Co-Opted Biased Social Science: 64 Years of Telling Half Truths about the Kibbutz

Reuven Author, PhD.

Sociology department, Western Galilee Academic College, Israel

Mail: shapi_ra@gan.org.il   Website: http://www.transformingkibbutz.com

Mail Address: Kibbutz Gan Shmuel, Mobile Post Hefer, ISRAEL 3881000.

Fax: 972-4632-0327*;* Phone: 972-4632-0597; Cellular: 972-542-209003.

<u>**Short biographical sketch**</u>

Dr. Reuven is a senior lecturer of anthropology and sociology at the Western Galilee Academic College in Acre, Israel. He held various executive positions in Kibbutz Gan Shmuel and its industrial plant, received his PhD from Tel Aviv University, and has lectured at academic colleges and a university. He authored three books, booklets for managers, and many articles in Hebrew and English in both journals and collections. He is currently writing a book on mismanagement and wrong leadership by ignorant executives in large organizations.

<u>**Cover Letter**</u>

I hereby declare that the submitted article is original of my own creation, has not been published as yet elsewhere, nor is under review in any other publication outlet. I am solely responsible for any mistakes and errors included in it.

Date: March 4, 2014

Co-opted Biased Social Science: 64 Years of Telling Half Truths about the Kibbutz

Abstract

Critics find that many social scientists comply with domination by power elites. Kibbutz power elites suppressed the first researcher whose seminal book included both praise and critique. Then became dominant a co-opted uncritical functionalist scientific coalition that concealed power elites' violations of kibbutz principles in inter-kibbutz organizations (IKOs) by evading their study, creating a fake image of democracy and egalitarianism that enhanced academic success but helped conceal the pernicious ultra-conservative oligarchic autocracy of life-long IKO leaders, harming efforts to overcome it and establish kibbutz progressive principles in IKOs. The oligarchic rule eventually led to the demise of the kibbutz radical system, a failure that functionalists have failed to explain. The findings support critics of this conformist tendency, pointing to the need for measures that will minimize self-serving selectiveness of survey researchers and chances of co-optation, as well as measures that will maximize chances for exposing such scientific failures.

Keywords Biased social research, academic freedom, co-opted scientists, kibbutz, inter-kibbutz organizations, functionalist research.

Recently the social sciences have been paying increasing attention to researchers' ethics and morality (Hedgecoe 2006, 2012; Lavanchy 2013; Penders and Nelies 2011; Sin 2005; Sismondo 2009). For Abend (2011, p. 164) "…the empirical investigation of, morality is a promising project, to which many disciplines – from neuroscience and psychology to anthropology and history – can and should try to contribute." While much literature deals with the scientists' ethics concerning individual interests less is devoted to moral caring for societal interests (e.g., Bogner and Menz 2010; Briggle 2009; Grundmann 2011; List et al. 2001). Such caring is considered the task of sociologists (Burawoy 2005) and other social scientists, but when empirical findings contradict normative knowledge (Shortall 2013), and especially when research exposes concealed, low-morality of self-perpetuating leaders (Ailon 2013; Judge et al. 2009; Kets De Vries 1993; Michels 1959[1915]), it invites researchers' suppression and co-option efforts as well

as use of leader powers to conceal/camouflage these efforts, keeping them a dark secret that its existence is veiled (Dalton 1959; Goffman 1959; Griffin and O'Leary-Kelly 2004).

Critical historians of the social sciences untangled a long line of cases of docile social scientists complicit with power-holders and elite social domination (below). The present article untangles one such a case of a dominant scientific coalition (Collins 1975, Ch.9) of functionalist social scientists whose policy did indeed harm democratic and egalitarian collectives by surrendering to whims of self-perpetuating conservative low-moral oligarchic leaders (Brumann 2000; Michels 1959 [1915]), telling members half-truths about their society that enhanced detrimental life-long tenures of such leaders. This engendered suppression and brain-drain of servant transformational leaders (Sendjaya et al. 2008) such that successors were conservative loyalists without critical thinking who implemented the old guard's outdated policies even worse (Hirschman 1970), leading to a terminal crisis. This article analyzes the genealogy of pernicious social research of Israel's kibbutz society of some 130,000 people that ignored two interlocked low-moral deeds: the co-optation of social scientists by oligarchic autocratic leaders who violated own preaching of egalitarianism and democracy, and the concomitant abiding of researchers by leaders' will to conceal essential knowledge from the rank and file, violating the latter's interests in promoting egalitarianism, democracy, and proper leadership succession that would prevent self-serving oligarchic rule.

Critics of the social sciences alluded to conservatism of dominant scientific coalitions (Collins 1975, Ch.9). Ross (1991) traced the failure of American social science to realize the promise of social studies for a free society from 1865 to 1915, while Madoo-Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley (1998) exposed the suppression of successful critical women sociologists by academic sociological patriarchs who delegitimized critical sociology through "professionalization" (also: Turner 2012a). Diamond (1992) proved that all major US universities collaborated with the McCarthy-serving FBI and CIA, just as they served other Cold War aims (Chomsky et al. 1997). Anthropologists similarly served these aims, including CIA's 1953 Iran coup, in return for financial support (Price 2012). Messer-Davidow (2000) found that exciting, life-changing ideas of feminism were disciplined and transformed by and within academe into dry, highly abstract academic jargon unhelpful for feminism. Greenwood and Levin (1998, p. 237) concluded:

"Existing power structures prefer orthodox social research, not because it produces better

research but because it does not interfere with existing social arrangements. The demand for social distance and objectification separates the researcher from the subject and prevents social research from becoming an instrument of social change. The dominance of these frameworks in university environments reveals that universities, in addition to being centers of learning, play an important role in replicating existing social arrangements."

Backed by the above cited recent studies these authors furthered critique, calling for the revitalizing of universities by reinventing the social sciences, asserting that "…larger organizational structures and processes of universities, campus administrative structures, national and international professional societies, and national and international ranking systems currently are inimical to the development of socially meaningful theories/practices in social sciences,…" (Levin and Greenwood 2011, p.27). Mills (1959) had already criticized US sociology quite similarly, and Boden and Epstein (2011, p.476) echoed his critique: Sociologists suffer a lack of truly academic freedom that "is a necessary precondition to sociological imagination that challenges and defies the status quo." Universities became "highly managed and controlled spaces that produce docile bodies …that limits and inhibits the imagination to such an extent that it is difficult to create socially and economically transformational knowledge" (ibid, p. 480).

One way to create transformational knowledge is by studying successful radical societies and firms (Erdal 2011; Semler 1993; Spiro 1983; Whyte and Whyte 1988). Such entities usually succeed due to servant transformational leadership (Sendjaya et al. 2008). However, with success, growth, and extra tenure their leaders become oligarchic self-perpetuating conservative ineffective rulers, whose power is used to camouflage/conceal this negative change, including from themselves (Brumann 2000; Kets De Vries 1993; Michels 1959[1915]). In the case of powerful national leaders of large movements who can harm the academic success of researchers, the researchers need integrity and courage to expose the negative leadership change since by docile orthodox research that evades exposure they can better advance academic careers though ignoring members' interests in research that would help advance their radical social ideals. Sadly, 64 years of biased kibbutz social research, from 1947 until 2011, untangles such an evasive case, supporting the above critique of dominant social sciences and calls for remedies.

The Case Study and Research Questions

"A partial truth is worse than a lie" goes the saying. A social scientist betrays subjects' trust if he

knows that his study tells a partial truth about their society, remaining mute about major facts concerning some half of its field in Lewin's (1951) and Bourdieu's (1977) terms. Rosner (1991, p.1) defined a kibbutz as "...a commune belonging to a Movement which is part of the Histadrut and the Labor Movement,"[1] but none of his innumerable studies that *inter alia* made him head the Israeli Sociological Society was devoted to the "Movements," as kibbutz federations were called. Nor did he study any of the other 250-300 inter-kibbutz organizations (IKOs for short), their 4000-4500 kibbutz member managers and administrators and 15-18,000 hired employees (Author 2008; Brum 1986; Niv and Bar-On 1992).[2] Rosner headed the IKO Kibbutz Research Institute, situated at Haifa University but staffed and financed by two Movements. Thus, he knew firsthand that their leaders and executives had dominated kibbutz society for decades without standing for truly democratic reelection, enjoyed privileges, and violated its principles in other ways, but the Institute never studied IKOs.[3] Why did he do this? Why did almost all kibbutz social scientists likewise ignore IKO violations of kibbutz principles? Did they not feel obliged to study them and to inform kibbutz members about these violations? Worse still, the 269 kibbutzim (pl. of kibbutz) adopted a *rotatzia* (rotation) norm that limited office tenures to a few years to prevent detrimental oligarchization of leaders (Michels 1959[1915]). Why did social scientists, aware of decades-long tenure of leaders and other IKO heads, not study the failure of *rotatzia* to prevent oligarchy? What explains this behavior, which betrayed kibbutz members' trust that social research would expose and explain major problems of their society and help cope with them? Moreover, how do we explain this while these researchers were trustworthy and honest, none of them was accused of any misconduct like those depicted by Kumar (2008)?

The article's thesis is that kibbutz leaders and their loyalists concealed/camouflaged violations of its principles in IKOs they headed and managed, barring public discussion of these violations which enhanced their authority, power, privileges, prestige, and other intangible capitals (e.g., Bourdieu 1977), enabling prolonged hegemony of the kibbutz field, *i.e.,* kibbutzim plus IKOs. Critics of these violations and autocratic rule were suppressed, sidetracked, and mostly exited,

---

[1] The Histadrut was the General Union of Labor and the umbrella organization of all socialist movements controlled by the Mapai Party.

[2] Numbers are inexact due to minimal research, see below.

[3] Personal knowledge from five years of employment by the Institute.

while the first major kibbutz seminal study that praised kibbutzim while criticizing a Movement's policy was harshly criticized and sent to oblivion (Kressel 2000; Landshut 1944).[4] Thereafter, critical research disappeared for three decades, as functionalist sociologists dominated kibbutz research following similar dominance of US and Israeli sociology (Madoo-Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley 1998; Mills 1959; Ram 1995), ignoring/evading IKOs integrality to kibbutz society; this evasive biased functionalist domination continues ever since.

One obvious motive for this biased research was the benign belief that, in view of the kibbutz society's virtues, researchers must not help its opponents by exposing major failures; they would help its success more by explaining virtues and exposing only minor unsolved internal problems of kibbutzim that would motivate correction efforts. Studying the prime problem of IKO practices contradicting kibbutz principles contrary to leaders' wishes would give grist to the critics and opponents of kibbutzim. However, this intention led to co-optation by kibbutz leaders and institutionalization of a hegemonic functionalist kibbutz scientific coalition (e.g., Collins 1975, Ch.9; Platt 1986) which, even after the avoidance of critique became superfluous, continued the suppression of critical students and the ignoring/evading of IKOs' anti-kibbutz practices. This greatly helped suppressing kibbutz critical thinkers and innovators who opposed these practices until IKOs' ruinous impact on kibbutz social and cultural uniqueness led to the terminal crisis of the 1980s. This partial-biased kibbutz research is explained by the following:

1. Researchers' co-optation by leaders and power-elites (e.g., Selznick 1949),

2. Functionalism and obtrusive research methods (Bourdieu 1988 1990; Collins 1975; Platt 1976; Wacquant 1989; Yankelovich 1991),

3. Evasion/denial of contradictory findings by users of unobtrusive methods (Webb and Campbell 1966) such as anthropologists and historians,

4. Avoidance of cognitive dissonance and loss of face by denying past mistaken findings that promoted successful academic careers,

5. Kibbutz researchers' elevated status encouraged lower morality (Piff et al. 2012),

6. Conflict sociologists surrendered to functionalists in order to join their dominant scientific coalition (Collins 1975, Ch.9).

---

[4] For example, Spiro's (1983) introduction to kibbutz research collection named "Thirty Years of Kibbutz Research," i.e. Landshut's (1944) study did not count a kibbutz research.

The article has six sections:

1. Hegemonic kibbutz research evaded IKOs to conceal violations of kibbutz principles.

2. A short history of evasion of IKOs' anti-kibbutz practices.

3. Kibbutz 1950s' crises encouraged minimal critique by researchers.

4. The dominant coalition co-opted kibbutz member researchers and conflict sociologists.

5. Functionalism made sociologists captives of a false kibbutz image of their own creation.

6. Summary, discussion, and conclusions.

1. Hegemonic Kibbutz Research Evaded IKOs to Conceal Violations of Kibbutz Principles

The kibbutz became the most successful of all communal societies by being a radical social movement, highly involved in its surroundings by creating a large and complex system, which included hundreds of communal kibbutzim and hundreds of bureaucratic, hierarchic, and autocratic IKOs. Kibbutz member IKO heads and elites dominated the field, enjoying power, prestige, privileges, intangible capitals, and prolonged tenures, unlike rotated kibbutz officers who were deprived of most of these advantages. Thus, without studying IKOs as an integral part of the kibbutz field, this society is incomprehensible (Author 2001, 2005, 2008; Stryjan 1989). No other communal society was so involved in national, social, and political struggles by a large web of IKOs with an advantageous scale of operations (Niv and Bar-On 1992). At most, communal societies had common spiritual leaders, maintained informal ties, and had some economic cooperation without societal involvement (Oved 1988; Pitzer 1997).

Kibbutz societal involvement was integral to its spearheading of the much larger Zionist movement (Buber 1958[1947]). On the one hand, the kibbutz was an exceptional success, as this objective was attained, while the kibbutz became "…a highly successful enterprise by virtue of its longevity (compared to almost every other utopian movement), as well as any other criterion by which the success of social systems is judged" (Spiro 1983, p.4). On the other hand, although the kibbutz took on the hardest missions of Zionism and was supported by non-socialist leaders who gave it a large portion of World Zionist Organization (WZO) resources, it had only minor influence on the structuring of the Jewish community in Palestine, and then on Israeli society. Even among Zionist socialists it remained a minority, and after four decades of pioneering culminating in a leading role in winning the 1948 War of Independence, the new State of Israel

opted for capitalism, contrary to kibbutz socialist aims. The Kibbutz Meuchad (KM) and Kibbutz Artzi (KA) Movements encompassing some 80% of kibbutzim that had hitherto a part of Palestine Jews leadership, remained outside the government, and their members, who had commanded the major victories of this war, were marginalized and ousted from the army (Near 1997).

Even more devastating were a series of political-ideological and economic crises in the 1950s, resulting *inter alia* from the self-serving, self-perpetuating efforts of the two prime leaders, KM's Tabenkin and KA's Yaari, who prevented their Movements' innovative involvement in coping with the new state's major problems (Kafkafi 1992; Kynan 1989). However, leaders' self-perpetuating efforts commenced in 1937-9 by the two urging reverence of Stalinism which contradicted kibbutz egalitarianism and Israeli democratic culture, legitimizing centralized control, autocracy, and censorship of publications (Author 2008, Chs.10-11; Keshet 1995; Porat 2000, pp.178-82). The two became conservatives and suppressed young radical leaders who objected both Stalinism and conservatism (Beilin 1984; Cohen 2000; Kynan 1988), policies which sidetracked the kibbutzim, helping the government ignore their unique needs. Later the kibbutzim succeeded when innovators overcame this suppression, enabling renewed success of the kibbutzim, which doubled their population from the 1960s to the 1980s (Author 2008, Ch.5; Brum 1986; Shalem 2000). However, the prime problem of autocracy by dysfunctional leaders continued. Worse still, leaders' successors were ultra-conservative loyalists lacking critical thinking and due to this lack they persisted with their policies and caused failures (Author 2008; e.g., Hirschman 1970).

IKOs were clearly integral to the success of kibbutz society (Brum 1986; Niv and Bar-On 1992; Stryjan 1989) but researchers evaded their study because it would have exposed a conformist sector of a radical society whose practices violated its principles (Ron 1978; Author 1979, 2001, 2005, 2008). Such exposure of anti-kibbutz practices would have ruined the radical kibbutz image; hence, leaders opposed it and researchers acquiesced: While hundreds studied kibbutzim and produced over 5000 publications,[5] only five studied IKOs rather recently, four without such exposure (Rosolio 1975, 1999; Niv and Bar-On 1992; Avrahami 1993) and the author, whose exposure of violations of kibbutz principles ever since 1978 was ignored by

---

[5] On the Kibbutz Research Institute website: http://research.haifa.ac.il/index.php/home-page

kibbutz scholars. "The kibbutz movement" was a common phrase in Israeli discourse, but its students never studied kibbutzim and IKOs as organs of a movement that had created a unique social field, ignoring Lewin's (1951) and Bourdieu's (1977) field theory. IKOs were presented as auxiliaries that did not affect kibbutz democracy and egalitarianism, ignoring the hegemony of oligarchic IKO heads whose violation of egalitarianism and democracy enhanced this hegemony and the subjugation of rotational kibbutz officers to IKO tenured power-holders (Author 1979, 2001, 2005, 2008). Rank and file members knew a little about these violations, but could not grasp their full scale and how they ensured hegemony of IKO heads and their loyalists, nor knew how IKO heads concealed and camouflaged this hegemony, helped by co-opted social scientists.

2. A Short History of Evasion of IKOs' Anti-Kibbutz Practices

The first kibbutz researcher did not evade/ignore IKOs: In 1939 Dr. Ruppin, head of the Zionist Colonization Department, sent brilliant young Dr. Landshut, a sociologist-economist, to KM's Kibbutz Givat Brenner for 18 months of residential study that produced a seminal book, published in 1944. It praised kibbutzim for their exceptional achievements, depicted Movements' policies and their impacts on kibbutzim, and criticized a major KM policy. Kibbutz leaders reacted angrily, totally rejecting the book and sending it to oblivion; for half a century it was ignored (Kressel 2000). This reaction frightened Prof. Martin Buber, Head of the Sociology Department at the Hebrew University, whose 1947 Hebrew book commenced the evasion of IKO anti-kibbutz practices. He wrote (English version 1958, p.141): "…the truly structural tasks of the new Village Communes [i.e. kibbutzim] begin with their *federation*, that is, their union under the same principle that operates in their internal structure. Hardly anywhere has it come to this" (Original italics). Buber did not explain why for twenty years, ever since 1927 the Movements and other IKOs "hardly came to" adopt kibbutz principles. He minimized his critique, seemingly to avoid the fate of Landshut's (1944) book. If this adoption was "the truly structural task," he should have studied its neglect, but neither Buber nor his disciples did this; Landshut's critique of KM's policy and discussion of IKO policies were ignored, and kibbutz leaders praised Buber's book and turned it into a must-read in kibbutzim, which consisted of some 40,000 adults.

A few years later, three American anthropologists came to study kibbutzim and they all did likewise, ignoring both Landshut's book and IKOs' anti-kibbutz practices (Rosenfeld 1951; Schwartz 1955; Spiro 1955). These practices literally violated kibbutz principles before their very

eyes, such as IKO officials who did not let fellow members use idle company cars on weekends, although these had been paid for by taxing kibbutzim. According to Marx (1985) and James et al. (1997) anthropologists tend to miss the impact of contexts, and so did kibbutz ones, who missed that this, non-sharing was one of IKOs' oligarchic practices, making IKO cars a status symbol of power elites known to everyone but the social scientists. The growing member discontent pushed kibbutzim in 1962 to coerce IKOs to let members use their cars (Author 2008, Ch.16). Many IKO officials objected to this, causing frequent conflicts (Adar 1975; Author 1979, 2008; Ron 1978), but researchers ignored them and their roots in IKOs anti-kibbutz practices.

Even more detrimental was the evasion of a major problem related to the *rotatzia* (rotation) norm that supposedly prevented oligarchy by limiting authority positions to a few, year tenure, a hallmark of kibbutz radical democratic egalitarianism. But prime leaders Tabenkin, Yaari, and Hazan remained in power for 48-52 years with no competitive reelections (Halamish 2013; Kanari 2003; Tzachor 1997), way beyond anything known in a true democracy. Both Tabenkin and Yaari became autocrats and exhibited clear hubris already in the early 1950s (Author 2008, Ch.12; Halamish 2013). Moreover, leaders' deputies continued for dozens of years, first as IKO executives and then as Knesset (parliament) members and cabinet ministers, while hundreds of IKO officials also continued for dozens of years. In one IKO alone, "Milu'ot" of the Western Galilee region (some 1700 employees), 38 kibbutz member officials continued over twenty years under the 28-year auspices of its head, Ushi Fridman (Author 2008, pp.93-4). Furthermore, even those IKO officials who seemingly abided by *rotatzia*, did not do so in reality: they circulated to other managerial jobs, never returned to the ranks and often became irreplaceable local kibbutz oligarchic patrons who nominated loyal clients to local rotational managerial jobs (Author 1990, 1995, 2001, 2005; Fadida 1972; Helman 1987; Ron 1978; Topel 1979).

Dominant researchers ignored these conspicuos violations of so basic a norm. Moreover, one could explain this ignoring until the vanishing of Tabenkin's and Yaari's leadership in the early 1970s[6] by researchers' fear that leaders would bar access to kibbutzim because, after Landshut's book, leaders probed students' research intentions carefully before allowing them entry (Kressel 2000, p.31). Following the leadership change, authors dared criticize IKO violations of kibbutz principles and officials' self-serving rule (Adar 1975; Author 1978/9, 1979, 1987; Beilin 1984;

---

[6] Tabenkin died in 1971, while Yaari became ill and resigned his offices in 1973.

Helman 1987; Ron 1978;), but dominant researchers ignored them. The few who mentioned these or later critical works (Author 1990, 1992, 1995, Kafkafi 1992; Keshet 1995; Kynan 1989; Porat 2000,) ignored oligarchic IKOs' negative impact on kibbutzim. Another suppression strategy was used against Kressel's (1974, 1983) excellent ethnography of his native kibbutz, Netzer Sireni that exposed local oligarchs violating its principles for decades: vehement denounce by Ben-David (1975) and Shepher (1975) which did not disprove the findings, but rather discredited them and cited sociologists' findings which seemed to prove that Netzer Sireni was a rare, unrepresentative case. However, other ethnographies (Author 1990, 1992, 2001, 2008; Bowes 1989; Fadida 1972; Topel 1979) and a kibbutz cultural history (Inbari 2009), refuted them, exposing quite similar cases of local oligarchic rule in all studied kibbutzim.

Functionalist sociologists and political scientist Lanir (1990) ignored oligarchic hegemony in the kibbutz field and never referred to its literature (e.g., Brumann 2000; Hirschman 1970; Lenski 1966; Michels 1959 [1915]), because oligarchy was anathema to the kibbutz ethos and culture; hence, none of the 26 articles of the 1983 Israeli Sociological Association's kibbutz research collection (Krausz 1983) mentioned oligarchic rule despite the above cited findings, as did later authors of the dominant coalition (Cohen and Rosner 1988; Shur 1987; Topel 1992). The first coalition member to admit oligarchy was Rosolio (1999, p.29, p.132), but only briefly and only inside kibbutzim, ignoring IKO oligarchs, their powers, intangible capitals, and patronage of local loyalist kibbutz managers. As a veteran ex-KM Secretary General, ex-Knesset (parliament) member, and a reader of critical, literature he surely knew these phenomena, but ignored them.

3. Kibbutz 1950s' Crises Encouraged Minimal Critique by Researchers

One reason early researchers ignored oligarchic rule was the timing of their studies 1949-1955, when kibbutz leaders were weakened by a series of crises as well as by their being sidetracked in national politics, and by financial distress in the kibbutzim that aroused bitter conflicts and mass exits. Without going into the details of these crises (see: Author 2008, Chs.10-11; Beilin 1984; Kafkafi 1988; Near 1997), suffice it to point out that taking a critical stand toward the kibbutzim in this dire state could have been perceived as a populist choice aimed at satisfying critical public opinion following the harsh critique of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion. Ben-Gurion's critique caused many kibbutzim to violate their principle of self-work by employing poor unemployed new immigrants as hired workers (Near 1997). This violation of a major principle joined the negative

circumstances in deepening the sense of crisis and encouraging mass exit (Author 2008).

Under pressure of this dire situation, leaders of the Ichud Movement decided to invite Hebrew University sociologists to study kibbutz social problems, hoping they would help in overcoming them. As disciples of Professor Eisenstadt who heeded conformist American functionalism (Ram 1995) the researchers used only survey studies that enhanced blindness to the real problems kibbutzim were facing by evasion of IKOs and the oligarchic hired labor-operated kibbutz factories (e.g., Author 1980; Inbari 2009; Kressel 1974). Neither IKO oligarchic hegemony and these factory oligarchs, nor the problems these caused in kibbutzim, were studied by functionalists' evasive surveys. Most conspicuous was the mass exit of disenchanted members: up to 80% of members left kibbutzim (Leviatan et al. 1998, p.163; Author 2008, Chs.14-15). Case studies found that the brain-drain of the talented, critics, and innovators who sought to advance kibbutz aims and principles but were suppressed by IKO and local oligarchs was followed by the mass exit of disenchanted ordinary members (Author 2001, 2008; Kressel 1974; Sabar 1996). But surveys by functionalists included only the minority who stayed, and never studied the majority who left. Surveys were "disengaged from any concrete situation, ...record responses induced by the abstract stimuli of the survey situation as if they were authentic products of the habitus" (Bourdieu 1990, p.294). In surveys, both respondents and researchers are sensitive and reflexive to an unknown degree to various survey wordings and hence, outcome biases are unknown (Yankelovich 1991).

Overcoming survey defects requires fieldwork to find non-reactive measures, albeit only juniors go to the field; senior researchers design the surveys and then perform the final analysis and writing, which leads to fame and academic promotion. Survey researchers are divided into junior field workers who have little or no say in survey design and analyses, and senior theoreticians who perform only these functions (Platt 1976). The latter lack "the profound intuitions gained from personal familiarity with the field" (Bourdieu 1988, p.3). Junior surveyors who met IKO functionaries and saw how their violations of kibbutz principles caused conflicts with the rank and file and the latter's frustration and exits, could not study these conflicts and exits, while seniors who were distanced from the field, hobnobbed with leaders and followed in Buber's footsteps, never questioned IKO anti-kibbutz practices and their impacts on kibbutzim.

These senior scholars gained academic recognition and their work was sanctioned by major international scientists, especially functionalists. Their reviewers, who were even more remote

from the field, could barely suspect that grasping humble *rotational* local kibbutz officers as the top stratum of kibbutzim (Ben-Rafael and Yaar 1992; Talmon-Garber 1957) was a terrible mistake that excluded from analysis the real kibbutz higher strata of IKO officials (Author 2005; Rosenfeld 1951). Lacking Bourdieu's (1988, p.3) "profound intuitions gained from personal familiarity with the field," reviewers did not suspect that kibbutz society was very different from all communal societies, and did not question its depiction as democratic despite leaders' life-long tenures and IKO officials' decades-long office continuity without reelection. For them kibbutz research was seemingly an "alien science" (Hedgecoe 2006), having a mistaken picture of it based on reading and communication with readers rather than communicating with field-workers and with ethnographers. Reviewers approved mistaken analyses of local units of large Movements and IKOs, some of which were known to every Israeli, without referring to pertinent sociological and political literature. When later reviewers consulted early works, they did not encounter oligarchic IKOs, powerful privileged cabinet ministers, Knesset (parliament) members, Zionist executives, and hundreds of other tenured IKO officials; hence, they too accepted mistaken analyses.

4. The Dominant Coalition Co-Opted Kibbutz Member-Researchers and Conflict Sociologists

Since the early 1960s, however, a few kibbutz members familiar with IKOs as partners, employees or officers, became researchers, as did Rosner. Natives of a studied culture joining an outsiders' research team may help overcoming its cultural bias (Schinke et al. 2010). Why it did not happen with these kibbutz members who joined evasion of kibbutz reality by functionalists? Worse still, a new generation of leaders criticized IKOs' undemocratic leadership and non-egalitarian practices, objected to reverence of the USSR, and called for a leadership reshuffle. These leaders were suppressed, sidetracked, and/or left (Author 2008; Beilin 1984; Cohen 2000), but even these events did not move students to study IKOs.

According to Kuhn (1962) the sticking to paradigms disproved by new findings is a common scientific problem. Collins (1975, Ch.9) pointed out that a paradigm provides a discipline with an organization that is basically social, unifying members around the common enterprise of dominating a field of study. Bourdieu pointed out that "intellectuals have a much greater than average capacity to transform their spontaneous sociology, that is, their self-interested vision of

the social world, into the appearance of a scientific sociology" (Wacquant 1989, p.4). Kibbutz member researchers had an interest in envisioning the kibbutz as egalitarian and democratic in order to justify their life choices. Through the enhanced capacity mentioned by Bourdieu, they used the mistaken paradigm of kibbutz society, in which IKOs were auxiliaries with no impact on kibbutz cultures, to ignore all the above cited critique pointing to the negative impact of the oligarchic rule of IKOs on kibbutzim. Kibbutz member-researchers turned their spontaneous egalitarian and democratic view of the kibbutz into an appearance of scientific sociology and senior sociologists rewarded them by publishing their works and promoting them to respected professorships (Author 2005, 2008). This status elevation encouraged lower morality (e.g., Piff et al. 2012) of ignoring the fact they were telling half-truths about their society.

Worse still, even kibbutz member sociologists who at first were not functionalists gave in to the functionalists in order to join the core set of kibbutz researchers (e.g., Hedgecoe 2006). For example, Topel as a Tel Aviv University student wrote ethnography of his Kibbutz Mefalsim, guided by conflict sociologist professor Yonathan Shapiro. He found three ruling oligarchs who used patronage of loyalists whom they promoted to local management while using other means to gain popularity, such as giving members a lift to the city in their IKO cars (Topel 1979). However, as was usual among ethnographers (James et al. 1997; Marx 1985, p.147) he ignored the context of IKOs which provided them with cars, city jobs, and other power resources for patronage. Later on he became a researcher in the IKO Yad Tabenkin, TKM's research institute,[7] enjoyed such resources, and witnessed TKM leaders enjoying them, but ignored all these in his 1992 booklet. Worse still, he ignored the above cited critical publications of IKOs' oligarchies and their ruling of kibbutzim, which had appeared since 1979, as well as his own work from 1979, asserting: "[A]lthough there are tendencies of power accumulation, the democratic processes and principle of *rotatzia* are functioning well" (Topel 1992, p.35). He surrendered to the dominant functionalist coalition and served it well: using concepts of conflict sociology he concealed its mistakes and dispensed with accusations of backward Eisenstadtian functionalism (Ram 1995). In return he was promoted to head Yad Tabenkin's social research and published extensively (e.g., Ben-Rafael and Topel 2009).

Other conflict sociologists did like Topel. Ben-Rafael and Yaar's (1992) analysis of kibbutz

---

[7] KM and Ichud Movements merged in 1980 to TKM Movement (Tnu'aa Kibbutzit Meuchedet).

stratification ignored oligarchic dominance by prime leaders and other tenured IKO officials. For instance, no such powerful figures were included in the list of roles which defined kibbutz member status (ibid, p.83), although Ben-Rafael's 1997 book mentioned them (p.141). Clear signs of co-optation success were Ben-Rafael nomination in the early 1990s to head Yad Tabenkin's prime research project and his three books and a number of articles published by Yad Tabenkin.

5. Functionalism Made Sociologists Captives of a False Kibbutz Image of Their Own Creation

In their efforts to conceal oligarchy, sociologists made other major mistakes which created a false kibbutz image that made them captives of their own untrue conceptions and false creations; only one example can be dealt with here (for more: Author 2005, 2008, 2012). Sociologists hailed the *rotatzia* norm, depicting it as an egalitarian device, but as cited IKO power elites and managers of large kibbutz factories violated *rotatzia* completely, held jobs for decades as against kibbutz managers 1.5-3 year terms (Kressel 1983; Leviatan 1978; Meged and Sobol 1970), and the seeming *rotatzia* of mid-level IKO managers was mostly a circulation between managerial jobs without returning to the ranks (Author 2005; Helman 1987; Ron 1978). However, their circulation was controlled by patrons, tenured powerful IKO heads or deputies who selected managers; in order to circulate a manager must prove docility to patrons. Thus, *rotatzia* enhanced the oligarchic process rather than curbing it as intended. Innovators whose successes diminished the authority of conservative IKO heads received passing glory but were soon demoted in the name of *rotatzia*, sidetracked, and often left (Author 1987, 2008). US army researchers did point to the negative effects of rotation (Gabriel and Savage 1981; Segal 1981), but kibbutz students missed *rotatzia*'s negative effects and members' distrust of privileged ineffective circulators, calling them by the derogative name of *askanim* (meaning: functionaries; Author 1995, 2008).

Sociologists joined forces with kibbutz leaders to create a false image of democracy and egalitarianism, an image that was true up to the 1930s after which it was falsified by oligarchic rule. Landshut (1944) and Rosenfeld (1951) had already exposed signs of *rotatzia*'s failing to prevent oligarchy but sociologists missed them as they were captives of their own false creation, a kibbutz that is not part of a large field dominated by oligarchic IKO heads, one that is unaffected by its power elite members' undemocratic and non-egalitarian practices. Thus, they

could not explain prime problems stemming from IKOs impact on kibbutzim, such as dwindling democracy (Argaman 1997), members' apathy, lack of work commitment, violations of egalitarianism, brain-drain, and more depicted by critical works. The use of obtrusive research methods (Platt 1976; Yankelovich 1991) that created a false image of the kibbutz bred other mistakes, while mistaken research publications read by kibbutz members from the late 1950s (e.g., Rosner 1960; Talmon-Garber 1957) oiled IKOs' oligarchization by leaving its opponents who sought egalitarianism and democracy with no independent outside proof to support their critique so that they became muted and/or left (Sabar 1996; e.g., Hirschman 1970). As mentioned, the brain-drain of talented critics and innovators was followed by the exit of the disenchanted rank and file, encompassing up to 80% of members. Only the massive intake of young radicals who believed in the radical image of the kibbutz and high birth rates prevented crises and enabled growth. However, this turnover also enhanced the dominance of the old guard, while in return for sociologists' help in concealing oligarchic rule, leaders helped their publishing efforts, which enhanced academic credentials, gained them respected professorships, and enabled the establishment of research institutes which were also blind to reality without any IKO studies.

The reasons that had justified uncritical writings in the early 1950s disappeared in the late 1950s: As cited innovators defied the conservative old guard rule; they industrialized kibbutzim, reformed their agriculture by introducing profitable export crops, and established regional processing plants that enhanced efficiency, while the heavy investments required became feasible by Brum's (1986) innovative financing scheme. Beside their renewed economic and social success, kibbutzim became prestigious after the victorious 1967 Six Day War in which kibbutz member commanders and pilots played a major role (with considerable death toll).

In the 1960s successful kibbutzim with only 3.7% of the population held 22% of Knesset (parliament) seats and a third of cabinet ministers and the prime rationale for concealing their reality, i.e., defending a progressive society, vanished. But admitting mistakes is always hard, and in the case of kibbutz students it was much harder as their successful careers had been built on the distorted image they had created. They would have had to abandon the mistaken paradigm that excluded IKOs, which permeated members' views of their society. A member of Kibbutz Kochav (fictitious name; Author 2008, Chaps.16-17) told me in 1986:

"The kibbutz is not, as we imagine, an isolated community. We very much belong to the

outside, but since members don't want to sit and discuss our relations with the entities to which we belong, we are not coping with the problem. In order to explain the problem, we must recognize it and maybe we do not want to do that…"

The kibbutz image of an isolated commune allowed social scientists and kibbutz leaders to reap nice dividends; hence, abandoning it promised hardships, toil, and conflicts with colleagues who either believed in the false image or preferred to retain it for less than noble reasons. The kibbutz member cited above did not mention IKOs as the "outside" to which his kibbutz belonged, because he had only a faint idea about his kibbutz "belonging" to various IKOs, many of which it owned indirectly through its Movement or other IKOs (Author 2008). The last time Kochav had held a discussion of this relationship was before he was born, but he was aware of this "outside" because he had read criticism of IKOs in the kibbutz press. However, he knew little else about them because academics stuck to their mistaken paradigm and IKO officials prevented discussion of IKO practices to conceal their privileges. For instance, after a kibbutz journal published my critique of IKO practices in 1979, managers of the studied IKO approached my kibbutz secretariat and asked it to denounce me. Instead they were invited to a public discussion of my study, but declined, clearly afraid that their anti-kibbutz practices would be exposed.

Since 1974, after most powerful leaders had vanished, a prime reason for researchers' acquiescing with leaders' wishes disappeared, no any leader limited access to kibbutzim (Kressel 2000). However, for the functionalists nothing changed; for instance, as was depicted in 1975 two of them vehemently denounced Kressel's (1974) seminal ethnography that untangled the oligarchic rule of Kibbutz Netzer Sireni by its three plant managers. Soon after, Prof. Rosner's Kibbutz Research Institute studied kibbutz plants without studying whether such a rule existed in these kibbutzim.[8] Time was even riper for a change from 1980 as a series of critical publications further disproved functionalists' rosy picture of kibbutz (Author 1978, 1978/9, 1979, 1980; Cohen 1978; Ron 1978; Shepher 1980). Functionalists' dominant coalition ignored critiques and this helped ultra-conservative loyalists with no critical thinking succeed the old guard and worsen implementation of its outdated policies (e.g., Hirschman 1970), such as establishing 21 new kibbutzim without proper financing, adding superfluous debts (Rosolio 1999). Then these successors remained paralyzed when encountering the new hostile governmental economic policy

---

[8] I participated in this study.

in 1985 that more than doubled debts yearly, and the kibbutz system collapsed (Krol 1989).

Even after this collapse with IKOs responsible for a large part of the system debts, while governmental help for rescuing kibbutz required abandoning their principles (ibid), functionalists continued to ignore IKOs, and helped conceal the heavy burden of their inflated bureaucracies. Many kibbutzim and IKOs declared bankruptcy and many of the latter were dissolved, but even in 1999 when the first sociologist, Rosolio, admitted the ruinous oligarchic rule of some kibbutzim he still ignored how IKO oligarchs had profited from this rule.

The fruitless functionalist social research subsided in the 2000s, while kibbutz historical, biographic, and culture studies flourished. These studies untangled facts that supported the critique of functionalist research, but without sociological oligarchy theory and without referring to critical works that used it, circumstantial explanations made it possible for functionalists to avoid admitting the mistakes and evade/ignore IKOs ruinous impact on the kibbutzim. For instance, Schwartz and Naor (2000) depicted as a planned democratic change the undemocratic demutualization of Kibbutz Carmelit by Barak (fictitious names), a local autocratic leader who headed a large national monopoly due to previous IKO jobs with a very high salary, and a clique of loyalists with lucrative IKO jobs. They did so primarily to divert salaries into their own pockets rather than giving them to the kibbutz, but the book ignored this and other contradictions of the rosy picture of "a planned change." Functional analysis ignored personal interests behind a decade of recurrent bitter conflicts, manager resignations, IKOs' support of the clique, and exit of some 10% of members designated "the Pillars of Carmelit" (Schwartz and Naor 2000, p.114; Author 2008, Ch.15).

Similarly functionalist is Topel's (2009) analysis of "the rise of technocrats." Large salary gaps of up to six-fold between managers and workers in demutualized kibbutzim should have stopped disregard of true stratification (Author 2005), but Topel's explanation of "the rise of technocrats" does not: Managers' power is depicted as stemming from credentials, rather than from powerful jobs in demutualized bureaucratic kibbutzim and oligarchic IKOs. He calls "technocrats" Barak-like oligarchs who rule with humble technical skills but much political acumen, ignoring the many highly technically skilled but powerless others (e.g., Mehri 2005).

Likewise functionalist is the recent Palgi and Reinhartz (2011) collection, all articles ignore critical works while Topel repeats "technocracy" thesis. Even the analysis of gender inequality by Fogel-Bijaoui (pp.73-82) is functionalist, referring neither to any of the above-cited critical works

about kibbutzim's and IKOs' masculine power elites, nor to similar classics (e.g., Kanter 1977). The collection index includes no reference to conflict, dominance, hegemony, self-interests, office tenure, power elites, autocracy, oligarchy, privileges or the like.

6. Summary, Discussion, and Conclusions

Ever since Buber (1958[1947]) ignored critical Landshut's (1944) book and minimized the critique of IKOs to two minor sentences in order to please kibbutz leaders, Buber-following functionalist coalition has erred scientifically and harmed its subjects' interest in comprehending and overcoming their society's problems by ignoring IKOs' anti-kibbutz practices. The benign early minimizing critique of crisis-ridden kibbutzim habituated surrender to dysfunctional leaders' wish for partial biased research that would serve their rule. This research deprived kibbutz critical thinkers and innovative transformational leaders of the knowledge leverage necessary to overcome these leaders' rule and restore egalitarianism and democracy in the kibbutz field. Early anthropologists ignored kibbutzim's context of oligarchic IKOs, a common phenomenon in anthropology which enhanced the dominance of a functionalist scientific coalition. Leaders' egalitarian preaching contradicted the undemocratic behavior and oligarchization of IKOs but students ignored this contrast, missing how the conspicuous lack of leaders' integrity ruined the trust (e.g., Erhard et al. 2009) on which kibbutz society was based (Rosner 1993). Though students knew that leaders and IKO staff violated kibbutz principles from their ties with them or due to kibbutz membership, they ignored the impact of violations on kibbutzim, the brain-drain and negative selective attrition they caused which pruned trusted servant transformational leaders essential for radical communes (Author 2008; Brumann 2000). Research ignored members' distrust of leaders which ruined the commitment and motivation that had enabled major achievements in the past (Spiro 1955), and the castrated democracy which enhanced Hirschmanian (1970) succession of the old guard by loyalists whose lack of critical thinking and ineptness joined inimical governmental policy to engender terminal crisis of kibbutz radical communalism.

While the kibbutz system sunk into a huge debt crisis functionalists refused to admit their mistakes that had contributed meaningfully to this failure, adhered to the false image of a well-functioning egalitarian democracy helped by effective IKOs. This false image greatly helped leaders' efforts to silence critics of IKO anti-kibbutz practices who were then muted, sidetracked,

and/or left. Functionalists barred/deferred critical publications that exposed the truth and either ignored those published or vehemently vilified them, even after the old guard had vanished, the kibbutzim resumed their successes, and the only reasons for the false kibbutz image were to save functionalists' face, defend their academic status, and avoid cognitive dissonance. However, when both power elites and dominant social scientists promulgated the rosy image critics of oligarchic rule lacked independent support for their critique, this rule continued and empowered functionalists; with the help of successor leaders who lacked critical thinking they established research institutes that furthered the half truths about kibbutz society.

Researchers were co-opted by powerful leaders through the stick of threat of Landshut's (1944) fate and the carrot of helping research and publication of the IKO-excluding paradigm. The applause for Buber's (1947) book clarified leaders' wish for this paradigm, which anthropologists supported by ignoring the impact of IKOs' context of kibbutzim. Functionalists' evasive questionnaires ignored IKOs' anti-kibbutz practices, hence up to 1978 they did not appear in the literature that kibbutz members have read ever since Buber's hit book, while IKO power elites as well concealed violations of kibbutz principles and their self-serving nature and tried to suppress any publicity. However, since 1978 critical works exposed the negative impacts of IKOs on several kibbutz domains but not on others, and this lacuna enabled functionalists to ignore, evade, and/or deny critical findings. Later on some conflict sociologists gave in to functionalists and even contradicted their own findings to join the dominant coalition.

Functionalists managed to retain the credibility of their findings and their academic prestige by never admitting mistakes, helped by international research cooperation[9] and publishing in major international outlets whose reviewers approved erroneous works lacking "the profound intuitions gained from personal familiarity with the field" (Bourdieu 1988, p.3) and/or due to functionalism. Functionalists were aware of the mass exit from kibbutzim (Leviatan et al. 1998) and saw talented innovative leavers succeeding in every domain of Israeli society and abroad (Sabar 1996) thus testifying to a brain-drain due to conservative oligarchic rule, but they ignored it, studying neither leavers nor exit rates, since this would have exposed the negative effects of oligarchic rule, contradicting their rose-colored descriptions. The kibbutz crisis led to suffering among both leavers and those who remained, except for power elites which benefited from

---

[9] I participated in one such international study at the Kibbutz Research Institute.

adoption of capitalist practices. Functionalists were caught by surprise and remained unable to explain this colossal failure of such a successful social system.

The only excuse functionalists can use may be that they followed US sociology which dominated world sociology (and still dominates: Burawoy 2005, p.21), while in its ranks

"The original passion for social justice, economic equality, human rights, sustainable environment, political freedom or simply a better world, that drew so many of us to sociology, is channelled into the pursuit of academic credentials. Progress becomes a battery of disciplinary techniques..." (ibid, p.5)

However, while Mills' (1959) critique of sociology became a classic included in every US introductory sociology course, in Israel even conflict sociologists did not mention it (e.g., Shapiro and Ben-Eliezer 1987), nor did they allude to the critics of docile social science cited here. Functionalists did compromise academic freedom much like US universities, collaborated with kibbutz power elites and helped their particularistic interests at the expense of societal ones much as major US universities did in the McCarthy era. Functionalists suppressed critical students much as US patriarchal functionalists suppressed critical women sociologists by "professionalization" that delegitimized critical theory. Successes in the academy made kibbutz functionalists oblivious to field theory and to other students' critical research; their high status encouraged low morality (Piff et al. 2012). Kibbutz movement successes in the 1960s-1970s, due to innovators and critical thinkers whom the old guard failed to suppress, proved to functionalists that they were right to applaud kibbutz negative practices such as *rotatzia*, ignoring ethnographic proof that *rotatzia* derailed innovator careers and enhanced conservative oligarchic rule (Author 2001, 2008), including proof based on US army studies. Some historians exposed functionalists' mistakes, but as they did not use pertinent sociological theories of bureaucracy, oligarchy, power elites, and fields, as well as social-psychological theories of tenured leaders' dysfunction phases and their moral decline with power accumulation and status elevation (Piff et al. 2012), they missed functionalists' major mistakes, sparing the latter the need to admit them. The late co-optation of some conflict sociologists and some historians by the dominant scientific coalition enlarged it and ensured its continued hegemony into the 21th century.

The findings support Greenwood and Levin's (1998), Levin and Greenwood's (2011), and Turner's (2012a) critique of current social sciences, as well as Turner's (2012b, p.479) call for

science studies' colleagues "to ask the politically uncomfortable questions we find so difficult." They add proofs of the perniciousness of conformist survey research that advances academic careers by submitting to power-holders' wish to tell powerless subjects half-truths that serve the formers' dominance. While Boden and Epstein (2011) criticized the lack of true academic freedom due to universities' changes, in the kibbutz case this freedom was compromised due to power-holders' control of resources and accessibility much as it was with some US anthropology (Price 2012). Evasive functionalist survey research produced biased rose-coloured images that suppressed much needed critically-minded social research that would have reinvigorated a defiant imagination that could have built on radical traditions in seeking a better society. Survey research is bound to low moral biases due to the tendency of hierarchic team seniors confined to academy's ivory towers to suppress the dissenting views of junior field workers who discern biases of research tools such as ignoring the low-moral practices of self-perpetuating leaders and their loyalists. Remote as they are from the field, senior surveyors miss, major phenomena but their views dominate; without sufficiently authoritative dissenting views research tends to, miss major social problems (Bogner and Menz 2010). Worse still, while interpersonal trust helps monitor actors' ethics and morality (Hedgecoe 2012), senior surveyors who avoid field-work may not create mutual trust with junior field workers who discern biases of survey tools, hence, biased research is probable.

Functionalists' survey research tends to be perniciously conformist, especially in case of radical societies ruled by oligarchic dysfunctional leaders interested in preventing critique. Researchers' co-optation that supports such leaders and confines whistleblowers (Wenger et al. 1999) is plausible and new measures are required to prevent it. One such measure may be the practice of seniors rather than only juniors perform preliminary field work and survey pilot studies. Wallerstein (2004) proposes integration of disciplines by "historical social sciences" and the case of critical kibbutz historians who exposed some of functionalists' mistakes supports this, but integration is difficult to achieve due to different academic backgrounds and research methods (Greenwood and Bernardi 2013); one should note kibbutz historian failures to utilize classics of sociology and political science. In addition, much history is written in the spirit of the leaders who shaped it. Thus, one must discern the critical historical material and integrate it with unobtrusive social research findings, and with the help of a good theory, in accord with Kurt Lewin's famous remark about its practicality, one may penetrate leaders' masks and

camouflages. However, the right theory may be found in another discipline; thus, more interaction and integration among disciplines by new solutions is called for.

Biased evasive research such as that of the kibbutz should be prevented; high-moral science must serve research subjects' legitimate interest in knowing the truth about their society; hence, more research on morality of social scientists is called for (Abend 2011; Sin 2005). An additional major problem of the social sciences must also be addressed in light of the suppression of critical kibbutz researchers: early students tend to defend findings against later critical disproof, as did the dominant kibbutz scientific coalition for dozens of years. Collins (1975, Ch.9) exposed the problem of such negative dominance, but his exposure did not change publication decision-making norms in the social sciences: Disagreement among reviewers still leads to rejection; hence, one member of a hegemonic coalition among reviewers can be enough to block exposure of its mistakes. A reform in this method is required to limit conservative hegemony of scientific coalitions. The natural sciences norm must be adopted: even if only one reviewer agrees with an article, it is not rejected rather reviewed by an additional reviewer, and if s/he approves it should be published. An additional measure can be that whenever co-optation of researchers is plausible, since gate-keeper power-holders have a vested interest in preventing critique, researchers must publish proof that their studies are not biased by this interest or by any other, considerations such as ignoring those parts of the studied field which empower self-perpetuating power-holders.

Acknowledgements

References

Abend, G. (2011). Thick concepts and the moral brain. *European Journal of Sociology* 52(2), 143-72.

Adar, B. (1975). Company car: Needs and passions. *Hashavua Bakibbutz Haartzi*, January 3 and 10 (Hebrew).

Ailon, G. (2013). From superstars to devils: The ethical discourse on managerial figures

involved in a corporate scandal. *Organization*, DOI: 10.1177/135050841350(1937

Argaman, D. (1997). *The general assembly of the kibbutz*. Givat Haviva: Yad Yaari (Hebrew).

Avrahami, E. (1993). *The functioning of the TKM - dilemmas and directions for change.* Ramat Efal: Yad Tabenkin (Hebrew).

Author. (1978). *The dynamics of kibbutz members employment in a regional inter-kibbutz plant*. M.A. thesis, Sociology and Anthropology Dept., Tel Aviv University (Hebrew).

Author. (1978/9). Autonomy of technostructure: An inter-kibbutz regional organization case study. *The Kibbutz* 6-7, 276-303 (Hebrew).

Author. (1979). Who hold the steering? The Regional Enterprises: a portrait. *Shdemot* 69, 9-23 (Hebrew).

Author. (1980). *The absorption of academicians in kibbutz plants*. Tel Aviv: KIA (Hebrew).

Author. (1987). *Anatomy of mismanagement.* Tel Aviv: Am Oved (Hebrew).

Author. (1990). Leadership, rotation, and the kibbutz crisis. *Journal of Rural Cooperation* 18(1), 55-66.

Author. (1992). Non-leadership in Israel: The paradox of *rotatzia*, rapid promotion and 'parachuting'. *International Problems, Society, and State* 31, 56-77 (Hebrew).

Author. (1995). The voluntary resignation of outsider managers: Interkibbutz rotation and Michels's 'Iron Law'. *Israel Social Science Research* 10(1), 59-84.

Author. (2001). Communal decline: The vanishing of high-moral leaders and the decay of democratic, high-trust kibbutz cultures. *Sociological Inquiry* 71(1), 13-38.

Author. (2005). Academic capital or scientific progress? A critique of studies of kibbutz stratification. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 61(3), 357-80.

Author. (2008). *Transforming kibbutz research*. Cleveland (OH): New World Publishing.

Author. (2012). Becoming a triple stranger: Autoethnography of a kibbutznik's long journey to discoveries of researchers' faults. In H. Hazan and E. Hertzog (Eds.), *Serendipity in anthropological research: The nomadic turn* (pp. 93-108). Farnham (UK): Ashgate Press.

Beilin, Y. (1984). *Sons in the shade of their fathers.* Tel Aviv: Revivim (Hebrew).

Ben-Rafael, E. (1997. *Crisis and transformation*. Albany (NY): SUNY Press.

Ben-Rafael, E., & Yaar, E. (1992). *Kibbutz stratification*. Unit 10, course *The kibbutz society - change and continuity*. Tel Aviv: The Open University (Hebrew).

Ben-Rafael, E., & Topel, M. (Eds.). (2009). *The kibbutz on paths apart*. Ramat Efal: Yad

Tabenkin (Hebrew).

Ben-David, I. (1975). Review of '*Stratification versus equality in the kibbutz*' by G. M. Kressel. *The Kibbutz* 2, 177-8 (Hebrew).

Boden, R., & Epstein, D. (2011). A flat earth society? Imagining academic freedom. *The Sociological Review* 59(3), 476–95.

Bogner, A. and Wolfgang M. (2010). How politics deals with expert dissent: The case of ethics councils. *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 35(6), 888-914.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bowes, A. M. (1989). *Kibbutz Goshen.* Prospects Heights (IL): Waveland.

Briggle, A. (2009). The Kass Council and the politicization of ethics advice. *Social Studies of Science* 39(2), 309-26.

Brum, A. (1986). *Always controversial.* Ramat Efal: Yad Tabenkin (Hebrew).

Brumann, C. (2000). The dominance of one and its perils: Charismatic leadership and branch structures in utopian communes. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 56(4), 425-51.

Buber, M. (1958[(1947)]). *Paths in utopia*. Boston: Beacon.

Burawoy, M. (2005). For public sociology. *American Sociological Review* 70(1), 4-28.

Chomsky, N. et al. (eds.). (1997). *The cold war and the university*. New York: New Press.

Cohen, M. (2000). *To give and to receive.* Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad (Hebrew).

Cohen, N., & Rosner, M. (1988). *The democracy and the kibbutz.* Tel Aviv: Sifriat Poalim (Hebrew).

Cohen, R. (1978). *The singles society.* Final thesis, Efal Seminar Center (Hebrew).

Collins, R. (1975). *Conflict sociology*. New York: Academic.

Dalton, M. (1959). *Man who manage*. New York: Wiley.

Diamond, S. (1992). *Compromised campus*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Erdal, D. (2011). *Beyond the corporation*. London: Bodley.

Erhard, W., Jensen, M. C., & Zaffron, S. (2009). A new model of integrity: An actionable pathway to trust, productivity, and value. Retrieved 2.11.2011 from SSRN No. 932255[1].

Fadida, Michael. (1972). *The dynamics of career patterns among political activists in a kibbutz*. M.A. thesis, Sociology and Anthropology Dept. Tel Aviv University (Hebrew).

Gabriel, R. A., & Savage, P. L. (1981). *Crisis in command.* New Delhi: Himalayan.

Greenwood, A., & Bernardi, A. (2013). Understanding the rift, the (still) uneasy bedfellows of history and organization studies. *Organization,* DOI: 10.1177/ 1350508413514286.

Greenwood, D. J., & Morten, L. (1998. Action research, science, and co-optation of social research. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies* 4(2), 237-61.

Griffin, R. W., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2004). *The dark side of organizational behavior*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grundmann, R. (2011). 'Climategate' and the scientific ethos. *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 38(1), 67-93.

Halamish, A. (2013). *Meir Yaari*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved (Hebrew).

Hedgecoe, A. M. (2006). Pharmacogenetics as alien science: Alzheimer's disease, core sets and expectations. *Social Studies of Science* 36(5), 723-52.

Hedgecoe, A. M. (2012). Trust and regulatory organizations: The role of local knowledge and facework in research ethics review. *Social Study of Science* 42(5), 662-83.

Helman, A. (1987). The development of professional managers in the kibbutz. *Rev'on Lekalkala* 33, 1031-38 (Hebrew).

Hirschman, A. O. **(19**70). *Exit, voice, and loyalty*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.

Inbari, A. (2009). *Going home.* Tel Aviv: Yediot Ahronot (Hebrew).

James, A., Hockey, J., & Dawson, A. (1997). *After writing culture*. London: Routledge.

Judge, T. A., Ronald, F. P., & Kosalka, T. (2009). The bright and dark sides of leader traits: A review and theoretical extension of the leader trait paradigm. *Leadership Quarterly* 20(4), 855-75.

Kafkafi, E. (1988). Leadership patterns in the KA as exposed in the Prague Affair. *Me'asef Lecheker Tnu'at Havoda Hatzionit Vehasocialism* 18, 25-34 (Hebrew).

Kafkafi, E. (1992). *Truth or faith.* Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi (Hebrew).

Kanari, B. (2003. *Tabenkin in the land of Israel*. Ramat Efal: Yad Tabenkin (Hebrew).

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Keshet, S. (1995). *Spiritual underground: The beginning of the kibbutz novel.* Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hame'uchad (Hebrew).

Kets de Vries, M. F.R. (1993). *Leaders, fools, and impostors*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Krausz, E. (ed.). (1983). *The sociology of kibbutz.* New Brunswick (NJ): Transaction.

Kressel, G. M. (1974). *Stratification versus equality in a kibbutz*. Tel Aviv: Cherikover (Hebrew).

Kressel, G. M. (1983). *To each according to his needs*. Tel Aviv: Cherikover (Hebrew).

Kressel, G. M. (2000). Introduction. In Siegfried Landshut, *The kvutza* (2nd edition) (pp.1-33). Ramat Efal: Yad Tabenkin (Hebrew).

Krol, Y. (1989). *The economic crisis in the kibbutzim of TKM 1984-1988*. Tel Aviv: TKM (Hebrew).

Kuhn, T. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kumar, M. N. (2008). A review of the types of scientific misconduct in biomedical research. *Journal of Academic Ethics* 6(3), 211-28.

Kynan, O. (1988). *In our own image…': Hashomer Hatzair and the mass immigration*. M.A. thesis, Jewish History Department, Tel Aviv University (Hebrew).

Landshut, S. (1944). *The kvutza*. Jerusalem: Sifria Tzionit Ktana (Hebrew).

Lanir, Y. (1990). *The kibbutz as a political system.* Ramat Efal: Yad Tabenkin (Hebrew).

Lavanchy, A. (2013). Dissonant alignments: The ethics and politics of researching state institutions. *Current Sociology* 61(5-6), 677-92.

Lenski, G. (1966). *Power and privilege.* New York: Free Press.

Leviatan, U. (1978). Organizational effects of managerial turnover in kibbutz production branches. *Human Relations* 31(12), 1001-18.

Leviatan, U, Oliver, H., & Quarter, J. (eds.). (1998). *Crisis in the Israeli kibbutz.* Westport CN: Praeger.

Levin, M., & Greenwood, D. (2011). Revitalizing universities by reinventing the social sciences: *Bildung* and action research. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 27-42). Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage.

Lewin, K. (1951). *The field theory in social science.* New York: Harper.

List, J. A., Charles, D., Bailey, P., Euzent, J., & Martin, T. L. (2001). Academic ecomomists behaving badly? A survey on three areas of unethical behavior. *Economic Inquiry* 39(1), 162-70.

Madoo-Lengermann, P., & Niebrugge-Brantley, J. (1998). *The women founders: Sociology and social theory 1830-1930.* Boston: Random-House.

Marx, E. (1985). Social-Anthropological Research and Knowing Arab Society. In Aluf Har'even

(ed.), *To Know Neighboring People*: 137-54. Jerusalem: Van Lear (Hebrew).

Meged, H., & Sobol, O. (1970). Rotatzia of secretaries and economic managers in the Ichud kibbutzim. Seminar paper, Labor Studies Dept., Tel Aviv University (Hebrew).

Michels, R. (1959[(1915]). *Political parties.* New York: Dover.

Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination.* New York: Oxford.

Near, H. (1997). *The kibbutz movement: a history.* Vol. II, London: Littman Library.

Niv, A., & Bar-On, D. (1992). *The dilemma of size from a system learning perspective: The case of the kibbutz.* Greenwich (CN): JAI Press.

Oved, Y. (1988). *Two hundred years of American communes.* New Brunswick NJ: Transaction.

Palgi, M., & Reinhartz, S. (Eds.). (2011). *One hundred years of kibbutz life*. New Brunswick (NJ): Transaction.

Penders, B., & Nelis, A. P. (2011). Credibility engineering in the food industry: Linking science, regulation, and marketing in a corporate context. *Science in Context* 24(4), 487-515.

Piff, P. K., Stancato, D. M., Côté, S. Mendoza-Denton, R., & Keltner, D. (2012). Higher social class predicts increased unethical behavior. Retrieved 8.8.2013: www.pnas.org./cgi/content/1118373109

Pitzer, Donald E. (ed.) (1997). *America's Communal Utopias.* Chapel Hill (NC): University of North Carolina Press.

Platt, J. (1976). *Realities of social research.* London: Sussex University Press.

Platt, J. (1986). Functionalism and the survey: The relation of theory and method. *The Sociological Review* 34(3), 501-36.

Porat, D. (2000). *Beyond the reaches of our souls.* Tel Aviv: Am Oved (Hebrew).

Price, D. H. (2012). Counterinsurgency and the M-VICO system. *Anthropology Today* 28(1), 16-21.

Ram, U. (1995. *The changing agenda of Israeli sociology.* Albany (NY): SUNY Press.

Ron, Y. (1978). The kibbutz ideology - theory and reality. *Hedim* 43, 170-89 (Hebrew).

Rosenfeld, E. (1951). Social stratification in a 'classless' society. *American Sociological Review* 16(4), 766-74.

Rosolio, D. (1975). *The regional structure of the kibbutz movement*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved (Hebrew).

Rosolio, D. (1999). *The system and the crisis.* Tel Aviv: Am Oved (Hebrew).

Rosner, M. (1960). Kibbutz work and worker status in the kibbutz. *Hedim* 64, 84-98 (Hebrew).

Rosner, M. (1991). Kibbutz (working paper). Haifa: Kibbutz Research Institute.

Rosner, M. (1993). Organizations between community and market: The case of the kibbutz. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 14(3), 369-97.

Ross, D. (1991). *The origins of American social science.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sabar, N. (1996). *Kibbutz L. A*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved (Hebrew).

Schinke, R. J., Enosse, L., Peltier, D., Watson, J., & Lightfoot, N. (2010). Cultural missteps and ethical considerations with indigenous populations: preliminary reflections from Northeastern Ontario, Canada. *Journal of Academic Ethics* 8(4), 233-242.

Schwartz, M. and Naor, R. (2000). *Without breaking the tools*. Ramat Efal: Yad Tabenkin (Hebrew).

Schwartz, R. D. (1955). Functional alternatives to inequality. *American Sociological Review* 20(3), 424-30.

Segal, D. R. (1981). Leadership and management: Organizations theory. In J. H. Buck and L. J. Korb (Eds.), *Military leadership* (pp. 41-69). Beverly Hills (CA): Sage.

Selznick, P. (1949). *TVA and the grass roots*. New York: Harper.

Semler, R. (1993). *Mavrick.* New York: Warner.

Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behavior. *Journal of Management Studies* 45(2), 402-23.

Shalem, E. (2000). *Public funding of collective organizations*. Ramat Efal: Yad Tabenkin (Hebrew).

Shapiro, Y., & Ben-Eliezer, U. (1987. *Elements of sociology*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved (Hebrew).

Shepher, I. (1980. The boundaries of kibbutz. In E. Marx (Ed.), *A Composite Portrait of Israel* (pp. 137-77). London: Academic Press.

Shepher, Y. (1975). Kibbutz Sodom and Gomorra. *Social Research Quarterly* 9-10, 383-8 (Hebrew).

Shortall, S. (2013). The role of subjectivity and knowledge power struggles in the formation of public policy. *Sociology* 47(6), 1088-103.

Shur, S. (1987). The study of distributive justice in communal micro societies: The lesson of the kibbutz. In Y. Gorni et al. (Eds.), *Communal life* (pp. 487-91). New Brunswick (NJ):

Transaction.

Sin, C. H. (2005). Seeking informed consent: Reflections on research practice. *Sociology* 39(2), 277-94.

Sismondo, S. (2009). Ghosts in the machine: Publication Planning in the medical sciences. *Social Studies of Science* 39(2), 171–98.

Spiro, M. E. (1955). *Kibbutz: Venture in utopia.* Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.

Spiro, M. E. (1983). Introduction: Thirty years of kibbutz research. In E. Krausz (Ed.), *The Sociology of Kibbutz* (pp. 1-6). New Brunswick (NJ): Transaction.

Stryjan, Y. (1989). *Impossible organizations.* New York: Greenwood.

Talmon-Garber, Y. (1957). The family and job nomination of kibbutz second generation members. *Megamot* 5(3), 370-92 (Hebrew).

Topel, M. (1979). *…To build and to be built: Power elite in an egalitarian society*. M.A. thesis, Sociology and Anthropology Dept., Tel Aviv University (Hebrew).

Topel, M. (1992). *Kibbutz organization*. Unit 2, course *The kibbutz society - change and continuity*. Tel Aviv: The Open University (Hebrew).

Turner, S. S. (2012a). De-Intellectualizing American sociology. *Journal of Sociology* 48(4), 346-63.

Turner, S. S. (2012b). Whatever happened to knowledge? *Social Studies of Science* 42(3), 474-80.

Tzachor, Z. (1997). *Hazan - A life movement*. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi (Hebrew).

Wacquant, L. J. D. (1989). Toward a reflexive sociology: A workshop with Pierre Bourdieu. *Sociological Theory* 7(1), 26-63.

Webb, E. J., & Campbell, D. T. (1966). *Unobtrusive measures in social research.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Wenger, N. S., Korenman, S. G., Berk, R., & Liu, H. (1999. Reporting unethical research behavior. *Evaluation Review* 23(5), 553-70.

Whyte, W. F., & Whyte, K. K. (1988). *Making Mondragon*. Ithaca NY: ILR Press.

Yankelovich, D. (1991). *Coming to public judgment*. Syracuse NY: Syracuse University Press.