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CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Today, most American Jews live both as Jews and as members of the general community. Their handling of these two roles is complicated by a lack of cultural uniformity in American Jewry and by the fact that Jews are treated as a minority group by the non-Jewish members of society. The modes of adjustment — personal, familial, and social — which Jews develop to meet the problem of being Jewish and at the same time members of the larger community are exceedingly varied. The purpose of this study is to find out whether there is an association between the way Jewish parents prepare their children for their dual role — membership in both the Jewish community and the larger general community — and the children's personal-social adjustment.

The study falls logically into three major divisions. The first part is concerned with the different ways in which Jewish parents communicate to their children their own ideas about the significance and the implications of being Jewish in a predominantly non-Jewish society. The second part of the study describes the differences in social adjustment among the Jewish children studied. The third part discusses the relation between the parents' behavior and their children's personal-social adjustment. The structure (with respect both to parental behavior and children's adjustment) was developed after considerable
reading of the literature concerning adjustment of minority children in
general and Jewish children in particular.

Lewin asserts that the "Jewish problem" is the social fact that
Jews are members of a less-privileged minority group to which, whether
they like it or not, all Jews, regardless of individual differences,
are defined by the "dominant" group as belonging. According to Lewin,
this membership is the basis on which the "dominants" limit the privi-
leges and opportunities of individual Jews. He believes that the
manner in which parents handle the Jewish problem should be "...the same

---

1 The stimulus for this study came largely from two writings:
Kurt Lewin, Resolving Social Conflicts, Harper and Brothers, New York,
1948, Chapter 11 ("Bringing Up the Jewish Child"); and Bruno Bettle-
heim, "How Arm Our Children Against Anti-Semitism?" Commentary, Vol. 12,
September, 1951.

Also useful was the following mimeographed material published by
the Commission on Community Interrelations of the American Jewish Con-
gress: Chein, Isidore, Some Comments on "The Needs of Jewish Youth,"
New York, 1948; A Psychologist's Notes on the Impact of Current Trends
on Jews, New York, 1949; and, with Jacob I. Hurwitz, The Reactions of
Hurwitz, Jacob I., On Being a Jew: Perceptions, Attitudes and Needs of
Jewish Children, New York, 1949. Radke, Marian, Group Belonging of
Jewish Children in Relation to Their Age, New York, 1951; The Meaning
of Minority Membership to Jewish College Students, New York, 1951;
and, with Hadassah Davis, Jacob I. Hurwitz, and Pearl Pollack, Group
Finally, the detailed interview schedule and the "description of the
issues" which were used in "Experience Survey of Jewish Educators
and Group Workers on Problems in Preparing Jewish Youth for Their
Dual Role of Membership in the Jewish and General Communities," New
York, 1950.

Also helpful were "The Problem of Jewish Identification," by
Isidore Chein, in Jewish Social Studies, Vol. 17, July, 1955, and
"Forms and Expressions of Jewish Identification" by Marshall Sklare,
Marc Vosc, and Mark Zborowski. The authors of the latter article
were kind enough to send me the two questionnaires involved in their
study; they used one with adolescents and the other with the parents
of the adolescents. The final report on this study, which did not
appear until after all my data were collected, was The Riverton Study:
How Jews Look at Themselves and Their Neighbors, by Marshall Sklare
as in matters of sex or any other education, namely, true, open, and realistic. He maintains that if parents handle the Jewish problem correctly, their children are likely to show "...well adapted and balanced behavior, living happily and mingling with both Jewish and non-Jewish groups." If the parents evade their responsibility, their children are likely to show "decided lack of adjustment" manifested in "...such typical signs of Jewish maladjustment as over-tension, loudness, over-aggressiveness, excessively hard work...."

Lewin also says that "...an early build-up of a clear and positive feeling of belongingness to the Jewish group is one of the few effective things that Jewish parents can do for the later happiness of their children. In this way parents can minimize the ambiguity and the tension inherent in the situation of the Jewish minority group, and thus counteract various forms of maladjustment resulting therefrom." Some confusion develops, however, concerning what age Lewin means when he says "early." He gives the impression that he means around three years. "It is of first importance that a stable social ground be laid very early. The same experience of being called 'foster-child' which might upset the fifteen-year-old boy who was not aware of the real situation will have little or no effect at all on the child who was properly introduced to his real situation at the age of three." (Underlining mine.) If Lewin meant that this "clear and positive feeling of belongingness to the Jewish group" should

---

2 Lewin, op. cit., p. 183. 3 Ibid., p. 170. 4 Ibid.
5 Ibid., p. 183. 6 Ibid., p. 176.
begin at the age of three, he does not tell us how it is to be developed. However, he does say that at adolescence the Jewish child can be taught that the Jewish group is a "...dynamic whole based on interdependence rather than similarity."  He says further, "As a rule, the adolescent is well able to understand this fact. It will help him to see that his belonging or not belonging to the Jewish group is not a matter mainly of similarity or dissimilarity, or even one of like or dislike. He will understand that regardless of whether the Jewish group is a racial, religious, national, or cultural one, the fact that it is classified by the majority as a distinct group is what counts. ... He will see that the main criterion of belongingness is interdependence of fate. ... He must be sufficiently fact-minded to see clearly their interdependence of fate with the rest of the American Jews and indeed with the Jews all over the world."  Lewin does not make it clear just how parents are to create this "positive feeling of belongingness" in a three-year-old, let alone in an adolescent.

Not only does Lewin believe in an "early build-up of a clear and positive feeling of belonging to the Jewish group," but he also believes that Jewish parents should prepare their children early to meet anti-Semitism, even "...where the general environment is sufficiently friendly to exempt the young child from anti-Semitic difficulties."  As an example of such an environment he cites "a town of medium size in the Middle West containing a small Jewish group living in good relations with the Gentiles. ... There would not at first be many occasions where the non-Jewish environment makes

7 Ibid., p. 184. 8 Ibid. 9 Ibid., p. 171.
the growing Jewish child feel he is classified as different from Gentile children. He might go through nursery school and kindergarten up to the fourth grade of elementary school before his first experience of being called a 'dirty Jew,' perhaps on the occasion of a children's fight. "The attempt to keep this problem away from the child as long as possible, and softpedal it, will in all likelihood make for greater difficulties in adjustment later on."

Lewin also says: "Outstanding among the techniques that parents should employ is the treatment of Jewish problems not as an individual and private matter but as a social issue. For instance, to press the child harder for good behavior, or to raise his personal ambition higher than is customary in the Gentile majorit, the child merely in a state of keener tension that makes for less easy adaptation. Parents should from the very beginning stress the social aspect of the situation." Gordon Allport, in the foreword to Resolving Social Conflict, summarizes Lewin's position as follows: "A Jewish child, he believes, should not be shielded from the situation created by his group membership. It is not safe to assume that the discrimination he will encounter in later life constitutes merely so many hard knocks that he can adjust to when the time comes. The social ground of an individual's life is too important a matter to be left to chance developments. Like a foster child, the Jewish child needs to know from an early age that his conditions of security are in some respects unlike those of an average child. To be clear about

10 Ibid., p. 169. 11 Ibid., p. 183. 12 Ibid.
one's memberships is the only way for child or for adult to avoid the ravages of anxiety, self-hate, and debilitating resentment."

The major points made by Lewin are as follows: (1) The Jewish child must be given a "clear and positive feeling of belongingness to the Jewish group." (2) His parents must begin early (around three years of age) in the child's life to give him this feeling. (3) The child must be taught that he is a member of a less-privileged minority group. (4) The child must be prepared to meet anti-Semitism before he runs into it — even if the community is characterized by very good Jew-gentile relations. His parents should not keep the problem of anti-Semitism away from him or attempt to "softpedal" it in any way. (5) The child must be taught that the Jewish problem is a social issue, not a private matter. (6) The parents should not press their child to behave better than others because he is a Jew. (7) It doesn't matter whether the child's parents define the Jewish group in national, religious, cultural, or racial terms; the important thing is that the child be enabled to "...see that the main criterion of belongingness is interdependence of fate." "The fact that it [the Jewish group] is classified by the majority as a distinct group is what counts." Conscientious pursuit of Lewin's program is likely to produce Jewish boys and girls who will "...show a well adapted and balanced behavior, living happily and mingling with both Jewish and non-Jewish groups." If parents do not follow these procedures, Lewin believes, their


children are apt to show such "...typical signs of Jewish maladjustment as over-tension, loudness, over-aggressiveness, excessively hard work." 17

I will discuss first the areas of agreement between Bettleheim and Lewin, then the areas of fundamental disagreement. Bettleheim believes that "When all is said, to be born a Jew -- or born into any other minority -- means, in our present society, to experience discrimination sooner or later, more or less. The older Jewish child, at the proper time, must be educated, openly and realistically, to know that this will be his situation, which, as an adult, he must come to terms with if he would free his energies for constructive action -- including, it might well be, the fight against intolerance. Very early he must be taught 18 that the problem is a social one, not individual for him." Disregarding for the moment the question of "proper time," the common points of agreement between Lewin and Bettleheim are that the Jewish child should be informed, openly and realistically, that he is a member of a minority group and that the problem of prejudice and discrimination is a social issue, not an individual matter. Lewin and Bettleheim also agree on the important role the family plays in preparing the child for a successful adjustment to the "Jewish problem," but they disagree rather sharply on just what the family should do to insure this adjustment. Bettleheim says that "...as by now most parents recognize, institutions cannot provide the answer, at least not the full answer. It is still the parents who must help their children face up to the experience of race prejudice, and particularly so in the early years. Long before any institutional system of psychological fortification can begin to operate, it is they who must know how they are to 'handle the problem,' how they are

17 Ibid., p. 170. 18 Ibid., p. 217.
to prepare their child — if at all. It is they who will meet their child running from school or from a group of playmates with the Inevitable Question — an experience, moreover, that is likely to be even more painful to them than to the child." Whereas Lewin asserts that the parents must give the child a clear and positive sense of belongingness, Bettleheim believes that what the parents must give is a sense of security.

But this much is certain: only the small child who knew a maximum security within his family circle is ready to weather the insecurities of all the succeeding groups with which he may later identify himself. **Security within the family group: that is the key to this problem.**

This appears as a point of difference, but I think it is only a one-way difference; I mean that Lewin would probably have accepted Bettleheim's statement and have been willing to incorporate it with his own. We know from Bettleheim himself, however, that he cannot accept what he calls the "group belongingness" approach of Lewin and others.

As for burdening the child of nursery school age with any explanation about "racial" groups and their irrational hostilities, this is on the face of it absurd. Some such explanation may be given to the child of seven or eight who already has gained through his own experience a notion of "ingroups" and "outgroups," ...But the younger child can know nothing about "groups" — he only knows the private happiness he feels in belonging to his family and his small group of playmates. ...

Certainly, the sense of security an individual gains from "belonging" may be extremely important to him in meeting life's various situations. And it is not impossible that even the relatively young Jewish child may know and accept the fact that he is "Jewish" if he belongs to a family of strong Jewish traditions and to a community where a large number of Jews lead a distinctive life of their own. ...

Yet for more and more American Jews the reality, the unalterable reality, is something very different. Large numbers of them live dispersed among non-Jews, and even those who live in "Jewish areas" — in the large cities, for instance — show no strong cultural divergence from the American community at

---

19 Ibid., p. 209. 20 Ibid., p. 217.
large; if anything, they seek continually to reduce what divergencies remain. ... Adult Jews themselves are troubled by the problem of what remains to define them as Jews; the problem can hardly be easier for their children. It would seem, then, that for these children of unsegregated and culturally integrated Jews, it is impossible to contrive the kind of "belongingness" that Lewin advocates.21

Bettleheim does not believe that the "belongingness" of Lewin can be achieved by most American Jewish youngsters, but he does say:

The child's protection from the consequences of intolerance, to the extent that he can be protected at all, lies in his early and consistent feeling of belonging to the most important group he ever depends on -- his family -- and for that, to reiterate once more, he must look to his parents. On their own sense of security and how they convey it to him, the child's security will basically and primarily depend.22

(On page 211 of this same article, Bettleheim makes a critical comment concerning "adjustment": "...there are other values in life besides being subjectively immune to the stings of prejudice, nor is such immunity the only criterion of mental health. One can pay too high a price for 'adjustment.'")

The basic disagreement between Lewin and Bettleheim arises because Lewin emphasizes the need for creating a "clear and positive sense of belongingness to the Jewish group," while Bettleheim believes that such "group belongingness" is almost impossible for many Jewish adults to achieve, and that it would be "absurd" to try to create it in a child less than seven or eight years old. Both agree, however, that by the time he reaches his late grade-school years a Jewish child should be prepared against anti-Semitism. Both agree, further, that this preparation must be "open and realistic," and that the child should learn that he is a member of a less-privileged minority. Finally, they agree that the young child should be taught that anti-Semitism is a social

21 Ibid., pp. 210, 211. 22 Ibid., p. 217.
rather than an individual problem. However, Lewin doesn't do a very
good job of telling Jewish parents just how they can give their children
the "clear and positive feeling of belongingness to the Jewish group"
which he recommends, nor is Bettleheim specific as to how parents can
provide the secure home atmosphere which he believes will make their
children early and consistently feel that they securely belong to the
family.

In this study I have tried to find out how Jewish parents handle
the matter of Jewish belongingness, i.e., to discover the different
ways parents help their children define (a) the Jewish group, (b) their
relationship to this group, and (c) their responsibility to this group.
This study has also attempted to find out how Jewish parents discuss
with their children the fact that they, as Jews, are members of a less-
privileged minority and are likely to be discriminated against. Among
the questions raised were the following: Do Jewish parents discuss anti-
Semitism with their children? How much emphasis do these parents place
on anti-Semitism? What are the reasons they give their children for the
existence of anti-Semitism? With what kind of behavior do Jewish parents
encourage their children to meet anti-Semitism?

Neither Lewin nor Bettleheim discusses the kind of influence
Jewish parents exert on their children's choice of associates. I am in-
terested in knowing whether Jewish parents (1) encourage their children
to associate with non-Jewish children, (2) discourage this kind of
association, or (3) allow their children to associate with non-Jewish
children when their children wish to do so. Although the parents'
attitudes toward "mixing" are related to the way they handle the question
of anti-Semitism, it seemed more profitable to treat the "association"
factor separately. One aim of this study was to find out what variations in approach Jewish parents exhibit when discussing with their children the idea of mixed (Jewish and gentile) groups in such activities as (a) scouting, where only one sex would be involved, (b) dances under the auspices of a Jewish organization, (c) dances under the auspices of a gentile organization (outside of school), and (d) informal gatherings of both sexes at various homes.

In summary, three kinds of information were sought from the parents: (1) How did they handle questions concerning Jewish belongingness or identification? (2) How did they handle the problem of anti-Semitism? and (3) In what way did they try to influence their children with regard to associating with non-Jews?

The second part of the study deals with the children, and the differences in personal-social adjustment among them. Since it was feasible to interview only approximately one hundred parents, the number of children in the study was also limited to approximately one hundred. To ensure statistically respectable results from this number, the child population was so selected as to be relatively homogeneous with respect to age and sex. Eighth-grade boys were chosen because they are old enough either to have had experiences with prejudiced people themselves or to have understood the significance of discussions they had heard about prejudice and discrimination, and yet still young enough to be rather closely supervised and influenced by their parents. The school room was selected as the testing situation because it contained both Jewish and non-Jewish children, because it provided a relatively "neutral" context, and because it ensured that there had been sufficiently continuous association among the children to produce detectable patterns of personal-social acceptance and rejection.
The data concerning the Jewish boys had to produce a distinction between those who showed a "well adapted and balanced behavior" and those who did not; between those who were "living happily and mingling with both Jewish and non-Jewish groups" and those who were not; and among those who "over- emphasize their Jewishness, those who behave normally, and those who try to hide or to under-emphasize their Jewishness."

Lewin's descriptions of behavior, quoted above, can be stated as testable propositions: (1) If a Jewish boy is well adjusted to his status as a Jew in a mixed society (in this study the classroom is the boy's "society"), he does not seek his friends exclusively among either his Jewish or his non-Jewish classmates, nor does he reject classmates on the basis of their being either Jewish or non-Jewish. (2) A well-adjusted Jewish boy is more frequently chosen and less frequently rejected by his classmates (both Jewish and non-Jewish) than the Jewish boy who is not adjusted to his Jewish status. (3) A Jewish boy who is not adjusted to his status as a Jew will, according to Lewin, show "...such typical signs of maladjustment as over-tension, loudness, over-aggressiveness, excessively hard work..."

The third and final part of the study involves seeing whether there is any relationship between various child-rearing approaches used by these parents and the personal-social adjustment of their children. Stated in the form of a null hypothesis, it reads as follows: There is no association between the personal-social adjustment of eighth-grade Jewish boys and the ways in which their mothers handle certain questions related to being Jewish.

The nearest city having a Jewish community large enough to contain one hundred eighth-grade boys was Cincinnati, Ohio. Approximately 95 per cent of all eighth-grade Jewish children who are attending public
school in Cincinnati are enrolled in two schools. The total number of Jewish boys in the eighth grades of these two schools came to approximately one hundred, which eliminated the sampling problem. These one hundred Jewish boys, and their parents, became the objects of my research, my "study population." Although I knew (from information supplied by Jewish social agencies) that there were approximately one hundred Jewish boys in these two eighth grades, it was no simple matter to find which boys were Jewish or considered themselves to be Jews.

The Cincinnati public schools were prevented by law from keeping any record of the religious affiliation of their students. The teachers supplied me with the rolls of each eighth-grade class, and the students provided the names and addresses of their parents. These data were put on cards and given to the Jewish Community Relations Committee in Cincinnati. The committee ran the cards through several screenings, in order to identify as accurately as possible the Jewish children and their parents. This screening process involved the following questions: (1) Did certain people who had lived in the Cincinnati Jewish community for a number of years recognize the family as being Jewish? (2) Was the family on the membership list of a local synagogue or temple? (3) Had the family contributed to Jewish charities? and (4) Was the child a member of the Jewish Community Center? It is very unlikely that any family got through this screening without being identified as Jewish if they had ever, in any way, identified themselves as Jews in the community. When I telephoned these families to arrange for interviews, only five of the mothers said that the family was not Jewish. (These five families were not studied further.)
Only those boys were included in the study who were in school at the time that the personal-social adjustment tests were given. It was impossible to interview both the mothers and the fathers; I chose to interview the mothers. To summarize: The study population comprised those boys in the eighth grades of two Cincinnati public schools who were defined as Jewish and who were at school the day the personal-social adjustment tests were administered, and the mothers of these boys.

The kind of information which the study required from the parents posed some challenging methodological and technical problems. It did not seem wise to limit the range of the data by using only such formal, and relatively ambiguous, categories as Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform. Neither did I want merely to count such formal behavior items as synagogue attendance and home observances, although these items are definitely related to the different ways the parents express their Jewishness. The study was designed more to discover the subtle ways parents influenced their children as regards Jewishness than to document how frequently they required their children to attend Hebrew School, synagogue, etc.

In a pilot study in Hamilton, Ohio, I asked the mothers to recall whether their boys had ever brought home any problems related to Jewishness and, if they had, what answers the mothers had given to them. This procedure elicited some interesting information, but little of it could be used to answer the questions posed by this study. Many of the mothers had never been asked questions relating to Jewishness by their children, at least none they could recall. And the mothers who had discussed such problems with their children reported experiences that were interesting but not in any way comparable with each other. Obviously,
the necessary data could not be obtained merely by asking the mothers to try to remember whether their eighth-grade sons had brought home questions concerning Jewish identity, anti-Semitism, and "mixing." The solution was to create hypothetical situations which the children might realistically be expected to bring to their mothers for discussion. Thus, all of the mothers would be asked to respond to the same "conflict situations." The mothers were to be asked how they would discuss with their sons each of such specific situations as the following:

"Your son comes home from school. After a while he tells you, 'Bill Smith is having a birthday party at his house next Saturday night and I didn't get invited. I run around with Bill and some of the others who are going; I thought he'd ask me, too. But I didn't think too much about it because only a few of the kids in the class were going anyway. Then on the way home with Sandy I was muttering something about not getting an invitation to the party and he said, "What do you expect -- you're Jewish, aren't you?" I never thought of that and I began wondering about it. Do you think my being Jewish could have had anything to do with Bill not inviting me?'"

These "situations" were based on questions which 13- and 14-year-old Jewish boys actually had asked discussion leaders, rabbis, camp workers, and parents. The richest source of material for these "situations" was a series of tape-recorded discussions I had with eighth-grade Jewish boys in Dayton, Ohio. The "conflict situations" used in the final study were worded in the language of an eighth-grade

\[23\]

See Chapter IV for a complete listing of the "incidents."
boy, and each situation was aimed specifically at eliciting a response concerning either (1) Jewish belongingness, (2) Anti-Semitism, or (3) Association with non-Jews. After constructing these incidents I asked some Jewish students at Miami University, as well as a number of religious and secular leaders in nearby Jewish communities, to comment on them and to offer further suggestions concerning content and wording. A second pilot study, made in Dayton, Ohio, and using these incidents, elicited satisfactory responses.

In addition to responding to the conflict situations, the mothers answered questions on the following: age, occupation, education, income, religious affiliation and designation, number, age and sex of children in the family, and country of birth of themselves and their parents. Both the procedure followed in arranging for interviews with the mothers and the interviewing procedure itself are discussed in Chapter IV.

Now we turn to the measurement of the boys' personal-social adjustment. The hypothesis required data concerning which of the Jewish boys sought their friends largely among their Jewish classmates and which did not; which were chosen for friends mainly by Jews, mainly by gentiles, by both, or by neither. The size of the sample made it imperative to get an acceptance score for every Jewish eighth-grade boy. Therefore, the instrument used had to be one that would yield a score for each boy. Some sort of sociometric technique was called for, but not the classic kind in which the children are asked to name which of their

24See the Appendix for the family background data sheet, and Chapter II for a complete report on all such data received from parents.
associates they would like (and which they would not like) to have with them in various specified situations. This study needed a device that would require each child to rate every other child in the class, and that would reveal varying degrees of personal-social acceptance or rejection. The instrument I chose was the well-known, versatile, and reliable Ohio State Social Acceptance Test.

In addition to measuring the personal-social adjustment of the boys according to the Social Acceptance Test, it was necessary to know whether the boys exhibited any "typical signs of Jewish maladjustment" as listed by Lewin, i.e., loudness, conformity, aggressiveness, tension, overworking, etc. To this end another test was developed, patterned after the Ohio State Guess Who Test. This test showed how each Jewish boy was judged by his peers; these judgments were the basis for deciding which of the boys exhibited maladjusted behavior and which did not. The next step was to find out whether there was any association between the child's "manifest personality," as measured by the Guess Who Test, and the kind of approach his mother had used in handling the "Jewish problem" with him. A full report on the construction and use of these sociometric instruments will be found in Chapter III.

This study does not attempt to examine all the variables that may be related to an eighth-grade Jewish boy's personal-social adjustment. Many of these independent variables, however, such as family income and occupation of father, have been included and an attempt has been made to assess their significance. Other variables, however, such as physical

25 See the Appendix for a copy of the social acceptance test.

26 See the Appendix for a copy of the "guess who" test.
appearance, security of relationship with the family, possession of physical skills, remain untested, although they may be significantly associated with a boy's acceptance of others and their acceptance of him.

In summary: The views of Lewin and Bettleheim were used as a point of departure. This study was designed to find out whether certain aspects of parental behavior are related to the Jewish boy's adjustment to the society of his peers. By means of individual interviews, the study investigated how each mother handled questions related to (1) Jewish belongingness, (2) anti-Semitism, and (3) "mixing." During the interview, the mother was asked to respond to hypothetical "conflict situations" which her own son might have questioned her about. Certain background data on the family were also collected. The other side of the research equation, the boys' personal-social adjustment, was measured by two kinds of sociometric devices: a social acceptance scale and a "guess who" test.
CHAPTER II
DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY POPULATION

This chapter gives the relevant facts about Cincinnati's Jewish community, and discusses in some detail the Jewish families studied and the school population tested.

Cincinnati differs in three important respects from the cities in which the greatest number of American Jews live: (1) It is located in the Midwest; (2) It has a population of less than 600,000; and (3) It has a Jewish population of only 25,000.\(^1\) In 1955, according to a recent demographic study by Erich Rosenthal, 73.6 per cent of the American Jewish population lived along the Atlantic seaboard, 8.6 per cent in California, 11.6 per cent in the five states bordering the Great Lakes, and 6.2 per cent in all other areas combined.\(^2\) Only 3.08 per cent of all American Jews lived in Ohio in 1955. Rosenthal's study also points out that "...70 per cent of the total Jewish population reside in the 13 largest cities of the country, i.e., those having more than 600,000 inhabitants."\(^3\) Rosenthal says that in New York City "...about 40 per cent of the total Jewish population of the United States are concentrated..."\(^4\) These facts lead Rosenthal to warn that "...any description of the total Jewish population will be heavily influenced

---


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 502.  
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 502.
by the social characteristics found in the Jewish population of New York City."5 The cities most closely resembling Cincinnati, both in total size and in proportion of population Jewish, are Buffalo (22,000 Jews in a total population of 580,000), Kansas City, Mo. (22,000 Jews in a total population of 457,000), Minneapolis (23,000 Jews in a total population of 522,000), and Milwaukee (30,000 Jews in a total population of 637,000).6

Not only is the American Jewish population unevenly distributed over the country, it is also unevenly distributed within the cities. The Jewish population in Cincinnati is so distributed that approximately 84 per cent of it is in an area five miles long and not quite two miles wide. Cincinnati's Jewish population is an extremely segregated one. And yet, Cincinnati is known for its long record of good Jewish-gentile relations. In any case, it was this segregation that enabled me to reach nearly 90 per cent of Cincinnati's eighth-grade Jewish boys by testing in only two of the city's public schools.

After the families to be used in the study were identified, as described in Chapter I, the next job was to make contact with them and try to secure the parents' -- specifically, the mothers' -- cooperation. The students were tested early in March, and the interviewing began early in April. Neither the boys nor their parents ever knew of the connection between the school tests and the home interviews.

The families were grouped according to conveniently limited ecological areas, and all the families in each area were first approached at the same time. The interviews were scheduled by areas in order to keep travel time at a minimum.

5Ibid., p. 502
6World Almanac, op. cit., p. 328
The first contact with the mothers was a letter sent from the Cincinnati Community Relations Committee. This letter told the mothers enough about the study to make them realize its significance, and thus to secure their cooperation, without arousing their anxiety. By introducing me and describing the study, the Committee endorsed the project. It asked the mothers for their full cooperation, and added a postscript that encouraged them to call the Community Relations office if they had any questions about me or the study.

Shortly after the mothers received the letters, I telephoned them to arrange for interviews in their homes. The letter alone had induced many of the mothers to participate in the study, and all I had to do was arrange a time for the interview. Some of the others needed reassurance before the interview could be discussed. These mothers asked such questions as, "Where did you get my name?" and "Tell me a little more about it." In the telephone conversations I never used the word "interview," feeling that it had a slightly forbidding connotation. I said, in effect, "I am calling to arrange a time convenient for you to talk with me." When they asked how long the talk would take, I answered, "No longer than an hour." When they asked, "What do you want to talk to me about?" I referred to the letter and said, "I'm studying the various ways parents handle situations brought to them by their children. It won't be a matter of 'right' or 'wrong' answers -- I would just like to find out what different approaches mothers use." If a mother said, "Why me?" as many of them did, I told her that I was getting in touch with all the mothers in the Jewish community who had sons in the eighth grade.

See the Appendix for a copy of this letter.
A number of the mothers who were willing, ultimately, to cooperate at first pleaded "busy" and were unable to find an hour when a private interview could be held. I continued to call these mothers during the interview period, and finally succeeded in talking with most of them. Two of the mothers were interviewed at their places of business. One mother came to the Community Relations Committee office. A few never were interviewed, because a time could not be arranged. A few mothers who said they would like to cooperate in the study were unable, because of illness, death in the family, or divorce, to see me during the two months I had set aside for my interviewing. Only three flatly refused to talk with me, without any reason whatsoever. Among the 102 Jewish boys was one set of twins, which meant that my total sample of mothers was 101. Of these, I finally interviewed 83. The distribution of the 18 "Refusals," according to reasons given, is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF REFUSALS ACCORDING TO REASONS GIVEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sickness, death in family, divorce</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too busy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Security&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn't arrange</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Not Jewish&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\] Because the husband was working for the government, the couple were afraid to be interviewed.

\[b\] Some of these mothers had to cancel appointments with me because of circumstances beyond their control, and other times could not be arranged for during my interviewing period.

\[c\] "There must be some mistake -- we're not Jewish."
The number of mothers not interviewed is important, because it reduces the total number by that amount. This means that some of the cell frequencies are lower than they would have been if all the 101 mothers had been interviewed. The fact that 18 mothers were not interviewed also raises the question: To what extent do the 83 who were interviewed represent all mothers of eighth-grade Jewish boys in Cincinnati? I have little doubt that the 83 mothers who were interviewed are fairly representative of the 101 originally selected, since the 18 who were unable to talk to me gave a variety of reasons for refusing. The absence of these 18 mothers may mean that among the 83 interviewed there is a slightly higher educational level, and a higher income level, than the entire 101 would have had.²

At two points in this study the question of representativeness is irrelevant: when I am looking for an association between parental behavior and the boys' personal-social adjustment; and when I am comparing the mothers' responses to the various interview items.

The following tables give the pertinent family characteristics, which were recorded at the end of each interview. Thus the reader can get a picture of the families in the study.

²This is a crude judgment, based on an evaluation of the addresses, and of the affiliations insofar as they were available to me, of the eighteen mothers not interviewed.
TABLE 2

NATIVITY OF PARENTS AND GRANDPARENTS OF EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH BOYS, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nativity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both native born</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One foreign born</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both foreign born</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All native born</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One foreign born</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two foreign born</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three foreign born</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four foreign born</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that it is not as simple to speak of "second and third generation Jews" as one might gather from the contemporary literature on American Jews. When both of a native-born boy's parents are foreign born, he is called "second generation," and when both of his parents are native born, he is called "third generation." But what can we call the native-born son of mixed ancestry, i.e., one parent native born and the other foreign born? Should he be called a "second and one-half generation" Jew? Nearly one-third of the boys in this study belong somewhere between the categories "second generation" and "third generation." Only five of the boys in the study came from families that had been native born for two generations on each side.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious affiliation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed affiliation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a In all except the last category, both parents belonged to the same congregation.

b Two of the mothers were non-Jewish; the husband of one was "non-affiliated" and the husband of the other was Reform. The other two mothers in this category called themselves Orthodox, but said that their husbands were not affiliated.

To get the facts reported in Table 3, I asked the mothers what their own and their husband's religious affiliation was. If a mother didn't know what the question meant, I asked "Are you affiliated with an Orthodox, a Conservative, or a Reform congregation?" In all except four families, the mother and the father had the same affiliation. This table shows a distribution differing from what is commonly thought to be characteristic of American Jewish communities. My findings differ, for instance, from those of Marshall Sklare and Marc Vosk in their recent study of the Jews of "Riverton." Sklare and Vosk found that the parents

---


of adolescents in this community were 16 per cent Orthodox, 43 per cent Conservative, 30 per cent Reform, 4 per cent "nonreligious," and 7 per cent "Don't know, it depends, or no answer." The sample used in my study shows a range of affiliation that makes statistical analysis not only possible but meaningful.

TABLE 4
YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY MOTHERS AND FATHERS OF EIGHTH-GRAGE
JEWISH BOYS, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of school completed</th>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years of college</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years of college</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business or vocational training$^a$</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years of high school</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years of high school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years of schooling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 8 years, but some</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No schooling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$This category includes all those who attended business college, etc., after graduating from high school, but who did not attend "regular" schools (as defined by the 1950 Census) offering courses required for college, university, or professional school degrees.

Table 4 shows that approximately 85 per cent of the fathers and 90 per cent of the mothers had graduated from high school, and that 34 per cent of the fathers and 14 per cent of the mothers had graduated from college. The parents then, have a relatively high educational level — higher, than would probably be found among the Jewish populations of the larger cities in the East.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, technical, and kindred workers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and kindred workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives and kindred workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers, except private household</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the categories used in the 1950 Census. The Census included a few categories such as farmers, farm laborers, etc., that were not needed in this table.

Deceased.

As indicated by Table 5, the occupational distribution of my sample is even more top-heavy than the educational distribution. If this table were divided into three categories, the result would be: professional and managerial, 75 per cent; clerical and sales, 11 per cent; and skilled labor, semi-skilled labor, and service workers 14 per cent. I suspect that the Cincinnati Jewish population differs from that of large Eastern cities in occupational distribution, as it did in educational distribution. Cincinnati's occupational distribution, showing a concentration in the professional and managerial groups, made it hard to find any association between father's occupation and son's adjustment.
Closely related to occupation and education is family income. Each mother was asked to select, from a list of income categories one which included the total income, before taxes, of her family for the year 1956. The eight categories used were those in Table 6; they range from under $3,500 to over $25,000. There was much less hesitation on this item than had been anticipated, probably because it was the last question, and was asked in the same matter-of-fact way as all the others had been. A few of the mothers demurred at first, but they answered when I explained how important the income variable is in social research. The nearest thing to a refusal came from three mothers who would not pick an exact category, but who finally did say that their family incomes were "over" a certain amount. In each of these cases I put the income in the next category above the figure they gave. The income categories in this study differ from those in most social research in that they continue beyond the "$10,000" level. The mid-point of the actual distribution turned out to be nearer $15,000 than $10,000.

The mid-point of the distribution is in the $10,000-$15,000 category, with approximately 36 per cent reporting more than $15,000 a year and approximately 43 per cent reporting less than $10,000 per year. Although the income distribution of the sample has a higher median than that of the city as a whole, it is not as skewed as the occupational distribution and, therefore, is more suitable for statistical purposes.
TABLE 6
INCOME OF THE FAMILIES OF EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH
BOYS FOR THE YEAR 1956, CINCINNATI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 and over</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-19,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-14,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,500-9,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000-7,499</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,500-4,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $3,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In one case the father had died recently and the estate had not yet been settled. In the other case the family business had gone into bankruptcy and the current earnings were not at all representative.*

The median age of the mothers was approximately 43, and that of the fathers was approximately 47. These medians were calculated from a distribution in which each class interval was just one year. These medians reveal nearly the same difference in age between husbands and wives as exists in the United States generally. Table 7 is abridged, each class interval being five years instead of one year. The table shows that nearly twice as many mothers as fathers were under 40 years of age, and it also shows, even more dramatically, that while only 4.8 per cent of the mothers were over 50 years of age, 28 per cent of the fathers were over 50.
### TABLE 7

**AGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE MOTHERS AND FATHERS OF EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH BOYS, CINCINNATI: 1957**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mothers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 40 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>82(^a)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) One father was deceased.

### TABLE 8

**EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE MOTHERS OF EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH BOYS, CINCINNATI: 1957**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neither working nor seeking work</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full time</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 8, about two-thirds of the mothers do not work. Those who work are about evenly divided between part-time and full-time work. Labor force statistics concerning married women indicate that the members of the study sample are employed at a rate higher than the national average for women who are at this income level and who have children under eighteen years of age.\footnote{11}

In addition to family affiliation, the mothers were asked how often the family attended religious services. The following table shows that 13 per cent said the family (or the father) attended religious services at least once a week, while approximately 50 per cent said that the family (or father) attended only at the high holidays or not at all.

Table 9 bears out the complaint of many rabbis that only a minority of Jews attend religious services, except at the high holidays, with any regularity.

As Sklare and Vosk have said, "Parents can do more than approve or object to the children's individual friends; they can, first of all, deliberately settle in parts of town where their children will be sure to find Jewish companions."\footnote{12} In this study, as in the Sklare and Vosk study, the parents were asked the actual composition of their neighborhood with regard to Jewish and non-Jewish residents, and were also asked what kind of neighborhood they would prefer. The results of these two questions are presented in table 10.


\footnote{12Op. cit., p.37.}
TABLE 9
ATTENDANCE AT RELIGIOUS SERVICES BY FAMILIES OF EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH BOYS, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance at religious services</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month or more, but not weekly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than only at high holidays, but less than once a month</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only at high holidays</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 10
DISTRIBUTION OF RIVERTON JEWISH FAMILIES AND THE FAMILIES OF EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH BOYS IN CINCINNATI, IN PRESENT AND PREFERRED NEIGHBORHOODS, ACCORDING TO NEIGHBORHOOD COMPOSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood composition</th>
<th>Present neighborhood Cincinnati (N=83)</th>
<th>Riverton (N=200)</th>
<th>Preferred neighborhood Cincinnati (N=83)</th>
<th>Riverton (N=200)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively Jewish</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly Jewish</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly non-Jewish</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively non-Jewish</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a A category not used in The Riverton Study.

*b For some reason, the parallel term was not used in The Riverton Study, where "Overwhelmingly" was used instead of "Predominantly."
If we combine the first two categories of Table 10, thus making a category comparable to the first one in the Riverton Study, we find that 60 per cent of the Cincinnati families say they live in neighborhoods that are either exclusively or predominantly Jewish, while only 20 per cent of the Riverton families live in such neighborhoods. Of the Riverton families, 28 per cent lived in predominantly gentile neighborhoods, while only 6 per cent of the Cincinnati families lived in such neighborhoods.

The two communities also differ in the kinds of neighborhoods they prefer. More of the Cincinnati families than of the Riverton families said they would prefer to live in mixed neighborhoods. Sixty per cent of the Cincinnati families were living in predominantly Jewish neighborhoods at the time of my interviews; approximately 34 per cent lived in mixed neighborhoods, and only 6 per cent lived in neighborhoods where non-Jews predominated. This distribution helps to corroborate the earlier assertion that the Cincinnati Jewish community is a highly segregated one.

**TABLE 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition of social groups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively Jewish</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly Jewish</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly non-Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively non-Jewish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jewish families also influence their children's attitude toward choosing friends by the kinds of groups the parents themselves invite to the home for purely social entertaining.

The responses tabulated in Table 11 are answers to the question: "When you entertain in your home, would you say that your guests are exclusively Jewish, predominantly Jewish, mixed, predominantly non-Jewish, or exclusively non-Jewish?" Slightly more than one-third of the mothers said that their entertaining was "exclusively Jewish." The mothers who said their entertaining was mixed could have meant that their entertaining was either always, usually, sometimes, or seldom "mixed." One mother first said her entertaining was mixed, but later pointed out that she invited all Jewish friends one night and all non-Jewish another night — that she did not really "mix" the two groups. She also said that the only reason she entertained any non-Jews at all was that her husband's business made it necessary. In fact, a number of the mothers who said their entertaining was "predominantly Jewish," or "mixed," volunteered the additional information that the non-Jewish quests were often business associates.

Since families have greater control over the composition of their guest lists than they have over the composition of the neighborhoods they live in, it is significant that the mothers interviewed showed a preference, in their home entertaining, for largely-Jewish groups.

In this section I shall include a few background statistics on the Jewish boys themselves. Table 12 presents the birth-order positions of these boys. Past research has indicated that birth order, as a social variable, may be significantly related to a boy's personal-social adjustment.
There are enough "oldest" and "youngest" boys to make possible the statistical analysis presented in Chapter V.

**TABLE 12**

BIRTH ORDER OF EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH BOYS, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth order</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only child</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldest of two or more</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle of three or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest of two or more</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 13**

AMOUNT OF RELIGIOUS TRAINING OF EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH BOYS, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious training</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious school</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious school and tutor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious school and Hebrew school</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parochial school for at least one year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One index of the family's religious influence on the son was the mother's answer to the question, "How much religious training has your
son received?" In Table 13 these answers are arranged in categories representing a continuum in amounts of religious training. "Religious school" means the classes the boys attend either on Saturday or Sunday mornings, either at a synagogue or a temple. "Hebrew school" means the religious training the boys get after school two or more afternoons a week. Approximately 10 per cent of the boys fell at the two extremes, while half of them fell into the category "Religious school and Hebrew school," which means attendance at religious school on the weekends and Hebrew school at least twice a week after public school. This table is closely related to the next one, which tells how many of the boys had been Bar Mitzvahed.

TABLE 14
EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH BOYS BAR MITZVAHED, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar Mitzvah</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the next chapter will present the data on the parents' attitudes toward the Bar Mitzvah, I should point out here how a comparison of Table 3 and Table 14 reveals that many boys whose parents were neither Orthodox nor Conservative had been Bar Mitzvahed. Only 43 per cent of the sample were Orthodox or Conservative, but 70 per cent of the boys had been Bar Mitzvahed. In other words, of the families that were in any way affiliated with a synagogue or temple, 80 per cent had boys who were Bar Mitzvahed.
Although intelligence is hardly a "background characteristic of the family," it fits in this chapter better than anywhere else, and since there is a relationship between intelligence and friendship patterns it has been included as a study variable. Percentile ranks are used instead of I.Q. scores, since most of the available school records gave the boy's rank but not his I.Q. These ranks were based on group tests which had been administered to all Cincinnati public school children, tests on which Cincinnati children approached the national norm — i.e., approximately 10 per cent in each decile.

**TABLE 15**

**PERCENTILE RANK OF EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH BOYS IN INTELLIGENCE TEST SCORES, CINCINNATI: 1957**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 reveals a very skewed distribution. There is enough variation, however, to permit a statistical study (see Chapter V) of the relationship between intelligence and personal-social acceptance.

**Summary of background characteristics of sample.** The boys in this study were all native born, and the majority of them (57 per cent) had native-born parents. Twelve per cent of the boys had foreign-born parents, and 31 per cent had one foreign-born parent and one native-born parent.
The largest number of families (38.5 per cent) belonged to Reform congregations, and the remainder were almost equally divided among Orthodox, Conservative, and "non-affiliated or mixed." The parents were a highly educated group, 85 per cent of the mothers and 90 per cent of the fathers having completed high school; 33 per cent of the fathers and 14 per cent of the mothers had graduated from college.

Eighty-six per cent of the fathers were in "white collar" occupations. Although the incomes of the families were high (the median yearly income was approximately $12,500), income had a better distribution, for statistical analysis purposes, than either education or occupation. Twelve per cent of the families had incomes of less than $5,000, and 18 per cent had incomes of over $25,000. In age, most of the parents were in their forties; the mothers' median age was 43, and the fathers' was 47. Not quite one-third of the mothers worked outside the home; of these, only one-half worked full time.

Most of the families attended religious services rather infrequently; half of the families (52 per cent) either did not attend, or attended approximately twice a year. At the other extreme were the 13 per cent who attended weekly or more often.

Fifty-three per cent of the mothers said that they lived in neighborhoods that were predominantly Jewish, 7 per cent said their neighborhoods were all Jewish, 34 per cent said their's were mixed, and 6 per cent said they lived in predominantly non-Jewish neighborhoods. Forty-two per cent said that their home entertaining involved predominantly Jewish groups; the rest of the mothers said that the social groups they entertained were either exclusively Jewish (36 per cent) or mixed (22 per cent).
With respect to birth order, the boys were about evenly divided between "oldest" (39 per cent) and "youngest" (37 per cent). Sixteen per cent were "only" children, and 8 per cent were "middle" children.

In regard to religious training, the largest group of boys (49 per cent) had attended religious school on weekends and also Hebrew school after public school. Nearly 11 per cent had received no religious training, while almost 10 per cent had gone to Jewish parochial school for at least a year. Seventy per cent of the boys had been Bar Mitzvahed.

School records showed that, as a group, the boys ranked high in intelligence: almost 43 per cent of them were in the top decile, only 18 per cent were below the 70th percentile, and none were below the 40th percentile.

The two schools used in the study were selected not because they were representative of Cincinnati schools, but because they contained approximately 90 per cent of the eighth-grade Jewish boys attending public school in the city. Both of the schools contain grades seven through twelve. Both schools draw their students primarily from families of the middle income level; very few "poor" children attend either school. In forming their classes, both schools try to put together students of nearly comparable intelligence and ability; thus, each of the classes tested was relatively homogeneous with respect to intelligence and performance. Such homogeneity was important, since the students were asked to rate their fellow classmates on the sociometric tests; because their fellow classmates were comparable in intelligence and ability, these variables did not have to be considered in accounting for the rating differences.
The two schools contained 21 eighth-grade classes, 9 in one school and 12 in the other. The following table shows the composition of these classes with respect to sex and Jewish and non-Jewish identification. The classes ranged in number of students from 23 to 38, the median size being 33. The majority of the classes had between 30 and 35 students. The proportions of Jewish students in the two schools differed slightly. In one school, the Jewish students were approximately 38 per cent of the eighth grade, while in the other they were 27 per cent. The figures in Table 16 enable us to calculate that the Jewish students made up 32 per cent of the eighth grades of the two schools. The number of Jewish boys in each of these 21 classes ranged from 1 to 9. Table 17 gives a frequency distribution of these classes, according to the number of Jewish boys in each class.

Tables 16 and 17 are very important, because they tell why certain of the scores were not calculated for some of the Jewish boys in my sample. For example: there are no acceptance scores from Jewish boys for the 18 boys in the last eight classes of Table 17, because I decided that such calculations should require at least four Jewish boys in each class. (I shall discuss the calculation of these scores in detail in Chapter III.) The number of Jewish boys in Table 16 is 107, but the choices made by 5 of the boys could not be used because these boys were absent the day the tests were given. The mothers of these five boys were not interviewed. Not all of the remaining 101 mothers were interviewed (a set of twins accounts for there not being 102 mothers), for reasons listed in the next chapter, but all the boys' choices were incorporated into the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Boys Jewish</th>
<th>Boys Non-Jewish</th>
<th>Girls Jewish</th>
<th>Girls Non-Jewish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of male Jewish students per class</td>
<td>Number of classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III
PERSONAL-SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT TESTING

This chapter will discuss the limitations inherent in the testing situation; how the tests were selected; the testing procedure; the methods used in scoring and classifying the test results; and some of the findings.

A number of the tests described in the Mental Measurements Yearbookcould have provided me with various kinds of data on the personal-social adjustment of the boys in the study (for example: the Minnesota Personality Scale, the Mooney Problem Check List, the California Test of Personality, and the California Psychological Inventory). These tests would have provided from five to eighteen different scores; depending on the test, I could have obtained scores on such things as "sociability," "self-acceptance," "sense of personal worth," "belongingness," and "relation to people in general." However, none of these tests seemed likely to provide data concerning each boy's social acceptance of others and their acceptance of him.

I decided the study required a sociometric type of test. I might have used both sociometric and personality tests, except that giving these two kinds of tests would have taken too much of the students' school time. In addition, the superintendent's office did not want to give me permission
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to use personality tests of the kind mentioned above, because Cincinnati's school officials believed that such tests often aroused anxieties in the children.²

My next job was to find the kind of sociometric test that would most clearly reveal patterns of inter-personal acceptance and rejection, as well as any signs of personal maladjustment. As I said in Chapter I, with respect to these patterns of acceptance and rejection: "I needed to know which of the Jewish boys sought their friends largely among their Jewish classmates and which did not; which were chosen for friends mainly by Jews, mainly by gentiles, by both, or by neither. The size of the sample made it imperative to get an acceptance score for every Jewish eighth-grade boy." With respect to signs of personal maladjustment, I said in Chapter I: "I wanted to know whether the boys exhibited any 'typical signs of Jewish Maladjustment' as listed by Lewin, i.e., loudness, conformity, aggressiveness, tension, overworking, etc."

With these considerations in mind, I decided to use a modified version of the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale to measure acceptance and rejection, and a "guess who" type of test to detect personal maladjustment. I decided to use the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale rather than a "pure" sociometric technique, because only by means of a forced-choice ranking method of this kind could I be sure to get data for each of the boys in my study. The scale departs from the "pure" form of sociometric testing in

²Cincinnati's school officials also required reassurance on the following points: that I was undertaking bona fide research, and that it had merit; that I would conduct the tests in a professional manner and would arouse as little anxiety as possible among the students; that no student would be coerced into participating in the project; that the anonymity of the students and the schools would be protected; and that the principals of the two schools were willing to cooperate with me.
serval ways. An excellent article by Lindzey and Borgatta discusses both the requirements of the "pure" form and the many departures from it. According to Lindzey and Borgatta:

The most important requirements of the sociometric test generally advocated by Moreno are as follows:

1) The limits of the group should be indicated to the subjects.
2) The subjects should be permitted an unlimited number of choices or rejections. They should be encouraged to choose as many or as few of the group members as they wish.
3) The subjects should be asked to indicate the individuals they choose or reject in terms of specific criteria. ...
4) Results of the sociometric questions should be used to restructure the group. ...
5) The subjects should be permitted to make their choices and rejections privately, without other members of the group being able to identify the responses.
6) The questions used should be gauged to the level of understanding of the members of the group. ...

Except in cases where special empirical interests prohibit it, members of the group should have been in association for a sufficient time to permit the formation of affective ties and repulsions within the group. If stability of choice and rejection is important, it is evident that this cannot be expected until the members of the group have shared experiences over a period of time.\(^3\)

The Ohio Social Acceptance Scale met Lindzey and Borgatta's requirements (1), (5), and (6): The limits were established within which the choices were to take place -- the home-room classes; the children had complete privacy when they made their choices, and were assured that no one except the researchers would ever find out what choices they had made; finally, the test was worded with the children's level of comprehension in mind. Lindzey and Borgatta's third requirement was also met, but not in the usual way. Most sociometric tests ask the subject to choose those he would like to work with, sit next to, etc. The test I used asked the subject to rank his classmates on a six-point continuum ranging from

"1. My very, very best friends," to "6. Dislike them." Each of these points was accompanied by a paragraph describing in "eighth-grade language" the kind of behavior usually associated with that degree of social acceptance. The construction of the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale is described in an article by Louis Raths.  

Concerning deviations from the more or less pure form of sociometric test, Lindzey and Borgatta say, "...relatively few studies in this area, perhaps not more than a quarter, meet all these requirements. ...There are many circumstances where modified sociometric techniques are the only ones that can be used, and others where modifications lead to more meaningful results."  

The acceptance scale used does not meet the second requirement listed above — an unrestricted number of responses. It requires each child to rate every other child in his class. Of this kind of deviation, Lindzey and Borgatta say, "One of the most frequent modifications is in the limitation upon the number of choices the individual may make, or, more accurately, the specification of the number of choices the individual is required to make." One of the main reasons for choosing the Ohio Acceptance Scale was that it requires each subject to rate each other subject. I was afraid that the method advocated by the sociometric "purists" would not produce the kind of data needed — each Jewish boy's pattern of acceptance of Jewish boys, non-Jewish boys, Jewish girls, and non-Jewish girls, as well as their acceptance of him. 

5Lindzey, p. 408. 6Ibid.
The test used did not meet Lindzey and Borgatta's fourth requirement in that it did not include a promise to "restructure the group." In discussing deviations from this requirement, Lindzey and Borgatta say:

In many cases, because of the nature of the group or the nature of the criterion, it is impossible to introduce such changes. Subjects frequently give careful and accurate judgments in the absence of immediate and personal benefit. Thus, we may view restructuring the group as desirable because of the added realism and motivation it provides for the subject but, at the same time, it is only one of many factors that determine the relation between subject and research worker and it should not be considered an indispensable requirement.

Obviously, I would not have been allowed to promise the "restructuring" of the twenty-one eighth-grade classes I tested.

In each class, the tester was introduced to the students by the teacher, who then either left the room or went to the back. Each tester introduced the tests in the following words:

First I want to tell you that you're not going to take a test! What you write for me will have nothing to do with your school grade — in fact, no one at this school will see these papers after you have written on them.

I'm asking you to help in a scientific study of eighth-grade students. This study is exactly like the studies being done by other scientists with such groups as social clubs, factory workers, and bomber crews. In this way we learn the characteristics of different kinds of groups.

What you write on the papers that I will hand out will help us understand eighth-grade groups. We need to know how each of you feels about every other person in your group. We need to know what you think. There are no right or wrong answers — just your answers. And in a scientific study like this, you should fill in these papers as honestly and carefully as you can.

Neither your classmates nor your teachers will know what you have written. Only the university research people working on this study will ever see these papers. So — you can be honest without any worry at all. You can help us do a serious and important study of eighth-grade classes.

(Booklets were passed out.)

To be sure we don't get any of the papers mixed up, will you please write your name on the cover? And now, write your name on the front of each booklet.

7Ibid.
All right, now open booklet number one. I will read the directions out loud, while you read them to yourself.

(Directions were read.)

It won't take long to go through the three booklets. You will have plenty of time to finish them. When you have finished one booklet, close it and start on the next one. When you have finished the third one, raise your hand and I will pick up your completed folder. Then you do your own work until the rest of the class is finished.

I'll answer questions now, if you still have any. If you have any questions after you start, just raise your hand and I'll come to you.

Okay. Work carefully and honestly. You can be sure that no one you know will ever know what you have written for me.

I felt that the students did a conscientious and thoughtful job of filling in the test forms, and the kind of careful discrimination shown by the test results supported this feeling.

The second test given to the students was a "guess who" test. As Lindzey and Borgatta describe it,

"This technique involves presenting the subjects with various behavior descriptions and asking them to 'guess who' among the members of their group this description best fits. ... In many cases this kind of data has been used to supplement conventional sociometric techniques and provide a picture of the reputations or impressions created by the subjects on other members of the group (i.e., the manifest personality)."

To get material for this test, I asked some of the eighth-grade classes in Oxford, Ohio, to "Describe in your own words the behavior of those members of your class whom you would call 'cheerful,' 'shy,' 'good sport,' 'touchy,' ..." Using the descriptions written by these students as a guide, I reworded certain items from the Ohio Recognition Scale called "Who's Who in My Group," and added some of my own to complete the test. A copy of this test is in the Appendix.

---

8 Ibid., 410.
The next step was to pre-test these two devices, which I did in another Oxford eighth-grade class, with the help of two Miami grade students. I had hired these students for the testing phase of my study; I needed help in administering the tests in Cincinnati, because in each of the two Cincinnati schools the testing had to be completed in one day. The pre-testing enabled me to prepare an effective introduction for the tests, and to work out the mechanics of distributing them. By encouraging the students to ask questions, I did my best to ensure that the instructions were clear, that the wording was understandable, and that the descriptions in the "guess who" test were not ambiguous.

The tests which were given to the actual study population in the two Cincinnati schools were administered within a few days of each other, in March, 1957. In both schools, the students were tested during English period, since this was the one time in each day when each of the eighth grade home-room classes met together long enough to be tested. I had met with the English faculty a week before the testing was to take place, to request their cooperation. I asked the teachers not to discuss the tests in any way, and I also introduced each teacher to the tester who would be coming to her class. The teachers were asked to introduce the testers to their classes, but not to introduce the test itself. The teachers were all very cooperative; they all kept the secret, and gave the students a feeling that taking the tests was something worth doing conscientiously.

Since the testing was done in March, the students had had ample time to get to know each other. (Two of the classes were tested again nearly six weeks later, in order to get the data required for determining the "test-retest" reliability of the social acceptance scale. A discussion of
the validity and reliability of the devices used is deferred until later in this chapter.)

Along with the test papers, every student was given a list of his classmates, the names arranged in alphabetical order. In front of each name was a blank in which the students were told to place a number from 1 to 6, representing one of six degrees of acceptability. (Each student was told to put an "x" in front of his own name.) I recorded the numbers directly on work sheets. These numbers were treated as values on a continuum of acceptance ranging from 1 ("My very, very best friends") to 6 ("Dislike them"). Number 4 ("Don't know them") was given the value of four in the scoring, and kept in the continuum, because all the children in each class did know each other and thus used Number 4 as an intermediate degree of acceptance.

One of the two scores derived from the social acceptance scale was based on the choices made by the Jewish boys hereafter called "social acceptance scores given." This score indicates how the boy accepted the others in his class. The other kind of score was based on choices received by the Jewish boy from his classmates -- hereafter called "social acceptance scores received." This score indicates how the boy was accepted by the others in his class. The scores were calculated class by class.9

I divided each class according to Jewish boys, Jewish girls, non-Jewish boys, and non-Jewish girls. For each of the Jewish boys in the study, there should have been seven "social acceptance scores received" and seven "social acceptance scores given" -- a total of fourteen different

---

social acceptance scores representing the average of each boy's acceptance of and acceptance by the following categories of classmates: (1) the whole class, (2) all the boys, (3) all the girls, (4) the Jewish boys, (5) the non-Jewish boys, (6) the Jewish girls, and (7) the non-Jewish girls. Some of the boys received fewer than fourteen scores, because there were not enough students in some of the smaller categories to produce a meaningful average. Thus, some of the N's are smaller than 83. I decided not to calculate acceptance scores for any categories having less than four members. The frequency distributions for each of these fourteen scores are presented below, along with some related statistical measures. These distributions show that the test was capable of producing a good range of scores and of revealing significant differences in choice patterns. For coding purposes, however, the categories were reduced in number to ten or less by increasing the size of the class intervals from .1 to .2 or .3, depending on the range of the distribution. The numbers assigned to the newly formed categories were punched onto each boy's I.B.M. card, and were then used in the statistical analysis presented in Chapter 5.

Table 18 presents the seven distributions of "social acceptance scores given" by Jewish boys. These scores are the averages calculated from the choices the Jewish boys made; a separate average was calculated for each of the categories of classmates. It would have been possible

---

10The distributions found in Table 18 were divided into equal class intervals of .2 each, except for the category "non-Jewish boys," in which .3 was the class interval. The distributions found in Table 19 were divided into equal class intervals. A class interval of 12 was used for "Jewish boys," "All boys," and "Whole class." A class interval of .3 was used for the remaining four categories of classmates.
TABLE 18
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCORES GIVEN BY EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH BOYS TO THEIR CLASSMATES, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Jewish boys</th>
<th>All boys</th>
<th>Non-Jewish boys</th>
<th>Whole class</th>
<th>Jewish girls</th>
<th>All girls</th>
<th>Non-Jewish girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 66 83 80 83 49 83 83
for each distribution to contain scores ranging from 1.0 to 6.0, the lower score indicating greater acceptance. The table shows that these Jewish boys first accepted themselves, then accepted the other boys, then the Jewish girls, and finally the non-Jewish girls. The table also shows that both sex and ethnicity are significant variables at the eighth-grade level, and that sex seems to be the stronger of the two.

Table 19 shows the seven distributions of "social acceptance scores received" by each Jewish boy. These scores are the averages calculated from the choices received by each Jewish boy; a separate average was calculated for each of the categories of classmates. The boy's score indicates the degree to which he was accepted by his classmates in each of the categories. Again, the lower the score, the greater the acceptance. The pattern formed by the distributions in Table 19 is almost identical with the pattern in Table 18. An explicit comparison of these two sets of distributions is presented later, in Table 22.11

---

11 The relationships found in these tables are pertinent to certain hypotheses concerning the influence of age, sex, and ethnicity on social acceptance, but they are not germane to the thesis of this study, so they will not be discussed any further here. These relationships, however, do reveal the discriminatory power of the acceptance test used in this study.
TABLE 19
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCORES RECEIVED BY EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH BOYS FROM THEIR CLASSMATES, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Jewish boys</th>
<th>All boys</th>
<th>Non-Jewish boys</th>
<th>Whole Jewish class</th>
<th>Jewish girls</th>
<th>All girls</th>
<th>Non-Jewish girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N  57  83  80  83  49  83  77
**Table 20.**

Means, standard deviations, and significance of difference between means of social acceptance scores given by eighth-grade Jewish boys, Cincinnati: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups rated by Jewish boys</th>
<th>Number of scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish boys</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Jewish boys</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish girls</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Jewish girls</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 21.**

Means, standard deviations, and significance of difference between means of social acceptance scores received by eighth-grade Jewish boys, Cincinnati: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups rating Jewish boys</th>
<th>Number of scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish boys</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Jewish boys</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish girls</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Jewish girls</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 18 through 21 show, (1) that the distributions have a good range, (2) that there are differences between means, and (3) that the differences between the means are statistically significant. These results indicate that this social acceptance scale was well suited to the needs of this study.

**Table 22**

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS OF SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCORES GIVEN AND RECEIVED BY EIGHTH-GRDE JEWISH BOYS, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of scores, according to social categories</th>
<th>Number of scores</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Given to Jewish boys</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received from Jewish boys</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given to non-Jewish boys</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received from non-Jewish boys</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given to Jewish girls</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received from Jewish girls</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given to non-Jewish girls</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received from non-Jewish girls</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 shows that there is no significant difference between the distributions of the scores given to a social category and the scores received from the same category. Although individual scores sometimes show a difference between "given" and "received," the averages of the
distributions do not differ significantly. The Jewish boys, as a group, accept each of the other groups at practically the same level as those groups accept the Jewish boys.

In regard to the validity and reliability of the acceptance scale, Pauline Pepinsky writes, "The concepts of 'reliability' and 'validity' as traditionally used -- and misused -- by psychologists, seem to have little direct meaning or application to the field of sociometry." According to Lindzey and Borgatta, in the article referred to earlier:

Just as psychometric notions of reliability are difficult to apply directly to sociometric techniques, so too the conception of validity as "whether the test measures what it purports to measure" is not readily applicable.\(^\text{12}\)

The reason it is difficult to apply the usual tests of reliability to sociometric tests is stated very well by Bonney and Fessenden:

Instead of measuring some quality or capacity which is presumed to remain approximately constant in the same individuals over a period of time ... we are, in sociometric testing, measuring the interpersonal responses of the members of a group toward each other. There are no grounds for assuming that these responses should remain entirely constant over any given time interval. ... In surveying 20 studies which have given data on the constancy of sociometric positions over varying periods of time, it was found that in those in which the time interval was one week or less the median rank-order coefficient was .90. ... a good many studies were found in which the time interval between test and retest was from two to nine weeks. The median coefficient calculated from these studies proved to be .76. ... Finally, from the above survey some studies were found in which the interval between testings varied from three months to one year (mostly three to five months). The median coefficient determined from these studies was .65. ... These figures show clearly that the stability of an individual's choice-status in his group decreases by noticeable degrees (.90-.76-.65) as the time interval between test and retest is increased. ... All the above data emphasize that an individual's choice-value in


\(^{13}\)Op. cit., p. 422.
a particular group is characterized much more by stability than by fluctuation.\textsuperscript{14}

In spite of the problems involved in the "test-retest" method of determining the reliability of sociometric tests, retests were given to two of the larger classes at one of the schools in the study, six weeks after these students had taken the first tests. The results of these retests are shown in Table 23. The findings in this table show a statistically acceptable amount of agreement between the two tests, the coefficients being approximately the same as those reported by Bonney and Fessenden. For some reason, the two sets of ratings given to the Jewish boys by each of the other groups (except the Jewish group itself) were more alike than were the two sets of ratings given by the Jewish boys to the other groups. In any case, these findings as a whole indicate that the results obtained by use of the scale are reliable.

The validity of the acceptance scale is fairly easy to establish. With respect to the validity of sociometric tests, Lindzey and Borgatta say:

\textit{If the investigator limits his interest to a measure of inter-personal choice, it is clear that the somewhat dubious concept of 'face validity' is applicable here. The sociometric measure is made up of interpersonal choices, and to talk of external measures or criteria to demonstrate that this is the case is to overlook the operational base of sociometric scores.}\textsuperscript{15}

Pepinsky's summary statement on validity is as follows:

To summarize briefly, validity --- is intrinsic to sociometric data, since test results are choice behavior, and the test pur-ports to measure that choice behavior. But generalization beyond the specific behavior sampled does necessitate reference to outside criteria or supportive data. In order to meet the remaining

\textsuperscript{14}Merl E. Bonney and Seth A. Fessenden, \textit{California Test Bureau Manual} (Bonney-Fessenden Sociograph), California test Bureau, Los Angeles, 1955, p.6.
\textsuperscript{15}op. cit., p. 422.
TABLE 23
TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY, USING SPEARMAN'S RANK ORDER COEFFICIENT, OF
SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCORES GIVEN AND RECEIVED BY SIXTEEN EIGHTH-GRADE
JEWISH BOYS, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of classmates</th>
<th>Rank order coefficients&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scores received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish boys</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All boys</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Jewish boys</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish girls&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All girls</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Jewish girls</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>All coefficients are significant at the .01 level except for the first coefficient for "Jewish girls," which was significant at the .05 level.

<sup>b</sup>Only eight pairs of scores were available in these categories, instead of the usual sixteen.
questions of whether subjects' stated choices may be accepted as "valid" in the sense that they are subjectively honest, this testing situation, like those in psychometric testing, should be set up in such ways as to maximize the rapport with the experimenter and the motivation for the subjects.\(^\text{16}\)

During the testing, there was nothing to indicate that the students did not take their jobs seriously. When I scored the tests and examined the results, I found no basis for assuming that the students had been anything but honest and conscientious in their ranking of their classmates.

Now I shall discuss the procedure used in scoring the "guess who" test, and some of the results. This test is presented in the Appendix. The instructions at the beginning of the test tell the subjects that they may place a classmate in any, all, or none of the fourteen categories listed. In the following two tables I have used the paragraph number from the test, and a descriptive phrase, to identify each of the fourteen "guess who" categories. The scoring procedure was as follows: The total number of times a boy was named to any one category was divided by the total number of students in the class minus one (himself); the ratios thus obtained were then distributed according to each of the fourteen categories; finally, each of these distributions was divided into three parts which are as equal as possible with respect to frequencies. Table 24 shows the unabridged distribution for each category, and Table 25 shows the abridged (three-fold) distribution for each category.

On each Jewish boy's I.B.M. card was punched a number from one to three, according to whether he was (1) "Least mentioned," (2) "Moderately mentioned," or (3) "Most mentioned." It is this rank number that is used in the statistical analysis found in Chapter 5.

\(^{16}\)Pepinsky, p. 41.
TABLE 24

DISTRIBUTION OF 107 EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH BOYS ACCORDING TO THE PERCENTAGE OF THEIR CLASSMATES MENTIONING THEM FOR EACH OF FOURTEEN GUESS-WHO CHARACTERISTICS, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Goes with the crowd</th>
<th>too bashful</th>
<th>Good sport</th>
<th>Very noisy</th>
<th>Always grumbling</th>
<th>Even-tempered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71-77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\] This table is continued on the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Touchy (8)</th>
<th>Bully (9)</th>
<th>Feels at home (10)</th>
<th>Almost never happy (11)</th>
<th>Stuck up (12)</th>
<th>Gets mad quickly (13)</th>
<th>Works all the time (14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71-77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 25
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF 107 EIGHTH-GRADE JEWISH BOYS AMONG THREE CATEGORIES, ACCORDING TO THE PERCENTAGE OF THEIR CLASSMATES MENTIONING THEM FOR EACH OF THE FOURTEEN GUESS-WHO CHARACTERISTICS, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guess-who characteristics</th>
<th>&quot;Most-mentioned&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Moderately-mentioned&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Least-mentioned&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Happy</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Goes with the crowd</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Too bashful</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Good sport</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Very noisy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Always grumbling</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Even-tempered</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Touchy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Bully</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Feels at home</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Almost never happy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Stuck up</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Gets mad quickly</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Works all the time</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a No boy who received fewer than three mentions is included in this category.
The conventional tests for reliability and validity are less applicable to the "guess who" test than to the acceptance scale. The aim of the "guess who" test, according to Lindzey and Borgatta, is to "...Provide a picture of the reputations or impressions created by the subjects on other members of the group (i.e., the manifest personality)."\(^1\) A "test-retest" measure of reliability was not even attempted on the "guess who" test, and the question of validity must be answered in the same way as it was for the acceptance scale. I have no reason to doubt that the students marked the "guess who" test as honestly and as conscientiously as they did the social acceptance test.

The extensive bibliography found at the end of the Lindzey and Borgatta article, and in the more recent Bonney and Fessenden manual, provided me with very useful source material.

\(^1\) Lindzey, p. 410.
CHAPTER IV
HOME INTERVIEWS

In the first chapter I discussed the nature of the data I hoped to get from the interviews with the boys' mothers, and also the development and pre-testing of the "conflict situations." The second chapter described the characteristics of the study population as revealed by the data from the "background data sheet." The filling out of this sheet, at the end of each interview, took only a fraction of the total interview time.

In this chapter I will discuss the interviewing procedure, and will present in some detail the responses of the mothers to each of the fifteen conflict situations and to four direct questions asked at the end of each interview.

All but one of my interviews were recorded on a recording machine. Contrary to many researchers, I believe that this kind of system is less likely to inhibit the respondent than any of the note-taking methods, and that it does a far more accurate and complete job. The recording machine I used was small enough to fit inside my brief case. After I had introduced myself, and when I felt that rapport had been established, I asked permission to use a recording machine. I explained to each mother how important it was to record the interview accurately and assured her that her anonymity would be preserved. Although a few seemed a little apprehensive at first, none objected to my using the
machine. Those who had been apprehensive at first soon lost their nervousness. This favorable reception was due in part to the particular recording apparatus. I placed the machine on the floor next to my chair, on the side farthest from the respondent and out of her sight. The machine had a very sensitive "conference" microphone, which I put out of sight on the floor near the respondent, usually under a coffee table. The machine made no noise at all during the recording, except for a faint ticking sound which began near the end of each record. To turn the record over I did not have to stop the recorder; all I had to do was pull it out of the machine, flip it over, re-insert it, and push the recording indicator back to the beginning. This operation involved no noise, and the loss of no more than a few words. Changing records was just as simple. Most of the interviews required only one record (fifteen minutes on each side), largely because I was able to turn the machine on and off unobtrusively with a foot pedal, thus recording only the respondents' pertinent remarks.

When rapport had been established and the machine was ready, I explained to the respondent the sources of the "conflict situations" and why I was using them. I asked each mother to imagine that her son had just come home from school and was relating to her the experience which I would read from a card. I asked her to reply as though she were talking to her son, not to me. During the interview I often asked, "Is this what you would say to your son?" When I analyzed the data later, I was pleased to find that it was generally quite easy to tell when the mother was talking to me and when she was "talking to her son." In all

1Even the much more bulky tape recorder which I used in the pretest interviews resulted in freer responses and less inhibition than I had expected.
the interviews, I read the conflict situations in exactly the same words, in the same order, and in as nearly the same style as possible. Most of the mothers seemed to identify readily with the situations.

The cards from which I read the descriptions of these incidents were arranged in such a way that the respondent could not know what analytic or descriptive categories I was using; I wanted the mothers to respond to each incident separately, not in relation to other similar incidents. The incidents were presented as follows.

1. On the way home from school the other day (I don't know how it got started), a few of us kids were talking about what it takes to be a Jew. We got into a real argument. One guy even said that Jews were born Jews and it didn't matter whether you were religious or not. He said if you're born a Jew, you die a Jew -- didn't matter what you did. I've been thinking about it some and I'm confused. What does it mean when someone says you're a Jew?

2. The eighth-grade boys' club at the Center is planning a dance for next month. We didn't get far last night because one of the boys asked if he could bring a non-Jewish date and we had a long discussion about it. At first most of the kids seemed to think it was okay, but the advisor began to raise some questions like, "How would the Jewish kids feel?" and "How would the non-Jewish girl feel?" and "What would the parents of the kids at the Center think about it?" We haven't settled it yet. We're going to vote on it at our next meeting, and our advisor said we should talk to our parents about it.

3. I don't know whether I told you or not, but a new kid has come into our class. The two of us seemed to hit it off pretty good. The other day he said "What are you, Christian or Jew?" I said I was Jewish. He looked at me sort of funny and I hardly ever see him any more. If we see each other at school and he says "hello," then I say "hello." We were getting to be pretty good friends, too, till I told him I was Jewish. Seemed funny to just quit like that. Why did he quit being friends with me? What can I do about it? Anything?

4. I saw Jack after school today, and he was mad because one of the older guys was needling him about working so hard getting ready for his Bar Mitzvah. This kid told Jack it was a waste of time and didn't mean anything anymore. I felt sorry for Jack but I couldn't think of anything to say to make him feel any better.
5. Young Tommy was really complaining today after school — his mother and father don't want him to join a boy scout troop that meets near where he lives, because it's mostly non-Jewish kids. They want him to join a troop at the temple, and that's a lot farther away. He said he doesn't see what being Jewish has to do with being a boy scout. I don't either. What difference does it make?

6. One of the Jewish boys in my class at school said that what happened in Israel didn't mean anything to him personally. He said he was an American and he didn't feel much different about Israel than any other foreign country. And he said his folks felt that way, too. I never thought about it that way before and I don't know what to think.

7. Bill Smith is having a birthday party at his house next Saturday night and I didn't get invited. At school I run around with Bill and some of the others that are going, and I thought he'd ask me too. But I didn't think too much about it because only a few kids in the class were going, anyway. Then on the way home with Milton I was muttering something about not getting an invitation to the party, and he said, "What do you expect? You're a Jew." That shook me. I never thought of that. Do you think my being Jewish could have had anything to do with Bill not inviting me?

8. Some of the kids are trying to get a group together for Saturday nights — you know, for listening to records and stuff at each other's houses. Well, Jane called Betty and asked her if she'd like to be in on it. Betty asked who was going to be in the group, and then she wanted to know why some of our non-Jewish friends weren't being asked too. Jane told her she thought it would be nice if just Jewish boys and girls would get together. Betty said she doesn't want to come if it has to be only Jewish kids. Maybe Betty's right, maybe it shouldn't be just Jewish kids. I don't know.

9. The other day after Religious School one of the kids said he didn't see why Jews should be all helping each other out all the time. He said there were a lot of Jews he didn't know or didn't like and he didn't see why, just because he was a Jew, he should worry about them. He asked me "Why should Jews have separate welfare things?" and I didn't know what to say.

10. On our way out of the last class this afternoon, Charlie said for me to give him his pen back. I told him I didn't have his pen, that mine must look like his. He said he was sure I had his pen, but I didn't. As we went down the hall we both started to get mad; when I got to my locker he was really mad, and he said "I guess that's what
you can expect from a Jew." I was really mad, but I didn't say any more and he went to his locker. I can't figure him out. He doesn't seem to be such a bad guy. Why should he say anything like that?

What should I do when a did makes a dirty crack to me like that about Jews?

11. One of the non-Jewish boys in my class and I have been getting sort of friendly lately. This morning he said he liked me, that I wasn't like the other Jewish kids. He said I didn't act smart or make a lot of noise all the time. He's a nice guy and he made me feel sort of good.

12. Some of my friends at school asked me if I would come to their church for a dance this Saturday night. They said it didn't matter what religion you were. It's put on by their Youth Fellowship and it's open to everybody. Can I go?

13. On the way home from school the other day one of the older Jewish boys said that he wasn't going to let being Jewish keep him from doing what he wanted to do in life. He said that his name didn't sound Jewish and that he would pretend he wasn't Jewish, if he had to, to get a job he wanted. He said he knew lots of people who had done it.

14. Harry was telling me today that they had a real hot discussion in his confirmation class at the temple about prejudice and discrimination. He said that some of the kids argued that there wasn't enough prejudice around here to even talk about, and a couple of others said you run into it almost everywhere you turn. He asked me what I thought about it, and I really didn't know what to say.

15. Harry said that in the discussion at confirmation class, the kids who thought there wasn't much prejudice said there wouldn't be any prejudice at all if some Jews didn't bring it on themselves. They said that the Jews who are always running into prejudice are the ones who are always looking for it. Is that right?

The following direct questions were asked at the end of each interview:

Question 1. Have you ever discussed prejudice and discrimination against Jews with your son?

Question 2. Has your son ever discussed problems related to Jewishness with you? Very much?
Question 3. Have you changed your religious behavior since the children were born?

Question 4. How many of the traditional home ceremonies do you observe?

Question 5. Do you keep kosher?

Question 6. Do you observe Christmas in any way?

Of the fifteen conflict situations, four were designed to reveal differences among the mothers with respect to their willingness to have their sons participate in various kinds of activities involving both Jewish and non-Jewish children. These four situations included one which it seemed reasonable to expect most mothers to disapprove of, and one which seemed likely to elicit most mothers' approval.

The following responses begin with the incident that aroused the least opposition and end with the one that aroused the most. These four "association" incidents were numbered in the interviews as 2, 5, 8, and 12. In order of acceptance, they are 5, 12, 2, and 8. I scattered these incidents throughout the fifteen in the hope of reducing "carry-over" from one situation to another similar one.

Incident 5

"Young Tommy was really complaining today after school -- his mother and father don't want him to join a boy scout troop that meets near where he lives, because it's mostly non-Jewish kids. They want him to join a troop at the temple, and that's a lot farther away. He said he doesn't see what being Jewish has to do with being a boy scout. I don't either. What difference does it make?"
The responses to this situation fell into two broad categories, which can be expressed as follows:

1) "Being Jewish has nothing to do with being a boy scout." 69 (83 per cent)

2) "The boy should attend the troop at the temple." 14 (17 per cent)

The majority of mothers whose responses fell in the first category answered with very little qualification.

We have to be careful sometimes that we don't let our Judaism obscure our Americanism. (13)

It doesn't make any difference at all. I don't see any reason why he shouldn't join the troop that's closest to his home. (2)

Well, son, I think I agree with you. Being a boy scout is part of being an American, a tradition. To us, boy scouts would be particularly a community kind of group activity, not necessarily part of the temple per se. (89)

I think if he's gone to school with these boys and is friends with them, it really wouldn't make any difference, as far as boy scouting is concerned. That's just all boys, and they don't mingle with --- it's not a social group, as far as parties and things like that are concerned. I would let him go to the closest one. (15)

Many others who approved of the boy attending the community troop stated their opinion in the form of a positive policy.

The boy is right. I think the children should mix with other people. We should not segregate ourselves in order to --- I think the boy should go to scouts where he likes and mix. (1)

Shouldn't make any difference. The boy scout movement is supposed to be --- to instil brotherhood and good feeling among all boys, and I think a mixed group is a much better idea than one particular religious group. (17)

---The number appearing in parenthesis after each quotation is the code number designating which mother is being quoted.

---Dashes (---) represent a pause or break in the response.
In a way it might be a good experience for Tommy to go with the non-Jewish scout troop, so that he could learn what the gentiles are like, and they in turn could learn from him. He might make new friends. (18)

There's a church over on ____ St., and the majority of them are goyim, but there's a few Jews that belong, and I don't see anything wrong, I think it's fine, they should mingle in some way. I mean, when they go to school they mingle, and I think with the boy scouts they should mingle too. (30)

Tommy is going to mingle with non-Jewish people all his life. He's not going to be enclosed in a ghetto and come in contact with Jews alone, and he has to learn to get along with everyone. The sooner he gets used to the fact that there are others in the world to consider besides Jewish people, the better off he is. (32)

I think it's good because it shows them that even though they're not the same religion they can get along together. (39)

I think the child is right, it doesn't make any difference. In fact, I would tell my child not to segregate himself. He should have friends of other faiths. We cannot live in a shell, we need other people. We have to get along with other people. (102)

Three of the sixty-nine who approved of the community scout troop did so with some qualification.

I don't think it really makes too much difference. But if the majority of the boys are gentile they might try to discuss or do things that are more for their religion, and you might feel like an outsider because you can't join in it whole-heartedly. But if it's at least 50-50, .... It's good for you to learn about the other person's religion and not just your own. You've got to deal with all kinds of people in this world. (3)

It wouldn't really make any difference to me if it was --- as I said, the only thing is when you get older and there's a boy-girl relationship --- when you're younger I don't think it makes much difference. (42)

The mothers who believed that the boy should attend the temple troop expressed themselves in several different ways. Four of them were afraid that religious conflicts might develop in a mixed troop.
Boy scouts are non-sectarian, but in many instances and things they do, religion always comes up, and it's far better to belong to a troop, if there is one, for Jewish children. They always celebrate Christmas. There's bound to be things they do Christmas. Even though they're supposed to be non-sectarian, they'll tell you that religion is always a part of it. So I think it's a good idea to belong to a troop of your own faith. (77)

Four mothers thought Tommy should be with those he "had more in common with."

You're right when you say that being a boy scout has nothing to do with being a Jew. However, it might be better to join with your temple group, because those are the people with whom you come in contact more, so you have more in common with them, and even though it's more convenient to get to your meetings at the other group, actually I think that would be the only point in favor of joining that group. I think it would be wiser to join the temple group; you are a part of that congregation, and you have so much more in common. (58)

Six of the mothers just didn't want any mixing.

I think I would tell him to go to the one that was a little further, because they were more possibly his friends, that he'd have more of the same interests. To these affairs I think he should go with Jewish children. I don't go too much for mixed groups. We just don't, our family just don't. It's just one of those things. Some people do. We just don't. (23)

Tommy's parents want him to be with his own people. I think that's what I would insist on my boy doing, yes I would. They don't mingle, then they don't meet them. Of course, they do at school, and that's where these kids come in contact. You can't keep them away every minute. (74)

The majority of the mothers, in responding to Incident 5, seemed to believe that being Jewish had nothing to do with being a boy scout, and that Jewishness was irrelevant in this context. However, some of those who agreed that Tommy should go to the nearest troop did not feel that Jewishness was irrelevant, but rather that Jewish boys would benefit from mixing with non-Jewish boys. A few mothers qualified their approval of the non-Jewish troop by saying that it would be all right as long as there were "enough" Jewish boys.
The mothers who believed that Tommy should go to the temple troop felt that being Jewish was important in this context for religious and social reasons.

**Incident 12**

"Some of my friends at school asked me if I would come to their church for a dance this Saturday night. They said it didn't matter what religion you were. It's put on by their Youth Fellowship and it's open to everybody. Can I go?"

The responses to this situation also fell into two broad categories:

1) "You can go." 54 (65 per cent)
2) "I disapprove of your going." 29 (35 per cent)

Of those who approved of the church dance for their sons, thirty-eight simply said "Sure," or "Of course, you can go."

Sixteen of those who approved of the dance did not just say that their sons could go, but actively **encouraged** their attendance.

Yes, I think you should go. (4)

I'd tell him "Yes, why not? It's nice to be with other people, see how they are." (48)

I see no reason why you shouldn't. I think it is a mistake to draw a line, because in life you have to take a lot of things, but you should not take anything for being a Jew—feel any different, but stand up for it. (57)

I would say you can go. There is no reason you can't go! It's nice to see other people's religions. **Reminder that this is a dance!** Yes, for a dance. There is no religious connection with a dance, it's just a social gathering. I see nothing wrong in them going to a church for a dance. (80)

I think you'd have a very interesting and enjoyable time, because the one way we can promote better understanding of our differences is to believe in interfaith, and that's just what this church group is trying to do. (89)
Yes, I think you could and I think you should. This will give you a chance to see what they are like and give them a chance to see what you're like. And I know that you're going to go there, not with a chip on your shoulder, you're going there because you definitely want to be with the children. You're going to show them what a Jewish person is like and give them a better chance to know you. You're going to give yourself a chance to know them better. I think you very definitely should go. (8)

The mothers who disapproved were about evenly divided between those who positively disapproved and those who would approve only under certain conditions, or who were ambivalent and hesitant about disapproving. I will quote first from the qualifying and hesitantly negative group.

No. Unless, of course, he went with a group of Jewish boys and girls. But not as an individual. (16)

I don't think it would hurt. Maybe I'm wrong, because personally, maybe it is wrong, but I don't --- like they have, they call it YM something, he goes to that with the goyim. But still, what's wrong with it? If they ask you to go --- I mean, I think that's where my mother made her mistake, when she put her foot down not to go at all, just to associate with Jewish boys and that's it. (39)

I wouldn't particularly want you to go by yourself, but if another Jewish boy and yourself wanted to go, if it's for a charitable affair, the money goes to charity, I wouldn't see any harm in it. I'd just as soon you wouldn't go, truthfully, because you'd have to dance with the gentile girls, and I'd rather you wouldn't go. But if you feel like you want to go, they're all friends of yours, and you know them from school, and it is a charity affair. (91)

Following are some quotations from mothers who positively disapproved.

I would prefer that you don't go to a church, because I feel that you have your own synagogue, and you can go there. If the dance is held at a neutral place it's one thing, but I would prefer that you stay away from the church. (14)

I would say no. We don't believe in the children mingling with non-Jews. Maybe we're a little too bigoted, I don't know. We've always told them "You can find everything in a Jewish boy or girl that you would admire in any other religion, and if you're looking for a certain thing you'll find it in our religion as well as in another religion, whether it's brains or beauty or whatever you're looking for." (23)
A dance? No. To attend a service, to see what theirs is like, yes. But to dance, a social affair, I don't think a Jew belongs there. (29)

I wouldn't encourage it exactly. Oh, I wouldn't be dead-set in opposing it, exactly, provided I'd know a couple of other kids. But I would definitely discourage the whole thing. I just don't think the boy would feel at home among the other kind, especially in his formative years. I would definitely want him to be strictly with his own. (41)

I think it would be wiser not to. There are times when we do these things, in fact through the temple we have these services where we invite non-Jewish friends. That's your opportunity to do something like that. We were invited by some of our friends to attend a church supper and we went. That was a little different -- we went as a family, and it was nice. It showed that we weren't narrow in our way of thinking. But as far as a dance is concerned, I feel that it's better to stay as much as you can within your own group. Just be friendly with people regardless of what their color or religious beliefs might be, and show them that you're a nice person. (58)

I wouldn't like him to go. But you can't separate them all the time. I think I'd tell him I'd rather he didn't go, there's lots of Jewish dances. (74)

I wouldn't like for him to go, but I don't know if he would even approach the subject to me on something like that, because he himself doesn't believe in mixing social. School affairs and things like that are one thing, but, I don't know, maybe it's the upbringing. (94)

Sixty-five per cent of the mothers, in response to Incident 12, approved of their sons' attendance at a dance at a church. The majority of those approving did so almost as a matter of course, seeming to feel that being Jewish was not important in this context. As in the case of the scout troop incident, many mothers encouraged their sons to attend not just because the dance would be fun but because they considered such an activity a way of improving "intergroup relations." Of the 35 per cent classed as disapproving, about half said they would approve only under certain conditions, or were hesitant about disapproving. The main concern of these "qualifying and hesitant" mothers was that their son might be the only Jewish boy present and might feel "out of place." The mothers
who positively disapproved were concerned primarily about "social mixing," particularly since it would involve gentile girls in this situation.

**Incident 2**

"The eighth-grade boy's club at the Center is planning a dance for next month. We didn't get far last night because one of the guys asked if he could bring a non-Jewish date and we had a long discussion about it. At first most of the kids seemed to think it was okay, but the advisor began to raise some questions like, "How would the Jewish kids feel?" and "How would the non-Jewish girl feel?" and "What would the parents of the kids at the Center think about it?" We haven't settled it yet. We're going to vote on it at our next meeting, and our advisor said we should talk to our parents about it."

The responses fell into two broad categories, each with several subdivisions.

1) "It's all right to invite a non-Jewish girl." 31 (37 per cent)
2) "A non-Jewish girl should not be invited." 52 (63 per cent)

Of the thirty-one who considered it all right to invite a non-Jewish girl to the Center, twenty were unqualified in their approval.

I would say that's perfectly all right, I see nothing wrong with that at all. As a matter of fact, the boys in my son's group do occasionally have parties and do occasionally bring non-Jewish girls. There's never any question about it at all, it's never raised. (2)

I would tell him that there's no question about it, as far as I was concerned, whether the girl was Jewish or not Jewish, as long as she was a nice girl and he had a good time with her. (60)

My answer would be bring whomever you please, of whatever race, religion or color. (73)

I think it's perfectly all right. I think it's just fine. (10)

I think they should accept the non-Jew and not raise the question of religion. (5)
You know how mother feels about these things, and I have never confined my personal relationships to people who were Jewish or non-Jewish. If I like a person I don't stop to consider the way they worship, and I feel that if someone chose to come to the dance they should be made perfectly welcome. (13)

I don't see anything wrong with it, I think it would be a very nice thing. We live in a country where there are all religions, and I think it's very nice to invite a non-Jewish girl to the Jewish dance. (6)

I personally feel it's a very un-American approach, just because you're a Jew to go only with Jews, and I feel that all groups should mix, for the democratic approach to things. (95)

Eleven of the mothers approved but with certain reservations. These qualifications usually took such forms as "It's okay at this age."

I think it would be perfectly all right to bring a non-Jewish girl. I think at your age you should associate with everybody, and when you get a little older, to realize what the difference is, then you should be a little more choosy in your friends. But at this age level, I think it would be perfectly all right to mix. (37)

I can't see that the eighth-grade level it would make the slightest possible difference. If you wanted to ask a polka-dot girl with green hair, if she was your choice at this point in your life, it would seem to me that these are the kind of things you have to experience before you make up your mind that it's wrong. (75)

I'd say if you want to do it, do it, but realize the fact that you are a Jew and they are a gentile, and no matter what happens, they don't mix well together later on. If you want to do it now as a temporary thing, you can do it, but tell us about it -- we won't make a fuss about it. But just let it be known that later on, when it does start to count, I'd prefer you going around with a Jewish kid. (80)

Of the fifty-two mothers who disapproved of a non-Jewish girl being invited, seventeen disapproved because the organization giving the dance was a Jewish one.

I'm firmly against it. Definitely. I think it's a wonderful thing for you to mingle with non-Jews at school and on the outside, but when it comes to a Jewish club, and it is a Jewish Center, I think it should be all Jewish children. (24)
I would tell him, my opinion on that is that as long as it's a Jewish place, then the kids should invite all Jewish children so that there is never any repercussion that the Center has to have through that, because they're more or less responsible for the doing of the children when they're there. (25)

I myself don't think it's a good policy to follow, but of course it is hard not to become acquainted with gentile girls, you meet them in class constantly. When you have a Jewish affair, with Jewish children, I think only Jewish children should go. (29)

The group is Jewish. After all, the goyim, they consider----they like their crowd to stick to their crowd, and I think she would feel out of place. (43)

Ordinarily I would say, "How do you feel about it?" I think the advisor raised some good questions. If it's an entirely Jewish organization, like a Jewish boys' club at the Center, it places any non-Jew in a very delicate situation. It would probably embarrass her, and it would probably embarrass some of the Jewish children who are in your group. If it were a public, civic, or school function, I would say it would be all right. (100)

Nine mothers disapproved because they believed that the resulting situation would be generally uncomfortable.

I think it's a very touchything to start. I think if the same little boy could find himself somebody with whom he'd be compatible with, who would be a Jewess, I think he would be a lot happier and his companions would be a lot happier and the entire function would be all put more at ease. (4)

I think probably it is not the thing to do. Not because there's anything real wrong with taking a non-Jewish girl to a dance, but it's the wrong kind of place. The child would be uncomfortable, perhaps the Jewish children too might feel self-conscious, and it might put a damper on the whole party and spoil your fun. (18)

There's no question that a non-Jew can't feel as much at home with a group of Jews as they would feel with non-Jewish, and vice versa. Put yourself in his or her place, and think how you would feel if you were in a group at----well, felt that you just didn't quite belong. Maybe it would be easier, because I think the Jews might have more of a tendency to accept a non-Jew than the other way around. So if it's a Center affair, it would seem to me you would all be a lot happier if the boy escorted a Jewish date. (67)
It's already happened. My son and his friend were going to take gentile girls to a Center dance, and I talked to them about it, and I said "You live in a world where there's just definitely Jews and gentiles, you can't get away from it! It would be better if people didn't pay any attention, but they do, and it just wouldn't be the right thing to do." As far as I am concerned it doesn't make any difference, but I feel it is better to go with your own type of person.

Twenty-three mothers disapproved on the grounds that Jews and gentiles shouldn't mix socially, especially if girls are involved.

I myself went out with plenty of fellows who weren't Jewish, and never intended to marry them, which is a nasty thing to do. But I did that, and I may be a hypocrite to keep him away from them, but I do say when he mentions anyone at all, "What Sunday school do they go to?" — that's my only way without coming out and saying it, so in the case of that dancing business I would say it should be all Jewish. Now at school, I wouldn't open my mouth. I'd say, "Well, after all, it is the Jewish Center, and I think that's the place to take a Jewish girl." (7)

I'm very much against it. I think, you should know, they shouldn't mix. Of course in school it's different, but I think something like that, Jewish kids shouldn't mix. (11)

He's never brought anything up about that. Of course he does know, I mean, he's already mentioned like in school, you know, this girl, cute little girl, but she's not Jewish, and he knows the difference and he knows that he shouldn't go out with anybody that isn't Jewish, it isn't right. I don't really think they'd allow him, would they? I suppose I'd tell him "no, I don't think you should do that." I mean, there are plenty of Jewish girls, and they don't need outsiders. They have a large variety of Jewish girls, they can take their choice. And plenty cute ones! (30)

That question we've had come up, and we have sat down and talked with him about the fact that taking a non-Jewish girl may create difficulties for her and for him, and that social groups just move in different areas, and while they associate freely in school, and he plays with non-Jewish boys, we feel he has to draw the line at that. (88)

I have nothing against the other religions. If you start out and you go with the non-Jewish people you may grow up to fall in love with them and want to marry them. I think it's to stick with your own group because you do marry into your own group. I was never allowed to go with a gentile person and I'm not the least bit sorry. At school it's good to mix, there's nothing wrong with mixing with them. (8)
I would not personally object to the kid bringing a non-Jewish girl to a dance. I feel that the children should play with everybody, regardless of what your religion is. As far as bringing a non-Jewish girl or boy to a dance, I can see no objection, except that what it may lead to later on. I don't believe in intermarriage, I don't believe the two religions can mix. (14)

I have an older daughter, I want you to know, and that has come up. I would tell him the same thing as I have told my daughter, which is, "You don't start, you have nothing to finish." You don't take non-Jews out. I think it's a bad policy. (20)

I always felt, and I always told my older boy, "Don't start anything and then you'll never have any trouble." Play with fire and you're bound to get burnt. It's all right to be friends with them, but socially I don't think it's a good idea myself, because you know it's always the one you're not supposed to have that's the one you want. I would encourage my boy to vote against it. (42)

I would suggest that this boy be prevailed upon to bring a Jewish girl. All the other girls will be Jewish, and she will somehow feel excluded from some of the conversations, and I think that a finger may be pointed at her. I don't think she will be happy. And I think that at your age, it is just as well that you hold to your own in order to avoid possibilities of unhappiness later. (59)

I would definitely say no. I would not have an outsider. First of all, the girl herself may feel very out of place. In talking, things sometimes slip — "the shicksa," or "the goy," or something like that, and not understanding — or, do understand — she might feel embarrassed. And if it's a Jewish organization, having a Jewish affair, I certainly think all the children should be Jewish, there shouldn't be any outsiders at all. And after all, you start taking out a shicksa once, it leads to things later, you never know what you start. (91)

I don't approve of it, because you're setting a pattern there. The girls or boys may be very fine persons and all, but as you get older you don't fall in love with a person because they're Jewish or not Jewish, and you can become attached to them just as easily as not. So, it's unfortunate, but I do think we have to maintain certain barriers. I would tell him I wouldn't approve of inviting the gentile girl. (87)

Of those who disapproved, one third expressed the fear that such mixing might lead to intermarriage. Unlike the mothers who thought the children were too young for it to matter one way or the other, these
mothers believed that "if you play with fire you get burned," or "what you
don't start, you don't have to finish." The majority of the mothers who
were unwilling to extend an invitation to a gentile girl based their de­
cisions on the fact that the dance was a Jewish affair. These mothers
believed that a Jewish affair should be for Jewish children only.

The responses to this incident show a tendency for the mothers to
say "I don't care, but the Jewish girls will resent it, and other parents
will resent it." The responses reveal the "felt" pressure from the
Jewish community, and a reaction to discrimination by gentiles — "they
don't include us, there's no reason why we should include them."

Incident 8

"Some of us kids are trying to get a group together for Saturday
nights — you know, for listening to records and stuff at each others'
houses. Well, Jane called Betty and asked her if she'd like to be in
on it. Betty asked who was going to be in the group, and then she
wanted to know why some of our non-Jewish friends weren't being asked too.
Jane told her she thought it would be nice if just Jewish boys and girls
would get together. Betty said she doesn't want to come if it has to be
only Jewish kids. Maybe Betty's right — maybe it shouldn't be just
Jewish kids. I don't know."

The mothers' responses to this situation fell into two categories:
1) "It's all right to have mixed groups of this kind."
   27 (32 per cent)
2) "Groups of this kind should not be mixed." 56 (68 per cent)

The mothers who approved of this kind of mixing can be divided into
several groups. Fifteen thought that Jewishness was unimportant in this
context.
I don't know how to answer that. I don't see how it makes any difference. I don't see why that need come up so often. Do you like Betty, do you like Jane? Well, let's have them. (2)

I would be inclined to agree with Betty -- I don't think the demarcation should be because of that. They shouldn't say "You're Jewish, you come; you're not Jewish, you don't come," on that basis. "She's a lot of fun, or she isn't a lot of fun." That is exactly what I would say to him. I don't think religion enters into that at all. (6)

I think that's an impossible situation. I don't think children really think that way. I have never heard of a group of children deciding by religion who is going to be around to listen to records. Of course, I go right back to the parents, who say "Well, maybe it would be nice just to have Christians, or just to have Jews, or just to have boys who haven't got braces." It shouldn't be just Jewish kids, that's ridiculous. (56)

Well, I kind of agree with Betty -- I think that if you have a social group, you don't have to make it a ghetto group. You might as well meet with the friends you pass the time of day with all the time. Why have religious background as a criterion for a social evening? (96)

Seven mothers thought it would be "a good thing" if the group were mixed.

I think Betty is right. It shouldn't be just Jewish children. I think we should go out and make friends amongst them all. (1)

I think they should include the non-Jewish. I never put a restriction on that in my house. More than three-fourths of the kids who come here are non-Jewish. But they're well-behaved. And any time they want they can come in. (5)

This is where personal prejudice comes in, because I myself am most at ease with Jewish people, therefore my inclination is to be with them, but theoretically I would say it should be a mixed group. I'd give him my theoretical answer. (73)

Five of the mothers thought it would be all right for such a group to be mixed "at this early age."

With this age, they're all so young, eighth graders, I think they should mix. (10)

Surprisingly few mothers said one thing to me, and then admitted that they would say something quite different to their sons.
Maybe Betty is right, maybe it doesn't have to be just Jewish children. At this time of your life it doesn't really make too much difference. It's good to mingle with non-Jews as well as Jews. However, sometimes the patterns that are set at this age linger on until you get older. And I guess you'd find yourself more at home with all Jewish children. However, I wouldn't object if this group were formed, and if it were mixed. (67)

The fifty-six mothers who disapproved of mixing in this kind of group expressed themselves in two general ways. Forty of them "positively disapproved."

The average mother --- if that came up, you know --- to be over at my house, naturally I'd want it to be of one faith, and I'm not prejudiced, as far as that goes, you know, they can associate with non-Jewish and everything else, but if I had it at my house I'd prefer it that they were all of one faith. (11)

I think if he'd say that, I'd tell him "Well, after all, I believe that you should go around with the Jewish children and maybe their parents only want them to have the Jewish children at the house." That's the way I feel. It's better for them; if they're going to start when they're that little to bring goyim to the house and all, they'll get away from the Jews altogether I'm afraid. (30)

I doesn't hurt to have a mixed crowd, but I would prefer that my boy would associate in his social life with a Jewish crowd. Now that doesn't mean you can't have an occasional mixed group, or that you have to refuse if you are invited occasionally, but to make a habit of associating mostly with them, because they are a majority, you're bound to be thrown with them, I would say "No, I'd much rather you not do it." (41)

If they are forming a steady social club, I believe it should be only Jewish children. If it's just a party, there's no harm in it, but if it's a steady thing, and they're going to be together Saturday nights I think they feel better, they act better, and they have more respect for one another. That's how I feel and I would tell my son that. I would advise him that I want him to go with Jewish children, I want him to be with Jewish children. (9)

I would tell him to say it should be all Jewish. I don't believe in social mixing. (23)

Maybe I'm narrow --- I guess my kids say that I am, too, sometimes, but there I am prejudiced. I like to tell my kids to stick to their own friends, that's what I like. (52)
If you are going to get together for social purposes, I wish you would limit it to the Jewish kids alone, because if the Jewish kids are not going to be accepted into the gentile social circles I don't think the two should mix together. They don't want us, why push in? Outside activities is a different thing, a mixture of everything — but when you get a close little social group, I think it should be limited to yours alone. (80)

I think it should be just Jewish kids. He wouldn't even ask the question — I'm sure he knows the answer by heart now. (87)

I think he would support Jane — there wouldn't be too much question in his mind that it should be limited to Jewish girls. He has raised the question when he himself has given a party, about inviting non-Jewish children, and we have said to him "Do you think they will feel comfortable?" (88)

In a social group that's originated among boys and girls, other than a civic or a school function, it should be all Jewish. (100)

In a get-together on Saturday, I think you're so much better off if you have your own kind, I mean just have the Jewish boys and girls together, because the parents know each other, and they feel a little safer that they're together themselves. That's the way I feel. But the real reason behind that, I want his social life to be made up around Jewish girls. (7)

They should have just Jewish kids, because there again, you don't want to — it isn't what is happening now, it's what it may lead to later. (14)

No, it should be kept all Jewish. You don't start something, you don't have anything to finish, I always say. (20)

I think it should just be Jewish kids, I really do. It's for the future, really, I mean, they do get involved, I mean I've seen it too many times over and over again, that I feel you have to stop it from when they're young. (40)

Sixteen of the fifty-six were included among the "disapprovers" because they were so hesitant and ambivalent about disapproving.

When they're that age, I don't know the answer. I know we would prefer it Jewish, but I don't think that if they were neighborhood children that I would have any objection. I believe in neighborliness. (68)

I would not say that if it weren't all Jewish that he couldn't go. I would never say that to him, because we have many Christian and Catholic friends. I don't think I'd have any answer to that. I think that would be left up to him. (31)
What shall I say? I feel both ways. When they are only thirteen, I see no reason for a social group not to be mixed. But when they get older then I do think so. Maybe I'm asking for trouble, because the friends you make now you carry with you. I mean right now I prefer him to be with a Jewish group. But I see no reason why you can't mix at this age. There again, I'm Jewish, I prefer him to be with a Jewish crowd, but I'm not going to knock him on the head and say "Look, you've got to do it." You've got to get along with non-Jewish people when you get older. (8)

Well, I always feel he's not going to live in a strictly Jewish atmosphere all the time, and I personally think it's fine to mingle. Yet, when you look farther ahead, you still basically would want him to marry a Jewish girl, and I do talk to him about that. It's nice to go out with all kinds, but for a happy --- let's say for a marriage without a strike against it, it would be so much better to marry a Jewish girl. (92)

Incident 8, concerning the home social group, brought responses showing less emphasis on "feeling uncomfortable" and more emphasis on the possibilities of future mixed dating and intermarriage than the responses to Incident 2, concerning the dance at the Center.

The responses to the four incidents showed a wide range of opinion among the mothers regarding the importance they attached to being Jewish, in connection with their association with gentiles. This variation should not surprise anyone familiar with Jewish life in the United States today, but I am sure that many of the mothers I interviewed would be surprised at the responses made by some of the other mothers.

Most of the mothers who approved of "mixing" did so for the following reasons: (1) "Jewishness is not important in this kind of situation," (2) "Mixing is a good thing," and (3) "Mixing is all right at this age." The mothers who disapproved gave the following reasons: (1) "Social mixing is not a good thing," (2) "Mixed groups are not as comfortable," and (3) "Mixed groups lead to mixed dating and mixed marriage."
Most of the mothers who approved of social mixing, regardless of age, disapproved of intermarriage. However, they also disapproved of social segregation — sometimes very strongly. These mothers, for the most part, seemed aware of the possible consequences of "mixing," but they either believed that their sons would ultimately make the "right" choice, or they felt that the risk had to be taken. The mothers who approved of social mixing only at an early age voiced definite fears about intermarriage.

Three main considerations seemed to underlie the disapproval of mixing. One of these was the mother's fear that her son might meet with discrimination or unpleasantness if he went into a mixed group. Another was a desire to retaliate against gentiles because of past experiences with discrimination. The third was a fear that their sons might become less Jewish, or might intermarry with non-Jews. Many mothers who showed by their general remarks that they had one or another of these three feelings, gave as their formal answer to questions concerning mixed situations such reasons as the following: "I just don't believe in social mixing," "You should be with those you have things in common with — your Jewish friends," or "It would be nicer if it were just Jewish."

The responses to Incidents 12 and 8 showed much more ambivalence and confusion than the answers to Incidents 2 and 5. Incident 5, concerning the choice between a Jewish or a mixed scout troop, was answered, in the main, without hesitation, the overwhelming majority saying that being a boy scout had nothing to do with being Jewish. This situation involved only boys, while the other three involved girls too. It is the difference in the frequency of ambivalent responses to these three — Incidents 2, 8, and 12 — that I am primarily interested in. I think that the mothers

---

A few mothers said they would have no objection to their son marrying a non-Jewish girl; no mother said she would want her son to marry a gentile.
who showed confusion or hesitation in responding to the "church dance" and the "Saturday night get-together" situations were mothers who did not like the idea of this kind of mixing, but did not feel that they should come right out and disapprove of it to their sons. So they cast about for an answer which would discourage mixing and still be congenial with their own general way of thinking. Incident 2, however, concerning the dance at the Jewish Center, supplied many of the otherwise confused mothers with a "good" reason — "The club at the Center is a Jewish organization." Therefore, Incident 2 elicited very few ambivalent responses. The responses to this situation provide clues to the possible nature of parental attitudes toward other organized social groups, particularly high school and college sororities and fraternities. These responses indicate that a large number of mothers are in favor of exclusively Jewish organizations and social affairs, both for themselves and for their children. All of the mothers agreed that some mixing is inevitable, and in general they approved of it at school or in civic affairs.

Six of the fifteen conflict situations were designed to reveal the mothers' feelings about some particular aspect of Jewish identification. These are Incidents 1, 4, 6, 9, 11, and 13, and they are presented here in the same order as they were in the interviews. These incidents do not produce a continuum of responses, as did the four incidents in the last section. In other words, these incidents belong together, but no significance should be attached to their order of presentation.

The answers to Incident 1, although very interesting, were so extremely varied and ambiguous, largely because of the nature of the question raised, that I found it impossible to classify the responses for the purposes of this study.
Incident 4 tries to reveal how a mother might influence her son's thinking with respect to Jewish traditions, in this case the Bar Mitzvah preparation and ceremony. Incident 6 uses the mothers' attitudes toward Israel as an index of their opinions concerning what a Jew's allegiance should be. Incident 9 raises the question of separate Jewish welfare agencies, in order to find out whether the mothers believe Jews have an obligation to look out for the welfare of other Jews. Incident 11 approaches the question of Jewish identification from another direction, trying to find out how these mothers feel about Jews who are considered by gentiles to be "not very Jewish." In the same general area, Incident 13 asks the mother what she would say to her son about Jews who deny their identity as Jews in order to "get ahead."

Incident 4

"I saw Jack after school today, and he was mad because one of the older guys was needling him about working so hard getting ready for his Bar Mitzvah. This kid told Jack it was a waste of time and didn't mean anything anymore. I felt sorry for Jack, but I couldn't think of anything to say to make him feel any better."

The responses have been classified as follows, in a generally descending order according to the importance the mothers seemed to attribute to the Bar Mitzvah.

1) "It's a very important experience for a Jew." 19 (23 per cent)
2) "The boy owes it to his family." 10 (12 per cent)
3) "It's a beautiful tradition." 15 (18 per cent)
4) "The boy isn't wasting his time." (vaguely positive) 11 (13 per cent)
5) "It depends on the family's beliefs." (neutral or tolerant) 15 (18 per cent)
6) "It's just something his parents want him to do." (negative)
13 (16 per cent)

1) "It's a very important experience for a Jew." 19 (23 per cent)

If his knowledge of Hebrew has been widened, that in itself
has been worth it. Then too, the impression -- it's the lasting
impressions you get in preparing for the Bar Mitzvah. And the
ceremony itself enhances the rest of your Jewish life, and I
think it makes you more of an enriched Jew, certainly mentally." (4)

I think it's a wonderful thing, it's something that comes
once in a lifetime to a boy, and it's his day. There are dif­
ferent thoughts on it. I'm not an overly religious person;
when it comes to Bar Mitzvah, there are those that don't be­
lieve in it. But it's a -- how would you word it? Something
that's been handed down for generations. I think it's a time
when a boy comes into his own right in the Jewish belief, when
he accepts the laws, and I think something should be done to
show that he has arrived at that stage. (5)

It's a part of our religion, just like when a gentile is
confirmed, same thing only Jewish. That boy who was teasing is
narrow-minded. I don't think he was brought up as a Jew should
be brought up, otherwise he'd be different, not make remarks
like that. (38)

Being Bar Mitzvahed is the heritage of every Jewish child.
It is something you will always look back upon and be thankful
that your parents and you did go through it. There's nothing
that he should have been needled about, it's something that he
should have been encouraged to do. (77)

The only thing is, if you are a Jewish boy, and you go to
Hebrew school and you're going to be Bar Mitzvah, you have to
study for it, you got to work for it in order to know what you're
going to do, and it's just one of those things, being a Jewish
boy to be Bar Mitzvah, I guess. It's a thing you have to do.
Whether you're teased or not, it shouldn't bother you. (91)

2) "The boy owes it to his family." 10 (12 per cent)

I think I would tell him if the boy can't understand the
importance now, he will later, and if it's of such great impor-
tance to his parents and grandparents, that he owes them that
respect and courtesy to go through with it, and later on he'll
understand why. (17)

If your folks want you to do it, then you got to do it.
It's hard, going to school all day and then running to Hebrew
school a couple days a week. It's like a law -- you gotta do
it. I feel like a fool in synagogue, I don't know what they're doing or saying. He at least ought to know how to open the book. (44)

3) "It's a beautiful tradition." 15 (18 per cent)

Son, I think that you too went through that, that you felt it was very hard, making your Bar Mitzvah work, and you had to go every day and sometimes twice a day. It was pretty rugged. But it compensated when you made such a lovely Bar Mitzvah. Everyone was proud of you and you were proud of yourself -- I think that's what you could tell Jack, that it compensates. (16)

My boy was very proud of his Bar Mitzvah, but I don't think the kids are proud of it in the sense of --- too much in the religious sense. I think it's the reception and the gifts they get that they're all interested in. And I think that perhaps, thinking on a child's level, he could remind the boy of this. But on the religious level, I don't believe I could have given him the information that would have been needed to convince the boy religiously that this was the right thing. (27)

Well, I think it's a very beautiful tradition. This has come up, because my son was Bar Mitzvahed and there were many days of "Oh, do I have to put time into this?" And I told him that it isn't something that means anything to him right now, but it will as he looks back on it, and it did; after it had happened he enjoyed every minute of it, it gave him a certain gratification which I had told him it would. Tell Jack that by working a little bit for something that he'll enjoy it. (34)

If my son told him of his own experiences, then he would make it seem like the happiest, most wonderful, most lucrative period he ever had! He thoroughly enjoyed his Bar Mitzvah, and I think if he'd simply mention his enjoyment of it to the other child, it would spur him to enthusiasm, because no one had a better time than he had. (97)

4) "The boy isn't wasting his time." (Vaguely positive) 11 (13 per cent)

I would say the boy isn't wasting his time, because any source of learning, no matter if it's for a specific affair, as the Bar Mitzvah is, it only enriches you. And you never know -- it isn't just learning for a Bar Mitzvah on a certain day. That day is past very quickly, but the effect it has on a person is the important thing, and we never know in life when we may have to call upon certain knowledge. (25)

You'd have to be pretty much of a non-believer not to find the family interested -- if not in the Hebrew, then interested in having the parties, and the kids go along with it for the
presents. It's amazing here in Cincinnati, even the reform temples that never had a Bar Mitzvah, now they're having them. They're swinging around to these things -- in fact, what's happening is that families that don't want to make a big to-do about these things are being coerced into them because the child wants what his friends have had. (64)

5) "It depends on the family's beliefs." (Neutral or tolerant)
15 (18 per cent)

I don't know what I'd say to him. The only thing is, I think, he wanted to be Bar Mitzvah, and that's part of the tradition, if you look at it that way. And I guess if you want it badly enough you're willing to put all that work into it. (31)

If it was important enough to his family, and important enough to him to work this far, I'd think he'd be strong enough about what's important to him to tell the other fellow he's full of beans. (75)

Well, I think that's wrong /teasing the boy/, because I think that's his religion, Bar Mitzvah. I personally don't believe in it too much, but I think it's good, I think it's good nowadays, and I would tell my son that I think it's important because it shows his -- when you're Bar Mitzvah you're supposed to become a Jewish man, go into your religion as an adult Jew, which of course they don't because I don't think they know enough, but that is the general belief. (93)

6) "It's just something his parents want him to do." (Negative)
13 (16 per cent)

I don't know. I don't know what I could say to make Jack feel any better. My boy was Bar Mitzvahed because it was the desire of my father that he be, before my father passed away. This is the only reason he was, I must tell you truthfully. (2)

As far as my son was concerned, he would have done something, because he's sorry he didn't make his Bar Mitzvah now that it's too late. He went two years and then he wouldn't go any more. We're not that religious, and I wasn't going to fight with him three times a week. But he wishes that he had made his Bar Mitzvah. I don't know why, but he does. It's all the other boys, I guess, talking about their Bar Mitzvahs. (15)

Well now, on that question I couldn't answer either. I know too little about it. It seems to be something the children want to do because they get presents. It seems to be a round of parties for the grown-ups. I have no sympathy with it, and personally I wouldn't know what to tell my son to say. I think I'd be tempted to say, "Well, with all the parties for grown-ups, I
don't think it's anything for children." I don't know if you've had an answer like that before. It's this present thing that's so shocking — oh, I think it's awful! (56)

My boy wanted to be Bar Mitzvahed, but only because of the presents! I don't know what I could tell him to tell Jack. As I say, he had this desire for the presents, and we simply told him that that wasn't our way of thinking, that that was orthodox and we lived another way.

My boy wasn't Bar Mitzvahed either. He will be confirmed. As far as helping the poor kid getting over his needling, what could I say that would be honest? It's one of the things he has to do, one of the things his parents want him to do. He might just as well go along with the parents' wishes, even if he has to take the needling. Life isn't a bed of roses! (80)

I think my boy would say "There's only one good thing about being Bar Mitzvahed, and that's the presents. I can't answer any better than that, because the boys don't go to Sunday school and I don't know what else to say about it. (101)

It is interesting to note how the acquisition of gifts was used by some mothers as a justification of the Bar Mitzvah, and by others as a basis for denunciation of it. The majority were in favor of the Bar Mitzvah, but only 35 per cent, at most, approved on traditional religious grounds. Many others who approved of the Bar Mitzvah gave reasons that were "social" rather than religious in the traditional sense.

Incident 6

"One of the Jewish boys in my class at school said that what happened in Israel didn't mean anything to him personally. He said he was an American and he didn't feel much different about Israel than any other foreign country. And he said his folks felt that way too. I never thought about it that way before, and I didn't know what to think."

The responses to this situation seemed to fall into the following three general classes, revealing attitudes toward Israel ranging from most favorable to negative.
1) "These are your people -- what concerns Jews all over the world concerns you." 54 (65 per cent)

2) "I'm not really clear in my own mind about Israel, although I do work for it." 16 (19 per cent)

3) "I don't feel any different about Israel than about any other foreign country." 13 (16 per cent)

1) "These are your people -- what concerns Jews all over the world concerns you." 54 (65 per cent)

In a way we feel closer to Israel than to any other country because so many of our own people -- we call our own people -- are there. And I think it's affecting all the Jews in the world, what Israel is doing. I personally always feel responsible, if Israel does something that isn't right, even though I never would consider going to Palestine or be a Zionist, I still feel a sort of closeness which I don't feel to any other country. (1)

I think that what happens in any country in the world concerns us, but I think it particularly concerns us what happens in Israel, because I feel that these are our people, whether we are Americans or not. They are of our own cultural background. It's a feeling of "these are your people," whether they belong to another country or your own country; what concerns the Jews all over the world concerns you also. (2)

He's heard my opinion. They have suffered so very, very, very much, and we have to do all we can to help those that are left. That's what he's heard in this house, and he's never questioned. He should feel that they should have help. Of course, he's first of all an American, that he knows -- but they are fellow Jews, and they have killed six million, and what is left we should help. (7)

I think his parents are wrong, I think the boy is wrong. I feel that even though it's true that you are an American, you must remember that you're American by birth, you're a Jew by heritage. These people are not Americans, but they are still Jews and you are a Jew, and I feel that you should do your share as far as you can in helping these people who are not as fortunate as you to be born in a land where they would have your opportunities. (58)

I think that what happens to Israel is part of every Jewish person. It goes back to the time when we were led out of bondage in Egypt, it's still a part of every Jewish person. It's true that it doesn't hit us as personally, but we are a member of the
Jewish tribe, and therefore should feel a little responsible toward it. It is our people. (77)

I think that what happens in Israel has a direct bearing on all Jews. When the Jews declared their state, their prestige in the whole world went up. Even here in America it's made a difference to the Jews. (87)

2) "I'm not really clear in my own mind about Israel, although I do work for it." 16 (19 per cent)

They are people, they are Jewish people, and if you have any heart at all, you'd want to help them. Not so much because they are in Israel, but they are people. Aside from being Jewish, they are put in a tight circle and if the Jews don't help the Jews, who will? (54)

We have a concern for Israel, certainly, beyond that we would feel for any other foreign country, but I don't steer my home-loving thoughts or feelings toward Israel in any way. (75)

I'd just tell him --- well, you see, I'm not really clear in my own mind about Israel, although I do work for it and have relatives there. Yet I cannot --- I feel here's where I am, you know? I would tell him not to make derogatory remarks about it, to feel that it is the Jewish homeland, and no matter what anybody else thinks about it, make up your own mind about it. (80)

It's a very big question. I'm not sure myself. We have discussed it at great length. And I'm not sure that I feel akin to them, or not. It's very much of a problem and a question in all of our minds, and we do discuss it. (101)

3) "I don't feel any different about Israel than about any other foreign country." 13 (16 per cent)

I'd feel the same way as that boy. I'm American and I have nothing to do with Israel. Although they are --- it is our homeland, I still am American, and that's all there is to it. (38)

That's dynamite right now. I agree with the child. We are Americans first, and when unfortunate things happen in Czechoslovakia I feel very deeply about them. I would tell my son just exactly that. I feel sorry for the Jews who have to find a new place to live, but we are Americans and that comes first. I don't feel any different about Israel than any other foreign country and I don't see why the children should. (56)

I like my children to feel that they are Americans, they are Jewish Americans. I don't like the idea that's been created among some of the groups that the Jewish American's real home is in Israel, and that the people in Israel feel that we should do
everything possible because we're as much a part of it as they are. My answer to him would be that Israel should be helped in every way just as we helped Hungary or any other country that needed help. There is a closer affiliation with Israel, but I don't want it to be so all-important that the fact that they [children] are Americans is placed in the background. This is their country. (60)

Unfortunately, what happens in Israel affects all the Jews, because of the way other people feel about it. It was one of the big questions before Israel was made a country. Whether you like it or not, it does affect you. (61)

Well, there is a big controversy, you know that. As for my family, we are very proud to be American citizens and we feel that we are only Jewish by religion, that otherwise we have no connection with Israel. But we try to help and we financially support Israel, because we want those refugees to have a place to live and get them out of the Arab countries and Hungary and so on. We are not Zionists, and we are not American Council for Judaism, either. (102)

The majority of the mothers wanted their sons to feel differently about Israel than about other foreign countries. Most of them felt more personally involved in and identified with Israel than with any other foreign country. Very few of the mothers whose responses showed the greatest feeling of "closeness" to Israel saw any conflict between being an American and feeling that the Jews in Israel were "our people." Not many of those who spoke of Israel as "our homeland" seemed to intend to live there themselves; they considered it a homeland for those Jews who needed one. Some of the more "neutral" mothers made the point that Israel was a democracy and that its success had raised the prestige of the Jews in the eyes of the world. Many of the mothers supported Israel largely on humanitarian grounds -- that these were people in need of help, rather than Jews in need of help. Several of the mothers found the incident "a touchy subject," one that had caused disagreement in the family. Some of the mothers who advised their sons not to "feel any differently" toward Israel did so because they feared that a close sympathy with Israel would produce conflicting loyalties.
Incident 9

"The other day after Religious School one of the kids said he didn't see why Jews should be all helping each other out all the time. He said there were a lot of Jews he didn't know or didn't like, and he didn't see why, just because he was a Jew, he should worry about them. He asked me 'Why should Jews have separate welfare things?' and I didn't know what to say."

The responses to this situation have been classified into the five groups listed below. These responses have been grouped not only according to degree of approval, but also according to reason for approval, of separate Jewish charities.

1) "Helping one another is a basic principle of Judaism; Jews are responsible for each other." 32 (39 per cent)

2) "If we don't care for our own, who will?" 26 (31 per cent)

3) "All religions have separate charities." 13 (16 per cent)

4) "We should care for each other -- but then, people call us clannish, so it's difficult to know what to say." 6 (7 per cent)

5) "We should help everyone." 6 (7 per cent)

1) "Helping one another is a basic principle of Judaism; Jews are responsible for each other." 32 (39 per cent)

All through history we've always taken care of our own, and as for liking, we're not liking them -- I may not like Abe but I like the Jews as a whole, and I think we should help them out so that the country will never feel that the Jews are a burden upon the country, so that by doing it we keep things quiet, that's always been the aim. So we keep out of public attention. We are a minority group, and that's the only way we can do it -- by keeping those things quiet. (7)

Because the Jewish people, their interests are a little bit different than the ordinary community things, and Jews are
a minority, and naturally they get lost in the shuffle if it's a community-wide welfare. Whereas it's more concentrated if they have a Jewish welfare drive. (16)

Because we've had a long history of trying to take care of our own, and being our brother's keepers, and not ever wanting to be on any public dole, if possible. We like to take care of our own people, just as you wouldn't want to see a member of your family go for public relief if it were at all possible to prevent it. (17)

I think I would explain to him that we Jews have our own institutions, and have our own Jewish problems, and people who must be taken care of, and that we as Jews should do our part to help those people. (23)

A Jew can understand the other Jew's problems, and he is closer to him in many ways. He understands why a Jew cannot work in certain fields, why a Jew is not accepted in certain factories, why a Jew doesn't do a lot of things. And if he does call for help, the Jew is the only one who really understands him and feels for him, where the other people probably won't --- you go to your own first, because they can see, they can understand, they feel more keenly than the other people. (41)

I think Jewish people feel pretty much as a family feels, a great big enlarged family. If I needed help, wouldn't you come to my assistance immediately -- you're my son. Now suppose something like that happened to your cousin, would you say "That's not my brother, I don't have to do it?" You would do it for him, because he's your cousin, he's family. And the same way with Jewish people, it's just enlarged, that's all. (59)

Helping one another is a basic principle of Judaism. Every Jew is responsible for one another, and it's centuries old. Jews have always taken care of themselves. Jewish family life is very close, they've always taken care of their own. You don't find many Jewish orphanages -- Grandma or Aunt Somebody always takes care of them. Giving to charity is part of Judaism, that's the way we live and breathe. (87)

2) "If we don't care for our own, who will?" 26 (31 per cent)

The old expression about charity beginning at home certainly has something to do with this, and if you can't take care of your own, who else will? Certainly I don't think the underprivileged Jew would get as much help if their own kind didn't help. (4)

If the Jewish people don't take care of themselves they'll never be taken care of. I've told my son this. If we don't take care of our own, I don't know how they'll be taken care of. (9)
The Jew has to help the other Jew, because there's no one else to help them. A gentile won't help the Jew. According to the Bible you're your brother's keeper, so you must abide by it. (29)

The Jewish people are a minority, and we must stick together and work together or our race can be wiped out very easily. We must help one another as much as possible. (36)

The Jews are willing to help other religions, and so -- but it is a definite thing that a non--Jew will not help a Jew, so I think it's a hard thing for a child to understand. (62)

We are a minority people, and we have to look out after our own because through the ages we have been confronted with the problem that the Jew has not been helped but has been kicked around quite a bit. It's a matter of protection, it isn't a case of just helping ourselves. But we need so much help that we can't expect to get it unless we do more for ourselves. (64)

3) "All religions have separate charities." 13 (16 per cent)

I would tell him most all religions have separate welfare things. Catholics have separate welfare drives, Protestants, and the Jews do likewise. The Irish have separate drives. This is the normal thing to do. (37)

Because society is basically made up of groups, and if you look about you each group seems to organize itself for its own charities. Perhaps the Jews seem to be doing it more because the need is greater. And we would also get onto the subject of what are Jews -- a race, or a religion, or a people? (71)

4) "We should care for each other, but then people will call us clannish. It's difficult to know what to say." 6 (7 per cent)

These things are so difficult to answer spontaneously. I would say "I'll have to examine my emotions and see whether I am actually giving you the truth, or giving the answer the way people say these things." I don't always approve of separate funds. On the other hand, I do believe we should care for each other. We have been the object of many thousands of years of discrimination, and unless we do stick together we'll all fall apart. On the other hand, sticking together as we do also inspires a finger pointed at us, saying "Those people are clannish, they don't want to mix, they don't want to do anything that everybody else does," which is very bad also. It's difficult to know what to do. (2)

I don't think I'd know what to say -- I think I've wondered
sometimes about that myself. In a way, I feel that it's wonder­ful that they do feel such a responsibility for each other, almost like a family. Yet I think that they should -- could if they wanted to -- become a part of the general welfare. (18)

5) "We should help everyone." 6 (7 per cent)

The only thing I would say to him would be that when the Jews have their separate charities, they're charities but they're not only for Jewish persons. When a Jew contributes money to an organization, he doesn't care -- well, he likes it to help his own people too, but if there's a man in need who's a Catholic or a Protestant he'll say "Sure, if my money will help him -- help him." (93)

Only a small percentage of the mothers had any misgivings about separate Jewish charities. An overwhelming majority of the mothers believed that Jewish welfare organizations were justified, although their reasons for supporting separate agencies varied considerably. Many responses in the first category included such statements as "We feel a kinship with other Jews," "We are our brother's keeper," "We should keep our troubles to ourselves," "A Jew can understand another Jew's problems," and "Helping one another is a basic principle of Judaism."

The second largest category had responses which gave minority-group reasons as a basis for separate charities. This category presented some adverse opinions of non-Jewish Americans ("A gentile won't help a Jew.") Seventy per cent of all the responses fell into the above two categories.

Incident 11

"One of the non-Jewish boys in my class and I have been getting sort of friendly lately. This morning he said he liked me -- that I wasn't like the other Jewish kids. He said I didn't act smart or make a lot of noise all the time. He's a nice guy and he made me feel sort of good."

I asked each mother to tell me what kind of reaction, if any, she would show if her son related the above experience. The responses have
been grouped into the following six categories.

1) "I would resent that." 15 (18 per cent)

2) "I think that's wonderful, but he has the wrong attitude." 19 (23 per cent)

3) "The other boy has something there." 20 (24 per cent)

4) "I wouldn't say anything." 12 (14 per cent)

5) "I'm glad you made a nice impression." 13 (16 per cent)

6) Unclassifiable. 4 (5 per cent)

1) "I would resent that." 15 (18 per cent)

I don't think I'd feel too good about that, because he's separating you from your people, and he has put the Jewish people in a category of being loud, and loud-mouthed, and boisterous, and being the sort of people you don't want to be associated with, and I'd have nothing more to do with him. If he couldn't associate you with your people, then you don't want to have anything to do with him at all. (16)

I would resent that! All children are noisy. I get on a bus going downtown every day, and it is terrific. They're much noisier, the gentile boys are, but they feel like they rule the world, in a sense, and I would tell my son this boy's conception is completely wrong. I don't think he's a worthwhile companion, because if he is going to single you out as a good Jew from a bad Jew, you don't need him. (7)

Do they have to be so timid and quiet just because they're Jews? Is this boy always quiet and polite and on his best behavior? I wouldn't worry whether children like that like me or not. Whenever they bring up that Jewish part, that "you're different, but I don't like the other Jews," beware of that kind, because that's the kind that hates them all. (41)

2) "I think that's wonderful, but he has the wrong attitude." 19 (23 per cent)

I think I would tell my son that he was just feeling flattered that he was being picked out for being different, yet he isn't any different than any of the other children. This boy just happens to like you and that's the reason he sees you differently. (34)

I think that's wonderful, I think you should continue
to be friends with him, he sounds like a very nice person. However, I think he has the wrong attitude about Jews. He's under the impression that a Jewish boy is loud and aggressive and perhaps mean, which is entirely wrong. (24)

That's already happened. I'd say that I'm glad if he likes you and you're not loud, it's good to hear you behave well outside the home. You should have told him, though, that it's like all other groups -- not everybody is alike, not everybody has big voices, not everybody dresses flashily, and so forth. (98)

I think that sort of kid I would invite to my home and ask mother to invite him for dinner, and show him that Jewish kids are no different than any other kids. The only difference is that our religion varies. We all believe in the same God, we all believe in the ten commandments, and all religions, at least in this country, are based on that. (102)

3) "The other boy has something there." 20 (24 per cent)

I don't know -- I mean, actually, it would make the kid feel good at the expense of the other Jewish children. I realize there are a lot of Jewish children that are rather noisy and more on the defensive. You find a lot of Jewish people being louder and more on the defensive than others. But I don't think I would say anything to my son, because I don't think he is old enough to understand. (1)

There again, you can be Jewish-y and you can be modern, like we are. I don't like using this expression, but -- "kike-ish" -- we aren't that way. We pride ourselves on it. I mean, basically we are Jewish, and I naturally resent anybody talking against anybody Jewish, but there's two types and I know it and you know it. We try to be very broad-minded, we try to be modern, to live American. (8)

I'm glad he liked you, and I hope you'll always be well-liked. I'm sure the gentiles are no better than the Jews, but I'm glad you set a good example for the Jewish people. The gentiles don't like boisterousness, so don't try to be boisterous. I'm real happy that he felt that way toward you. (20)

Now all Jewish people aren't noisy -- you aren't, and that's proof of it. But the other boys who are boisterous have created a bad name for everybody else. (59)

Well, the other boy has something there, because there are a lot of Jewish people who are loud, and some of the Jewish people don't care for the way they act. Well, the Jewish people are, on the whole, something like the Italians. They're highly emotional, and some are very loud. (92)
4) "I wouldn't say anything." 12 (14 per cent)

   I probably wouldn't say anything to him about it, something like that, I wouldn't say anything. Because I think you can stress something too much, and I'd just let it go. (27)

   Well, I think the best thing is just to ignore that. (86)

   I don't think I would say anything. That's a hard thing to say about. I don't think he would mean anything by it, I mean it's just a remark. Sometimes people make remarks and there's really no meaning behind them. (39)

5) "I'm glad you made a nice impression." 13 (16 per cent)

   I'd probably say "That's nice, honey." That's about it, just let it go. If you make too much comment on those things I think you just start something, start him thinking about why and what for. (51)

   That's the way you ought to be, quiet and not -- just because you're Jewish you don't have to be loud or act smart. (63)

   I have heard that a lot of times. What would I say? I would say that I'm glad you made a nice impression. It's good to get along with people. I would just as soon people spoke well of you than say "There goes a dirty Jew," or something. I would say I would feel complimented. (80)

Most of the mothers recognized that the incident involved a stereotype. Only one mother in five spoke out strongly against the remark. One mother in five was willing for her son to feel complimented by the remark, but the mothers in this category either cautioned their boys against thinking of themselves as different from other Jews or hoped that the gentile boy would somehow get his misconceptions concerning Jews straightened out. The rest of the mothers did not seem to want to stir things up. In general, then, the mothers showed considerable variation in their responses to this incident -- some resented the remark and let their sons know it, some did not seem to resent it, and others resented it but hid their resentment from their sons.
Incident 13

"On the way home from school the other day, one of the older Jewish boys said that he wasn't going to let being Jewish keep him from doing what he wanted to do in life. He said that his name didn't sound Jewish, and that he would pretend he wasn't Jewish, if he had to, to get a job he wanted. He said he knew lots of people who had done it."

The responses to this incident have been grouped according to the following six categories:

1) "You should be proud to be a Jew." 22 (26 per cent)

2) "You just wouldn't be yourself." 16 (19 per cent)

3) "Sooner or later you'll be found out." 18 (22 per cent)

4) "That's a very wrong attitude." 8 (10 per cent)

5) "There's no reason to pretend you're not Jewish these days."

10 (12 per cent)

6) "Don't announce your religion." 9 (11 per cent)

I know lots of people who have done it, too, but I don't approve of it. One doesn't go around wearing an arm-band announcing "I am a Jew," but if the occasion ever arises where you are questioned, you of course say proudly, "I am a Jew." Never accept a job under false pretenses. Always be proud that you are a Jew, because you have a heritage to be proud of. (2)

I'd try to explain to him that he is a Jew, and he should be proud of his religion and not try to hide it. And if he couldn't get that particular job, probably he'd get another one. (15)

There's nothing to be ashamed of, nothing to hide; so they know you're Jewish, so what? You haven't done anything wrong because you're Jewish. You can be proud of being Jewish. I don't think those people that hide their Jewishness know much about the Jewish religion, I don't think they understand it. I think you should be proud of your ancestry, you should be proud that you are a Jew. (20)
I would tell him never to deny his Jewish blood. As a matter of fact, I think he's proud to be a Jew. I think he feels that the Jewish people have just a little more something than the others. I think he feels -- and I have worried about this -- I think he feels he's just a little bit better. (27)

2) "You just wouldn't be yourself." 16 (19 per cent)

Those people aren't honest, and honesty begins with oneself -- it's the hardest thing in the world to be honest with yourself. That to me would be living a lie. (13)

I would discourage him from doing that, I would discourage any Jewish child from doing that. Just think what you'd have to go through all your life, that you can't talk about certain ceremonials, that you can't mention certain things for fear you'll be suspected, that you can't mingle with certain people. You just wouldn't be yourself, and how long can a person go on that way? Living a lie all your life, it would wreck you. It wouldn't be worth it, whatever financially you get out of it. (41)

We all know lots of people -- we have a lot of people in our family who have changed their religion, and it's just a joke, that's all. You're not fooling anybody. The worst part is that you're trying to fool yourself and trying to be something you're not. I think it's much more of a challenge if you have a handicap, if you consider being a Jew a handicap, to overcome it by your own efforts and your own personality and your own achievements. But to pretend to be something you aren't I think is strictly wrong. (95)

3) "Sooner or later you'll be found out." 18 (22 per cent)

Well, I think it's a little ridiculous to bank on his name not sounding Jewish, and not acting Jewish, because eventually if you take a bigger job they'll ask you what your religion is and it would come out. But it shouldn't stop him from doing what he wants to do. He may have to work a little harder, but the first thing he should let people know is that he is Jewish and then take it from there. Eventually it will come out and he'll have some explaining to do. I mean, to be ashamed of being a Jew is about the worst thing you can do. (1)

You should make yourself good enough to be accepted as a Jew. You should get the job you want on merit, not by any sort of deception, because sooner or later you're going to be found out. It's going to spoil your whole career, it's going to break your heart. (17)

I'd give him Gentleman's Agreement to read. Pretending
not to be a Jew creates problems. You make more of an issue out of being Jewish if you try to hide it. (60)

4) "That's a very wrong attitude." 8 (10 per cent)

My son has a lot of scorn for people like that, which is probably a reflection of our attitudes, because he has heard us make comments about people whose names have been altered -- from Goldberg to Gilbert. We've often said to him that we feel a name is what you make it, and that you can be proud of your name depending on what you've done with it. (68)

I would tell my child that this is a very wrong attitude. We know people, too, who did it. Some of our acquaintances moved away and became Unitarian, and my children voiced it that it was not right. (102)

5) "There's no reason to pretend you're not Jewish these days." 10 (12 per cent)

I would say that was just real stupid, and get all that kind of guff out of your head. In this world that we live in today --- certainly, I remember in my day there was some question of engineers and chemists, but that is no longer true, and I feel today in most places, if you're good, if you have studied, you're going to get in. And if you conduct yourself like a gentleman, there won't be any reason for it. (4)

It hasn't affected your Daddy in any way. It isn't what your name is, or what your religion is, it's what you are and how you act. (14)

I wonder what he wants out of life that would be hindered by being Jewish. It seems to me that every day things happen where Jews are more acceptable in the minds of Christians than they were years ago. Times have changed and people are needed no matter what their religion. (15)

We all know people who've done it, but it doesn't make him any the less Jewish. We think, and it has been our experience, that people are successful on the virtues of what they are able to accomplish in life, given an ordinary amount of good fortune. I think a lot of people who are not successful because they haven't worked hard enough or don't know their stuff, blame it on anything they can -- they're too short, or too fat, or too Jewish, or too something. We work hard on the achievement theory: you get it because you're equipped to do it and because you work for it. (75)

6) "Don't announce your religion." 9 (11 per cent)
Yes, I agree with him. Don't announce your religion. If you want something just go after it. I asked him the other day if he applied for a job and it asked for religion, what would he do. He said he'd put down Jewish, but I told him he shouldn't put anything down. Because if you want a job, what has it got to do with religion? Either you do your job or you don't. Just put nothing down. (63)

I would say "Suit yourself." I don't think you can ever deny being Jewish, the world won't allow you to, and you'll always feel that you are. So, I don't think you have much choice in the matter. But if you want to make your life that way, I think that's all right too. (73)

I don't think the problem is as bad today as it was a few years ago, provided boys have the grades to get into college. And we've discussed it quite a lot. I have two cousins who changed their names. Now I don't know, with our name, how hard it's going to be for our boys. I don't know what they're going to do. Believe me, if changing a name will get them in, I guess we'll all change our names. (84)

Most of the mothers said they "knew lots of people" who had pretended they weren't Jewish for various reasons, and most of the mothers disapproved of this behavior. Their reasons ranged from pride in religion and cultural heritage, through the moral obligation to be honest even with oneself, to a belief that conditions today do not warrant name-changing. Only a few mothers did not disapprove, and even these did not positively approve. Some of the mothers who disapproved of the attitude of the boy in the incident thought that their own sons might have it tougher than gentile boys, but said that this handicap should only prompt them to work harder.

The responses to each of these "identification" incidents were arranged in a continuum from most acceptance to least acceptance of the particular aspect of Jewishness involved. However, it was difficult to arrange the incidents themselves in a meaningful or useful order, as the "association" incidents were arranged. My evaluation of the responses lead to the following order, based on intensity of positive
Jewish identification shown by the responses: Incidents 6 ("Israel"), 13 ("name changing"), 9 ("separate charities"), 4 ("Bar Mitzvah"), and 11 ("different from other Jews"). The greater the number of positive responses (positive with respect to Jewish identification), the higher in this order is the incident.

The responses to the "Israel" incident sounded like answers which had been given many times before, whereas the responses to the "name changing" incident seemed much more like "rough drafts." There were no really negative responses to Incident 9 ("separate charities"), but the positive ones seem to have been more the result of conditions outside the Jewish culture than was true of the responses to Incidents 6 and 13. Incident 11 aroused the fewest positive responses, but among these positive responses were some of the strongest reactions aroused by any of the five incidents. The majority of the mothers, however, seemed inclined to ignore or play down the slur on Jews which the incident clearly implied.

Only three of the five incidents elicited strong reactions. The "Israel" incident, which had the largest number of "positive" responses, brought forth a few vigorous "negative" replies. These strong negative responses rejected the idea that American Jews should have strong ties with Israel. The "different from other Jews" incident, which elicited the largest number of "negative" responses (no resentment of remark), also brought forth several "positive" replies (strong resentment of the "backhanded compliment"). Incident 9 ("separate charities") elicited the third set of strongly emotional reactions, and brought out more responses showing distrust of gentiles than any other incident in the study.
The five remaining incidents (Incidents 3, 7, 10, 14, and 15) were developed to find out what Jewish mothers say to their sons about prejudice and discrimination against Jews. In Incidents 3, 7, and 10 the son relates an experience with prejudice which he himself has had; I asked the mother how she would interpret these events for her son. In Incidents 3 and 10 the son has quite obviously been discriminated against because of his Jewishness, but in Incident 7 discrimination may or may not have been involved. Incidents 14 and 15 were developed for the purpose of finding out what the mothers would tell their sons about prejudice and discrimination -- its extent and the degree to which they considered Jews responsible for it.

Four of these five incidents have two parts, and thus call for two answers. The incident itself, the "story," has been called "a," and the other part "b." These five incidents, then, call ultimately for nine separate, but related, sets of responses. All of these responses are connected in one way or another with the question of anti-Semitism. When I read these responses, I decided that they could most meaningfully be classified by sorting them into three major subdivisions under the general heading of prejudice and discrimination.

These three subdivisions can be expressed as questions: 1. To what degree did the mother seem to view the world as hostile to Jews? (Incident 7, Incident 14, and both parts of Incident 15 are classified under this subdivision.) 2. To what degree was the mother willing to speak out on the anti-Semitism involved in the incident? (Incidents 3a and 10a are classified according to this subdivision.) 3. How did the mother advise her son to react to rejection as a Jew? (Incidents 3b and 10b are classified according to this subdivision.)
Incident 7

"Bill Smith is having a birthday party at his house next Saturday night and I didn't get invited. At school I run around with Bill and some of the others that are going and I thought he'd ask me too. But I didn't think too much about it because only a few kids in the class were going anyway. Then on the way home with Milton I was muttering something about not getting an invitation to the party, and he said, 'What do you expect? You're a Jew.' That shook me. I never thought of that. Do you think my being Jewish could have had anything to do with Bill not inviting me?"

The responses to this situation were grouped into five categories, ranging from a view which sees the world as not especially hostile to Jews, to a view which sees the world as extremely hostile to Jews.

1) "It has nothing to do with being Jewish at all." 16 (19 per cent)

2) "It could be, but it's unlikely." 12 (15 per cent)

3) "It might or might not be, there's no way of telling." 18 (22 per cent)

4) "It could be, and probably is." 22 (26 per cent)

5) "Yes, I think so, and I think you might have this all your life." 15 (18 per cent)

1) "It has nothing to do with being Jewish at all." 16 (19 per cent)

"No, maybe Bill has only invited his best friends, and maybe he doesn't see his best friends at school. You can't invite everybody you know to a party. You should not be offended, and you shouldn't think it's because you're Jewish. I would say it has nothing to do with it at all." (37)

That has happened. I told him, "It's your own fault, you just don't try to make friends, and if you're not invited it's just because you haven't impressed him with your own person."
And about the Jewish part, I would say to him that I don't think it would have anything to do with that, it must be your own personality that you weren't invited. I'd tell him that it isn't that important -- so you missed one party. If you want to be invited, you'll have to invite. (7)

I would say to my boy that in the first place, I wouldn't worry if you're not invited to every party. Suppose this boy happened to be also Jewish and you still wouldn't be invited, what would be then? More likely the reason is elsewhere, not because you're Jewish. Maybe you're not acting just right, maybe you're talking too loud, maybe you're too forward. A lot of things could be the reason. I personally don't think it's because you're Jewish. (41)

Well, you can use it as an escape. Maybe you aren't as close a friend as you think you are. If you want to go through life saying that everything that goes haywire is because you're a Jew, why, it's a fine excuse, but it doesn't have much validity. (96)

2) "It could be, but it's unlikely." 12 (15 per cent)

I would say that it could have, but I would also tell him you can't be invited to all the parties. There are a lot of parties given by Jewish children to which you're not invited -- you can't be invited to all the parties. You've got to learn that some people will invite you and some won't, that it doesn't make any difference whether you're Jewish or not. (68)

It's possible, but I think I would play it down. I don't think I would make too much of an issue out of the Jewish problem. I might suggest other reasons. I don't think one should be too Jewish self-conscious. A lot of people, I think, blame things on that that really aren't -- it's just a way out. I would explain to him, if the boy's always been nice to him, it's possible there's other reasons -- maybe he had only so many people he could ask, so he's only asking his closest friends. (23)

I would say that the possibility exists, I mean the fact that in school they're close, but I think it's more apt to be that he could only invite so many children and his house wasn't big enough for any more, or the budget they wanted to use for the affair wasn't large enough to include more, that he could just include a certain few people that may live in the same locality as he does. (32)

3) "It might or might not be, there's no way of telling." 18 (22 per cent)

That hasn't come up. I'm sorry it hasn't come up -- I
wish he did go with more non-Jews. I can imagine it coming up, and I think it happens to all of us. In college you run into that type of thing, and all you can do is try to fight it the best you can. It could have been — you might as well face it. I also could not have been — it may have been that he was selecting certain people who were his friends in other connections. So it might or might not be, there's no way of telling. (95)

Possibly. Not necessarily. Maybe he had just a select few. It may have been just the few he was most interested in. Or, there may have been an element of prejudice. (73)

4) "It could be, and probably is." 22 (26 per cent)

It could have. I think children can be very thoughtless. Some of them, very cruel. (5)

I'd like to think it didn't, son, knowing how we feel, and let's hope that it didn't. But maybe Bill hasn't been taught to accept people for what they are as you have. (13)

I'm afraid I would blame the boy's background. How does he act — does he invite you to his home? Does he associate with Jewish kids? Are the circle of friends he has Jewish? And if he doesn't run with Jewish kids, then he doesn't ask you. But here again, I think the kids accept this, they expect it, because these situations do come up, and they'll mention so and so's having a party and we weren't invited. So, I would say perhaps he didn't invite you because you are Jewish — if his social circle is gentile, in school you can be friends. I think the kids do invite only their own, and I don't feel bad about it. (27)

It could be but I'd just ignore it. I'd just tell him "Don't let it worry you." (38)

I guess it could. There are some people who are friendly to a point, and maybe a party in his home was beyond that point. He associates with you at school, but for either his own or his family's reasons, he doesn't intend to invite you into his home. (76)

There's a possibility it did, but it didn't come from the youngster, it came from the parents. They probably felt that while in school they have to mix, that's something they can't prevent, but social, a lot of them don't want to, but you can't hate them for it, because that's their belief, that's all. Personally, to me, I think it's narrow. (94)

5) "Yes, I do, and I think you might have this all your life, too."

15 (18 per cent)
If the majority of the children were gentile, I think it would, and the boy was gentile, I think it would have something to do with it, just like when you have parties you invite mostly the Jewish children, because you do have something more in common than with all gentiles. And maybe he would feel that you would have felt out of place, being the only Jew there, and maybe it's best that you aren't invited to something like that, then you have no chance of being hurt. (3)

It's very possible. It's very possible that Bill doesn't think very highly of Jews and that is the reason he didn't want to invite you to the party, but you'll come across that all through your life, so you might as well get used to the fact right now. (24)

I think it's Bill's parents who made the mistake. I'm sure if you're a friend of Bill's, and you've been going with him, and he's been here and you've been there, and he has a party, certainly he's going to ask you. Certainly it wouldn't be the child's thought not to invite you. (56)

Yes, it could very well be. I'm sure as you go through school you'll make friends you'll go around with at school but when it comes to your social affairs and going out socially that you won't go out together. It's the same thing as inviting them to your Center dance -- the same principle is involved here, and evidently his parents don't believe in a mixed crowd either. It doesn't mean you have to stop being friends with him -- there are other phases of friendship than your social phases. (87)

Yes, I do, and I think you might have this all through your life, so you might as well start facing it now. It's the same thing as the other question of the boy not liking you because you're Jewish, and it has to do with bad teachings at home and prejudice that your generation is going to have to fight, just the way we have had to. It's not simple, and it hurts. (101)

The distribution of responses to Incident 7 was fairly normal. The first category of responses contained those of the mothers who told their sons that Jewishness had nothing to do with their not being invited to Bill's party. They mentioned instead such considerations as Bill's party budget, and the size of his house. A few of these mothers told their sons that they had been left off the party list not because of their Jewishness, but because of possible unpleasant personality traits,
and exhorted their sons to institute a campaign of self-improvement. Some of the mothers in this category made the point that Jewishness was often used as an excuse for failure, when the fault actually lay with the individual. A few of the mothers in this first group said they thought anti-Semitism might be involved in the incident, but that they would not let their sons think so if they could help it. The responses in the second category were similar to those in the first, except that the mothers in this second group were less sure that the larger community pays no attention to Jewishness. None of the mothers in this second group blamed the son alone for failing to get an invitation. Most of the mothers in the third category believed that their sons' failure to get invited either might or might not have been a result of his Jewishness. They felt that there was not enough evidence for a decision. Although the responses in category (5) are much like those in category (4), those in category (5) show more certainty that the failure to get an invitation was due to the son's Jewishness. Therefore, I will discuss these two categories together. Some of these mothers seemed to feel that the larger community limited its contacts with Jews because of hostility, while others seemed to think that the gentiles limited such contacts because they felt the same way about "social mixing" as these mothers felt as Jews.

The majority of the mothers who saw anti-Semitism in Incident 7 tended to blame the parents rather than Bill. A few mothers said that children are often "thoughtlessly cruel with one another;" only one or two said that "perhaps Bill did not like Jews." It was interesting to notice that many of the mothers supported one kind of behavior for Jews and condemned as "narrow" the same behavior in gentiles.
Incident 1:

"Harry was telling me today that they had a real hot discussion in his confirmation class at the temple about prejudice and discrimination. He said that some of the kids argued that there wasn't enough prejudice around here to even talk about, and a couple of others said you run into it almost everywhere you turn. He asked me what I thought about it, and I really didn't know what to say."

The responses to this incident fell into five classes, ranging from opinions that there is practically no prejudice to those asserting that there is a great deal of prejudice.

1) "Most of it is in the Jew's own mind." 11 (13 per cent)
2) "There is very little prejudice." 24 (29 per cent)
3) "It depends on what neighborhood you live in." 12 (15 per cent)
4) "There certainly is prejudice, no doubt about it." 21 (25 per cent)
5) "There's an awful lot of prejudice." 15 (18 per cent)

I wouldn't know what to say either, because I've run into very little ill-feeling among gentiles and Jews, so I certainly wouldn't go looking for it. Just be pleasant and happy with them, and be as nice to them as you want them to be to you, and I don't think you'll have much trouble in this world, I really don't. (20)

Well, I think a lot of it is in people's minds. They, I mean, manufacture that type of thing, most of it is in their minds. They have that resistance when they're with gentiles. I think the Jewish people have been sensitive. (5h)

Personally, I don't think so. But I think people who are looking for it can find it, a great deal more than those who are unconscious of it. I've never experienced it. (97)
2) "There is very little prejudice." 24 (29 per cent)

We have very little discrimination around here and we don't run into it very often. So I could tell him that as you get older you may run into it on occasion, but right now it's nothing to be alarmed about. (2)

As far as I'm concerned there isn't very much, and it's never bothered either Daddy or I, and I hope it doesn't bother you. (37)

I think in this country we live in, the United States, there isn't too much prejudice. There shouldn't be. I think people are more broad-minded nowadays. (48)

You behave yourself, you're not going to be singled out for anything. (56)

You would be bound to find some, but I wouldn't say I've run into too much. Maybe it's if you try not to go beyond your own limitations, or not to go where you're not wanted, then you don't run into it. But if you're bound to look for something, go places that you don't belong, you will find it. (77)

I think there is less prejudice all the time -- oh, there's always going to be some prejudice, I suppose, but it seems to me there's less than there used to be. (81)

3) "It depends on what neighborhood you live." 12 (15 per cent)

I don't think there's a lot of prejudice in this neighborhood. I wouldn't know what to say for children -- I think it's more in the adult world where it applies. I can't say there is much prejudice around here -- maybe in some neighborhoods there is, but I wouldn't know how to answer him here. (9)

I'm sure you'll run into prejudice, I don't know how often. It really depends a lot of times on what field of work you go into, and often what neighborhood you live in. You probably didn't know what to answer because you've lived in a Jewish neighborhood and more or less been sheltered. (87)

It all depends on the community that you live in. If you live in a community such as we do, in which there are a number of Jewish people who have reached positions of prominence, people who are cultured and well-informed and well-thought-of, discrimination against them would be very slight, and their children wouldn't feel prejudice, or very little of it. But when you go away to a community in which you are one of many gentiles, in which you have to really strike out on your own, that's when you feel it. But for the most part there is very little felt until you wander outside your own
circle, and then you feel it -- in employment, in college entrance. You're very fortunate to live in a community in which you feel so little of it. And yet you do feel some. (100)

4) "There certainly is prejudice, no doubt about it." 21 (25 per cent)

I think I'd tell him that there is a certain amount of prejudice, but it's usually in people who don't know any better, in the more ignorant class of people who have never gone to school and have not had a good education. And we probably do run into it, in fact we do, we all run into a little prejudice, both in jobs and otherwise, but we should make the best of it and try to affiliate with people who are more social-minded. I don't find it a detriment. (23)

I think there's a certain amount of prejudice. I think there's no doubt about it, because there's all kinds of different people wherever you go, and certain people are always going to be prejudiced. (34)

There certainly are prejudiced people in the world, no doubt about that. Anything they don't know about, they don't understand -- or that threatens them in any way. Lots of times people criticize, or are afraid really, of the success of Jews, because it seems to be a pattern of Jewish life that Jews study and work and seem to try awfully hard, perhaps because they feel the need to achieve and be successful. Then when they get that success, other people who have worked less hard and have not achieved it are resentful of it. There is prejudice, certainly there is, and I think we should use that prejudice, wherever we find it, to try to show that the Jews don't have horns, that we're nice, community-minded, giving people. (75)

There's just nothing you can do about it -- there is some prejudice. You can't help it, it's here. You can worry about it, or just know it's there and go about your business. (96)

5) "There's an awful lot of prejudice." 15 (18 per cent)

I think there's too much prejudice. If the day ever comes that people will get accounted for their own merits rather than their religion's merits, we'll all be better off. But wherever you go, you're going to find prejudice and you have to be big enough to overlook it and just realize that if these kids had been taught right they wouldn't have this prejudice. (3)

There's definitely prejudice, I don't care where you go. It may not show at first, but it definitely comes out. Maybe
it's moved over, maybe it's hidden, but eventually it comes out. (8)

I'm afraid you do run into it all the time, and I think it's a good thing to talk about it, and explain it and understand it. Because you can't help it, since we're a minority group, you will come across it all the rest of your life. (24)

Yes, you do run into it, but sometimes you have to overlook it, because you run into it all the time. But you got to try to make people think that you don't really feel the hurt by it. But you do run into it every day. (39)

There's an awful lot, I think. I would try to explain to him that there's an awful lot of prejudice, and some people run into it more than other people, and how and why they do. I would go into it at as great length as I thought he was interested in. Sometimes they're bored by these discussions, and then again they are very interested. (101)

The responses to this item ranged between one extreme and another -- from those mothers who told their sons that prejudice and discrimination existed largely in people's imaginations to those who said that a great deal of prejudice actually existed. Most of the mothers accepted the fact that prejudice does exist and probably will continue to exist for some time to come. For the most part, they differed as to how much prejudice they thought there was. The mothers in the first category (who practically denied the existence of prejudice) tended to personalize the problem -- that is, if the mother had not experienced it herself, she did not recognize its existence. Many of these mothers seemed to believe that prejudice exists only for those Jews who look for it. Although some of these mothers lived apart from the gentile community in many ways, none of them suggested that this relative isolation might have protected them and their children from experiencing discrimination. Of the mothers in the other categories (those who recognized the existence of varying degrees of prejudice), some said that they had not been the objects of discrimination themselves, but most of them pointed out that this was probably because they had stayed within "certain limits," and
had not wandered outside "our own circle." One mother said, "Maybe it's because we live in something like a ghetto -- it's the line of least resistance." (95) Many mothers in the fourth and fifth categories encouraged their sons to "be big enough to overlook prejudice sometimes," to "ignore it," or to "expect it."

**Incident 15**

"Harry said that in the discussion at confirmation class, the kids who thought there wasn't much prejudice said there wouldn't be any prejudice at all if some Jews didn't bring it on themselves. They said that the Jews who are always running into prejudice are the ones who are always looking for it. Is that right?"

a) "There wouldn't be any prejudice at all if some Jews didn't bring it on themselves."

The responses to (a) were classified into five categories, ranging from statements saying that Jews bring prejudice on themselves to those saying that there would be prejudice no matter what individual Jews did.

1) "Absolutely. The Jews bring prejudice on themselves." 11 (13 per cent)
2) "Maybe some bring it on." 20 (24 per cent)
3) "Yes and no." 7 (9 per cent)
4) "I don't think that's true." 32 (38 per cent)
5) "Never. That's not true." 32 (38 per cent)

I think so, yes -- I think it's what you make it. That's right. (5)

I think so, to a great extent. And I think some of that
we do bring on ourselves by being suspicious of people. I think that we as Jews are our own worst enemies, and our biggest anti-Semites are Jews. He's heard discussions whereby we feel that we discriminate against our own kind -- we're not tolerant. (13)

I'd say yes, that's true, we bring it on ourselves. (54)

Well, it's just like anything else -- there's certain people in every race that do look for trouble, and they bring it on themselves. I mean, most Jewish people, the reason they're talked about is they do bring it on themselves, they try to be bigger big-shots than other people, and let you know about it, and they like to talk loud and show off, and the more they do that the more people talk about them. (91)

2) "Maybe some bring it on." 20 (24 per cent)

Maybe some do bring it on themselves. I really don't --- I guess they do. I guess I'd say maybe they do. (10)

I think that's partly true. They do bring quite a bit on themselves and they do get into quite a bit because of themselves. (24)

There are some that probably are obnoxious at times, that push themselves forward where they are not wanted and they just press it. Possibly that's the reason they make it bad for the other fellow. (40)

Yes, for the most part, I think so. I think that they bring it on themselves. One reason, they're very sensitive, always on guard, and they make a lot of to-do about it. I feel that if you just go along and accept people, meet them half-way, there wouldn't be as much trouble. If those boys and girls didn't have in mind "I'm a Jew and the other fellow is a gentile, and be careful, etc." I think it would be much easier. You would just be your natural self, and things would take care of themselves. (98)

3) "Yes and no." 7 (9 per cent)

I would tell my son that's like the old question of which came first, the egg or the chicken. We've discussed it loads of times. I do think the Jews bring prejudice on themselves in certain ways, and other ways it's forced on them. It's like the chicken and the egg. (68)

4) "I don't think that's true." 13 (16 per cent)

I don't think that's true. I mean, there aren't too many people looking for trouble. (51)
I don't think it's a question of the behavior of an individual. (71)

We would say to him that it isn't true. There is prejudice. Some of it is activated by certain types of conduct, but it is there. (88)

5) "Never. That's not true." 32 (38 per cent)

No, that's not right. You'll find prejudice throughout the world, regardless of whether people look for it or not, and this we have had a discussion of. I said no one need look for prejudice, that it was always there, and the reason it was always there was that basic fear and insecurity of people, and having to put the fault of their own inadequacy on someone else. So they look to some minority group, someone who is a little outside their own group, and blame them; that's where the prejudice enters. (2)

No, that's not true, that's not true, because the ridiculous fairy tale that Jesus Christ was killed by Jews will always go on. You just remember that Jesus himself was a Jew, and they are worshipping him today. I'd say "No, that isn't true." (7)

No, I don't think so. There are some people who are just bigoted, and there's nothing you can do about it. You're a nice Jew or not a nice Jew, they'll still be that way. (15)

I don't feel they bring it on themselves. If you were a gentile and did the very same thing that a Jew did, it would be overlooked and nothing done. But the fact that you are a Jew, you're blamed for it because you are a Jew, that's all. (52)

I think there will always be prejudice, just by the way the world is run. And as long as there are certain teachings of certain churches, as children who belong to certain churches are brought up with the belief that Christ is their God and the Jews were responsible for his death, that in itself is enough to cause some prejudice. It is an unfounded prejudice, but I'm afraid it will always exist. (60)

No, I don't think that's true. I think prejudice is instilled from home training, and from no contact at all with an actual person. I think that's instilled at home. (93)

The distribution of responses to Incident 15 (a) is a little more lopsided than most of the others. The answers range from one extreme to the other, with a significant plurality (38 per cent) of the mothers
strongly disagreeing with the proposition that "there wouldn't be any prejudice at all if some Jews didn't bring it on themselves," and 13 per cent unqualifiedly agreeing. Many of the responses in categories (1) and (2) contain stereotypes of Jews not mentioned in any of the interview incidents. Most of the responses in these first two categories seem to view prejudice as an individual rather than a social problem — as the immediate produce of a given Jew's behavior.

b) "The Jews who are always running into trouble are the ones who are always looking for it."

The responses to this part of Incident 15 were grouped into five categories, ranging from unqualified agreement to complete disagreement.

1) "Absolutely. They're looking for it if they find it." 17 (20 per cent)

2) "It's half right — you do run into more if you are looking for it." 27 (33 per cent)

3) "I don't think you can generalize about it." 12 (15 per cent)

4) "I don't think it's true." 11 (13 per cent)

5) "No, that's not true." 16 (19 per cent)

1) "Absolutely. They're looking for it if they find it." 17 (20 per cent)

I think so, yes. No doubt in my mind about that. (5)

I think so, to a great extent. I think that if you look for anything you're bound to find it. If you look for dishonesty very hard, you're going to discover it. And I think some of that we do bring on ourselves by being suspicious of people. (13)

I think if you look for things you find them. I think you better not look for them and don't find them. Don't argue with people, just be fine yourself and don't worry about the other fellow being prejudiced. (20)
Absolutely. They're looking for it if they find it. (47)

I think that's right, I'd tell him that's right. When you look for something you find it. Just be yourself and not look for nothing. My boy wouldn't know what prejudice was, I'd have to explain to him. (74)

I think when you go out looking for something you can usually find it, whatever it is, and I think you find it where it doesn't really exist a lot of times. (81)

2) "It's half right -- you do run into more if you are looking for it." 17 (33 per cent)

I think if you look for it, you will find -- you will read into things, things that are not meant as prejudice. But prejudice does exist, and I would not deny its existence. But I think sometimes people look for it where it is not. (6)

Yes, I would say some people look for it. Some people interpret things in their own way, and will make something of something that really isn't there. I think I'd try to explain to him that if you look for the good in people you will find it, and don't push your Jewishness on people just because you are Jewish. They should take it as a matter of course. You're Jewish, you know you're Jewish, you do Jewish things, but you don't have to go push it on people. It's just there, it's just natural. (23)

Sometimes it happens that way, because some people have a chip on their shoulder -- I think they are so conscious of being Jewish that it is uppermost in their mind, and that worries them when they make any contact with anyone other than a Jew. I think that's a wrong attitude. (29)

That could be right -- I mean, if you look for it you'll find plenty of it. Just stay on your side of the fence, I don't think you'd find so much. (51)

I think it's half-right, that you do run into more if you are looking for it, and that you do bring things on yourself if you take exception to what everybody says and if you feel in your heart that you're just a little bit different from them, you bring it on yourself. (67)

Partly. I think that some Jews, expecting prejudice against them, carry a chip on their shoulder, and they almost produce what they're looking for. (100)

3) "I don't think you can generalize about it." 12 (15 per cent)

To some extent. I think sometimes because they are Jewish
they are on the offensive -- they might pick up something that really wasn't meant as a prejudice, because they are looking for it to some extent. But other times you're not looking for it, and it's thrown right into your lap. (3)

Well, if you look for something you're alerted to it and more sensitive to it -- you might find it more easily. But I'm sure occasionally they're disappointed or have a pleasant surprise, too. (58)

I don't think it's wholly right -- it may be partly right. There are some people who go around with a chip on their shoulder, looking for trouble. On the other hand, I think prejudice is going to be there no matter what you do. I don't think you can generalize about it. (95)

4) "I don't think it's true." 11 (13 per cent)

No, I don't think it's true. I don't think we look for trouble, I think it's brought to us. (9)

I don't think that's true, but I don't know what I would say to him. (31)

Well, not always -- sometimes -- maybe sometimes people do look for it, but I think most always they run into it, because it's already there. (39)

5) "No, that's not true." 16 (19 per cent)

No, I don't think so. There are some people who are just bigoted, and there's nothing you can do about it -- you're a nice Jew or not a nice Jew, they'll still be that way. (15)

No, I'm sure you're going to run into it without looking for it, because there are people who are going to be prejudiced, and it's just going to be your bad luck sometimes to bump up against them, I guess. (76)

No, I think you're going to find some regardless of where you are -- there's too much going on, too much talk, you're bound to run into some even though you aren't looking for it. (77)

There were more affirmative responses to the second part of Incident 15 than there were to the first part. In their responses to Incident 15 (a), a majority of the mothers said they believed prejudice to be relatively independent of the action of Jews, but in their responses to Incident 15 (b), an equally large majority said they thought that many of the Jews who ran into prejudice were looking for it. Both Incident
15 (a) and 15 (b) were "extreme" statements, but the mothers responded to them for what they were -- the exaggerated language of everyday speech. Very few of the mothers seemed to consider the idea that "the Jews who are always running into trouble are the ones who are always looking for it" too extreme. The exaggerated descriptions themselves evidently did not influence the mothers' responses, since they responded affirmatively in the case of one exaggerated incident and negatively in the case of the other.

These three incidents prompted the mothers to express their opinions on the extent of anti-Semitism, and to discuss whether they believed that Jews themselves were in any way responsible for the prejudice and discrimination directed against them. The answers to these incidents all indicate, in some way or another, whether the mothers encouraged their sons to see the larger community as hostile, or as a place where they could expect to find acceptance on their individual merits. None of the mothers held the "extreme" opinion on every incident, although some came very close to this kind of consistency. The question "How extreme are the extremes?" must be answered by the reader himself from the sample answers quoted in the text.

Very few mothers denied the existence of prejudice, although they differed widely as to how much they thought there was, and as to the extent to which they believed Jews themselves were responsible for it. Quite a few of the mothers seemed to consider the "Jewish problem" an individual rather than a social matter, feeling that it could be solved by "good behavior." In many cases, these mothers also believed prejudice was due largely to the behavior of certain Jews whom they described as "pushy" and "loud."
The second subdivision under the general heading "anti-Semitism" can be expressed by the question "To what degree was the mother willing to speak out on the anti-Semitism involved in the incident?" This subdivision comprises the responses to Incidents 3 (a) and 10 (a). The third subdivision will contain the responses to Incidents 3 (b) and 10 (b).

Incident 3 (a)

"I don't know whether I told you or not, but a new kid has come into our class. The two of us seemed to hit it off pretty good. The other day he said, 'What are you? Christian or Jew? I said I was Jewish. He looked at me sort of funny and I hardly ever see him any more. If we see each other at school and he says 'hello,' then I say 'hello.' We were getting to be pretty good friends, too, till I told him I was Jewish. Seemed funny to just quit like that. Why did he quit being friends with me?"

The responses to this part of Incident 3 have been grouped into four categories, ranging from evasion of the whole question of Jewishness to a positive assertion that prejudice against Jews was the basis for the rejection involved in the incident.

1) "I don't know." 13 (16 per cent)
2) "The boy just didn't want to play with someone outside of his religion." 6 (7 per cent)
3) "The boy's parents have taught him wrong." 33 (40 per cent)
4) "Someone has preached discrimination to the boy." 31 (37 per cent)

I'd say I don't know. Because I wouldn't want to tell my son "Maybe he quit because he found out you were Jewish." Would that be right? I would say I don't know. (10)
I think the best advice would be to ask the boy himself.

That would be hard to answer. The only way I would be able --- I personally would just try to explain to him that maybe it isn't just the way the child feels, it may be that he has heard things that made him feel that way. But why he doesn't continue to be friends is something that would be hard to explain. (90)

2) "The boy just didn't want to play with someone outside of his religion." 6 (7 per cent)

I'd probably say this little boy doesn't care to play with a Jewish boy. Maybe he's the kind doesn't like to play with somebody that's out of his religion. (48)

I think that probably is due to something that had nothing to do with you. Maybe he had an unfortunate friendship with someone and the only thing he could blame the unfortunate occurrence on was the fact that the child was Jewish. (56)

3) "The boy's parents have taught him wrong." 33 (40 per cent)

Probably the boy has misunderstood something in his home referring to the Jews. Maybe his parents made a remark and the boy didn't understand it properly, or maybe the parents did it deliberately. (5)

He could be very narrow-minded. I'd say that to Larry, that the boy is very narrow-minded, he didn't have a good upbringing. If he did he wouldn't see any difference between a Jew or a non-Jew. (30)

Oh. Oh dear. The information of the child's parents was incorrect -- everybody's the same. (60)

Because of bad parental discussions at home, and to ignorance, and it would be nice if you could talk to him and explain it to him. Explain that you're just the same as he is. (101)

Because his parents have given him ideas that Jews are different people, and that -- it's hard to express -- and that Jews --- really, they don't know Jews, when they do these things. But a lot of parents have said that Jews are different, people you don't mingle with -- just like we don't want you to mingle with gentile girls, to go out of your class, and that's the idea, they make it a class, and the Jews are in the minority. (29)

He quit because somewhere along the line somebody must have
told him Jews were strange. Why don't you just go on saying "Hi" to him, and if he wants to play, fine, and if he doesn't, that's too bad. (96)

4) "Someone has preached discrimination to the boy." 31 (37 per cent)

I would say that essentially the child has been reared in an anti-Semitic environment and some of this has rubbed off, and he's heard at home negative things about being Jewish or about Jews in general, and some of this prejudice has come to be a part of him. He's now, or certainly will grow into being, unless he changes, a prejudiced individual. The reason why he doesn't like you is just for the simple fact that you are a Jew. (4)

We would tell him that undoubtedly someone had preached some discrimination to the boy, and as a Jew he wasn't acceptable to this boy. (68)

I don't know how I would explain that -- I'd hate to tell him some people don't like Jews. That would be tough to tell him, but I guess I would have to tell him that some people have a dislike for Jews. I would really hate to tell him, but I guess I'd have to tell him. (7)

Sixteen per cent of the mothers denied, in one way or another, that a negative judgment against Jews was involved in the rejection. The remaining 84 per cent asserted that the rejection was based on prejudice, but differed in the degree to which they were willing to express this opinion openly to their children. They also differed as to where they said they would lay the blame for the prejudice -- some looking no further than the boy himself, some blaming the parents, and others finding the source of the rejection in the existence of anti-Semitism in society.

**Incident 10 (a)**

"On our way out of the last class this afternoon, Charlie said for me to give him his pen back. I told him I didn't have his pen, that mine must look like his. He said he was sure I had his pen, but I didn't. As we went down the hall we both started to get mad; when I got to my locker he was really mad, and he said 'I guess that's what you can
expect from a Jew.' I was really mad, but I didn't say any more and he went on to his locker. I can't figure him out. He doesn't seem to be such a bad guy. Why would he say anything like that?

The responses to this incident have been grouped into four categories, ranging from evasion of the relevance of Jewishness to an explicit recognition of anti-Semitism as a factor in the incident.

1) "I wouldn't be able to figure it out, either." 6 (7 per cent)
2) "He just said it in a fit of anger." 28 (34 per cent)
3) "He doesn't know any better." 25 (30 per cent)
4) "He is prejudiced against Jews." 24 (29 per cent)

1) "I wouldn't be able to figure it out, either." 6 (7 per cent)

That's hard to explain. You know — I couldn't imagine any home insinuating — bringing up religion, so it's really hard to explain why he would say — I couldn't explain it to him, because I'd have to know the environment of the home, and I probably wouldn't know them. (11)

I'd say if it was your pen, and you never saw the other boy's pen, I don't see any basis for talking that way. I couldn't figure it out any more than he could. (68)

2) "He just said it in a fit of anger." 28 (34 per cent)

Well, I don't think the boy is bad if he said that to you. He may have heard it someplace, that expression, it may have just been an expression of anger. (1)

I wouldn't know why he would say that, son. Have you ever given him any reason for feeling that you aren't up and up? I think he just said it, he was angry, and just said it in a fit of anger. I don't think he meant anything by it, and I would just pass it off, I would forget about it. (20)

He said that because he was angry, and I'm sure tomorrow he'll apologize to you. He didn't know what else to say, and he thought he was hurting you by saying that. (37)

He was just mad and he didn't believe you — I don't think that the fact that he said it was because you were a Jew means anything. You know, sometimes when you get angry you use vulgar language, and usually you don't have vile
talk in your mouth, and I think that's just another vulgar word as far as he was concerned. (59)

I think that when a kid is mad enough he will say most anything. I think the kid got into such a state that he really wasn't responsible for what he was saying. (80)

3) "He doesn't know any better." 25 (30 per cent)

I would say he doesn't know any better. My boy would get mad if that boy would make that remark. Maybe even start a fight, because he resents being talked about -- his religion. (10)

I think the child was more or less raised that way, and he hears things like that around the house, and that's why he'd say something like that. (42)

There are some children from some families who have been brought up in such narrow fashion that when they get into uncomfortable situations, they start calling the other person names, in this case "Jew" because he is a Jew -- if he'd been Italian he would have called him a "wop." Their parents have never explained that they shouldn't differentiate between races and religion. (60)

Maybe at home, maybe in hearing his parents talking back and forth at one time or another, he might have heard the parents say that the Jews do this or the Jews do that, and the child not knowing any better, just thinks that all Jews are alike, and he accused you of taking his pen. But the child doesn't know any better, he most probably hasn't been taught any different.

4) "He is prejudiced against Jews." 24 (29 per cent)

I say it's bred in the gentile children from the very beginning -- that anything that is done wrong is done by Jewish children. They come up against a lot of it. (9)

Why would he say it? Because that's what they hear their parents say -- anything goes wrong, you read anything in the paper about gambling, right away they say it's a Jew. That's the opinion of most people, Christian people in the world today, and that's what the Jew has to combat. So you yourself have to try to be nice and understanding, try to explain to him, help him look for his pen. (29)

There are a lot of people who are perfectly nice people, who just have some preconceived ideas that Jews are no good, so if they know you're a Jew you're automatically no good. And I guess Charlie is one of those people. (61)
The only thing I could say there is that it's the innate hate that's taught to them through the teachings, and that's all. (93)

Seven per cent of the mothers refused to recognize (at least in answering their sons) the insulting remark made by the gentile boy. The largest group -- 34 per cent -- for the most part begged the question by treating the remark as simply an expression of anger. It was an angry remark, to be sure, but these mothers did not explain why an anti-Semitic rather than a "general" epithet was used. Another large group -- 30 per cent -- vaguely blamed poor upbringing, while 29 per cent came right out and said the boy was prejudiced against Jews. The responses of the mothers to both these incidents revealed varying degrees of willingness to say that prejudice was the explanation for the unpleasantness involved.

The third subdivision under the general heading "anti-Semitism" can be expressed by the question, "How did the mother advise her son to react to rejection as a Jew?" This last subdivision comprises the responses to Incidents 3 (b) and 10 (b).

**Incident 3 (b)**

"What can I do about it?" This question, in the interview, immediately followed the incident describing a gentile boy asking if the Jewish boy was Christian or Jewish, and being less friendly afterward.

The responses to this question have been grouped into five categories, ranging from those advising the son to be extra friendly to those counselling him to ignore the other boy.

1) "Be friendly -- invite him home." 9 (11 per cent)
2) "Make more effort to be friendly." 16 (19 per cent)
3) "If you value his friendship, ask him what happened." 13 (16 per cent)

4) "Be polite, but don't push yourself." 18 (22 per cent)

5) "Do nothing. Stay away from him." 20 (24 per cent)

Unclassified or no response 7 (8 per cent)

1) "Be friendly -- invite him home." 9 (11 per cent)

I think the only thing you can do is be friendly. You might invite him home after school -- I can have some cookies or ice cream for you if you'd like to. Play with him -- chess, baseball, whatever you do with any boy. Just bring him home and let him see what you are, and what your family is, and your home. I think he'll like it very much, and he'll get to know the Jewish people, too, that way. (20)

If the opportunity arises, talk to the boy at his own level and tell him that everyone believes basically the same thing. Be as friendly as ever and if possible invite him to our home, and so forth. Eventually the other boy will realize that the fact that he is a Christian and you are a Jew makes for no differences in essentials. (60)

2) "Make more effort to be friendly." 10 (19 per cent)

Keep being friendly with this child -- in fact, make more of an effort to overcome something that's evidently bad already in this child's system. Being friendly with him up to this point, you're in a position to help that boy. (25)

If that should ever come up, I think the best thing to do is go out of your way to make that boy your best friend, and let him see he was wrong. (56)

I would try to explain to him that he should, under the circumstances, if he likes the boy and he has occasion to be friendly with him, to put himself forward. And if the boy rejects it, then accept it. But perhaps this child has had a narrow training, and doesn't quite understand. You should always be aware of that, and wherever you can, minimize religion and keep it on a school basis, on studying, on athletics. (84)

3) "If you value his friendship, ask him what happened." 13 (16 per cent)

If you were really interested in developing his friendship, and really thought there was something worthwhile there
to work with, I would take him aside some day and ask him
"Why aren't we more friendly, like we used to be? Is it
solely because I'm Jewish?" If he does say that's the
reason, then I'd say "Why? I'm just like you." Get his
reasons, and inasmuch as you've had some religious back­
ground, present your arguments. (4)

I think I would speak to the boy. If you think a lot
of him and you value his friendship, talk to him, ask him if
his parents had told him not to mingle with Jewish boys -- a
very strange way of thinking. Tell him it doesn't matter if
you're Jewish or non-Jewish, as long as we get along all
right we can be friends. (36)

4) "Be polite, but don't push yourself." 18 (22 per cent)

I wouldn't force myself on him. If he wants to be
friendly to you, and you have never done anything to warrant
him not being friendly with you, then I wouldn't force the
issue, but if he wants to gradually realize that you're the
type of person he wants to be friends with, then don't go
against him. But don't push yourself on him. (3)

Nothing. You can't force anybody to like you and want
to be with you. You be polite, meet them halfway. Don't
push yourself if he doesn't want you. (17)

Why don't you just go on saying "Hi" to him, and if he
wants to play, fine, and if he doesn't, that's too bad. Just
keep on being yourself, there's nothing you can do about it.
(96)

5) "Do nothing. Stay away from him." 20 (24 per cent)

I would tell him to let the child alone, that he has
enough friends. He can get along without him. (37)

I wouldn't do anything about it. Just disregard it,
ignore it, and -- I don't like to say it, but just stick
to your Jewish friends and you won't come up against any­
thing like that. (52)

There's nothing you can do about it. You just have to
live your own life in the best way you can, be a God-fearing
person and live honestly and people will accept you for what
you are. The people who are prejudiced, nothing can change.
(68)

This incident gave the mothers very little opportunity to show any
real aggressiveness, which is probably why even the extreme'negative
responses advised no action more hostile than "ignore the boy" or "stay
away from him." At the other end of the continuum -- one of rather limited range -- were mothers who urged their sons to try and correct the "errors" in the gentile boy's thinking by being extra nice to him or inviting him home.

**Incident 10 (b)**

"What should I do when a kid makes a dirty crack to me like that about Jews?" This question followed the "stolen pen" incident. The "crack" was "I guess that's what you can expect from a Jew."

The responses to the question were grouped into five categories, ranging from those urging the son to "be friendly with him anyway" to those advising the son to "hit him."

1) "Be friendly -- show him a Jewish boy is the same as anyone else." 9 (11 per cent)
2) "Don't do anything. Ignore him." 47 (57 per cent).
3) "I don't know what to say." 7 (11 per cent)
4) "Don't lose your temper, but question him." 7 (8 per cent)
5) "Hit him." 11 (13 per cent)

I think I would tell my boy to try to explain the differences of religion and the fact we're really the same. If that were impossible -- if the child were not sufficiently intelligent or broadminded to accept it -- I would just tell him to ignore him. (6)

I would be friendly with him regardless, to show him that a Jewish boy is the same as anyone else, and has feelings and is friendly and you can have fun with him just the same as anybody else. It wouldn't help to fight and argue with him. Not fight, but explain it to him. It's not the same as it was years ago. (2h)

You could give him a helping hand. It's up to each of us individually to try to correct mistaken beliefs among our
fellow men. We have to say "Look, I can be Jewish, but that doesn't have to mean I've taken your pen." But you have to remember your friend was mad, and there isn't much we can do with someone when he is mad. So at some other time, when the situation is a little better, you might try to talk to him about it. (89)

2) "Don't do anything. Ignore him." 47 (57 per cent)

I'd just ignore it. I think that's your best bet, unless it really gets heated. But don't make any remarks about his religion -- two wrongs don't make one right. (3)

This is what I have always told him -- be big, think your thoughts and don't say anything, because there's so many big things to fight over and that's so minor, because you know deep down in your heart you're right. I wouldn't fight over something like that. (9)

I would just ignore it. That's all. You don't argue with ignorant people, and anyone that says something like that is not intelligent. (14)

I'd tell him just don't have anything to do with him, just get out of his way -- when a boy starts knocking your race, it shows he wasn't brought up right. (48)

Nothing. You can't be a missionary at that point, I think. (71)

Oh, he'll have to accept it. We'll talk about it -- we'll come to the conclusion that you have to be big about those things. (84)

I'd just smile at him and walk away. I've found in life that that kills a person better than to get angry and holler back. It shows him you're just as low as he is when you holler back. (94)

3) "I don't know what to say." 9 (11 per cent)

I really don't know what to tell you to do except the same thing I do -- if you feel like standing up, do so, and if you don't, don't. (2)

That's a problem, whether to stand up and tell him he's wrong, which he won't believe anyway -- or ignore it and go away, which is the usual answer. I don't know. (18)

Maybe his Daddy would say "Take a poke at him," and I'd say "Turn around and walk away." Mothers tend to be more that way. Give him one chance, if he doesn't do it anymore; but if he starts it again then you have a right to poke at him I guess. (67)
I don't know, I really don't know. I know that the Anti-Defamation League has a set group of questions and answers, they do teach young people how to react to these situations. I'd like to get a copy of that, because I really don't know. I would do nothing, I would just walk off because I wouldn't have an answer. (100)

4) "Don't lose your temper, but question him." 7 (8 per cent)

I wouldn't raise my voice, I wouldn't let it fluster me. I would try not to let it arouse my temper, because when that happens you so often lose all your good points of argument. I'd try to keep my wits about me and I'd say "Just what do you mean? Do you mean that all Jews are dishonest?" And if he said that, you tell him "I'm not dishonest, my mother isn't dishonest, my father isn't dishonest -- I think we are pretty good Jews." And you tell him the question of honesty hasn't a thing to do in the world with being Jewish. (4)

I wouldn't fight with him, but I would ask him "Why do you say that to me?" (72)

5) "Hit him." 11 (13 per cent)

I'd tell him to wash his mouth. I'd tell my boy to tell that kid "Flash out your mouth!" (59)

If it were me, I'dsock him in the teeth. I'd tell him to. (73)

I would tell him to answer back and tell him "Don't you call me that or I'll give you one," or something like that. I have always taught my children never to hit first, but if there is no other way, I would tell him just don't show that you're a coward, you go after him. Teach him a lesson. (102)

This last incident, by its nature, aroused more aggressive reactions than did Incident 3 (b). Even so, only 13 per cent of the mothers responded in what might be called an aggressive way. At the other end of the continuum, only 11 per cent said they would advise their sons to continue being friendly. Even this incident, as provocative as it was, found 57 per cent of the mothers urging moderation -- telling their sons not to take any action. Both these incidents -- 3 (b) and 10 (b) -- ask the mothers to advise their sons "what to do" in situations involving rejection and prejudice. In both cases, the mothers almost never
encourage their boys to assert themselves aggressively. Most of the mothers thought the incidents were unpleasant, but felt that their sons should not counter-attack but should retire with dignity.

After the mothers had responded to the conflict situations -- the "incidents" -- I asked them six direct questions. The first of these questions asked the mothers whether or not they had ever discussed with their sons prejudice and discrimination against Jews, and the second asked if they had discussed problems related to being Jewish. The other four questions concerned family rituals, asking whether the parents had changed their religious behavior since the children were born, how observant the family was of Jewish traditions in the home, whether the family kept kosher, and whether the family took notice of Christmas in any way.

**Question 1**

"Have you ever discussed prejudice and discrimination against Jews with your son?"

The responses to this question were classified into three categories -- "Yes," "No," and "No response." The twenty-one "no response" were a result either of my forgetting to ask the question or of the machine failing to record when the answer was a short, monosyllabic one (I sometimes didn't get the machine turned on soon enough to catch the reply). The following percentage distribution includes only the recorded replies.

- **Yes** 23 (37 per cent)
- **No** 39 (63 per cent)
- **No response** 21

Of the 63 per cent who said they had not discussed prejudice and
discrimination, one-third simply said "No." Nearly all of the mothers who said more than that replied that the family "never had occasion" to discuss the topic. A few said they "tried not to bring it up."

Apparently, when these mothers had discussed the topic it had been in rather general terms. Very few of the mothers said they would initiate such a discussion.

I doubt that any of the mothers consciously distorted their responses, but I do think that some of them might have forgotten some of their discussions with their sons. The two main reasons why the boys might not have brought home for discussion certain unpleasant incidents having to do with being Jewish are that eighth-grade boys don't share all their experiences with their parents, and children usually try not to upset their parents by bringing home unpleasant experiences. (I ran into examples of these attitudes while I was doing my preliminary interviewing among eighth-grade Jewish boys in Dayton, Ohio. As one of these boys said, "When I told my mother what happened, she said 'Oh, that's nothing, think nothing of it. I'm sure they didn't mean anything by it.' And then, when she thought I wasn't around, she burned up the telephone telling all her friends about it. So I don't tell her much like that any more." ) I am sure that the mothers in my study underestimated the amount of prejudice and discrimination that their sons had experienced.

**Question 2**

"Has your son ever discussed problems related to Jewishness with you?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very seldom</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These responses fell into almost the same pattern as the responses to Question 1. Only one-third of the mothers said they had ever discussed problems related to Jewishness with their sons. Of the mothers who described their discussions, very few sounded as though they had brought these problems up for discussion themselves ("I think he brings it up, when it comes up. He brings home discussions they've had at religious school, and at school." (80) ). A few of the mothers thought it seemed a good idea to discuss such matters ("Every child at a certain age feels -- has doubts about religion, and about everything. My son has them. A child at his level you can talk with, and we have a lot of discussions." (57) ). A number of the mothers who said these problems had been discussed acted as though they would have been happier if their sons had not raised such questions. The great majority of the mothers said that they had never discussed problems related to Jewishness with their sons, and gave such reasons as "There have never been any problems" (97); "We don't discuss our Jewishness -- it's just part of our life" (87); and "I think it's because we live in a Jewish neighborhood" (42).

**Question 3**

"Have you changed your religious behavior since the children were born?"

The responses to this question fell into three main categories, the last of which required further division.

- Observe less 12 (15 per cent)
- Observe same 31 (37 per cent)
- Observe more 40 (48 per cent)
Nearly half of the mothers said that they had become more observant of Jewish traditions, and 90 per cent of these attributed the change to their children. In some cases the parents changed "for the good of the children," and in some cases the children forced changes on the parents because of what they had learned in religious school. The parents who had changed for the good of the children made such comments as "Yes, we've become more observant. I never used to go to Sunday School myself, and they are going because I think in these crazy times they may as well know what they are, and become somewhat educated as to what being Jewish means and what the Jewish traditions are," (61) and "Oh, definitely. We didn't belong to a congregation until the children came, because we felt no personal need for it, but with the children we felt the need for identification for them." (88) The parents who said that the children had forced them to change said such things as "If anything, I've gotten a little more Jewish because they ask for it. When he started going to Sunday School, he came and said 'Mommy, please light the candles,' so that's when I started," (3), and "I think more observant. They put pressure on you, they really do." (100)

Nearly one-third of the mothers said that they observed Jewish traditions to just about the same extent after the children arrived as they had before. Few mothers in this group elaborated much on their answers, although some of them said they felt guilty that they weren't observing more. Some of them said that they had not increased their
observances even when their children had asked them to. One mother in seven said that she had become less observant after the children were born, but did not attribute the change to the children; most of these mothers seemed to feel they had "just drifted away."

**Question 4**

"Do you observe any Jewish customs in the home?"

- Observe most or all 24 (28 per cent)
- Observe many 14 (17 per cent)
- Observe very few 33 (40 per cent)
- Observe none 12 (15 per cent)

Approximately 85 per cent of the mothers said that they observed some Jewish traditions in the home; 15 per cent said that they did not observe any. Twenty-eight per cent said that they observed "everything," and appeared to feel no need to justify doing so. A number of the mothers who said that they didn't observe any traditions seemed to feel guilty, making such comments as "I suppose my subconscious tells me there is more I should be doing to impress my son. But I feel Jewish inside, and I see no reason to display it. I don't have to do it, and I don't feel like doing it. I suppose I'm too lazy to do it," (2) and "I've been brought up very orthodox, overly so, and I guess I just threw it all over, and I suppose it isn't the right thing as far as my children are concerned." (69)

**Question 5**

"Do you keep kosher?"

- Yes 20 (24 per cent)
- To some extent 3 (4 per cent)
- No 60 (72 per cent)

Very few extra comments were volunteered in response to this question.
Question 6

"Do you observe Christmas in any way?"

Tree and presents 14 (17 per cent)

Presents only 4 (5 per cent)

Nothing at all 65 (78 per cent)

Of the mothers who said that they celebrated Christmas in any way, nearly all had additional comments to make, such as the following:

"Yes, we have Christmas. We don't of course profess any religious observance of it, but it's one of those holidays that's been for so long. We have a tree -- we don't have wreaths on the door. We have what we think is the fun." (61)

"Yes, we have a Christmas tree up every year, but we have always impressed on the children that a Christmas tree is a beautiful object, that it has nothing to do with the religious aspect." (68)

"I've tried to say to the children, probably because I'm justifying it myself, 'This is a religious holiday for other people -- it is not a religious holiday for us in any way -- but it has come mean, really through the misuse of it by the Christians, just a time of good will and gift-giving and happiness, and it would seem to be a deprivation of part of the community good will not to be allowed to celebrate it. And I often cite that you cannot in December buy a carton of cigarettes without Santa Claus on the package, so I say the people to whom this was a religious holiday have relinquished the religion. If they ever take it back, if Christmas ever became again the religious holiday it should be, we would not be able to participate in it. It doesn't belong to us. We try to give the big gifts for Hanukkah so they'll remember it, but I think it's a kind of false, forced thing. Christmas is still the big deal of the community. I'm sure the rabbis would have fits, but that's the way we do it." (75)

The mothers who said they did not celebrate Christmas in any way included those who simply said "No," those who felt that a Jew should "draw the line" at Christmas, and those who attempted to make Hanukkah a big enough holiday to compete with Christmas for the children. Those who felt that they should draw the line at Christmas said:
"No, I don't believe in it. I always feel that we make our point clear — we're Jews. It would confuse the children. They have their holidays and we have ours, and I think it makes it easier." (1)

"I think Christmas is a wonderful holiday, and I'm always tempted to feel sorry that we don't have it that way. But we don't. I don't think it's right. I think that every religion should observe their own things." (57)

Those who made a particularly big holiday of Hanukkah said:

"I made quite a point of decorating for Hanukkah so that they shouldn't feel that ... You should see our front window! We had our candelabra on the windowsill, and we had our big Star of David in the window." (25)

"Absolutely nothing for Christmas. We have a big Hanukkah. My husband and I made a tremendous menorah we've had for about eight years now, and the children light the candles. And they each have their own menorah they decorate." (87)

Nearly 25 per cent of the mothers said that they observed Christmas in some way. Some of these mothers were quite matter-of-fact about it and seemed to feel no need to justify their Christmas activities. Most of them, however, tried to explain their participation in a "Christian holiday" by defining Christmas as religiously neutral — by saying they considered Christmas an American tradition rather than a holy day.

The majority of the mothers, 78 per cent, said that they did not observe Christmas in any way, although a number of them sent cards to gentile business associates and friends. The mothers in this group did not all feel the same about Christmas, however — at one extreme were a few who said that December 25 was just another day at their house, and at the other extreme were a few who very much wanted to share in the general holiday festivities but felt that it wasn't right or that their husbands or sons wouldn't allow it. Most of the mothers, however, believed that "the line has to be drawn somewhere," and that by not celebrating Christmas and thus emphasizing that it was a gentile holiday they were helping
their children to recognize the fact that they were Jews. A majority of these mothers pointed out that they celebrated Hanukkah, not Christmas, and many made it quite clear that they tried to counter the Christmas influence by having a "big Hanukkah."

The next chapter will present the statistical analysis, including not only the "score" of each response with respect to each of the above incidents, but also five additional "scores" based on groups of incidents. These latter are crude scores, and each mother was assigned one on the basis of the combination of responses she had made in each of the following five general areas:

1) **Social mixing.** To what degree was the mother willing to have her son participate in various activities involving both Jewish and non-Jewish children? (Incidents 2, 5, 8, and 12)

2) **Jewish identification.** To what degree did the mother encourage her son to feel positively about, or to accept, various aspects of Jewishness? (Incidents 4, 6, 9, 11, and 13)

3) **Recognition of hostility toward Jews.** To what degree did the mother influence her son to view the world as hostile to Jews? (Incidents 7, 14, 15 (a), and 15 (b))

4) **Recognition of anti-Semitism.** To what degree was the mother willing to speak out on the anti-Semitism involved in certain incidents? (Incidents 3 (a) and 10 (a))

---

(1) There is no connection between Christmas and Hanukkah, except that the two holidays usually fall at approximately the same time of year. A relatively minor Jewish holiday, Hanukkah has traditionally been observed fairly simply. Of recent years, however, gift-giving and home decorating during Hanukkah have become increasingly elaborate in many Jewish homes.
5) Reaction to rejection. To what degree did the mother urge her son to take positive action in the face of rejection? (Incidents 3 (b) and 10 (b))

These five scores were developed by treating the ranking numbers of the categories under each incident as values (they are continuums), summing the values which each mother was assigned for the combination of incidents in each of the five general areas, plotting the five distributions of these sums, dividing each of these distributions into four or five equal parts, and, finally, giving each of these parts a "rank value." These five scores are an attempt to represent a group of related responses, each one acting as a statistically useful and analytically meaningful index.

The data in this chapter have meaning and significance for the professional sociologist, for leaders in the Jewish community, for Jewish parents, and for many other interested persons. For the purposes of this study, however, all of these data were reduced to twenty-eight columns of punches (items) on eighty-three 1.E.K. cards. The twenty-eight items are a result of the fact that there were coded responses to fourteen incidents; that three of these incidents had two parts; that five "general area" items were added, based on groups of responses to the incidents; and, finally, that there were added the coded answers to the six direct questions asked at the end of each interview. In the next chapter, the personal-social adjustment data will be correlated with the home data to see whether there is any statistically demonstrable connection between the two sets of data.
This chapter presents the data which tell us whether there is any association between the boys' personal-social adjustment and the parents' handling of various questions related to Jewishness. The hypothesis of this study is, stated in the null form: eighth-grade Jewish boys whose homes vary with respect to the handling of certain Jewish questions do not differ significantly from each other in personal-social adjustment.

The cross-tabulations required to test this hypothesis used the results reported on in the previous three chapters. These data were punched onto eighty-three I.B.M. cards, with seventy-eight columns on each card. Except for the family's code number, no variable required more than one column.

Preliminary cross tabulations showed that it would have been foolish, as well as very costly, to make all the possible cross tabulations between the twenty-eight different personal-social adjustment items and the forty-seven different "family" items. From the twenty-eight personal-social adjustment items, I picked the six which I believed would be most useful in the testing of the hypothesis: three social-acceptance scores and three guess-who scores.

The three social-acceptance scores selected were those received by the Jewish boys from (a) all the class, (b) the other Jewish boys, and (c) the non-Jewish boys. The three guess-who scores were based on the
items in which the Jewish boys were ranked according to whether their classmates considered them "very noisy," "touchy," and "working all the time." The most important of the above scores is the group social-acceptance score which each Jewish boy received from his whole class. This score was cross tabulated against every one of the "family" items (47) in the first runs. The other two social-acceptance scores and the three guess-who scores were cross tabulated against selected "family" items (27). The tabulations described above produced 182 contingency tables. The following list presents all the "family" items -- all the coded interview data; against these items, the scores received by each boy from the whole class were cross-tabulated. The twenty-seven "starred" items are the "selected family items" described above.

1. Incident 4. Bar Mitzvah.
2. Incident 6. Israel.*
4. Incident 11. "Not like the other Jewish kids."
6. "Jewish identification." Score based on preceding five items.*
9. Incident 2. Jewish Center dance.*
10. Incident 8. "Saturday night get-togethers."*
11. "Social mixing." Score based on the preceding four items.*
13. Incident 11. "Is there much prejudice?"
15. Incident 15(b). "Are the Jews who find prejudice the ones who look for it?"*

16. "Recognition of the existence, in the non-Jewish community, of hostility to Jews." Score based on the preceding four items.*

17. Incident 3(a). Rejection by gentile friend.


19. "Willingness to recognize specific behavior as involving anti-Semitism." Score based on preceding two items.*

20. Incident 3(b). Rejection by gentile friend -- "What should I do?"

21. Incident 10(b). Stolen pen accusation -- "What should I do?"

22. "Reaction to rejection." Score based on the preceding two items.*

23. Composition of social groups entertained in the home.*

24. Composition of neighborhood.*

25. Preferred composition of neighborhood.


27. Discussion of problems related to Jewishness.*

28. Attendance at religious services.*

29. Religious training of son.*

30. Bar Mitzvah.*

31. Change in religious behavior.*

32. Home observances.*

33. Kosher.*

34. Christmas.*

35. Nativity of parents and grandparents.*

36. Religious affiliation.*

37. Education of mother.*

38. Education of father.
39. Father's occupation.
40. Employment status of mother.
41. Birth order of son.*
42. Family income.*
43. Son's I.Q. rank.*
44. Discipline questionnaire.*
45. Public school attended.
46. Age of mother.*
47. Age of father.

These forty-seven "family" items are not all related in the same way to the hypothesis of this study. They fall into three general categories. The most directly relevant items are the "incident" items -- items 1 through 22 on the list. These twenty-two items include seventeen incident scores and five "general area" scores.

The second class contains "family" items which approach the parents' behavior in a more direct way. As well as providing additional information, these variables served as a check on the responses to the conflict situations. In this class are items 22 through 34. The first three of these items are related to "social mixing" -- one of the general area scores. Items 26 and 27 are related to the general area score called "Recognition of the existence, in the non-Jewish community, of hostility to Jews." Items 28 through 34 are related to the general area score called "Jewish identification."

(1) The questionnaire was developed by Richard L. Jackson and reported on in his M.A. thesis. "Children's School Adjustment as Related to Severity to Home Discipline." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, The Ohio State University, 1957.
The third class of "family" items -- 35 through 47 -- includes the kind of variables that have been shown, in other studies, to be correlated with personal-social adjustment, or which I suspect are relevant to personal-social adjustment. I included these items not only as a means of gaining data but also as control variables.

Having decided to use the chi square technique, I combined the categories in each of the items to be cross tabulated, producing 132 fourfold contingency tables. The distribution of the responses to each item was divided into parts as nearly equal as circumstances would allow. This step raised the cell frequencies to a point more likely to produce reliable chi squares. Later, when the theoretically-expected cell frequencies were calculated, none were below the accepted number -- 10.

The results of the chi square analysis of the 132 tables showed that the null hypothesis could not be rejected. Only 7 of the 132 possible chi squares were found to be statistically significant at the generally accepted level of .05 or less.

Not one of the eighty-one possible chi squares involving the three guess-who items were statistically significant at the .05 level. Two of the twenty-seven social-acceptance scores which the Jewish boys received from their Jewish classmates produced chi squares large enough to have a P value of .10, but not large enough to be significant.

The social-acceptance scores received by the Jewish boys from the whole class were significantly associated with three "family" items -- high social acceptance was associated with low identification with

Israel, with the same amount of religious observance (or less) after the birth of the children, and with not keeping kosher. At the .10 level of significance, high social-acceptance scores were associated with belonging to a Reform congregation, with approving of "mixing" at the Center dance, with approving of "mixing" at the Saturday night get-togethers, and with entertaining "mixed" rather than exclusively Jewish social groups in the home.

The statistically significant chi squares, and those that fall between .10 and .05, are presented in Table 26.

The social-acceptance scores received by the Jewish boys from the non-Jewish boys in the class were significantly associated with four "family" items: high social acceptance was associated with low identification with Israel, with belonging to a Reform congregation, with being an older or only child rather than a middle or younger child, and with expressing the view that prejudice against Jews exists whether Jews are looking for it or not. At the .10 level of significance, high social-acceptance scores were associated with approving of "mixing" at the Center dance, with approving of "mixing" on Saturday night get-togethers, and with the item called "Recognition of the existence, in the non-Jewish community, of hostility to Jews."

The acceptance scores received from other Jewish boys were not significantly associated with any of the "family" items. High social-acceptance scores from the other Jewish boys, however, were associated at the .10 level with a higher level of education on the part of the mother, and with not keeping kosher.

It would be very poor science to consider the above associations as anything but suggestive, since the null hypothesis cannot, in the main
### TABLE 26

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CERTAIN FAMILY ITEMS AND ACCEPTANCE SCORES RECEIVED
BY SONS, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family items</th>
<th>Whole class (N - 33)</th>
<th>Non-Jewish boys (N - 80)</th>
<th>Jewish boys (N - 57)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Composition of social groups entertained in the home | 3.35 | .10 |
| Change in religious behavior                        | 6.36 | .02*|
| Kosher                                             | 4.02 | .05*|
| Religious affiliation                               | 3.79 | .10 |
| Education of mother                                 |       |    |
| Birth order of son                                  | 5.52 | .02*|
| Mothers' response to:                               |       |    |
| Incident 6. Israel                                  | 4.00 | .05*|
| Incident 2. Jewish Center dance                     | 3.30 | .10 |
| Incident 8. Saturday night get-togethers            | 3.51 | .10 |
| Incident 1h. "Is there much prejudice?"             |       |    |
| Incident 15(b). "Are the Jews who find prejudice the ones who look for it?" | 3.85 | .05*|

All starred P's are statistically significant.
be rejected. The statistical analysis clearly supports the position that the direction in which a mother would like to influence her son's thinking and behavior has practically no bearing on the boy's acceptance by his classmates, either Jewish or non-Jewish. Social acceptance was significantly associated, however, with certain "family" items. Low social acceptance was associated with behavior tending to differentiate the family from the larger non-Jewish community (strong identification with Israel, keeping kosher, being affiliated with an Orthodox congregation, and disapproving of social "mixing").

The sociometric scores in this study are not associated with the socio-economic variables (education, occupation, and income) at a statistically significant level, because my sample is relatively homogeneous with respect to these variables (Chapter II). The I. Q.'s of the Jewish boys were not a very important variable in my study, because each of the eighth-grade classes was relatively homogeneous in this respect.

As a further attempt to find significant relationship between the two sets of variables, the number of cases analyzed was reduced from eighty-three to twenty-eight. Fourteen boys who had received high social-acceptance scores from both Jewish and non-Jewish boys (and high acceptance from the class as a whole) were compared with fourteen boys who had received low social-acceptance scores from both Jewish and non-Jewish boys (and low acceptance from the class as a whole). I believed that these two groups would be associated significantly with some of the "family" items -- with more of the items, and to a greater extent, than was the case when the scores of all eighty-three boys were analyzed.

On the basis of the above grouping, contingency tables were prepared for every "family" item and every guess-who item. The social-acceptance
scores received from the girls were left out of the tabulations. Of the possible fifty-nine chi squares only six were significant at the .05 level, and four of these involved guess-who items.

The level of significance of each contingency table was obtained from a special table in Guilford's book. With reference to this table, Guilford says, "For the special case of a fourfold table in which two equal groups of observation are being compared, Table N in Appendix B will serve to answer the question of statistical significance....Table N has solutions based upon exact probabilities up to an $N_1$ of 20..."

The two "family" items that produced significant chi squares were the responses to Incident 15 (b) and to the question concerning father's occupation. The following table shows the chi squares of associations having a level of significance of .20 or less. The accepted level of statistical significance is still .05 or less, but associations with higher levels of probability are sometimes significant in the patterns they produce. Table 27 demonstrates, for the second time, the association of high social-acceptance scores with Incident 15 (b). In this case, mothers whose sons were accepted by both Jewish and non-Jewish classmates expressed the view that anti-Semitism exists whether Jews are looking for it or not. High social acceptance was also significantly associated with the boy's father being in a professional category. Of the fathers of the twenty-eight boys involved in this phase of the analysis, ten were professional men and eighteen were distributed among the other occupational categories. At the statistically non-significant level of .20, high social acceptance was associated with a higher level of education for the mother and with the son being an older or only child.

3 Guilford, op.cit., pp. 235, 236.
TABLE 27

THE FAMILY ITEMS AND GUESS-WHO ITEMS FOUND TO BE ASSOCIATED WITH THE FOURTEEN JEWISH BOYS RECEIVING THE HIGHEST AND THE FOURTEEN JEWISH BOYS RECEIVING THE LOWEST SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE SCORES FROM BOTH JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH BOYS, CINCINNATI: 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family items:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident 15 (b)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of mother</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's occupation</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth order of son</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guess-who items:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always go along with the crowd.</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are unusually good sports.</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are always grumbling.</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are even-tempered.</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get their feelings hurt.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are almost never shy or bashful.</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are &quot;stuckup.&quot;</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "starred" items are statistically significant.

With respect to the guess-who items that produced significant chi squares, high social-acceptance scores were associated with being considered "a good sport" and "always at ease with people," rather than "a conformist" or "a snob." At the statistically non-significant level of .20, high social acceptance was positively associated with being thought of as "even-tempered," and negatively associated with being considered
"a grumbler" and "touchy."

This second statistical analysis, using only the most extreme cases of social acceptance and social rejection, demonstrated again that the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The final attempt to find significant associations used only eighteen of the eighty-three cases. These eighteen included one group of nine Jewish boys who were accepted by Jewish boys and rejected by non-Jewish boys, and another group of nine Jewish boys who were rejected by Jewish boys and accepted by non-Jewish boys. A comparison of these two groups should show whether a boy's adjustment to the general community, including both Jews and non-Jews, has been influenced in any way by his mother's handling of certain situations. Of the fifty-nine chi squares calculated on the basis of these two "extreme" groups, not one association was statistically significant.

The principal findings of this study can be summarized in the following general observations. The Jewish boys differed from each other with respect to social acceptance and reputation. The homes these boys came from differed significantly with respect to nearly all the "family" items, most of which had to do with the meaning of being Jewish. Yet, of all the 286 cross tabulations that were made between these two sets of data (school data and home-interview data), only nine chi squares were statistically significant at the .05 level. Four of these nine chi squares involved the same two items -- Incident 6 (Israel) and Incident 15 (b) ("Jews who find prejudice are looking for it"). Thus, only seven

---

This analysis of the relationship between the social acceptance scores and the guess-who scores was not required by the hypothesis, but was included as a further check on the validity of the social-acceptance test and the acceptance scores. The results increased by confidence in the validity of the test.
"Family" items were significantly associated with the sons' personal-social adjustment. The inescapable conclusion is that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. There is no association between the ways in which the mothers of eighth-grade Jewish boys handle certain questions related to being Jewish, and the personal-social adjustment of the boys.

It would be fruitless, as well as tedious, to carry this kind of statistical analysis further. The study has shown that in a given midwest Jewish community, Jewish mothers vary markedly in the way they say they would handle certain aspects of being Jewish. The study has also shown that sex and ethnic identity were significantly related to sociometric choices in eighth-grade classrooms, although no significant differences appeared between the giving and receiving of social ratings. There was very little difference between the way Jewish boys rated each other and the way they were rated by non-Jewish boys. The study further demonstrated that an eighth-grade Jewish boy's social acceptance by his public school peers -- both Jewish and non-Jewish -- was not related to the amount of religious training he had received, how often he attended religious services, whether or not his parents discussed anti-Semitism or Jewish problems, the nativity of his parents and grandparents, the composition of his neighborhood, the composition of the social groups his parents entertained, the views his mother expressed on social "mixing," etc. I do not mean to imply that the above items are not important in the socialization of the Jewish boy; they may be very important, but they do not seem to be related significantly to the boy's social acceptance or his reputation in the classroom. Some significant associations, however, showed up between certain "family" items and the boys' personal-social adjustment.

The two incidents which brought forth these significant responses
were Incident 6 and Incident 15 (b). Low identification with Israel (Incident 6) was associated with acceptance by the whole class and with acceptance by non-Jewish boys. The view that prejudice against Jews exists whether Jews are looking for it or not (Incident 15 (b) ) was associated with acceptance by the non-Jewish boys, and also with a high degree of acceptance by both the Jewish and the non-Jewish boys. Boys whose mothers did not want them to feel strongly identified with Israel, fearing a conflict of loyalties, rated highest in social acceptance.

Lewin believed that Jewish parents should encourage their children to accept an "interdependence of fate" with Jews everywhere. Bettleheim believed that this kind of identification would be difficult to develop in contemporary American Jewish life. At any rate, the mothers in my study who do not try to do what Lewin suggests have sons who are highly accepted socially. Both Lewin and Bettleheim advised parents to treat anti-Semitism as a social rather than an individual problem. Boys whose mothers treated anti-Semitism in this way also had sons who were highly accepted socially.

Five other items produced significant chi squares, but only three are relevant to the purposes of this study: (1) change in religious behavior after birth of children, (2) kosher, and (3) religious affiliation. Boys whose mothers said they (1) had not become more observant, (2) did not keep kosher, and (3) belonged to a Reform congregation, received high social-acceptance scores. If these relationships do form a pattern, it is one that combines high social acceptance accorded the sons with, on the part of the mothers, a minimizing of the differences between Jews and non-Jews.
It is possible that the boys involved in this study were still too young for the parents to have had much influence in the areas touched on by the "incidents" and the direct questions, and maybe the differences in approach, whatever they were, will show up in the boys' social relations later. There is the further possibility that such variables as personal appearance, physical vitality, athletic prowess, etc., may have obscured the effect of the variables used in this study.

I am inclined to agree with Bettleheim when he says, "Security with the family group: that is the key to this problem."

To anyone who plans to make a comparable study, I offer the following recommendations: (1) maintain the same general study design; (2) use pre-coded categories for recording the family data -- categories based on a close examination of the data presented in this study; (3) include additional measures of the boys' personal-social adjustment; and (4) develop measures to evaluate the "emotional tone" of the home.
No. ____________________   Data Sheet ____________________   Date ________

Name: ____________________   Son's name ____________________
Address: ____________________   Telephone no. ____________________

Mother: Birthplace ____________________   Age U.S. ________
        Age ________   Religious affiliation ____________________
        Education ____________________   Employed ________

Maternal Gr.M.: Birthplace ____________________   Age U.S. ________
        Religious affiliation ____________________

Maternal Gr.F.: Birthplace ____________________   Age U.S. ________
        Religious affiliation ____________________

Father: Birthplace ____________________   Age U.S. ________
        Age ________   Religious affiliation ____________________
        Education ____________________   Occupation ____________________

Paternal Gr.M.: Birthplace ____________________   Age U.S. ________
        Religious affiliation ____________________

Paternal Gr.F.: Birthplace ____________________   Age U.S. ________
        Religious affiliation ____________________

Synagogue attendance of parents ____________________   Of son ________

Son: Religious school ____________________
        Hebrew school ____________________   Bar Mitzvah ____________________


Other children: ____________________

Family income for 1956: (1) Under 3,500. (2) 3,500 - 5,000. (3) 5,000 - 7,500.
        (4) 7,500 - 10,000. (5) 10,000 - 15,000
        (6) 15,000 - 20,000. (7) 20,000 - 25,000.
        (8) Over 25,000.

Comments: ____________________
This letter is to introduce Mr. David Lewis of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of Miami University, who will be calling you by phone in the next few days. Mr. Lewis is currently on a year's leave of absence from the University and is carrying on an independent research project in the area of parent-child relations, with specific reference to Jewish families.

The Community Relations Committee believes that Mr. Lewis's plans for this research are well conceived, and we have the utmost confidence in his ability to do a competent piece of research. The results of this study will contribute not only to the general theory of social psychology, but will be of particular value to us in our work. Therefore, I am asking you as one of the parents in a cross section sample of Jewish parents in the Cincinnati community to give Mr. Lewis your fullest support and cooperation.

Mr. Lewis will be calling you and asking for an opportunity of meeting and talking with you, and we will indeed be grateful to you for your courtesy and cooperation.

Cordially,

Charles Posner
Director

P.S. I want to assure you that this research is strictly confidential and nothing will ever be used to identify any individual parent or child. If you have any questions, will you please feel free to call me personally at CHerry 1-5620.
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BOOKLET NO. 1

DIRECTIONS: In this booklet is a list of all the students in your class. We want you to put a number in front of every name except your own. The number you put in front of each name should be the number of one of the following paragraphs. Before you start, put an X in front of your own name. As soon as you have put a number in front of everyone else's name, and an X in front of your own name, close this booklet and start on Booklet No. 2.

"My very, very best friends."
1
I would like to have this person as one of my very, very best friends. I would like to spend a lot of time with this person and would enjoy going places with him (her). I would tell some of my troubles and some of my secrets to this person, and would do everything I could to help him (her) out of trouble. I will give a NUMBER 1 to my very, very best friends.

"My other friends."
2
I would enjoy working with and being with this person. I would invite him (her) to a party, and to a picnic with other friends. I would like to work with this person and I would like to be with him (her) often. I want this person to be one of my friends. I will give a NUMBER 2 to every person who is my friend.

"Not friends, but all right."
3
I would be willing to be on a committee with this person or to be in the same club. I wouldn't mind if this person were on the same team with me, or lived in my neighborhood. I wouldn't mind working with this person in school. He (she) is not one of my friends, but I think he (she) is all right. I will put a NUMBER 3 in front of the name of every person I think is all right.

"Don't know them."
4
I do not know this person very well. Maybe I would like him (her) and maybe I wouldn't. I don't know whether I would like to be with this person or not. I will put a NUMBER 4 in front of the name of every person I don't know very well.

"Don't care for them."
5
I say "hello" whenever I meet this person around school or on the street, but I do not enjoy being with this person. I might spend some time with him (her) if I didn't have anything else to do, but I would rather be with somebody else. I don't care for this person very much. I will give a NUMBER 5 to people I don't care for very much.

"Dislike them."
6
I speak to this person only when it is necessary. I do not like to work with this person and would rather not talk to him (her). I will give a NUMBER 6 to every person I do not like.
DIRECTION: In this booklet there are many paragraphs. They tell about different kinds of people. There is also a list of all the students in your class. On this list each name has a number in front of it. As you read each paragraph, ask yourself: “Is there anyone in our class like this?” If there is, put the person’s number under the paragraph. If you think of more than one person, write the numbers of those other names also. If there is nobody in your class like this write “nobody” and go on to the next paragraph. You can choose the same person for more than one paragraph. Work carefully. Think about the people you pick for each paragraph, but do not spend too much time on any one paragraph.

When you have done all the paragraphs, close this booklet and raise your hand.

1. Some people are very happy. They seem to have a lot of fun. You enjoy being with them because they like to laugh and have a good time. They make the people around them feel good. Are there any students in your class like this? Who are they?

2. Some people always go along with the crowd. They aren’t shy or bashful, but they are afraid to be different or original. Anything the crowd wants to do is okay with them. Are there any people like this in your room? Who are they?

3. Are there any students in your class who are too bashful? They are often alone, and seem to be uncomfortable with other people. They are hard to get to know. They are very shy and bashful. Who are they?

4. Are there any students in your class who are unusually good sports. They wait their turn instead of always wanting to be first. They don’t get mad if they lose and they often laugh even when the joke is on them. Are there any especially good sports in your class? Who are they?

5. Some people are very noisy. They never come into a room without letting everyone know it. They are always talking in a loud voice and laughing out loud at everything whether it is funny or not. Are there any people in your class like this? Who are they?

6. Some people are always grumbling and making excuses when things don’t go right. They hate to lose, and they always blame other people if the game isn’t going well. Are there any people like this in your class? Who are they?
7. Are there any people in your class who are especially even-tempered? They almost never get upset or angry, and are calm even when things go wrong. They are always cool and level-headed. Who are they?

8. Are there any students in your room who get their feelings hurt easily? They always think you are insulting them when you are just kidding. They can't take a joke. Who are they?

9. Some people are “bullies.” They pick on younger or weaker students and often tease them or hurt them. Are there any people in your class who are bullies? Who are they?

10. Some people always seem to feel at home wherever they are. They are not afraid to say what they think in class discussions. They don't mind meeting strangers and they can talk easily with adults and older students. Who are some students in your class who are almost never shy or bashful?

11. Some students seem to be unhappy most of the time. They don't seem to know how to enjoy themselves. It's no fun having them around because they almost never laugh or tell funny stories or good jokes. They are almost never happy. Who are they?

12. Some people are snobs. They are “stuck up.” They think they are better than you are. Are there any people in your class who are “stuck up” and snobbish? Who are they?

13. Are there any students in your class who lose their tempers? They get mad quickly, and become angry and excited when things go wrong. When they lose their tempers, they often do things or say things that are very rude and impolite. Who are they?

14. Some students work very hard all the time. They never seem to take their minds off their work and never seem to have time for any fun. Are there any students like this in your class? Who are they?
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