003). *Class, codes and control IV*. *The structuring of pedagogic discours*e. London-New York: Routledge.

Blos, P. (1962). *On adolescence: A psychoanalytic interpretation*. New York: Free Press.

Boltanski, L., & Chiapelo, E. (2007). *The new spirit of capitalism* (Elliot, G., trans.). London-New York: Verso.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (2011). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. (2007). The bio-ecological model of human development. In: W. Damon & R. Lerner, *Handbook of Child Psychology. 6ᵗʰ edition,* I: 14. (pp. 793-825).

Calhoun, C. (2007). Sociology in America: An introduction. In: C. Calhoun (ed.), *Sociology in America: A history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Capshew, J. (1999). *Psychologists on the march: Science, practice, and professional identity in America, 1929-1969*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Crosnoe, P., & Kirkpatrick-Johnson, M. (2011). Research on adolescence in the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *37*, 439-460.

Lenoir, R. (2004). Prokataskevasmeni pragmatikotita kai domisi tou koinoniologikou antikeimenou [Prefabricated reality and construction of the sociological subject]. In: P. Champagne, R.

Lenoir, D. Merllie, L. Pinto (Eds.), *Miisi stin koinoniologiki praktiki* [Initiation to sociological practice] (A. Karastathi, Trans.). Athens: Institute of Books - A. Kardanitsa.

Chodoff, P. (2005). Psychiatric diagnosis: A 60-year perspective. *Psychiatric News*, *40*(11).

Côté, J. (2014). Towards a new political economy of youth. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17(4), 527-543.

Cremin, L., (1959). John Dewey and the progressive-education movement, 1915-1952. *American Journal of Education*, 67(2), 160-173.

Crogan, P. & Kinsley, S. (2012). Paying Attention: Toward a critique of the attention economy. *Culture Machine*, 13, 1-29.

Cohen, M. (2005). Reconsidering schools and the American welfare state. *History of Education Quarterly*, *45*(4), 511-537.

Coleman, J. (1961). *Adolescent society: The social life of the teenager and its impact on education*. Glencoe: Free Press.

Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on societies of control. *The MIT Press*, 59, 3-7.

Demos, J., & Demos, V. (1969). Adolescence in historical perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *31*(4), 632-638.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: McMillan.

Drake, W. (1961). Some implications of the institutionalization of American education. *History of Education Quarterly*, *1*(1), 41-47.

Dornbush, S., (1989). Sociology of adolescence. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *15*, 233-259.

Durkheim, E. (1983). *Pragmatism and sociology* (J. Whitehouse, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Durkeim, E., & Mauss, M. (1963). *Primitive classification* (Needham, R., trans.). Chicago: Chicago UP.

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

Georgoulas, A. (2017). *Metaschimatismoi tis ekpaideusis, synchroni ideologia kai diadikasies symbolikis kiriarchias* [Transformations of education, modern ideology and processes of symbolic domination]. Athina: Topos.

Georgoulas, A. (2014). Naturalismos kai koinoniki theoria (Naturalism and social theory). In: *E genesis tis koinoniologias kai e sychroni anthropologia* [The genesis of sociology and modern anthropology] (pp. 53-59). Athens: Topos.

Gunter, B., & Moore, H. (1975). Youth leisure and post-industrial society: Implications for the family. *The Family Coordinator*, *24*(2), 199-207.

Freud, A. (1958). Adolescence. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, *13*(1), 255-278.

Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics, Lectures at the College in 1978-79*. Burchell, G. (trans.). New York: Palgrave-McMillan.

Friedman, M. (1955). The role of government in education. In: R. Solo (ed.), *Economics and the public interest*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press,

Fustenberg, F. (2000). The sociology of adolescence and youth in the 1990s: A critical commentary. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *62*(4), 896-910.

Goldin, C., & Katz, L. (2011). Mass secondary schooling and the state: The role of state compulsion in the high school movement. In: D. Costa & N. Lamoreaux (Eds.), *Understanding long-run economic growth: Geography, institutions, and the knowledge economy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 282-290.

Greenwood, J., (2009). *A conceptual history of psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

James, W. (1980). *Principles of psychology*. Vol. 1, 2, Holt: New York.

_____

Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism or the cultural logic of late capitalism*. London: Verso.

Janowitz, M. (1977). Professionalization of sociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, *78*(1), Varieties of political expression in sociology, 105-135.

Johnson, S., Blum, R., & Giedd, J. (2009). Adolescent maturity and the brain: The promise and pitfalls of neuroscience research in adolescent health policy. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 245. no3. 216-221. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.05.016

Hall, G. S. (1904). *Adolescence: Its psychology and its relations to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion and education*. New York, D. Appleton and Company.

Harter, S., (199). *The construction of the self: A developmental perspective*. New York: Guildford Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford Press.

Hursh, D. (2017). Assessing No Child Left Behind and the rise of neoliberal education policies. *American Educational Research Journal*, *44*(3), 493-518.

Kennedy, D. (2001). *Freedom from fear: American people in the depression and war*. New York: Oxford UP.

Kerckhoff, A. (2002). The transition from school to work. In: J. Mortimer & R. Larson (Eds.), *The changing adolescent experience societal trends and the transition to adulthood*. New York: Cambridge UP.

Kett, J. (1971). Adolescence and youth in nineteenth-century America. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 2*(2), 283-298.

Larson, R., (2002). Globalization societal change and new technologies: What they mean for the future of adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *12*(1), 1-30.

Lengermann P., & Nierbrugge, G. (2007). Sociology's relation to social work. In: C. Calhoun (ed.), *Sociology in America: A history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Males, M. (2009). Does adolescent brain make risk taking Inevitable?: A skeptical appraisal. J*ournal of Adolescent Research*, *24*(1), 3-20.

Marshall, T. (1950). *Citizenship and social class and other essays*. Cambridge UP.

Mead, M. (1954). *Coming of age in Samoa: A study of adolescence and sex in primitive societies*. Melbourne: Penguin.

Meyer, J., Tyack, D., Nagel, J., & Gordon, A. (1979). Public education as nation-building in America: Enrollments and bureaucratization in the American States 1870-1930. *American Journal of Sociology*, *85*(3), 591-613.

Mortimer, J., & Larson, R. (2002). Macrostructural trends and the reshaping of adolescence. In: J. Mortimer & R. Larson (Eds.). *The changing adolescent experience societal trends and the transition to adulthood*. New York: Cambridge UP.

Munakata, Y., Casey, B., & Diamond, A. (2004). Developmental cognitive neuroscience: progress and potential. *TRENDS in Cognitive Sciences*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2004.01.005

Nakano Glenn, E. (2002). *Unequal freedom: How race and gender shaped American citizenship and labor*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP.

Owen, L. (2011). School violence. In: M. Shally-Jensen (ed.), *Encyclopedia of contemporary social issues, Volume 2,* Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio.

Papadopoulos, M. (2017). *E autoktonia tis psychiatrikis* [The suicide of psychiatry]. Athens: Nisos.

Parsons, T. (1959). The school class as a social system: Some of its functions in American society. *Harvard Educational Review*, *29*(4), 297-318.

Parsons, T. (1942). Age and sex in the social structure of the United States. *American Sociological Review*, *7*(5), 604-616.

Pickren, W., & Rutheford, A. (2010). *A history of modern psychology in context*. New Jersey: John Wiley.

Pitts-Taylor, V. (2010). The plastic brain: Neoliberalism and the neuronal self. *Health*, *14*(6), 635-652.

Rodgers, D. (1980). Socializing middle class children: Institutions, fables and work values in nineteenth-century America. *Journal of Social History*, *13*(3), 354-367.

Ross, D. (1993). The development of social sciences. In: J. Farr & R. Seidelman (Eds.), *Discipline and history: Political science in the United States* (pp. 83-97). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Rose, N., & Abi-Rached, J. (2010). *The new brain neuro: The new brain sciences and the management of the mind.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Tomes, N. (2008). The development of clinical psychology, social work, and psychiatric nursing: 1900–1980. In: E. Wallace & J. Gach (Eds.). *History of psychiatry and medical psychology*. New York: Springer.

Shanahan, M. (2000). Pathways to adulthood in changing societies: Variability and mechanisms in life course perspective. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 667-692.

Schaffer, R. (1991). *America in the Great War: The rise of the war welfare state*. New York: Oxford UP.

Schnell, R. (1979). Childhood as ideology: A reinterpretation of the common school. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *27*(1), 7-28.

Shorter, E. (2013). The history of the DSM. In: J. Paris & J. Phillips (Eds.), *Making the DSM-5, Concepts and controversies*. New York: Springer.

Sklar, M. (1992). Studying American political development in the Progressive Era, 1890S-1916. ch. 2. In: *The United States as a developing country studies in U.S. history in the Progressive Era and the 1920s*. New York: Cambridge UP.

Sloan, C. (2008). The expanding educational services sector: Neoliberalism and the corporatization of curriculum at the local level in the US. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *40*(5), 555-578.

Smetana, J., Campione-Barr, N., & Metzger, A., (2006). Adolescent development in interpersonal and societal contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *57*, 255-284.

Steinberg, L., & Morris, A., (2001). Adolescent development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 83-110.

Steinberg, L. (2007). Risk-taking in adolescence: New perspectives from brain and behavioral science. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *16*, 55-59.

Teske, S. (2011). A study of zero tolerance policies in schools: A multi-integrated systems approach to improve outcomes for adolescents. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing*, *24*, 88-97.

Wallerstein, I. (2007). The culture of sociology in disarray: The impact of 1968 on US sociologists. In: C. Calhoun (ed.), *Sociology in America: A history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, J. & Kelling, G. (1982). Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety. *Atlantic Monthly*, *249*(3), 29-38.

Zimring, F. (1998). *American youth violence*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.