

**Dilemmas in Formulating the Israeli High School
Sociology Curriculum:**

Analysis of the 1988 - 1998 Curricula

Nissan Naveh

Beit Berl Academic College (Retired)

August 21 2008

Dilemmas in Formulating the Israeli High School Sociology Curriculum:

Analysis of the 1988 - 1998 Curricula

Nissan Naveh

Beit Berl Academic College (Retired)

This article deals with conflicts and dilemmas in the teaching of high school sociology in Israeli schools in the past three decades, from the end of the 1970s until today. During this period, two “new” curricula were introduced: one in 1988 and one in 1998. The background of these curricula has been written about extensively (Naveh 2002). The development of sociology as a high school subject during the 1960s and 1970s took place mainly in the wake of the development of sociology as an academic discipline in the West (see Ram 1993). The undisputed sign of the influence of the teaching of sociology in the universities on its teaching in the high schools during this period was the strengthening of the “academic” approach in the teaching of the subject in the high schools as reflected in the 1988 curriculum.

The 1988 sociology curriculum: An academic emphasis

The experience of teaching high school sociology in Israel during the 1960s and 1970s led to the introduction of a new sociology curriculum at the end of the 1980s (1988 Sociology Curriculum). This curriculum was formulated by a team headed by Dr. Yael Enoch of the Open University, a sociologist with experience in developing study units and head of the Introduction to Sociology program; Dr. Dan Giladi, Head Inspector at the Education Ministry and former high school teacher who established the study of the social sciences in Israeli high schools); a group of senior teachers, most of whom are instructors, teacher trainers, and curriculum developers; personnel from the Education Ministry’s Curriculum Division; and other academicians. The makeup of this team was intended to ensure the representation of various viewpoints in the curriculum, as well as a certain balance between the rigors of academic-level sociology, the field (high school classrooms), and educational research, in the consolidation of the curriculum.

The 1988 curriculum was taken from an academic-level introductory

sociology curriculum commonly used at the time in most of Israel's universities, particularly inspired by those used at Tel Aviv University and the Open University. It included the following units:

Unit name	No. of lessons (45 min. each)
The Essence of Sociology	10
Culture	20
The Social Group	35
The Socialization Process	20
The Family	20
Social Control and Deviance	20
Organizations	25
Social Stratification and Mobility	30

In most schools, the curriculum was taught over two scholastic years in 11th and 12th grades, culminating with matriculation exams in the subject. The choice of this age group was made because the assumption on the part of the teachers at the time was that the subject was appropriate for 17- and 18-year-olds, as they are more socially and mentally mature, more connected to society, and more involved in public issues, and readier to study an abstract subject usually studied at the university level.

The 180 lessons were usually divided up thusly: The teachers were allotted three hours a week for the 11th graders, during which they taught the intro, culture, group, socialization, and sometimes the family units; and the 12th graders studied three hours a week the units considered more difficult, abstract, and complex, i.e., deviance and control, organizations, and social stratification. This last unit is also considered integrative, and during it, the teacher created intellectual links between various components in the curriculum.

The order in which the units were covered was left up to the individual teacher. The curriculum specifies the recommended number of instruction hours for each unit (see above table). One of the changes introduced into this curriculum, in contrast to past curricula, was that fundamental sociology concepts such as *norm*, *status*, and *role* were covered in various units over the course of learning the material, and not as a unit unto itself, as had been taught in the past. This change indicated a trend that would grow in subsequent curricula, of teaching concepts in a content-based

context, and using them in analyzing various phenomena, as opposed to teaching them separately. In each of the units, the following were presented:

1. The main learning objectives
2. The main ideas
3. The basic concepts covered in the unit
4. Bibliographies / Required reading

In some of the units, theories and research methods to be covered in that unit appeared (see Appendix A, “Culture”, a sample chapter from the 1988 Sociology Curriculum). The objectives were not covered fully by the pupil bibliography, so that the teacher had to find an appropriate way to teach these objectives based on required teachers’ reading material specified in each unit. Usually, such required reading material was to be found in Open University textbooks such as *The Individual and Society: Introduction to Sociology* (1984).

Let me emphasize that as a rule, high school teachers at that time mainly taught lecture style, occasionally accompanied by class discussion of certain subjects for the purpose of clarification and extension of the material. During the period in which the curricula discussed herein were formulated, academic and education philosophies evolved that supported the investigation and discovery approaches, and social involvement programs alongside those that encouraged critical thinking were developed. All these were manifested in Israeli high school sociology curricula, yet there was no single main direction emphasized; what remained was a collection of approaches.

Referring the teacher to academic sources ensured him or her a “platform” of sorts in the classroom from which to present the discipline, as well as an “informational advantage” over the pupils, whose only source of knowledge was the textbooks. I further emphasize that use of alternative teaching tools such as films, games, and simulations were rare at the time overall, although use of newspapers was common enough among sociology teachers.

The curriculum was to a large extent dictated by the textbooks. Until the introduction of the curriculum in the 1980s, the introductory textbook most commonly used was that of Eisenstadt and Ben-David (1966), which to a large degree presented what was commonly called “the systemic approach” (Ram 1993). The textbooks

written in the 1980s and 1990s and in the present century do not present this approach, but instead use a variety of approaches, among them branches of “critical sociology”.

In the 1988 curriculum, two required textbooks were introduced:

Fundamentals of Sociology, New Edition by Prof. Yonatan Shapira and Dr. Uri Ben-Eliezer (1987, Am Oved); and *The Individual and the Social Order* by Daniela Roth-Heller and Nissan Naveh (1986, Am Oved). Shapira is a renowned Israeli sociologist; he served as head of the Sociology Department and Dean of Social Sciences at Tel Aviv University. *Fundamentals of Sociology* was written at the end of the 1970s and Prof. Shapira updated it later in a new edition together with Dr. Ben-Eliezer.

Fundamentals of Sociology paralleled Prof. Shapira’s Intro to Sociology lectures at Tel Aviv University; it was used by high schools for years, and blazed the trail for teaching philosophy of the subject at the high school level. Its language is academic, and the authors used concepts and theories to elucidate the phenomena discussed therein. Parts thereof that were considered by the curricular committee to be too difficult and abstract, or too complex for the high school level, were omitted from the curriculum.

The second book, *The Individual and the Social Order*, is a reader, that is, a compilation of articles accompanied by introductions written by two teacher-researchers. Daniela Roth-Heller was at the time a sociology instructor at Tel Aviv University, and Nissan Naveh was a high school teacher and instructional and research assistant in the sociology of education at Tel Aviv University (see Appendix B Table of Contents *The Individual and the Social Order: A Sociology Reader* Daniela Roth-Heller and Nissan Naveh (eds.) 1986, Am Oved). *The Individual and the Social Order* was an improved edition of a previous edition of the same reader, updated based on developments in sociology research and comments by teachers who had used it over the years.

The Individual and the Social Order was used by university students—at least at Tel Aviv University—as well as high school pupils. The former benefited from Hebrew translations of “classic” articles, relieving them of the need to read all the material in the bibliography, and the latter benefited from the up-to-date material. *The Individual and the Social Order* was required reading in high school for years, and to a large extent set the course both for sociology instructional content and its

orientation.

The choice of these textbooks created a great similarity between the learning process in Intro to Sociology for first-year university students and high school sociology studies. High school pupils experienced grappling with academic texts from the professional literature, including articles published in professional journals and chapters from both classic and new sociology books. The more widespread the teaching of sociology became in high schools, the greater the difficulty on the part of the pupils with these academic texts, and the need arose among the teachers for applying various techniques to help them. Among these aids were written abstracts of the articles, teachers rewriting the articles in “user-friendly” language, and even commercial teaching aids that had been developed, including learning material processors and compilers (see El’ad and Harel 2006; Roth-Heller and Naveh 1995).

At the beginning of the 1988 curriculum, its general principles are presented:

“The overall approach in teaching the social sciences must emphasize the complexity of the phenomena and the social processes [therein] while respecting the various philosophies and recognizing our limitations in reaching the ultimate truth. Therefore, the main goal of the curriculum is fostering independent thinking and analytical capacity.

“An important means of achieving this approach is to juxtapose various positions and leave the right of critique regarding all of them to the pupils. The guiding principle of teaching the social sciences at the high school level will be emphasizing the problematic nature of various topics that occupy our society; points of dispute between various populations; and the confrontation between competing values systems.

“The objective of teaching the social sciences at the high school level is to lead the pupils to identify social phenomena, relate to them, understand them, and form a position regarding them, all with tolerance on the one hand and a critical perspective on the other. Relating to problems will be done while analyzing them using accepted social science theories and approaches.”

— 1988 Education Ministry Sociology Curriculum

The above excerpt expresses the influences of academic sociology on the one hand, and educational philosophy on the other, on the design and formulation of Israel’s high school sociology curriculum:

1. The main and decisive influence of academic sociology - The curriculum indisputably reflects both academic sociological content as

taught in universities and the theoretical orientation prevailing in Israeli academia at the time; the vicissitudes of teaching the subject in academia were reflected in the high school curriculum. These fluctuations in turn came through in the direct influence of the professors who were members of the curriculum committee, in the influence of university instructors on former students who became high school teachers, and in textbooks written by academics and used in high schools. The dispute between schools (philosophies) mentioned in the 1988 curriculum's rationale is between the functionalistic school and the conflict school. Note that the symbolic interactionism school and instances of the exchange school are nearly absent from the curriculum, and other newer sociological approaches—particularly branches of “critical sociology”—are there, yet few and far between.

In the 1988 curriculum, one can discern the influence of the Tel Aviv school of sociology led by Prof. Yonatan Shapira (referred to in the literature as “elitism”, and in the 1970s was the main alternative to Eisenstadt's systemic approach), two of whose students were the authors of *The Individual and the Social Order*; in contrast to the minority view presented by the Jerusalem school of sociology led by Prof. Eisenstadt (1989, 1967), which dominated Israeli sociology until the mid-1970s (Ram 1993).

2. The main and important influence of vicissitudes in education research and philosophy in Israel and abroad -
The 1988 curriculum to a great extent is driven by the study of the discipline. The main considerations in its formulation were discipline-based rather than education-based; It does not have a clear, underlying educational philosophy. Despite this, its creators managed to transmit several pedagogical messages, among them fostering critical thinking; encouraging an investigative approach, i.e., identifying and researching phenomena, giving legitimacy to societal disputes, encouraging tolerance, and developing independent and analytical thinking. As aforementioned, these features were inspired by pedagogical philosophers of the time such as the work of Leah Adar (1973), who was the first to examine fundamental precepts of sociology instruction in Israel. She set forth the following objectives for the social sciences as taught at the high school level:
 - A. Knowledge of the world in which we live
 - B. Development of critical thinking
 - C. Aiding the learner to shape opinions on the issues studied

Adar's influence on the formulation of the curriculum of those years is easily discerned.

It is worth noting that in choosing study materials for the 1988 curriculum—i.e., choosing the articles and chapters in the reader—considerations of presenting a range of Israeli sociology approaches came into play; therefore, in addition to the critical approach and the various systemic approaches, other approaches are presented, such as:

- The elitist approach (see Ram, 1993), a prominent proponent of which was Yonatan Shapira, and which minimized the importance of shared values and consensus in society, and focused instead on power and confrontation. Ralf Dahrendorf and C. Wright Mills influenced this approach, which is clearly manifested in the 1988 curriculum.
- The pluralistic approach, whose prominent proponent is sociologist Sammy Smuha (1984) of Haifa University, and which is presented in the curriculum to a certain degree
- The Marxist approach, the article by one of its proponents (Rosenfeld 1979) is presented in *The Individual and the Social Order*, as well as Shlomo Svirsky (1981), a chapter of whose important book *Not Weak, But Weakened* is presented at length in both the curriculum and the reader (see Appendix B)

The “new” (post-1998) curriculum: A pedagogical-didactic emphasis

The backdrop to the writing of the 1998 curriculum was first of all the need to refresh the curriculum, which had become outmoded after almost 10 years of use. Yet the need for a new curriculum also arose from claims—particularly voiced by personnel in the Education Ministry’s Curriculum Department—that the 1988 curriculum was academic in character and not appropriate to the needs of high school pupils.

The demand was raised to write a curriculum wherein in addition to content, pedagogical and didactic principles as well as objectives and evaluation tools would be presented. A change of personnel on the Education Ministry’s committees also raised the need to change the curriculum’s content makeup. In a comprehensive process, and with the investment of a great many resources—among whom were academics, sociologists, education researchers, veteran teachers, and particularly Education Ministry personnel—the new (1998) curriculum was created. Formulating it took several years, including the approval process, at the end of which it was released and first used in 1998.

The curriculum’s devisers report that the main changes therein are “the

addition of three units on employment, the political establishment, and social change; relating to social phenomena and dilemmas that occupy our society; enrichment of the learning sources with new research findings and articles.”

In addition, the curriculum’s formulators claim that the new curriculum “emphasizes perceiving society as an open and changing system, which is manifested in the presentation of topics by raising questions. For every topic, the pupil is asked main questions to stimulate thought, discussion, and investigation” (1998 sociology curriculum).

The overwhelming majority of the new curriculum deals with teaching and learning methods, and not with content. The 180-lesson curriculum covers only four topics: culture, the group, the family, and socialization. Each unit presents teaching objectives, fundamental questions, main ideas, concepts, and approaches. There is no introductory unit, no presentation of questions and topics on the macro level, and particularly conspicuous is the absence of the unit on stratification. While the curriculum is not based on a specific textbook, over the years that it was being formulated, its formulators developed appropriate learning materials that became obligatory (called “The Sociology Experience”). Only at the beginning of this century, after an outside evaluative study was conducted on these materials, were they replaced by textbooks that were found to be more appropriate and that were approved by the Education Ministry (Naveh and others, 2003 and onward). The important didactic principles in the new curriculum are:

1. Use of a variety of teaching methods, particularly those that encourage active learning
2. The curriculum particularly pushes structured research methods and hands-on, experiential learning.
3. Adapting the curriculum to the character of the learners is necessitated.
4. Relating to various theoretical approaches is necessitated.
5. The curriculum encourages the teacher to integrate computer use into his or her teaching.
6. Teachers are encouraged to develop sensitivity to “charged” issues and to create a classroom climate of openness and safety in discussing such subjects.
7. Teachers are encouraged to use a variety of evaluative methods suitable to the curriculum, particularly a portfolio containing exercises, papers, tests, and other material.

In most schools, sociology is taught in 11th grade (three hours a week, in which the culture and group units are taught) and 12th grade (three hours a week, in which the family and socialization units are taught). The fundamental concepts are learned during the culture or the group unit; there is no introductory unit *per se* unless it is combined with the other units, and the curriculum does not deal with topics on the macro level, particularly the topic of social stratification. The introduction of the new curriculum in 1998 was accompanied by the expansion of the teaching of sociology using experiential methods and in general a variety of teaching and learning techniques.

Conclusion

In formulating the 1998 curriculum, conspicuous are the new currents of thought in education and in applied teaching whose use was particularly espoused in the US in the 1980s and 1990s. Educational considerations won out in this curriculum over discourse in sociological content.

Conflicts and dilemmas in formulating a high school sociology curriculum

Developments in teaching high school sociology in the 1980s and 1990s as manifested in the two curricula point to several issues arising from our review thereof. These issues can be framed as conflicts and occasional dilemmas between alternatives:

1. Bodies of knowledge organized by generalizations in sociology versus sociology research methods - The 1988 curriculum relates to the science of sociology explicitly via the content presented therein, and not via the research methods introduced therein. The curriculum's formulators state in the footnotes, "It is important to transmit to the pupil a basic understanding of research methods and analytical tools used in the social sciences. The teacher should explain how the social scientist reaches conclusions." At the same time—excepting the unit on the group, which discusses methods of researching groups—the curriculum does not relate at all to research methods on either a conceptual or a theoretical level.

The 1998 curriculum, on the other hand, relates much more to research. One of its stated objectives is "understanding sociology research methods and trying them out". The main

didactic principle in this curriculum is conducting active research that includes “junior-style experiments” contained within the learning process. The issue of principle with which the curriculum formulator and textbook author struggled is whether to teach research methods separately from the introduction to the discipline, or as part of the introduction.

There are those who claim that learning sociology research methods is actually in itself training for both sociologically oriented thinking and for learning the actual content of the discipline. In the textbook *Sociology: Social Circles*, authors Ronit El’ad and Orit Ran combine the methodological introduction and the learning tasks and explanations throughout the various chapters of the book.

2. A combined, integrated pan-Israeli sociology curriculum versus a sector-based curriculum - Israel’s school system is population-segregated, i.e., there are separate schools for Arabs and Jews, Orthodox Jews and non-observing Jews, and other divisions, giving rise to the question of whether the curriculum addressing all the pupils in a society wherein the schools are so segregated and differentiated should be general, or should separate curricula be developed for each population sector?

This is one of the dilemmas facing textbook authors that must decide whether to address one reading audience or several. This issue arises in every case in which the members of a certain population—usually a minority group—seek their “own sociology”. For better or worse, the curriculum used today is general.

3. Universal versus local knowledge - Israel is unique in that it is both an ethnic and a democratic state. Being both a democracy and of Jewish national character, it is beset by many tensions, which are not explicitly addressed in the curriculum. The curriculum formulators had to answer the question of whether to make the curriculum’s introduction universal (general sociology as taught around the world), or particular (with a local-Israeli emphasis), about which they wrote:

“The curriculum combines the teaching of both general and Israeli concepts and content. . . The emphasis will be on the one hand on classic studies and theories, and on the other, newer studies, all while emphasizing studies done on Israeli society, in an effort to reinforce the material taught about our society. Circumstances necessitated that some of the bibliographical sources be based on studies done on other societies; it is the teacher’s task to use as far as possible sources referring to Israeli society, and to illustrate every topic with examples from Israeli society.”

—1988 Sociology Curriculum [my emphases]

The actual application of emphasizing Israeli society occurs too infrequently in the

curriculum. For example, in the culture unit, the curriculum formulators made do with presenting this aim: “Emphasizing cultural pluralism in Israeli society”. The reader will surely notice the period at the end of this heading, as opposed to a question mark.

Among the seven main ideas presented in the culture unit, only the seventh deals with Israeli society, and it states unequivocally, “Israeli society is a pluralistic one characterized by democracy, which gives legitimacy to the existence of coexisting sub-cultures.” Here the question arises: Really? In the required reading for the culture unit, there is no Israeli source, yet the Recommended Reading list for pupils (note: not mandatory), includes *In the Land of Israel* by Amos Oz (1984); *Scapegoat* by Eli Amir; and a booklet on kibbutz. The reader will certainly notice the absence of any sources dealing with Arabs, Druse, ultra-Orthodox Jews, or various ethnic groups. In the 1998 curriculum, Israeli culture is also presented as pluralistic, even including a unit titled “The Cultural Makeup of Israel’s Heterogenic Society”, yet the discussion on Israeli society is not the centerpiece of the learning process, but rather a supplementary mention and example. The dilemma that accompanies the development of a curriculum or the writing of a sociology textbook is whether to teach general theories and concepts via which the pupil can examine every culture and society, or to focus on characteristics of the society in which the learning is taking place.

4. What topics will be studied? Will subjects on the micro level be included, or on the macro level? Are the abstract units on organizations, deviance and social control, and stratification to be included? Should social change be included, or should it be studied as part of other units? The 1988 curriculum spreads out sociology fan-style, or comprehensively, inclusive of all of the topics, both micro and macro. In contrast, the 1998 curriculum offers the pupil knowledge of the culture, group, socialization, and family units only.
5. Will the curriculum be comprised of defined content, or a required reading list, or both? - The 1988 curriculum is based on a required bibliography that determines the curriculum's orientation. In contrast, the 1998 curriculum eliminates the need for a formal textbook, and makes do with determining required content. At the same time, even the curriculum's formulators, after putting the curriculum together, developed a learning materials syllabus that matches the curriculum to their chosen methods. In this way, the learning materials that they themselves developed became the required bibliography.
6. Will the learning materials transmitted to the high school pupils be actual, full scientific articles, or will the pupils be required to make do with "language-processed" versions of abstract, difficult academic material? - The 1988 curriculum required the learner to grapple with original articles written by sociologists. In contrast, the 1998 curriculum does not require reading specific texts, and the learning materials developed for it are mostly article abstracts, abridged articles, and excerpts.
7. Should we teach the fundamental terminology as a separate unit, or teach it as it comes up in each study unit? Neither the 1988 nor the 1998 curriculum include terminology as a separate unit, and neither do curricula or textbooks preceding them.
8. Should the teacher begin teaching sociology with an introductory unit introducing the subject, the questions dealt with therein, and the research process, or should s/he integrate these topics throughout teaching the actual material? - The 1988 curriculum includes an introductory unit on the essence of sociology; while the 1998 curriculum does not include such a unit; the teacher begins teaching the subject by introducing the pupils to symbolic interactionism.
9. Should a monolithic approach, or a pluralistic approach

be used in presenting sociology? - Should curriculum formulators or textbook authors be loyal to a certain sociology approach (for discipline-related or didactic reasons), or are they obligated to present a range of sociological approaches? The 1998 curriculum, for instance, avoids dealing with culture as a sociological issue from the point of view of the conflictual approach.

Conclusion

This article deals with the “What to teach?” questions of the Israeli high school sociology curriculum. A survey of two sociology curricula developed during the 1980s and 1990s respectively raises a number of issues with which the curricula formulators had to grapple, and which constituted dilemmas and conflicts during the formulation process. The research challenge now is in examining other facets of these curricula reflecting such issues as the teaching methods used to teach the curriculum, defining the learning population, and defining the demands made of the pupils by the teachers.

Bibliography

1988 Sociology Curriculum. Jerusalem: Education Ministry.

1998 Sociology Curriculum. Jerusalem: Education Ministry.

Adar, Leah (1973) *Social Studies Planning*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press.

Amir, Eli (1984) *Scapegoat*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved.

Eisenstadt, Shmuel Noach (1967) *Israeli Society: Background, Development, and Problems*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

— (1989) *Israeli Society in All its Manifestations*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

— and Yosef Ben-David (1966) *Introduction to Sociology*. Tel Aviv: Mishlav.

El’ad, Ronit and Yigael Harel (2006) *Sociology: Focus, Scientific Consulting* (scientific consulting: Nissan Naveh) Even Yehuda: Reches Publishing.

- Enoch, Yael (1984) *The Individual and Society: An Introduction to Sociology*. Tel Aviv: Open University.
- Naveh, Nissan (2002) "The Early Days in the Development of the Social Sciences as a Subject Taught in Israeli High Schools", from Amos Hoffman and Yitzchak Schnell (eds.) *Values and Objectives in Israeli Curricula*. Even Yehuda: Reches Publishing.
- ; Ronit El'ad, and Orit Ran (2003) *Sociology: Society's Circles—Culture*. Even Yehuda: Reches Publishing.
- ; Ronit El'ad, and Orit Ran (2003) *Sociology: Society's Circles—The Group*. Even Yehuda: Reches Publishing.
- ; Ronit El'ad, and Orit Ran (2004) *Sociology: Society's Circles—The Institution of the Family*. Even Yehuda: Reches Publishing.
- ; Ronit El'ad, and Orit Ran (2004) *Sociology: Society's Circles—The Socialization Process*. Even Yehuda: Reches Publishing.
- Oz, Amos (1984) *Here in the Land of Israel*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved.
- Rosenfeld, Henry (1979) "Changes in the Extended Family Structure", from Roth-Heller, Daniela and Nissan Naveh (1986) *The Individual and the Social Order*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, pp. 463-474.
- Ram, Uri (ed.) (1993) *Israeli Society: A Critical Look*. Tel Aviv: Breirot.
- Roth-Heller, Daniela and Nissan Naveh (1986) *The Individual and the Social Order*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved.
- (1995) *Simply Sociology*. Even Yehuda: Reches Publishing.
- Shapira, Yonatan and Uri Ben-Eliezer (1987) *Fundamentals of Sociology, new*

edition. Tel Aviv: Am Oved.

Smouha, Sami (1984) "Three Sociological Approaches to Ethnic Relations in Israel",

Megamot ["trends"] 206 -169 ,2 ,28.

Svirsky, Shlomo (1981) *Not Weak, But Weakened: Sephardim and Ashkenazim in*

Israel. Haifa: Machberot l'Mechkar u'l'Bikoret.

Appendix A

Sample unit from the 1988 curriculum - unit on culture

Culture

Objectives:

1. Clarifying the symbolic meaning of human culture
2. A discussion on the impact of cultural patterns on human behavior
3. Presenting the cultural relativist worldview versus the ethnocentric worldview
4. Discerning the existence of various sub-cultures
5. Emphasizing cultural pluralism in Israeli society

Main ideas:

1. Human culture has symbolic significance as manifested in the existence of various beliefs, values, norms, symbols, and signals.
2. Human behavior is learned and molded by cultural patterns.
3. Human social intercourse has an affect on the differing interpretations by those involved of behaviors and symbols.
4. Human culture changes as a result of social, political, geographical, and other processes.
5. The cultural relativist worldview stresses the variegation of human culture and emphasizes the legitimacy of values espoused in various cultures; while the ethnocentric worldview stresses differences between cultures, as well as the supposed superiority of one culture over another.
6. Sub-cultures have value systems and norms unique to them that exist alongside the behavioral norms of the prevailing culture of which they are a part.

Various sub-cultures can be discerned, such as those based on ethnic populations, geographic regions, and occupations. Among those that can be discerned are *normative sub-cultures*, whose values are consistent with that of the prevailing culture; and *deviant sub-cultures*, part or all of whose values systems contradict part or all of those of the prevailing culture.

7. Israeli society is a pluralistic one in which democratic ideology gives legitimacy to the existence of sub-cultures that coexist therein.

Concepts to be studied in this unit

Culture, beliefs, values, behavioral norms, symbols, signs, cultural patterns, sub-

cultures, normative sub-culture, deviant sub-culture, pluralistic society, ideology, legitimacy, democracy

Approaches to be studied in this unit

Cultural relativism; ethnocentrism

Reading

For the pupil (mandatory)

Cohen, Albert J. *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang*, pp. 177 - 179

Hall, Edward T. *The Silent Language*, pp. 21 - 26

Miner, Horace, "Body Ritual among the Nacirema", pp. 17 - 20

Shapira, Yonatan and Dr. Uri Ben-Eliezer *Fundamentals of Sociology, New Edition* (1987, Am Oved). Chapter on Symbolic Reciprocity, pp. 26 - 38

Roth-Heller, Daniela and Nissan Naveh *The Individual and the Social Order* (1986, Am Oved). Introduction to the chapter on Culture, pp. 15 - 16

For the pupil (recommended)

Bruce, Leonard and Philip Selznick *Sociology: Fundamentals, Principles, and Approaches*. Chapter on Cannibalism and Religion and the Andes survivors, pp. 60 - 65; Cultural Universalism, pp. 76 - 77

Zborowsky, Mark *Cultural Components in Response to Pain*, pp. 135 - 147

Selections from prose and abridged articles on sociological terms:

Amir, Eli *Scapegoat*

Oz, Amos *Here in the Land of Israel*

Booklet: *Values and Tests in Society* from the Oranim Curriculum on the Kibbutz

For the teacher (recommended)

The Individual in Society: Introduction to Sociology, particularly Unit Three - 36, 37, 38. Open University

Appendix B

“The Individual and the Social Order” by Daniela Roth-Heller and Nissan Naveh (eds.) *A Sociology Reader*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1986.

Table of Contents

Unit One: Elucidating the Sociological Approach

Lazarsfeld, Paul *Sociology versus Common Sense*

Unit Two: Culture

Miner, Horace, “Body Ritual among the Nacirema”

Hall, Edward T. *The Silent Language*

Unit Three: Fundamental Concepts

Goffman, Irving *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*

Shapira, Rina; Haim Eldar, and Miri Lerner *Blue shirt and White Collar*

Levinson, D. J. *Role, Personality, and Social Structure*

Unit Four: The Group

Humans, J. K. *Street corner society*

Michael, Gal *The Army Unit as a Social Group*

Schwartzwald, Y. *Risk Displacement*

Unit Five: Socialization

Aron, Raymond *Family, School, and the Masses*

Becker, Howard S. *Becoming a Marijuana User*

Wrong, Dennis *The Oversocialized Conception of Man in Modern Sociology*

Zborowsky, Mark *Cultural Components in Response to Pain*

Unit Six: Control and Deviance

Cohen, Albert J. *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang*

Erikson, Kai T. *Notes on The Sociology of Deviance*

Shoham, Shlomo *Differential Association Theory*

Sutherland, Edwin H. *The Professional Thief*

Unit Seven: Organizations

Dalton, Melville *The Conflict Between Staff and Line Managerial Officers in Industry*

Goffman, Erving *Characteristics of the Totalitarian Institutions*

Michaels, Robert *The Conservative Basis of the Organization*

Parkinson, Cyrile Northcote *Parkinson's Law and the Rising Pyramid*

Peter, Laurence J. and Raymond Hull *The Peter Principle*

Toffler, Alvin *Organizations In Future Shock*

Weber, Max *Bureaucracy*

Unit Eight: Stratification and Power

Davis, Kingsley and Wilbert Moore *Some Principles of Stratification*

Kornhauser, William “*Power Elite*”, or “*Veto Groups*”?

Marx, Karl *The German Ideology*

— and Friedrich Engels *The Communist Manifesto*

Svirsky, Shlomo *The Economic Development of Israel and the Formation of Ethnicity-related Division of Labour*

Tumin, Melvin M. *Some Principles of Stratification: A Critical Analysis*

Weber, Max *Class, Status, Party*

Unit Nine: Institutionalization and Change

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Lackman *Institutionalization*

Cohen, Erik *Changes in the Social Structure of Work in the Kibbutz*

O’Dea, Thomas F. *Sociological Dilemmas: The Five Paradoxes in the Process of Institutionalization*

Rosenfeld, Henry *The Process of Change in the Structure of the Extended Family*

Talmon, Yonina *The Family in the Kibbutz*