***Supplements to the Literature Review***

**1. Role Models**

The term “role model” was coined in the 1950s by the American sociologist Robert King Merton (1910–2003) to denote a person who plays specific roles and sets an example for behaviors derived from them. The term has been put to extensive use since then, appearing in contexts of various areas of interest, both in communal and public contexts as well in research and academic contexts. More recent explanations of the expression refer to three angles: a person who inspires our opinions and thoughts on various matters as well as our perceptions of self and the other, and a desire to resemble that person in a broad sense; a role model who demonstrates a certain behavior that we wish to emulate; and a role model who shows us how to attain objectives and goals and illuminates the range of our latent possibilities and potential. From all three of these perspectives, he or she has powerful influence on those who choose to emulate him or her at the personal and social levels. Role models are important in processes of motivation and change because they affect our willingness to attain goals and objectives and point the way to achieving them (Morgenroth, Ryan, & Peters, 2015). Parents and other family members are their children’s basic and most important role models. Parents provide the most intimate and quotidian demonstration of values, beliefs, and perceptions that are important to society, knowledge and skills that one needs in life, and appropriate ways of behavior. In adolescence, the significance of parents as role models actually grows due to their developmental role in forming the adolescent’s personal identity and easing his or her transition to the adult world. When parents are positive role models, they enable youth to strengthen their sense of worth, build up their self-efficacy, crystallize their conceptions and views, practice skills and behaviors, and become adults. Parents’ ability to be role models hinges on their strengths and capabilities, the nature of the family structure, the strength of relations among family members, and children’s subjective grasp of whether their parents are “fit” to be their role models. Adolescents’ perceptions of their parents as role models depend on the scope and quality of their relationship with their parents and the extent of their parents’ involvement in their lives—manifested, for example, in the difference between children who live with both parents at home and those living with one parent. Youth who live with their mothers and report shaky relations with their fathers note that their fathers are not role models for them.

Siblings may also serve adolescents as role models. Like parents, they maintain a strong relationship and provide emotional support, advice, and assistance. Elder siblings, in particular, rest on the seam between parents and their younger siblings. Often it is precisely the relationship of near-equals, the self-imposed distancing from parents, and the typical transition to peer group at this age that enable youth to view siblings as important significant figures and role models, even if these models may be adverse in essence and effects. Reportage by young people who see siblings and not parents as their role models may also attest to family conflicts, poor relations among family members, and the absence of parental figures in their lives (Bryant & Zimmerman, 2003). Some adolescents also choose individuals outside their families, including members of their communities, as role models.

Adolescents form various kinds of relationships with significant adults. Some are formal, related to specific mentoring programs at school or in a youth movement, a community center, or a religious institution. Others are informal, established on the basis of a connection made with a non-parental adult such as a teacher, counselor, coach, or employer. These encounters facilitate very important personal and social development, e.g., imparting knowledge, reinforcing self-confidence, practicing optimal relations, and developing skills and sense of worth. By sharing their personal or professional experience, these role models may help adolescents to develop future aspirations in various areas of life. They also create a link with the community and bolster the sense of belonging, thereby averting risk behaviors and developing personal resilience (Arbeit et al., 2019).

One of the most familiar interventions in treating at-risk youth is working with adults who serve them as mentors. Mentoring includes establishing a personal relationship and solidifying trust between mentor and mentee, abetting processes of consulting and emotional support, learning and broadening of horizons, strengthening self-confidence as a stage in the development of capabilities and capacities, and promoting self-expression. As adult figures, mentors influence adolescents’ self-conception, shape their views of the world in a positive direction, mediate with the adult world, and help and guide them in setting goals and aspirations for life (Itzhaki, 2018). People who are perceived as role models can help youth develop scholastically and occupationally by applying their influence to help, support, and inspire. Such is especially the case in regard to at-risk youth, whose surroundings do not present them with positive role models and may expose them to negative ones. In addition, dropout youth are typified by deficiencies in learning skills, scholastic achievements, and the self-efficacy that is needed for study and employment. By adopting occupational role models, they develop personal maturity in career choice and vault the hurdle of inability to choose a career aspiration (Flouri & Buchanan, 2002). Role models who are mentioned as sources of inspiration for occupational choice are chosen on the basis of their strong achievements and their success in a specific area of endeavor. These models provide a pattern for the behavior that is needed for this success and instill deep-seated identification and strong involvement in the wish to be like them—something that takes on a motivational and proactive function for those who identify with them.

One may distinguish between role models who are observed from afar, without direct and intimate acquaintance with their followers, and others. Examples of such models are successful athletes, famous singers, leaders, and those at the top of their field. The other kind of model is closely and directly acquainted with his or her follower, e.g., a family member, a mentor, or an employer (Valero et al., 2019). These near-peer role models belong to the youngster’s peer group in one sense or another and are comparable to him or her in terms of age, gender, life experience, vocation, and so on. Due to this resemblance, their role-modeling is more concrete and applied than the distant pattern. Youth are more motivated to resemble them than they are to role models who are far from them in cultural, gender, age, ethnic, or socioeconomic terms. They reinforce the perception of “If he could do it, then so can I.” Indeed, these people become role models only to the degree that another person views them as successful. This idea corresponds with Bandura’s (1977, 1986) social-learning theory, which posits that we acquire the ability to develop efficacy by, among other things, observing and then imitating the successful actions of others (Bandura, 1977, 1986, in Muir, 2018). Bandura describes it as follows: “Seeing or visualizing people similar to oneself perform successfully typically raises efficacy beliefs in observers that they themselves possess the capabilities to master comparable activities” (Bandura, 1997: 87, in Muir, 2018).

Role models within an intimate peer group are more meaningful than others for dropout youth, who typically have poor self-image and little faith in their self-efficacy. Therefore, by observing and emulating these models, they regain faith in themselves.

**2. At-risk youth and families**

The family is a universal system in human society, extant since the dawn of humankind. A family comprises at least two generations and is typified by relations of kinship, communication, biology, and emotion, along with obligatory bonding or belonging. Its role centers on meeting its members’ basic needs, typically physical, economic, and nutritional, along with senses of security, stability, protection, belonging, and love. Family members depend on and influence each other. Relationships within the family are dynamic and vary with the personal development of the members and transitions among periods of life. The typical balance of forces within the family relates to the extent of parents’ authority toward their children and their specific parenting style (by which is meant the totality of the behavior, approach, and values that make up the parent–child relationship, affecting the latter’s emotional, social, and intellectual development). The family is the first source of social adjustment and education and socialization processes with which children learn to understand their surrounding society’s norms and rules. In the postmodern twenty-first-century era, one encounters family models other than the traditional model of woman, man, and children, including single-parents, same-sex parents, co-parents by contract, and so on (Ponzetti, 2003). Rapid developments in adolescence—sexual, cognitive, social, etc.—are accompanied by changes in parent–adolescent relations. Sexual development, which includes hormonal changes, may affect mood swings and changes that trigger confrontations and squabbles with parents. Cognitive development affects the adolescent’s thinking patterns including abstract perception, creating a critical and judgmental stance toward society in general and parents in particular. Social development and the transition of focus from the nuclear family to the peer group create emotional distance and attenuate the sense of closeness and intimacy (Meisels, 2001).

It is very widely agreed that parenting style has a definitive effect on the sound development of children and youth, foremost in respect of achievements during the lifespan. The research literature shows that behavior problems among adolescents trace to family-related factors and that most adolescents who have behavioral disorders come from families with poor parenting styles. The effect of parenting style on adolescents’ self-image is a case in point. When parents are ill-inclined to strengthen their children’s self-perception by providing reinforcement, reflection, and guidance that will abet the construction of strong and stable self-image, their children are bound to develop poor self-image as they grow up, leading to risk behaviors such as states of depression and anxiety, substance abuse, suicidal tendencies, eating disorders, antisocial conduct, behavioral problems, failure in studies, delinquency, and crime (Aremu et al., 2019). At-risk youth are often typified by lack of family support and weak relations and faulty communication with parents. Most families in this condition have functioning difficulties and are prone to internal pressures and conflicts among members. Many parents experience complexities and crises such as divorce and absence of a spouse, turning mothers into single parents who struggle to feed and raise their children. Some parents have entanglements with law enforcement, poor socioeconomic status, and economic stress; they themselves experience poor self-image and sense of failure. These situations may result in neglect of children and non-involvement in their lives—especially in their studies—and may find expression in violent and hostile behavior toward them. In relations within families that have a dropout adolescent, the situation may worsen as the daily hardships are augmented by the specific difficulties associated with dropping out, e.g., separation from formal settings and deep-seated parental disappointment with the adolescent (Hertz, 2019). In the context of quitting school, it is found that youngsters who come from distressed, criminal, or single-parent households and lack parental emotional and scholastic support and involvement in school activity are at higher risk of dropping out than are others (Fortin et al., 2006).

**3. Youth employment**

Adolescence is typically a critical junction in the development of perceptions of and attitudes toward the world of work and the formation of occupational identity. Teens find jobs by participating in high-school programs that prepare them for work, studies that create a structured combination of vocational training and mentoring at dedicated workplaces, or job-finding initiatives of their own. Encouraging adolescents to work while being enrolled in school is of economic and social importance. Pursuant to the 2008 global economic crisis, senior economists around the world concluded that occupational experiences in adolescence affect the extent of ability to participate in the labor force as adults, as long as an appropriate balance of time spent at study and at work is maintained (Zelson & Rashavsky, 2013). Most youth who work do so in part-time or per-hour jobs and in service positions such as working in the food industry or as waiters, clerks, cashiers, ushers, sales staff, and babysitters (Zimmer-Gembeck & Mortimer, 2006). Like many social phenomena, youth employment has undergone changes, some far-reaching, over the years. In the past, children helped their parents by doing chores related to managing and maintaining a farm or workshop. With the advent of the Industrial Revolution and in its aftermath, young children were put to various kinds of work, often difficult and life-endangering, for employers who were not family members and who subjected them to atrocious and exploitative conditions. The family’s need to make ends meet denied these children the ability to continue their formal studies. As the legal status of the child was better understood and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child was enacted (1989), many countries passed legislation to protect working youth that determined a minimum age, maximum number of working hours, hours of rest, and a standard wage for their employment (Houshman et al., 2014).

In the past, children and youth worked for their own existence and to help meet their family’s needs. From the 1970s, onward, however, a phenomenon emerged of adolescents working for economic independence irrespective of their family’s economic status. Youth became a consumer population in its own right, using its earnings to satisfy personal needs. Concurrently, as the importance of obtaining official school diplomas as a condition for further studies and better occupational advancement took an upward turn, many schools devised ways to integrate occupational experiences into the curriculum. Surprisingly, adolescents who combine supervised part-time work with their studies are found to outperform others scholastically. Even while holding jobs, they do more homework, undertake more scholastic tasks of other kinds, and engage in more preparation for exams. This is because the skills that they acquire on the job, such as meeting deadlines, carrying out tasks, and assuming responsibility, are also helpful in their studies (Zimmer-Gembeck & Mortimer, 2006). The context of the world of work has potential to shape adolescents’ personal identity and abet their development in both the near and the long terms. Occupational experiences affect one’s understanding of the value of working, the wish to work in the future, the acquisition of personal and social skills, the accumulation of knowledge and tools for optimum participation in the labor force, connect one with occupational opportunities, and develop an occupational “grapevine” (Houshman et al., 2014).

Since 1953, Israel has had a youth labor law that protects the rights of working adolescents. Essentially, it sets a minimum working age, limits permissible working hours, and requires breaks during work, workers’ compensation insurance, and a minimum wage. The minimum working age is fourteen during school vacations and fifteen otherwise, provided the working hours are after school. Young people who do not attend school must obtain special dispensation from Ministry of Education regulators. In Israel, responsibility for youth labor belongs to the Federation of Working Youth, which was established in 1924 to protect the rights of working youth whose employers exploited them. Since then, this organization has evolved into an occupational association of youth and young people as the General Federation of Working and Studying Youth, serving as the representative organization of working adolescents. In a comprehensive survey that it conducted in 2014, the Federation found that 62 percent of young people countrywide—some 380,000 in number—were participating in the labor force to one extent or another. Among them, 36 percent were actually working and 26 percent were not working but were seeking work. Among those who worked, 57 percent had held more than one job during the survey year, attesting to instability, irregularity, and inconsistency in their posts. It was also found that youth characteristically tend to choose temporary and short-term positions in order to afford something specific (e.g., a smartphone, driving lessons, clothing, or a trip abroad) and leave the jobs once the money is accrued. Indeed, 83 percent of respondents in the survey who took on jobs reported that they had done so to make money. This rate far exceeded that of other reasons, such as alleviating boredom (12 percent), being independent (10 percent), helping the family (6 percent), and paying for studies (3 percent). As for gender, the survey showed that more girls worked (64 percent) than boys (60 percent); this was due to the preponderance of girls in babysitting work. A majority of respondents reported working 6.4 hours per week; 7 percent reported more than twenty weekly hours (Degani & Degani, 2014).

Acquiring working credentials and preparing for labor-force participation is important for adolescents at large but even more so for at-risk and dropout youth. At-risk youth face several barriers in joining the labor market: (1) changes in this market in the twentieth-first century, as growing demand for complex skills excludes the poorly educated from this market; (2) the structure of opportunities, which is closed to disempowered and excluded population groups such as at-risk groups and prevents their acquisition of jobs; (3) employer discrimination and prejudice against at-risk youth who have certain ethnic characteristics; (4) lack of family and community support. (5) poor access to positions of influence and power and lack of a promotive network of connections; (6) a record of delinquency and criminality or of alcohol and substance use, closing off occupational opportunities. A safe and sound transition to the world of work for at-risk youth depends on the extent of preparation to partake of this world and the creation of a cooperative web among government, business, and educational elements for the formulation of tailored programs. Another factor, of course, is the extent of willingness among at-risk youth to participate in such programs. Programs that prepare them for the world of work are run at youth centers (e.g., the Youth Advancement Units), which aim to dissuade youngsters from dropping out or encourage dropouts to re-enroll in studies, to strengthen occupational self-efficacy, to avert risk situations and behaviors, to create opportunities for personal development and for experiencing a normative environment, and to reinforce the relationship between current action and future aspirations (Kahan-Strawczynski, Yurovich, & Hoffman, 2007). In a study on the long-term effects of work on adolescents from low-socioeconomic-status families, it was found that those who persisted in working came away with stronger senses of confidence, belonging, and well-being, resulting in greater optimism about the future and a wish to define future aspirations and make plans for their fulfillment (Purtell & McLoyd, 2011).

**4. Generation Z**

Generation Z is comprised of people born from the late 1990s to 2010, a time when the world experienced economic crises, terror attacks, and climate changes. It was born into the digital-technology era and is the first generation to be accompanied by smart devices from its first breath. It has been called many things: “digital natives,” “post-millennium,” “screen kids,” a “virtual generation,” and the “iGeneration.” Members of Generation Z are expected to live longer, work longer, and have to finance their retirement longer. They are also more materialistic, inundated with technology, widely and globally interconnected, and better educated in the formal sense. Their cultural, social, and leisure lives are typified by globalization and are more volatile, complex, and opaque than those experienced by previous generations. Generation Z consumes information in more visual and graphic ways, based more on symbols than on words. It sees education not only as an episode at a given point in life but as a protracted lifelong process that relates to technology and its ubiquity in place and time. Socially, members of Generation Z interact with more people in digital space and in relationships that cross borders, countries, and continents. In the family sense, they are more diverse ethnically and come from multiple family paradigms such as racially-mixed families, single-parent households, and same-sex couples. Their learning and thinking patterns are typified by celerity and a tendency to self- and autodidactic learning. They excel in multiple roles and multitasking and do not depend on teachers to mediate their learning. Their optimum modes of learning are experiential, proactive, and creative (Ran et al., 2019). As natives of a rich technological world, members of Generation Z continually peer at screens and inhabit virtual environments. These habits allow them to amass and exchange knowledge and information quickly and with very large numbers of people; this is also their favored form of socialization. Consequently, they find it difficult to form relations and friendships in the real (non-virtual) world. The gap between the controlled and planned virtual world and the real one, which is often perceived as unsafe, creates feelings of disillusionment and anxiety among members of this generation that affect their self-confidence, personal resilience, patience, and ability to contain or include others. However, they seek out new challenges and are unfazed by changes. They see themselves as entrepreneurs and leaders and, accordingly, seek out occupations that influence society and the world even though they orient their careers toward fields that combine personal and working life.

Generation Z, as the offspring of Generation X, grew up in an atmosphere that sanctified individualism, competitiveness, and acquisitiveness. Thus, it has been exposed since childhood to a climate of pressure and criticism that yields feelings of anxiety and depression (Bencsik et al., 2016). Generation Z is the best-educated generation in history. In a comprehensive survey on the demographic properties of Generation Z-ers aged 18–20, the Pew Research Center (United States) found that more members of this generation than of previous generations finished high school and intend to go on to college. The correlation was also found vis-à-vis minority populations, immigrants, and young women. Generation Z shows a considerable decrease in the share of school dropouts among boys but mainly among girls. This is because their parents (including minorities and immigrants) are better educated and wealthier and because fewer adolescent girls in this generation are married or are mothers. However, Generation Z takes more time to join the labor market, attain mobility, and engage in relocation (Fry & Praker, 2018).

**5. Socialization of youth**

Green (2010) finds a material difference between sociology and psychology in reference to adolescence. Whereas psychology defines adolescence as a stage of personal development—biological, mental, cognitive, moral—sociology relates to it as part of a population group that has a socio-political-economic context. To emphasize these differences, sociology usually avoids the term “adolescence” in preference of “youth.” “Youth” is an amorphous term in sociology even though, as in psychology, it is defined as a period between the onset of the teen years and the mid-twenties. However, it lacks psychology’s dichotomous outlook and is more flexible in its definitions. Psychology has developed theories that see adolescence in objective, homogeneous, and universal terms, whereas sociology contemplates the social context—one that includes historical, political, cultural, ethnic, environmental, and gender elements—and its effects on youth. Sociology once saw youth as a stage in which individuals were socialized by principal agents of socialization, i.e., parents, teachers, peers, or others of significance. Postmodern sociology sees adolescents as full-fledged “social players” who have ideas, thoughts, abilities, and efficacies of their own and as sources of power and influence, like adults. Just the same, adolescents’ reactions and references remain under adult hegemonic control; traditionally, youth are considered a population that poses a risk to society in the sense of the new crowding out the old (cf. the Biblical verse Leviticus 26:10). Thus, the young generation presents a threat to the old one. Youth are perceived as irresponsible, fresh, deficient in morals and virtues, and rebellious. One may see this in an emphatic form among those whom adults consider delinquent or at risk; with them, the conflicts with adults are more intensive. In addition, youth culture is defined as a subset of the dominant adult culture and is characterized as one of protest and subversion. Consequently, young people are viewed as a population in need of education, enforcement, and policing, often resulting in a contemptuous and aggressive attitude toward adolescents that sometimes reaches the level of exploitation and disregard of the basic rights (Green, 2010).

One may understand the matter through the lenses of Social Constructionism, in which a critical stance is taken toward the seemingly self-evident knowledge through which we understand the world. Social Constructionism rejects the notion that we see the world objectively, that we are immune to all outside influence, and that what we see as extant is what we think and perceive as extant. Accordingly, Social Constructionism demands that we be alert to and, perhaps, even suspicious of these outlooks. Social Constructionism objects to the square patterns and models that psychology and sociology built; instead it proposes a dynamic, interactive process that plays out repeatedly among people and patterns, and structures their outlooks. The same occurs in regard to the term “youth,” which is usually identified as a time of change and development, a time of identity and confusion (Erikson, 1968), a period of risks and nonconformity, and the classification of youth as normative or at-risk, as of different ethnic origin, and as bearers of one culture or another. The definitions that have entered psychological or sociological patterns disregard the specific subjective point of view and the broadening of discourse as Social Constructionism wishes to do (Burr, 1995). In our twentieth-first-century era, adolescents and young adults inhabit a reality that is totally different from that experienced by previous generations. The “late-modern” era ushers the young into a life fraught with many risks such as climate change, nuclear threat, and economic instability and insecurity, that are countered by a boundless arena of opportunities. The traditional context of family, school, and work loses its potency as youth make the transition to adulthood. Matters that were once known and familiar undergo continual change within the contours of twenty-first-century life. This situation conduces to instability and insecurity but also, as stated, offers multiple opportunities. Accordingly, we find youth struggling with the process of transitioning to adulthood, taking a much longer time to do so. Today’s young people stay in college and university longer and are in no rush to move out of their parents’ homes, even when they already have regular work. They postpone couplehood and family formation to a later time, mainly due to fear of taking full responsibility for life and a sense of uncertainty and inability to cope with it. These difficulties crimp young adults’ ability to make decisions and generate confusion among them that influences their quality of life and mental well-being, accompanied by a sense of the future as something inchoate and uncontrollable (Furloug & Carmel, 2007).