

ФЕДЕРАЛЬНОЕ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ БЮДЖЕТНОЕ
ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНОЕ УЧЕРЕЖДЕНИЕ ВЫСШЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ
“Саратовский национальный исследовательский государственный
университет имени Н.Г. Чернышевского”

Б.Р. Могилевич

**English Reader for Bachelors, Masters and Post-graduate
Students of Sociology**

Саратов 2016

Пособие предназначено для использования на занятиях по английскому языку бакалавров, магистрантов и аспирантов социологических специальностей с целью формирования переводческих компетенций при работе с текстами в сфере профессиональной коммуникации. В пособии представлены аутентичные профессиональные тексты, дающие возможность овладения профессиональной терминологией. Кроме того, в пособии представлены тексты, предназначенные для формирования компетенций составления резюме и аннотаций текстов профессиональной коммуникации. Данное пособие представляет вторую часть цикла учебных материалов по английскому языку для всех уровней подготовки специалистов по социологическим специальностям.

Содержание

PART I.....	4
WHAT IS SOCIOLOGY?	4
ORIGINS OF SOCIOLOGY	7
METHODOLOGY	10
SOCIOLOGICAL METHODS	13
SOCIETY	16
CLASSICAL VIEWS ON SOCIAL CHANGE	19
SOCIALIZATION	23
SOCIAL GROUPS	26
SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY	29
DEVIANCE AND NORMS	32
PART II.....	35
THE SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS OF SOCIOLOGY	35
THE EVOLUTION OF SOCIOLOGY	37
“CONFLICT” BY GEORG SIMMEL	39
COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR	42
OVERPOPULATION	44
KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY	47
THE FORMATION OF RELIGIONS	51

PART I

Excercise 1. Translate the text

WHAT IS SOCIOLOGY?

Sociology is the study of society and human social action, of the origins, institutions, organization, and development of human life. It is a social science which studies the social lives of people, groups, and societies. Sociologists try to explain human behaviour but, unlike other scientists, they stress that human behaviour results from the way that people interact and mix with each other. They are therefore interested in what goes on within social groups, from the smallest, such as the family or friendship groups, through to large societies.

It is a relatively new academic discipline which evolved in the early 19th century. It usually concerns itself with the social rules and processes that bind and separate people not only as individuals, but as members of associations, groups, and institutions. Sociology is interested in our behavior as social beings; thus the sociological field of interest ranges from the analysis of short contacts between anonymous individuals on the street to the study of global social processes. Most sociologists work in one or more specialties or subfields.

In a broad sense, sociology is the scientific study of social aggregations (from a dyad to the world), the entities through which humans move throughout their lives. A related trend in the discipline, emerging since the late 1970s, attempts to make it a more “applied” discipline, applicable in areas such as non-profit organizations and nursing homes. The results of sociological research aid educators, lawmakers, administrators, and others interested in resolving social problems and formulating public policy, through subdisciplinary areas such as survey research, evaluation research, methodological assessment, and public, sociology.

Sociological methods, theories, and concepts compel the sociologist to explore levels of reality that go beyond the commonly accepted rules governing human behavior. This specific approach to reality is known as the sociological perspective.

Social theory. Social theory refers to the use of abstract and often complex theoretical frameworks to explain and analyze social patterns and macro social structures in social life, rather than explaining patterns of social life. Social theory always had an uneasy relationship to the more classic academic disciplines; many of its key thinkers never held a university position.

While social theory is sometimes considered a branch of sociology, it is inherently interdisciplinary, as it deals with multiple fields including anthropology, economics, theology, history, philosophy, and many others. First social theories developed almost simultaneously with the birth of the sociology science itself. Auguste Comte, known as “father of sociology”, also laid the groundwork for one of the first social theories — social evolutionism. In the 19th century three great, classical theories of social and historical change were created: the social evolutionism theory (of which social darwinism is a part of), the social cycle theory and the Marxist historical materialism theory.

Although the majority of 19th century social theories are now considered obsolete they have spawned new, modern social theories. Modern social theories represent some advanced version of the classical theories, like Multilineal theories of evolution (neoevolutionism, sociobiology, theory of modernization, theory of post-industrial society) or the general historical sociology and the theory of subjectivity and creation of the society.

Unlike disciplines within the natural sciences — such as physics or chemistry — social theorists may be less committed to use the scientific method to vindicate their theories. Instead, they tackle very large- scale social trends and structures using hypotheses that cannot be easily proved, except by historical and psychological interpretation, which is often the basis of criticism from opponents of social theories. Extremely critical theorists, such as deconstructionists or postmodernists, may argue that any systematic type of research or method is inherently flawed.

Many times, however, “social theory” is defined without reference to science because the social reality it describes is so overarching as to be unprovable. The social theories of modernity or anarchy might be two examples of this.

However, social theories are a major part of the science of sociology. Objective science-based research can often provide support for explanations given by social theorists. Statistical research grounded in the scientific method, for instance, that finds a severe income disparity between women and men performing the same occupation can complement the underlying premise of the complex social theories of feminism or patriarchy.

In general, and particularly among adherents to pure sociology, social theory has an appeal because it takes the focus away from the individual (which is how most humans look at the world) and focuses it on the society itself and the social forces which control our lives. This sociological insight (or sociological imagination) has through the years appealed to students and others dissatisfied with the status quo because it carries the assumption that societal structures and patterns are either random, arbitrary or controlled by specific powerful groups — thus implying the possibility of change.

This has a particular appeal to champions of the underdog, the dispossessed, and/or those at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder because it implies that their position in society is undeserved and/or the result of oppression.

Excercise 1. Translate the text

ORIGINS OF SOCIOLOGY

History. Sociology is a relatively new academic discipline. It emerged in the early 19th century in response to the challenges of modernity. Increasing mobility and technological advances resulted in the increasing exposure of people to cultures and societies different from their own. The impact of this exposure was varied, but for some people included the breakdown of traditional norms and customs and warranted a revised understanding of how the world works. Sociologists responded to these changes by trying to understand what holds social groups together and also explore possible solutions to the breakdown of social solidarity.

Auguste Comte and Other Founders. The term sociology was coined by Auguste Comte (1798—1857) in 1838 from the Latin term socius (companion, associate) and the Greek term logia (study of, speech). Comte hoped to unify all the sciences under sociology; he believed sociology held the potential to improve society and direct human activity, including the other sciences. While it is no longer a theory employed in Sociology, Comte argued for an understanding of society he labeled The Law of Three Stages. Comte, not unlike other enlightenment thinkers, believed society developed in stages: the first was the theological stage where people took a religious view of society; the second was the metaphysical stage where people understood society as natural (not supernatural).

Comte's final stage was the scientific or positivist stage, which he believed to be the pinnacle of social development. In the scientific stage, society would be governed by reliable knowledge and would be understood in light of the knowledge produced by science, primarily sociology. While vague connections between Comte's Law and human history can be seen, it is generally understood in Sociology today Ulife Comte's approach is a highly simplified and ill-founded approach to understand social development.

Other classical theorists of sociology from the late 19th and early, 20th centuries include Karl Marx, Ferdinand Toennies, Emile Durkheim, Vilfredo

Pareto, and Max Weber. As pioneers in Sociology, most of the early sociological thinkers were trained in other academic disciplines, including history, philosophy, and economics. The diversity of their trainings is reflected in the topics they researched, including religion, education, economics, psychology, ethics, philosophy, and theology. Perhaps with the exception of Marx, their most enduring influence has been on sociology, and it is in this field that their theories are still considered most applicable.

Sociology and Other Social Sciences. The social sciences comprise the application of scientific methods to the study of the human aspects of the world. Psychology studies the human mind and micro-level (or individual) behavior; sociology examines human society; political science studies the governing of groups and countries; communication studies the flow of discourse via various media; economics concerns itself with the production and allocation of wealth in society; and social work is the application of social scientific knowledge in society. Social sciences diverge from the humanities in that many in the social sciences emphasize the scientific method or other rigorous standards of evidence in the study of humanity.

Sociology Today. In the past, sociological research focused on the organization of complex, industrial societies and their influence on individuals. Today, sociologists study a broad range of topics.

As the study of humans in their collective aspect, sociology is concerned with all group activities-economic, social, political, and religious. Sociologists study such areas as bureaucracy, community, deviant behavior, family, public opinion, social change, social mobility, social stratification, and such specific problems as crime, divorce, child abuse, and substance addiction. Sociology tries to determine the laws governing human behavior in social contexts; it is sometimes distinguished as a general social science from the special social sciences, such as economics and political science, which confine themselves to a selected group of social facts or relations.

It should also be noted that recent sociologists, taking cues from anthropologists, have realized the Western emphasis of the discipline. In response, many sociology departments around the world are now encouraging multi-cultural research.

САРАТОВСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМЕНИ Н. Г. ЧЕРНЫШЕВСКОГО

Excercise 1. Translate the text

METHODOLOGY

Sociology versus Common Sense. Common sense, in everyday language, is understood as “the unreflective opinions of ordinary people” or “sound and prudent but often unsophisticated judgment” (Merriam- Webster). Sociology and other social sciences have been accused of being nothing more than the sciences of common sense. While there is certainly some basis for the accusation — some of the findings of sociology do confirm common sense understandings of how society seems to work — sociology goes well beyond common sense in its pursuit of knowledge.

Sociology does this by applying scientific methodology and empiricism to social phenomena. It is also interesting to note that common sense understandings can develop from sociological investigations. Past findings in sociological studies can make their way into everyday culture, resulting in a common sense understanding that is actually the result of sociological investigation.

The Scientific Method. A scientific method or process is considered fundamental to the scientific investigation and acquisition of new knowledge based upon verifiable evidence. In addition to employing the scientific method in their research, sociologists explore the social world with several different purposes in mind. Like the physical sciences (i.e., chemistry, physics, etc.), sociologists can be and often are interested in predicting outcomes given knowledge of the variables and relationships involved. This approach to doing science is often termed positivism.

The positivist approach to social science seeks to explain and predict social phenomena, often employing a quantitative approach. But unlike the physical sciences, sociology (and other social sciences, specifically anthropology) also often seek for understanding social phenomena. Max Weber labeled this approach *Verstehen*, which is German for understanding. In this approach, which is similar to ethnography, the goal is to understand a culture or phenomena on its own terms rather than trying to predict it. Both approaches employ a scientific method as they

make observations and gather data, propose hypotheses, and test their hypotheses in the formulation of theories.

Sociologists use observations, hypotheses and deductions to propose explanations for social phenomena in the form of theories. Predictions from these theories are tested. If a prediction turns out to be correct, the theory survives. The method is commonly taken as the underlying logic of scientific practice. A scientific method is essentially an extremely cautious means of building a supportable, evidenced understanding of our natural world.

The essential elements of a scientific method are iterations and recursions of the following four steps:

- characterization (operationalization or quantification, observation and measurement);
- hypothesis (a theoretical, hypothetical explanation of the observations and measurements);
- prediction (logical deduction from the hypothesis);
- experiment (test of all of the above; in the social sciences, true experiments are often replaced with a different form of data analysis).

Social research methods. There are several main methods that sociologists use to gather empirical evidence, which include questionnaires, interviews, participant observation, and statistical research.

The problem with all of these approaches is that they are all based on what theoretical position the researcher adopts to explain and understand the society the researcher sees in front of themselves. If one is a functionalist like Emile Durkheim, one is likely to interpret everything in terms of large-scale social structures. A symbolic interactionist is likely to concentrate on the way people understand one another. A researcher who is a Marxist or a neo-Marxist is likely to interpret everything through the grid of class struggle and economics. Phenomenologists tend to think that there is only the way in which people construct their meanings of reality, and nothing else.

One of the real problems is that many sociologists argue that only one theoretical approach is the “right” one, and it is theirs. In practice, sociologists, often tend to mix and match different approaches and methods, since each method produces particular types of data.

The Internet is of interest for sociologists in three, ways: as a tool for research, for example, in using online questionnaires instead of paper ones, as a discussion platform, and as a research topic. Sociology of the Internet in the last sense includes analysis of online communities (e.g. as found in newsgroups), virtual communities and virtual worlds, organizational change catalyzed through new media like the Internet, and societal change at large in the transformation from industrial to informational society (or to information society).

Excercise 1. Translate the text

SOCIOLOGICAL METHODS

Quantitative and Qualitative. Like the distinction drawn between positivist sociology and Verstehen sociology, there is often a distinction drawn between two types of sociological investigation: quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative methods of sociological research approach social phenomena from the perspective that they can be measured and/or quantified. For instance, social class, following the quantitative approach, can be divided into different groups — upper-, middle-, and lower-class — and can be measured using any of a number of variables or a combination thereof: income, educational attainment, prestige, power, etc.

Quantitative sociologists tend to use specific methods of data collection and hypothesis testing, including: experimental designs, surveys, secondary data analysis, and statistical analysis.

Qualitative methods of sociological research tend to approach social phenomena from the Verstehen perspective. They are used to develop a deeper understanding of a particular phenomenon. They also often deliberately give up on quantity — necessary for statistical analysis — in order to reach a depth in analysis of the phenomenon studied. Even so, qualitative methods can be used to propose relationships between variables. Qualitatively oriented sociologists tend to employ different methods of data collection and hypothesis testing, including: participant observation, interviews, focus groups, content analysis and historical comparison.

While there are sociologists who employ and encourage the use of only one or the other method, many sociologists see benefits in combining the approaches. They view quantitative and qualitative approaches as complementary. Results from one approach can fill gaps in the other approach. For example, quantitative methods could describe large or general patterns in society while qualitative approaches could help to explain how individuals understand those patterns.

Objective versus Critical. Sociologists, like all humans, have values, beliefs, and even pre-conceived notions of what they might find in doing their research.

Because sociologists are not immune to the desire to change the world, two approaches to sociological investigation have emerged.

By far the most common is the objective approach advocated by Max Weber. Weber recognized that social scientists have opinions, but argued against the expression of non-professional or non-scientific opinions in the classroom. Weber took this position for several reasons, but the primary one outlined in his discussion of Science as Vocation is that he believed it is not right for a person in a position of authority (a professor) to force his/her students to accept his/her opinions in order for them to pass the class. Weber did argue that it was okay for social scientists to express their opinions outside of the classroom and advocated for social scientists to be involved in politics and other social activism.

The objective approach to social science remains popular in sociological research and refereed journals because it refuses to engage social issues at the level of opinions and instead focuses intently on data and theories.

The objective approach is contrasted with the critical approach, which has its roots in Karl Marx's work on economic structures. Anyone familiar with Marxist theory will recognize that Marx went beyond describing society to advocating for change. Marx disliked capitalism and his analysis of that economic system included the call for change.

This approach to sociology is often referred to today as critical sociology (see also action research). Some sociological journals focus on critical sociology and some sociological approaches are inherently critical (e.g., feminism, black feminist thought).

Ethics. Ethical considerations are of particular importance to sociologists because of the subject of investigation — people. Because ethical considerations are of so much importance, sociologists adhere to a rigorous set of ethical guidelines.

The most important ethical consideration of sociological research is that participants in sociological investigation are not harmed. While exactly what this

entails can vary from study to study, there are several universally recognized considerations.

For instance, research on children and youth always requires parental consent. Research on adults also requires informed consent and participants are never forced to participate. Confidentiality and anonymity are two additional practices that ensure the safety of participants when sensitive information is provided (e.g., sexuality, income, etc.).

To ensure the safety of participants, most universities maintain an institutional review board (IRB) that reviews studies that include human participants and ensures ethical rigor.

As regards professional ethics, several issues are noteworthy. Obviously honesty in research, analysis, and publication is important. Sociologists who manipulate their data are ostracized and will have their memberships in professional organizations revoked.

Conflicts of interest are also frowned upon. A conflict of interest can occur when a sociologist is given funding to conduct research on an issue that relates to the source of the funds. For example, if Microsoft were to fund a sociologist to investigate whether users of Microsoft's products are happier than users of open source software, the sociologist would need to disclose the source of the funding, as it presents a significant conflict of interest.

Excercise 1. Translate the text

SOCIETY

Society refers to a group of people who share a defined territory and a culture. Society is often understood as the basic structure for interactions of a group of people or the network of relationships between entities. A distinction is made between society and culture in sociology. Culture refers to the meanings given to symbols or the process of meaning-making that takes place in a society. Culture is distinct from society in that it adds meanings to relationships. All human societies have a culture and culture can only exist where there is a society.

Distinguishing between these two components of human social life is primarily for analytical purposes — for example, so sociologists can study the transmission of cultural elements or artifacts within a society.

The origin of the word society comes from the Latin *societas*, a «friendly association with others.” *Societas* is derived from *socius* meaning “companion” and thus the meaning of society is closely related to “what is social.” Implicit in the meaning of society is that its members share some mutual concern or interest in a common objective.

Society can have different meanings than the predominant meaning employed in this text. For instance, people united by common political and cultural traditions, beliefs, or values are sometimes also said to be a society (e.g., Judeo-Christian, Eastern, Western, etc). When used in this context, the term is being used as a means of contrasting two or more societies whose representative members represent alternative conflicting and competing worldviews.

Another use of society can be in reference to smaller groups like academic learned and scholarly societies or associations, such as the American Society of Mathematics.

It should also be noted that there is an ongoing debate in sociological and anthropological circles if there exists an entity we can call society. Some Marxist theorists argue that society is nothing more than an effect of the ruling ideology of a certain class system and should not be understood as a sociological concept.

Societal Development. The sociological understanding of societal development relies heavily upon the work of Gerhard Lenski (1995). Lenski outlined some of the more commonly seen organizational structures in human societies. Classifications of human societies can be based on two factors: 1) the primary means of subsistence and 2) the political structure. Here we focus on the subsistence systems of societies rather than their political structures.

While it is a bit far-reaching to argue that all societies will develop through the stages outlined below, it does appear that most societies follow such a route. Human groups begin as hunter-gatherers, move toward pastoralism and/or horticulturalism, develop toward an agrarian society, and ultimately end up undergoing a period of industrialization (with the potential for developing a service industry following industrialization). The reason this is presented as a model is because not all societies pass through every stage. Some societies have stopped at the pastoral or horticultural stage, though these may be temporary pauses due to economic niches that will likely disappear in time. Some societies may also jump stages as a result of the introduction of technology from alien societies and culture.

Another reason for hesitancy in presenting these categories as distinct groups is that there is often overlap in the subsistence systems used in a society. Some pastoralist societies also engage in some measure, of horticultural food production. Industrial societies have agrarian components.

An industrial society is a society in which the primary means of subsistence is industry. Industry is a system of production focused on mechanized manufacturing of goods. Like agrarian societies, industrial societies increase food surpluses, resulting in more developed hierarchies and significantly more division of labor.

The division of labor in industrial societies is often one of the most notable elements of the society and can even function to re-organize the development of relationships. Whereas relationships in pre-industrial societies were more likely to develop through contact at one's place of worship or through proximity of housing,

industrial society brings people with similar occupations together, often leading to the formation of friendships through one's work.

When capitalised, Industrial Revolution refers to the first known industrial revolution, which took place in Europe during the 18th and 19th centuries. What is some times referred to as The Second Industrial Revolution describes later, somewhat less dramatic changes resulting from the widespread availability of electric power and the internal-combustion engine. Many developing nations began industrialisation under the influence of either the United States or the USSR during the Cold War.

A post-industrial society is a society in which the primary means of subsistence is derived from service-oriented work, as opposed to agriculture or industry. It is important to note here that the term postindustrial is still debated in part because it is the current state of society; it is difficult to name a phenomenon while it is occurring.

Post-industrial societies are often marked by:

- an increase in the size of the service sector or jobs that perform services rather than creating goods (industry);
- either the outsourcing of or extensive use of mechanization in manufacturing;
- an increase in the amount of information technology, often leading to an Information Age;
- information, knowledge, and creativity are seen as the new raw materials of the economy.

Post-industrial society is occasionally used critically by individuals seeking to restore or return to industrial development. Increasingly, however, individuals and communities are viewing abandoned factories as sites for new housing and shopping. Capitalists are also realizing the recreational and commercial development opportunities such locations offer.

Excercise 1. Translate the text

CLASSICAL VIEWS ON SOCIAL CHANGE

As Western societies transitioned from pre-industrial economies based primarily on agriculture to industrialized societies in the 19th century, some people worried about the impacts such changes would have on society and individuals. Three early sociologists, Weber, Marx, and Durkheim, perceived different impacts of the Industrial Revolution on the individual and society and described those impacts in their work.

Weber and Rationalization. Max Weber was particularly concerned about the rationalization and bureaucratization of society stemming from the Industrial Revolution and how these two changes would affect humanity's agency and happiness. As Weber understood society, particularly during the industrial revolution of the late 19th century in which he lived, he believed society was being driven by the passage of rational ideas into culture which, in turn, transformed society into an increasingly bureaucratic entity.

Bureaucracy is a type of organizational or institutional management that is, as Weber understood it, rooted legal-rational authority. Weber did believe bureaucracy was the most rational form of societal management, but because Weber viewed rationalization as the driving force of society, he believed bureaucracy would increase until it ruled society. Society, for Weber, would become almost synonymous with bureaucracy.

As Weber did not see any alternative to bureaucracy, he believed it would ultimately lead to an iron cage; society would bureaucratize and there would be no way to get out of it. Weber viewed this as a bleak outcome that would affect individuals' happiness as they would be forced to function in a highly rational society with rigid rules and norms without the possibility to change it. Because Weber could not envision other forces influencing the ultimate direction of society — the exception being temporary lapses into non-bureaucracy spurred by charismatic leaders — he saw no cure for the iron cage of rationality.

Society would become a large bureaucracy that would govern people's lives. Weber was unable to envision a solution to his iron cage of bureaucracy dilemma; since a completely rational society was inevitable and bureaucracy was the most rational form of societal management, the iron cage, according to Weber, does not have a solution.

Marx and Alienation. Karl Marx took a different perspective on the impact of the Industrial Revolution on society and the individual. In order to understand Marx's perspective, however, it is necessary to understand how Marx perceived happiness. According to Marx, species being (or happiness) is the pinnacle of human nature. Species being is understood to be a type of self-realization or Self-actualization brought about by meaningful work.

But in addition to engaging in meaningful work, self-actualized individuals must also own the products of their labors and have the option of doing what they will with those products. In a capitalist society, which was co-developing with industry, rather than owning the fruits of their labors, the proletariat or working class owns only their labor power, not the fruits of their labors (i.e., the results of production). The capitalists or bourgeoisie employ the proletariat for a living wage, but then keep the products of the labor. As a result, the proletariat is alienated from the fruits of its labor — they do not own the products they produce, only their labor power.

Because Marx believed species being to be the goal and ideal of human nature and that species being could only be realized when individuals owned the results of their labors, Marx saw capitalism as leading toward increasingly unhappy individuals; they would be alienated from the results of their production and therefore would not be self-realized.

But the alienation from the results of their production is just one component of the alienation Marx proposed. In addition to the alienation from the results of production, the proletariat is also alienated from each other under capitalism.

Capitalists alienate the proletariat from each other by forcing them to compete for limited job opportunities. Job opportunities are limited under

capitalism in order for capitalists to keep wages down; without a pool of extraneous workers, capitalists would have to meet the wage demands of their workers. Because they are forced to compete with other members of the proletariat, workers are alienated from each other, compounding the unhappiness of the proletariat.

While Marx did have a solution to the problem of alienation, he seldom discussed it in detail. Marx's proposed solution was for the proletariat to unite and through protests or revolution (or legislation in democratic nations) overthrow the bourgeoisie and institute a new form of government — communism. This form of government would be based on communally owned and highly developed means of production and self-governance.

Durkheim believed there were two components that would alleviate the decreasing social solidarity in industrializing societies: organic solidarity and conscientious attempts to find camaraderie through one's place of employ. Whereas social solidarity was maintained in pre-industrial societies through a mechanistic sense of similarity and dependence along with communal religious affiliations, in industrialized societies, social solidarity would be maintained by the interdependence of specialists on one another. If one individual specialized in treating the injured or ill, they would not have time to raise crops or otherwise produce food.

Doctors would become dependent on farmers for their food while farmers would become dependent on doctors for their healthcare. This would force a type of organic solidarity — organic in the sense that the parts were interdependent like the organs of an animal are interdependent for their survival.

In addition to the inevitable interdependence a specialized society would warrant, Durkheim believed that a conscientious effort to develop and foster friendships would transition from a religious brotherhood to friendships developed at one's place of employment. Specialized individuals would have a great deal in common with their co-workers and, like members of the same religious

congregations in pre-industrial societies, co-workers would be able to develop strong bonds of social solidarity through their occupations.

Thus, for Durkheim, the answer to the decrease in mechanistic solidarity and the increasing anomie was organic solidarity and solidarity pursued within one's specialty occupation.

САРАТОВСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМЕНИ Н. Г. ЧЕРНЫШЕВСКОГО

Excercise 1. Translate the text

SOCIALIZATION

Socialization generally refers to the process in which people learn the skills, knowledge, values, motives, and roles (i.e., culture) of the groups to which they belong or the communities in which they live. In other words, socialization is the process of creating and incorporating new members of a group from a pool of newcomers, carried out by members and their allies.

It should be pointed out that socialization includes two components. The first component of socialization is the process, mentioned above, that leads to the adoption of culture. The second component is the outcome of the process, for example, “Was the socialization successful?” or “He has been socialized to believe God exists.” Socialization is seen as society’s principal mechanism for influencing the development of character and behavior. Most sociologists treat socialization as a cornerstone both for the maintenance of society and for the well-being of the individual.

The three goals of socialization are: 1) impulse control and the development of a conscience; 2) role preparation and performance, including occupational roles, gender roles, and roles in institutions such as marriage and parenthood; 3) the cultivation of sources of meaning, or what is important, valued, and to be lived for.

In short, socialization is the process that prepares humans to function in social life. It should be re-iterated here that socialization is culturally relative — people in different cultures are socialized differently. This distinction does not and should not inherently force an evaluative judgment. Socialization, because it is the adoption of culture, is going to be different in every culture. Socialization, as both process or an outcome, is not better or worse in any particular culture.

Primary and Secondary Socialization. Socialization is a life process, but is generally divided into two parts. Primary socialization takes place early in life, as a child and adolescent. Secondary socialization refers to the socialization that takes place throughout one’s life, both as a child and as one encounters new groups that require additional socialization.

While there are scholars who argue that only one or the other of these occurs, most social scientists tend to combine the two, arguing that the basic or core identity of the individual develops during primary socialization, with more specific changes occurring later — secondary socialization — in response to the acquisition of new group memberships and roles and differently structured social situations. The need for later life socialization may stem from the increasing complexity of society with its corresponding increase in varied roles and responsibilities.

There are three specific ways these two parts of socialization differ.

Content: Socialization in childhood is thought to be concerned with the regulation of biological drives. In adolescence, socialization is concerned with the development of overarching values and the self-image. In adulthood, socialization involves more overt and specific norms and behaviors, such as those related to the work role as well as more superficial personality features.

Context: In earlier periods, the socialize (the person being socialized) more clearly assumes the status of learner within the context of the family of orientation, the school, or the peer group.

Also, relationships in the earlier period are more likely to be affectively charged, i.e., highly emotional. In adulthood, though the socialization takes the role of student at times, much socialization occurs after the socialization has assumed full incumbency of the adult role. There is also a greater likelihood of more formal relationships due to situational contexts (e.g., work environment), which moderates down the affective component.

Response: The child and adolescent may be more easily malleable than the adult. Also, much adult socialization is self-initiated and voluntary; adults can leave or terminate the process at any time.

Socialization is, of course, a social process. As such, it involves interactions between people. Socialization, as noted in the distinction between primary and secondary, can take place in multiple contexts and as a result of contact with numerous groups.

Some of the more significant contributors to the socialization process are: parents, friends, schools, siblings, and co-workers. Each of these groups include a culture that must be learned and to some degree appropriated by the socialization in order to gain admittance to the group.

Total Institutions. Not all socialization is voluntary nor is all socialization successful. There are components of society designed specifically to resocialize individuals who were not successfully socialized to begin with. For instance, prisons and mental health institutions are designed to resocialize the people who are deemed to have not been successfully socialized. Depending on the degree of isolation and resocialization that takes place in a given institution, some of these institutions are labeled total institutions.

The most common examples of total institutions include mental hospitals, prisons, and military boot camps, though there are numerous other institutions that could be considered total institutions as well. The goal of total institutions is to facilitate a complete break with one's old life in order for the institution to resocialize the individual into a new life.

САРАТОВСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМЕНИ Н. И. ЧЕРНЫШЕВСКОГО

Excercise 1. Translate the text

SOCIAL GROUPS

In sociology, a group is usually defined as a number of people who identify and interact with one another. Aspects that members in the group may share include: interests, values, ethnic/linguistic background, roles and kinship.

One way of determining if a collection of people can be considered a group is if individuals who belong to that collection use the self-referent pronoun “we;” using “we” to refer to a collection of people often implies that the collection thinks of itself as a group. Examples of groups include: families, companies, circles of friends, clubs, local chapters of fraternities and sororities, and local religious congregations.

Collections of people that do not use the self-referent pronoun “we” but share certain characteristics (e.g., roles, social functions, etc.) are different from groups in that they usually do not regularly interact with each other nor share similar interests or values. Such collections are referred to as categories of people rather than groups; examples include: police, soldiers, millionaires, women, etc. Individuals form groups for a variety of reasons.

There are some rather obvious ones, like reproduction, protection, trade, and food production. But social categorization of people into groups and categories also facilitates behavior and action. An example may help explain this idea.

Suppose you are driving somewhere in a car when you notice red lights flashing in your rearview mirror. Because you have been socialized into society, you know that the red lights mean you should pull over, so you do. After waiting for a minute or two, an individual in a uniform walks toward your car door. You roll down your window and the individual asks you for your “license and registration.” Because groups and categories help facilitate social behavior, you know who this individual is: a member of a law enforcement category like the police or highway patrol. In all likelihood, you do not have to question this individual as to why they are driving a special car with lights on it, why they are wearing a uniform, why they are carrying a gun, or why they pulled you over (you

may ask why they pulled you over, but doing so often increases the likelihood they will give you a ticket).

In short, because you recognize that the individual driving the car belongs to a specific social category (or group), you can enter this interaction with a body of knowledge that will help guide your behavior. You do not have to learn how to interact in that situation every single time you encounter it. Social categorization of people into groups and categories is a heuristic device that makes social interaction easier.

Social Identity Theory. Social identity is a theory formed by Henri Tajfel and John Turner to understand the psychological basis of inter- group discrimination. It is composed of three elements:

Categorization: We often put others (and ourselves) into categories. Labeling someone as a Muslim, a Turk, or soccer player are ways of saying other things about these people.

Identification: We also associate with certain groups (our in groups), which serves to bolster our self-esteem.

Comparison: We compare our groups with other groups, seeing a favorable bias toward the group to which we belong.

Social Identity Theory is a diffuse but interrelated group of social psychological theories concerned with when and why individuals identify with, and behave as part of, social groups, adopting shared attitudes to outsiders. Each individual is seen to have a repertoire of identities open to them (social and personal), each identity informing the individual of who he is and what this identity entails. Which of these many identities is most salient for an individual at any time will vary according to the social context.

Where personal identity is salient, the individual will relate to others in an interpersonal manner, dependent on their character traits and any personal relationship existing between the individuals. However, under certain conditions social identity is more salient than personal identity in self-conception and that when this is the case behavior is qualitatively different: it is group behavior.

Primary and Secondary Groups. In sociology we distinguish between two types of groups based upon their characteristics. A primary group is typically a small social group whose members share close, personal, enduring relationships.

These groups are marked by concern for one another, shared activities and culture, and long periods of time spent together. The goal of primary groups is actually the relationships themselves rather than achieving some other purpose. Families and close friends are examples of primary groups.

Secondary groups are large groups whose relationships are impersonal and goal-oriented. Some secondary groups may last for many years, though most are short term. Such groups also begin and end with very little significance in the lives of the people involved. People in a secondary group interact on a less personal level than in a primary group. Rather than having as the goal the maintenance and development of the relationships themselves, these groups generally come together to accomplish a specific purpose.

Since secondary groups are established to perform functions, people's roles are more interchangeable. Examples of secondary groups include: classmates in a college course, athletic teams, and co-workers. The distinction between primary and secondary groups was originally proposed by Charles Horton Cooley. He labelled groups as "primary" because people often experience such groups early in their life and such groups play an important role in the development of personal identity. Secondary groups generally develop later in life and are much less likely to be influential on one's identity.

Reference Groups. A group that is used as a standard against which we compare ourselves would be a reference group. Take the case of someone who grew up in a poverty-stricken neighborhood. If all friends and relatives (her reference group) were in the same situation, just scraping by, she may not have considered herself poor at the time. Reference groups can also serve to enforce conformity to certain standards. A college freshman who has his heart set on joining a prestigious fraternity on campus may adopt behaviors and attitudes that are accepted by members of the fraternity.

Excercise 1. Translate the text

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Social psychology is the study of the nature and causes of human social behavior, with an emphasis on how people think towards each other and how they relate to each other. As the mind is the axis around which social behavior pivots, social psychologists tend to study the relationship between minds and social behaviors. In early-modern social science theory, John Stuart Mill, Comte, and others, laid the foundation for social psychology by asserting that human social cognition and behavior could and should be studied scientifically like any other natural science.

On the one hand, social psychology can be said to try to bridge the gap between sociology and psychology. It can be said to be codisciplinary with sociology and psychology, providing overlapping theories and research methods in order to form a clearer and more robust picture of social life.

However, social psychologists have different perspectives on what ought to be emphasized in the field, which leads to a schizm in the discipline between sociological social psychology and psychological social psychology. The discipline can be split in three general subfields, which concentrate on the relative importance of some subjects over others.

Sociological social psychology looks at the social behavior of humans in terms of associations and relationships that they have. This type leans toward sociology. One offshoot of this perspective is the Personality and Social Structure Perspective, which emphasizes the links between individual personality and identity, and how it relates to social structures.

Psychological social psychology looks at social behavior of humans in terms of the mental states of the individuals. Psychological social psychology is very similar to personality psychology because personality psychology looks at how the personality in people is developed, and how our attitudes and values are influenced and affected.

Symbolic interactionism, one of the major perspectives of sociology, looks at social behavior in terms of the subjective meanings that give rise to human actions.

Social psychology attempts to understand the relationship between minds, groups, and behaviors in three general ways. First, it tries to see how the thoughts, feelings and behaviors of individuals are influenced | by the actual, imagined, or implied presence of other(s). This includes J social perception, social interaction, and the many kinds of social influence (like trust, power, and persuasion).

Gaining insight into the social psychology of persons involves looking at the influences that individuals have on the beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors of other individuals, as well as the influence that groups have; on individuals. Second, it tries to understand the influence that individual perceptions and behaviors have upon the behavior of groups. This, includes looking at things like group productivity in the workplace and group decision making. Third, and finally, social psychology tries to understand groups themselves as behavioral entities, and the relationships and influences that one group has upon another group. In some textbooks there is also fourth level called the “ideological” level. It studies the societal forces that influence the human psyche.

The concerns of social psychology. Some of the basic topics of interest in social psychology are: socialization — investigates the learning of standards, rules, attitudes, roles, values, and beliefs, as well as the agents, processes, and outcomes of learning, and sociobiology — looks at the native faculties of human systems, including genetics, and their effect upon temperament, attitudes, learning skills, and so on; sociolinguistics and sociology of language — looks at how societies affect language use, and vice-versa; social perception and social cognition — looks specifically at the types of schemas that people have; the ways they develop impressions of one another; and the ways that they attribute the causes of social behavior.

The “unit act” model of action. The American sociologist Talcott Parsons created a model of human social action which stressed that the most basic

interesting event to recognize is goal-directed social action. It was further refined by his student Robert K. Merton. In this model, social actions are made up of and involve: the actor or agent performing an action; the (immediate) goal, or a future state of affairs that is desired; the situation in which action is located, including both: the conditions of action (the normative background, relevant norms) and the means of action (which the actor has some degree of control over).

And to this, we can also include: the actual consequences of the action; the motives of the actor; the end-goal, or the broader state of affairs that the actor is trying to reach by means of the immediate goal.

САРАТОВСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМЕНИ Н. Г. ЧЕРНЫШЕВСКОГО

Excercise 1. Translate the text

DEVIANCE AND NORMS

Deviance is any behavior that violates cultural norms. Deviance is often divided into two types of deviant activities. The first, crime is the violation of formally enacted laws and is referred to as formal deviance. Examples of formal deviance would include: robbery, theft, rape, murder, and assault, just to name a few. The second type of deviant behavior refers to violations of informal social norms, norms that have not been codified into law, and is referred to as informal deviance. Examples of informal deviance might include: picking one's nose, belching loudly (in some cultures), or standing too close to another unnecessarily (again, in some cultures).

Sociological interest in deviance includes both interests in measuring formal deviance (statistics of criminal behavior) and a number of theories that try to explain both the role of deviance in society and its origins.

Theories of Deviance. Social-Strain Typology. Robert Merton, in his discussion of deviance, proposed a typology of deviant behavior. A typology is a classification scheme designed to facilitate understanding. In this case, Merton was proposing a typology of deviance based upon two criteria: (1) a person's motivations or his/her adherence to cultural goals; (2) a person's belief in how to attain his/her goals.

According to Merton, there are five types of deviance based upon these criteria:

- conformity involves the acceptance of the cultural goals and means of attaining those goals (e.g., a banker);
- innovation involves the acceptance of the goals of a culture but the rejection of the traditional and/or legitimate means of attaining those goals (e.g., a member of the mafia values wealth but employs alternative means of attaining her wealth);
- ritualism involves the rejection of Cultural goals but the routinized acceptance of the means for achieving the goals (e.g., a disillusioned

bureaucrat who goes to work everyday because it is what he does, but does not share the goal of the company of making lots of money);

- retreatism involves the rejection of both the cultural goals and the traditional means of achieving those goals (e.g., a homeless person who is homeless more by choice than by force or circumstance);
- rebellion is a special case wherein the individual rejects both the cultural goals and traditional means of achieving them but actively attempts to replace both elements of the society with different goals and means (e.g., a communist revolution).

Structural-Functionalism. The structural-functionalist approach to deviance will argue that deviant behavior plays an important role in society for several reasons. One of the more important contributions to society comes from actually drawing the lines between what is deviant and what is not. Denoting a behavior or action as deviant clarifies the moral boundaries of a society. This is an important function as it affirms the cultural values and norms of a society for the members of that society.

In addition to clarifying the moral boundaries of society, deviant behavior can also promote social unity, but it does so at the expense of the deviant individuals, who are obviously excluded from the sense of unity derived from differentiating the non-deviant from the deviants.

Finally, and quite out of character for the structural-functionalist approach, deviance is actually seen as one means for society to change over time. Deviant behavior can imbalance societal equilibrium; in returning societal equilibrium, society is often forced to change. Thus, deviant behavior plays several important roles in society according to the structural-functionalist approach.

Social-Conflict. The social-conflict approach to deviance views deviance, as it does with most things, as a power struggle. The power struggle when it comes to deviance is framed in reference to the deviant and the non-deviant.

But it is important to understand that, according to the social-conflict approach, the determination of what is deviant and what is not deviant is closely

tied to the existing power structure of a society. For instance, laws in capitalist countries tend to reflect the interests of the wealthy and powerful. Laws that codify one's right to private property will tend to favor those with property and disfavor those without property (who might be inclined to take property).

The social-conflict approach takes this idea to the next step by arguing that the powerful and wealthy are able to avoid being labeled deviant by actually changing what is considered deviant so they are not included in that classification. In short, the social-conflict approach to understanding deviance argues that deviance is a reflection of the power imbalance and inequality in society.

Violent crimes are more likely to be reported to police than are property crimes. A clear example of how deviance reflects power imbalances is in the reporting of crimes. Wealthier individuals are more likely to commit property crimes, particularly crimes that are often referred to as white-collar crimes. Examples of white-collar crimes include: antitrust violations, computer/internet fraud, credit card fraud, phone/telemarketing fraud, bankruptcy fraud, healthcare fraud, insurance fraud, mail fraud, government fraud, tax evasion, financial fraud, insider trading, bribery and public corruption, counterfeiting, money laundering, embezzlement, economic espionage, trade secret theft.

White-collar crimes are almost exclusively property-related. Property-related crimes are in contrast to violent crimes, which tend to be committed by individuals of lower socio-economic classes. The power balance comes into play when the percentage of each of these types of crimes is examined. Violent crimes are more likely to be reported than white-collar crimes. In addition to the higher likelihood of violent crimes being reported, a much larger percentage of people are in prison for committing violent crimes than for property crimes source.

PART II

Exercise 1. Make a short summary of the following text: (Remember that a summary normally consists of about 1/10 of the original).

THE SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS OF SOCIOLOGY

Sociologists study society and social behavior by examining the } groups and social institutions people form, as well as various social, religious, political, and business organizations. They also study the behavior; of, and social interaction among, groups, trace their origin and growth; and analyze the influence of group activities on individual members. Sociologists are concerned with the characteristics of social groups, organizations, and institutions; the ways individuals are affected by each other and- by the groups to which they belong; and the effect of social traits such as sex, age, or race on a person's daily life.

The results of sociological research aid educators, lawmakers, administrators, and others interested in resolving social problems and formulating public policy. Most sociologists work in one or more specialties, such as social organization, social stratification, and social mobility; racial and ethnic relations; education; family; social psychology; urban, rural, political, and comparative sociology; sex roles and relationships; demography; gerontology; criminology; and sociological practice.

Although sociology emerged in large part from Comte's conviction that sociology eventually would subsume all other areas of scientific inquiry, in the end, sociology did not replace the other sciences. Instead, sociology has developed a particular niche in the study of social life. Sociology came to be identified with the other social sciences (psychology, economics, etc.). Today, sociology studies humankind's organizations, social institutions and their social interactions, largely employing a comparative method.

Today, sociologists research micro-structures that organize society,' such as race or ethnicity, social class, gender roles, and institutions such as the family; social processes that represent deviation from, or the breakdown of, these

structures, including crime and divorce; and micro-processes such as interpersonal interactions and the socialization of individuals.

Sociologists often rely on quantitative methods of social research to describe large patterns in social relationships and in order to develop models that can help predict social change. Other branches of sociology believe that qualitative methods — such as focused interviews, group discussions and ethnographic methods — allow for a better understanding of social processes. Some sociologists argue for a middle ground that sees quantitative and qualitative approaches as complementary.

Results from one approach can fill gaps in the other approach. For example, quantitative methods could describe large or general patterns while qualitative approaches could help to understand how individuals understand those patterns!

Exercise 1. Make a short summary of the following text.: (Remember that a summary normally consists of about 1/10 of the original).

THE EVOLUTION OF SOCIOLOGY

A number of Western political theorists and philosophers, including Plato, Polybius, Machiavelli, Vico, Hobbes, Locke, Montesquieu, and Rousseau, have treated political problems in a broader social context. Thus Montesquieu regarded the political forms of different states as a consequence of the working of deep underlying climatic, geographic, economic, and psychological factors. In the 18th cent., Scottish thinkers made inquiries into the nature of society; scholars like Adam Smith explored the economic causes of social organization and social change, while Adam Ferguson considered the noneconomic causes of social cohesion.

It was not until the 19th cent., however, when the concept of society was finally separated from that of the state, that sociology developed into an independent study. Auguste Comte attempted to analyze all aspects of cultural, political, and economic life and to identify the unifying principles of society at each stage of human social development. Herbert Spencer applied the principles of Darwinian evolution to the development of human society in his popular and controversial *Principles of Sociology* (1876—1896). An important stimulus to sociological thought came from the work of Karl Marx, who emphasized the economic basis of the organization of society and its division into classes and saw in the class struggle the main agent of social progress.

The founders of the modern study of sociology were Emile Durkheim and Max Weber. Durkheim pioneered in the use of empirical evidence and statistical material in the study of society. Weber's major contribution was as a theorist, and his generalizations about social organization and the relation of belief systems, including religion, to social action are still influential. He developed the use of the ideal type—a working model, based on the selective combination of certain elements of historical fact or current reality—as a tool of sociological analysis. In

the United States the study of sociology was pioneered and developed by Lester Frank Ward and William Graham Sumner.

The most important theoretical sociology in the 20th century, has moved in three directions: conflict theory, structural-functional theory, and symbolic interaction theory. Conflict theory draws-heavily on the work of Karl Marx and emphasizes the role of conflict in explaining social change; prominent conflict theorists include Ralf Dahrendorf and C. Wright Mills. Structural-functional theory, developed by Talcott Parsons and advanced by Robert Merton, assumes that large social systems are characterized by homeostasis, or "steady states." The theory is now often called "conservative" in its orientation. Symbolic interaction, begun by George Herbert Mead and further developed by Herbert Blumer and others, focuses on subjective perceptions or other symbolic processes of communication

Exercise 1. Make a short summary of the following text. (Remember that a summary normally consists of about 1/10 of the original).

“CONFLICT” BY GEORG SIMMEL

The sociological significance of conflict has in principle never been disputed. Conflict is admitted to cause or modify interest groups, unifications, and organizations. On the other hand, it may sound paradoxical in the common view if one asks whether irrespective of any phenomena that result from conflict or that accompany it, it itself is a form of socialization.

At first glance, this sounds like a rhetorical question. If every interaction among men is a socialization, conflict — after all one of the most vivid interactions, which, furthermore, cannot possibly be carried on by one individual alone — must certainly be considered as socialization. And in fact, dissociating factors — hate, envy, need, and desire — are the causes of conflict; it breaks out because of them.

Conflict is thus designed to resolve divergent dualisms; it is a way of achieving some kind of unity, even if it were through the annihilation of one of the conflicting parties. This is roughly parallel to the fact that it is the most violent symptom of a disease which represents the effort of the organism to free itself of disturbances and damages caused by them.

But this phenomenon means much more than the trivial "si vis pacem para bellum" [if you want peace, prepare for war]; it is something quite general, of which this maxim only describes a special case. Conflict itself resolves the tension between contrasts. The fact that it aims at peace is only one, an especially obvious, expression of its nature: the synthesis of elements that work both against and for one another.

This nature appears more clearly when it is realized that both forms of relation — the antithetical and the convergent — are fundamentally distinguished from the mere indifference of two or more individuals or groups. Whether it implies the rejection or the termination of socialization, indifference is purely negative. In contrast to such pure negativity, conflict contains something positive.

Its positive and negative aspects, however, are integrated: they can be separated conceptually, but not empirically.

The Sociological Relevance of Conflict. Social phenomena appear in a new light when seen from the angle of this sociologically positive character of conflict. It is at once evident then that if the relations among men (rather than what the individual is to himself and in his relations to objects) constitute the subject matter of a special science, sociology, then the traditional topics of that science cover only a subdivision of it: it is more comprehensive and is truly defined by a principle.

At one time it appeared as if there were only two consistent subject-matters of the science of man: the individual unit and the unit of individuals (society); any third seemed logically excluded. In this conception, conflict itself — irrespective of its contributions to these immediate social-units — found no place for study. It was a phenomenon of its own, and its subsumption under the concept of unity would have been arbitrary as well as useless, since conflict meant the negation of unity.

A more comprehensive classification of the science of the relations of men should distinguish, it would appear, those relations which constitute a unit, that is, social relations in the strict sense, from those which counteract unity. It must be realized, however, that both relations can usually be found in every historically real situation. The individual does not attain the unity of his personality exclusively by an exhaustive harmonization, according to logical, objective, religious, or ethical norms, of the contents of his personality.

On the contrary, contradiction and conflict not only precede this unity but also are operative in it at every moment of its existence. Just so, there probably exists no social unit in which convergent and divergent currents among its members are not inseparably interwoven. An absolutely centripetal and harmonious group, a pure “unification” (“Vereinigung”), not only is empirically unreal, it could show no real life process. The society of saints which Dante sees in the Rose of Paradise may be like such a group, but it is without any change and development; whereas the Holy Assembly of Church Fathers in Raphael’s Disputa

shows if not actual conflict, at least a considerable differentiation of moods and directions of thought, whence flow all the vitality and the really organic structure of that group. Just as the universe needs "love and hate," that is, attractive and repulsive forces, in order to have any form at all, so society, too, in order to attain a determinate shape, needs some quantitative ratio of harmony and disharmony, of association and competition, of favourable and unfavourable tendencies.

But these discords are by no means mere sociological liabilities or negative instances. Definite, actual society does not result only from other social forces which are positive, and only to the extent that the negative factors do not hinder them. This common conception is quite superficial: society, as we know it, is the result of both categories of interaction, which thus both manifest themselves as wholly positive.

САРАТОВСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМЕНА Г. ЧЕРНЫШЕВСКОГО

Exercise 1. Make a short summary of the following text. (Remember that a summary normally consists of about 1/10 of the original).

COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR

By "collective behavior" social scientists typically mean that realm of action not governed by the everyday rules and expectations which normally shape social behavior: the behavior of crowds (such as "the wave" rolling around a sports stadium) and mobs; religious revivalism; political bandwagons, fads and fashion; mass sociogenic illness and collective hysteria and rumor (such as urban legends).

Besides being large-scale social phenomena, sociologists' interest in their genesis and development stem from the fact that they are major engines of social change.

Collective action can be understood as the result of an emerging¹ collective definition of the situation. This definition includes elements of shared cognitive belief (the "facts" that are commonly defined as being real and relevant), emotional factors (such as the personal needs being frustrated and the dominant emotion evoked), and the predominant motivation of those present. How such a commonly-shared mindset comes to be gets us into such topics as how information flows through social networks and connectivity opportunities provided by email and the Web.

A century ago one of the first social science investigations of collective action focused on the behavior of crowds. Gustave LeBon, in *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind* (1897), wrote of the "crowd mind," emerging from anonymity and deindividuation (which often leads to antisocial behavior), contagion (e.g., epidemic hysteria, a variant of Functional Somatic Syndromes), convergence, and emergent norms.

Though contemporary social scientists have dismissed LeBon's "crowd mind," his antecedents continue to influence social research. Indeed, individuals (whether crowd members or observers) frequently act on the basis of their inferences about what the crowd "thinks, fears, hates, and wants."

Being major agents of social change, perhaps the most-studied forms of collective behavior are social movements, such as the American civil rights, anti-war, feminist, and environmental crusades of recent decades. These can arise, for instance, when cultural values become ambiguous during times of social change or crisis, when people find themselves in unanticipated situations, or when individuals' motives are similarly blocked. Such are the occasions when novel shared definitions of the situation arise and a collectivity is formed, experiences solidarity, and mobilizes for action.

Institutional psychologies. Institutions are perceptual, cognitive, emotive and behavioral systems. As grammar allows one to make sense of a string of words, so institutions provide individuals with consensual ways for deriving meaning from their social interactions. They also provide individuals routine ways for making decisions and acting in various situations with various types of others. The instituted community blocks personal curiosity, organizes public memory, and heroically imposes certainty on uncertainty. In marking its own boundaries it affects all lower level thinking, so that persons realize their own identities and classify each other through community affiliation.

From a more social perspective, institutions are social housekeepers in that they program the routine services necessary for the day-to-day functioning of the group. With social evolution, distinctive institutions emerged to address the separate needs of society. For instance, out of society's need for protection against external threats arose the military; out of the social need for an informed and trained citizenry emerged education; and out of the social need for moral consensus and restraint of selfish impulses arose religion.

Ideally these social needs addressed simultaneously address the needs of individuals, such as the social need for procreating the next generation of members matching the personal needs for intimacy and connectedness in the institution of the family.

Exercise 1. Make a short summary of the following text.: (Remember that a summary normally consists of about 1/10 of the original).

OVERPOPULATION

Early in the 19th century, Thomas Malthus argued in *An Essay on the Principle of Population* that, if left unrestricted, human populations would continue to grow until they would become too large to be supported by the food grown on available agricultural land. At that point, the population - would be restrained through mass famine and starvation. Malthus argued for population control, through moral restraint, to avoid this happening. The alternative to moral restraint, according to Malthus, is biological and natural population limitation.

As the population exceeds the amount of available resources the population decreases through famine, disease, or war, since the lack of resources causes mortality to increase. This process keeps the population in check and ensures it does not exceed the amount of resources. It has often been argued that future pressures on food production, combined with threats to other aspects of the earth's habitat such as global warming, make overpopulation a still more serious threat in the future.

Many proponents of population control have averred that famine is far from being the only problem attendant to overpopulation. These critics point out ultimate shortages of energy sources and other natural resources, as well as the importance of serious communicable diseases in dense populations and war over scarce resources such as land area.

A shortage of arable land (where food crops will grow) is also a problem.

The world's current agricultural production, if it were distributed evenly, would be sufficient to feed everyone living on the Earth today. However, many critics hold that, in the absence of other measures, simply feeding the world's population well would only make matters worse, natural growth will cause the population to grow to unsustainable levels, and will directly result in famines and deforestation and indirectly in pandemic disease and war.

Some of the other characteristics of overpopulation include: child poverty, high birth rates, lower life expectancies, lower levels of literacy, higher rates of unemployment, poor diet with ill health and diet-deficiency diseases, increasingly unhygienic conditions, increased crime rates, mass extinctions of plants and animals.

Possible Solutions to Overpopulation. Some approach overpopulation with a survival of the fittest laissez-faire attitude, arguing that if the Earth's ecosystem becomes overtaxed, it will naturally regulate itself. In this mode of thought, disease or starvation are “natural” means of lessening population. Objections to this argument are: in the meantime, a huge number of plant and animal species become extinct; this would result in terrible pollution in some areas that would be difficult to abate; it obviously creates certain moral problems, as this approach would result in great suffering in the people who die.

Others argue that economic development is the best way to reduce population growth as economic development can spur demographic transitions that seem to naturally lead to reductions in fertility rates.

In either case, it is often held that the most productive approach is to provide a combination of help targeted towards population control and self-sufficiency. One of the most important measures proposed for this effort is the empowerment of women educationally, economically, politically, and in the family. The value of this philosophy has been substantially borne out in cases where great strides have been taken toward this goal.

Where women's status has dramatically improved, there has generally been a drastic reduction in the birthrate to more sustainable levels. Other measures include effective family planning programs, local renewable energy systems, sustainable agriculture methods and supplies, reforestation, and measures to protect the local environment.

David Pimentel, a Cornell University professor of ecology and agricultural sciences, sees several possible scenarios for the 22nd century: a planet with 2 billion people thriving in harmony with the environment or, at the other extreme,

12 billion miserable humans suffering a difficult life with limited resources and widespread famine.

Spreading awareness of the issues is an important first step in addressing it.

САРАТОВСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ИМЕНИ Н. Г. ЧЕРНЫШЕВСКОГО

Exercise 1. Make a short summary of the following text.: (Remember that a summary normally consists of about 1/10 of the original).

KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY

A kinship terminology is a specific system of familial relationships which reflects different sets of distinctions. Most kinship terminologies distinguish between sexes (this is the difference between a brother and a sister) and between generation (this is the difference between a child and a parent). Moreover, kinship terminologies distinguish between relatives by blood and marriage.

Different languages (and thus, societies) organize these distinctions differently. Kinship terms and terminologies can be either descriptive or classificatory. "Descriptive" terms refer to only one type of relationship, while "classificatory" terms refer to many types of relationships. Most kinship terminologies include both descriptive and classificatory terms. For example, in Western societies there is only one way to be related to one's brother (brother = parents' son); thus, in Western society, brother is a descriptive term. But there are many ways to be related to one's cousin (cousin = mother's brother's son, mother's sister's son, father's brother's son, father's sister's son, and so on); thus, in Western society, "cousin" is a classificatory term.

What may be a descriptive term in one society can be a classificatory term in another society. For example, in some societies there are many different people that one would call "mother" (the woman of whom one was born, as well as her sister and husband's sister, and also one's father's sister). Moreover, some societies do not lump together relatives that the West classifies together (in other words, in some languages there is no word for cousin because mother's sister's children and father's sister's children are referred to in different terms).

Societies in different parts of the world and using different languages may share the same basic terminology; in such cases it is very easy to translate the kinship terms of one language into another. But it is usually impossible to translate directly the kinship terms of a society that uses one system into the language of a society that uses a different system.

Some languages, such as Chinese, Japanese, and Hungarian, add another dimension to some relations: relative age. There are different words for “older brother” and “younger brother.”

Western kinship terminology. Most Western societies employ Eskimo Kinship terminology. This kinship terminology is common in societies based on conjugal (or nuclear) families, where nuclear families must be relatively mobile.

Members of the nuclear family use descriptive kinship terms: Mother — the female parent; Father — the male parent; Son — the males born of the mother; Daughter — the females born of the mother; Brother — a male born of the same mother; Sister — a female born of the same mother.

It is generally assumed that the mother’s husband is also the genitor. In some families, a woman may have children with more than one man or a man may have children with more than one woman. Children who share one parent but not another are called “half-brothers” or “half-sisters.” Children who do not share parents, but whose parents are married, are called “step-brothers” or “step-sisters.” If a person is married to the parent of a Child, but is not the parent of the child themselves, then they are the “step-parent” of the child, either the “stepmother” or “stepfather.” Children who are adopted into a family are generally called by the same terms as children born into the family.

Typically, societies with conjugal families also favor neolocal residence; thus upon marriage a person separates from the nuclear family of their childhood (family of orientation) and forms a new nuclear family (family of procreation). This practice means that members of one’s own nuclear family were once members of another nuclear family, or may one day become members of another nuclear family.

Members of the nuclear families of members of one's own nuclear family may be lineal or collateral. When they are lineal, they are referred to in terms that build on the terms used within the nuclear family: Grandfather — a parent’s father; Grandmother — a parent's mother; Grandson — a child’s son; Granddaughter — a child’s daughter.

When they are collateral, they are referred to in more classificatory ; terms that do not build on the terms used within the nuclear family:

Uncle — father's brother, father's sister's husband, mother's brother, mother's sister's husband;

Aunt — father's sister, father's brother's wife, mother's sister, mother's brother's wife;

Nephew — sister's sons, brother's sons;

Niece — sister's daughters, brother's daughters.

When separated by additional generations (in other words, when one's collateral relatives belong to the same generation as one's grandparents or grandchildren), these terms are modified by the prefix «great».

Most collateral relatives were never members of the nuclear family of the members of one's own nuclear family.

Cousin (the children of aunts or uncles) is the most classificatory term. Cousins may be further distinguished by degree of collaterality and generation. Two persons of the same generation who share a grandparent are "first cousins" (one degree of collaterality); if they share a great-grandparent they are "second cousins" (two degrees of collaterality) and so on. If the shared ancestor is the grandparent of one individual and the great grandparent of the other, the individuals are said to be "first cousins once removed" (removed by one generation); if the shared ancestor is the grand- parent of one individual and the great-great-grandparent of the other, the individuals are said to be "first cousins twice removed" (removed by two generation), and so on. Similarly, if the shared ancestor is the great-grandparent of one person and the great-great-grandparent of the other, the individuals are said to be "second cousins once removed."

Distant cousins of an older generation (in other words, one's parents' first cousins) are technically first cousins once removed, but are often classified with "aunts" and "uncles."

Similarly, a person may refer to close friends of one's parents as "aunt" or "uncle," or may refer to close friends as "brother" or "sister". This practice is called fictive kinship.

Relationships by marriage, except for wife/husband, are qualified by the term "-in-law". The mother and father of one's spouse are one's mother-in-law and father-in-law; the spouse of one's son or daughter is one's son-in-law or daughter-in-law.

The term "sister-in-law" refers to three essentially different Relationships, either the wife of one's brother, of the sister of one's spouse, or the wife of one's spouse's sibling. "Brother-in-law" is similarly ambiguous. There are no special terms for the rest of one's spouse's family.

Exercise 1. Make a short summary of the following text. (Remember that a summary normally consists of about 1/10 of the original).

THE FORMATION OF RELIGIONS

Most religions start out their lives as cults or sects, i.e. groups in high tension with the surrounding society. Over time, they tend to either die out, or become more established, mainstream and in less tension with society. Cults are new groups with a new novel theology, while sects are attempts to return mainstream religions to (what the sect views as) their original purity. Mainstream established groups are called denominations. The comments below about cult formation apply equally well to sect formation:

There are four models of cult formation: the Psychopathological Model, the Entrepreneurial Model, the Social Model and the Normal Revelations model.

According to the "Psychopathological Model," religions are founded during a period of severe stress in the life of the founder. The founder suffers from psychological problems, which they resolve through the founding of the religion. (The development of the religion is for them a form of self-therapy, or self-medication.)

According to the Entrepreneurial Model, founders of religions act like entrepreneurs, developing new products (religions) to sell to consumers (to convert people to). According to this model, most founders of new religions already have experience in several religious groups before they begin their own. They take ideas from the pre-existing religions, and try to improve on them to make them more popular.

The Social Model emphasises not the founder of the religion, but rather the early religious group. According to this model, religions are founded by means of social implosions. Members of the religious group spend less and less time with people outside the group, and more and more time with each other within it. The level of affection and emotional bonding between members of a group increases, and their emotional bonds to members outside the group diminish. According to

the social model, when a social implosion occurs, the group will naturally develop a new theology and rituals to accompany it.

The Normal Revelations model was added to the theory by Stark in a later work. According to the Normal Revelations model, religions are founded when the founder interprets ordinary natural phenomena as supernatural; for instance, ascribing his or her own creativity in inventing the religion to that of the deity.

Some religions are better described by one model than another, though all apply to differing degrees to all religions.

Once a cult or sect has been founded, the next problem for the founder is to convert new members to it. Prime candidates for religious conversion are those with an openness to religion, but who do not belong or fit well in any existing religious group. Those with no religion or no interest in religion are difficult to convert, especially since the cult and sect beliefs are so extreme by the standards of the surrounding society. But those already happy members of a religious group are difficult to convert as well, since they have strong social links to their pre-existing religion and are unlikely to want to sever them in order to join a new one. The best candidates for religious conversion are those who are members of or have been associated with religious groups (thereby showing an interest or openness to religion), yet exist on the fringe of these groups, without strong social ties to prevent them from joining a new group.

Potential converts vary in their level of social connection. New religions best spread through pre-existing friendship networks. Converts who are marginal with few friends are easy to convert, but having few friends to convert they cannot add much to the further growth of the organization. Converts with a large social network are harder to convert, since they tend to have more invested in mainstream society; but once converted they yield many new followers through their friendship network.

Cults initially can have quite high growth rates; but as the social networks that initially feed them are exhausted, their growth rate falls quickly. On the other hand, the rate of growth is exponential (ignoring the limited supply of potential

converts): the more converts you have, the more missionaries you can have out looking for new converts. But nonetheless, it can take a very long time for religions to grow to a large size by natural growth. This often leads to cult leaders giving up after several decades, and withdrawing the cult from the world.

It is difficult for cults and sects to maintain their initial enthusiasm for more than about a generation. As children are born into the cult or sect, members begin to demand a more stable life. When this happens, cults tend to lose or de-emphasize many of their more radical beliefs, and become more open to the surrounding society; they then become denominations.

The goal or dream of most founders of religions is to convert their entire society; but of the myriad religions founded throughout history, few have been very successful. Most of the world's religious people adhere to one of a few major religions (Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism). It is very difficult for a religion to grow to this size. Most of these religions (especially Christianity) became established when they were adopted by politically powerful individuals. The religion of the common people took much longer to change (sometimes centuries).

Кроме того, для формирования компетенций работы с текстами профессиональной коммуникации и создания вторичных текстов (аннотаций и резюме) можно использовать задания и грамматические пояснения из электронного пособия Могилевич Б.Р. «English for Masters of Sociology», 2015 г., Электронная библиотека СГУ.