



**A Series of Information Resources
on**

***Youth Subcultures:
Understanding Subgroups to Better
Address Barriers to Learning
& Improve Schools***

As calls for addressing barriers to student learning and improving schools increase, better understanding of youth subculture is essential. This series is intended to stimulate thinking about the implications for policy and practice of the complex, multifaceted subgroups with which youth come to be identified and/or assigned by peers.

Public health and education policy makers, practitioners, researchers, and educators need to know as much as they can about the factors that lead youth to manifest behaviors stemming from group defined values, beliefs, attitudes, and interests. Such understanding is basic to promoting healthy development, preventing problems, intervening as soon as problems arise, and enhancing intervention impact on severe and chronic problems.

To these ends, the Center is producing a series of resources, such as this one, as aids for policy and practice analyses, research, education, and school and community improvement planning.

About Jocks as a Youth Subculture

Our focus here is on briefly highlighting:

- (1) how youth are identified as "Jocks"
 - (2) the impact of this subgroup
 - (3) prevalent policy and practice efforts to address negative impact
 - (4) data on intervention efforts
 - (5) proposed new directions
 - (6) resources for more information.
-
-

The Center for Mental Health in Schools is co-directed by Howard Adelman and Linda Taylor and operates under the auspices of the School Mental Health Project, Dept. of Psychology, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1563. Phone: (310) 825-3634.

Permission to reproduce this document is granted. Please cite source as the Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA.

About Jocks as a Youth Subculture

“Adolescents seek out an identity that allows them to be actors in their social world and that allows them to feel effective, successful, and connected in their everyday activities. Extracurricular activities provide youth with the opportunity to form just such identities. In addition, because participation also influences peer group formation, participation feeds into a synergistic system. ... As one moves into and through adolescence, individuals become identified with particular groups of friends or crowds. Being a member of one of these crowds helps structure both what one does with one’s time and the kinds of values and norms one is exposed to.

Eccles & Barber (1999)

In their studies, Eccles and Barber (1999) found that the most common extracurricular activities for both males and females were “team sports, bands or orchestras, and church, with participation on sports teams being the most common by a substantial margin.” This is not surprising since athletics are iconic throughout the U.S. as well as in many other cultures. In the U.S., more than 55.2 percent of students enrolled in high schools participate in athletics (National Federation of State High School Associations, 2009).

Athletics clearly is a broad arena of youth subculture identity, and a variety of subgroups have coalesced around formal and informal sports teams and around peers who adopt an athletic lifestyle. Good athletes usually are admired, and exceptional athletes often are treated as superstars. However, there are significant status differentials among the various youth sports and among those who identify with this subcultural arena.

On school campuses, those who are identified or identify themselves with athletics often are referred to as “jocks.” While the term “jock” may be used interchangeably with “athlete,” researchers suggest that the constructs are not equivalent. Our focus here is on youth who are identified by others as jocks or who adopt the term to describe themselves.

Defining Jocks and Identifying Subgroup Members

While athletes tend to be viewed in positive terms, the term jock mostly conveys a negative stereotype. (Derivation of the term usually is attributed to male athletes use of the protective garment known as a jockstrap. Other negative terms cited as synonyms in the literature include *meathead*, *musclebrain*, and *musclehead*.) In general, the term is used to designate male high school and college athletes who form an exclusive group that is perceived as a conceited elite. Those using the term pejoratively see jocks as abusing their athletic status by being rude, arrogant, stupid, bullies, full of themselves, stuck-up, and self-centered. Research findings indicate that jocks as contrasted with other athletes are more closely associated with problem behaviors such as bullying and heavy drinking. However, they also share many of the positive attributes attributed to athletes in general.

Miller and her colleagues have been instrumental in clarifying that “jocks” can be separated from the overall pool of athletes (Miller et al., 2003, 2005, 2006). These researchers stress that identity as a jock reflects more than just participation in, or orientation toward, sports. It represents a distinct identity “with implications not only for the lived athletic experience but also for other, less-obviously related domains, including gender norms and health-risk behavior” (Miller, 2009).

They note:

“Early physical maturation may act as a selection criterion for early male recruitment into sports. Boys who are taller, heavier, or more muscular than most of their age peers are

likely to be perceived as good candidates for many team sports and may consequently come to think of themselves in “jock” terms. ... Popular cultural imagery associated with sports ranges from the ascetic (“my body is my temple”) to the socially gregarious (partying with the team), and anecdotal evidence suggests that identification as a “jock” may signal a stronger affiliation with the latter facet of athletic involvement. Furthermore, adolescent jocks tend to be immersed in sport-based social networks of peers and adults” (Miller et al., 2003, 2005, 2006).

These researchers conclude that jock identity is “less about a narrow focused commitment to athleticism than it is about the wider embrace of a dominant vision of masculinity and the imperatives associated with it.” Those in high-status, high-profile sports who apply the term to themselves are described as having a tendency to rigidly adhere to stereotypical expectations of masculinity and have “a tolerance for risk and health-compromising behaviors such as substance use and unsafe sex.” Applying basic principles of identity theory to the specific case of sport-related identities, Miller and her colleagues are developing a “toxic jock” theory that suggests participation in a “high-profile, high status sport marked by pervasive, hegemonically masculine imagery” can lead to a dangerously risk-oriented identity (Miller et al., 2006; Miller, 2009).

Given the negative stereotype, it is not surprising that survey findings indicate that, only 18 percent of students strongly identify with the identity of “jock,” while 55 percent strongly identify with the identity of “athlete.” Two thirds (68 percent) of men and 39 percent of women surveyed identified themselves as athletes. Twenty-five percent of men and only eight percent of women identified themselves as jocks, indicating that jock identity remains disproportionately a male characteristic (Miller et al., 2006). With respect to current gender differences however, it should be noted that girls only began playing sports in large numbers after passage of Title IX, and within a few years, participation rose from 1 in 27 girls playing sports to 1 in 3 (Stevenson, 2007).

What is the impact of this subgroup on society and on subgroup members?

From society’s perspective, participation in athletics is associated with many positive outcomes that pay off for society. For example, Troutman and Dufur (2007) note:

“High school athletes report higher self-concept, express a more internal locus of control, and have fewer discipline problems. Involvement in interscholastic sport is also related to academic achievement. Participants have higher grades, spend more time on homework, have higher educational aspirations, and are more likely to attend college than are their counterparts. ... Researchers attributed these positive effects of sport in part to the stronger social ties and bonds associated with this activity. Compared to various other extracurricular activities, interscholastic sport requires a more time intensive commitment, resulting in more frequent interaction with members of the group and membership in larger, more intense social networks.”

Barber, Eccles, and Stone (2001) suggest the positive outcomes for individuals and the society may stem from “the characteristics of athletic competition” (e.g., participants learn from practicing, negotiating rules, resolving disputes, winning, recovering from defeat). In addition, sports participation is seen as increasing “athletes’ social (and perhaps economic) capital through supportive relationships with adults, such as coaches and school counselors who act as advisors and advocates for college admission and scholarships. These skills and social networks likely extend to school and the workplace and endow athletes with an educational and occupational advantage, regardless of their social identity.”

Of course, another possible reason for the good outcomes is that it often is the case that “athletes are positively selected and come from more privileged families” (Stevenson, 2007).

At the same time, society has had to contend with some negatives associated with athletes in general and jocks in particular. For example, research suggests that compared to nonjocks, those who identify as jocks are reported as manifesting significantly more misconduct, including skipping school, cutting classes, having someone from home called to school for disciplinary purposes, and being sent to the principal's office (Miller, et al., 2005). Jocks often are identified as a source of harassment at schools. Some also use illegal performance enhancing substances and alcohol and engage in high levels of sexual activity. And, it has been suggested that among this group use of steroids is for both improving performance and shaping their bodies to fit an idealized image.

The American Academy of Pediatrics (2005) captures the dilemma around addressing athletes and jocks rather well. They note that:

“Pursuit of excellence in sports is an endeavor to be admired and encouraged. ... However, sometimes the drive for success can be so engrossing and so compelling that a young person can easily lose sight of what is fair and right. Some individuals may view the use of performance enhancing substances as a substitute for hard work.. ... Adolescents may be uniquely vulnerable to the lure of performance enhancing substances. Many adolescents engage in risk taking behavior and experimentation at a time when they are coping with the developmental tasks of adolescence, including defining their sexual identity, emancipating themselves from their families, achieving a sense of mastery and self-efficacy, and finding a peer group with which they can identify.”

The concerns raised are supported by research. For instance:

Findings from a 2008-2009 survey of more than 120,000 students in grades 6 through 12 indicate that nearly 2% of junior high students and almost 5% of 12th graders reported using steroids in the previous year; note that for the 12th graders the rate for boys was 7.1%, while the rate for girls was 2.7%.
(<http://www.pridesurveys.com/customercenter/us08ns.pdf>)

Eccles and Barber (1999) found that “being involved with team sports contributes significantly to an increase in alcohol use and getting drunk over the high schools years for males.... The proportion of their friends who drank and skipped school was also quite high. This pattern is consistent with the jocks' own behavior patterns.”

La Greca, Prinstein, and Fetter (2001) report that “athletically oriented teens tend to be sexually active (e.g., 59% were sexually active, compared with 42% of teens overall) and may be engaging in risky sexual behaviors; these teens also view themselves as popular and may have more opportunities to find sexual partners than other teens. In fact, surveys of high school athletes have found that male athletes engage in sex at earlier ages than male nonathletes.” “Moreover, among college students, higher rates of risky sexual behaviors (i.e., more partners, less contraceptive use) have been observed in athletes than in nonathlete peers.”

“In terms of sexual behaviors, nonconformists (65%), jocks (59%), and burnouts (56%) were more sexually active than average (40%). ... Jocks had the highest reports of casual sex; 29% reported having sex with someone they didn't know well in the last year.” These researchers see their findings as consistent with surveys suggesting that adolescent jocks may be a high- risk group for STDs.

“Also of concern is the jocks' relatively high rates of risk taking behavior, suggesting that they may be at risk for nonintentional injuries, even outside of athletic competition.” “Athletes reported exceeding the speed limit and riding bikes or motorcycles without helmets more than nonathletes. Thus injury prevention programs might also target jocks within high schools.”

It should be noted that findings about sexual activity differ for male and female athletes. Miller, et al. (2005) found that “female athletes at the high school and college levels report less frequent and less risky sexual activity than nonathletes. Female high school sports participation has also been linked with reduced odds of teen pregnancy.” However, they also found that female and black adolescents who identified themselves as jocks reported lower grades than other female athletes.

What are the prevalent policy and practice efforts to address negative impact?

Probably the most dramatic impact on school athletics and beyond has come from Title IX which opened up large and widespread involvement for females. And this includes a growing subgroup of females whose behavior overlaps the jock subculture. In general, the increase in female participation is associated with positive impact on education and in subsequent employment. However, Stevenson (2007) reports a substantial female-male gap still exists in many states.

Beyond the gender issue, there has been a substantial amount of policy relevant to athletics in general stemming from both legislation and litigation. A significant portion of this has been motivated specifically by concerns about the type of negatives associated with those identified as jocks. For instance, considerable attention has been directed at countering use of performance enhancing drugs through health education, penalties, and treatment. Related to all this has been federal support to encourage testing for substance abuse.

As Goldberg et al. (2007) note, the stated policy intent generally has been to approach performance enhancing substances as a health concern. They describe a process by which “Students would remain on their team after their first offense if they attended a drug counseling session and adhered to its follow up, they would face no legal consequences or school sanctions, and they would not have a permanent record of their test results.” These researchers conclude that “If a student remains on a team and enters counseling that student may be more apt to be helped than if excluded from sports and ostracized from the team and school. More restrictive policies may have different results, which could be a greater deterrent or, paradoxically, could lead to an increase substance use.”

With respect to guidelines for educating students, Garzon, Ewald, Rutledge, and Meadows (2006) stress:

“Educational programs regarding anabolic steroid and other supplement use are important in order to accurately inform adolescents and those involved with adolescents about potential risks. Scare tactics should be avoided since they do not work well in the adolescent population and may actually create a credibility issue. ... The sports physical examination can be an opportune time to assess students for supplement use. ... It is important that parents and teachers as well as students have accurate information regarding supplement use. ... Review health education curricula used by teachers to assess it for current information, format of presentation, grade levels, and courses in which the information is presented. ... Elicit the participation of representatives from local agencies such as hospitals, clinical, and private gyms to increase community awareness of the issue and to gather support for initiatives to curtail use. “

Other policy and practice arenas where jocks are targeted involve high-risk sexual behavior and other risk-taking that leads to nonintentional injuries. La Greca, Prinstein, and Fetter (2001) suggest that given jocks’ relatively high social status, it may be useful for school-based prevention efforts to recruit jocks as peer models who advocate “safe sex” and ways to avoid vehicular injuries.

Finally, while not targeted more than others, jocks are among those focused on in efforts to reduce harassment and misconduct and *general* alcohol and drug abuse.

Any data on intervention impact?

Research on the association between participation in athletics and positive and negative outcomes is all correlational and thus cause and effect remain unclear. Subgroup disaggregation of data generally is sparse. Male and female comparisons are common; some efforts have been made to compare school-sponsored vs. out-of school sports/physical activities, but rarely is involvement in different sports contrasted; socio-economic and other demographic and difference comparisons are insufficient. As noted above, for example, only a few researchers have compared students designated as jocks with other athletes and nonathletes.

Several studies have attempted to determine the impact of intervention efforts on deterring the abuse of various substances by athletes. For example, Garzon, Ewald, Rutledge, and Meadows (2006) report that a health education program called “Athletes Training and Learning to Avoid Steroids” has generated positive findings. The program is described as targeting male adolescent athletes. Its objectives are to ensure avoidance of anabolic steroids and other performance enhancing supplements, as well as alcohol and other drugs; also stressed are healthy nutrition and exercise practices. The researchers state:

“The program uses a team centered approach and addresses the causes and risks of substance abuse that are unique to male adolescents. Peer instructions and a coach facilitator use a scripted program to address the topics. The effectiveness of the program was evaluated by a randomized control trial conducted one year after program intervention. The results revealed a 50% reduction in new use of anabolic steroids and performance enhancing supplement use and improved substance abuse protective factors, such as enhanced nutrition behavior, athletic self efficacy, and perception of athletic competence.

A similar program geared to female middle and high school students is currently being evaluations. This program is known as Athletes Targeting Healthy Exercise and Nutrition Alternatives. Results suggest that high school athletes from this program used significantly fewer diet pills and athletic enhancing substances than the students who received only a questionnaire.”

Goldberg et al. (2007) report on a student athlete testing program. They note that

“No drug and alcohol testing deterrent effects were evident for past month use during any of four follow up periods. Prior-year drug use was reduced in two of four follow-up self-reports, and a combination of drug and alcohol use was reduced at two assessments as well. Overall, drug testing was accompanied by an increase in some risk factors for future substance use.

These researchers also raise concerns about “the attitudinal changes that occurred among students at drug and alcohol testing policy schools.” They found a negative effect on certain potential substance use mediators, including authorities less opposed to drug use. They suggest that such findings “may signal potential future adverse effects of drug and alcohol testing.”

Proposed New Directions

School and out-of-school coaches, school nurses, counselors, teachers, administrators, general medical practitioners – almost everyone has been called on to focus on the problem of performance enhancing supplements. The call is for more vigilance, including drug testing and more health education. Those who have experienced harassment from jocks and other forms of misconduct also advocate for various targeted interventions.

From the perspective of our Center’s work, we agree about the need for attending to the negatives

associated with jock identity. At the same time, the approach must avoid traditional tendencies to look at such students as requiring totally unique intervention strategies. As is evident from the information provided above, some of the concerns overlap those raised by other youth subgroups. Below and in the box on the next page, we offer a perspective about policy and practice related to *all* students with a few examples to illustrate how specific considerations related to those designated as jocks might be addressed.

The emphasis is on developing and implementing a comprehensive intervention continuum that:

- *Promotes healthy development and prevents problems*

For instance:

- > providing information to educate school and key community stakeholders about the problems associated with jock identity and the need to address these matters
- > establishing working alliances to dialogue with students designated as jocks and those who they harass, as well as mobilizing other athletes to be positive role models – all with the intent of minimizing negative encounters and promoting social emotional learning

- *Intervening when problems are noted*

For instance:

- > implementing agreed upon promising practices to respond as quickly as feasible
- > protecting all students (e.g., from bullying or harassment)
- > ensuring a student's status as a jock isn't interfering with success at school (e.g., enhancing regular attendance and motivated participation in classroom learning)
- > providing medical, mental health, and learning supports (e.g., related to social, emotional, and learning problems)

- *Attending to chronic and severe problems*

For instance:

- > identifying and referring for appropriate individual interventions as necessary (e.g., related to negative physical, emotional, and cognitive impact)
- > establishing a safety net of support (e.g., through school, family, community mental and physical health providers, social service and juvenile justice agencies)

In contrast to a waiting for problems, new directions thinking stresses a proactive approach to preventing social rejection, enhancing personal well-being, and improving academics, and using a continuum of interventions that contributes to enhancing a positive school climate.

A Perspective on What Schools Should Do Based on the Work of our Center at UCLA

Schools experience many overlapping concerns related to youth subgroups and youth subculture. Of special concern is addressing any negative impact (e.g., criminal acts, bullying, sexual harassment, interracial conflict, vandalism, mental health problems). But, also essential is a focus on promoting healthy development and fostering a positive school climate.

As always, the more we understand about subgroups and individual differences, the more effective our interventions can be. But to keep from the tendency to focus on each concern as if it is discrete, schools need to work in a new way.

Given the complexity of the negative behaviors that arise in relation to youth subgroups, those in the school, district, and community who have responsibility for gangs, safe schools, violence prevention, bullying, interracial conflict, substance abuse, vandalism, truancy, and school climate need to work collaboratively. The *immediate objectives* are to (1) educate others about motivational and behavioral factors associated with a particular subgroup, (2) counter the trend in policy and practice to establish initiatives in terms of separate categories that lead to a host of fragmented and too often ineffective programs and services, and (3) facilitate opportunities on campus for youth subgroups to engage positively in subcultural activity and connect with effective peer supports.

By working collaboratively and differentiating the causes of observed problems, school staff and community stakeholders can integrate fragmented and marginalized initiatives for promoting positive youth development, preventing problems, intervening as soon as problems are identified, and providing effective ways to respond to pervasive, chronic, and serious problems. *Longer-term*, the aim is to help develop a comprehensive system of student and learning supports that (a) addresses a wide range of barriers to learning, teaching, parenting, and development and (b) re-engages disconnected youth. Such a system encompasses a continuum of integrated school-community intervention systems that are fully integrated into the improvement agenda for schools and communities (Adelman & Taylor, 2006a, b).

Toward these ends, schools must reach out to the community and establish a collaborative mechanism where those with specialized knowledge not only bring that knowledge to the table, but also work to build the needed comprehensive system of student and learning supports that addresses a wide range of barriers to learning, teaching, parenting, and development (Adelman & Taylor, 2007). And it is essential to remember that those with specialized knowledge include youth themselves (Center for Mental Health in Schools at UCLA, 2009).

Moving forward requires building a comprehensive and systemic continuum of interventions and fully integrating the system into the improvement agenda for schools and communities. To guide development of a systemic approach, we have suggested using a continuum of integrated school-community intervention systems as a unifying framework. This includes school-community systems for promoting healthy development, preventing problems, intervening early to address problems as soon after onset as is feasible, and addressing chronic and severe problems.

Policy that helps schools and communities develop the full continuum of interventions is essential to moving forward in enhancing equity of opportunity. Such policy must effectively establish a *comprehensive intervention framework* that can be used to map, analyze, and set priorities. It must guide fundamental *reworking of operational infrastructure* so that there is leadership and mechanisms for building integrated systems of interventions at schools and for connecting school and community resources. And, it must provide guidance for the difficulties inherent in facilitating major *systemic changes*. By working in this way, we can counter the trend in policy and practice to establish initiatives in terms of separate categories that lead to a host of fragmented and too often ineffective programs and services.

For resource aids related to policy examples, intervention frameworks and related mapping tools, examples of ways to rework the operational infrastructure and develop key mechanisms such as a *Learning Support Resource Team*, guides for facilitating systemic change, and much more, see the Center's Toolkit at <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/summit2002/resourceaids.htm>

References and Resources

Cited References

- Adelman, H.S., & Taylor, L. (2006a). *The implementation guide to student learning supports in the classroom and schoolwide: New directions for addressing barriers to learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Adelman, H.S., & Taylor, L. (2006b). *The school leader's guide to student learning supports: New directions for addressing barriers to learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- American Academy of Pediatrics (2005). Policy statement: Use of performance-enhancing substances. *Pediatrics*, *115*, 113-1106
- Barber, B., Eccles, J., & Stone, M. (2001). Whatever happened to the jock, the brain, and the princess? Young adult pathways linked to adolescent activity involvement and social identity. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *16*, 429-455.
- Center for Mental Health in Schools (2009). Youth participation: Making it real. *Addressing Barriers to Learning*, *13*, 1-5.
- Center for Mental Health in Schools. (2008). *Transitions: Turning risks into opportunities for student support*. Los Angeles, CA: Author at UCLA.
- Eccles, J. & Barber, B. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *14*, 10-43.
- Garzon, L., Ewald, R.E., Rutledge, C.M., & Meadows, T. (2006). The school nurse's role in prevention of student use of performance enhancing supplements. *Journal of School Health*, *76*, 159-163
- Goldberg, L., Elliot, D., MacKinnon, D., Moe, E., Kuehl, K., Yoon, M., Taylor, A., & Williams, J. (2007). Outcomes of a prospective trial of student athlete drug testing: The student athlete testing using random notification. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *41*, 421-429
- LaGreca, A., Prinstein, M., & Fetter, M.. (2001). Adolescent peer crowd affiliation: Linkages with health-risk behaviors and close friendships. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, *26*, 131-143.
- Miller, K., Hoffman, J., Barnes, G., Farrell, M., Sabo, D., & Melnick, M. (2003). Jocks, gender, race, and adolescent problem drinking. *Journal of Drug Education* *33*, 445-462
- Miller, K., Farrell, M., Barnes, G., Melnick, M., & Sabo, D. (2005). Gender/racial differences in jock identity, dating, and adolescent sexual risk. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *34*, 123-136.
- Miller, K., Melnick, M., Farrell, M., Sabo, D., & Barnes, G. (2006). Jocks, gender, binge drinking and adolescent violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *21*, 105-120.
- Miller, K. (2009). Sport-related identities and the "toxic jock".(Report). *Journal of Sport Behavior*. <http://www.southalabama.edu/psychology/journal.html>

National Federation of State High School Associations (2009). *High school sports participation increases for 20th consecutive year*. <http://www.nfhs.org/content.aspx?id=3505>

Stevenson, B. (2007). Title IX and the Evolution of High School Sports. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 25, 486-505.

Troutman, K. & Dufur, M. (2007) From High School Jocks to College Grads: Assessing the Long-term Effects of High School Sport Participation on Females' Education Attainment. *Youth and Society*, 38, 443-462

A Few Additional References

Dodge, T. & Jaccard, J. (2006). The Effect of high school sports participation on the use of performance enhancing substances in young adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 39, 367-373.

Kuehn, B. (2009). Teen steroid, supplement use targeted: officials look to prevention and better oversight. *Journal of the American Medication Association*, 302, 2310-2303

Miller, K., Melnick, M., Barnes, G., Farrell, M., & Sabo, D. (2005). Untangling the links among athletic involvement, gender, race, and adolescent academic outcomes. *Sociology of Sports Journal*, 22, 176-193

Moore, M. & Werch, C. (2005). Sport and physical activity participation and substance use among adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 36, 486-493

Yamaguchi, E., Johnston, L. & O'Malley, P. (2003). Relationship between student illicit drug use and school drug testing policies. *Journal of School Health*, 73, 159-164

Sources for Additional Information

School based drug testing programs, Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools
<http://www.ed.gov/programs/drugtesting/index.htm>

Science Daily, "Random Drug Testing May Not Keep Student Athletes Clean" (10/19/07)
<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/10/071018142501.htm>

The Center's Series of Information Resources on *Youth Subcultures: Understanding Subgroups to Better Address Barriers to Learning & Improve Schools**

Online:

What is Youth Culture? A Brief Introduction

Glossary of Terms Related to Youth Culture Subgroups

Youth Subcultures: Annotated Bibliography and Related References

About Youth Gangs

About the Goth Youth Subculture

About Hip Hop Youth Subculture

About "Loners" and "Losers"

About "Jocks" as Youth Subculture

About Emo Youth Subculture

About Surfing and Skateboarding Youth Subcultures

About the Cheerleading Youth Subculture

About "Mean Girls" as a Youth Culture Subgroup

About "Nerds" and "Geeks" as an Identified Subculture

About "Preppies" as a Youth Culture Subgroup

About Sexual Minority (LGBT) Youth Subculture

Youth and Socially Interactive Technologies

About Raves as a Youth Culture Phenomenon

Others are in development

*Many of the terms used by youth in referring to subgroups often are pejorative and offensive. We do not condone such language. We do, however, recognize the need to go beyond adultcentric definitions and descriptions of youth subgroups if we are to understand youth perceptions and perspectives. So the *Information Resource* documents reflect the terms used by youth.