КУЛЬТУРА И ОБЩЕСТВО

УЧЕБНЫЕ ЗАДАНИЯ ПО АНГЛИЙСКОМУ ЯЗЫКУ ДЛЯ СТУДЕНТОВ ОБЩЕСТВОВЕДЧЕСКИХ ФАКУЛЬТЕТОВ

САНКТ-ПЕТЕРБУРГСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ

КУЛЬТУРА И ОБЩЕСТВО

УЧЕБНЫЕ ЗАДАНИЯ
ПО АНГЛИЙСКОМУ ЯЗЫКУ
ДЛЯ СТУДЕНТОВ ОБЩЕСТВОВЕДЧЕСКИХ ФАКУЛЬТЕТОВ

PART I

TEXTS FOR ORAL TRANSLATION
AND DISCUSSION

UNIT 1

SOCIOLOGY AND OTHER SCIENCES
OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR

A number of sciences, in addition to sociology, are concerned with human behavior. Most of these are social sciences, including anthropology, economics, political science, and psychology. But history — one of the humanities — also involves the study of human behavior, and at least a part of biology — a natural science — is concerned with the study of human behavior.

When compared with the other social sciences, sociology is unique because it is the only one that covers the entire spectrum of human behavior, while the rest are relatively focused on one aspect of human behavior. Furthermore, sociology includes an interest in these same behaviors. Anthropologists are primarily concerned with the cultures of people; one of the specialties of sociology is *cultural sociology.* Economists are almost exclusively interested in economic behavior; sociology includes *economy and society* as a specialty, as well as the *sociology of work, occupations, and professions.* Psychologists are mainly interested in individual behavior, but sociology, as we emphasized in our discussion of the definition of sociology, is also interested in individual behavior. Political scientists focus on the political institution; sociology includes the specialty *political sociology.*

Historical studies are done by a number of sociologists, including those who identify with the *history of social thought* specialty and others who do historical comparative research. And, finally, the biological bases for human behavior are being studied by sociologists in the *biosociology* specialty.

Because sociology encompasses the interests of all these other social sciences, as well as parts of history and biology, it is in a unique position with respect to the study of human behavior. Sociology has the potential to

be an integrative discipline, bringing together the knowledge gained by all the other disciplines into a more comprehensive understanding of human behavior.

Sociology also benefits from the work of these other fields of study and can, at least potentially, contribute to them. Sociology does often use the research conducted in these other fields, but the other disciplines do not seem to use much of the sociological work that is available to them.

This brief discussion of the relationship between sociology and other fields of study underlies how varied sociology is. The variety found in sociology is seen by some as a disadvantage, because sociology tries to do everything and has no essential core. But, as we will point out in the next section, the variety found in sociology may have some advantages, especially for the beginning student.

THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF SOCIOLOGY

Sociology is a wide-ranging way of studying human behavior. While sociologists generally accept the definition offered above, there are many different kinds of sociologists, and their approaches to the field are often very different. It is important to understand that *there is no one sociology; there are many sociologies.* To show this clearly, we will identify next some of most important differences among sociologists, beginning with their specialties.

SOCIOLOGICAL SPECIALTIES

Sociologists often ask each other, "What kind of sociologist are you?" or "What are your sociological interests?" when they want to know another's specialty. Specialties generally focus on some type of human behavior (crime), some part of society (the political institution), or ways of studying these things (statistics). Sociologists currently recognize about fifty different specialties. At the present time the most popular specialty is social psychology, which is concerned primarily with the way individual behavior is influenced by social context. The next five most popular specialties are family and marriage, sociological theory, sociology of gender, statistical and mathematical methodology, and medical sociology.

KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF OTHER SOCIETIES

Sociologists have always had a great interest in societies of other than their own. Early sociologists were especially intrigued by the work of anthropologists (and others) who described remote societies and their cultures — often small, non-Western societies with unusual and exotic cus-

toms. It was both fascinating and instructive to learn how differently societies could be organized, and how much the beliefs and values of people could differ from one society to another.

Sociologists today continue to be interested in the small nonliterate societies, because there are still lessons to be learned and insights to be gained from such classes. The reports and descriptions of these and other distinct cultures have traditionally been called **cross-cultural studies.**

Today an even greater need exists for sociologists to understand other societies around the world. No longer are nations and societies on the other side of the earth simply regarded as unusual and exotic places with no relevance for our personal lives. Travel and commerce among all nations of the earth are now commonplace. For sociologists, this means that we are now able to obtain information, both quantitative and qualitative, from nations previously closed to sociological scrutiny. We must know about other societies, not just because they are sociologically instructive, but because we live in an interdependent global society.

EXERCISES

I.. Read and translate the text.

II. Answer the following questions.

1. Why is sociology described as unique when compared with the other social sciences?
2. Do you agree that the most popular specialty is social psychology? Why or why not?
3. What makes sociology an integrative discipline?
4. Is the variety found in sociology an advantage or a disadvantage? Why?
5. What is the impact of travel and commerce on sociology?
6. Why do sociologists today continue to be interested in the small nonliterate societies? Do you think this type of society can be found in your country?
7. Why have sociologists always been interested in societies other than their own?
8. How does your own specialization relate to studying human behavior?
9. Which of the humanities, in your opinion, should use more of the sociological work?
10. Which of the humanities seems to you the most interesting area, second only to your own field of study? Explain your choice.

UNIT 2

CULTURE. THE IMPORTANCE OF CULTURE. THE MEANING OF CULTURE

Culture is the entire complex of ideas and material objects that the people of a society (or group) have created and adopted for carrying out necessary tasks of collective life. As this definition suggests, cultures are human creations, but, of course, people inherit much of their culture from those who created it. In other words, every culture has a history. When children are born into a society they learn the elements of their culture, and they in turn pass them on, probably in some modified form, to those who follow them. Cultures, therefore, are also capable of change.

One convenient way to think about culture is to recognize that the people of every society have an array of tasks to perform and problems to solve. All people must have ways of providing food, clothing, and shelter, ways of producing and caring for children, and of solving disputes between members. Perhaps most important, all people must have a way of making life orderly and predictable.

There are two important aspects of culture: values and norms. **Cultural values** can be defined as the standards of desirability, of rightness, and of importance in the society. Among the tribes of northern India, the older people tend to value the old traditional ways of doing things, but some of the younger people who have been exposed to modern ways no longer value the old ways. They value progress and change. One young man, who had graduated from college and returned back to his village, said, "We don't want to be wild any more". **Cultural norms** are rules for what should and what should not be done in given situations.

A CULTURAL EXPLANATION OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR

Culture offers an explanation of human behavior. The people in different societies have different beliefs and customs, and these influence their behavior. An example from Japanese society will illustrate how cultural beliefs influence behavior. Many Japanese believe that a person's blood type influence character and behavior.

Most Americans do not even know their blood type (A, B, O, or AB), but most Japanese do, and many believe it is an important piece of information about a person. Indeed, it is viewed with some suspicion if a person does not know or will not reveal his or her blood type. The significance of blood type for many Japanese is perhaps roughly equivalent to the way Americans view astrological signs. Some people believe wholeheartedly, many find it an amusing pastime, while the rest think of it as a superstition.

4

Among the Japanese, blood types are associated with character traits. For example, type A people are thought to be orderly, law-abiding, fastidious, soft-spoken, fashionable, and calm. On the negative said, type A people are considered picky, selfish, secretive, pessimistic, inflexible, and reckless when drunk. Type A people are programmers, and gossip columnists.

In Japan, both mate selection and product marketing are often based on blood types. Young people may make some of their decisions about members of the opposite sex on the basis of blood type. One young woman says she finds out her mate's blood type within the first 2 hours, because if he is the wrong type there is no need to waste further time.

Many products in Japan are marketed with an eye toward blood types. For example, one company marketed soft drinks that came in several flavors according to blood type; type AB was banana flavored and was supposed to reduce stress among the hyperactive AB personality. At least one Tokyo hair salon asks its customers about their blood types in order to cut and style their hair accordingly. In addition, there are key chains, chewing gum, calendars, magazines, and books built around blood types. Merchandisers may be using blood types as a somewhat playful sales gimmick, but the belief in their significance is widespread in Japan and influences a wide array of behavior. This is a small example of how a culture can influence human behavior.

TWO COMPETING VIEWS OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR

Two alternative explanations of human behavior compete with the cultural explanation. First, *human nature* is believed by some people to explain why people do what they do. Second, *sociobiology,* a scientific theory rooted in evolutionary biology, claims that much of human behavior is genetically determined. We will describe each of these explanations of human behavior and show why a cultural explanation is preferable.

HUMAN NATURE

Many times one hears people say, "It's just human nature to be selfish, ... or jealous, ... or compassionate, ... or aggressive." Speakers who make these statements seem to believe that these traits, or others, are found in all humans, and thus they explain behavior.

But how useful is human nature as an explanation of behavior? It seems to be a very weak explanation because it is difficult to find any human trait that is universal. Too much variety is found among the people in different Societies. Often, it is possible to find societies in which the behavior of people is very different and even completely opposite. An example of

complete differences can be found in an examination of two societies, the Quakers of the United States and the Yanomamo of South America.

Quakers believe in nonviolence and generally behave nonviolently. Their lives are built around these principles, and they rarely engage in aggressive or violent behavior. The Yanomamo, who live in the Amazon rain forest, have such a violent life-style that they have been called "the fierce people."

The violent ways of the Yanomamo can be found in all phases of their lives. They are constantly warring with neighboring villages and fighting among themselves. According to data gathered by anthropologists, 44 percent of the Yanomamo men over the age of 25 have killed someone. In the Yanomamo family, husbands often punish their wives brutally and children are routinely abused.

It is difficult to imagine how a single "human nature" explanation can cover both the Quakers and the Yanomamo. But a second view of human behavior is not dispensed with so easily, for it rests on an established scientific base. Over the last two decades, a biological-evolutionary view of human behavior, called *sociobiology*, has emerged.

SOCIOBIOLOGY

There is a long history of scientists claiming that biological characteristics influence human behavior. The theories have been of various sorts, but in recent decades the theory that has had the most impact is sociobiology. The fundamental idea of **sociobiology** is that human behavior reflects genetically inherited traits. Sociobiologists argue that humans are very much like other species of animals, that is, that human characteristics and behaviors are products of the Darwinian notions of natural selection and evolution. **Natural selection** is the idea that the fittest of any species will survive and spread its favored traits throughout the population.

According to this theory, we humans who are alive today have inherited the genetic characteristics that increased the chances of survival among our ancestors. The reasoning of sociobiology goes this way: if a specific trait appeared at some time in the genes of early humans, and that genetic trait made it more likely for the carrier and its offspring to survive, then that trait would more likely be passed on to the next generation. In the long run, through the process of natural selection, the traits that improved chances of survival would be found hi the human population. Traits that detracted from survival, or were less advantageous for survival, would disappear or become rare. Sociobiologists conclude from this that any widely observed human behavior must have been beneficial for survival and, therefore, have been passed down genetically.

6

As an example of the sociobiological approach, we have an attempt to explain the predisposition for human beings to feel love. The basic hypothesis was: "the great majority of women and men are born with a genetic capacity and need for forming durable attachments of an emotional character [love]".

The sociobiological explanation for the human tendency to feel love is stated as follows: When early humans lived by hunting and gathering food, they had to cover a wide geographic area in pursuit of game and in search of other food. Hunting, especially, required speed and mobility. During the time when females were pregnant or were caring for their young, they were relatively immobile and needed assistance. The males, not similarly restricted, could range over large areas in search of food and game. If women and then- children were to survive under these conditions, the males had to return with some food for them. Sociobiologists reason that males who were selfish might not return with the food, but if a male were born with a tendency to feel an attachment for the female who bore his child (a tendency to feel love), he would return to the female and child to share his food. If he did so, the child carrying his genes (perhaps including the gene that made him capable of feeling love) would be more likely to survive.

Or, consider the opposite scenario — a male who did not have the genetic tendency to feel love for a female. Because this male would probably not return as often to the female and her child, this child might die from lack of food, and the male's genes would not survive to the next generation. In this way, in the course of hundreds of thousands of years, the genes that produced a capacity for love would have survived in the human species.

Many features of this sociobiological description are not proved facts; many may be unprovable. In fact, no one has actually isolated a gene that gives people the capacity to love. We also know very little about the lives of prehistoric humans, so much of the scenario above is simply conjecture. Nevertheless, suppose it were all true. We are still left with the question, "Does it make any difference in our attempt to understand human behavior?" Perhaps all humans do have the capacity for love, but what difference does it make when love is viewed so differently in different cultures? According to an anthropological account, one Yanomamo woman said her husband must care for her because he beat her over the head so often. A beating on the head is hardly considered an expression of love in American society.

Furthermore, although Americans believe in entering marriage on the basis of love, many societies consider love before marriage to be irrelevant. Often the bride and groom hardly know each other at the time of marriage, so they would not likely be in love. Why do the cultures of some societies emphasize love as a basis for marriage and other cultures deemphasize or

ignore it? This interesting sociological question is one that the sociobiological point of view cannot address. Even if the sociobiological explanation were true (and that is by no means certain), sociobiology often misses interesting and important questions and issues such as why the people in different societies adopt such widely different behaviors.

Another way of seeing the power of culture is to observe how the people of every society tend to believe that their way of life is best.

ETHNOCENTRISM

When the ancient Greeks heard people speaking in other languages, the sounds they heard seemed meaningless. To the Greeks, such talking sounded like "bar, bar, bar, bar." Thus, they called people with other languages *barbarians*. The Greeks applied this word to all people who came from other societies whom they regarded as uncivilized.

People in all societies tend to think of themselves as the chosen people or, at the very least, as those at the center of humanity. From this view, it is understandable that people of any society would think their ways of doing things were the right ways, and the ways of other people were less right. This altitude is labeled *ethnocentrism*. **Ethnocentrism** is a view held by the people of a society that says that they are of central importance in the universe and therefore their way of doing things is the "right" way.

Obviously, not every group of people can be right, since often the customs of one group are totally different from the customs of another. Also, if we had been born into another society, we obviously would have grown up thinking that the norms of that society were right and proper. It is the culture itself that makes things "right."

CULTURAL RELATIVISM

The study of diverse cultural traditions often helps us to see how different customs can be equally acceptable. This view is the key to an important idea called *cultural relativism*. **Cultural relativism** is an approach that evaluates the behavior of the people of another society, not on the basis of the evaluator's culture but on that culture's own terms.

In an extreme version of cultural relativism, there are no rights and wrongs, only different cultural values and norms. A more moderate version emphasizes the fact that cultures vary, and other people's patterns of behavior are best judged in the context of their own culture. The following example illustrates the point.

Staphorst is a small town in the Netherlands. If you were to drive into Staphorst you would find a picturesque community where the people still

8

dress in traditional Dutch clothing, reminiscent more of the time of Rembrandt than of the twentieth century. You might be tempted to photograph these people but, if it were a Sunday, it would be better to refrain, since the people of Staphorst are very religious and dislike having their photographs taken on their special day of worship. Indeed, the Staphorst people take Sunday so seriously that males and females do not spend time together on that day. They even separate their male and female farm animals on Sunday.

If you were to stay around Staphorst for a while, you would learn that their Sunday behavior is only a minor reflection of their conservative religious views. The people of Staphorst are 95 percent Protestant (75 percent Calvinist and 20 percent Dutch Reformed). They follow a conservative religious tradition and believe strongly in a literal heaven and hell. They are conservative in other ways, also, rejecting most of the ways of modern Dutch life.

The Staphorst example shows us that, if we take the time to look at the cultural traditions of other people, we can be more sensitive to the integrity of other cultures. In other words, we will be more inclined toward cultural relativity and less inclined toward ethnocentrism.

Cultural relativism, however, does not suggest that one must invariably accept the practices of other people regardless of what they might be. For example, when the Nazi government of Germany in the 1930s put into slavery or killed entire categories of people (Jews, gypsies, and the mentally retarded), one could not regard this phenomenon as just another example of cultural diversity. The idea of cultural relativity implies greater tolerance for cultural differences but not a blind acceptance of all forms of human behavior.

THE COMPONENTS OF CULTURE

Culture is defined as the entire complex of ideas and material objects shared by the people of a society. We are now ready to look more systematically at the major components of culture. We begin with a consideration of symbols.

People who live in the same culture generally understand each other, because they share the same symbols. **Symbols** are words, gestures, and objects that communicate meaning when people agree on and recognize what they represent. Every symbol has a social character because a group of people agrees on the symbol's meaning. Shared symbols are used by the people of any given society to communicate with each other and to create a certain order and predictability in daily life. Symbols can be divided into two types: nonverbal and verbal.

9

NONVERBAL SYMBOLS

In historical movies, when the Lord and Lady of the Manor ride through the village in their carriage, the tradesmen and shopkeepers often tip their caps and bow slightly. The symbolism of tipping one's hat to someone of high status is unmistakable: the lower-status person is showing respect for the high-status person. This act is an illustration of a nonverbal symbol, a physical display that *has* social meaning.

In a time when men wore hats, they used to tip their hats when meeting women acquaintances on the street; this gesture was a nonverbal symbol of their respect. Tipping the hat as an act of respect is rarely seen today, but *a* vestige of this custom can still be seen in some instances. When the president of the United States steps out of his helicopter, he usually exchanges salutes with the military personnel in attendance. The military salute is an evolved version of tipping one's hat and is initiated by the lower-status person and returned by the higher-status person. It is a nonverbal symbolic act, a sign of respect for someone in a higher social position.

Another example of using nonverbal symbols to show respect for people of higher status can be seen among students in many military settings (for example, West Point), who come to attention when their instructors enter the room. They are seated only when told to do so. Coming to one's feet in the presence of someone of a higher status is a common display of respect found in many societies.

However, the meanings of nonverbal symbols are by no means the same from one society to another. Nonverbal symbols can sometimes have exactly opposite meanings in two different societies. In the United States, audiences and fans will often show their approval of performances by whistling. In Europe, however, audiences and fans whistle as a way of demonstrating disapproval and dissatisfaction.

The kiss, another nonverbal symbol, also varies widely in its meaning and use from one society to another. American male political leaders often have to brace themselves when they meet political leaders from the Middle East, some European countries, or Russia, because a common greeting among men in these countries is to exchange kisses on the checks. In U.S. society, kisses on the cheek between men and women are used as a way of greeting friends and acquaintances, but men do not usually exchange kisses unless they arc close relatives — fathers and sons and brothers may kiss after having been separated for some time.

The kiss on the lips between lovers is not as natural as it may seem. The lip kiss is said to have been invented by the people of ancient India, although the earliest Indian records (about 2000 b. C.) indicate that their prior

custom was a nose or "sniff" kiss. By the time the famous Indian manual of sex and love, the *Kama Sutra*, was written in the fourth century, the lip kiss was well established. The practice of kissing with the lips spread westward to Persia, Syria, Greece, Italy, and eventually to the countries that make up Northern Europe. For Americans, who inherited their culture from these European countries, the lip kiss between romantic partners has always been an expression of love and affection. In many societies, however, lip kissing between lovers was unknown until it was introduced by explorers, traders, and missionaries from the West. According to reports from these observers, the people of most African societies did not kiss on the lips, nor did the New Zealand Maoris, the Australian aborigines, the Papuans, Tahitians, or other South Sea Islanders. It is said that the Chinese considered kissing vulgar because it reminded them of cannibalism. Among Eskimo tribes of the Arctic, the custom was for lovers to rub their noses together.

In contemporary Japan, kissing in public, even a greeting kiss, is still considered inappropriate by many people. The traditional greeting for friends, spouses, or lovers in Japan is a smile and polite bow. Kissing in a public place, especially if the kiss is passionate, is considered by many Japanese to be shameful or a sign of weakness. Nonetheless, the young people of Japan are breaking away from the traditional prohibitions, and kissing in public is becoming more common.

Lip kissing has spread to most societies from its Indo-European origins. This spread of a cultural custom from one society to another is called **cultural diffusion.**

Nonverbal symbols include many other things besides the physical acts performed by people. Many physical objects are also endowed with symbolic meaning. Flags, emblems, insignias, and coats-of-arms are some familiar examples of objects that have special meaning for people. These objects are displayed on homes, automobiles, and clothing as a way of conveying messages to other people. In recent years the makers of clothing have adopted the practice of placing their names, logos, and trademarks on the outside of clothing. The successes of clothing lines carrying these symbols suggest that aesthetics is not the only reason for a brand name to be written on the outside of one's shirt, blouse, or pants. It takes only a little sociological imagination to see that recognizable names, logos, or trademarks send out a social message for the observers. Indeed, many different types of clothing convey messages to observers. Scientists, some of whom never go near a laboratory, nonetheless don their laboratory jackets as a symbol of their status as scientists.

VERBAL SYMBOLS AND LANGUAGE

Although the nonverbal symbols of a culture are often interesting, it is the verbal symbols that have the most sociological significance. **Verbal symbols** are any verbal utterances that are part of the spoken or written language of a society. The language system shared by the people of a society serves as one of its most important social bonds. But more than that, language influences the way people of the same culture perceive reality.

The ability to learn and use verbal symbols is undoubtedly the most extraordinary ability that human beings possess, and using words and language is a critical element in people's social and cultural lives. At an early age, humans can learn hundreds — and then thousands — pf different symbols and can use them to communicate with other people. Not only do humans learn words, but they also learn the rules of grammar and sentence structure that are characteristic of their particular language. English-speaking children, even as toddlers, learn to add an *s* to the end of a noun when they want to speak of more than one object. We find it humorous when small children say "mouses" instead of mice, but they are simply following a generalized rule that, in all likelihood, no one has explicitly taught them.

Small children hear the plural form used for many nouns and then, quite reasonably, adopt the rule as a way of using the language properly.

The capacity to learn symbols, as well as the rules for using them, allows humans to store and transmit information, thoughts, and ideas with great ease. This ability gives language its particular importance as a carrier of culture. Through language we share not just the names for things but also the rules and values that shape and influence how we relate to these things. An example of this principle can be found in some recent controversies surrounding the rights and responsibilities of biological fathers.

In American society the term *biological father* is important; a biological father has certain rights and responsibilities with regard to any children he produces. However, in recent years new reproductive technologies have allowed women to conceive babies by being impregnated with the sperm of male donors. This practice has raised questions and created problems in some cases about the rights of the "biological father." In some cases the sperm donors have claimed their rights as biological fathers. For Americans this raises a perplexing question because sperm donors would not ordinarily have rights to a child, but a biological father (which the donor seems to be) does.

In some societies the notion of a biological father does not have the same meaning and significance as it does for Americans. For example, a

12

few societies exist where two or more men are married to the same woman. In such a case, there is often no way to determine which husband is the biological father. In one such society in the foothills of the Himalayas, the lack of concern about the biological father extends to cases where wives become pregnant while visiting their home villages. The pregnancy is accepted (even welcomed) by the woman's husbands, and the infant is considered theirs. Apparently, the biological father is of no importance and has no rights to the child.

Americans might have a difficult time understanding how these Himalayan people could be unconcerned about the actual biological father and about his rights and responsibilities. But again, the reason is that Americans cannot easily ignore the social meanings attached to the term biological father. The words and symbols shared by the people of a society are important not simply because they convey information but also because they carry social rules and values.

KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEFS

Knowledge and beliefs, taken together, constitute a body of information created by the people of a society that influences behavior. Knowledge is presumed to be verifiable information, while beliefs are presumed to be difficult to verify. In practice, however, these forms of information are frequently interchangeable.

Consider, for example, the following four statements about the sun:

- The sun is a god and should be worshiped.
- The sun is our primary source of heat and light.
- Sunbathing, which leads to a deep tan, is healthy for humans.
- Direct exposure to the sun over a period of time may produce skin cancer.

Which of these statements are knowledge and which are beliefs? Most of us would agree that the first statement is a belief, while the second is a factual statement and, therefore, knowledge. Statements 3 and 4, however, are more troublesome. Some of us think that three is knowledge and four is only a belief, while others think the opposite is true. Furthermore, a true believer in a sun god would think it ridiculous to doubt the validity of the first statement. Knowledge and beliefs are not as easy to disentangle as one might suppose. An analysis of our reactions to this series of statements about the sun reveals the cultural nature of knowledge and beliefs. Those statements that we believe to be valid or true will influence how we behave. From a cultural viewpoint, knowledge and beliefs are accepted by substantial numbers of people

in a society, and therefore shape general behavior. If we are to judge from the number of people who seek out beaches and swimming pool each summer, working assiduously at getting suntans, most Americans still seem to believe that a suntan is healthy (or at least attractive).

However, knowledge and beliefs in every society undergo continuous change. As knowledge and beliefs change, behavior also changes. Even today, some people have modified their views about suntanning and have changed their suntanning practices. It is ironic that, if Americans begin to shield themselves from the sun at the beach or the swimming pool, their behavior will parallel the behavior of Americans a century ago. In that era, women in particular kept their faces, arms, and legs shielded from the sun, not because of a fear of skin cancer but because a tanned skin was associated with laborers and peasants whose work exposed them to the full day's sun.

We return now to what many regard as the key or primary component of culture: cultural values, or simply values. In comparison with knowledge and belief that focus on *what is,* values are related to what *should be.*

VALUES

We noted earlier that values are a society's standards of desirability, of rightness, and of importance. Values are expressions of what is good or bad, beautiful or ugly, pleasant or unpleasant, appropriate or inappropriate. Cultural values are shared by a substantial number of people in a society and therefore influence the behavior of most people. The social rules governing behavior (called norms) are generally consistent with, or reflections of, cultural values.

Although it is possible to identify cultural values, not everyone in a society holds exactly the same values. Individual variation suggests the notion of personal values. **Personal values** are the values individuals use to make decisions about their personal lives and about the ways in which they respond to public issues. Personal values, like cultural values, deal, not with the trivia of life, but with fundamental and important aspects of our social lives. It is not a value to prefer the music group U2 or the movies of Jodie Foster, although selecting any of them could perhaps reflect a more basic value. Personal values are likely to influence our occupational choices, our decisions about marriage mates (or about marriage itself), and our views about politics. Personal values influence our reactions to public issues: for example, our choice of a political party or our views on international relations, the environment, medical practices, and so on.

Values are not neutral; they are positively or negatively charged. Cultural and personal values can also vary in degree from very strong to very

14

weak. Some values are more important, more pervasive, and more influential than others. Later, in our discussion of American cultural values, we will look for our most important ones.

Values vary from society to society. What one group of people considers desirable may be viewed as undesirable by another group. For example, in our society a high value is placed on youth, beauty, and vigor. Many people make strenuous efforts to remain youthful in appearance. Health clubs, weight-loss spas, cosmetic surgery facilities, the clothing industry, and many related businesses thrive on the desire of Americans to stay young looking. In other societies, youth is not so highly valued. In many societies around the world, older people are considered wise and valued advisors.

Engaging in competition in order to win is another value not shared by the people of all societies. Americans generally believe that winning is much better than losing, and that it is inappropriate to play a game without trying to win. However, among the Tangu people of New Guinea, winning is not the object of their game, *Taketak*. *Taketak* involves spinning around dried fruit rinds ("tops") into masses of stakes that have been driven into the ground. Players from each of two teams take turns spinning the tops in the palms of their hands and throwing them into the masses of stakes, trying to hit as many stakes as possible. Stakes that have been touched are removed. The object of the game is not to have one team "win" by hitting all the stakes, but to have both teams hit exactly the same number of stakes, at which time the game ends. Ending in a tie expresses one of the primary values of the Tangu culture — the notion of moral equality among all persons.

DOMINANT VALUES OF AMERICAN SOCIETY

Observers and social analysts have tried since the earliest days of American history to identify the dominant values of the people who settled on the land that is now the United States. The effort continues into the present, as contemporary sociologists try to isolate dominant values held by most people in the United States today. It is interesting to note that some of the dominant American values observed in the earliest days of this society still prevail today. The most prominent among these is the way Americans value individualism.

Individualism is the concept behind the special importance that Americans attach to the rights, freedoms, and responsibilities of every person. Individual rights and freedoms and individual responsibility are key features of the U.S. political philosophy that has its roots in the Judeo-Christian religious tradition. Americans believe that individuals have a fundamental responsibility for their own lives, and their successes or failures

result from their own efforts and actions. This *belief in* individual responsibility leads directly to the *value of* individualism — the freedom of every person to do, think, say, and believe what he or she wants. Naturally, no individual has a right to harm other people or to infringe on their rights, but aside from those limitations, individuals have the freedom to lead their lives as they wish.

Personal Control. Also a part of individualism, and closely related to personal freedom, is the notion of personal control. **Personal control** means that individuals cannot be made to do things they do not want to do by social, political, or economic forces. In concrete terms, a person has the right to be neighborly or to ignore the people next door. It is the ability to be distant from incompatible relatives and to be with compatible friends instead; to skip unwanted memberships in church or union; to vote for candidates not supported by parents or spouses or not to vote at all; and to reject unwelcome advice or demands for behavior change from spouses, employer, or anyone else.

Americans value the right to be in control of their own lives. Not only do Americans believe they have a right to control their lives, but they are confident that they can do so and are optimistic about meeting and overcoming every challenge. Again this idea is expressed in the words of the California corporation manager who said, "Given open communication and the ability to think problems out, most problems can be solved."

Hard Work, Success, and Personal Achievement. Americans also place a high value on work, personal achievement, and success. These values are certainly found in the occupational world, where most people (especially males in our society) act them out. The emphasis on work and success often becomes so important that people sometimes forget why they are working and striving to succeed. These three powerful values are pervasive in American life. Indeed, they extend into many areas of life beyond the work world. Some observers note that Americans work even when they are engaging in leisure-time activities. Sports are no longer games but highly organized, serious competitions. Travel becomes a ceaseless driving marathon to see how many miles can be covered in a day, how many "points of interest" can be seen in a week. Childrearing is often measured more in terms of success and achievement than experienced as the joy of being with a child. Parents feel that they have "done a good job" when their children achieve good grades, win the most-popular-student award, make the football team or cheerleading squad, or graduate with honors.

Closely related to success is the value of materialism. **Materialism** is a preoccupation with acquiring more and more possessions and property.

Sometimes the emphasis on acquiring cars, houses, video and sound systems, and recreational equipment is simply called greed. But material things are acquired for reasons other than the pleasure they give; possessions are also an indication of status. The term **conspicuous consumption** is often used to describe the American tendency to acquire things simply to display them.

Rationality. One important additional value of American society is rationality. **Rationality** as a value emphasizes the importance of setting goals and objectives and then achieving these goals in the most efficient way possible. Rationality reaches its peak when it is possible to calculate exactly which procedure will achieve an objective most quickly and with the least expenditure of effort.

Although the value of rationality has characterized much of the Western world in the last several centuries, it has a special prominence in the United States. Almost every part of life in the United States is in some way marked by an emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness. As a result, nearly everything is produced with an eye toward minimizing time and cost, and maximizing output and productivity.

McDonaldization: Rationality in Action. There is no better way to see the importance of rationality in our everyday lives than to look closely at a familiar part of our society: the McDonald's fast-food restaurant chain. McDonald's is built on the principles of rationality — *efficiency, predictability, control, and quantification.*

The McDonald's system offers us efficiency by getting us from being hungry to being satisfied (or at least no longer hungry) in the shortest period of time. Because both the customers and the management value the speed with which food can be delivered and eaten, the restaurants offer a limited, simple menu with food prepared and served in assembly-line fashion. While not noted by most customers, the speedy service offered is even more important for the restaurant than for the customer. It is in the restaurant's interests to move the customers in and out as rapidly as possible. To ensure this efficiency, the seating is made intentionally hard so that customers will not linger after finishing their meal. Some McDonald's establishments go beyond that subtle encouragement, however, and post signs stating mat customers may spend no longer than 20 minutes in a booth or at a table.

Predictability is also an aspect of the McDonald's system. Customers know almost exactly how they will be greeted at McDonald's or any other familiar fast-food restaurant. For years, the customers at Roy Rodgers' restaurants heard "Howdy partner" when they approached the counter. In almost every other fast-food restaurant, the counter staff is well rehearsed to deliver a welcoming script.

More importantly, it is the food in fast-food restaurants that is predictable. The Big Mac or Egg-McMuffin we get in Kansas City will be the same as the one we get in downtown Miami, or in a shopping mall in Portland, Oregon (or, for the international traveler, in downtown Amsterdam or Moscow). The Big Mac or Egg-McMuffin may not be gourmet eating, but it will be dependably acceptable as food. The predictability of McDonald's food is a result of the high level of control exercised over the preparation of the food and the routine measurement and quantification of all aspects of the process.

Control is another principle of rationality and, in the case of McDonald's, refers especially to the *substitution of nonhuman technology for human judgment*. One of the earliest technological developments at the McDonald's restaurants was a French-fry machine that determined precisely when the fries were done to perfection. The cooking of the French fries was not to be left to the judgment of a busy or disinterested worker. In any McDonald's (as well as in most other fast-food restaurants) the soft-drink and milkshake dispensers automatically measure the precise, predetermined amounts that go into the paper cups.

Quantification, the exact measurement of every aspect of the process, is another feature of a completely rationalized system. When you eat a McDonald's hamburger you can be quite sure that exactly 19 percent of it will be fat, or, if you order the new "light" burger, it will be only 9 percent fat. Potatoes will be sliced so that each french fry is exactly nine thirty seconds of an inch wide. Thirty-two slices of cheese, no more, no less, will be cut from a pound of cheese. Everything is measured and timed in the McDonald's system; the numbers are precise and unvarying.

The success of the McDonald's system, has, of course, been imitated by fast-food restaurants throughout the food-service industry. More important, the principles of rationality as employed by the McDonald's system have now become pervasive throughout businesses and the service industries of society. The vice chairman of Toys "Я" Us wants to be thought of "as a sort of McDonald's of toys." Jiffy-Lube, Midas Muffler, H & R Block, Pearle Vision Centers, Kampgrounds of America (KOA), Kinder Care, and Nutri-System all reflect the principles of rationality so successfully introduced by McDonald's. Even the services of lawyers and doctors (McDocs) can be obtained from an efficient, rationalized system.

The principles of rationality, as exemplified by McDonald's, have now been adopted throughout U.S. society and in many other societies of the world. For this reason, one of the authors of this text has labeled this phenomenon the "McDonaldization of society".

NORMS

Norms are another major component of culture. While values are the general guidelines for evaluating behavior in society, norms deal with more specific situations and circumstances. We have defined norms as the rules for what one should or should not do in given situations.

William Graham Sumner (1906) was one of the earliest sociologists to address the norms, or rules, of society. Sumner made the distinction between folkways and mores. **Folkways** are rules that generally govern everyday conduct. Violations of those rules usually bring no serious repercussions. The eating rules of a society often fall into the category of folkways. For example, eating an entire dinner with a spoon would be considered odd behavior for an adult, but it would not be a violation that calls for punishment.

Mores (pronounced *mor-ays),* by comparison, are rules relating to much more serious behaviors. Mores involve the moral standards of the society. Thus violations of the mores will result in severe punishments (often called **sanctions**) for violators. Stealing, robbing, killing, and espionage are considered to be immoral acts and are often punished severely.

Frequently, the rules that a society considers important are written into **laws** by the government. When norms are made into laws, the government takes on responsibilities for enforcing the rules. Many laws reflect the mores of the society.

An illustration of the relationship between mores and laws can be found in the many towns and counties in the United States where business is prohibited on Sundays. These laws, called *blue laws,* reflect a time when Sunday business was considered immoral. Today, some of these laws remain in effect, although most Americans do not consider shopping on Sunday immoral. This example shows that laws often reflect the norms of a society, but not invariably.

Variations in Following Norms. Although norms are the rules of behaviour in a society, not everyone follows the norms at all times. One reason is simply a *lack of knowledge* about certain norms. Some people might not know what the rules are. Such is often the case with newcomers to a society, as illustrated by the immigrants in Israel who were unfamiliar with the norms that surround bus riding there. An Israeli bus driver described their plight:

They don't know how to behave. They don't know what it means to stand in line; they haggle about the fare as if they were in the market; sometimes they even jump through the windows.

19

Faced with such violations of the norms, the driver may take the role of teacher, educating the immigrants about the norms of bus riding:

The driver may have to convince these passengers that it is not customary to cook and eat on the bus. Less dramatic is the need to explain the basic rules of the game — that fares are fixed and have to be paid, that buses run according to a time schedule, and that the driver has to comply with traffic regulations.

Sometimes people arc familiar with a norm, but they *do not accept it or choose not to follow it.* For example, although the norm of tipping for service in restaurants is generally understood in the United States, some people tip only when they consider the service to be of high quality. They do not accept the norm of routine tipping. (Some norms are easier to reject than others because penalties for rejection are not always severe.)

IDEAL VERSUS REAL CULTURE

Sociologists also make a distinction between the ideal and real cultures. The **ideal culture** reflects the values and norms that most people of a society are aware of and accept. The **real culture** reflects what people actually do in the conduct of their everyday lives, even though it may differ from the ideal culture.

An illustration of the distinction between the ideal and real cultures concerns a dominant American value discussed earlier: individualism. This value is undoubtedly supported by the vast majority of Americans, and it does influence behavior in the society. However, there are limits to how much individualism is allowed in the real world, even by those who accept the ideal of individual freedom. If an individual who is suffering from a fatal illness wishes to commit suicide, many people object strongly. Dr. Jack Kevorkian has been the subject of public outrage and state legislation because he has openly assisted people who want to end their lives. Americans place a value on individualism, as an ideal, but in real-life situations, most do not give an individual the right to end his or her life.

MATERIAL CULTURE, TECHNOLOGY, AND CULTURAL LAG

The definition of culture presented earlier included both the "ideas and material objects that the people of a society have created..." So far we have devoted most of our attention to cultural ideas, but now we will focus directly on the material objects of culture. **Material culture** includes all the artifacts, objects, and tools that are used in some way by the members of a particular society. In the United States, homes, cars, appliances, clothing, and works of art arc all part of the material culture, as are the highways and roads, the machines that produce agricultural products and manufactured

goods, television and radio networks and stations, and energy-producing facilities.

The concept of technology is closely related to the material culture, but the two terms are not synonymous. Technology includes machines and production systems that are, of course, material things, but there is more to technology than machines. **Technology** is the interplay of machines, equipment, tools, skills and procedures for carrying out tasks. This broader view, especially with the inclusion of procedures, allows us to see that a technology exists for running, providing medical care, or conducting political campaigns. For example, today's political campaigns combine the technology of television with the technology of public relations. Political candidates are instructed by their staffs what to say, as well as how to say it and where and when to say it, in order to maximize their coverage of the evening news. In this case, the technology of media management is more important than the material aspects of television (cameras, videotape, transmission lines, and so on).

Technology in the contemporary world often changes very rapidly, usually much faster than social and cultural systems. Technological changes often make existing social practices or cultural forms obsolete, irrelevant, or even dangerous. Members of the society may not recognize the obsolescence of certain social or cultural practices and may continue to follow them. **Cultural lag** exists when social and cultural practices are no longer appropriate for prevailing technological conditions.

For example, cultural lag exists between the level of productivity possible with modern machines and automated production systems and the expectations that most people have about working. In contemporary developed societies, fewer people are required to produce things (cars, wheat, bricks, household appliances, and so on). Yet we cling to the ideas that everyone should work and that their work should produce "things" (although increasingly we consider services, such as tax consulting, public relations advising, or beauty counseling useful and productive). We also tend to think that everyone should work productively at least 40 hours a week. As machines take over even more tasks of production (and services), we will have to give people economic rewards for what we now consider "nonwork." Perhaps someday people will be routinely paid for creating artistic works, traveling, thinking, meditating, or having therapy. If this idea strikes us as strange or impossible, we might recognize our own reaction as an example of cultural lag.

Another example of cultural lag is found in the use of computers as a means of communication. Online bulletin board systems allow computer users to communicate with others on a wide range of topics, including some

that may violate the norms (or even the laws) of society. The most prominent example is the exchange of sexual material that violates sexual norms or laws. Law enforcement agents today often monitor these online systems, but online users are claiming that the police have no right to spy on their personal communications. Computer communication is a new and widely used technology; however, the cultural norms about the privacy of these communications are lagging behind the technology.

COUNTERCULTURES

Often, in a society, groups emerge that are not just different in their ways, but are consciously in opposition to the widely accepted norms and values of the dominant culture. This type of group is known as a **counterculture**.

Many different groups in the United States have been called countercultures, including the beatniks of the 1950s, the hippies of the 1960s, the Ku Klux Klan, skinheads, neo-Nazis, Satanists, survivalists, Hell's Angels, and even some religious groups, such as the Church of Scientology and the Unification Church.

Most counterculture groups explicitly demonstrate their rejection of dominant cultural values. Both the beatniks and the hippies made it clear, through their lifestyles and their words, that they rejected conventional morality about sex, drugs, and work. The Ku Klux Klan has openly rejected the cultural value of equal treatment for all Americans, singling out for special vilification African Americans and Jews, although immigrants, Catholics, union members, and communists have also been among their targets.

The 1995 bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City focused attention on a loosely knit counterculture that has recently emerged in the United States. The term militia groups has been applied to these quasimilitary organizations, all of whom are highly critical of the federal government, claiming that it is repressive, corrupt, and evil. There have been a number of specific versions of this counterculture, including the Aryan Nations, The Order, Posse Comitatus, and the Covenant, Sword, and Arm of the Lord. These groups claim to be patriotic and defenders of the country, but they see the government itself as the major threat to the American way of life. One widespread belief is that the federal government will soon turn over control of the country to a foreign army, led by the United Nations, Zionists, or some other non-Americans.

The militia groups (sometimes calling themselves survivalists) are often heavily armed and carry out their own self-styled military training exercises. Others of these antigovernment groups have committed robberies,

assassinations, bombings, and other acts of terrorism. Thus, they clearly meet the criteria of countercultural groups.

EXERCISES

I. Read and translate the text.

II. Answer the following questions.

1. Why does the author say that every culture has a history?
2. Do you think it is possible for an entirely new culture to emerge in the present-day world?
3. How is culture related to tradition?
4. Is the culture of a nation better preserved in large towns or in small villages? How can you account for this difference?
5. Give a few examples of nonverbal behavior. Are they peculiar only to your culture, or are they universal, at least in Euro-American culture?
6. What, in your opinion, better explains human behavior: one's blood type or one's zodiac sign? Do you know your own blood type? Does this knowledge, or lack of it, affect your everyday life? Can you imagine a situation when it would?
7. What kind of person is normally described as successful in your culture? How is achievement related to success?
8. We often hear people say, "Well, this is human nature." What does this statement generally imply?
9. Can language be described as part of culture? Compare cultural norms and language norms. How do they differ?
10. Do you think that a national culture can be enriched in the present-day world? Lost partially or entirely? Give your own examples.

UNIT 3

FORMS OF SOCIAL LIFE

Human behavior is not random; it is patterned. Regularity and order can be found in the actions of all humans, whether they are Nepalese living in Katmandu, aborigines living in the outback of Australia, or New Yorkers living on the Upper East Side of Manhattan. Average people living anywhere will know how to relate to the people with whom they come in contact in their daily lives. Imagine what would happen, however, if we were to. take a person from any one of these places and put him or her in another society. The results would vividly reveal how the patterns of behavior in a society must be learned.

23

Because many of the social patterns of our own society are so familiar, we often give them little attention. We will examine a wide range of different patterns of social relations.

SOCIAL STRUCTURES

Social structures are regular patterns of social interaction and persistent social relationships. Social structures are constructed by the ongoing interaction of people, but at the same time, by observing these patterns of interaction, we can identify social structures. Social structures can be observed at any social level from the interaction between two people, through groups and organizations, to entire societies. To illustrate how a social structure is created through interaction, and, simultaneously, how social structures are observable in the regularities of everyday interaction, we will consider a familiar example.

Imagine a number of college students who come together at the beginning of a school year to live on the same corridor of a dormitory. When they first move in they are probably strangers, or perhaps they know each other only casually. Over a period of time, however, through their interaction, they will start sorting themselves into sets of people who spend time together. These sets of people will talk, go to meals together, help each other with homework, and so on. Some of the emerging groups are apt to have special interests and activities — sports, dorm politics, partying, practical jokes, or studying. Using the words of the social structure definition, we can say that regular patterns of social interaction and persistent social relationships will occur among these students.

When anthropologist Michael Moffatt lived among the residents of a dormitory at Rutgers University in New Jersey, he was able to observe the social structures that emerged during the first two months of the school year. He reports:

"By late October, the residents of the floor had connected themselves together in the complex network of friendship [groups]." He describes some of the larger friendship groups and cliques, identifying their leaders, their special activities, and their differing styles. He also notes that there were some two- and three-person groups that were either outside the larger groups, or in some cases connecting two different groups. Also, some first-year students "floated between this clique and others on the floor." These patterns of interaction (social structures) on a single dormitory floor were clearly identifiable after only two months of interaction. One can be quite certain that at the beginning of each academic year similar structures will emerge in dormitories and residence halls at every other college.

24

Because social structures are created by people, they can change over time. But structures tend to have some persistence, and when sociologists speak of social structures they are talking about patterns of interaction and social relationships that persist over time. Included would be the major social structures found in societies, for they generally do not change rapidly. Very often structures reflect patterned inequalities by which some people are treated as more important than others; some have more privileges and power than others.

INTERACTION

The ability of humans to meet and interact with other humans is a high-level skill, but most of the time we do it with ease. In an average day a person typically interacts with a wide variety of people, including friends, relatives, lovers, acquaintances, and strangers. As long as we share the same language with these people, we can negotiate almost any kind of situation, whether it is friendly or hostile, comfortable or awkward, casual, or formal. When interaction occurs between two people, two things happen, almost simultaneously. Each person in an interaction situation is sending words and cues and receiving and processing words and cues as they come in from the other person. The important feature of any interaction is the way people use their minds to interpret the words and cues of another person, deduce their meaning, and respond accordingly.

This abstract description of interaction makes it seem complex and unfamiliar, but if we take an everyday situation we can see how the process of interaction works. Consider a hypothetical yet commonplace situation in which a male and a female college student are getting acquainted. If they are in college and happen to sit next to each other in a class, over a period of time they may have a series of interactions that could ultimately result in their dating and becoming romantically involved. Their early interaction is important in this process. Two people seated side by side may rarely talk with each other at first. Gradually, however, they may start to interact. Of course, the very act of engaging in conversation when it is not necessary is in itself a symbolic act. When two people find themselves engaged in conversation they may recognize that their interaction could imply a mutual attraction. Even as they talk about something as mundane as the sociology professor or the next test, the young man might reflect to himself that he is attracted to the young woman and that she might be attracted to him.

As this interaction continues, different things might be happening at different levels simultaneously. Noncommittal ideas may first be exchanged, as the students talk about the professor or about studying for the

25

next examination. The young woman may say she doesn't have anyone with whom to study, but if she makes this remark, the young man must interpret what it means. He has only a second or two to decide if she is saying that it might be pleasant for the two of them to get together outside of class, ostensibly to do some studying. At the same time, as he is assessing what her words really mean, he is formulating his response. If he responds to her objective statement inappropriately, he may look foolish. If he treats it as a suggestion that they get together outside of class and she did not mean it that way, he may be embarrassed. The young man must quickly select from his many possible choices: "I don't have anyone to study with either," or "I always find it helps to study with someone just before the test," or "Why don't we get together before the test?"

If the young man made the last of these statements, the young woman would have to decide exactly what his words mean. He could be asking for a date, or he could simply be suggesting that they study together. The woman must weigh all the evidence, again in just a second or two, and make some appropriate response. As a rule, a person in this situation will reply in such a way that the response will be appropriate regardless of the real intent of the statement. Or the young woman could simply say, "Are you asking me for a date or do you want to get together to study?" However, before doing so she will have to weigh the consequences of this response. Will the young man be shocked by her directness? Will her statement have the effect of acknowledging the previously unstated attraction between them?

The interaction just described goes on within the context of the cultural values and the social norms we discussed in the last chapter. In some societies, the norms of courtship would make it totally inappropriate for two young people to make a date of any kind. Often parents would have to be consulted and a chaperon obtained before two young people of the opposite sex could spend any time together. We can see from these normative constraints why human behavior is not random but is, as we said, patterned. The interaction between two people who are getting acquainted is partially open to their own creativity and inventiveness, but it is also patterned by the norms that prevail in a society.

But there is another important social constraint on the interaction between the young man and woman we have been describing. Both people have social statuses, or positions, and attached to these statuses are social roles. Status and role are important sociological concepts because they reveal why there is a great amount of regular and patterned social behavior.

26

STATUS AND ROLE

The words and actions of the young man and woman described above will certainly be influenced and shaped, especially in the early interaction, by the fact of their genders. Many American young people still believe it more appropriate for males to initiate invitations for dates than for females to do so. This view is changing, but many young women still say, "I think it is fine for a woman to ask a guy for a date, *but I wouldn't do it.*" This statement tells us that although some young women do not see anything wrong with a woman initiating a date, many still feel that it might be inappropriate behavior. But why is it viewed as inappropriate? To understand why someone would feel this way and why this feeling is shared by many other people — young and old, female and male — we have to examine the importance of the sociological concepts of status and role.

A status is a socially recognized position in a social system. A role is the behavior generally expected of one who occupies a particular status. Again we can use gender as an example of status and role. In all societies, males and females have socially recognized positions, with certain expectations, about what one will and will not do. However, males and females are not expected to act in the same way in every society. We will examine some societies in which men and women are expected to act in ways that are very different from those traditionally expected of them in U.S. society. But -and here is the important point — gender is always a status that carries with it some expected behaviors. Roles are always connected with gender.

Statuses can be of two types: ascribed and achieved. An **ascribed status** is one into which individuals move or are placed, irrespective of their efforts or capacities. Examples of ascribed statuses include being male or female, young or old, black or white, son or daughter. We have little control over our ascribed statuses. (An example of an effort to control ascribed status would be a person who undergoes a sex change.) In contrast, an **achieved status** is one that people acquire through their own efforts. Examples include becoming a college graduate, getting married, having children, becoming an astronaut, or even becoming a bank robber.

A related concept is that of master status. A **master status** refers to a position so important that it dominates and overrides all other statuses, both for the person and all other people. For example, a study of male college basketball players at a major university demonstrated that the status of being on the men's basketball team overwhelmed all other statuses of these young men. Even if these men wished to be seen as more than simply basketball players, everyone else on campus identified them in this way. For

them, *basketball player* became a master status that overrode all other statuses.

Often in our society, a master status is related to one's occupation. A person who is a Supreme Court Justice, a nun, a college president, or an opera singer is likely to be seen primarily in terms of his or her major occupational role — a master role.

Another point about statuses and roles is that they have a reality of their own; they exist irrespective of the persons who fill them. Whoever occupies the status of the president of the United Stales, or is the center-fielder on a baseball team, or the anchorperson on a television news show must attend to certain expectations that accompany the status. In general, the people who fill a status understand the expectations and follow the behavior expected of them.

However, not everyone in a particular status behaves in exactly the same way. There are two reasons for this. First, the role expectations connected with a status are not fully detailed. Role expectations are not so precisely stated or understood that every detail of expected behavior is clear. Second, individuals who hold statuses may have their own orientations toward the role. Let us deal with each of these issues separately.

Roles do not specify every exact behavior that a person in a given status must follow. In fact, roles often have only broad requirements within which a person must operate. Airline pilots, for example, are expected to be competent to fly planes in all kinds of conditions and handle difficult and emergency situations in a calm and collected way. When pilots speak to the passengers, they generally present themselves as steady, serious, and relaxed, even though they may not always feel that way. However, some pilots will occasionally inject humor, irritation (with delays, for example), or other emotions into their public presentations. When they are not within hearing or sight of the passengers, their behavior may be even more at odds with the general role expectations for airline pilots. Behind the scenes they are able to introduce their unique, personal characteristics and still fulfill the role expectations connected with a status. In other words, people do not simply conform to role expectations; they also actively modify their roles. This ability of individuals to modify (at least to some degree) their own roles has been called **role making**.

Another way to see how individuals can vary their performance of a role is to note that the dominant view about what is expected of people in a given status need not be universal. Different orientations toward a role can exist. The college student role has broad outlines — enrolling, going to class, studying, taking exams — but different students might emphasize different features of the student role. These different emphases are called **role orien-**

tations. Some students might emphasize the academic and intellectual aspect of the student role. With this orientation they would take advantage of college to become involved in intellectual pursuits. Their role orientation; toward their college-student status has been called the *academic-intellectual* role orientation. In comparison, other college students are more oriented toward the vocational or professional training they receive in school. They see student life as an opportunity to learn profession and gain entry into it. This orientation has been called the *vocational* role orientation.

Some students see their college experience as an opportunity to engage in an active social life or to learn social skills. For them, college is a learning ground for their future social lives. The fraternity-sorority scene may be a forerunner of the country club life that they expect to enter later. This has been called the *social life* role.

As we have seen, the roles connected with statuses do not make individuals in the same status behave in the same way, but enough similarity is evident in role performance to produce some general patterns of behavior. These patterns, found among males and females, airline pilots, and students, and a vast array of other statuses, are sufficiently consistent to produce identifiable patterns in social life. However, statuses and roles can always be modified and changed over time, through the continuing actions and interactions of people.

DYADS AND TRIADS

When two people engage in interaction, it is called a **dyad.** When a third person is introduced into the interaction, it is called a **triad.** While both dyads and triads involve interaction, and both can be seen as groups, there are some interesting differences between two-person and three-person interaction. From a sociological and practical point of view, the triad is a much more complicated social arrangement.

A dyad has only one relationship, but a triad has three (A and B, A and C, B and C). That in itself makes the triad more complicated. Consider, for example, the common situation of a husband and wife dyad becoming parents of a new baby, thus becoming a triad. The relationship between the husband and wife becomes more complicated because each will now have a relationship with the baby. It is a fairly common occurrence for a new mother to devote so much attention to her relationship with the baby that her husband feels neglected. A substantial amount of research shows that satisfaction with marital relationships declines when married couples have children. Part of the reason can probably be attributed to the changes in interaction when a married-couple dyad becomes a triad.

Similar problems often emerge in three-person friendship groups. Although three-person groups can maintain a cohesive "three-musketeers" relationship, a balance is difficult to maintain. All pairs of relationships in a triad must be about equal in time spent together, displays of friendship, conversation, and so on. If this equality is not maintained, then one of the pairs will dominate, leaving the third person relatively isolated. Many people who have been in three-person friendship groups have had the experience of two members drawing closer together and shutting out the third.

Although dyads and triads are frequent forms of social interaction, the social group brings us to a more purely sociological level. We turn to this level next.

SOCIAL GROUPS

While the word *group* is used in various ways in everyday speech, and even in sociology, the technical sociological meaning focuses our attention on some important features of social life. A **group** may be defined as a relatively small number of people who interact with one another over time and thereby establish patterns of interaction, a group identity, and rules or norms governing behavior.

One key feature defining a group is the interaction among all members. A larger entity such as a society (for example, U.S. society) differs from a group in that all the members of a society cannot possibly interact with each other because of their large number.

Although a large number of people cannot technically constitute a social group, a small number of people will not necessarily constitute a group either. Several people who meet briefly on an elevator are not a group, because they lack a group identity and because they do not interact on the basis of patterns they have established.

IN-GROUPS AND OUT-GROUPS

According to our definition, a basic characteristic of a group is that the interacting individuals have a group identity. Therefore, to qualify as a group, the people who compose it must define themselves as members and, conversely, those outside the group must be defined as outsiders. The emphasis on group identity leads to the distinction between *in-groups* and *out-groups*. An **in-group** is one that members are involved in and with which they identify', while an **out-group** is one to which outsiders belong. The importance of this distinction is the tendency for people to believe in the rightness and desirability of the in-group, and to reject the ways of the out-group. The in-group, out-group distinction usually takes on its greatest sig-

nificance when two or more groups are in close proximity. Members of fraternities and sororities on a college campus may view members of other fraternities and sororities as out-groups. This can lead to an attitude of "us" against "them." In extreme cases, in-group, out-group attitudes may lead to conflict between groups.

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY GROUPS

Sociologists also differentiate between primary groups and secondary groups. The concept of **primary groups** was developed by Cooley (1909) to describe groups "characterized by intimate face-to-face association and cooperation." Primary groups are typically small and close-knit. The relationships among the members are very personal. They strongly identify with each other as well as with the group as a whole. As a result of the closeness of the relationships, the primary group often has .a profound effect on its members. As examples of primary groups, Cooley cites the family, play groups of children, and neighborhood or community groups.

Secondary groups, in contrast to primary groups, are typically large and impersonal. Members do not know each other as intimately or completely as do the members of a primary group. Members' ties to a secondary group are typically weaker than the ties to primary groups. Secondary groups have a less profound impact on members. They are usually formed for a specific purpose, and the members rarely interact with each other outside of the activities that are oriented toward the group goal. The members of a local Parent-Teacher's Association or a labor union are examples of secondary groups.

REFERENCE GROUPS

Another sociological perspective on groups is revealed by thinking of how groups (both primary and secondary) serve as reference groups. **Reference** groups are any groups that a person takes into account when evaluating his or her actions or characteristics. As humans we are always trying to evaluate ourselves and our behavior. Am I attractive? Am I doing a good job? Should I wear these clothes tonight? One way we answer these questions for ourselves is to refer to the performance or the qualities of the members of some group. Although individuals often use groups of which they are members as reference groups, a person does not necessarily have to be a member of a group in order to use it as a reference group. Take, for example, a woman who is making reasonably good career progress and, after some years, becomes a manager in a major corporation. If this woman's reference group is made up primarily of the circle of friends with whom she

went to high school, she will probably have positive feelings about her career progress. Many of her high school friends have probably not gone on to jobs in the corporate world; compared to them she is doing well. On the other hand, if this same woman manager takes as her reference group the fastest-rising executives in her own corporation, she will evaluate her career success more negatively.

As this example shows, a reference group can be used to make comparative evaluations about oneself and one's performance. But reference groups can also provide a normative function by supplying an individual's norms and values. Thus, a young manager may not yet be a member of top management, but the latter can be his or her reference group, supplying the aspiring executive with the relevant standards of behavior. For example, if an aspiring young female manager notices that the successful female executives wear tailored suits and silk blouses, she too might stock her wardrobe with these items.

Religious group membership often provides an important reference group that has a profound influence on individual behavior. A study of U.S. adults has shown that membership in different religious groups influences attitudes toward premarital sex, birth control, and abortion. Research evidence also reveals that religions as reference groups influence alcohol use.

A person will likely have a number of reference groups, and those groups will probably change over time. Many college students have reference groups that include students who are socially popular figures, varsity athletes, and campus leaders. After graduation some of the characteristics and qualities of these types may seem superficial and irrelevant. Whatever one's reference groups are while in college, they are likely to change dramatically when one leaves the campus and enters the business or professional world.

EXERCISES

I. Read and translate the text.

II. Answer the following questions.

1. What are social structures? What social structures do you feel that you belong to?
2. At what social level can social structures be observed?
3. What is the difference between a social status and a social role? What is the difference between an ascribed status and an achieved status?
4. Imagine a 30-year-old female scholar, married, with a PhD in sociology; describe her in terms of status; point out some of her most likely roles.

5. Are people capable of modifying their roles? Their statuses?
6. Describe me academic-intellectual role orientation.
7. Can passengers on a suburban train be described as a social group? Give your reasons.
8. Why is it necessary to distinguish between dyads and triads? How does interaction within a family change after the birth of a baby?
9. What are social constraints on the interaction between a student and a professor in your culture?
10. Can you give any examples from fiction or film that display relationships in a dyad or in a triad? Do you find *interaction in a dyad* easier than interaction in a triad? In a large group?

UNIT 4
SOCIALIZATION

The late Bruno Bettelheim, a world-famous psychologist, once told an anecdote that illustrates the importance of the topic of socialization. Bettelheim's story involves a familiar parenting experience, getting a reluctant young child (say, a boy) to eat his vegetables. An American parent might say, "You must eat your vegetables, they are good for you and will make you strong," A Japanese mother, by contrast, would be more likely to say, "How do you think it makes the man who grew these vegetables feel? He grew them for you to eat and now you reject them." Or "How do you think it makes the carrots feel? They grew so you could eat them, but now you will not."

Thus, the Japanese teach even their young children to be sensitive to the feelings of others. In contrast, the admonition of the U.S. parent ("It will make you grow") emphasizes how the child himself will benefit from eating the vegetables. When the Japanese mother stresses how important it is for the child to be sensitive to the feelings of others, she is paralleling the notion of social responsibility and group loyalty found in the Japanese culture. Similarly, in the United States when the parent stresses the well-being of the individual child, she is reflecting her culture's concern with individual self-interest.

There is makes a distinction between broad and narrow cultural socialization. "Cultures characterized by broad socialization tend to encourage individualism, independence, and self-expression". By contrast, cultures with narrow socialization emphasize the importance of obedience and conformity and discourage deviation from cultural norms. Socialization in the United States, especially in the schools and through the mass media, tends to be broader than in countries like Japan.

33

THE NATURE OF SOCIALIZATION

Socialization is the process by which a person learns and generally accepts the established ways of a particular social group or society. The principal purpose of socialization is to make sure that the new members will do things in about the same way as they are currently being done. In other words, societies, groups, and organizations maintain a certain amount of continuity over time because of the socialization of new members. Generally, new members accept what is taught to them as the right and proper way of doing things.

In a similar way, from a cultural perspective, socialization passes on the values and norms to the new members, which allows norms and values to persist from one generation to the next. Even when the new members of a society are not born into that society but come in as immigrants, various forms of socialization initiate these newcomers into the culture of the new society.

In addition to its significance at the level of the society and culture, socialization also contributes to the process of producing the characteristics and personality of the individual. The socialization that occurs early in life, in infancy and early childhood, is especially critical in this regard. Often called **primary socialization**, it is usually provided by the parents or other caregiver(s) and lays the foundation for personality development. In this process infants become social beings. The early stages of socialization nurture a tendency for the human infant to want and need interaction with other people — a tendency that generally endures.

Socialization continues throughout the lifetime of every individual. As people move into new jobs, organizations, communities, and even new life stages they will learn the values, norms, and behaviors expected of them in these settings. Later in this chapter we will turn to the socialization that occurs during adolescence, adulthood, and old age, but first we focus on the critically important socialization that occurs in infancy and early childhood.

The importance of socialization during infancy and early childhood can be understood by considering what human beings would be without contact with other humans. At this fundamental level we are not focusing on socialization *per se*, although some socialization is occurring, but simply on the contact and interaction between infants and other human beings.

ACQUIRING HUMAN QUALITIES

Human babies cannot care for themselves when born; they must have some other human present to give them food and keep them warm, or they will not survive. Although babies in these early days of life seem to be very

limited and almost entirely biological in their nature, increasing evidence shows that they are already orienting toward the humans in their environment. Video camera observations have shown that infants, even in the first hours after birth, have a "quiet-alert stag" when they are attentive to their environment, especially to people. In the first few days or weeks of life infants will make eye contact with a parent and will respond to a parent's facial expressions and voice sounds. This research on very young infants seems to show that the physical dependence infants have on other humans is augmented by an early tendency to be attracted to their primary caregivers.

Since the human infant begins responding to other humans at such an early stage of life, we might too easily assume that many social and personal qualities normally found in humans are also inborn or inherent. But the evidence is to the contrary for, although human infants might have the tendency toward sociability, they must have sustained contact with other human beings or it will not develop. We can never know with complete certainty how an infant would develop if it were kept alive without contact with other humans, but a few documented cases of isolated children provide some insights. These substantiated cases of infants who have been raised in nearly complete isolation reveal all too clearly that, without human contact, the qualities we associate with humanness can be almost completely lost.

CHILDREN ISOLATED FROM HUMAN CONTACT

Mythological stories have been told of children who were reared by animals instead of human beings, and some cases of children who were allegedly found living in the wild with animals have been minimally documented. (They are called **feral**, meaning *wild children*.) In one such case in India, two children were found living with wolves. They were brought to an orphanage where they were cared for, observed, and photographed over a period of years. Long after they were found, these children continued to display animal-like behavior, such as walking on all fours, eating food with their mouths, and preferring to play with dogs.

The reported cases of feral children are generally not as trustworthy as the cases of children who lived in human settings but were kept virtually isolated from human contact. In each known case a family member placed the child in some isolated part of the home, providing only enough food and water to keep the child alive but offering no human contact. When found, the children did not talk, nor did they show the range of emotions that humans usually display (crying, smiling and laughing, responding to human gestures of friendship, and the like).

One such case occurred in Temple Hills, California, where a father locked his daughter in a room from age 2 until she was discovered (in 1970)

at age 13. The girl (called Genie) was placed by her father in a restraining harness, seated on a potty chair during the day, and placed in a strait-jacket at night. The mother of this girl, terrorized by her brutal husband and further limited by blindness, had almost no contact with Genie after infancy. When Genie was finally found she was unable to speak, because during her formative years her father had not allowed her to make any sounds. Even with intensive training after her discovery, Genie was unable to use language at more than a rudimentary level. The professionals who worked with her did not believe she was mentally retarded, because she showed a quick mind in nonverbal ways and had especially good spatial skills. Genie was eager to communicate, but it was nearly impossible for her to master pronouns, tenses, and the meanings of familiar terms of social intercourse. "She could not learn to say 'Hello' in response to 'Hello,' [and] could not grasp the meaning of 'Thank you'.

Efforts to socialize her were only partially successful; long after she was found she persisted in behaviors that went beyond normal acceptability. One of Genie's teachers, who developed a close relationship with her, described how this 14-year-old girl "had many distasteful mannerisms and her behavior was often disconcerting and unpalatable" Genie would spit and blow her nose on everything and everyone around her. She also had a special fondness for plastic things and certain items of clothing or accessories.

Genie also masturbated whenever and however she could. Any object that she could use for masturbation attracted her. For more than four years after her discovery the professionals working with her were unable to limit this socially unacceptable form of behavior.

Genie has spent most of her adult years in institutions. Now in her thirties, she lives in a home for the retarded. Despite her apparent innate intelligence, she was never able to overcome the early years of isolation and live a normal social life.

The information provided by Genie and the limited number of other cases of extreme isolation demonstrate that human beings do not become "human" if they do not have at least some human contact. Furthermore, there seems to be a critical formative period when infants and children need human contact and interaction or the effects upon their personalities are devastating and largely irreversible.

EARLY SOCIALIZATION: "GETTING HOOKED ON PEOPLE"

How does a baby become human and develop personal traits? Most human infants eventually approximate the human qualities that are prominent in the particular group into which they happen to be born. To under-

stand how this happens, we must go back to our earlier discussion of the human infant who cannot survive on its own.

Because a baby absolutely needs adults for comfort and survival, adults control the situation. Although most parents first respond by freely gratifying their baby's every need, they do not do so for long. Eventually, adults start to assert their power. Parents continue to give what a child needs, but they start exacting a price. Mothers and fathers will feed and change the diapers of the baby, but eventually they want something in return, even if it is only a smile. If they get the smile, they may give something else — a hug, a cuddle, or a tickle. If the baby responds again, more comforting rewards are given.

This is the beginning of socialization for the norm of reciprocity. The **norm of reciprocity** calls for two interacting people to give one another things of equal or almost equal value. People want to continue to interact with one another if they are receiving something roughly equal in value to what they are giving.

Reciprocity in interaction is probably the earliest social lesson. The human infant is both highly dependent and pleasure seeking. Put these two things together, and it follows clearly that he must have the help of others in securing his own gratification. This simple fact is the root-source of a process that we shall call, quite unscientifically, "getting hooked on people".

"Getting hooked on people" means that after a while the baby needs more than the food and the dry diapers that the adult provides. The baby also needs the smiles, the attention, the hugs, and the comforting words of the adult who delivers the other necessities.

At first adults will give warmth and comfort freely — but not forever. Adults soon start demanding more and more from their babies for what they provide. Thus babies must slowly give up their totally selfish ways. They have to start doing some things that they do not want to do and stop doing other things. Eating solid foods instead of warm milk, especially milk from the mother's warm body, comes just one step before sitting on the cold potty — and so the process of making a responsible member of society begins. Later, adults bestow smiles, praise, and affection for brushing teeth, keeping a room clean, sitting quietly during religious services, bringing home good grades on report cards, or writing thank-you letters promptly.

Parents and other adults also use negative sanctions, which they have at their disposal by virtue of their powerful position. They may augment their reward system by scolding, spanking, withholding desserts, or "grounding" to get the child or adolescent to do what is "right."

The use of reward and punishment to produce acceptable social behavior is not the only way to accomplish socialization; it is only a basic mecha-

nism that is part of the larger process of socialization. Something else happens in this process that cannot be explained by the simple idea of rewarding good behavior and punishing bad behavior. Children do what their parents and others expect of them, even when their parent are not around to see what they are doing. Children will generally do the right things without constant reward or punishment. The following discussion explores how and why this happens.

EXERCISES

I. Read and translate the text.

II. Answer the following questions.

1. What kinds of people can find socialization hard?
2. Is it usual, in your culture, to teach small children to be sensitive to the feelings of others?
3. Are human qualities inborn or acquired?
4. What happens if a child is isolated from human contact? Give examples from fiction or media stories that support your view.
5. What are the advantages and disadvantages, if any, of early socialization? Do you remember any of your own pre-school experiences of socialization?
6. Do you agree that socialization continues throughout the entire lifetime of every individual?
7. Would you describe yourself as a sociable person? What are the advantages of being a sociable person?
8. In what kinds of situations is it usual, in your culture, to combine verbal and non-verbal interaction? When would it be better to limit oneself to verbal interaction? Non-verbal interaction?
9. How does the use of reward and punishment produce acceptable social behavior?
10. What, in your opinion, are the most effective kinds of reward? Of punishment? What kinds of reward and punishment do you find unacceptable?

UNIT 5

GENDER AND AGE: STRATIFICATION AND INEQUALITY

We are born either male or female, and, except for a tiny number of people who take the dramatic step of changing their sex, there is little we can do about it. The sex of a person is determined by certain physical characteristics, including the reproduction organs by which the sexes are bio-

logically identified. Age is also a biological characteristic, but unlike sex, which is relatively stable, the process of aging goes on continuously. These two biological characteristics — sex and age — are part of our makeup at all times. What makes sex and age sociologically important is that every society attaches social significance to these biological characteristics.

Sociologists today generally use the word gender, not sex, when speaking of the social nature of being male and female. **Gender** emphasizes that males and females are socially defined, and these social distinctions influence the positions of males and females in society and their behaviors. Gender, therefore, like other aspects of the society, is *socially constructed.*

Since gender is socially constructed, it is not fixed, but variable — from one society to another and one time to another. An additional underlying theme of this chapter is that "gender carries undue importance in the social world, and its salience tends to reinforce men's power over women".

Age is also socially constructed and, like gender, the social definitions of different ages determine the place of people in society and influences their behavior.

The organization of societies around gender and age distinctions are of considerable importance because the result is often one of inequities, or systems of inequality. We have already seen how inequalities exist in wealth, power, and access to many of society's opportunities. Being male or female, or being young or old, leads to different social arrangements and social behaviors. Although these differences do not inevitably lead to negative results, we will see that gender and age distinctions often produce inequalities.

We will begin by considering the positions of males and females, both in American society and in societies around the world. Later we will focus on age groups, especially the elderly and the young.

GENDER STRATIFICATION

There are three key dimensions in gender stratification: power, division of labor, and gender roles. **Power** is the ability to impose one's will upon others, even if they resist. Power can exist only when there is a relationship between individuals, between groups, or between classes of people. In this chapter we are interested in the power relationship between sexes — males and females.

Division of labor is also a general sociological term, commonly used to describe how the occupations of a society are specialized so that any individual has only one major occupation or task. When we use the term *division of labor* in connection with *gender*, we refer to the society-wide as-

signment of different work tasks to males and females. We will refer to this as **division of labor by gender.**

Gender roles are the expectations that prevail in a society about the activities and behaviors that may and may not be engaged in by males and females. These expectations are widely understood and produce social pressures such that people feel the need to comply with them. These role expectations are socially learned through the process of socialization.

These three concepts — power, division of labor, and gender roles — are closely related to each other. They also reflect inequalities between different groups of people. With regard to power, obviously if one set of people has power over another, inequality results. With regard to division of labor and gender roles, the inequality is not as immediately obvious, but a closer examination will show how each concept leads to inequality between males and females. We will begin by looking at differences in male and female power in different societies.

POWER AND GENDER

In most societies around the world, males have greater power than females, both in the personal and public spheres. For example, males have generally been the political leaders, historically (for example, classical Greece, Imperial China, and the Roman Empire) and in contemporary modern societies. There have been a few notable women leaders in recent decades (Great Britain's Margaret Thatcher, the Philippines' Corazon Aquino, the late Golda Meir of Israel, and Indira Gandhi of India), but these women constituted only a tiny percentage of the world's national leaders. The male dominance of political leadership is also the standard among the vast majority of nonliterate societies on which we have ethnographic information.

At the private level the picture is almost identical. In the family, for example, males almost always have greater power than females. Much of the power of males within the family comes directly from a patriarchal tradition. Patriarchy means that a husband or father has unquestioned authority or dominance over other family members. Also, an organization — or, indeed, an entire society — may be based on the principle of patriarchy. In the case of Western societies, including the United States, support for patriarchy can be found prominently in the sacred writings of the Judaic and Christian religious traditions. Although these sources of male power might have diminished somewhat in recent years, their influence has certainly not disappeared.

In non-Western cultures the basis for male power in the family is also found in religious and ideological systems. In the Islamic world males are

given ultimate authority, both within their families and in the larger society where they predominate. Hinduism also gives primary power to males, again both inside the home and in the public world.

It is worth noting, however, that there have been some societies, as shown by anthropological and historical records, in which women have had power that was equal to, or perhaps even exceeded, the power of men. The key contributing factor has usually been the economic contribution of women. When economic or historical circumstances make men dependent on the activities of women, men are more likely to share power.

For example, among the African tribe called the Kung, who live in the Kalahari Desert, food supplies depend upon hunting animals and gathering vegetation from the "bush." The Kung women do the gathering, which requires that they go far out in the bush. From this activity alone they provide between 60 percent and 80 percent of the tribe's food. The Kung women also assist, in various ways, when men do the hunting. The Kung society is essentially egalitarian, as are other societies where the economic contribution of women is significant compared to that of men.

A cross-national study of 111 contemporary societies confirms anthropological studies showing the importance of women's economic contributions. This study shows that the more women participate in the labor force, the less males are able to exercise power over them. Specifically, men are less able to restrict women to traditional roles (early marriage, high fertility, and illiteracy) if women participate in the labor force.

Similar conclusions about the importance of women's economic contributions have been reached by studying families in the United States. As a woman's income increases relative to her husband's income, his share of the household work increases.

In the *public* sphere, however, there are only limited indications that women gain very much public or political power in societies where they make greater economic contributions. American women, for example, are contributing greatly in the economic realm, but, as we will see later in this chapter, their positions of power in the political or economic realms are still very limited.

Despite the existence of societies in which women exercise power at least equal to that of men, in the overwhelming majority of societies males have had dominance over females.

Therefore, the question that needs to be addressed is: Why do males so often have greater power than females? Biology is often used to account for the greater power and prestige of males. *Sociobiologists*, who look for evolutionary explanations of human behavior, argue that males evolved as the hunters and food providers, while females evolved as specialists in having

and caring for babies and in taking care of the home. The related assumption is that the male activities are more important, and thus they receive greater power and prestige. One major flaw in this argument is that it is not supported by the facts we have about food sources in hunting and gathering societies. In the hundreds of thousands of years before the development of agriculture, humans had to get their food by hunting animals and gathering edible vegetation. We know from contemporary hunting and gathering societies that women typically get most of the food (just as we saw in the case of the IKung above). If preagricultural hunting and gathering societies were at all similar, it is hard to see how females could have been genetically programmed to leave the "breadwinning" activities exclusively to males.

One of the early economic theories of male domination goes back to the work of Friedrich Engels. The key to most economic explanations of male dominance lies not in who does the work, but in who controls the means of production (for example, land, tools, machines). Contemporary scholars who advance the economic hypothesis point out that the power of women has usually been less in agrarian societies where women have not typically been the owners of the land. Women's power is especially low in societies where the inheritance system passes land from fathers to sons and where, at marriage, a woman must leave her home and live in her husband's family residence.

DIVISION OF LABOR BY GENDER

In societies around the world, men and women are usually assigned different work tasks, which is another way of saying that labor is typically divided by gender. Exactly why a division of labor is so commonplace is a matter of considerable discussion. Some argue that certain tasks are assigned to men because of their greater physical strength. Whatever the validity of this explanation, it cannot account for all differences in gender-related work. An analysis of 50 types of work in 186 societies identified only two tasks invariably assigned to men: (1) the hunting and butchering of large animals, and (2) the processing of hard and tough materials, such as mining and quarrying rocks and minerals, smelting metal ores, and doing metalwork. Women, on the other hand, were most likely to be responsible for grinding grain, carrying water, and cooking. At first glance, it would appear that this division of labor is based purely on physical strength, but carrying water — a woman's task — requires considerable physical strength. Furthermore, women in many societies carry heavy loads including — in addition to water — firewood, food, and various other products. According to reports, African women, who often carry heavy loads by balancing them

42

on their heads, can carry as much as 70 percent of their body weight. This means that a woman weighing 140 pounds could carry nearly 100 pounds on her head.

In addition, there are more societies in which women are responsible for erecting and dismantling shelters than there are societies in which men have this responsibility. Women are responsible just as often as men for preparing the soil and planting seed, as well as for tending and harvesting crops.

It has been argued that when agriculture was done primarily with a digging stick, this task was left most often to women. With the taming of animals and the development of the plow, agriculture was taken over by men. But farming done with a digging stick must have been just as backbreaking as farming done with draft animals and the plow. Physical strength alone, therefore, does not account for variations in the division of labor by gender.

Some scholars have suggested that differences in male and female work may reflect a desire, especially by men, to establish a clear male identity. Many people define themselves as male or female on the basis of what they do. For females, childbearing (and nursing) is unarguably their exclusive responsibility: "Perhaps because women have ways of signaling their womanhood, men must have ways to display their manhood". From this point of view, men in all societies must have a way of demonstrating maleness in an activity prohibited to females. One activity frequently reserved for males is fighting battles and waging wars. There is an ironic symmetry in this idea: women are responsible for producing tile, while men are responsible for taking life.

We have now seen how power and the division of labor vary from one society to another, but at the same time generally favor men. We are now ready to turn our attention to the third dimension of gender stratification: gender roles.

GENDER ROLES

Feminist sociologists have become increasingly critical of the concept of gender roles. They are critical because the concept of gender roles implies that all members of the society, including women, accept the legitimacy of gender expectations and their inequalities. Some critics object to the implication that individuals learn gender roles early in life, which thereafter remain fixed and unchangeable. This view of gender roles, they believe, puts the emphasis on individual learning and obscures the social nature of gender.

43

We believe that social roles in general, and gender roles in particular, are shaped by and reflect structural and cultural features of societies and cultures. We may also point out that a gender role approach can be useful for several purposes: (1) to point out conflicts, discontinuities, or contradictions in traditional roles; (2) to show the link between culture and behavior; (3) to demonstrate how interaction creates gender roles; or (4) to reveal the inequality of male and female roles.

CULTURAL DIFFERENCES IN GENDER ROLES

Cultural differences in gender roles were described many years ago by Margaret Mead (1935) in her now classic study of three New Guinea tribes.

The cultures of the three tribes Mead studied happened to have dramatic differences in gender roles, thus demonstrating how gender roles are learned from the culture in which one lives.

Mead first studied the Arapesh, a society in which both the males and females generally behaved in ways that are associated with the traditional gender roles of females in Western societies. Both sexes among the Arapesh were passive, gentle, unaggressive, and emotionally responsive to the needs of others. In contrast, Mead found that in another New Guinea group, the Mundugumor, both the males and the females were characteristically aggressive, suspicious, and, from a Westerner's view, excessively heartless and cruel, especially toward children. The striking feature of these two cultures is that males and females were expected to be very alike, and they were.

Mead then studied a third New Guinea tribe, the Tchambuli. In this group, the gender roles of the males and females were almost exactly reversed from the roles traditionally assigned to males and females in Western society. Mead reported in her autobiography that "among the Tchambuli the expected relations between men and women reversed those that are characteristic of our own culture. For it was Tchambuli women who were brisk and hearty, who managed the business affairs of life, and worked comfortably in large cooperative groups". The children also exhibited these characteristics. Girls were the brightest and most competent, and displayed "the most curiosity and the freest expression of intelligence." The Tchambuli boys "were already caught up in the rivalrous, catty and individually competitive life of the men". Mead reported also that while the women managed the affairs of the family, the men were engaged differently: "Down by the lake shore in ceremonial houses the men carved and painted, gossiped and had temper tantrums, and played out their rivalries".

This cross-cultural examination of gender roles shows vividly how the behavior and the seemingly "natural" personal attributes of the sexes can vary greatly.

44

STEREOTYPED PERSONALITY TRAITS AND GENDER ROLES

Although we have been using the general term gender roles, it is possible to make a distinction between stereotyped personality traits and the expected behavior associated with gender. We will distinguish between these two closely related ideas next.

STEREOTYPED PERSONALITY TRAITS

Many people believe that certain personality traits are inherently related to being either male or female, that males and females are born with distinguishing tendencies and characteristics. This way of thinking creates stereotypes. A **stereotype** is a belief that a certain category of people has a particular set of personal characteristics. Stereotypes exist for racial groups, religious groups, ethnic groups, and, in the case at hand, males and females.

A number of personality traits are associated with being either male or female. Women are thought to be followers rather than leaders. Women are thought to be more sympathetic, sensitive, compassionate, and concerned about others. They are portrayed as more inclined toward artistic and aesthetic activities. They are assumed to be less inclined toward mathematics, science, and even intellectuality. Women are often thought to be more moral, more religious, or, in some cultures, "purer" than men.

Men are thought to be better leaders, more objective, aggressive, independent, active, dominant, competitive, logical, scientific, calculating, tough, strong, and unsentimental.

Believing in the stereotyped personality traits of males and females serves as a support or justification for many kinds of gender inequality. If males are believed to be better leaders and decision makers, it would, of course, follow that men should be given positions of leadership. If women, on the other hand, are thought to be more sensitive, compassionate, and concerned for others, then they would "naturally" fit better into the tasks and jobs that call for these skills (caring for children, the ill, or the elderly, for example). But the occupations so often reserved for women have much less prestige than the leadership jobs allocated to men.

BELIEFS ABOUT GENDER STEREOTYPES

Gender stereotypes continue to be surprisingly persistent, with many Americans still believing that the basic personality traits of males and females are very different. Most people think it is desirable for males to have certain personality traits and females others. Both men and women believed that it was best for males to be *aggressive, ambitious, competitive, independent, and self-sufficient; to have leadership abilities; to defend their own*

beliefs; to be willing to take a stand; and to have strong personalities. By comparison, according to both men and women, the most desirable personality traits for females include being *compassionate, gentle, sympathetic, tender, and warm, and they should love children.* The African Americans in this study, both males and females, were less likely to accept the traditional gender stereotypes than were Anglo-Americans and Hispanics.

Contemporary public opinion polls also continue to show adults holding oversimplified descriptions of females and males. A 1990 Gallup poll found that a majority of Americans (58 percent) believe that women and men are different in terms of their personalities, interests, and abilities. Men are most often described — by women as well as men — as aggressive, strong, proud, disorganized, courageous, confident, and independent. Women, on the other hand, are most often described as emotional, talkative, sensitive, affectionate, patient, romantic, and moody.

In general, a belief in stereotyped male and female personality traits is found among people who prefer a traditional allocation of tasks between the sexes. Most important, men are more likely to believe in stereotyped personality traits than women are. Studies have found also that age is related to beliefs about stereotyped personality traits, which means that older people believe in the stereotypes more than younger people do. Also, better educated people are less likely to believe in stereotyped personality traits, while religious people are more likely to do so.

EXPECTED BEHAVIORS OF MALES AND FEMALES

The prescriptions for male and female behavior, according to the traditional gender roles, fit the stereotyped personality traits like a glove fits a hand. As we previously noted, whenever people hold stereotyped views of male and female personality characteristics, they are likely to hold traditional expectations about male and female behavior.

Although traditional gender-role expectations are found in almost every sphere of life, they are revealed most clearly in the family. According to the traditional feminine role, women are expected to perform supportive tasks within the family, and in general are expected to be subordinate to men. Women have the primary responsibility of taking care of home and children. Recent studies, conducted in Sweden and the United States, continue to find that men generally do between 20 and 30 percent of the housework, even when both husband and wife are employed. This pattern prevailed across social classes in both countries.

The traditional expectation for men is that they will provide for and, if necessary, defend their families. Although these traditional female and male

role expectations may seem exaggerated and even out of date, they still exist for substantial numbers of people in contemporary society. For example, in a modem-day family (with or without young children) it would still be acceptable for a wife to remain in the home while her husband was the sole wage earner. However, it would be considered very unusual if a husband stayed at home while his wife was the sole breadwinner.

ATTITUDES ABOUT GENDER ROLES

Traditional views about the feminine and masculine roles have been undergoing significant changes since the feminist movement began in the 1960s. The reduced support for the traditional gender roles that occurred during the late 1960s and early 1970s has been described as a "revolution in attitudes". Changes in attitudes have continued to move in the feminist direction since then. In 1985, a national sample of American adults expressed more profeminist views than a similar sample had in 1977. Both men and women, in every age group from 18 to over 65, showed less acceptance of the traditional feminine role in 1985 than they had less than a decade earlier.

While both men and women have modified their attitudes about gender roles, virtually all studies show that males are more likely than females to hold traditional attitudes about the feminine role. Recent studies find that even among young people males continue, to have more traditional views than females. This pattern has been found among students at a public university in Virginia, high school and college students in Michigan, and college students at a large urban university in Pennsylvania.

Studies in other countries have also found that males have more traditional gender role attitudes than females. This is true of high school students in New Zealand.

SOCIALIZATION FOR GENDER ROLES

To document the ways in which girls are socialized to exhibit female personality traits, and boys, male personality traits, is much like trying to document the ways in which people learn how to talk or use proper sentence structure. This socialization is such a continuous and ever-present experience that examples are both obvious and subtle.

Gender roles can be learned in a variety of ways, including direct training. Direct training occurs when significant others, especially parents, in the child's environment reward the child for behaviors that are consistent with traditional gender roles. If a 3-year-old boy falls and skins his knee, his parent might say, "Oh, you are such a brave little man, you won't cry. Will you? If you don't cry we will let the puppy in the house." If significant oth-

ers respond one way to boys and another way to girls, and if their responses reinforce the expected gender-role behaviors, then male and female behavior will likely be shaped and modified accordingly.

While everyday observations lead us to believe that such gender-role reinforcement does go on, it has not been easy to document this reinforcement in scientifically controlled observational studies. What is demonstrable is that parents and others respond to children on the basis of their gender. Parents often provide toys and clothes that are consistent with their expectations of how children of each sex should behave. In one study, the homes of 120 infants were visited by researchers who compared the number and types of toys, the colors and types of clothing, and the colors and motifs of the children's rooms. Twenty baby girls and boys in each of three groups — 5 months, 13 months, and 25 months — were included in the study.

The researchers found that boys were provided with more sport equipment, tools, and large and small vehicles, while girls had more dolls, fictional characters, child's furniture, kitchen appliances and utensils, typewriters, and telephones. Girls' clothing was pink and multicolored more often, while boys' clothing was more often blue, red, and white. The color of girls' bedrooms was varied (not necessarily pink), but the bedrooms of boy were often decorated in one color.

The tendency to identify infant males and small boys more often with stereotypic colors has also been found in other studies. When mothers in public places were asked if strangers had made mistakes about their two-year-olds' gender, 70 percent of the mothers of girls said mistakes had been made, while only 30 percent of the mothers of boys said so. Parents of boys appeared to be more concerned that boys be seen as males and took more care to dress them and cut their hair so they would not be mistaken for females.

This greater concern that boys be identified as boys indicates that adults consider it more serious when boys are misidentified, or in some way slip over into the female gender. It has often been noted that there is more adult tolerance for "tomboy" behavior in girls than feminine behavior in boys. Some observers have reasoned that this is true because "male-type" behavior is more highly valued in our society. Perhaps this is why it seems more tolerable when a girl behaves like a boy than when a boy behaves like a girl. At least, the reasoning goes, the tomboy female is aspiring to a "higher-status" position, while the boy who is more "feminine" is actually "lowering" himself. Perhaps this is why young girls can more successfully deviate from the traditional gender role. They cannot safely do so, however, much beyond the age of 10 or 11.

One additional indication of how parents treat their sons and daughters differently is found in the names they give them (Lieberson and Bell, 1992; Rossi, 1965). A recent study has shown that parents are more likely to give boys traditional names and girls more fashionable names. Traditional boys' names often reflect family, Western culture, and religion (Michael, Christopher, John, David, for example), while girls' names are more likely to be fashionable, novel, and decorative (Jennifer, Nicole, Tiffany, and Jessica, for example). The implication of these naming patterns is that boys are seen as more important in terms of "historical continuity and stability — boys are taken more seriously..."

Modeling is a second way in which traditional gender roles may be learned. **Modeling** occurs when children observe significant others of the same sex (again, often parents) engage in a behavior and then imitate that behavior. For example, girls see their mothers (and other females) applying makeup and may imitate that behavior in play. Of course, modeling is based on the assumption that children can determine which sex they belong to and thus which behavior to model. This process may be aided by parents and significant others who will make it clear which sex is the appropriate or inappropriate model. If a boy begins to apply lipstick in imitation of his mother, he may be told that "little boys do not wear lipstick."

The mass media, and especially television, may also serve as important gender-role models for children. Evidence shows that children respond to television portrayals of the sexes, in that children who watch the most television are more likely to hold gender stereotypes.

A THEORY OF GENDER-ROLE LEARNING

In addition to acquiring appropriate gender-role behavior through social rewards, children also acquire gender roles as a result of the organization of the ideas and experiences they have encountered in early life. Children develop a sense of self from interacting with other persons. They learn that they are boys or girls because they are so identified by parents and significant others.

Kohlberg's view of gender-role development starts with the idea that children organize their worlds as simply and efficiently as possible. Gender is already a part of most children's understanding by the age of 3 and is firmly fixed by the age of 5 or 6. Once children have an idea of their gender, they tend to build their values and attitudes around this basic dimension. Parents start this process of gender-role differentiation, and normal developmental processes characteristic of all children then complete the process of acquiring a gender identity. **Gender identity** is a recognition of one's gender and an acceptance of characteristics typically associated with that gender.

49

Learning gender identity depends on symbolic communication with others, especially with significant others. At first children simply learn labels for themselves, much as they learn any other label for any other object. More than half of $2^1/2$-year-old children do not give the correct answer when they are asked their gender. By the time they are 3 years old, however, from two-thirds to three-fourths of children will answer the question correctly.

Although young children may recognize that boy or girl applies to them, they do not necessarily recognize that these words apply to entire categories of people. A young girl named Susan may know that she is both Susan and a girl, but she may not recognize that girl is a word that can be applied to a whole set of young females. At the age of two or three, children usually focus on superficial social characteristics, such as clothing styles and hairstyles, not on genital or other gender-related physical differences. This focus is reflected in the anecdote about the 3-year-old who came home and announced to her mother that she had seen a new baby at her friend's house. When asked if the baby was a boy or a girl, she said she didn't know because "it wasn't wearing any clothes."

Kohlberg argues that the structuring of a child's world goes on at the same time as gender-role stereotypes are being learned. The male child recognizes not only that he is a boy but also that boy is a general category of people of which he is a part. Furthermore, he learns that boys are part of the general category called males and men. Girls learn the same kinds of things. When boys and girls begin to identify with their respective categories, they begin to value characteristics that are associated with their category.

Children tend to value things that are the same as, or similar to, things they already know and like. A boy, for example, learns to value certain games, toys, and active and sometimes aggressive behaviors because they are consistent with being a boy. Thereafter the boy will look for, and be interested in, activities that are associated with his already accepted malelike behavior. The same process occurs for girls.

There is a steady interweaving of the mental development of the child and the social learning that occurs with socialization. Through this process, males and females learn, and generally accept as appropriate, the major dimensions of the gender roles of their society. Through the remainder of this chapter we examine the ways gender roles continue to influence the behavior of males and females.

EXERCISES

I.   *Read and translate the text.*

II.   *Answer the following questions.*

1. What is the difference between the terms 'sex' and 'gender'?
2. Why is age regarded as a social characteristic? What social significance is attached to age in your culture? In other cultures?
3. What does division of labor by gender mean? What are predominantly 'feminine' professions in your country? Do you think this situation should be changed?
4. Do you agree that women gain little public or political power although they make greater economic contributions?
5. How has the feminist movement influence traditional views about the feminine and masculine roles?
6. When someone says, "Oh, women drivers!", does it imply approval or disapproval? What is the stereotype of a woman driver in your culture?
7. Have you observed any changes in gender role expectations over the past few years?
8. What are the two ways in which traditional gender roles may be learned?
9. What is the impact of the mass media on gender stereotyping?
10. Do males have dominance over females in your culture? Do you know of any European cultures where this dominance is far less marked today than it used to be?

PART II

TEXTS FOR WRITTEN TRANSLATION

Text 1
SOCIOLINGUISTICS

Sociolinguistics has changed almost out of all recognition since the 1960s, when the first readers in the subject were published. At that time Sociolinguistics was a peripheral, hybrid subject, a rebel discipline attracting a relatively small number of scholars who refused to consider language divorced from the context of which it is inevitably a part. Its roots lay in the disciplines that had traditionally investigated people, society and culture, especially anthropology; and much of the emphasis in research was on the different forms and uses of language that could be observed in different cultures throughout the world.

Since that time a very large amount of research has been carried out on language in its social context and there have been huge advances in our understanding of how language is used, in European-type cultures as well as in

those cultures more traditionally studied by anthropologists. Sociolinguistics has developed a research methodology of its own that is every bit as rigorous and scientific as that of mainstream linguistics, though it is, of course, different. It has been recognized as simply another, equally valid, way of doing linguistics, and is routinely taught as a part of a wide range of degree courses, at all levels. Its coming of age has been marked by the publication of several excellent textbooks designed for teaching. There have been related developments in other branches of linguistics, too, such as pragmatics, discourse analysis and corpus linguistics, all of which analyse different aspects of language in context. All these fields of linguistics — and others — now overlap with Sociolinguistics in their subject-matter, both in-formed by it and informing it themselves.

The proliferation of interest in language and society is welcome, and has made it possible to approach the analysis of language in its social context from several different standpoints. Each approach and perspective has its own specialized journals which provide outlets for research, and the enthusiasm with which researchers investigate their subject is leading to an ever-increasing number of these specialized journals. However, while the increase in research outlets is beneficial for the development of the discipline as a whole, it makes learning about Sociolinguistics more difficult for students and their teachers.

Text 2
CULTURE AND ITS COMPONENTS

Culture is the entire complex of ideas and material objects that the people of a society (or group) have created and adopted for carrying out the necessary tasks of collective life. Cultural rules give the people of a society a guide for behavior and make their behavior relatively predictable.

As an explanation of human behavior, culture offers an alternative to a "human nature" explanation. The extensive differences in the behavior of people in different societies supports the importance of culture as an explanation.

Sociobiology offers another alternative explanation. It stresses that human behavior is influenced by genetically inherited tendencies. A major criticism of sociobiology is that it does not allow for cultural factors to override whatever genetically inherited tendencies humans might have.

Most people think of their own cultural practices as the best and right way — a perspective called *ethnocentrism*. The study of different cultures allows us to see that particular cultural practices are best judged in the context of the culture in which they occur — a view called cultural relativism.

The most important components of culture include the verbal and non-verbal symbols of a people. The verbal symbols, or language system, of a culture tend to shape people's perceptions of the real world (the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis). Knowledge and beliefs are also components of culture. Values, the standards of desirability within a culture, are centrally important for understanding culture. In the United States the most prominent value is individualism. Closely related is the importance placed on personal control of one's life. Other significant American values are hard work, personal success, personal achievement, materialism, and rationality. McDonaldization refers to a form of rationalization that has been adopted by businesses and service industries throughout the society.

Norms are the general guidelines for evaluating behavior in society. Folkways are norms that govern everyday conduct; while mores are norms that reflect the moral standards of the society. Norms are not observed uniformly by all people in a society.

An ideal culture does exist, which contrasts with the real culture — what people actually do in the conduct of their everyday lives.

Material culture and technology are also important elements. When the material culture and technology change, a cultural lag often results as other parts of the culture become obsolete or irrelevant.

Subcultural groups (or, simply, subcultures) are groups with identifiable cultural characteristics that set them apart from the dominant culture. Subcultures often get changed and influenced by the dominant culture through a process of cultural assimilation. To retain its distinctive ways, a subcultural group must make an effort to remain separate from the dominant culture. Groups with cultural characteristics that are consciously in opposition to the dominant culture are called ***countercultures***.

Text 3

DEVIANCE

Deviance is socially defined, which means that whenever most of the people in a given society or social group consider a behavior deviant, it will be deviant. It can be shown that many behaviors that were at some time acceptable are now deviant; similarly, many behaviors that were deviant at an earlier time are now acceptable. Deviant behavior can often serve to define for the society what is and is not acceptable behavior.

A number of theories of deviance exist: strain theory, deviance as learned behavior (differential association and subcultural), conflict theory, and labeling theory. Each one has a different perspective on deviant behavior.

From a social control perspective, there are attempts to keep most people in conformity with the prevailing norms of the society. Although the most powerful people in the society are most likely to define acceptable and deviant behavior, everyone at some time or another acts as rule enforcer and rule creator.

Three different stages of a career of deviance can be defined. The first stage is becoming deviant, the second is coping with deviance, and the third is leaving the deviant role. Important social aspects are involved in all three of these stages.

Crime is the most attention-getting aspect of deviant behavior. Several distinct types of crime can be defined, including crimes against people (violent crimes), property crime, white-collar crime, political crime, organized crime, vic-timless crime, and juvenile delinquency. Most crime in the United States is crime against property, but this country also has a high murder rate, especially compared to other nations. Crime is higher in urban areas than in rural areas, and this is pro-bably attributable in part to the extensive use of drugs in today's society. The number of women arrested for crimes has increased substantially. Drugs in general are linked to crime, and cocaine, especially crack, is particularly related to violent crime. Drug abuse has become such a serious problem in the United States that some law-enforcement officials and political leaders have suggested decriminalizing drugs. However, attempts in Europe to decriminalize drugs, while they have many merits, have recently run into serious problems.

Persons convicted of crimes in the United States are expected to spend time in jail or prison. As a result, the U.S. prison system has been charged with managing ever-larger numbers of inmates; overcrowding has become an increasing problem. Larger numbers of females are being imprisoned, with dire implications for their children. Prisons are extremely expensive, and costs have risen dramatically, even though the crime rate has not shown a parallel increase. Serious questions have been raised about whether arrest and punishment deter individuals from further crime. As a result, some experts have been exploring alternatives to imprisonment for various crimes. Others have sought to put more people in prison for longer periods of time through such mechanisms as "three strikes and you're out" laws. After a lull, capital punishment is once again employed in the United States. However, there are serious questions about how well it performs as a general deterrent, and it is clearly practiced in a discriminatory fashion.

Text 4
THE PROCESS OF SOCIALIZATION

Socialization is the process by which a person learns and accepts the ways of a particular social group or society. Every social system makes sure that new members joining the system learn the accepted ways of doing things. Socialization is also important in producing the characteristics and personality of the individual.

The process of socialization begins in the very early stages of life, and through this process human qualities are acquired. Infants who are isolated from human contact during the early years of life do not show the characteristics we normally associate with human nature. Human infants develop reciprocal relationships with adults in which they learn to satisfy their basic needs by behaving in the way adults want them to. Through socialization, a child develops a social self, that is, the learned perception that a person has about his or her qualities and attributes. People learn to evaluate themselves through interaction with others, just as they learn to evaluate all other social objects. Social objects include the values, norms, and roles that prevail in the society.

Parents are important primary socialization agents, and many parents take very seriously the responsibility of shaping the personalities of their children. However, socialization is too complex and subtle for parents to achieve exactly what they desire in the socialization of their children.

Research on childhood socialization has shown that working-class families socialize their children differently from middle-class, white-collar families. Working-class families socialize their children to be obedient and to observe social rules. Middle-class parents socialize their children to take initiatives and to participate in decision making (autonomy). These two forms of behavior are related to the kinds of roles that children from different social classes are likely to play in the adult work world. Reverse socialization occurs when children socialize their parents. Empirical evidence shows that children teach their parents about some aspects of contemporary life.

Peers are important socializing agents for young children, and often the socialization of peers runs counter to that of parents. The mass media, especially television, are pervasive socializing forces in contemporary society. Children spend much of their time watching television, and evidence reveals that they are influenced by violence and by male and female characterizations seen there.

Adolescents and adults are also socialized by television, which is just one aspect of adult socialization. Adolescents receive anticipatory socializa-

tion for the adolescent stage of life. Adult socialization occurs when people receive graduate and professional training or enter new occupations, organizations, work settings, institutions, or life stages. The total institution provides a particularly vivid example of adult socialization; this socialization is so extensive that it is referred to as resocialization. Death is the final stage of life, and the elderly and terminally ill are socialized to prepare for dying.

Text 5

PEERS AS SOCIALIZING AGENTS

At a very early age, children begin to learn about their social world from playmates and nursery school companions. One sociologist who has studied nursery school children intensively contends that, once children move outside the family and start to have peer cultures, the nature of adult-child socialization is transformed radically. This researcher claims that "with the creation of an initial peer culture [even in nursery school], other children become as important as adults in the socialization process".

As children move into elementary school, socialization by their peers is clearly in evidence.

A study of preadolescent boys in Little League baseball also shows vividly how intense peer-group socialization can be. Boys in this age group apparently feel free to discuss many topics with their peers that they would not discuss with adults. This freedom enhances the importance of peer-group socialization. Once again, since the boys' social world is one they have created and is separate from the adult world, it is taken seriously by the boys.

In a Little League setting young boys are often learning traditional male behavior from their peers. Through the reactions and words of their peers they learn how to control and channel their behavior in ways that are consistent with the male gender role. The sociologist who observed hundreds of preadolescent boys over three years says explicitly that, through socialization by peers, "Boys learn to act like men." The socialization is effective and may, in some cases, run counter to the child-rearing goals of the boys' parents.

As young people move into adolescence, there is evidence that peer socialization is even more likely to be in conflict with socialization messages coming from other sources, especially parents and the schools. Alcohol use, reckless driving, and other risk-taking behaviors are commonly learned from adolescent peers.

STRATIFICATION

Social stratification, or structured social inequality, is a universal feature of human societies. Social inequalities and social ranking are usually justified by reference to an ideology, a set of ideas used to explain and justify the inequalities. The inequalities in American life are justified by a meritocratic ideology that emphasizes an ideal of equality of opportunity.

Sociologists have distinguished three basic dimensions of social stratification: class, status, and power. Class is an economic variable strongly emphasized by Marx as the determinant of social stratification. However, Weber argued that status, or prestige, and power were also important dimensions in a system of social stratification. An examination of the American stratification system reveals that, despite an egalitarian ideology, considerable inequality exists in contemporary American society. Inequalities in the concentration of wealth and income in the United States have been substantial throughout the nation's history, and they have become more pronounced during the 1980s and 1990s. Inequality is also manifested in differences among the social classes in both life chances and life-styles.

Stratification systems differ in the extent to which they are open or closed. An open class system is one in which there are few obstacles to social mobility, which is the movement between positions in a system of stratification. In a closed class system little possibility exists for mobility; people's positions in a social hierarchy are determined almost completely by birth. The most closed of all stratification systems is a caste system, which is exemplified by traditional Indian society.

There are different types of social mobility. Vertical mobility can be either upward or downward. Horizontal mobility involves the movement between comparable positions in the social structure. Sociologists have examined both intragenerational, or career, mobility and intergenerational mobility, in which parents' occupational positions are compared with those of their offspring. In general, studies of social mobility suggest that, despite a widespread belief that the United States has provided unique opportunities for social mobility, upward social mobility is no greater in the United States than in other Western industrialized nations.

THE DURATION OF HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS

Sociologists have referred in passing to the transitory nature of human ties in urban society. But they have made no systematic effort to relate the

shorter duration of human ties to shorter durations in other types of relation-ships. Nor have they attempted to document the progressive decline in these durations.

For one thing, the decline in the average duration of human relation-ships is a likely corollary of the increase in the number of such relation-ships. The average urban individual today probably comes into contact with more people in a week than the feudal villager did in a year, perhaps even a lifetime. The villager's ties with other people no doubt included some tran-sient relationships, but most of the people he knew were the same through-out his life. The urban man may have a core group of people with whom his interactions are sustained over long periods of time, but he also interacts with hundreds, perhaps thousands of people whom he may see only once or twice and who men vanish into anonymity.

All of us approach human relationships as we approach other kinds of relationships with a set of built-in durational expectancies. We expect that certain types of relationships will endure longer than others. It is in fact pos-sible to classify relationships with other people in terms of their expected duration. These vary, of course, from culture to culture and from person to person. Nevertheless, throughout the wide sectors of the population of the advanced technological societies something like the following order is typical:

Long-duration relationships. We expect ties with our immediate family, and to a lesser extent with other kin, to extend throughout the life-times of the people involved. This expectation is by no means always ftil-filled, as rising divorce rates and family breakups indicate. Nevertheless, the social ideal is a lifetime relationship. Whether this is a proper or realistic ex-pectation in a society of high transience is debatable. The fact remains, however, that family links are expected to be long term, if not lifelong, and considerable guilt attaches to the person who breaks off such a relationship.

Medium-duration relationships. Four classes of relationships fall within this category. Roughly in order of descending durational expectan-cies, these are relationships with friends, neighbors, job associates, and co-members of churches, clubs, and other voluntary organizations.

Short-duration relationships. Most, though not all, service relation-ships fall into this category. These involve sales clerks, delivery people, gas station attendants, barbers, hairdressers, etc. Exceptions to the service pat-terns are professionals such as physicians, lawyers and accountants, with whom relationships are expected to be more enduring.

Text 8

FAMILY

Many people today express concern about the condition of the family in the United States. But concerns about the family go back to the nineteenth century and yet the family is important to most Americans. The structure of American households has changed somewhat over the last quarter-century, but the majority of people still live in a family context. However, the functions that the family performs are fewer that those that the family performed historically.

The family can be organized in many different ways and still carry out a variety of functions that are both necessary and useful for the society. Some important functions of the Family, found in most societies, are reproduction, care and nurturance of children, socialization, fulfillment of economic needs, provision of intergenerational and kin support, regulation of sexual behavior, and social placement. Many different types of family structures exist, as well as many different norms governing family life.

The family is an adaptive institution. Historical and contemporary examples support the idea that the family is likely to adapt to changes in other parts of the society, especially the economic system.

In many societies, including contemporary Iran, and to a lesser extent Japan, marriage is arranged by parents. However, in many Western societies the young people themselves choose their mates on the basis of mutual attraction and romantic love. The mate selection system of the United States has, throughout its history, been based primarily on romantic love. But, even when mate selection is left to young people, the family and other social groups can influence the process.

Cohabitation is now a stage of premarried life for many young people. The trend is more advanced in Scandinavia but is also prominent in the United States.

The early years of marriage are difficult in terms of adjustment, but these are also the years of high satisfaction with the marital relationship.

Marital quality tends to decline with the arrival of children and continues to be negatively influenced by children throughout the later life stages. Most evidence shows that marital quality improves in the later years of marriage.

The relationship between family and work (both inside and outside the home) is the source of many complications and problems in contemporary family life. Despite the increase of women in paid employment, they still do most of the housework and child care.

59

Conflict and violence in marriage are more widespread than is often suspected. The major serious forms of violence are spouse abuse and child abuse. Two types of couple violence are patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence. It is the former that leads to the most serious harm to women. Child abuse covers a range of behaviors, including the uncertain area of physical and verbal actions that are accepted by many people as normal parental discipline.

The divorce rate of the United States is among the highest in the world. Divorces increased gradually after 1920 and more rapidly in the 1960s and 1970s. Since the peak in 1979, the divorce rate has declined somewhat. The declines may be due to later marriage.

Separation and divorce are stressful and complicated experiences. Six stations of divorce have been identified: emotional, legal, co-parental, economic, community, and psychic. Children do suffer when their parents divorce, but the long-range effects on children, while they exist, are not universal. As a result of divorce and remarriage, family relationships in contemporary society are becoming increasingly complex.

T e x t 9
GENDER ISSUES

Every society is organized to some degree on the basis of gender and age categories, and often the results are inequities or systems of inequality The inequalities between males and females, the gender stratification sys tem, can be analyzed in terms of three separate but closely related concepts: power, division of labor by gender, and gender roles.

In most societies males tend to have greater power and more privileges than females, but some exceptions are notable. Women have greater power in societies where they carry out activities on which men are dependent. In societies around the world, men and women are typically assigned to different work. The division of labor by gender often finds men doing heavy and dangerous work, but there are many instances when females, too, are assigned heavy and arduous tasks.

Cross-cultural evidence shows that the gender role differences familiar in American society are not universal and therefore are not inborn characteristics of the sexes. Anthropological studies give evidence that gender roles are learned through the socialization process.

The stereotyped personality traits associated with males and females attribute certain traits (emphasizing achievement and action) to males and other traits (emphasizing emotional support and comfort) to females. Therefore, traditional feminine and masculine roles in American society empha-

size that females should participate in activities that are supportive and expressive, while males should participate in ones that are active and instrumental.

Attitude studies among Americans show that traditional gender-role attitudes have been reduced; but many Americans, especially those with fundamentalist religious beliefs, still hold to some traditional expectations, especially for women.

The socialization for gender roles occurs through social rewards provided by significant others and by models provided by males and females in the child's environment. Also, children themselves develop a gender identity and actively adopt the behaviors and altitudes associated with the different genders.

Traditional gender roles are reinforced by classmates in the schools, beginning as early as kindergarten and the elementary grades. Teachers also respond to the genders differently, giving greater recognition and advantage to the males.

In the public world, especially in political and economic life, women are underrepresented in the more prestigious positions. Sex segregation in occupations, produced in large part by sexism and institutional sexism, continues to leave women less rewarded in the work world.

In the stratification of society by age, the elderly and children are the most disadvantaged. Children and young adults are defined by the rest of the society as being less than mature, and thus limitations are placed on their rights.

The definition of old age is changing in the United States because of the improving health and economic positions of many people over age 65. The elderly population is growing rapidly, and will continue to increase in numbers and as a proportion of the population. Many elderly people today are reaching old age with considerably greater economic resources than in the past. However, elderly women who live alone, especially if they are members of minority groups, have much higher than average levels of poverty than other categories of the elderly.

When the poverty levels of the elderly and children are compared, higher rates of poverty are found among children.

CONTENTS

PART I. TEXTS FOR ORAL TRANSLATION AND DISCUSSION

PART II. TEXTS FOR WRITTEN TRANSLATION