

The Total Institution-Day School Continuum: A Model for Adapting and Updating the "Ideal Commune"

YUVAL DROR

1. The Purpose of the Article and the Case Histories in It

The article enlarges on a paper presented at the ICSA Conference at Yad Tabenkin, Eyal, Israel (1995), which dealt with "Communalism—Contribution and Survival."¹ Its three purposes are:

- a. To interpret the communal survival formula of the kibbutz, which involved not remaining faithful to the ideal types of its inception, in terms of more complex, continually updated historical models, to be illustrated from the field of education.
- b. To continue to update research on changing kibbutz secondary education adding to the continuum between total institutions and day schools, a model previously presented in various forums on the dilemma of size in kibbutz secondary education.
- c. To illustrate the use of the model both in updating historical research and in determining educational policy.

The model and its applications have been reexamined on the basis of many historical and current case studies carried out in schools. These we have collated from the mid-1980's until the present at Oranim, the school of education of the kibbutz movement, which is affiliated with Haifa University. In the interests of reliability, some of the research was done in collaboration with colleagues from other universities who are not kibbutz members. Some were presented by principals of regional kibbutz schools at the Seminar on Kibbutz Secondary Education, a joint project of school principals and university staff, held at Oranim during 1992 and 1993. Other case studies were made by

1. "Communalism—Contribution and Survival/" 5th International Conference of ICSA, 30 May - 2 June 1995, Yad Tabenkin, Eyal, Israel.

students in the university division of Oranim, studies based on interviews, structured questionnaires and gathering written material, all of which was collected at the Institute for Research on Kibbutz Education at Oranim.

Many were published in one of three collections. One is *The Kibbutz School: Uniqueness or Growth* (1994),² containing historical case studies illustrating the dilemma of size in the kibbutz, past and present, and in specific instruments for planning kibbutz schools by weighting all the variables within the proposed model. Another is *Four Schools, Four Worlds* (1995)³—two current and historical research studies on kibbutz secondary schools, one a residential and one a day school, which are compared with two non-kibbutz schools. In addition, three of the eight articles in the special issue of *The Journal of Moral Education* (1995)⁴ deal with the kibbutz experience and its implications for moral education. This issue examined the children's society (Dror),⁵ education for work (Bar-Lev and Dror),⁶ and Zionist education in the kibbutz (Gibton and Sabar),⁷ all basing themselves on research studies, most of which were made at Oranim and others at the schools of education at Bar Ilan and Tel Aviv universities.

The structure of the article follows its purposes. In Section 2. the development of the kibbutz dilemma of size model, as updated, will be presented. In Section 3. the reasons for additions to the total continuum. In Section 4. The historical and current usages of the continuum model are illustrated by means of a variety of schools, and measurement methods are demonstrated. Section 5. presents conclusions, followed by Section 6. the general communal implications of updating the kibbutz dilemma of size model and its historical and current applications.

2. Yuval Dror, Yaskov Liberman, eds., *The Kibbutz School: Uniqueness or Growth* (Oranim: Institute for Research on Kibbutz Education, 1994), in Hebrew.

3. Yaskov Liberman, Yuval Dror (with Nir Resisi and Louis Gotlieb), *Four Schools, Four Worlds* (Oranim: Institute for Research on Kibbutz Education, 1995), in Hebrew.

4. Yuval Dror, ed., (Special Issue) "The Kibbutz Experience: Implications for Moral Education," *Journal of Moral Education*, 24/3 (1995).

5. Yuval Dror, "The Kibbutz Children's Society—Ideal and Reality," *Journal of Moral Education* 24:3 (1995): 273-288.

6. Mordechai Bar-Lev and Yuval Dror, "Education for Work in the Kibbutz as a Means Towards Personal, Social and Learning Fulfilment," *Journal of Moral Education* 24:3 (1995): 259-272.

7. Dan Gibton and Naama Sabar, "Many Doubts, Few Excuses: Zionist Education in Kibbutz High Schools," *Journal of Moral Education*, 24:3 (1995): 289-306.

2. Developing and Updating the Kibbutz Dilemma of Size Model

In our previous article, "School Size as a Function of Uniqueness, Autonomy, Integration and Comprehensiveness" (1995),⁸ we dealt with the size dilemma in kibbutz schools, and in schools in general. The work is based on a model that used the findings gathered in a doctorate in 1984,⁹ discussed in an international workshop at Yad Tabenkin in 1986,¹⁰ on the size dilemma in the kibbutz. In 1989 it was published for the first time in a Hebrew-language book, edited by Dan Bar-On and Amitai Niv,¹¹ which summed up the workshop proceedings. The preface defined the size dilemma according to the areas of communal-ity in which they were examined: "After the first survey stage in regional projects ... we defined the subject as the kibbutz confrontation with the problem of size, whether large or small, a confrontation that arises from the tension between maintaining uniqueness on one hand and withstanding competition from a changing environment on the other. Having completed the second stage of the regional survey, we decided to examine the size problem in three additional sectors. Dan Bar-On undertook to study the welfare services, Amitai Niv, industrialization, and Yuval Dror, education. As a result of our surveys, we returned to the historical background of the size problem in kibbutz thinking, and at the same time tried to examine the optimal size for an individual kibbutz as it is reflected in current research. The material was collated at the Yad Tabenkin convention in 1986, and the main points presented at the beginning of the book: only after one understands that there is no solution to the problem of optimum size for the individual settlement, can one examine attempts to resolve the size dilemma beyond the limits of the settlement."¹²

The general kibbutz context of the size dilemma in education continued to occupy us even after the book was published. In view of

8. Yuval Dror, "School Size as a Function of Uniqueness, Autonomy, Integration and Comprehensiveness: An Historical Model with Current Implications," *Journal of Educational Administration and History* 27:1 (1995): 35-50.

9. Yuval Dror, "The Formation of 'Kibbutz Studied': Curricula in the Kibbutz Movements—Ideological, Social and Educational Analysis," (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University, 1984).

10. Yuval Dror, "The Kibbutz Dilemma of Size in Secondary School Education," presented at international workshop on "The Kibbutz Dilemma of Size," Efal, Israel, July 1986.

11. Yuval Dror, "The Dilemma of Size in Secondary Formal Education: Past, Present and Future," in Dan Bar-On and Amitai Niv, *The "Dilemma of Size" of the Kibbutz from the Point of View of Learning Systems* (Efal: Yad-Tabenkin, 1989), 49-62, in Hebrew.

12. Dan Bar-On and Amitai Niv, *Ibid*, 5.

the crises and the changes within the kibbutz movement, and particularly in its educational system in the 1980's, we required a precise definition and two more updatings of the model. At the convention "Utopia-Imagination and Reality" at Haifa University and at Oranim in 1990, we defined the principles characteristic of kibbutz education.¹³ In 1991 the integration and comprehensive variables were added, in view of the increasing openness of kibbutz schools to the non-kibbutz environment, as more and more of them became comprehensive schools that offered technology options.¹⁴ By the time our article was published in 1995,¹⁵ the model was examined against the background of the international literature on rural versus urban schools, and of increasing instances of amalgamation among kibbutz elementary schools and among rural schools in Israel in general. At the ICSA International Conference in 1995,¹⁶ we had to update the kibbutz school size dilemma model once more, this time in view of another conspicuous change in kibbutz education: many residential schools of the Kibbutz Artzi are now becoming day schools as these once total institutions and those of the United Kibbutz movement amalgamate. The paper we presented there—"The Continuum Between Total Institution and Day School: the kibbutz school's only chance to survive"¹⁷—offered a third essential update. This one, like its predecessors, is based on historical and current case studies, and exemplifies the size dilemma in all sectors of kibbutz society, whether welfare services, industrialization or other areas.

We defined the uniqueness dimension in kibbutz education, which is included in the model on the basis of seven principles stated at the conference on Utopias in 1990: the child and the integration of personal and social education as center; the educating environment that links school and community; coordinated activity of all those involved in education—teachers and child care workers, youth leaders and parents; education and teaching combined through integration of studies with social life and work; active learning emphasizing the interdisciplin-

13. Yuval Dror, "Kibbutz Education in the Eighties—Between 'Identity' and 'Change'/" presented at the Utopia—Imagination and Reality" International Conference, Haifa University and Oranim, Israel, January 1990.

14. Yuval Dror, "The Mapping of the 'Dilemma of Size' of the Kibbutz High-School at the End of the Eighties: A Multi-Variable Model for the Purposes of Research and Application," *Shorashim*, F (1991): 177-87, in Hebrew.

15. See note 8.

16. See note 1.

17. Yuval Dror, "The Continuum Between Total Institution and Day School: The Kibbutz School's Only Chance to Survive," presented at the ICSA International Conference, May-June 1995.

ary approach; student autonomy in the children's society and autonomy of educational teams.¹⁸

The penultimate updating of the model on the size dilemma in kibbutz schools appeared in the *Journal of Educational Administration and History* 27:1 (1995) as shown the table below. The dilemma of size in kibbutz secondary school education is defined as the reconciliation of the continua noted in the introduction, each of them presented here in its polar position:¹⁹

	Classic, autonomous kibbutz secondary school	Changing kibbutz school, integrated into environment
A Uniqueness	Entirely unique kibbutz education (methods, content, graduates)	Complete similarity to non-kibbutz education (methods, content, graduates)
B Autonomy	A school in each kibbutz (kibbutz Teachers and pupils)	Complete integration of kibbutz teachers and pupils into neighboring non-kibbutz regional urban or rural school
C Size	Small kibbutz school (200 average)	Large regional school (600 average)
D Integration	Integration into the economic level parallel to the kibbutz	Integration with weaker socio-economic levels from the so-called "Other Israel
E Comprehensiveness	Academic studies in the humanities and Sciences	Comprehensive school including a range of technological options
F Totality	A comprehensive residential school where education comprises formal and Informal elements, kibbutz centered	A day school where most of the education given is formal, has affinity to the society around it

Thus at one pole we have complete kibbutz autonomy and uniqueness in small, local academic secondary schools. If these are integrated at all, it is by admitting students from equally educated, well-off backgrounds. At the other pole there is similarity and complete integration

18. See note 13.

19. See note 8, 39-40.

of kibbutz students in regional or urban education, that is in large, integrated, comprehensive and technological secondary schools.

The F Totality dimension, an expansion of the uniqueness concept, is a third essential updating.

3. Why Totality Was Added and How It Is Measured

The addition was needed because of changes in kibbutz ideal types in general and in kibbutz education in particular during the last decade.

The totality dimension arises from the very question that guided Bar-On and Niv in their field study of the size dilemma: did the ideal types that kibbutz movement education set itself meet the test of reality? Or from the perspective of more than 70 years since the establishment of the first "complete" school at Ein Harod in 1924, is it necessary to change the models we use both in historical research and in determining current policy? And if we generalize from kibbutz society to communes in general, can ideal historical models serve after decades of communal survival, or should we define basic variables and continua of possibilities, to be translated into communal activity adapted to real life today? Our unequivocal answer supports a flexible approach, adapted to the environment, in view of the changes in kibbutz education in particular, within the kibbutz in general. The rationale behind the present update is based on the increasing rate at which Kibbutz Artzi residential institutions are becoming day schools run jointly by the two main kibbutz movements. This being so, the components of the uniqueness variable do not suffice. While the variable remains in the first place in the model, it fails to express profound and significant changes going on simultaneously in two different frameworks, total educational institutions and total kibbutz societies. Given these framework changes, the total-residential variable is presented as a continuum between total institutions and day schools, as in earlier additions and updates the terms uniqueness, integration and comprehensiveness were clarified.

The Kibbutz Artzi once believed in a nationwide school for all the youth in their movement. Their institution at Mishmar Haemek was established in 1931 as just such a total school, combining studies, social life within the children's society and a branch of Hashomer Hatzair, their youth movement. The result was effective ideological preparation for kibbutz life. The concept was to establish "a republic of youth," independent of the daily life of the kibbutz, without real intervention from kibbutz members. This ideal institution lasted only fourteen years. In 1945 an additional school was established at Bet Alpha and in 1951,

just twenty years after the first national institution was founded, the movement had 14 regional schools. In practice, the isolation of students and staff from their homes, in the one national institution, was too heavy a burden. The regional framework served the movement from the 1940s until the 1980s as an alternative ideal type.

HaKibbutz HaMeuchad (The United Kibbutz Movement), on the other hand, favored a kindergarten to Grade 12 school in every kibbutz, which was to serve as an educating community. By contrast with the Kibbutz Artzi, which removed education from daily kibbutz life, the United movement favored close community contact with education, which was part of the surrounding social network. This model did not survive long either. The first school was established in Ein Harod only in 1924, and by the time the state was established in 1948, and particularly after the split within the movement in 1951, small kibbutz schools began to unite: first two or three schools from neighboring kibbutzim within the movement and later two or three times as many, involving collaboration between the two factions that had parted company. Another movement, Hever Hakvutzot, (later Ichad HaKevuzot VeHaKibbutzim), had never adopted an ideal school type but rather a pragmatic approach to meet the needs of a particular district. Over the years these movements began to collaborate with the United Kibbutz Movement, with moshavim and even with urban communities.²⁰

The pragmatic approach was adopted as well by the United Kibbutz Movement, which arose from the amalgamation of two others in the 1970's. It no longer has any local schools: the last three closed one after the other in the 1980's. Moreover, in the last decade the pragmatic approach that favors individual educational solutions for the needs of a particular district had been adopted by the Kibbutz Artzi too. A third of its nineteen institutions are no longer residential, or are only partially so. In most of the others, the practical possibility of becoming day schools, with growing collaboration between similar institutions of the United Kibbutz Movement, is being discussed. These are to be opened to a more varied population, in some instances on a day school basis only. Since none of the ideal types in kibbutz education has survived, it would be well to examine the sole surviving ideal institution of the Kibbutz Artzi since 1945, its total regional residential institution: even that has begun to change and even to disintegrate.

The final, or possibly the first and foremost reason for updating the size dilemma model is that kibbutz education is the reflection of the society in which it operates. Privatization processes move forward,

20. See note 9.

individual development is emphasized and more and more kibbutz members work outside their settlement in varied occupations. All this of necessity puts academic learning at the center of the kibbutz school's activity, at the expense of education. The day school that concentrates on teaching, without carrying the residential school burden of education seems a better way to reach this goal. Of all the kibbutzim in Israel, there remains just one, Baram of the Kibbutz Artzi, where children still sleep together in the children's house. The change to family sleeping arrangements that swept that movement in 1991 during the Gulf War, gradually led to a change from residential to day schools. Similarly to the situation prevailing in the United Kibbutz Movement, many Kibbutz Artzi parents want to supervise their adolescent children, by doing away with regional residential schools and having the youngsters live in "youth blocks" in their home kibbutz, or even continue to sleep under the family roof until they join the Army. Moreover, residential schools depend on a devoted staff of child care workers and teachers, the overwhelming majority of them women. Family sleeping arrangements have in effect confined this group to their own homes and children during the very hours that in a kibbutz residential school would be devoted to educational activities with their students. The costs of maintaining a Kibbutz Artzi residential school are no small matter either, and the cutbacks that came in the wake of the kibbutz financial crisis have taken a toll within the costly residential school system. Since in recent years researchers have not found any significant differences between residential and day school graduates in the kibbutz, stronger and voices within Kibbutz Artzi support the change from the former to the latter—with the United Kibbutz Movement and the other settlement frameworks.²¹

4. Totality-Current and Historical Applications to Kibbutz Schools

In view of all the foregoing, these will be shown by means of the totality dimension of our size dilemma model, used in relation to kibbutz secondary schools lying between the two poles of the Total—Day School continuum. (A) An alternative residential school, founded in the mid 1950's, in a remote Kibbutz Artzi settlement, admitting Youth Aliyah children, since the 1970's, entered into collaboration with two United Kibbutz Movement settlements, and with a third in the 1980's. In the 1990's collaboration has extended to moshavim in the area. (B) In the 1990's, an educational partnership developed into three campuses in three adjacent kibbutzim, having become feasible only

21. See notes 2. and 4.

then, with the removal of the historical barriers between the participant movements. (C) In another regional teaching project operating since the beginning of the 1990's, four neighboring kibbutz district schools, two residential institutions from Kibbutz Artzi, a United Kibbutz Movement day school and another inter-movement collaboration project, all study together two days a week. Because the article focuses on the development of the model for research and for activity, we present the principal points only of the case studies on which it is based.

4.1 The Anne Frank Haven at Kibbutz Sasa: Partnership with Yiron, Baram and Neighboring Moshavin

The Anne Frank Haven is a special secondary school founded at Sasa in upper Galilee in 1956. It had a threefold Zionist purpose: absorbing children from weaker strata of the population through Youth Aliyah, thus enlarging the small group of kibbutz children of this age so they could be educated at home, and increasing the population of their own remote settlement by admitting the Haven graduates to membership. The main feature of this Kibbutz Artzi residential institution is teaching and educating kibbutz and city children together, in groups where both were equally represented. This is an "ideal type" of kibbutz youth society, since in most, now as in the past, outside students are educated in parallel but separate groups. In 1978, nearby Yiron of the United Kibbutz Movement entered educational partnership with Sasa as Baram, of Kibbutz Artzi, did in 1987. The kibbutz junior and senior high school students are at the Haven on a day school basis, with residences in each of the three kibbutzim. At the Haven there are 80 to 100 children in grades 7 to 12 from each kibbutz. It has grown gradually, then, from 80 children from Sasa and Youth Aliyah to a school for over 300 students.

In the early 1990's the Haven underwent another change as it opened its doors to day students from the moshavim and other nearby settlements, in which category there were in the 1994-95 school year some 100 of the 322 students, as well as about 100 Youth Aliyah children, including those of recent immigrants from Russia. It is natural, then, that the Haven has changed its name and become the ORT—Anne Frank Comprehensive Cooperative School—Sasa-Yiron-Baram. The name expresses inter-kibbutz collaboration, the link to the ORT school network and, in addition, the desire of the present school to be comprehensive. Changes in the school population are, of course, highly significant, although proportions do not deviate from those at the Anne Frank Haven over the years. The original plan was for half kibbutz children and half from Youth Aliyah. However some years the

ratio was 40-60—in either direction. Most of the neighboring moshavim were established during the mass immigration of the 1950's, and the inclusion of their children at the school adds an element of regional integration to the traditional goal of integrating Youth Aliyah children from the city. An exception to this population element are the 30 children from Amuka, a community settlement with a old established, prosperous population, and ten from Rehania, a Circassian village.

The crises the Haven has undergone in recent years are linked to the member kibbutzim themselves, and principally to the new map of kibbutz elementary and secondary school districts in upper Galilee. There is an ongoing argument among the partners as to the site of elementary schools that feed into the Anne Frank Haven. Yiron, Baram and Kibbutz Malkiyah, which is not a partner, have a joint elementary school. While this school is for kibbutz children only, Sasa and the nearby moshavim, who are also partners in the Haven, have a joint elementary day school too. Beyond the question of school location, there is also an argument over the principle of where exactly in the educational process to start integration and school centralization. Yiron and Baram joined the Haven later and are content, for the present, to begin integration in junior high school. Sasa, however, understands that meaningful integration should take place not only in the Haven but also within the district at the elementary school level. Members of Kibbutz Sasa, many of whom are graduates of the Haven, feel committed to their unique integration methods. On the other hand, Baram mainly is looking for a larger school with broader learning possibilities, along the lines of city comprehensive schools. (The difficulties in absorbing Youth Aliyah children at Baram led the kibbutz to reexamine its link with the Haven.) On this issue Yiron is somewhere between Sasa and Baram—both as to its positions and its seniority in the partnership.

Baram and Yiron now understand the unavoidable connection between a joint elementary school and the continuation of the Anne Frank School as an integrative framework. They also comprehend the possibility of an elementary school common to three kibbutzim and the moshavim and other settlements in the area. A larger school, whether elementary or secondary, reduces costs, a highly influential factor, given the straitened financial circumstances of the kibbutz movement. In the new school district map there is at least a theoretical possibility that one of the partners in the Haven will withdraw. On the other hand there is a chance that nearby Malkiyah will join, rather than continue to have its children travel to a secondary school much farther away. So

may additional kibbutzim and other communities, as has actually been happening at other kibbutz schools.²²

4.2 The Emek Hefer Regional Council Education Center

The Center unites five elementary schools of the United Kibbutz Movement and Kibbutz Artzi: Giv'at Haim Ihud and Meuhad (result of the split within the kibbutz movement in 1951), Ein Hahoresh and Haogen-Ma'abarot. It includes Ma'ayan as well, which was the regional residential secondary school of the Kibbutz Artzi attended by adolescents from Hama'apil, Ein Hahoresh and Lahavat Haviva, and the secondary classes of both groups at Giv'at Haim, which studied till then at the Hof Hacarmel Secondary School. The nucleus of the new center was Ein Hahoresh and both factions of Giv'at Haim. Till then, these children did not go to school together because they belonged to different kibbutz movements.

The Ma'ayan educational institution, like the other regional organizations, was established at the end of the 1940's. The two Giv'at Haim kibbutzim split for political reasons but by the 1970's both were sending their children to the district secondary school, a 45-minute drive each way. In the 1990's, ideological differences waned while economic difficulties emphasized the costly absurdity of the existing situation. As a result, the model of three school divisions for formal education and one nonformal/social was developed: the elementary division centered around the Giv'at Haim elementary schools, which all the kibbutz and moshav children in the district attended; intermediate and senior divisions at Ein Hahoresh, where the residential school closed, giving place to a two-section secondary school and a central social section that coordinates all extracurricular, nonformal activities of the youth movements and the semi-nonformal community activities for which the school is responsible. Included here are school councils with student, parent and institutional participation from all campuses; activities related to holidays and current events, enrichment classes in the arts, technology and sports, and community projects like help to the aged, immigrant absorption, tutoring, and environment protection. Parents are involved in weekend cultural activities, annual events and those connected with holidays and vacations such as camping, hikes and sports days. There are some 400 students at each level, 800 in the

22. Miriam Ben-Peretz, Moshe Giladi, and Yuval Dror, "The Anne Frank Haven: A Case Study of an Alternative Educational Program in an Integrative Kibbutz Setting," *International Review of Education* 38/1: 47-63. Yuval Dror, "The Anne Frank Haven in an Israeli Kibbutz," *Adolescence*, 30/119: 617-629.

70 COMMUNAL SOCIETIES

two elementary schools. The forecast for the year 2000 is 1800 students in 60 homeroom classes.

The Center has a number of advantages: children from all the kibbutzim and moshavim are integrated from elementary school, along with a relatively small number of outside children, including new immigrants and an institution of this size allows for varied study and social options along with an adequate level of intimacy, in sections of 400 to 600 students. Formal education is more comprehensive here than it is in comprehensive schools: from 1995 there has been a preschool section in which all the kindergartens in the region combine, and which feeds into all the formal and nonformal frameworks of the elementary school section. Everyone active in education is involved—students and teachers, parents, youth leaders and auxiliary staff such as child care workers and education committee coordinators. In sum, this district educational center is unique in basing itself on the educational traditions of previously separate kibbutz institutions, the old and the new combining and together becoming more complex and up-to-date.²³

4.3 Mateh Asher Joint Elective Course Project: Four Kibbutz Schools in Western Galilee

The Mateh Asher Joint Project has operated since 1990, and involves four secondary schools. The Ladder of Tyre District School for seven kibbutzim in the United Kibbutz Movement has 400 students, including 30 outside children. The Na'aman residential school of Kibbutz Artzi has 300 students, a third from outside the kibbutzim. The residential school of Oshrat (Kibbutz Artzi) serves five kibbutzim, and has 300 students, a quarter from outside. The partnership between Manor, the educational institution at Eilon (Kibbutz Artzi) and Kabri (United Kibbutz Movement) comprises three kibbutzim: Eilon, Kabri and Idmit and has 300 students, half from outside. There is a total of some 1300 students, 300 of them from outside, from 18 kibbutzim.

The most limited inter-institutional collaboration is between Manor, once the district educational institution of Kibbutz Artzi and the former local day school at Kabri. Each was the ideal type of its movement, the former updated in 1945. When the children from Kibbutz Baram were withdrawn from Manor in 1987 and sent to the Anne Frank Haven, Eilon, an old kibbutz and Idmit, a new one, neither with enough children of secondary school age, sought partners in their educational venture. Kabri too was no longer able to carry the cost of its local

23. See note 2, 113-26.

school. Thus they established a partnership that included Klil, a community settlement: it included a junior high school section at Kibbutz Eilon with residence for those interested and more outside children, with a senior section at Kabri. Thus the relatively limited framework was maintained, along with the residential option, while educational and social options, including opportunity for contacts with children from outside, were broadened.

Comprehensive inter-institutional cooperation takes in the senior campus run jointly by Manor, Kabri, two other Kibbutz Artzi residential institutions and the United Kibbutz Movement day school. This partnership is effective as regards twelve elective hours weekly in the senior school section, concentrated in two days a week. Each of the four campuses offers elective courses, and each grade level on all the campuses does its elective study on the same two days. To assure proper supervision and overcome transportation problems, students must take all their elective courses on one campus: each offer special courses in science, technology, the humanities or art. These limitations make it possible for a campus to specialize in fields where it has special competence. The advantages are clear, and include learning solutions for exceptional children. The first year mainly the most talented students participated, but numbers have grown, and today include weaker ones too. The principals meet regularly in the interests of ongoing agreement among all partners schools, which in turn not only makes the teaching staff more mobile and more effective, but allows for further cooperation in extracurricular activities, and joint representation vis-a-vis outside bodies. Despite costly transportation, and coordination problems, the basic premise of the project appears to be realized: "The Mateh Asher joint project is the cooperative teaching and education venture of four kibbutz schools in the district. Its main goal is to find opportunities for inter school cooperation: it is not an intermediate stage on the way to full union." In view of its successes, more ways to broaden cooperation in academic, social and administrative areas are constantly being examined. In 1995, a new project in distant learning, based on communication between computers, came into effect.²⁴

What can we learn from the wide variety of kibbutz secondary schools developing in the present out of the experience of the past? For one thing, that exclusive ideal types are dying out, including the updated residential institutions of the Kibbutz Artzi. Moreover, different combinations with different proportions of residential and day schools are possible. Third, we see that all examples of regional organization are in a continuous stage of change, and have not become

24. See note 2, 127-30.

stable for reasons that stem not only from the kibbutzim themselves, but also from external educational—social and technological influences. This being so, the continuum from total residential to day schools is part of the alternative model, the updated model of kibbutz school size, composed of five variables, plus the new totality dimension. (Additions and changes are always possible.) The model, continually updated, can serve, like earlier versions, for historical research, as shown in the Oranim case studies. At the same time the model can be used for planning in schools that are continually updating and/or in others like them: adaptations to environmental conditions are of course essential. "The Kibbutz School Between Uniqueness and Growth," mentioned earlier,²⁵ is an outstanding example of the combined research and planning uses of the model.

5. Measuring Totality on the New Continuum

Having a totality continuum that runs from residential to day schools does not yet mean that totality is measurable, though measuring is essential for complex and varied school types. Generally this is done by measuring the residential quality on one hand and closedness on the other. We will not go into detail here, having done so in "An Alternative Approach to Classifying and Measuring Residential Education, Group Care and Treatment Programs."²⁶ We dealt extensively with the theoretical development of these dimensions, proposing to define them as internal totality' and [external] community' dimension. Briefly, totality in our system depends on the type of activities in a given institution: maximum totality comprises formal studies, supplementary education and semi nonformal social activities within the school, besides completely nonformal, nonacademic activities like the youth movement. Minimum totality, by contrast, comprises formal studies and few if any other elements. Shapira²⁷ defines community orientation according to the emphasis placed on the community to which the school belongs and its ideology.

In this context community refers to the local (or regional) community, and the wider national and international ones. The degree of closedness therefore depends on how much emphasis the residential or

25. See note 2.

26. Yuval Dror, "An Alternative Approach to Classifying and Measuring Residential Education and Group Care and Treatment Programs: Internal Totality and Community Orientation as Separate Components," *Child and Youth Care Forum* 24/3:195-208.

27. Rina Shapira, "Residential Settings and Their Communities: Exchange Relations," in Yitzhak Kashti and Mordechai Arieli, *Residential Settings and the Community: Congruence and Conflict* (London, Freund Publishing Company), 140-56.

day school places on activities in the community. The two suggested dimensions—especially that of structured internal totality—determine the place of kibbutz secondary schools on the continuum. Educational institutions where most formal and nonformal activities, and the ideology, looks inward to the kibbutz are more total than day schools whose main activity is formal study, and where affinity for the larger society outside is simply one of uncommitted good citizenship.

What is there, then, that links the residential and day schools at either end of the continuum? It is the seven principles of kibbutz education, mentioned in the Uniqueness continuum. Maximum adherence to these principles is common to all kibbutz educational institutions, whether preschool, elementary, or secondary, and have been part and parcel of kibbutz education from its very beginning. Some of these principles are applied in other schools, but not with the same intensity, nor are they so integral a part of education as they are in the kibbutz in Israel. Differently from the bygone ideal types in the kibbutz world, the principle of combining a uniqueness and a totality dimension, and the entire updated model of school size proposed here, form a framework for analysing kibbutz schools of the past, and for planning changes in the future.

6. Conclusion: The Updated Model of Kibbutz School Size-Communal Implications

Updating the model by adding the totality dimension has communal significance beyond the borders of education in the Israeli kibbutz. From the experience of kibbutz secondary education, one learns that ideal types do not long withstand the test of reality, and must be constantly updated. Moreover, communal survival in other areas is possible not through dichotomy, but through continua of possibilities in different dimensions. Some of these dimensions come from outside the commune, and are balanced by retaining and preserving the basic principles common to all possibilities on the continuum. Our updated model with its new totality dimension also confirms Amitai Niv's communal survival model 1978/9).²⁸ It too is based on the balance between preserving internal values and openness to the society surrounding it. The survival of kibbutz education, like the survival of the kibbutz and of communes in general, depends on the balance between preserving unique communal principles, and links to the national and world society. It is no coincidence that Niv and Bar-On, from their different vantage points, developed the kibbutz' size

28. Amitai Niv, "The Survival of Social Innovation: The Case of the Commune and the Kibbutz," *The Kibbutz*, 6-7 (1978/79): 115-30, in Hebrew.

dilemma model, with its balance between preserving internal communal values, and integrating with the society external to it.²⁹ The totality continuum between residential and day schools, as an addition to the kibbutz secondary school size dilemma model, shows a possibility of balanced communal survival. This can be accomplished through transition from historical ideal models to more complex types that continually adapt to their environment, using the model both for historical research and for determining current communal policy.

29. See note 12 (and 11).