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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The complexity of human interaction becomes forcefully evident when one attempts to locate a single aspect of it, such as the attitudes of Jewish high school students toward religious groups, in a specific area of sociology. One could justifiably place a study of these attitudes in minority relations, sociology of religion, or social psychology. While the differences between the areas are largely a matter of emphasis, they remind one of the different dimensions from which such a study can be approached. Minority group research has approached inter-group relations largely from the national and racial perspectives. This is not surprising when one considers how recent is the popularity of religion as an area of attention from sociology. Since 1950 it has been the object of increasing concern not only from sociologists but clergymen who are aware of interreligious group tensions.\(^1\) Religion is viewed sociologically as part of man's culture and referred to as a major institution. It is an interacting segment of a larger socio-cultural entity influencing and being influenced by the other component parts.

In the process of socialization a series of religious definitions are provided which are important determinants of human behavior.  

The most distinctive characteristic of religion in the United States is its pluralism. The intricate complexity of human behavior is manifested again by the fact that this religious pluralism can be both a divisive and unifying force. The emphasis on external conformity has been known to cause friction in the presence of cultural and religious differences. On the other hand, during the 1950's and '60's, religion has become "publicly acceptable" to Americans.

The proportion of church members has increased considerably over the past century. Some observers have noted a widespread "revival" of religion which, because it affects all major churches, must be regarded as a phenomenon reflecting basic conditions of the general social system rather than conditions strictly internal to one or a few churches. Will Herberg speaks of a "new attitude" toward religion which has emerged in contemporary American society.

Americans believe in religion in a way that perhaps no other people do. It may indeed be said that the

\[ ^2 \text{Ibid., 34-39.} \]
\[ ^3 \text{Robin Williams, American Society (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), 450-454.} \]
\[ ^4 \text{Vernon, op. cit., 227.} \]
primary religious affirmation of the American people, in harmony with the American Way of Life, is that religion is a "good thing," a supremely "good thing" for the individual and the community. And "religion" here means not so much any particular religion, but religion as such.6

What emerges from this "common faith" is the conception that the three "communions"—Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism—are diverse but equally legitimate, equally American, standing for essentially the same "moral ideals" and "spiritual values."7 The differences separating these groups are transcended in the context of this common affirmation.

Given the complexity of human behavior, an attempt to arrive at conclusions about the influence of religion on prejudice presents an enormous task. Certainly religion never acts alone but always in combination with the influence of other social institutions. A full explanation would demand a multi-disciplinary attack so that an individual study in the etiology of prejudice can only make modest claims. What follows is an exposition of some of the roots of prejudice. Our primary concern among these is with the reaction to anti-Semitism as a source of prejudice.

Survey of the Literature

Melvin Tumin has published an inventory of some 183

---

7 Ibid., 101.
studies on the various dimensions and manifestations of anti-Semitism. This review confirms the impression that there are fewer studies of the attitudes of Jews toward other groups than of the attitudes of others toward Jews. Other areas of concentration are personality differences, values, and educational achievement. Jewish-Gentile interaction has also been studied in such areas as mixed group participation, intermarriage, and dating (the latter on a small scale). The work on attitudes of Jews is of a more self-reflective nature. Tumin maintains that among the diverse patterns of Jewish self-images resulting from reactions to Gentile discrimination and prejudice, the two most frequent and problematic take the form of aggressive self-assertion and aggressive self-denial. These themes and aspects related to them are offered as hypotheses rather than demonstrated theories.8

Such a glance at related research helps to focus this study. The main concern is with Jewish reaction to Gentile discrimination and prejudice as revealed by the attitudes of Jewish high school youth toward other religious groups.

The studies having most immediate relevance here are those of Allport and Kramer, A. I. Gordon, and J. Adelson.

Allport and Kramer tested various causal hypotheses of prejudice among 437 university students, 63 of whom were Jewish. Among the conclusions which this research yielded are the fol-

1. Jews and Catholics with greater experience of being victimized (i.e., experiencing discrimination and prejudice) tended to be more anti-Semitic. A marked tendency exists for victims of prejudice to turn on other groups (occasionally their own) with feelings of hostility and hate just as the frustration-aggression hypothesis predicts. But at the same time the victims could identify and sympathize with other unfortunates and become less susceptible to bias.

2. Jewish subjects are least prejudiced of all yet at the same time most frequently victims of prejudice.

3. Women were found to be less prejudiced than men.

4. Tolerance may grow from certain types of religious training but not mere exposure to religion at home or at church. Jews and persons lacking any religious training are freer of anti-Negro prejudice than Catholics or Protestants.

5. Intimate, equal status contact reduces susceptibility to second-hand stereotypes of minority groups. 9

The study of A. I. Gordon reveals that while on the whole the 159 Jewish university students he studies were remarkably free from aggressive attitudes toward the Negro, "it is

---

evident that aggressive attitudes as a whole are more pronounced in those who have had bad frustrating anti-Jewish experiences than in others."10 There is no significant relationship between the sex of the students and the degrees of frustration revealed in their Personal Opinion Inventory Scores.

The Adelson study is concerned with the authoritarian personality of the Jew who is himself an object of prejudice. His mode of dichotomisation for the "good" and "bad" Gentile as well as the "good" and "bad" Jew reveals his personality structure to be virtually identical with his non-Jewish counterpart in the nature and quality of his authoritarianism. What distinguishes him from other Jews are: membership in sororities and fraternities; Reform affiliation; attendance at religious services only on high holidays (non-attenders were least authoritarian). Sex, he found, does not distinguish high from low authoritarianism.11

These three studies as well as the investigation this researcher is about to describe converge on a common reference point: the frustration-aggression syndrome. Both Allport and Gordon refer to its use explicitly. While Adelson's work is done within the authoritarian framework, his concern for Jewish "self-hatred" and the minority group individual's reaction to

10 A. I. Gordon, "Frustration and Aggression Among Jewish University Students," Jewish Social Studies, V (1943), 41.
majority group prejudice allows it to join this convergence. Various modern psychologists and other social scientists have made more or less systematic use of the frustration-aggression hypothesis. Freud's earlier writings indicate that he used it rather extensively. Dollard formulated the general principles of frustration and aggression from the earlier writings of Freud and applied them to a Southern community in the United States. Its most detailed theoretical treatment is found in *Frustration and Aggression*. An explicit statement of the proposition by the authors is as follows: "...the occurrence of aggressive behavior always presupposes the existence of frustration and, contrariwise, that the existence of frustration always leads to some form of aggression." While this frame of reference does not claim to be a complete systematization of human behavior, it does attempt to place within a common discourse diverse phenomena which includes prejudice, strikes, suicides, criminality, and war.

Jewish-Gentile relationships have been described by Marden in his text on minorities in America as the most enigmatic of all our dominant-minority situations. With the

---

12Dollard et al., *Frustration and Aggression* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1950), 21-22.

13Ibid., 1.

14Ibid., 26.

composition of the Jewish population changing steadily from a preponderantly foreign-born to preponderantly native-born, their full acceptance as Americans has not followed this trend in acculturation. In the United States they remain a "peren-nail minority." They maintain a distinctiveness in physiognomy, culture, and "associational visibility." The emphasis of this study is not on minorities as such but rather on one aspect of the dynamic interaction between a minority group and its reciprocal dominant group. Because of his religion, the Jew remains somewhat alien in a dominantly Christian society. Narden maintains that the dominant-minority pattern of social relationships tends to produce characteristic attitudes and behavior patterns in the personalities of the members of the two groups. There are two polar pairs of attitudes and behavior which they evoke: the superiority complex of the dominant linked with the inferiority complex of the minority; and the "bullying" complex of the former coupled with the persecution complex of the latter. Among the dominants who feel secure in their status the superiority trait is revealed in

16. A. Schermerhorn, These Our People (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1949), 377-413. This minority situation is regarded by the dominant gentile group as inherently different and for this reason Jews are consciously or unconsciously excluded from full participation in the life of the culture. Narden, op. cit., 29.

17. "Associational visibility" is determined by finding out whether or not an individual in question associates mostly with Jews. Narden, op. cit., 416.
behavior which is at various times tolerating, condescending, benevolent. On the other hand those who feel less secure exhibit a tendency toward aggressive behavior which is designated as the "bullying complex." The inferiority complex refers to the tendency of persons long inured to minority status to accept the definition of themselves which the dominant group holds. The persecution complex reveals itself in the unusual sensitivity of the minority person toward the behavior of dominant persons. His frequent interpretation of even innocent behavior as threatening is a striking example of the fact that the minority situation typically evokes the interpretation of discrimination.

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the attitudinal effects of anti-Semitism experienced by the subjects. In this, it should be noted, the data employed relate to such experiences as perceived and reported by them, not as observed in an experimental or otherwise artificially structured situation. The effects of such anti-Semitism will be indicated by responses to questions whose purpose was to elicit reports of personal and vicarious experiences of discrimination and prejudice. These descriptions defined by the respondent himself as examples of discrimination are used as illustrations of frustration. The reactions to these perceived experiences as evidenced

18 Ibid., 34.
19 Ibid., 33.
in the negative verbal valuations of other groups by him are seen as aggressive responses.

Those responsible for anti-Semitic acts or expressions are in most instances non-Jews; however, this is too broad a category to be sufficiently meaningful. It was decided, therefore, to introduce a further categorical division following more specific religious designations. To some extent, the current interest in interreligious group dialogue suggested such use of specific religious groups as a focal point, in that, it was felt, the exploration of the implications of religious identification both for the Jew and the anti-Semite could yield valuable results. Finally, since not all anti-Semitic manifestations could be linked to individuals with formal or identifiable religious affiliation, "non-church member" was added.

Probably the most influential source for this study was a doctoral dissertation written by Sister M. Jeanine Gruesser in 1950. Sister Jeanine's original plan of investigation centered on the relationship between frequency of contact and prejudice. The subjects were originally intended to be Catholic and Jewish children attending elementary schools and living in the same neighborhoods within the larger urban areas of New York City. This plan was altered because permission to carry on this investigation in public schools was withheld for the reason that the character of the study necessitated a declaration of religious affiliation on the part of the pupils. The research on Jewish
students through private organizations did not yield a comparable number of subjects on the seventh and eighth grade level so that ultimately the results of this phase of the study were not published. The study was consequently limited to Catholic students attending parochial schools. Among the conclusions derived were the following:

1. Differences in scores of attitudes toward Jews between children having close personal relations with Jews and those having either limited personal or minimal relations with them proved to be highly significant. Over half the children in both categories indicating personal association with Jews declared that they liked most Jews. Among those who had no Jewish friends, almost half of the group gave evidence of not liking Jews.

2. No definite relation appeared to exist between attitude toward Jews as revealed by attitude scores, and the size of the Jewish group in the neighborhood.

3. The "impression" that anti-Jewish feeling predominated over dislike for Negroes or Italians or any other nationality or religious group living in the various neighborhoods was reported. This impression was based on reactions to statements in terms of remarks and exchanged glances observed by the investigator while the tests were being given as well as remarks on the
questionnaire. 20

This impression is cited as an incidental conclusion by the author; it has particular bearing here, however. The present writer experienced similar audible reactions with regard to the items referring to Catholics while testing some of the groups involved in her research.

The public school system in the city in which this investigation was made also considers research requesting information on religion, race, and income an invasion of the student's privacy. For this reason it became necessary to turn to private agencies for the selection of a sample. Personal consultations with Sister Jeanine Gruesser confirmed the investigator's impression that it was more important to do the study of Jewish high school students given the inaccessibility of Catholics, Protestants and Jews within the public school system. This impression was originally derived from the survey of literature noted earlier, which made it clear that current research emphasizes the self-reflective attitude of Jews rather than their attitudes toward non-Jews in reaction to Gentile discrimination and prejudice. It was also decided that testing high school students was more feasible than elementary students since their attitudes were apt to be more articulate and crystallized.

A tentative statement of the principal hypothesis of this study is as follows: the frequency of expressed unfavorable categorical judgments of an out-group, including the expressed anticipation of "victimization" originating from members of that out-group, is directly related to the frequency of personally and vicariously experienced discrimination and prejudice by the subjects and perceived by them as being attributable to that out-group in past associations. This hypothesis contains two corollaries which will be tested in separate breakdowns. The first is that the frequency of expressed unfavorable categorical judgments of an out-group, including the expressed anticipation of "victimization" originating from members of that out-group, is directly related to the frequency of discrimination and prejudice personally experienced by the subjects and perceived by them as being attributable to that out-group. The second is that the frequency of expressed unfavorable categorical judgments of an out-group, including the expressed anticipation of "victimization" originating from members of that out-group, is directly related to the frequency of combined personal and vicarious experience of discrimination and prejudice on the part of the subjects and perceived by them as being attributable to that out-group. Whereas the unfavorable categorical judgments are clearly aggressive responses in the theoretical framework set forth in this study, some objection might be raised to including the expressed anticipation of "victimization" on the grounds
that these could be nothing more than factual predictions or generalizations. Without denying this possibility, one may nevertheless treat such expectations as reflecting (or so operating as to predispose the respondent to make) an unfavorable categorical judgment of the out-group in question. Obviously, in this context, to the extent that unfavorable categorical judgments are involved in such expectations, they are at most implied in contrast to the other overt (actual) expression of such judgments. In addition to this main hypothesis, three additional hypotheses are tested which can be stated in the following manner: 1) there is no direct relationship between the frequency of expressed actual and implied intolerance of out-groups and sex; 2) there is no direct relationship between the frequency of expressed actual and implied intolerance of out-groups and the frequency of attendance at religious services; 3) there is no direct relationship between the frequency of expressed actual and implied intolerance of out-groups and the frequency of contact with these out-groups.

Definition of Terms

Intolerance is defined here as readiness to pass unfavorable judgments on persons or religious communities. Actual and implied intolerance are unfavorable categorical judgments made with reference to persons or religious communities. They are taken as manifestations of attitudes. 21

---

21 According to Thurstone and Chave, the concept "atti-
Actual intolerance is indicated by means of the negative verbal opinions recorded by the student in certain questions on the Questionnaire on Intergroup Relations and by his agreement with negative opinions on the Remmers' Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Any Defined Group. Implied intolerance is indicated by the expression of anticipated "victimization" originating from members of an out-group in the Questionnaire on Intergroup Relations. Personally experienced discrimination and prejudice, or "victimization," include any negative overt or covert act which an individual reports was directed toward himself, or to another, in which case it would be vicariously experienced, because he is Jewish.

The Design of the Research

The chi-square technique is used to test the relationship between variables. In most instances a two-tailed test table is used to determine $p$. Levels of significance were judged on the basis of $.01$ and $.05$.

While relationship of cause and effect can seldom be
completely established in sociological research, we can approximate a causal explanation. The conclusions which follow in this study are tentative approximations of what dependent variables are related with independent variables.

One of the variables which we had hoped to relate to intolerance was that of parental occupation and education. Unfortunately, the responses to the questions eliciting this information did not permit the kind of accuracy that would be demanded. The descriptions of parental occupation when given were not always explicit; while explicit categories were listed for parental education many students reported that their parents were educated in Europe and that they were unable to make a comparable judgment. Others simply reported that they did not know how far their parents went to school.

The validity of verbal expressions of attitude are not accepted as infallible indicators of actual and implied intolerance. No doubt a number of attitudes did not receive expression in this study. The final results must be interpreted with these limitations in mind.

The instruments chosen for this investigation are a Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Any Defined Group, Form A, Purdue Measurement Instrument, 1960, edited by H. H. Remmers, hereafter referred to as Remmers' Scale; and a Questionnaire on Intergroup Relations, hereafter referred to as the QIR. Both are reproduced in Appendix I.
While it is maintained that the Remmers' Scale reliably tests students from grade six to advanced graduates, it was found, in the results of the pilot study, that it included terms beyond the comprehension of the students to be tested. Consequently, expressions were added parenthetically to the following items:

6. Are quick to apprehend. (catch on)
9. Are highly emotional. (excitable)
12. Are self-indulgent. (usually think only of themselves)
17. Are mentally defective. (of inferior intelligence)

These meanings were judged to be within the range of the students' grasp by four judges. The purpose of choosing this Scale was twofold: first, to obtain a standardized measure of ascertaining the degree of favorableness and unfavorableness of respondents toward other religious groups and non-church members; and secondly, to use it as a means of validating the QIR.

The QIR consists of 38 questions composed of check lists, structured and open-end questions. A tentative form of the QIR was pretested in a pilot study with 47 youth group students participating. Revisions and substitutions were made and the revised form was then used in this study. The QIR was administered to the respondents immediately following the administration of Remmers' Scale.

These instruments were administered to 785 students in November and December of 1962. The students at the Academy and
Hebrew high school extension branches were informed by their instructors that they would take an attitude test. The administration of the test took place during regular class sessions. The situation differed somewhat as far as the youth groups were concerned. A letter was sent out inviting them to participate in a sociological study on the attitudes of Jewish high school youth. They were then asked to vote on whether or not to participate. Every group contacted voted to participate. The tests were given during regular meetings after school hours or in the evening.

It was necessary to ask for assistance in the administration of the Remmers' Scale and the QIR since all of the Academy students could not be reached in the course of one school day by one investigator. Similarly many of the youth groups met on the same evening in the same building at the same time. Two colleagues were briefed by means of self-administration of tests and observation of the writer's procedure in one classroom session.

The participants were told that over 700 Jewish high school students were participating in this survey. Every effort was made to conceal the university and religious affiliation of the investigators. The students were also told that this was an independent sociological study endorsed by the local branches of the Anti-Defamation League and the American Jewish Committee. No names were required. Each student was assigned a number to
insure anonymity. It was pointed out to the respondents that the way they could help to make the study successful and valid was by answering the questions "according to the way you feel."

Of the 785 questionnaires returned, 23 were rejected, leaving a total of 762. Those rejected included five Hebrew high school extension students who were actually eighth grade students in the public school system; two others were college students; one refused to fill out the Scale and the QIR after examining them briefly; and twelve questionnaires were found to be so incomplete as to be unusable. Not all of the questionnaires were literally complete in their responses as will be seen in the distributions recorded in some of the tables to follow. However, those questionnaires were rejected in which all or most of the questions requesting information on personally and vicariously experienced discrimination and prejudice were omitted. These questions were regarded as essential to the study in that they constituted the base of the main hypothesis.

Description of the Sample Population

The sample consists of 762 Jewish high school students attending a private or public high school in a large city in the United States. Within it there are three basic groups designated according to institutional membership. These three groups are comprised of students attending a Jewish parochial high school full-time; those attending Hebrew high school extension classes part-time but public high schools full-time; and those
attending public high schools full-time, members of Jewish youth groups not attending Hebrew high school extension classes at the present time. A Jewish high school youth is defined here as an offspring of one or both Jewish parents. He is a member of one of the Jewish groups described below attending high school in what is usually designated as freshman through senior grades in the American school system.

The first group includes 209 students attending a Jewish parochial high school on a full-time basis. The term Academy is used alternately with Jewish parochial high school to differentiate these students from students attending Hebrew high schools on a part-time basis. Their program of study includes, in addition to the regular high school curriculum, a program of religious and cultural subjects.

The second group numbers 120 students attending part-time instruction at local Hebrew high school extension classes. They attend sessions ranging from three to nine and a half hours weekly sponsored by a central agency of Jewish education.

The third component of the sample consists of 433 public high school students belonging to youth groups sponsored by national and local Jewish organizations. The national organization plan includes religious, cultural, and social services, social and athletic activities. The city organization has a primarily socio-cultural orientation. Membership in both groups is limited to Jewish youth. Groups were chosen on a proportion-
ate basis in order to insure regional and sex representation. The six groups from the south side of the city, a total of 169, were members of the national organization as were the five groups, including a total of 88 from the west side. Included with the seven national organization groups on the north side were an additional group of 70 students from a city youth organization. These youths were invited to participate because it was felt that the national youth organization did not adequately represent Jewish youth on the north side. The north side total was 176. During the codification of the data these regional differences appeared to be reflected in the responses. Rather than combine these totals, we decided to retain the regional designations (south side youth group, west side youth group, and north side youth group) in order to keep the possibility of outstanding regional differences in view.

Of the 762 students participating in this study 553 attend public schools full-time. One hundred and twenty of these attend after-school instruction at Hebrew high school branches. Two hundred and nine students attend a Jewish parochial high school full-time. The sample includes 370 boys and 387 girls. Five respondents did not check male or female in response to Question 1 on the QIR.

Table 1 lists the number and percentage representation of the social characteristics of the total population participating in the study. These figures are located in the column on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Population Total</th>
<th>Social Characteristics</th>
<th>Academy (N=209)</th>
<th>Hebrew High School (N=120)</th>
<th>Youth Groups Combined (N=433)</th>
<th>Group Total (N=762)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>762 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at Hebrew Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Heb. High &amp; Grade School</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Heb. High Some Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Heb. High No Grad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox and Traditional</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know-Oth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't Compl. High School</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complt. High</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compltd Col. Grad. Prof.</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't Compl. High School</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complt. High</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compltd Col. Grad. Prof.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1**

Number and Percentage of Social Characteristics of the Total Sample Population by Groups (N=762)
the left. Figures representing responses of students from the Academy, Hebrew high school group, and the combined youth groups within this total are found in the columns on the right. There is a slightly higher percentage of girls represented (50.8 per cent) as opposed to boys (48.5 per cent). The modal age was 15, a total of 29.9 per cent of the population, followed by 14 and 16 years of age, 24.5 and 22.9 per cent respectively. Freshmen and sophomores make up more than half of the sample, juniors totaled 26.1 per cent while seniors constituted 14.2 per cent of the total.

Over 81 per cent of the students have attended some form of Hebrew high school, grade school, or Sunday school. Of this population, 44.7 per cent have attended both high school and grade school and 36.9 per cent have attended grade school or Sunday school only. Eighteen per cent of the sample report not having attended Hebrew high school or grade school. This group was concentrated in the combined youth group total. Forty-eight of these students were in the south side group; 24 in the west side and 65 in the north side youth groups.

Religious affiliation is represented in the following manner: Orthodox-Traditional (combined), 41.8 per cent; Conservative, 40.3 per cent; Reform, 10.8 per cent; no affiliation, don't know, 6.3 per cent. The Academy students accounted for 60.2 per cent of the Orthodox-Traditional representation, followed by 27 per cent from the youth groups and 12.8 per cent
from the Hebrew high school group. Three-fourths of those with Conservative affiliation were concentrated in the youth groups while slightly less than one-quarter were in the Hebrew high school group. The remaining 3.9 per cent were from the Academy. The combined youth group accounted for 91.5 per cent (a total of 75) of the Reform representation, the remaining 8.5 per cent (a total of 7) was recorded by Hebrew high school respondents.

Reports of "no affiliation" and "don't know" were recorded by 5 youth organization respondents and 1 respondent from the Hebrew high school group.

The statistics on parental education are limited by the fact that a total of 120 responses concerning the father's education and 86 regarding the mother's education could not be included in the tally. While explicit categories were listed for parental education some students reported that their parents were educated in Europe and that they were unable to make a comparable judgment. Others simply reported that they did not know how far their parents went to school. Parental educational attainment, when given, shows that 10.2 per cent of the fathers and 9.3 per cent of the mothers did not complete high school. Over 41 per cent of the mothers and 22 per cent of the fathers terminated their education with graduation from high school. Over 21 per cent of the mothers and 19.7 per cent of the fathers went on to college but did not graduate. Completion of college studies was reported for 32.3 per cent of the fathers and 16.4
per cent of the mothers. The category "miscellaneous" includes those parents who were educated in Europe and "don't know" responses; the percentage representations were 10.9 and 7.1 per cent for fathers and mothers respectively. No response totals were 4.9 and 4.2 per cent.

The combined youth group accounted for more fathers and mothers who did not complete high school, 64.1 and 56.3 per cent respectively; the totals reported by Academy students were 25.6 and 36.6 per cent; Hebrew high school respondents reported 10.3 per cent of the fathers and 7 per cent of the mothers did not complete high school.

Students from the youth groups reported that 69.6 per cent of the fathers and 69.4 per cent of the mothers completed high school. Youth group totals reflect their incidence in the population. Students from the Academy reported 21.4 per cent fathers and 16.6 per cent mothers in this category. The Hebrew high school group accounted for 8.9 per cent fathers and 14 per cent mothers who completed high school. Reports of parents who completed high school and attended college for a limited time were registered by respondents from the youth group with totals of 66.7 per cent fathers and 51.8 per cent mothers in this category; they were followed by similar reports of 14.7 per cent fathers and 20.5 per cent mothers from the Hebrew high school group.

Completion of college studies was reported for 46.3 per
cent of the fathers and 44 per cent of the mothers by the respondents in the youth group; 32.1 per cent of the fathers and 35.2 per cent of the mothers of Academy students have achieved this level compared to 21.6 per cent and 20.8 per cent of fathers and mothers of respondents from the Hebrew high school group.

The introduction of the social characteristics that we have just described might be considered premature at this point. However, it was felt that a comprehensive view would be appropriate in order to familiarize the reader with the entire sample population in view of the detailed and specialized nature of the following investigation.
CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF ATTITUDES TOWARD MEMBERS OF RELIGIOUS GROUPS

A Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Any Defined Group, Form A, edited by H. H. Remmers was used to measure favorable and unfavorable attitudes toward other religious groups.¹ The groups rated were non-church members (defined as people who do not belong to any religious group), Catholics, Jews, and Protestants. This generalized attitude scale consists of seventeen items ranging from most favorable (10.3 is the scale value for Item 1: Can be depended upon as being honest) to least favorable (1.0 is the scale value for Item 17: Are mentally defective).² The indifference point is 6.0. Scores above 6.0 indicate a favorable attitude, scores below 6.0, an unfavorable attitude. The median scale value of the statements endorsed is the attitude score. If an odd number of statements is endorsed, the scale value of the middle item of those endorsed gives the score. If an even number of items is endorsed the score will be half-way between the scale values of these items. Our analysis of the scores on this Scale is not based on 6.0 as the neutral point assigned by Remmers. Scores are analyzed in terms of more and

¹Reproduced in Appendix I.

²Scale values and method of scoring are found immediately following the Scale in Appendix II.
less favorable ratings. Later in the study we divide the population in half: those more and less favorable on the basis of median scores and thereby include the entire population rather than limiting the analysis to extreme groups. This procedure has been defended by Gordon Allport in his criticism of certain methods of research on the prejudiced personality. Referring to studies which utilize extreme groups and contrasting groups of subjects—those very high and very low prejudice scores—he writes:

...Median or "average" subjects are discarded. This procedure is defensible, but it has the disadvantage of over-emphasizing types. We are likely to forget that there are plenty of mixed or run-of-the-mill personalities in whom prejudice does not follow the ideal pattern here depicted. 3

Table 2 illustrates the arithmetic means and standard deviations indicating the variability of the ratings within the group and the sample size of all of the groups. The youth group is divided into regional designations. Tables A through J presented in Appendix II demonstrate the differences between the mean ratings given to non-Church members, Catholics, Jews, and Protestants by the various groups expressed in units of the standard error of the difference between means (z).

All of the groups shown in Table 2 rated non-church members less favorably than they did the other groups. In Table A, Appendix II, Academy students gave a significantly lower rating 4

---

4Significant at the .05 level.
TABLE 2
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF REMMERS' ATTITUDE SCALE SCORES AND SAMPLE SIZES OF GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups</th>
<th>Groups Rated on the Remmers' Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-church Members</td>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>Protestants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew High School Group</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Side Youth Group</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Youth Group</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side Youth Group</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research Population</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means = group means based on individual mean scores.*

to non-church members than did the south and west side youth groups although they did not extend these significantly lower ratings for Catholics and Protestants.

While the difference in means may not be great (on the basis of Remmers' designation) for Catholics as compared to non-church members, Table B illustrates the significant differences
in means between the south side youth group and others with regard to Catholics. The mean of this group differed (negatively) from the west side 3.15;\(^5\) the north side group 2.08;\(^6\) the Academy 3.24;\(^7\) and the Hebrew high school group 2.36.\(^8\) There were no significant differences in the ratings of Protestants between the south side group and any other group as is demonstrated in Table C (see Appendix II).

As might be expected, the attitudes of the respondents toward Jews is relatively favorable as is shown in Table 2. On the other hand, Table D, Appendix II shows the north side youth group rating Jews significantly less favorably than all others.\(^9\) None of the other comparisons is significantly different. While this significantly lower rating of Jews on the part of the north side group cannot be projected to all of the groups, it anticipates the results of the tests relating "victimization" and intolerance toward Jews in Chapter III. This evidence allows itself to be interpreted in the light of the Jew's acceptance of the same attitude toward his group which he thinks the anti-Semite has, reflecting what has been designated by Lewin and

---

\(^5\)Significant at the .01 level.
\(^6\)Significant at the .05 level.
\(^7\)Significant at the .01 level.
\(^8\)Significant at the .05 level.
\(^9\)Significant at the .05 level.
others as "self-hatred."10

The north side respondents differentiated (in terms of rating) non-church members from every other group but did not significantly differentiate among Catholics, Jews, and Protestants. (Table E, Appendix II)

In Table F, Appendix II, the south side group differentiated non-church members from all other groups, Catholics from Protestants, and Catholics from Jews. They did not differentiate between Jews and Protestants in their rating. (The distinction between Jews and Protestants is a borderline decision which may or may not be significant).

The west side group is shown as differentiating non-church members from other groups in Table G, Appendix II, but does not distinguish Catholics, Jews and Protestants from one another.

Table H, Appendix II shows that Hebrew high school students differentiate non-church members from all other groups. They also differentiate Catholics from Protestants, Catholics from Jews, but not Jews from Protestants. Academy students are shown to differentiate non-church members from other groups in Table I, Appendix II, Catholics from Jews, Jews from Protestants, but not Catholics from Protestants.

Table J illustrates that all four respondent groups combined have significantly differentiated all four groups rated on

10Tumin, op. cit., 100.
the Remmers' Scale. However, the only two individual groups which make this distinction between religious groups are the south side youth group and students attending Hebrew high schools.

Summary and Conclusions

An analysis of the Remmers' Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Any Defined Group based on the arithmetic means of respondent groups and standard deviations showing the variability of ratings of the different groups (non-church members, Catholics, Jews, and Protestants) indicates that all respondent groups rated non-church members less favorably than they did those with religious affiliation. Students at the Academy rated non-church members significantly lower than others did. Jews were rated most favorably of all the groups on the Scale with students from the north side rating them less favorably than did other groups. While Catholics were not rated as unfavorably as non-church members they were rated less favorably than Protestants and Jews. Students in the south side youth group were more negative in their ratings of Catholics than any other respondent group.

Figure 1 summarizes the data found in Tables A through J, Appendix II. It illustrates more succinctly the significant differentiations between the groups rated on the Scale. All respondent groups combined showed that all four evaluated groups were

---

1 Significant at the .01 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-church Members</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Protestants</th>
<th>Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew High School Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side Youth Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Side Youth Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Youth Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.—Illustration of significant differentiation among non-church members and religious groups by the total sample and individual groups.

Individual bars represent significant differentiation; continuous bars represent absence of significant differentiation.
significantly differentiated. Non-church members were signifi-
cantly differentiated from the religious groups by the five indi-
vidual groups. The south side youth group and the Hebrew high
school group differentiated Catholics from Protestants and Jews
but not Protestants from Jews. Academy students differentiated
Catholics and Protestants from Jews but not from each other.
The north and west side youth groups did not significantly dif-
ferentiate any of the three religious groups from each other.

The lack of differentiation can be explained in part by
an appraisal of individual reactions encountered in written and
oral comments from the students. A number of respondents main-
tained that they could not distinguish between Catholics and
Protestants. Others felt that the generalizations on the Scale
were too broad and that religion had nothing to do with the way
a person acted. Sixty-one students did not rate the non-church
member group on the Scale; 47 did not rate Catholics; in the case
of Jews and Protestants, the comparable figures were 35 and 59
respectively.

Thirty-five respondents offered written comments to ex-
plain why they did not rate these groups. When the QIR was
checked for consistency with the Scale it was found that thirteen
of the 35 rated Catholics or Protestants negatively. Seven of
these who felt that the generalizations were unfair or could not
distinguish between Catholics and Protestants checked the state-
ment that they did not particularly like boys and girls atten-

\[\text{Question 37(h).}\]
ing Catholic parochial schools. In general there is an apparent inconsistency between the relatively favorable rating of Catholics on the Remmers' Scale and the frequency of negative verbal evaluations of Catholics within the QIR, as will be noted.

Twenty-two of the 35 respondents were apparently consistent in their favorable opinions. The comments listed below are written by those who refused to rate groups on the basis of the Remmers' Scale and who were consistent (with favorable ratings) in the QIR.

In my opinion all people of all faiths are equal. It depends on many different factors to shape the individual. These generalizations are much too broad.

I think that the questions below all have exceptions and I cannot answer them.

...none of these questions are fair when asked about a religious group as a whole. I personally do not pick my friends by their religion but rather by their actions.

Fifteen students stated that they did not know the difference between Catholics and Protestants. One student refused to fill out the Scale, two others wrote "no comment."

Another possible explanation for the lack of differentiation between religious groups (when such occurred) might be found in Will Herberg's description of Protestantism, Catholicism and Judaism as three "equal" branches of "American religion"; the consistent differentiation of non-church members from the three religious groups by all of the groups participating in the study can be seen as a logical dichotomy in view of the
emphasis on religion in American society; and the negative ratings of non-church members a reflection of the value placed on "belonging" to one of the three branches. In the following discussion Will Herberg's description of the contemporary "religious situation" is taken as a point of departure.

The contemporary "religious situation" is reflected in a paradox of pervasive secularism and mounting religiosity. This situation is manifested in the influx of members into churches and the increased readiness of Americans to identify themselves in religious terms in contrast to the way they seem to think and feel about matters central to the faiths they profess.\(^\text{13}\) It is not so much the secularist aspect which draws our attention as that of religious identification. This form of self-identification is represented as the first fruits of Americanization which has emerged in the process of immigrant assimilation in the New World.\(^\text{14}\) The problem of self-location and self-identification for the immigrant and his offspring is focused by the question "What am I?"

This question is perhaps the most immediate that a man can ask himself in the course of his social life. Everyone finds himself in a social context which he shares with many others, but within this social context, how shall he locate himself? Unless he can so locate himself, he cannot tell himself, and others will not be able to know, who and what he is; he will remain "anonymous," a nobody—which is intolerable. To live, he must "belong"; to "belong," he must be able to locate

\(^{13}\) Herberg, \textit{op. cit.}, 14.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., 26.
himself in the larger whole, to identify himself to himself and to others. There is nothing necessarily deliberate or conscious about all this. The process of self-location and identification is normally a "hidden" social process of which the individual is little aware; only at moments of disintegration and crisis does it emerge to the level of consciousness and require some measure of deliberate decision. Nor is actual social location ever one-dimensional; which aspect of a man's "belonging" becomes operative often depends on the concrete situation. 

...The way in which one identifies and locates oneself to oneself ("Who, what, am I?") is closely related to how one is identified and located in the larger community ("Who, what, is he?"). Normally they reflect, sustain and illumine each other; it is only in abnormal situations that they diverge and conflict. 15

According to Herberg, in the process of assimilation the newcomer is expected to change many things as he becomes American, including nationality, language, and culture. One thing he is not expected to change is his religion. The third generation American in his search for identity and location finds it in the religion of his forbears.16 National distinctions have merged but within the three religious denominations of Catholic, Protestant, and Jew. Herberg sees the structure of America as one great community divided into three big sub-communities religiously defined, all equal and equally American, so that these three denominations can be seen from another point of view as three great branches or divisions of "American religion." In these three communities one can discover an underlying unity of

15 Ibid., 24-25.
16 Ibid., 35.
the "spiritual values" of American democracy. 17

For each individual a primary context of self-location and identity is made within one of the three major religious groups. It is by identification with one as opposed to another that the possibility of tension over differences can occur between Catholics and Jews as will be demonstrated in the pages to follow. Location can also be made within the larger context of religion per se versus non-religion or anti-religion. It is another aspect of "belonging" made operative which enables the individual to transcend interreligious group differences. It is from within this larger context of membership in a religious group that the logical dichotomy of non-membership results. If the value placed on religious membership is emphasized in a society the difference is intensified. The consistent differentiation of non-church members from the religious groups shown in Figure 1 as well as the unfavorable ratings attributed to them when placed in relation to church members supports this conclusion. What was previously noted as an apparent inconsistency in the ratings of Catholics on the Remmers' Scale and the QIR can also be interpreted in this light. The relatively favorable rating of Catholics on the Scale can be accounted for in terms of the context in which they were rated; church members as opposed to non-church members; the more negative rating of Catholics which follows in the QIR is to be understood in terms of the

17 Ibid., 52.
context of different religious groups: comparison of Catholics and Protestants. This conclusion is further supported by the fact that Catholics were rated relatively less favorably than Jews and Protestants but not as unfavorably as non-church members on the Scale. The concrete situation which causes this identification to emerge to the level of consciousness is not limited to disintegration or crisis as Herberg suggests. The situation experienced by the students in taking the test evoked consciousness of the different contexts.

The following description points out the ramifications of this religious identification for society as a whole.

All this has far reaching consequences for the place of religion in the totality of American life. With the religious community as the primary context of self-identification and self-location, and with Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism as three culturally diverse representations of the same "spiritual values," it becomes virtually mandatory for the American to place himself in one or another of these groups. It is not external pressure but an inner necessity that compels him. For being a Protestant, a Catholic or a Jew is understood as the specific way, and increasingly perhaps the only way, of being an American and locating oneself in American society. It is something that does not in itself necessarily imply actual affiliation with a particular church, participation in religious activities, or even the affirmation of any definite creed or belief; it implies merely identification and social location.18

If it is true that "being an American" virtually demands placing oneself in one of the three religious groups (and we see no reason to deny this), the questions which follow as a consequence are: What of the individual who does not locate himself

18 Ibid., 52-53.
or cannot be located by others in one of these groups? Is his status as an American compromised in his own eyes and in the eyes of others? For one thing, it appears that patriotism and church membership are associated in some minds. One of the test items on the Scale which the students were asked to check as a possible description of the groups rated was: "Would likely prove disloyal to our government." One hundred and forty-four respondents checked it with reference to non-church members as opposed to thirteen who checked it for Catholics; Jews and Protestants were checked twelve and thirteen times respectively.

While Herberg holds that such factors as actual affiliation and participation and anti-religious identification of others are not significant in determining the American's understanding of himself the negative ratings of non-church members as well as their consistent differentiation from religious groups show that these factors influence the identification and evaluation of others. It is difficult to imagine that this would not at some point operate significantly to influence the process of self-identification. The process is one of affirmation and negation. Identification is confirmed in relation to those who are similar as well as in opposition to (or separation from) those who are different.

We do not know with certainty what these students had in mind when they rated non-church members on the Scale. This cate-

19Ibid., 53.
gory was included as a rounding out measure and the results were entirely unexpected. The investigator told the students in the beginning instruction that "non-church members" means "people who do not belong to any religious group." Usually the question was asked, "Does this mean atheists?" The response was: "It includes atheists as well as people who might not belong to a formal religious group." Thus, this category could imply two possibilities: non-believers (atheists, humanists, etc.) and persons who believe in God but do not belong to a particular religious group.

Question 16(c) in the OIR asked the students to estimate the frequency with which they come in contact with non-church members. Of the 627 responses which could be used for analysis, 368 (59 per cent) stated that they had some degree of contact; 259 (41 per cent) reported never coming in contact with them. Six per cent estimated that they came in contact with non-church members most of the time; 11 per cent checked "often"; and 83 per cent checked "once in a while."
CHAPTER III

TESTS OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN "VICTIMIZATION"
AND INTOLERANCE

One of the most crucial elements tested in the QIR with relation to the principal hypothesis was that of frequency of personally experienced "victimization" and intolerance. The provisional hypothesis developed was that the frequency of expressed unfavorable categorical judgments of an out-group, including the expressed anticipation of "victimization" originating from members of that out-group, is directly related to the frequency of personally and vicariously experienced discrimination and prejudice by the subjects and perceived by them as being attributable to that out-group in past associations. In its theoretical referents, this hypothesis can be placed in the context of Dollard and Doob's frustration-aggression syndrome which would suggest that deprivation, thwarting or frustration produced by such experiences of intolerance would give rise to hostile and aggressive impulses leading to such verbalized "payment in kind."¹ In addition to this, Allport and Kramer assumed in their investigation that "victims" of prejudice would be more inclined than the

¹Dollard et al., op. cit., 1-11.
average person to show hostility toward other groups.² A. I. Gordon's study offers further empirical verification of the frustration-aggression hypothesis.³ In the present study the population was divided into those who experienced overt or covert "victimization"⁴ "many times"; a "limited number of times" (a few times or once); or "never."⁵

Ninety-one students answered "many times" in one of the three designated questions and were placed in the first category. Forty-two (46.2 per cent) of these checked "many times" in response to Question 27; 30 (33.0 per cent) checked Question 29 and 19 (20.8 per cent) Question 30. Students in this category constitute 12 per cent of the research population.

²Allport and Kramer, op. cit., 27.
³A. I. Gordon, op. cit., 27-42.
⁴While the terms "victimization" and "victim" lack the emotional detachment desired in an empirical study they are used in the absence of more appropriate terms to indicate actual or vicarious experience of overt or covert anti-Semitic actions. These terms are used by Allport and Kramer in the work cited above.
⁵These divisions were made on the basis of the following questions:
27. Have you ever been openly discriminated against because you are Jewish? (Check one.)
   a) Many times b) A few times c) Once d) Never
29. Have you ever felt that other individuals disliked you because you were Jewish although nothing was openly said or done? (Check one.)
   a) Many times b) A few times c) Once d) Never
30. Have you ever been called names because you are Jewish? (Check one.)
   a) Many times b) A few times c) Once d) Never
The second category totaled 487 students. Three hundred and forty-one (70.0 per cent) checked "a few times" and "once" in their responses to Question 27; 102 (21.0 per cent) checked these answers for Question 29; and 44 (9.0 per cent) did so for Question 30. This category represents 64 per cent of the population.

Finally, twenty-four per cent reported "never" having experienced any form of "victimization." Of these 180 checked (d) in Question 27, and 2 respondents checked (d) in Question 29.

Analysis of the sex differential by levels of "victimization" is shown in Table 3. A total of 574 (76.0 per cent) respondents reported some form of "victimization." Of this number 314 were boys and 260 were girls. Ninety-one respondents reported "victimization" "many times"; of this total 67 (73.6 per cent) were boys, 24 (26.4 per cent) girls. The Category "limited number of times" totaled 483 respondents. It consisted of 247 (51.2 per cent) boys and 236 (48.8 per cent) girls. One hundred and eighty-one (24 per cent) of this sample population reported "never" to all questions bearing on "victimization"; 55 (30.3 per cent) of these were boys, 126 (69.7 per cent) girls.

The reader is directed to Table 3 for a detailed distribution of this population by group membership.

The principal hypothesis was restated in terms of a null hypothesis to determine by means of the chi-square technique the presence or absence of association between frequency of person-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>BOYS</th>
<th>GIRLS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=91)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=483)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew High Schools</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Number of Times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew High Schools</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew High Schools</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Groups (Combined)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*Seven questionnaires not tabulated; question left unanswered by respondent.
ally experienced discrimination and prejudice and a series of variables reported in the QIR. They were: sex; actual and implied intolerance (the former as evidenced in the frequency with which respondents reported they did not particularly like other groups including Catholics, Protestants and Jews); and the positive and negative results of the ratings of these same religious groups with non-church members added, as obtained on the Remmers' Scale. Implied intolerance of a religious out-group was tested by means of rating Catholics and Protestants as to their tolerance of Jews; and the frequency with which religious or national groups were checked as most prejudiced toward Jews. The relationship between frequency of personally experienced "victimization" and frequency of contact with Catholics and Protestants was tested and its relationship with schools attended and organizational membership was noted.

A restatement of the first corollary of the principal hypothesis reads: there is no direct relationship between the frequency of expressed unfavorable categorical judgments of an out-group, including the expressed anticipation of "victimization" originating from members of that out-group, and the frequency of discrimination and prejudice personally experienced

6 Questions 37(a) through (e).
7 Questions 34(a) and (b).
8 Questions 32 and 32(c).
9 Questions 16(a) and (b).
by the subjects and perceived by them as being attributable to
that out-group in past associations. The test of the second
corollary which includes personally and vicariously experienced
"victimization" follows this exposition.

One key to the verification of this aspect of the hypo-
thesis can be seen initially in the sex differential reported
in Table 3. More boys than girls experienced overt and covert
discrimination "many times" than would be expected by chance.
More girls than boys reported never having had this experience.
Both boys and girls had approximately the same representation
in the Category "limited number of times." The chance hypothesis
was rejected, p being significant at the .01 level. Pursuing
this breakdown as we do later in the study, it is found that
more negative verbal expressions are recorded by boys than girls.

The chance explanation was also rejected in the results
of the test seeking to discover the relationship between person-
ally experienced "victimization" and the number of times a re-
spondent reported that he did not particularly like one or more
of the groups listed in Question 37(a)-(e).10

Table 4 summarizes the frequency of personally experi-
enced discrimination and the frequency with which the respondents

10.37. Place a check (X) after each of the following
groups that you do not particularly like.
a) Boys and girls from public schools____
b) Boys and girls from Catholic schools____
c) Boys and girls from the Jewish Academy____
d) Boys and girls attending Hebrew High Schools____
e) Protestant boys and girls_____
### TABLE 4

**FREQUENCY OF PERSONALLY EXPERIENCED DISCRIMINATION AND PREJUDICE BY FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS 37(a) THROUGH (e) (N=760)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Personally Experienced Discrimination and Prejudice</th>
<th>Checked Do not particularly like one or more groups</th>
<th>Did not check Do not particularly like one or more groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many Times</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Number of Times</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two questionnaires not tabulated; question left unanswered by respondent.

\[ x^2 = 17.31 \quad \text{df} = 2 \quad p < .01 \]
checked one or more of the groups listed in Question 37(a)-(e) and those who did not check any. Thirty-seven per cent of the total checked one or more groups; over 62 per cent did not check any. Of the 91 who experienced "victimization" "many times," 54.9 per cent checked one or more groups as opposed to 45.1 per cent who did not check any; the number who checked one or more groups was greater than that expected by chance. Thirty-seven per cent of the 487 students found in the Category "limited number of times" checked one or more groups; 63 per cent did not. Those who report "never" experiencing these forms of "victimization" totaled 182; of this number 29.1 per cent checked one or more groups; 70.9 per cent did not. Fewer respondents checked one or more groups than would be expected by chance. The difference in such reported tendencies toward "dislike" of the object groups specified is more pronounced in the group which experienced discrimination and prejudice "many times" than in those who experienced discrimination and prejudice a "limited number of times" or "never." Subjecting these findings to a chi-square test, $p$ was found to be less than .01.

The response pattern suggests a generalized hostility which is not differentiated toward any specific group as compared with another. For example, there was no significant relationship between checking Catholics as opposed to Protestants and "victimization." However, checking boys and girls from Catholic schools as opposed to not checking them was related to the
frequency of "victimization" (p was found to be significant at the .05 level). More students who experienced discrimination and prejudice many times checked Catholics more frequently than would be expected from their representation in the population. Those who responded "never" checked Catholics less frequently than would be expected.

Of all the groups listed in Question 37 as not particularly liked, boys and girls from Catholic schools were checked most frequently, a total of 167 times. Only 29 students checked Protestant boys and girls. Yet even here, more students (10) who experienced overt and covert discrimination checked Protestants more frequently than those who experienced it a "limited number of times" or "never" in proportion to their representation in the population. However, since there were only 29 responses it would be somewhat presumptuous to speak of factors influencing their choices.

The relationship between personally experienced "victimization" with positive and negative ratings of non-church members, Jews, and Protestants is not as clear as it is with ratings of Catholics on the Remmers' Scale. Median scores were determined for all four groups tested on the Remmers' Scale. The scores of students were then divided in half in terms of more and less tolerant—and tested against the independent variable. The results based on the 6.57 median of more and less tolerant ratings of non-church members were found to be greater
than .05 in a two-tailed test, the standard we have been employing up to this time. However, a one-tailed test produced a p of less than .05. This latter result shows that those who have experienced discrimination and prejudice many times have a higher frequency of negative scores in terms of their frequency in the research population.

More and less tolerant ratings of Catholics based on the 8.11 median score were found to be related to "victimization." The chance hypothesis was rejected, p being less than .05. Negative ratings occurred with greater frequency than expected in the "many times" Category. Having personally experienced discrimination and prejudice many times tends to lower ratings of Catholics on the Remmers' Scale.

The results of positive and negative ratings of Jews by the respondents based on a 8.30 median score were similar to those relating to non-church members. P was found to be greater than .05 in a two-tailed test but less than .05 in a one-tailed test. The difference was clearly with those who had experienced "victimization" "many times." This group checked more negative scores for Jews than would be expected by chance distribution. Since the significance of the one-tailed test is .05, it does not allow us to generalize with the same degree of confidence as we might on the basis of a two-tailed test. However, these results recall the references in Chapters I and II to the suggestion that "self-hatred" was one of the possible reactions of
the Jew to Gentile discrimination and prejudice. Kurt Lewin points out that the aggression of the Jew against his oppressor frequently cannot be asserted. As a result, the aggression is turned back on the Jewish group itself.  

The chance hypothesis was retained in the test of positive and negative ratings of Protestants (8.27 median) on the Remmers' Scale.

In summary, then, frequent experience of discrimination ("many times") is related to the number of negative ratings of Catholics on the Remmers' Scale. It makes a borderline difference in terms of rating non-church members and Jews negatively but no difference in the ratings of Protestants.

Expected tolerance and intolerance of Catholics and Protestants toward Jews was tested by means of Question 34(a) and (b).  

Tables 5 and 6 illustrate the relationship between the frequency of personally experienced discrimination and prejudice and the way in which the respondents answered questions 34(a) and (b). Those who reported having experienced discrimination

---


12 34. Place a check in the column which best describes how you would rate the following groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Tolerant</th>
<th>Less Tolerant</th>
<th>About the</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Than Others</td>
<td>Than Others</td>
<td>Same as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward Jews</td>
<td>Toward Jews</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Most Catholics  

b) Most Protestants
**TABLE 5**

RATING OF CATHOLICS IN QUESTION 34(a) BY FREQUENCY OF PERSONALLY EXPERIENCED DISCRIMINATION AND PREJUDICE (N=673)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Catholics more tolerant than others toward Jews</th>
<th>Catholics less tolerant than others toward Jews</th>
<th>Catholics about the same as others</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many times</td>
<td>15 18.5</td>
<td>34 42.0</td>
<td>32 39.5</td>
<td>81 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited number of times</td>
<td>78 18.1</td>
<td>127 29.5</td>
<td>226 52.4</td>
<td>431 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>20 12.4</td>
<td>19 11.8</td>
<td>122 75.8</td>
<td>161 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Eighty-nine questionnaires not tabulated; question left unanswered by respondent. \(x^2 = 40.88\) \(df = 4\) \(p < .01\)

**TABLE 6**

RATING OF PROTESTANTS IN QUESTION 34(b) BY FREQUENCY OF PERSONALLY EXPERIENCED DISCRIMINATION AND PREJUDICE (N=659)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Protestants more tolerant than others toward Jews</th>
<th>Protestants less tolerant than others toward Jews</th>
<th>Protestants about the same as others</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many times</td>
<td>20 24.7</td>
<td>13 16.0</td>
<td>48 59.3</td>
<td>81 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited number of times</td>
<td>99 23.5</td>
<td>45 10.7</td>
<td>277 65.8</td>
<td>421 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>25 15.9</td>
<td>10 6.4</td>
<td>122 77.7</td>
<td>157 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)One hundred and three questionnaires not tabulated; question left unanswered by respondent. \(x^2 = 12.81\) \(df = 4\) \(p < .05\)
"many times" rated Catholics "less tolerant" 42.0 per cent of the times as opposed to 29.5 per cent of the respondents who experienced it a "limited number of times." Only 11.8 per cent of those who "never" experienced "victimization" checked them as "less tolerant." The proportions for rating Catholics "more tolerant than others" are approximately the same for those who experienced "victimization" "many times" and a "limited number of times," 18.5 and 18.1 per cent respectively. Over 12 per cent of those who never experienced discrimination and prejudice checked Catholics "more tolerant." Differences are more pronounced in the rating of Catholics "about the same as others;" 39.5 per cent of those in the Category "many times" checked it as opposed to 52.4 per cent in the "limited number of times" and 75.8 per cent in the "never" Categories.

Table 6 illustrates that the negative ratings of Protestants are not as frequent as those for Catholics. Of the 81 respondents included in the Category "many times," 16.0 per cent rate Protestants "less tolerant than others"; 10.7 per cent of the 421 respondents in the "limited number of times" Category and 6.4 per cent of the 157 in the "never" Category rate them negatively. Over 24 per cent in the "many times" Category rated Protestants "more tolerant than others toward Jews" followed by 23.5 per cent of the respondents in the "limited number of times" Category and 15.9 per cent in the Category "never." Protestants were rated "about the same as others" by 59.3 per
cent of the respondents who experienced "victimization" "many times" followed by 65.8 per cent and 77.7 per cent of the "limited number of times" and "never" respondents respectively.

Those who experienced discrimination "many times" tend to rate both Catholics and Protestants as "less tolerant toward Jews" more frequently than would be expected in terms of the incidence of "less tolerant" in the total sample population. Those who "never" experienced discrimination and prejudice personally report Catholics and Protestants "about the same as others" more frequently than expected in terms of incidence of "same as others" in the total research sample. In the chi-square test for the above rating of Catholics, the chance hypothesis was rejected when \( p \) was found to be less than .01. In the case of rating Protestants, the chance explanation was also rejected when \( p \) was found to be less than .05.

It was found in the test of association between personally experienced "victimization" and contact that those who have never experienced overt and covert discrimination have less contact with Catholics and Protestants than those who have experienced it "many times." Frequency of contact based on a single question asking how often the respondent came into contact with either of these groups is less than expected by chance for those in the "never" Category. \( p \) was found to be significant at the .05 level for contact with both Protestants and Catholics. In view of the results we can conclude that the experience of
"victimization" is related to the frequency with which one comes into contact with non-Jewish groups.

A more generalized question for eliciting a salient expression of implied intolerance was determined in Questions 32 and 32(c). The test was made to determine whether the frequency with which one listed a religious or national group was related to the frequency of personally experienced overt and covert discrimination. In both cases of the religious and national groups checked vs. not checked, the chance explanation was rejected (p being significant at the .01 level). The religious group most frequently cited was Catholics, a total of 175 times as opposed to 39 times for Protestants and 10 times for Christians. Non-church members were cited ten times. The national group cited most frequently was Germans or Nazis, a total of 53 times. The Arab-Moslem-Egyptian category totaled 21. Negroes were cited 12 times. Question 33 asked the respondents if they thought members of their family felt the same way as they did about the group cited. Two hundred and sixty-six replied "yes," 86 "no"; 30 said they did not know; 380 did not respond to the question. Of the 175 respondents who checked Catholics as a single or multiple group, 112 said that their family felt the same way.

1332. Is there any particular religious or nationality group which seems most often to be prejudiced against Jews?  
a) yes  b) no  
32c. If yes, list the name of that group.
The tests of significance by means of the chi-square technique support the conclusion that frequency of personally experienced discrimination and prejudice, particularly if it has been experienced "many times" is associated with actual and implied intolerance as expressed by the respondents in the GIR. This association was not present in all tests of significance on the Remmers' Scale. The chance hypothesis was rejected in the following tests of relationship of "victimization" and intolerance. Actual intolerance was indicated by: the respondents checking one or more groups that they did not particularly like (p<.01); the frequency of checking boys and girls attending Catholic parochial schools as a group the respondent did not particularly like (p<.05); and the negative ratings of Catholics on the Remmers' Scale (p<.05). (Rating of Jews and non-church members made a borderline difference. The chance hypothesis was retained in the rating of Protestants.) Implied intolerance was indicated by: the rating of Catholics as "less tolerant than others toward Jews" (p<.01); the rating of Protestants as "less tolerant than others toward Jews (p<.05); the listing of a religious or national group as "most prejudiced toward Jews" (p<.01).

These results are consonant with the independent investigation undertaken by Allport and Kramer who stated in their conclusions that:

Those who feel that they are victims to a more than average degree tend to develop more than average prejudice against other minority groups (and, as in the case
of Jewish victims, even against their own group); this fact is consistent with the hypothesis that frustration and insecurity lead to displaced aggression.14

The authors caution the reader with regard to this interpretation of results. A more refined breakdown of the data indicates that the frustration-aggression hypothesis is by no means a fully adequate explanation. In some cases, particularly with the Jewish subjects, "victimization" may engender sympathy and compassion rather than displaced resentment and aggression.15

The findings of the present study support the following conclusions reached by A. I. Gordon:

The Dollard hypothesis is supported by the evidence with respect to the Negro, for in those cases where the personal experiences of a frustrating nature have been most numerous, the attitudes of the Jewish students toward the Negro is least liberal.16

Gordon reported that among his 159 subjects, not one had been free of anti-Jewish experience. Of the 762 respondents in this study, 182 reported never having any personal experience of this nature. One hundred and two of these reported "never" in response to both personal and vicarious experiences of anti-Semitism. The responses of these students emphasize the association of intolerance and "victimization" by contrast in their performance on the test. In the case of actual intolerance (Question 37(a)-(e)) they checked one or more groups less often

14Allport and Kramer, op. cit., 38.
15Ibid., 38.
16Gordon, op. cit., 41.
than would be expected by chance. They also checked, less often, Catholics as a group they disliked. Substantially the same results obtained with implied intolerance. They did not list a national or religious group as prejudiced toward Jews nor did they rate Catholics or Protestants "less tolerant than others toward Jews" as often as was expected of their proportion in the population. These respondents reported having less contact with Catholics and Protestants than was the case for those who experienced discrimination and prejudice "many times." This may be a part of the explanation as to why they were not "victimized."

The social characteristics of those respondents who personally experienced discrimination and prejudice "many times," a "limited number of times" and "never" are summarized in Table 7. Those who experienced discrimination "many times" are predominantly male (73.6 per cent as opposed to 26.4 per cent females). The age most frequently recorded is 15 (30.7 per cent), followed by 14 year-olds (24.2 per cent) and 16 year-olds (17.6 per cent). Respondents in the category 17-18 years of age totaled 8.8 per cent; those in the category 12-13 years of age, 11 per cent. Over half (54.9 per cent) have attended some form of Hebrew high school and grade school; 33 per cent have attended some Hebrew grade school whereas 12.1 per cent reported no Hebrew high school or grade school attendance. Religious affiliation of the respondents in this category breaks down to 48.3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Characteristics</th>
<th>Many Times</th>
<th>Limited Number</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
<td>Number Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91 100.0</td>
<td>487 100.0</td>
<td>182 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67 73.6</td>
<td>247 50.7</td>
<td>55 30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24 26.4</td>
<td>236 48.5</td>
<td>126 69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>4 .8</td>
<td>1 .6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10 11.0</td>
<td>46 9.4</td>
<td>12 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>22 24.2</td>
<td>102 20.9</td>
<td>62 34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>28 30.7</td>
<td>143 29.4</td>
<td>56 30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16 17.6</td>
<td>125 25.7</td>
<td>33 18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8 8.8</td>
<td>36 7.4</td>
<td>11 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>7 7.7</td>
<td>35 7.2</td>
<td>8 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hebrew School Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Hebrew High &amp; Grade School</td>
<td>50 54.9</td>
<td>208 42.7</td>
<td>81 44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Hebrew High, Some Grade</td>
<td>30 33.0</td>
<td>203 41.7</td>
<td>49 26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Hebrew High, No Grade School</td>
<td>11 12.1</td>
<td>75 15.4</td>
<td>50 27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>1 .2</td>
<td>2 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox and Traditional</td>
<td>44 48.3</td>
<td>209 42.9</td>
<td>66 36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>34 37.4</td>
<td>197 40.5</td>
<td>75 41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>8 8.8</td>
<td>53 10.9</td>
<td>21 11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Affiliation and Don't Know</td>
<td>5 5.5</td>
<td>26 5.3</td>
<td>16 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>2 .4</td>
<td>4 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance at Religious Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily and Weekly</td>
<td>42 46.1</td>
<td>152 31.2</td>
<td>53 29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbath, Holidays Occasionally</td>
<td>32 35.2</td>
<td>216 44.4</td>
<td>80 44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Holidays and Special Occasions only</td>
<td>17 18.7</td>
<td>117 24.0</td>
<td>47 25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>2 .4</td>
<td>2 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father's Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete High School</td>
<td>11 12.1</td>
<td>54 11.1</td>
<td>13 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed High School</td>
<td>20 22.0</td>
<td>109 22.4</td>
<td>38 20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Some College</td>
<td>18 19.8</td>
<td>91 18.7</td>
<td>41 22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed College, Grad, Prof.</td>
<td>29 31.8</td>
<td>153 31.4</td>
<td>63 34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>10 11.0</td>
<td>52 10.7</td>
<td>21 11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3 3.3</td>
<td>28 5.7</td>
<td>6 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother's Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete High School</td>
<td>8 8.8</td>
<td>46 9.4</td>
<td>17 9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed High School</td>
<td>38 41.7</td>
<td>192 39.4</td>
<td>82 45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Some College</td>
<td>20 22.0</td>
<td>110 22.6</td>
<td>36 19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed College, Grad, Prof.</td>
<td>13 14.3</td>
<td>84 17.3</td>
<td>28 15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8 8.8</td>
<td>51 10.4</td>
<td>15 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4 4.4</td>
<td>24 4.9</td>
<td>4 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Jewish</td>
<td>60 65.9</td>
<td>349 71.7</td>
<td>134 73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>18 19.8</td>
<td>93 19.1</td>
<td>23 12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Membership and No Response</td>
<td>13 14.3</td>
<td>45 9.2</td>
<td>25 13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>One twelve-year-old is included in this category.  
<sup>b</sup>One eighteen-year-old is included in this category.
per cent Orthodox-Traditional; 37.4 per cent Conservative; and 8.8 per cent (8) Reform affiliation. Over 46 per cent attend religious services daily and weekly; 35.2 per cent attend occasionally. Those who attend on high holidays and special occasions only comprise 18.7 per cent of this group.

An analysis of parental education of the respondents in the Category "many times" shows that 12.1 per cent of the fathers and 8.8 per cent of the mothers did not complete high school. Twenty-two per cent of the fathers and 41.7 per cent of the mothers terminated their education with completion of high school. Fathers and mothers who went on to college but did not graduate totaled 19.8 per cent and 22 per cent respectively. More fathers (31.9 per cent) than mothers (14.3 per cent) completed college.

Membership in all-Jewish organizations totaled 65.9 per cent (less than that of either the "limited number of times" or "never" respondents), as opposed to 19.8 per cent membership in mixed organizations. While this indication of out-group contact is based on organizational membership the previous reference to contact was based on estimates of frequency of out-group associations by the respondents. In either case the conclusion which can be drawn is that "victimization" is to some degree a function of greater contact.

The social characteristics of those who experienced discrimination and prejudice a "limited number of times" show
proportionately fewer males (50.7 per cent) than those in the "many times" Category, but males still outnumber females who constitute 48.5 per cent of this group. The age appearing most frequently is comparable to the "many times" Category, a total of 29.4 per cent of 15 year-olds, followed by 25.7 per cent 16 year olds, and 20.9 per cent 14 year-olds and 9.4 per cent and 7.4 per cent for the 12-13 and 17-18 year old age groups respectively. Hebrew school attendance proportions differ somewhat from the "many times" Category. Over 42 per cent attended Hebrew high school and grade school for some length of time; 41.7 per cent attended Hebrew grade school only; 15.4 per cent reported no Hebrew school training, a slightly higher proportion than the "many times" respondents. Orthodox-Traditional and Conservative proportions are about equally represented here, 42.9 and 40.5 per cent respectively. Over 10 per cent (53) reported Reform affiliation. Attendance at religious services on a daily and weekly basis was proportionately lower than that of respondents in the former category (31.2 per cent); occasional attendance was reported by 44.4 per cent; and 24 per cent reported attending on special holidays only. Both of the latter proportions were higher here than in the "many times" Category.

Parental educational achievement in this category is similar to that of the former ("many times"). Over 11 per cent of the fathers and 9.4 per cent of the mothers did not complete high school. Over 22 per cent of the fathers and 39.4 per cent
of the mothers terminated their schooling upon completing high school. Some 18.7 per cent fathers and 22.6 per cent mothers went on to college but never completed their studies. College graduation and professional training were reported for 31.4 per cent of the fathers and 17.3 per cent of the mothers. Educational achievement proportions are substantially the same in both the "many times" and "limited number of times" Categories. Membership in all-Jewish organizations was 71.7 per cent (higher than that of the respondents in the "many times" Category). Membership in mixed organizations is substantially the same, 19.1 per cent.

Respondents who report "never" having personally experienced "victimization" find females predominating over males, 69.2 and 30.2 per cent respectively. More 14 year-olds (34.1 per cent) and 15 year-olds (30.8 per cent) are also represented in this category. Proportions which follow these are 18.1 per cent 16 year olds, 6.6 per cent in the 12-13 year-old age group, and 6.0 per cent in the 17-18 year-old age group. Some form of Hebrew high school attendance was reported by 44.5 per cent of these respondents. Hebrew grade school attendance (but no high school) was reported by 26.9 per cent of these respondents. No Hebrew high school or grade school was reported by 27.5 per cent, the largest proportion registered in any of the three categories. Conservative religious affiliation had the largest representation in this category (41.2 per cent) followed by 36.3 per cent.
Orthodox-Traditional and 11.5 per cent (21) Reform affiliation. A slightly higher percentage (8.8 per cent) than was obtained for the other principal categories indicated no affiliation or answered "don't know." Attendance at religious services was described as occasional by 44 per cent of these respondents in the "never" Category, a somewhat higher figure than that indicated by the earlier group. Over 29 per cent attend services daily and weekly; 25.8 per cent reported attendance on special holidays only—again, a higher percentage than those in the "many times" Category.

Parental educational achievement reports showed 7.1 per cent fathers and 9.3 per cent mothers did not complete high school. Termination of formal education at the high school level was reported by 20.9 per cent of the fathers and 45.1 per cent of the mothers. Over 22 per cent of the fathers and 19.8 per cent of the mothers went on to college but did not graduate. Completion of college and professional training was reported for 34.6 per cent of the fathers and 15.4 per cent of the mothers. Membership in all-Jewish organizations totaled 73.6 per cent, a higher proportion than that in the "many times" Category. Over 12 per cent belonged to mixed organizations, a lower proportion than that appearing in either of the other two principal categories.

A comparative analysis of the social characteristics of all three principal categories reveals that over half of the
respondents who experienced discrimination and prejudice "many times" are males; of those who reported this experience a "limited number of times" half are males. Over half of the respondents who "never" experienced "victimization" are females. Fourteen and 15 year-age groups predominate in all three categories. Over half of those who report "victimization" "many times" have attended Hebrew high school and grammar school for some length of time. Less than half but over 40 per cent report the same attendance in the "limited number of times" and "never" Categories. Orthodox-Traditional affiliation was reported by less than half of the "many times" respondents. Orthodox-Traditional and Conservative affiliation were about equally represented in the "limited number of times" Category. Conservative affiliation was the predominant representation in the "never" Category.

Respondents who had anti-Jewish experiences "many times" attended religious services more frequently than those in the "limited" and "never" Categories. There were no notable differences in parental educational achievement among the three categories. Membership in all-Jewish organizations was less frequently reported by those in the "many times" Category than either of the other two principal categories. A test of significance was made to determine the association between these two variables. No significant association was found to exist between personally experienced overt and covert discrimination and
membership in all-Jewish organizations. In another chi-square test it was found that students attending the Academy (full-time) reported "victimization" "many times" more often than would be expected for their proportion in the sample studied. The Hebrew high school group (those attending part-time Hebrew instruction) and the youth group attending public high schools report "many times" less often than would be expected of their proportion in the population; p was found to be less than .01. The overall conclusion which can be derived from the foregoing analysis is that "victimization" tends to be a function of 1) sex; 2) the amount of contact with non-Jews (i.e., the more contact the greater the likelihood of unfortunate experiences); and 3) the level of identifiability as Jews (identifiability by means of religious observance.)

The three principal categories, "many times," "limited number of times," and "never," were expanded to include subcategories of vicariously experienced "victimization" based on similar decreasing frequencies yielding a total of 9. This design provided the basis for testing the influence of personal and vicarious experience of discrimination and prejudice on intolerance. The questions used to extend the established categories were 23 and 31. 17 The subcategories derived may be described as

17 Have you ever heard of any specific instance in which any members of your family or close friends were openly discriminated against because they were Jewish? (Check one.) a) Many times b) A few times c) Once d) Never
follows:

1. Discrimination and prejudice experienced personally "many times" and discrimination and prejudice experienced vicariously "many times."

2. Discrimination and prejudice experienced personally "many times" and discrimination and prejudice experienced vicariously a "limited number of times."

3. Discrimination and prejudice experienced personally "many times" and discrimination and prejudice "never" experienced vicariously.

4. Discrimination and prejudice experienced personally a "limited number of times" and discrimination and prejudice experienced vicariously "many times."

5. Discrimination and prejudice experienced personally a "limited number of times" and discrimination and prejudice experienced vicariously a "limited number of times."

6. Discrimination and prejudice experienced personally a "limited number of times" and discrimination and prejudice "never" experienced vicariously.

7. Discrimination and prejudice "never" experienced personally and discrimination and prejudice experienced vicariously "many times."

8. Discrimination and prejudice "never" experienced personally and discrimination and prejudice experienced vicariously a "limited number of times."


In the first subcategory, 33 respondents reported personal and vicarious anti-Jewish experiences "many times." Of this number, 21 (64 per cent) checked (a) in Question 28 and

31. Have you ever heard from any members of your family or close friends that they have been called names because they were Jewish? (Check one.)
a) Many times  b) A few times  c) Once  d) Never
12 (36 per cent) checked it in Question 31. The second subcategory, discrimination and prejudice experienced personally "many times" and vicariously a "limited number of times" totaled 50. Thirty-four (68 per cent) of this total and 16 (32 per cent) of the respondents checked (b) and (c) in Questions 28 and 31 respectively. There was a total of 6 respondents in the third subcategory who had experienced discrimination and prejudice "many times" personally but "never" vicariously.

Subcategory 4 revealed a total of 42 students who had experienced discrimination and prejudice personally a "limited number of times" and reported this experience vicariously "many times" by checking (a) in both Question 28, 35 (83 per cent) times, and Question 31, 7 (17 per cent) times. Two hundred and seventy-two respondents checked Questions 28(b) and (c) and 31(b) and (c) yielding totals of 200 (74 per cent) and 72 (26 per cent) respectively in Subcategory 5. In Subcategory 6, those who experienced discrimination and prejudice a "limited number of times" personally but reported "never" having this experience vicariously in Question 28(d) totaled 170.

Respondents who "never" experienced "victimization" personally but reported this vicarious experience "many times" checked Question 28(d) 8 times in Subcategory 7. Of the 72 respondents included in Subcategory 8, 54 (75 per cent) and 18 (25 per cent) report "never" having anti-Jewish experiences personally but a "limited number of times" vicariously in
Questions 28 and 31 respectively. (These two subcategories were combined for testing significance. See Table 8.) Those who report "never" to both personal and vicarious experiences of discrimination and prejudice are found in Subcategory 9 which is made up of 102 respondents. One hundred (98 per cent) students checked (d) in Question 28: 2 checked (d) in 31.

The null hypothesis tested at this juncture is the following: there is no direct relationship between the frequency of expressed unfavorable categorical judgments of an out-group, including the expressed anticipation of "victimization" originating from members of that out-group, and the frequency of discrimination and prejudice experienced personally and vicariously by the subjects and perceived by them as being attributable to that out-group in past associations.

The questions on the QIR used to test this relationship are limited to Questions 37(a) through (e) for actual intolerance and 34(a) and (b) and 32 for implied intolerance. The reasons for this limitation are found in the numerical distribution of the subcategories. It was felt that the representation, as that found in Subcategory 3 (discrimination and prejudice experienced personally "many times" and vicariously "never"), was an inadequate basis for generalization in terms of factors influencing choice. The problem of inadequate representation was also present in Question 34(b) where the number who checked Protestants as "less tolerant" was not large enough in the cell
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Vicarious Experience of Discrimination and Prejudice</th>
<th>Checked</th>
<th>Did not check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many Times--Personal N=89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Many times</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Limited number of times</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x^2=0.75$ df=2 $p&gt;.05$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Number of Times--Personal N=484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Many times</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Limited number of times</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Never</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x^2=2.61$ df=2 $p&gt;.05$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never--Personal N=182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8. Many times, Limited Number of times (combined)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Never</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x^2=2.69$ df=1 $p&gt;.05$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aSeven questionnaires not tabulated; respondent did not answer question.*
making the chi-square test irrelevant. Because the relationship between the Remmers' Scale Scores was not clearly significant (except for Catholics) in the test with personally experienced discrimination and prejudice it is doubtful that the further breakdown with the addition of vicarious experience would have yielded different results.

The chi-square test was also used to determine the relation of frequency of personally and vicariously experienced discrimination and prejudice with the frequency the respondent reported that he did not like one or more of the groups listed in Question 37.18

Table 8 reveals the number and percentage of responses to Question 37(a) through (e) within the extended categories which include personal and vicarious experiences of discrimination. Of the 89 respondents in the first breakdown, 19 (21.4 per cent) checked one or more groups; 14 (15.7 per cent) did not check any group in Subcategory 1. Students in Subcategory 2 who experienced "victimization" "many times" personally and a "limited number of times" vicariously checked one or more groups 27 (30.3 per cent) times; 23 (25.8 per cent) checked none. Within Subcategory 3 (respondents personally experienced "victimization"

1837. Place a check after each of the following groups that you do not particularly like.
   a) Boys and girls from public schools
   b) Boys and girls from Catholic schools
   c) Boys and girls from the Jewish Academy
   d) Boys and girls attending Hebrew high schools
   e) Protestant boys and girls
"many times" but "never" vicariously) 4 checked one or more groups; 2 did not. In the test of significance for this breakdown the chance hypothesis was retained, p being greater than .05, indicating the absence of definite association between frequency of personally and vicariously experienced discrimination and actual intolerance expressed.

The second breakdown (consisting of 484 respondents) includes Subcategories 4, 5, and 6. Forty-two respondents experienced discrimination and prejudice a "limited number of times" personally and "many times" vicariously in Subcategory 4. Seventeen (3.5 per cent) in this subcategory checked one or more groups; 25 (5.2 per cent) did not check any. Of the respondents in Subcategory 5 (personal experience of "victimization" a "limited number of times" and vicarious a "limited number of times") 105 (21.7 per cent) checked one or more groups; 167 (34.5 per cent) did not check any. Fifty-four (11.1 per cent) of the respondents checked one or more groups; 116 (24.0 per cent) did not check any in Subcategory 6 (discrimination and prejudice personally experienced a "limited number of times" but "never" vicariously.) The chance hypothesis was retained in this instance, p again being greater than .05, indicating the absence of definite relationship between the variables "victimization" and actual intolerance.

The results were substantially the same with regard to the third breakdown which includes 182 respondents. Eighty
respondents "never" experienced "victimization" personally but had some vicarious knowledge of it; 28 (15.4 per cent) of these checked one or more groups; 52 (28.6 per cent) did not. Of the 102 respondents who have not had this experience personally or vicariously (Subcategory 9) 25 (13.7 per cent) checked one or more groups; 77 (42.3 per cent) did not check any group. No significant relationship was evident between the independent and dependent variables, \( p \) being greater than .05.

The results were somewhat different in the test for implied intolerance. The rating of Catholics was derived from Question 34(a).\(^{19}\)

The chance hypothesis was retained in the first breakdown which includes the Subcategories 1, 2, and 3 (the same breakdown as used in Table 8). It was rejected in the second breakdown where respondents in Subcategories 4, 5, and 6 rated Catholics. More respondents in Subcategory 4 (personal experience of "victimization" a "limited number of times" and vicarious "many times") checked Catholics as "less tolerant than others" than would be expected by chance. Fewer respondents in Subcategory 6 (personally experienced "victimization" a "limited number of times" and "never" vicariously) checked Catholics as "less

---

\(^{19}\) Question 34. Place a check in the column which best describes how you would rate the following groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More Tolerant</th>
<th>Less Tolerant</th>
<th>About the</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Than Others</td>
<td>Than Others</td>
<td>Same as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward Jews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Toward Jews</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Catholics</td>
<td>1)_________</td>
<td>2)_________</td>
<td>3)_________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Protestants</td>
<td>1)_________</td>
<td>2)_________</td>
<td>3)_________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tolerant" than expected; *p* was significant at .01. In the breakdown which included Subcategories 7-8 and 9, the chance hypothesis was retained.

If discrimination and prejudice are personally experienced a "limited number of times" the additional vicarious experience influences the frequency with which the student checks Catholics as "less tolerant than others toward Jews." If there is no indication of personally experienced discrimination, vicarious experience does not influence the number of times Catholics are rated as "less tolerant than others toward Jews." The absence of numberical representation within Subcategory 3 prevents generalizations from being made on this score, however.

The second test of implied intolerance was based on responses of "yes" or "no" to the question "Is there any particular religious or nationality group which seems most often to be prejudiced against Jews?"20

No definite relationship was found to exist between the responses to this question and the personal and vicarious experiences of "victimization" found in Subcategories 1, 2, and 3; the chance hypothesis was retained. In Subcategories 4, 5, and 6 the results were similar to those found in the analysis of 34(a) and personal and vicarious "victimization." More respondents in Subcategory 5 (discrimination and prejudice experienced personally a "limited number of times" and vicariously "many times")

20Question 32.
checked "yes" than would be expected from their representation in the population. Fewer respondents in Subcategory 6 (personal "victimization" a "limited number of times," vicarious "never") checked "yes" than would be expected from their proportional representation. No definite relation was evident in the breakdown of Subcategories 7-8 and 9. The chance hypothesis was retained.

We can conclude, then, that if one has personally experienced "victimization" "many times," vicarious experience does not reinforce negative opinion. If one has personally experienced "victimization" a "limited number of times," vicarious experience does reinforce negative opinion. If one has never personally experienced "victimization," vicarious experience does not reinforce negative opinion. These conclusions emphasize the prime importance of personal experience combined with frequency.

Summary

In the preceding pages an analysis of the relationship between experienced discrimination and prejudice and intolerance was presented. For purposes of testing and precision it was necessary to use refined breakdowns which at times dissipated numerical distribution demanding a note of caution in interpreting final results. In the tests of relationship between the independent variable (personally experienced discrimination and prejudice), and the dependent variables (actual and implied
intolerance) it was found that if one has personally experienced discrimination and prejudice many times, it is to some degree associated with expressions of actual and implied intolerance by the respondents in the QIR. (The results did not duplicate in the tests of significance on the Remmers' Scale.) Intolerance toward Jews was most frequently expected from Catholics by the Jewish high school students in both the structured and partially structured questions. Respondents who reported never having experienced discrimination and prejudice expressed negative verbal opinions less frequently than would be expected of their proportion in the research population. They also checked Catholics less often than would be expected by chance. These results are consonant with independent research cited earlier in this chapter.

An investigation of the social characteristics of the respondents indicates that over one-half of the respondents who experienced "victimization" "many times" are males. Over half of those who never had this experience personally are females. Respondents who had anti-Jewish experiences many times attended religious services more frequently than those in the other categories, had more out-group contacts and were most frequently students attending the parochial high school.

In order to discern the influence of vicarious experience on attitudes the three major categories, "many times," "limited number of times," and "never" were expanded to include
vicariously experienced "vicimization." In the chi-square test it was found that by holding personally experienced "vicimization constant, vicarious experience is not associated with expressions of actual intolerance.

In the case of implied intolerance it was found that if one has personally experienced "vicimization" many times, vicarious experience does not reinforce negative opinion. If one has personally experienced "vicimization" a "limited number of times," vicarious experience does reinforce negative opinion. If one has "never" personally experienced "vicimization" vicarious experience does not reinforce negative opinion. These conclusions show that factors of immediate concern to the individual such as personal experience of "vicimization" and the frequency of its occurrence influence the frequency with which negative opinion is expressed. Negative opinions are not solely directed against non-Jews. The possibility of viewing one's own group unfavorably is also shown by the data.
CHAPTER IV

TESTS OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTOLERANCE AND
SEX, RELIGIOUS ATTENDANCE, AND CONTACT

There is a convergence of elements resulting from the
preceding analysis which emphasizes the relationship of experi­
enced discrimination and prejudice with actual and implied in­
tolerance. Earlier we found that those who experienced "victimiza­
tion" "many times" expressed negative verbal opinions more
often than would be expected, and that those who "never" had
this experience expressed negative verbal opinions less frequent­ly than would be expected by chance. We also noted in Table 2
that substantially more boys than girls experienced "victimiza­
tion." This differential, when tested in relation to actual and
implied intolerance, reinforces the basic assumption. Table 9
shows that more boys (20.7 per cent) than girls (16.7 per cent)
check one or more groups as those they do not particularly like
among Catholics, Jews and Protestants than would be expected by
chance. This type of response is taken as an indication of the
subjects' intolerance. More girls (34.5 per cent) than boys
(28.1 per cent) did not check one of these groups. Chi-square
was equal to 8.16; p was found to be less than .01.

When percentages in Table 9 are calculated for each sex
as a unit they yield a more striking emphasis. We find that
42.4 per cent of the boys checked one or more groups; 57.6 per cent did not. Of the girls 32.6 per cent checked one or more groups while 67.4 per cent did not.

**TABLE 9**

**COMPARISON OF 370 BOYS AND 387 GIRLS IN RELATION TO FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TO QUESTION 37(a) THROUGH (e) \( (N=757)^a \)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Checked Do not particularly like one or more groups</th>
<th>Did not check Do not particularly like one or more groups</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number    Percent</td>
<td>Number    Percent</td>
<td>Number    Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>157       20.7</td>
<td>213       28.1</td>
<td>370       48.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>126       16.7</td>
<td>261       34.5</td>
<td>387       51.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Five questionnaires not tabulated; respondent did not answer the question.  \( x^2 = 8.16 \) \( df=1 \) \( p < .01 \)

One of the groups listed in Question 37 was "boys and girls attending Catholic parochial schools." In a test to determine the relation of frequency of checking this particular group with the sex variable it was found that more boys than girls checked it than would be expected by chance; \( p \) was found to be less than .01.

In the case of implied intolerance the chance explanation was rejected when more boys than girls checked a national or religious group as most prejudiced toward Jews. \( p \) was found to be significant at .01. Table 10 illustrates the comparative ratings: 29.9 per cent boys checked "yes" while 19.1 per cent checked "no"; 25.6 per cent girls checked "yes" while 25.4 per
cent checked "no."

### TABLE 10

**COMPARISON OF 344 BOYS AND 358 GIRLS IN RELATION TO FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TO QUESTION 32 (N=702)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Checked &quot;yes&quot;</th>
<th>Checked &quot;no&quot;</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sixty questionnaires not tabulated; respondent did not answer the question. $x^2=8.32$ df=1 p<.01

More boys than girls rated Catholics as "less tolerant than others toward Jews" in Question 34(a). The chance explanation was rejected in a chi-square test with $p$ less than .01. The chance hypothesis was retained in the case of rating Protestants as "less tolerant than others toward Jews" in Question 34(b). $P$ was found to be greater than .05. The negative ratings on the part of the boys tend to support the impression gained from current research that male subjects are more often prejudiced. Melvin Tumin notes this occurrence in his discussion of the anti-Semitic personality. The explanation for its occurrence in this study would seem to be the result of personally experienced "victimization."

---

1 Tumin, *op. cit.*, 13.
A chi-square test was made of organizational membership data by sex. The results demonstrated that there was no association between the variables of sex and membership in Jewish as opposed to mixed organizations. Over 37 per cent of the boys belonged to all-Jewish organizations as opposed to 42.1 per cent of the girls. Ten per cent of the boys belonged to mixed organizations as opposed to 9.9 per cent of the girls.

In his research on the etiology of prejudice, Gordon W. Allport maintains that religion bears no univocal relationship to prejudice. Instead it works in contradictory directions. Mere exposure of an individual to religious upbringing does not incline him toward tolerance. Under some circumstances it could dispose him toward prejudice. In view of this indefiniteness an effort was made to relate one specific aspect of religion with prejudice by analyzing attendance at religious services. No effort was made to investigate the degree of observance of sacred ritual within the home; students were merely asked to estimate the frequency with which they attended religious services. It is on the basis of these responses to Question 7 that the breakdown for religious observance was determined. Seventy-two of the respondents report attendance at services daily; 176

---

2 Allport, op. cit., 424.

37. How often do you attend religious services?
   a) Daily____ b) Sabbath every week and High Holidays____
   c) Sabbath occasionally and High Holidays____ d) Sabbath occasionally____
   e) High Holidays only____ f) Special occasions only____
   g) Other____
attend weekly. Three hundred twenty-eight attend Sabbath and holiday services occasionally. One hundred thirty-five participate during high Holidays only, 39 on special occasions only; 7 reported qualified attendance. The three major categories derived from these characteristics can be listed as follows:

- Daily and weekly attendance 248 (32.7 per cent)
- Attendance at Sabbath services and holidays occasionally 328 (43.3 per cent)
- Attendance during High Holidays or special occasions only 181 (24.0 per cent)

The relationship between frequency of religious attendance and the following variables were determined by means of the chi-square technique: frequency of personally experienced discrimination and prejudice; actual intolerance (based on Questions 37(a) through (e)); implied intolerance of Catholics and Protestants (based on 32(c) and 34(a) and (b)); membership in all-Jewish organizations as opposed to mixed organizational membership; and sex.

Table 11 illustrates the number and percentage of personally experienced discrimination and prejudice by frequency of attendance at religious services of 756 respondents. A total of 194 (78.5 per cent) of the students who attend services daily and weekly have experienced some form of "victimization." Forty-two (17.0 per cent) report it "many times"; 152 (61.5 per cent) a "limited number of times"; 53 (21.5 per cent) report "never" having had this experience. Of the 328 respondents who described
their attendance as occasional, 248 (75.6 per cent) have experienced "victimization." Thirty-two (9.7 per cent) of this number checked "many times"; 216 (65.9 per cent) a "limited number of times"; and 80 (24.4 per cent) "never." Attendance at religious services on special occasions only was declared by 181 participants. Of this number 131 (74.0 per cent) had some experience of "victimization." Seventeen (9.3 per cent) checked "many times"; 117 (64.7 per cent) a "limited number of times," and 47 (26.0 per cent) "never."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Attendance at religious services</th>
<th>Frequency of personally experienced discrimination and prejudice</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many times</td>
<td>Limited Number of times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily and weekly</td>
<td>42 17.0</td>
<td>152 61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbath, Holidays occasionally</td>
<td>32  9.7</td>
<td>216 65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Holidays, special occasions only</td>
<td>17  9.3</td>
<td>117 64.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six questionnaires not tabulated; respondents did not answer the question.

In the first test of religious attendance by frequency of personally experienced discrimination, p was found to be
greater than .05 in a two-tailed test of significance. However, it was found to be significant in a one-tailed test where \( p \) was less than .05, the significance being demonstrated by the fact that students who attend services with regularity (daily and weekly) have personally experienced overt and covert discrimination more times than might be expected from their incidence in the general population. This result becomes more explicit in Table 11 where it can be seen that the proportion of respondents who have experienced discrimination "many times" is almost twice as great for those who attend services regularly as it is for those who attend occasionally or on special occasions only.

The chance explanation was retained in a test of the relationship between religious attendance and actual intolerance, as measured by the frequency with which respondents checked or did not check one or more groups as those they did not particularly like. The distributions presented in Table 12 demonstrate that in all three categories the respondents did not check one or more groups as frequently as they did in the other tests of relationship.

A total of 62.6 per cent did not check any group as compared with 37.4 per cent who did. Those who attended religious services regularly checked one or more groups 94 times (12.4 per cent); 154 (20.3 per cent) of these did not check any group. Respondents who attended services occasionally totaled 120 checks (15.9 per cent) as opposed to 208 (27.5 per cent) left blank.
The last category, made up of those who attended services on special holidays only, registered 69 checks (9.1 per cent) while 112 (14.8 per cent) left blanks. The similarities among these groups are even more striking when the percentages are calculated horizontally. Those who did check one or more groups listed in their respective order based on frequency of attendance at services registered 37.9, 36.6, and 38.1 per cent. Percentages of those who did not check any group (again in order of respective frequencies) are 62.1, 63.4, and 61.9.

### TABLE 12

**FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE AT RELIGIOUS SERVICES BY FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION 37(a) THROUGH (e) (N=757)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance at Religious Services</th>
<th>Checked</th>
<th>Did not check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>like one or more groups</td>
<td>like one or more groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily and weekly</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbath, Holidays occasionally</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Holidays only special occasions only</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Five questionnaires not tabulated; respondent did not answer the question. $x^2 = .14$ df = 2 $p > .05$*

The association between the independent variable and the frequency with which the respondents checked a religious or national group as most prejudiced toward Jews as well as their
ratings of Catholics and Protestants as "less tolerant toward Jews" was tested. Frequency of attendance at religious services is not significantly related to frequency of expressed actual or implied intolerance of the respondents, p being greater than .05 in all cases.

More students attending services regularly are members of all-Jewish organizations than would be expected by their proportionate representation in the sample. Fewer than the expected number of students who attend services on High Holidays and special occasions only belong to all-Jewish organizations. The chance hypothesis was rejected here, p being greater than .01.

More boys than girls attend services daily and weekly. More girls attend Sabbath and High Holiday services occasionally than would be expected on the basis of their representation; (p was significant at the .01 level.) However, this result is wholly consistent with the different obligations for men and women in Judaism. This difference in obligation demands a more active role on the part of the man which increases his identifiability and thereby makes him a more obvious target for "victimization."

The indefiniteness of research on the relationship between religious practice and prejudice is complicated by the fact that the indices of "religiosity" used in such studies have been so varied as to make it extremely difficult to relate results with independent research efforts. Robin Williams maintains
that "only certain types of religious training are effective in lessening intergroup hostility." Individuals who have had strong religious training or who participate in organized religious activities do not necessarily manifest less hostility or greater tolerance than those who do not. Gordon Allport distinguishes between "institutionalized" and "interiorized" religious outlook having opposite effects on the personality (qualities which were not measured in the present investigation). The "institutional" type of attachment, external and political, is found to be associated with prejudice. The "interiorized" outlook, associated with tolerance, is expressed in the belief of the basic creed of brotherhood. The evidence cited in this investigation merely shows that in this particular instance frequency of attendance at religious services is not related with actual or implied intolerance.

Two studies which test the association between intolerance and attendance at religious services are cited below. Both authors admit the inadequacy of the criteria used. Abraham L. Rosenblum's study showed that more ethnic prejudice was found in the attitudes of respondents who attend church less than once a month, seldom, or never, than in those who attend regularly—every week, twice a month, or once every month. The

---

4Robin Williams, Reduction of Intergroup Tensions (New York: Social Science Research Council, Bul. 57, 1947), 68.
5Allport, op. cit., 421-422.
comparable proportions are 51.3 per cent for those who attend regularly as opposed to 72.7 per cent for those who attend less regularly. The second study concludes that data are insufficient to warrant conclusion that there is a relationship between intolerance and church attendance. The sample population consisted of 91 high school students from rural Alabama, 133 from a small city in Florida, and 64 from a large metropolitan area in Michigan. The correlation coefficients (r) between authoritarianism as depicted on the $F$ Scale scores and frequency of church attendance for the various groups were small, and not statistically significant.

In the published research on contact and prejudice, one discovers lack of consonance similar to that found in the study of religion and prejudice. Writing about the influence of contact on prejudice, Robin Williams states "there is no evidence that some kinds of contact sometimes are followed by increased mutual understanding and friendliness, and that the reverse is also true." The effect of contact will depend upon the kind of association that occurs and upon the kinds of persons involved.

---


8 Williams, op. cit., 15.

9 Allport, op. cit., 251.
In order to reach some degree of precision in describing type of contact in this study, responses to five questions were used to categorize the respondents. The results indicate that close contact with Catholics and Protestants influences ratings positively, confirming Williams' first statement of relationship.

The relationship between frequency of contact with Catholics and Protestants and frequency of expressed actual tolerance and intolerance;\textsuperscript{10} positive and negative ratings of Catholics and Protestants based on Remmers' Scale medians; and implied intolerance\textsuperscript{11} were also tested. Categories of "close," "limited," and "minimal" association were based on responses to Questions 14, 15, 16(a) and (b), 17(a) and (b), and 21(a) and (b). (See Appendix I for Questionnaire on Intergroup Relations).

In the first category, "close contact," 66 of the students reported having Catholics as best friends. Twenty-four listed all or most of their friends as attending Catholic churches. One hundred twenty-four reported contact with Catholics "most of the times." The total number reporting this type of contact was 214 (28 per cent) of the total population.

"Limited contact" with Catholics was reported by 490 (65 per cent) of the students. Two hundred fifty-one came in contact with Catholics often; 68 checked few or half of their friends attended Catholic churches; and 171 listed Catholics as

\textsuperscript{10}Questions 37(b) and (e).

\textsuperscript{11}Questions 34(a) and (b).
a group present in their neighborhood.

The third category, "minimal contact," contains 56 (7 per cent) of the respondents. Twenty-four had no Catholic friends. Twenty-six reported associating with Catholics once in a while or never. One had no friends attending a Catholic church and 5 reported no Catholics living in their neighborhood.

The chance explanation was tenable in both tests of actual intolerance by degree of contact. The frequency with which students stated that they did not particularly like boys and girls from Catholic schools was not related to frequency of contact. The same was true of the positive and negative ratings of Catholics on the Remmers' Scale.

The respondents were also asked to rate Catholics and Protestants on a comparative basis. The ratings of Catholics are summarized in Table 13. Over 26 per cent rated Catholics "less tolerant than others toward Jews"; of this number 8 per cent had close contact; 16 per cent had limited contact; and 2.6 per cent had minimal contact with Catholics. Catholics were rated "more tolerant than others toward Jews" in 16.8 per cent of the responses; of this number, 6.5 per cent had close contact; 9.2 per cent had limited contact, followed by 1.1 per cent who had minimal contact. The largest percentage of respondents (56.5 per cent) rated Catholics "about the same as others;" 14.7 per cent of these respondents reported close contact, 38.2 per cent and 3.6 per cent had limited and minimal contact, respec-
### TABLE 13

RATING OF CATHOLICS IN QUESTION 34(a) BY FREQUENCY OF CONTACT (N=673)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of contact with Catholics</th>
<th>Catholics More tolerant than others toward Jews</th>
<th>Catholics less tolerant than others toward Jews</th>
<th>Catholics about the same as others</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Eighty-seven questionnaires not tabulated; respondent did not answer the question. $x^2=10.35$ df=4 p<.05

### TABLE 14

RATING OF PROTESTANTS IN QUESTION 34(b) BY FREQUENCY OF CONTACT (N=659)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of contact with Protestants</th>
<th>Protestants more tolerant than others toward Jews</th>
<th>Protestants less tolerant than others toward Jews</th>
<th>Protestants about the same as others</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One hundred and three questionnaires not tabulated; respondent did not answer the question. $x^2=13.19$ df=4 p<.05
The chance explanation was rejected in this case of implied intolerance. Student rating of Catholics was related to contact. More students rated Catholics as "more tolerant than other groups toward Jews" in the "close contact" Category. $P$ was significant at the .05 level indicating that close contact influences ratings positively.

Contact with Protestants was also categorized on the same basis of differentiated association. The first category, "close contact," included 51 students who indicated Protestants as best friends. Those who reported all or most of their best friends attended Protestant churches totaled 25. One hundred twenty-one reported contact with Protestants "most of the time" bringing the total in this category to 197 (26 per cent) of the total group.

Limited contact with Protestants was reported by 465 (61 per cent) of the population. Two hundred and ten associate with them "often"; 71 report half or few of their friends attend Protestant churches; and 184 list Protestants as a neighborhood group.

Thirty-nine of the students in the "minimal contact" Category report having no Protestant friends. Forty-six come in contact with them once in a while or never. One respondent had no friends attending Protestant churches; 12 estimated that no Protestants lived in their neighborhood. This category
includes 98 (13 per cent) of the total population. Application of the chi-square test to the relationship between frequency of contact with Protestants and actual and implied intolerance produced substantially the same results as those derived for Catholics. The frequency of checking Protestants as opposed to not checking them as a group "one does not particularly like" is not associated with the frequency of association. The chance explanation was also retained in the test of positive and negative ratings of Protestants on the Remmers' Scale and frequency of contact with Protestants.

Table 14 presents the respondents' ratings of Protestants by frequency of contact. Over 10 per cent rated Protestants "less tolerant than others toward Jews" (as opposed to 26.7 per cent who rated Catholics in this fashion.) Of this number 2.4 per cent had close association with them; 6.7 and 1.2 per cent had limited and minimal contact respectively. Protestants were rated "more tolerant than others toward Jews" by 21.9 per cent of the respondents (as opposed to 16.8 per cent for Catholics.) Of this total, frequency of contact was divided: 8.7 per cent, 10.8 per cent, and 2.4 per cent for "close," "limited," and "minimal" association respectively. Over 67 per cent rated Protestants "about the same as others" in their relations with Jews (compared with 56.5 per cent for Catholics). Frequency of association representations here were 16.8, 43.1, and 7.9 per cent, respectively. Rating Protestants as "more
tolerant than others toward Jews" is positively influenced by close association with them, p being significant at the .05 level.

A study published by Jerry Neprash tends to support this finding. Neprash worked with boys between the ages of 9 and 15 who were members of YMCA groups. He found a close relationship existing between frequency of personal contact and the development of friendly attitudes toward minority groups. Mere proximity, however, appeared to have little effect unless it is followed by closer relationships.12

Similarly, Sister Jeanine Gruesser's study showed that extent of association of Catholic children with Jews varied inversely with the frequency of their unfavorable valuations of them. Those who had no Jewish friends exhibited pronounced "in-group" attitudes. Children having most contact with Jews manifested a liking for all groups.13

Emphasis is placed on the qualitative aspect of contact in the study by Allport and Kramer. They find that casual contact does not diminish prejudice as markedly as intimate, equal status contact. "Only a fairly close knowledge of a minority group reduces one's susceptibility to second-hand stereotypes," they declare.14

12 Jerry Neprash, "Minority Group Contacts and Social Distance," Phylon, XIV, 2 (June, 1953), 207-212.
13 Gruesser, op. cit., 144.
We pointed out earlier that frequency of contact with out-groups was related to frequency of personally experienced discrimination and consequently this type of discrimination was related to intolerance. But now we have seen that close contact tends to influence the ratings of Catholics and Protestants positively. This apparent contradiction disappears when we recall that the five questions about frequency of contact discussed in this chapter bore upon intimate or best-friend relationships which were not included in the tests of contact discussed in Chapter III. This aspect of more intimate intergroup association provides the logical basis of agreement found in this study with the three studies cited above. It supports Williams' contention that "contact must be intensive enough to result in personal likes and dislikes which help to break up stereotypes."15

Summary

In addition to the tests relating discrimination and prejudice to actual and implied intolerance, the relationships between intolerance and sex, religious observance and contact were observed. The chi-square analyses relating sex and actual and implied intolerance reinforce the basic hypothesis. It was found initially that respondents who have experienced some form of "victimization" "many times" tended to express negative

15Williams, op. cit., 71.
verbal opinions more frequently than those who report this experience a "limited number of times." Those who "never" experienced "victimization" do not express negative opinions as frequently as might be expected by chance. The test relating the sex differential and intolerance demonstrates that more boys than girls experienced discrimination and prejudice and that they in turn check one or more groups as those they "do not particularly like" among Catholics, Jews, and Protestants more frequently than would be expected by chance; more boys than girls checked "boys and girls from Catholic parochial schools" as a group they did not particularly like. Similarly, boys expressed more negative opinions in the case of implied intolerance, indicated by the frequency with which they checked a national or religious group as most prejudiced toward Jews and rated Catholics as "less tolerant than others toward Jews." There was no significant difference between boys and girls in their rating of Protestants. Nor was any observed in the case of membership in all-Jewish as opposed to mixed organizations.

The overall conclusion with regard to the influence of religious observance is that frequency of attendance at religious services is not related to frequency of expressed negative opinion. However, the criteria used to correlate religious observance and intolerance demand a note of caution in interpreting results. The instruments employed provide a quantitative rather than a qualitative index.
In the test relating the variables of religious attendance at services and frequency of personally experienced "victimization," p was found to be significant in the one-tailed test but not in the preferred two-tailed test. The significance occurred in the cell where respondents reported daily and weekly attendance. This experience of "victimization" was not reflected in the negative opinions expressed by this group in the tests relating attendance at religious services and actual intolerance. The chance explanation was retained in the three cases of implied intolerance centering upon the identification of a specific religious or national group and in the respondents' rating of Catholics and Protestants as "less tolerant than others toward Jews."

The influence of contact on prejudice was also subjected to analysis. The chance explanation was held tenable in two tests of actual intolerance of Catholics and Protestants. The frequency with which students checked boys and girls from Catholic schools and Protestant boys and girls as groups they "did not particularly like" was not related to frequency of contact with these groups. The same held true for negative ratings of Catholics and Protestants on the Remmers' Scale.

In contrast, the chance explanation was rejected in the analysis of expected tolerance and intolerance of Catholics and Protestants and degree of contact. Both groups were rated on a comparative basis. Rating Catholics and Protestants as "more
tolerant than others toward Jews" proves to be positively related
to close association. In spite of the fact that both of these
groups were rated "more tolerant" more frequently by respondents
having close contact there was a marked difference between the
ratings. Catholics were rated "less tolerant than others toward
Jews" more frequently than Protestants; by contrast, Protestants
were rated "more tolerant" than Catholics more frequently.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF PERSONAL AND VICARIOUS EXPERIENCES
OF DISCRIMINATION AND PREJUDICE

In the introduction, we spoke of the complexity of human behavior, the influence of religious belief on this behavior, and the limitations imposed by this complexity in relating religion to prejudice and contact. Now we shall attempt to place the data of this investigation in a more sharply defined and therefore more meaningful context by using the frustration-aggression hypothesis as a frame of reference. The authors of *Frustration and Aggression* do not claim to have achieved a complete systematization of human behavior. Rather it is viewed as an extension of Dollard's elaboration of Freud's systematic use of the frustration-aggression hypothesis. This hypothesis attempts to place such diverse phenomena as prejudice, strikes, suicides, criminality, wife-beating, and war within a systematic frame of reference.¹ The hypothesis is stated by its authors in the following manner:

...occurrence of aggressive behavior always presupposes the existence of frustration and, contrariwise, the existence of frustration always leads to some form of aggression.²

---

¹Dollard et al., *op. cit.*, 21-26.
²Ibid., 1.
In this conceptualization frustration and aggression are joined as "response sequences." The term "instigator" is first introduced as an antecedent condition, either observed or inferred, from which a response can be predicted. Physical stimuli, verbally reported images, ideas or motives can serve as instigators. An act which terminates a predicted sequence is called a "goal-response," and may be defined as that reaction which reduces the strength of the instigation to a degree at which it no longer has much of a tendency to produce the predicted response. The termination of a behavior sequence is frequently only temporary. Interference with the occurrence of an "instigated goal-response" is called a frustration. Interference with goal-seeking activities or inaccessibility of the goal itself may be slight or great. It is nevertheless some form of interference which induces frustration. Such expressions as "to disappoint a person," "to cause pain to someone," "to block somebody from carrying out an act" indicate that one person is imposing a frustration on another. It is not important at this point to ask why such acts occur or whether they are justified. The instigators remain and the adequate "goal-responses"

3Ibid., 2.
4Ibid., 4.
5Ibid., 6. An example cited in the text is that of a ticket-buyer who reaches the box-office, purchases his ticket and no longer stands in line; the purchase of the ticket is said to be the goal response.
are interdicted. Aggression, according to the hypothesis, is the primary and characteristic reaction to frustration and will occur when something happens to interfere with a "goal response." While it is evident that frustration is not always observably followed by aggression it may be temporarily compressed, delayed, deflected or displaced, but it is never destroyed. It is not limited to overt manifestations. Such nouns as anger, resentment, hatred, hostility, irritation, and annoyance as well as verbs such as torment, insult, hurt, humiliate, and threaten carry something of the meaning of the concept. It may be directed at the object which is perceived as causing the frustration or it may be displaced to some altogether innocent object.

There are other consequences of frustration such as substitute responses and rational problem solving which involve extensive theoretical formulation in their own right. They are deliberately "ignored" by the authors who opt to concentrate on the consequences of frustration and aggression. They admit that the data offered in support of their hypothesis lacks the refinement necessary to "prove" it. The limitations to which they allude will undoubtedly be reflected in our analysis.

---

6 Ibid., 7.
7 Ibid., 10.
8 Ibid., 2.
9 Ibid., 10.
10 Ibid., 19.
the other hand once these limitations were acknowledged the hypothesis yielded valuable results in situations quite similar to our own which encourages us in its use. The personal and vicarious experiences of discrimination and prejudice are offered as examples of frustration; the expressions of intolerance by our respondents as examples of aggression. It may be argued that the terms frustration and aggression are perhaps too strong in view of the evidence contained in the questionnaire on Intergroup Relations and the Remmers' Scale. We use them with the qualification that varying degrees of frustration and aggression occur in social interaction.

To utilize the foregoing analysis more immediately we must infer that the "instigator" (the antecedent condition) for our purposes, is the expectation on the part of the respondent that in a democracy, such as the United States, there are rights and privileges which he will be able to pursue and enjoy. He can expect that he will be treated and evaluated by others as a person not as a group; that he can express his religious tradition symbolically by such means as wearing a skull cap, a mezuzah, or absent himself freely from school or work for religious holidays; that public accommodations will be open to him. The fact that a breach in the performance of these expectations are cited by the respondents as a description of discrimination that he, his family, or close friends have experienced because they are Jewish indicates that they do not believe that they are
enjoying the full fruits of their expectations—that being Jewish somehow compromises their achievement. It is possible as a result of the reports of these experiences to conclude that frustration exists. In order to say that frustration exists one must specify two things: that an organism could have been expected to perform certain acts; that these acts have been prevented from occurring. We would supplement the first condition in the following manner: not only is the "organism" (in this case a person) expected to perform acts but "he" will expect others to reciprocate—a necessary dimension in social interaction—and that interference of either or both expectations constitutes a frustration.

The logical sequence is that aggression will be the characteristic reaction to the occasions of frustration or "victimization" reported in the QIR. This aspect will be treated in greater detail in the next chapter in the analysis of expressions of intolerance. The testing of the hypothesis in Chapter III demonstrated that those who experienced "victimization" "many times" were more frequently negative in their evaluations of Catholics than those who experienced it a "limited number of times" or "never." The evidence that Catholics are actually the "objects" causing the frustration is inconclusive in the accounts of experienced "victimization." No "obvious" effort was made to elicit this information. Spontaneous descriptions were thought

\[11\text{Ibid.}, 7.\]
to be preferable. In the descriptions of "victimization" (limited to Questions 27(e) for personal experience and 28(e) for vicarious) which follow, Catholics were cited 37 times as "aggressors." Question 32, where responses were not quoted from actual experiences, yielded different results. The question asked: Is there any particular religious or national group which seems most often to be prejudiced against Jews?

The religious group cited most frequently, a total of 175 times, was Catholics. The national group mentioned most frequently was German-Nazis—53 times. Here it would seem that Catholics are "perceived" as the "objects" (persons) who cause the frustrations.

Personal Experiences of Discrimination and Prejudice

The analysis of all of the questions which elicited information concerning personal experience of discrimination and prejudice revealed that 76 per cent have had some experience of it, while 24 per cent report never having had this experience personally. Of the 76 per cent, 16 per cent experienced "victimization" "many times"; 84 per cent reported its occurrence "a

---

12Protestants were mentioned 4 times; Negroes, 12 times; Christians, 3 times. This count includes personal and vicarious experiences. Catholics were cited 30 times in the personally experienced incidents. Experiences of World War II were cited 59 times, the majority obviously being vicarious experiences.

13Protestants were cited 39 times, Christians 10 times.

14The Arab-Moslem-Egyptian category totaled 21.
few times" or "once." Table 15 illustrates the categories and frequency of experienced discrimination described by respondents to Question 27(e). Here the student was requested to describe one situation in which he had been discriminated against because he was Jewish. The students most frequently reporting incidents were those attending the Academy (30.2 per cent) and south side youth group (25.7 per cent). North side youths reported 17.9 per cent of the cases followed by youths from the west side group and Hebrew high schools with 13.4 and 12.8 per cent, respectively.

The descriptions of "victimization" or frustration which follow are at the same time examples of aggression probably resulting from some frustration of the anti-Semite, thus presenting us the classic case of the vicious circle: one person's aggression is another person's frustration, etc. This is a striking example of the counter-effects of prejudice. Because many of the statements were similar, not all are recorded below. Where similar statements are quoted it is because they are of a type which occurred frequently. We have deleted the parts of responses which would identify the location of this study; other blank spaces in statements should be attributed to the respondent.

Category 1: Namecalling (Total 111)

Namecalling was the experience of discrimination cited most frequently by the respondents. Students from the south side youth group experienced it more often than any other group,
### Table 15

**Categories and Frequency of Personally Experienced Discrimination by Groups Described in Question 27(e)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of personally experienced discrimination</th>
<th>Academy</th>
<th>Hebrew High</th>
<th>Youth Groups South Side</th>
<th>Youth Groups West Side</th>
<th>Youth Groups North Side</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Namecalling</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Anti-Semitic remarks and actions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical encounters</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reports of multiple experiences&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Religious antagonism</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Taunting-Threats</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exclusion from public places</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Refusals-Can't remember</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>These experiences include the frequencies listed below. The changes which these frequencies would bring about in the original totals in the left column are reported in parentheses.

- Namecalling, 18 (129)
- Anti-Semitic remarks, 5 (71)
- Physical encounters, 16 (62)
- Taunting-Threats, 12 (42)
- Exclusion, 4 (16)
a total of 36 times. Academy students reported this type of incident 24 times, the north side youth group 21 times, followed by the west side and Hebrew high school group with totals of 16 and 14 times respectively. Implicit in these incidents of namecalling are standards of judgment expressed in negative valuations. In this experience, the respondent sees himself judged on the basis of an extrinsic quality (a social norm judging from its frequency) as opposed to a judgment based on an intrinsic quality, i.e., with respect for him as an individual.\textsuperscript{15}

Examples of some of the most typical comments in this category are:

- Been called names against my religion.
- I have been called "dirty Jew."
- I was called a "bad Jew."

The remarks which follow are interesting in that they reflect the different kinds of reactions to namecalling. The first are reactions to what may be construed as a frustrating experience. The immediate response is to minimize or rationalize.

- Just called a name or something.
- Sometimes when walking along the street people say "Jew" or "Kike." These are the only times.
- Just once or twice when some friends and myself were walking—we were called names.
- Many people used to call me a "dirty Jew," but I found this when I was younger. The boys and girls I know now don't say anything against any religion.

Someone called me a "Jew" meaning especially that the Jews are fat and rich. I never took it seriously—it doesn't bother me except that it's foolish.

It was merely calling names by a bunch of kids.

Called unmentionable names.

Some guys in school came up to me and called me several names which I must censor.

It wasn't very bad, they just called me "Jew" and turned away...

A boy in grammar school called to me "you're a God damn Jew" hoping to start a fight. I didn't oblige him. He didn't like the idea of me being a Jew.

The following statements indicate a more intense type of reaction, illustrating the frustration-aggression sequence. The aggression is manifested verbally and physically.

I was walking slowly in the halls in school and a couple girls (bums) said get out of the way, "dirty Kike."

He called me a "dirty Jew" and I beat him up....

People have called me a "dirty Jew" and a "rich Jew"—out of jealousy!

A few kids smaller than me called me a name so I chased them until they went in a house.

One time, a boy called me a "dirty Jew." I fought him.

While walking down the street I have been called "dirty Jew." But that person will never forget me.

A bunch of Catholics, Protestants, and Mexicans called me a few names and I kicked the shit out of them.

The following remarks indicate the variety of situations in which namecalling was experienced. The individuals encountered were adults as well as children.
I was on a golf course and a man was telling me "come on Jew boy hit that ball, come on Jew boy come on."

My next door neighbors hate Jews so they called me "a dirty Jew" once when I was walking by their house.

I used to live in a mostly Gentile neighborhood and I was once called a "dirty Jew" and asked to leave the game.

When I wear my . . . jacket some non-Jews make comments. (Look at the "Jewish.")

While going to Hebrew school a boy called my friends and me a "dirty Jew" and a "Kike."

While getting on the bus, the bus driver called us "d--n Jews."

In grammar school I was called bad names after discussing the Eichmann trial.

I was standing in front of a bowling alley with some of my Jewish friends when a boy walked by and called us dirty names for Jews.

I was insulted by a boy in my classroom because I wouldn't let him cheat off my paper. He called me a "dirty Jew."

Being called names such as "dirty Jew" in a Gentile neighborhood where I used to live.

One time we were waiting at the bus stop some boys came over and spit at us saying "we hate dirty Jews."

Some person started calling me some rather obscene names.

Once when I was walking home from services, a kid threw some dirt at me and a friend and called us "dirty Jews."

It was at a test, and I didn't help someone because I didn't finish yet, so he got up and called me a "Jew" "go back where you came from" and more.

Kids saying, "Hey Jew boy."
In a store because I stated something in Jewish I was called a "dirty Jew."

I was called "rotten Jewish" because I wouldn't go out with a boy.

We (my brothers and sister) were walking up a street and these people started chasing us calling "dirty Jews."

I was walking down the street and someone called me a "dirty Jew."

When I was in a school store someone asked what religion I was. I said Jewish and one of the girls called me a "dirty Jew."

I was walking on someone's lawn. The owner came out of his house and openly called me a "Kike," etc.

Some boys asked me if I was a Jew and I said "yes" and they started to chase me (never caught me).

Some kids once were throwing stones at me and calling me a "dirty Jew."

On the bus the driver calls us little rats and said we were so miserable because we are Jewish.

When I was in a Negro neighborhood, and a few boys knew I was Jewish, they called me a "dirty Kike" and Hitler should have killed me.

Some Negroes called me names and threw stones at me also a few Protestants.

In history class a girl referred to me as a "dirty Jew." (She was a Protestant Hillbilly).

There were only three statements in this category containing references to Protestants. The following remarks include references to Catholics. 16

A Catholic boy was riding his bike past my house and for no reason he called me "dirty Jew." I felt very hurt.

16 All but two of these statements were recorded by students from the south side of the city.
I was canning for Polio and I entered a Catholic building. I knocked on the door, the person said "no" and called me a "Jew" when I turned my back.

When passing a Catholic school children yell "dirty Jews."

One day during a High Holiday, a couple of Catholic girls, called one of my girlfriends and myself a name (which was quite nasty) about our religion. I am proud of my religion.

A group of Catholic children would come around a Jewish group and call us "dirty Jews."

When I was younger I was playing with a kid who was a Catholic and I was called a "dirty Jew."

Once some Catholic kids took my basketball and when we fought them they called us "dirty Jews."

This Catholic called me a "dirty Jew."

I was in the library doing Hebrew home work and some girls from a Catholic school began to call me names.

When I went to a day camp mostly Protestant and Catholic they kept on telling my cousin and me we were "dirty Jews."

Statements making direct reference to religious differences were made by four respondents:

A girl I know called me a "dirty Jew" because I don't believe in the laws of her religion.

When I have been on buses with a yamelka I have been called a "Jesus killer."

Walking with friends and called names like "Jesus murderer" and so forth.

Some boys and girls (of another faith) were extremely boorish have slandered my faith and have called me names.

The stereotype, "dirty Jew," has appeared most frequently in the descriptions of namecalling incidents. Sister Jeanine
Gruesser noted its occurrence in her study of Catholic students' valuations of Jews. A survey made in New York by the Mayor's Committee on Unity noted frequent references to "dirty Jews." This same characterization was made in a study of more than 1200 school children from elementary to first year college levels in 1945. All of these studies were done in the 1940's. It is interesting to note the persistence of the stereotype and its confirmation from experience by Jewish high school students. The occurrence of this stereotype which does not single out religion was more frequent than "Christ killer."

Category 2: Anti-Semitic Remarks and Actions (Total 66)

The reports in this category include, for the most part, negative remarks made about Jews not directly addressed to the respondent who experiences the contradiction of his acceptance as an individual (intrinsic valuation) but the rejection of his group. In the absence of identifiable characteristics the individuals are accepted on their own merits.

When I was in a restaurant with a friend who was a Catholic and she started talking about the so-called "Hebes"—very distasteful.

17 Sister Jeanine Gruesser, op. cit., 100.


19 "We, the Children...Boys and Girls Discuss Intercultural Understanding," Educational Leadership, II (March, 1945), 241-271.
While walking through a corridor at grammar school, some of my "friends" started saying how cheap and sly all Jews were—when they found out that I was Jewish they "sincerely apologized."

Among some girls I was with a few didn't know that I was Jewish and started talking about Jews in an uncomplimentary way.

Once while I was playing with a Catholic a boy was fighting with her sister over a swing. My friend was very angry and said "you must be a Jew." She never realized that I was one and she was playing with me just as she would with a Catholic.

On a train bound for California one woman said she had moved out of Miami Beach because the Jews moved in...

When I was pledging for a Jewish sorority some non-Jewish girls made some remarks about Jews.

One girl said to me that she thought that all Jews were rich and snobbish.

On a bus there were a group of boys who made some crude cutting remarks about the Jewish religion.

When a freshman I told a boy that I went to a certain grammar school before graduating and he said in different words that a bunch of Jews go there, not knowing I was Jewish.

I was waiting to make a phone call at a public telephone and a non-Jewish girl who was also waiting made a loud remark about "dirty Jews."

I was at work once and people didn't know that I was Jewish. They made a comment about Jews being loud and stingy.

Standing in a gym class and the girls not knowing that I was Jewish, because of my name and what I looked like, a topic of religion was brought up and remarks were made about Jewish people.

On the bus coming home from school a boy that goes to a Catholic school made some remarks about Jews.

I was counselor on a trip, a boy said "all the counselors are dirty Jews."
They told me Jews killed Christ and should all die.

In a class at ... while a boy sat next to a girl she asked him sarcastically if he was a Jew. He said "no" and she smiled happily.

Experience of dislike for Jews in general was cited in a number of cases:

At the school I used to go to—some of them didn't like Jews.

When tagging for a Jewish organization a person found out the money would help Jews. He told me he'd "never give a cent to the Jews."

A person I met in a small town disliked me rather suddenly and to my dismay she later told me it was because she found out I was a Jew.

It was a group of guys who didn't like my friends and me because we were Jews. There isn't much of that in my school, but some people are just ignorant.

The boys of a non-Jewish group do not wish to associate with you after they find out you are Jewish.

We lived in the midst of many anti-Semites. They constantly criticized.

They don't like Jews.

It's just that they don't like Jews, they don't give a reason, just tell me I'm a bum or start a fight.

I lived on the west side of ... and came in contact many times with people who did not very much like my religion.

At one time I lived in a neighborhood dominated by Catholic Poles and Catholic Germans who, as they outnumbered Jews, were always looking for excuses to bother them.

In the locker room at school, (I play football) more than one of the members of the team were anti-Jewish.
Once when I was selling candy bars for our school I asked a lady to buy one but when she heard it was a Jewish school she gave me a look and walked away.

The following remarks indicate a more personal encounter on the part of the respondents.

A former geography teacher openly showed dislike for me because I came from Israel and made it hard for me to pass that particular course.

I have a Catholic girlfriend who has many Jewish and Catholic friends. Some of the Catholics don't like me because I am Jewish.

Once I was confronted by an Irish lad who honestly believed that he would catch the plague if I got near him.

Our ball rolled out on a lawn across the street. I went out to retrieve it and an old anti-Semite came out yelling all sorts of insults. She called the police and solely because I was Jewish she made him arrest me.

A boy upon finding out that I was Jewish broke a date I had with him.

A boy was against my religion and did not allow me the privilege of my belief, but just bickering with me over the subject but no fighting occurred.

Category 3: Physical Encounter (Total 46)

Forty-six respondents report anti-Semitic actions in which they personally experienced fighting. Students from the Academy and south side report this experience most frequently.

I was walking home and had my skull cap on and some boys insulted, abused, and beat me up because I was Jewish.

I have had fights because of being a Jew.

While riding my bike, two boys came over and one said, "Oh, there's a dirty Jew!" And the other pushed me off my bike.
I have been beaten up by one anti-Semite on a few occasions in grammar school.

One time I was in a rumble with some Catholics. We were walking down an alley (4 Jews) and these other guys with brass knuckles and spiked boards started to grab our skull caps. A fight followed. I was slugged about 12 times with brass knuckles.

We were walking along an alley and got beat up because we wore our skull caps and were Jewish. We got all slugged with brass knuckles and beaten up. (Author's note: Apparently both respondents were involved in the same encounter.)

I was walking to the school store and an older boy asked me if I was a Jew when I said "yes" he started hitting me.

While coming home from Hebrew school I was beaten up by an older boy and called dirty names.

Once a boy hit my sister in my presence and called her a "dirty Jew."

Some kids jumped me.

I was going home from Hebrew school and was beaten up by some boys. (Maybe it wasn't because I was Jewish but I can think of no other reason.)

Some Catholic girls came up to me one night when I was walking home from Hebrew school and started calling me names and hitting me.

While playing basketball at the YMCA some friends and I were attacked by a group of drunk Christians who had decided that Jews shouldn't be allowed in "their" Y.

I was walking down the street coming home from Hebrew school with a friend a couple of guys who openly hated Jews jumped us and we fought them.

While playing football for my school. During the latter part of the game which we were winning I and some of my teammates were excessively ruffed up and called "dirty Jews."

Some big dumb Goys that wanted to act tough with their chains.
I was backed up to a wall by some Catholics, one decided he didn't like the idea, so while they were discussing it, I took off (ran).

I walked into the corner store and was called a "dirty Jew." I gave a dirty look to the girl who called me this. She walked up to me and slapped my cheek, I was furious especially since I am from Israel and was never treated like this before.

In Michigan I was told, "Get off the road dumb Jew." I answered back and said I wouldn't. They (2 of them) hit me in the jaw and rode on in their car.

Working for the park district as a guard my brother was a mate. He was rough on one of the poorer guards. This guard called me a . . . "Kike." This ended up in a fight.

I was riding down the street and two boys on bikes stopped me and punched me a few times.

While attending school on the west side hoodlums called a group of us names and tried to begin a fight by hitting a few of us.

In one of the statements cited above a respondent added the following remark to his description of "victimization": "Maybe it wasn't because I was Jewish but I can think of no other reason." It is possible that the aggressive act directed toward the respondent was not directed toward him because of his Jewish identity. We are more concerned with the effects of the definition of the situation than with the validity of that definition. The overt aggressive actions are definitely linked by the respondents to the fact that the individual is a member of a particular group. There is some indication of what the immediate response was to this "instigation" of frustration. In the study alluded to earlier by Sister Jeanine Gruesser, it
was found that Catholic students tended to think of Jews as pugnacious. She suggests that due to the frequent incidence of fighting between Catholics and Jews the occasions and circumstances surrounding them demand closer investigation. The evidence here suggests initiation of conflict on the part of the non-Jew.

**Category 4: Reports of Multiple Experiences (Total 33)**

Here the respondents were asked to cite one example of discrimination. Thirty-three listed more than one. Such repetition of cases seems to convey a sense of urgency that would be lost if the examples were broken up and cited in separate categories. As a result, some of the examples overlap. A more important reason for citing these responses in this manner is the conclusion derived from testing the hypothesis in Chapter III, i.e., that those who have experienced discrimination and prejudice "many times" tend to respond negatively more often than others.

"Jew" was written on my door with the name of my rabbi underneath it. A group ganged up on me when they found out I was Jewish.

I have been beat up once, spat at several times, and hit or pushed. Also I have been called "dirty Jew" or "Kike."

Because of my religious belief I have been beaten in the park, and on streets, embarrassed, called names of ill repute and generally discriminated against.

---

20 Sister Jeanine Gruesser, op. cit., 98.
Called names from passing cars; intimidated into fight; and turned down from a job.

Called "dirty Jew," nasty remarks made about Second World War conditions.

Once I was beat up, other times made fun of.

Once in public school a teacher lightly mentioned her feelings about Hebrew school as almost foolish—this I took as a personal insult. Usually on public buses the driver will not stop for us after school because they know what school we attend.

Gangsters in front of a public school saw me getting out of my school late one day and started cursing and spitting at me. A girl in my building cursed me because she simply doesn't like Jews.

A man called me a "Jew bastard." When I was younger an older boy beat me up frequently. A man made jest of my skull cap.

In the school locker room Jewish students are sometimes threatened or asked for money. Attempts to join organizations.

A few years ago a few persons called me a "dirty Jew." A certain high school teacher marked me lower when he found out about my religion.

Comments in gym class, lunchroom and on buses. In summer school some Spanish girls and boys began a fight.

At a YMCA meeting. Worked over in a lockerroom by Catholics.

Being stopped on the street by hoodlums, being yelled at from open car windows, fights, etc.

In public school when my friends first found out I was Jewish in the fourth grade. At my job also.

Calling names, discriminated against by a teacher.

Being called names and being clobbered a few times.

Once a boy spat at me and called me a "dirty Jew." Another time a boy tried to knife me.
On one occasion in my old neighborhood I was called a "dirty Jew," and have frequently been discriminated against because of my yamelka.

Having an argument; bullied.

At public school in a different city I had a hard time getting along with some people. I have been called profane names and my religion mocked. I have also been pushed around.

**Category 5: Religious Antagonism (Total 33)**

These respondents have experienced negative reactions because certain articles symbolizing religious observance are worn by them or because they absent themselves from school for religious holidays. Twenty-five of the 33 reports were cited by students from the Academy.

Because I wear certain Jewish clothes people laugh. When I walked to the synagogue once people laughed at me and called me names.

When attending a public school for a summer course I had to remove my skull cap. I feel this is a breach of my religious freedom.

Some people make fun of boys that wear skull caps. They say "You dirty Jew get the 'Jew Cap' off."

(Author's note: skull cap incidents were mentioned most frequently as occasions for antagonistic actions.)

Because I wear a religious marker around my neck.

In school when wearing a Jewish star—looks and funny remarks.

Many girls wear crosses to school and gym class. I was told by my gym teacher not to wear my Jewish star to gym any more.

Two girls (not Jewish) were following my girlfriend and me. For no reason other than we were wearing "J" stars they spit at us and called us names.
A few times at school when asked if I would be absent during Jewish holidays I heard mutterings of "Jew Jew."

When I was in the third grade, I had to stay home for two days for Passover. When I returned my teacher did not allow me to have a new book and screamed at me to go back to Israel because that's the only place Jews belong.

Cracks about taking off for Jewish holidays.

Teachers gave tests on Jewish holidays when they knew that most of the class was Jewish and wouldn't be in school.

Category 6: Taunting, Threats (Total 30)

Teasing, taunting and threatening actions reported by 30 students can be viewed as actually or potentially frustrating. The acts themselves vary in intensity, but the respondents tend to see even the mild ones as discriminatory.

Jokingly various members of the football team have referred to me as "Kike."

Some of my friends called me some names jokingly. They don't mean any harm but it still bothers me.

Cracking jokes purposefully.

I was in a room where a lot of anti-Semitic jokes were being told.

When I went to a private Jewish school children from the public school would come and laugh at us.

There have been a few times. One was when I was the only Jewish person in a gym class and they tried to get my goat by saying that Jews were "niggerlovers."

I was made fun of on a bus twice.

Some boys in my gym class when I was a Freshie would come up to me and say "Too bad Eichmann missed you."

Visiting a friend in a Catholic neighborhood, I was taunted.
I was walking home from the bowling alley and some Catholics threatened my boyfriend and me with a knife because we were Jewish.

By Catholic cousins who tried to scare me as a child saying that I should attend their kind of church.

Throwing stones at our house windows. Ruining our Succoth (hut) on the Holiday of Tabernacles.

A group of Catholics called me a "dirty Jew," tossed a few other taunts, etc.

When a temple of my religion is damaged or paid a great disrespect, I feel that I, being of that faith, have been discriminated against.

Some swastikas were written all over our hallway.

Some Catholics drew a swastika on our sidewalk and the front of our house with charcoal and chalk.

I was little, one of my friends told me if I didn't believe in Jesus, then I didn't believe in G-d.

A picture of Jesus Christ was glued on our door.

**Category 7: Exclusion and Discrimination in Public Places (Total 12)**

There were 12 respondents who reported that they had been excluded from or discriminated against in public places. These examples illustrate more concrete experiences of deprivation.

I was once informed that since I was Jewish I had killed Christ and due to this I was not welcome to join a club sponsored by an ice skating rink.

Trying to get a job. They did not want Jews.

We went to a private beach outside of ... and were not allowed in. Sign read "Restricted."

Refused admittance to a hotel.

While applying for a job.
I couldn't play golf at a golf club.

A job interview for a Catholic hospital.

Once I was not allowed on a beach in Michigan because the neighborhood was anti-Semitic.

We went to a place I don't remember where it was—they didn't want us to stay at a certain resort.

When we were trying to apply at a hotel but we were told not to because of our religion.

While looking for an apartment several places were not for rent to Jews.

Waiting to be served in a restaurant.

Category 8: Miscellaneous (Total 47)

This category includes a variety of responses which were difficult to categorize because of number and lack of clarity. Of the 47 responses 5 reported that they had been excluded from parties or groups. Twenty-five simply mentioned places or situations where they experienced discrimination or prejudice. Ten of these reported they occurred at school; 8 occurred in the neighborhood in which they lived; 3 were on buses; 4 reported occurrences in sports. Three respondents called attention to the fact that other Jews discriminate:

I don't remember exactly but I know I have been hurt. It was usually in the form of remarks by other Jews who were not as observant as I.

I've been called all types of names because I am Traditional and they are Reform and were jealous of the knowledge I had.

Jewish people are very prejudiced; they have names for colored people and non-Jews—I think this is wrong.
Category 9: Refusals, Can't Remember (Total 46)

Nine of the 46 responses included in this category stated explicitly that they did not remember the circumstances. Twenty-three were left blank. The 8 refusals took the following forms of expression.

- My business.
- No thanks.
- Don't ask personal questions. Language was not in good taste.
- Not a very pleasant situation. Therefore no thanks.
- Do not wish to tell.
- I'd rather not talk about it.
- Do not wish to tell about it.
- I do not care to discuss this fact? (Respondent's punctuation.)

In the preceding analysis of the reports of personal experiences of discrimination we have not only a description of concrete experiences; we have some insight into the variety of ways individuals respond to them: some tend to minimize or rationalize a particular experience while others responded with angry statements or fighting; still others refused to discuss them as was shown in the statements in Category 9.

Vicarious Experiences of Discrimination and Prejudice

We have also analyzed vicarious experience of discrimination as a possible factor influencing attitudes. Tests of
relationship of this variable in Chapter III were not as conclusive as those found in the tests relating personally experienced discrimination with intolerance. Vicarious experience of "victimization" is not associated with expressions of actual intolerance. On the other hand it tended to reinforce expressions of implied intolerance in the category where incidence of personally experienced "victimization" was experienced a "limited number of times"; it did not tend to reinforce expression of implied intolerance of those who experienced "victimization" "many times" or "never." Three hundred and ninety-seven (52 per cent) of the respondents had heard reports of anti-Jewish experiences from relatives or friends; 553 (46 per cent) report never having heard of such experiences from others. 21

The categories in Table 16 contain the reports of vicarious experience of discrimination by the respondents and their respective groups. Students attending the Academy cited these experiences more frequently than any other group, a total of 28.3 per cent of the cases. They also accounted for the highest percentage in reports of personally experienced discrimination in Table 15. The actual descriptions which they offer suggest that their identifiability by means of religious observance (wearing skull caps, etc.) plays an important part in determining the frequency of "victimization." In Table 16 the second highest total, 22.4 per cent, was registered by students from the south

21 The remaining 2 per cent were no response answers.
TABLE 16
CATEGORIES AND FREQUENCY OF VICARIOUSLY EXPERIENCED DISCRIMINATION DESCRIBED
IN QUESTION 28(e) BY GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Vicariously Experienced Discrimination</th>
<th>Academy</th>
<th>Hebrew High School Group</th>
<th>Youth Groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Side</td>
<td>West Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Namecalling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Anti-Semitic remarks and actions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Physical encounters</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reports of multiple experiences(^a)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Religious antagonism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Taunting-Threats</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exclusion from public and private places</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. European experiences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Refusals-No example cited</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)These experiences include the frequencies listed below. The changes which these frequencies would bring about in the original totals in the left column are reported in parentheses. 
Namecalling, 2 (27)
Anti-Semitic remarks, 4 (48)
Physical encounters, 7 (45)
Religious antagonism, 3 (17)
Taunting-Threats, 3 (17)
Exclusion, 13 (54) Nine of the 13 were from jobs.
European experiences, 16 (75)
Miscellaneous, 8 (39)
side youth group. These totals were comparable to those found in Table 15. It is less likely that these totals can be attributed to the same type of identifiability as that of the Academy students. It is possible that their identification is based on "associational visibility." 22 The means of identification must be obvious if we consider the statements of respondents who experience anti-Jewish remarks in the presence of individuals who do not realize that they themselves are Jewish. The north side youth group ranked third in both tables with the vicarious total standing at 19.6 per cent. In view of the fact that religious identifiability suggests itself as occasion for "victimisation" of Academy students one could expect this to be reflected in the totals reported by the Hebrew high school group. However, this was not the case. They rank fourth in vicarious experience reports (16.9 per cent) but fifth behind the west side youth group in personal accounts. The west side group's vicarious total was 12.8 per cent. These vicarious descriptions are very similar to those found in the personal accounts of discrimination with the exception of European and World War II experiences. As might be expected they are not always as clear or vivid as the ones resulting from personal experience nor are they as numerous.

22 "Associational visibility" is defined in footnote 17, page 8.
Category 1: Namecalling (Total 25)

Although only 25 respondents cited incidents of namecalling in Question 28(e), a more specific question (31) asks the respondent: Have you ever heard from any members of your family or close friends that they have been called names because they are Jewish? Three hundred and ninety-two respondents said that they had. Of this number 50 heard it "many times"; 271 a "few times" and 71 heard of it "once." Namecalling generally appears to be the most frequently cited incident—although not necessarily in the totals of Question 28(e).

Yesterday at a basketball game a boy from another team called one of our boys "dirty Jew." So another boy didn't say a word just held up his mezuzah for all to see.

My father was called a "dirty Jew" by a man who was drunk and came into our store.

My girlfriend's best friend called her a "dirty Jew." I believe there was no reason for doing such.

My friend, his father and I were walking down the street, and called "dumb Jews" by passers-by in a car.

My father, may he rest in peace, was coming home from the synagogue a man comes up to him and started calling him names and cursing all Jews.

In a baseball game a friend of mine was called "Kike," "Father Abraham," etc.

A girl I knew was called a "four-eyed Jew" because she wore glasses.

My cousin was getting on the bus and a guy said to him hurry up you "lousy Jew." But the man regretted it.

My parents owned a building and many tenants (who were evicted) called them names for being Jews.
When my grandmother was talking to her Polish neighbor she called my grandmother's friend a "dirty Jew."

Category 2: Anti-Semitic Remarks and Actions (Total 44)

Forty-four respondents had knowledge of anti-Semitic remarks and actions from others. The following statements were not directly addressed to the individuals who heard them. At times they repeat the situations described in some of the personal accounts (Category 2, Table 15) where the respondent experiences acceptance of himself as an individual but rejection of his group.

My sister was assistant teaching in the Peoria schools. The teacher who she was working with took her aside and complained about the mannerisms of the Jews even of Jewish children, as she put it.

My mother was once in a super market and a lady told her that Hitler should have exterminated all the Jews and that she was moving out of the neighborhood because the Jews are moving in.

A man didn't know my father was Jewish and called the Jews very ugly names. He was very embarrassed when he found out my father was Jewish.

When my girlfriend was dating a non-Jewish boy, his mother made some remark about the Jews.

When we were on a vacation and wanted to rent a cottage but the people made some remark concerning Jews (they didn't know we were) so we decided against staying.

The following were negative actions in such forms as deprivation and humiliation, reported by individuals close to the respondents.

During World War II a lady once spit in my mother's face while she was downtown.
My uncle was discriminated against by a sergeant in the Army so he hit him.

At work sometimes my parents were put in hard situations because they were Jewish.

My father was involved in an accident. The cop saw his membership card to the Temple and from that point on he was sure it was his fault.

My mother for many years was not elected president of the PTA because of her religious affiliation but when the majority became Jewish she was elected.

An employee who places people in different jobs at a store in Detroit told my cousin, "If I knew you were a Jew I wouldn't have placed you in an executive position."

When my aunt was running for an office in high school some non-Jewish girls spread it around not to vote for her because she was a Jew.

My mother was cashier at a Catholic high school, one of the boys said that he hated Jews to her and that she was cheap because she was Jewish.

My mother was welcome in an office until her co-workers found out she was a Jew. They didn't talk to her after that.

My dad was in the Army and this fella asked him in front of everyone if he thought that Jews were "Kikes."

My brother has had Catholics come up to him and try to extort money from him.

My sister was running for an office at . . . high school. While walking down the halls she noticed that one of her posters was torn to pieces and the other had "Jew" written all over it.

A boy in our club was made to eat cigarettes because he was a Jew.

My cousin whose father is a trustee of . . . , was campaigning for his father and had a door slammed in his face saying "I don't want a "Kike" representing me."
Category 3: Physical Encounter (Total 38)

Most of the statements in this category indicate that some member of the respondent's family or close friend reported some form of physical encounter, usually fighting with non-Jews. There is no indication what the "response sequence" was to these instigations of fighting.

A few boys from a Catholic school began to push around one of my friends.

My uncle was beat up by a Negro.

In . . . Park, a few boys approached with clubs and asked one of my group if he was Jewish. He replied, "No, I'm ticklish." One of the alien party calmly floored him with a blow to the back of the head.

While attending an academy on the west side Negro boys threw rocks and sticks at my brothers and tried to beat them up.

My brother was attacked by a non-Jew and beaten up.

One of my best friends were beaten up or ridiculed because of being Jewish.

Two girls were taken into alleys and were beaten up.

Some Jewish boys were walking down the street and some other boys started fighting with them by saying "Hey you Jew boys!"

My friend got beat up, and got tobacco stuffed in his mouth.

A few children wearing yamelka were attacked and a teen-ager was stabbed.

At college my cousin got into a fight because of his firm religious beliefs. He was dropped from his school for a year.

My sister was slapped in the face because she was tagging for a religious group.
On a bus in Milwaukee a friend of mine was picked up by his collar, called a "dirty Jew" and thrown against the seat.

Category 4: Reports of Multiple Experiences (Total 29)

We noted in the examples from personal accounts the importance of citing multiple experiences of "victimization" in a separate category. Eleven students from the Academy and 10 students from the Hebrew high school groups accounted for 21 of the 29 responses.

My grandfather practically forced my mother to leave his house because she was Jewish. My sister and I are likewise discriminated against by my relatives.

1) When checking into a motel. 2) My sister was beaten up by two Catholic girls who distinctly made something of the fact that they were Catholic and she was Jewish.

Once my sister had a knife pulled on her. Then we got phone calls at funny times. The people would ask for my sister and hang up.

My uncle was in a German concentration camp. As a boy my father lived in a Polish-German neighborhood and was harassed quite often.

Family members persecuted in Russia. Discriminated on the west side by Negro policemen in the old 24th ward regarding littering laws.

My aunt was denied a job at a Protestant college because she was Jewish. The Nazis killed some of my distant relatives.

A) Friends of mine in Nazi Germany persecution, torture, robbery, and murder.
B) Many relatives turned down jobs.
C) Many of my friends have got into fights because of being Jewish.
When my mother lived in Poland she and her family were discriminated against especially after such holidays as Easter and Good Friday. Situations have occasionally arisen with my father and his occupation.

**Category 5: Religious Antagonism (Total 14)**

Incidents in this category arose because of the individual's involvement in the performance of religious observance.

Four of the respondents wrote:

My brother wore his skull cap to school (public). The teacher asked him to remove it because he was causing a "situation" she couldn't handle (the other kids in class were making fun of him.)

In shows one of the girls didn't want to sing Christmas carols so a girl told her to meet her outside after school.

When my brother went to the Army he was ashamed to wear his Jewish star for fear of being beaten up.

Getting permission to abstain from work on the Sabbath and holidays in the United States Army!

**Category 6: Taunting, Threats (Total 14)**

There are striking similarities between the instances of aggression in this category and those experienced personally by the respondents.

On the south side my aunt belongs to a new temple one block away from a church. Their temple was broken into—and notes were left.

Swastikas were drawn on our back porch with writing "dirty Jews."

My mother had been working at an office and was fired and threatened shortly after someone realized that she was Jewish.
Some kids from school were robbed and threatened with knives. They were also called names which I cannot even put in writing.

When my father worked at a factory some of the other workers made fun of him.

My grandfather was laughed at and called names.

Category 7: Exclusion from Public and Private Places (Total 41)

There were 12 cases of exclusion cited in the descriptions of exclusion in the personal accounts of "victimization." However, 41 examples of such deprivations are included in this category. Eleven respondents cited exclusion from jobs. The following statements are illustrative:

My mother applied for a job and was accepted. When they found out she was Jewish they said they would call, they didn't.

A friend's father drove 200 miles for an interview for a job and when the interviewer saw the man's name he said: "We don't hire Jews here; go home."

A chemist could not get a job because he was Jewish.

My mother believes she lost a job because she is Jewish. Upon calling the Anti-Defamation League to in­quire about the basis of her suspicions she found that there were previous complaints.

My brother was turned down from a job with . . . , on his application there was a red "J."

Seven students reported exclusion from hotels and restaurants. Four examples are listed below.

Not allowed to go into a certain hotel.

In a hotel there was a vacancy sign but the clerk told my father there were no vacancies.
Went to . . . to eat. When they gave their name which was a Jewish one they were not served.

Wouldn't let friends into a certain restaurant.

Seven instances of exclusion from clubs were reported. They include the following.

My parents were not allowed into a certain club. This club is anti-Semitic.

Not allowed into highly Christian clubs.

I remember my sister and friends not being allowed in a club because they were Jewish.

Not allowed into a sports club.

Three of the four students who reported knowledge of exclusion from colleges wrote:

My sister missed out on a summer class at college because the Jewish quota was filled.

My sister-in-law's sister almost didn't get into . . . University because of the Jewish quota.

My uncle had trouble entering college because of his religion.

Three respondents noted exclusion from housing.

My parents wanted to rent an apartment and could not because they were Jewish.

When I was little our family tried to buy a home in . . . . They were persuaded not to.

When my parents were buying a house, I believe the owners didn't want to sell to them because they were Jewish.

Category 8: European Experiences (Total 59)

The total of 59 responses in this category is lower than might be expected since it includes the experiences of Jews in
the second World War in Germany. This can be accounted for by the fact that 3 such examples were cited in Category 1 and that a number of respondents did not assume this was the type of experience the GTR had intended to be described. This was evidenced by the fact that during the test some students asked "Do you mean 'things' like concentration camps?" In the responses which follow it is interesting to note the intensity conveyed in very terse statements. The following are typical:

The concentration camps in Germany.

Germany!

During the war.

More detailed descriptions are cited below:

My father was sent to Auschwitz concentration camp for 2 years, and our family then (I was not yet born) was persecuted as were all Jewish families by the Nazis.

One time my father was beat up because he was a Jew in Austria.

In Poland my grandparents had to hide for fear of the soldiers pulling or ripping off the grandfather's beard and often were called names as "dirty Jew."

During Nazi Germany many relatives were either mistreated or killed because of their Jewish heritage.

An aunt, uncle and their children were killed in a crematory oven because they were Jewish.

My uncle was in a concentration camp.

A friend's whole family was wiped out by the Nazis.

Almost all of my relatives except for approximately 10 were destroyed during World War II in Germany.

In World War II. Hitler put my parents in concentration camps because they were Jewish.
When my mother lived in Russia she had to move to America because threats were made on their lives because of her religion.

Some close relatives of my father were killed at Auschwitz. They were from the Warsaw ghetto.

My parents were in concentration camps during World War II.

My father was in Europe during the Nazi regime and was persecuted many times by being sent to concentration camps and wearing a "Juden" tag.

My parents and some of the rest of my family were in Hitler's concentration camps because they were Jewish.

My parents were in a ghetto and concentration camps in Europe being transported from camp to camp. Also much of my family died this way.

Some distant relatives of mine during World War II in Germany. They were sent to concentration camps because of their religion.

Category 2: Miscellaneous (Total 21)

This category includes statements which did not give specific descriptions or were not sufficiently clear to record. The former included 4 reports of incidents in the Army. For example:

One time when my father was in the Army he had a lot of trouble because he was Jewish.

Five respondents stated simply they had knowledge of discrimination in their parent's or relative's neighborhood. Business as a general reference was cited 3 times. Two reports of a more specific nature are listed below.

My aunt was once (discriminated against) when she went to defend her children from a very mean woman who despised the word Jewish. This lady is a loyal German!
When my great uncle came here from Russia he was often attacked for being a Jew.

**Category 10: Refusal, Can't Remember.**

No Examples Cited (Total 72)

Twenty students reported that they could not remember the incidents in which members of their family or close friends were openly discriminated against in statements similar to the following:

I don't remember exactly what happened.
I couldn't describe it.
I can't remember any situation distinctly.

There were 3 refusals:

- Cannot.
- No thanks.
- No.

**Summary**

In the analysis of personal accounts of experienced discrimination we found that the possible sources of frustration were at times aggressive acts. There was also some indication of what the immediate responses were to these experiences of "victimization." These responses anticipate the reactions analyzed as actual and implied intolerance in the chapter immediately following this one. In the accounts of vicarious experience there was little evidence of what the immediate response was for the respondent, his relatives or friends. As we noted
previously these descriptions were not as numerous or detailed which may help to explain the results found in the attempt to relate vicarious experience with intolerance. We are able to conclude that personal experience combined with frequency is of prime importance in relating "victimization" to expressions of actual intolerance. Vicarious experience does not tend to influence these expressions. On the other hand vicarious experience tends to influence expressions of implied intolerance in the case where respondents report incidence of personal "victimization" a "limited number of times." It does not tend to reinforce the frequency of expressions of implied intolerance in cells where "victimization" was reported "many times" or "never."
CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS OF EXPRESSIONS OF ACTUAL
AND IMPLIED INTOLERANCE

The examples of personal and vicarious "victimization" analyzed in the preceding chapter were viewed as frustrations induced by the inability of the respondent to realize those expectations normally associated with life in a democratic society because of his Jewish identity. The logical response to such deprivation or thwarting, as suggested by the frustration-aggression hypothesis, is aggression. Each frustration acts as an instigator to a great variety of aggressive responses. Some, such as fighting, striking or swearing, are "overt" in the sense that other persons can perceive them. Others, like insults, exclusion or negative opinion, are of a more moderate nature. Still others are so minimal, "non-overt," that only the subject himself is aware of them. These terms do not refer to discrete classes of aggressive behavior but simply to points on a descriptive continuum.\(^1\)

The individual perceives what he imagines to be the "cause" of his thwarting or deprivation.

\(^1\)Dollard et al., op. cit., 33.
Since it is assumed that the strongest instigation is to acts of aggression directed against the agent perceived to be the source of the frustration, such perceptions, whether correct or not, will play an important role in determining the direction of the aggression.²

The group perceived most frequently as least tolerant toward Jews was Catholics. The direction of aggressive responses should then be indicated by the frequency with which negative opinions are expressed toward Catholics. This was in fact what occurred. We are not concerned here with the ultimate truth or falsity of the beliefs contained in these opinions. Rather it is with their implications for behavior. If the respondent believes his ideas to be true, whether they conform to reality or not, the consequences of the ideas are real indeed.³

Some of the descriptions of frustrating experiences included an indication of the immediate response to these experiences. A small number of respondents minimized or rationalized the incidents; others reported more aggressive verbal and physical responses. Clinical evidence shows that there is some indication that aggression can remain in a "non-overt" form for long periods of time without any appreciable expression.⁴ Evidence of the present study suggests that the instigation to aggression is not necessarily terminated by the immediate response of the

²Ibid., 156.
³Moberg, op. cit., 11.
⁴Dollard, op. cit., 156.
"victim" in the particular situation. It is reasonable to assume that experience of "victimization" may result in a type of frustration which is remembered over a period of time and, if repeated, can culminate in aggressive responses such as negative opinion or intolerance.

This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part deals with an analysis of expressions of actual intolerance. It is concerned with the valuations written in Question 38 attributed to the various groups checked in Questions 37(a) through (e). The second part deals with expressions of implied intolerance. The valuations of Catholics and Protestants are analyzed here in a different context.²

Actual intolerance was measured by the number of times respondents checked one or more of the groups listed below. Their comparative totals are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Boys and girls from public schools</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.3 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Boys and girls from Catholic schools</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>59.0 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Boys and girls from the Jewish Academy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.6 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Boys and girls attending Hebrew High School (part-time instruction)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Protestant boys and girls</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.2 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100.0 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over half (59 per cent) of the responses were registered for the boys and girls attending Catholic parochial schools. Boys and girls attending public schools were checked 16.3 per

²Questions 34(a) and (b) and 35.
cent of the times; 10.6 per cent of the total was assigned to boys and girls attending the Jewish parochial high school, while 10.2 per cent were assigned to Protestant boys and girls. Only 3.9 per cent of the total number of checks (283) were registered for boys and girls attending Hebrew high schools on a part-time basis. In view of the disproportionate number of checks assigned to Catholics the valuations ascribed to them in Question 38 will be analyzed first; statements attributed to Protestants will follow. Statements attributed to boys and girls from public high schools included frequent references to Jews in public schools, and as a result, this group, as well as students attending the Jewish Academy and those attending part-time instruction in Hebrew high schools will be analyzed in sequence.

Question 38 sought to discover the respondent's reason for not liking the particular group or groups he had checked. The reasons offered by the respondent are viewed here as valuations of the particular group under consideration. The concept of valuation is used to signify the meaning one person or group has for another. "Insofar as these valuations have been given verbal manifestations, they may be taken as expressions of attitudes." During the codification of these responses we noticed that the statements contained elements of prejudgment, varying

---

6 Question 38. If you have checked a group or groups above, what is your reason for not liking the group or groups as much as others?

7 Sister Jeanine Gruesser, op. cit., 90.
degrees of qualification and intensity (by use of adjectives), as well as the characteristics of stereotypy described by Robin Williams. A stereotype, he maintains,

...attributes a cluster of traits to individuals as representative of a group; it is thus in one aspect a cluster of cognitive judgments, implying a set of behavioral expectations. In another aspect it involves a set of evaluations. That is, the prejudice is not simply a set of expectations; it is also a set of evaluations of good and bad, superior and inferior. Thus a prejudiced individual brings to the immediate situation certain beliefs as to the traits of others coupled with a positive or negative predisposition toward these traits.8

The statements which follow illustrate the expected behavior patterns as well as the negative predispositions toward these patterns. They are arranged in such a manner that those who qualified their remarks with adjectives like "some," "not all," "usually," "in my experience" and those who did not qualify them demonstrate a range of intensity.

Expressions of Actual Intolerance

Traits most frequently ascribed to Catholic parochial school boys and girls by Jewish high school students are listed in the form of stereotypes in Table 17. The group which expressed negative valuations most frequently were students from the south side youth group (40.1 per cent) compared to 18.5 per cent of the students from the north side youth group. Students from the Hebrew high school group accounted for more of the statements (16.8 per cent) than did those from the Academy

8Williams, op. cit., 36.
group (15 per cent).

### TABLE 17

STEREOTYPY IN TRAITS MOST FREQUENTLY APPLIED TO BOYS AND GIRLS ATTENDING CATHOLIC PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS BY 167 JEWISH HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype</th>
<th>Academy</th>
<th>Hebrew HS Group</th>
<th>Youth Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Anti-Semitic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14 3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Religious indoctrination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Air of superiority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inferior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 .. ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Negative patterns of behavior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13 1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Religious and cultural difference</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal dislike</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. No contact-Exclusive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 2 ..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Miscellaneous-No reason cited</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 .. 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number: 25 28 67 16 31
Percent: 15.0 16.8 40.1 9.6 18.5

We should point out here that the frequencies reported in these totals (in Table 17) do not correspond to the frequencies of "victimization" reported by these groups in Tables 15 and 16. For example, students from the Academy reported incidents of "victimization" most frequently. An analysis of these traits based on the breakdown of frequency of personally experienced discrimination shows 112 statements made by those who experienced "victimization" a "limited number of times." Twenty-eight
statements were accounted for by those who "never" experienced "victimization" while those who experienced it "many times" accounted for 27. These strikingly similar totals in the latter categories are best understood in relation to the frequency their numbers did not check Catholics as a group. One hundred and fifty-four respondents did not check any group while 28 did in the "never" Category; 64 did not check any group contrasted with the 27 who did in the "many times" Category.

The quotations cited below do not include all of the statements made. A selection was made which would allow the range of qualification and intensity to be demonstrated by means of the adjectives used by the respondents. The letters (M), (L), and (N) which follow every quotation indicate the number of times the respondent reported personal experience of discrimination, i.e., "many times," "limited number of times," or "never."

Stereotypy in the Valuations of Boys and Girls from Catholic Schools

Anti-Semitism was the trait most frequently ascribed to Catholics. The responses were frequently repetitive and uniform. As the remarks increase in intensity in the absence of qualification, patterns of negative behavioral expectations are included. Thirty-two respondents reported in definite terms that Catholics were in some way prejudiced against Jews. Four other statements citing lack of respect for Jews were also included with these valuations yielding a total of 36. Students from the
south side youth group made these ascriptions most frequently.

It depends on the person—but kids from Catholic schools seem to me to most frequently be the most hostile to Jews. (L)

Certain minority hate Jews. (L)

Many girls and boys I know from the Catholic schools are extremely anti-Semitic. Of course they all aren't. (L)

They are seemingly prejudiced toward Jews. (M)

The Catholics seem to dislike the Jewish people. (N)

Children from Catholic schools do not like Jews. (L)

Because they tend to become the bitter enemies of Jews. (L)

Because they're the ones who hate Jews. (L)

They can't stand Jews and are openly against them. (L)

They have prejudices against Jews as a rule and often carry it out in words or actions. (L)

Because they are prejudiced against the Jews. Many of my Jewish friends have come in contact with them. They spit on the Jews. They are taught only to love themselves and their religion. They despise Jews. (L)

The following remarks are illustrative of those who report a "lack of respect" on the part of Catholic parochial school students.

Because most of them that I have seen are bums. They have no respect for me and I have none for them. (L)

I do not like the children from a Catholic school because they do not respect us, but cause trouble for us many times. (M)

I feel that they have no discipline whatsoever. After all they come from a religious school and should be taught to respect. I feel they do not. (L)

Religious indoctrination was designated as a distinct
stereotype because those who stated that Catholics were in some degree anti-Semitic included statements which explicitly stated that it was taught. One student mentioned the "Christ-killer" accusation on the part of Catholics. Other expressions noted religious bias not only on the part of Catholic parochial school students but students attending the Jewish parochial high school full-time as well as those attending Hebrew high schools on a part-time basis.

Many Catholic schools teach boys and girls to dislike Jews. Some of the boys and girls tend to speak openly about disliking Jews. But even though I feel that, many Catholics do not share this belief and make fine citizens. (L)

I think they are taught to dislike Jews. (L)

They are more prejudiced than most people because they are taught to be. (L)

They seem to be trained in anti-Jewish views. (M)

In a number of Catholic schools, students are taught that Jews killed Christ and moreover that they should and will be punished. (M)

I feel that they are taught to discriminate against my race more than others of their religion attending public schools. (N)

They are not exposed to other religions and therefore become intolerant. Also, the discipline exacted by the nuns and priests is too harsh and hardens the students. (L)

They do not seem as tolerant toward others, being immersed as they are in dogma and church doctrine. (N)

9 Other statements of this nature are found in the analysis of Question 34(a) in this Chapter.
The following statements are not limited to Catholic parochial school students. They refer to those who attend Jewish religious instruction at the parochial high school or the Hebrew high school extension classes.

I do not feel one should go to a school that is only of his religion. (L)

They are nice, but taught the wrong things. They feel suspicious. This is true of most parochial schools regardless of religion. (L)

Because I think that children that go to religious schools no matter what religion are one-sided, and they never learn the truth about other peoples religion. (L)

They tend to believe that all Jews are Communists and any parochial school does not allow students to see the various sides of an issue. Possibly this can also include Hebrew High Schools. (N)

Another characteristic applied to Catholics (a total of 23 times) was that of assumed self-superiority. Expressions of it were found in such phrases as "they think they are perfect," "better than others" or "snobbish." Over half (13) of the remarks in this total (23) are registered by students from the south side youth group.

They usually think they are better than Jews. (L)

Because when they are among other kids their own age, they become rough and think they're "the greatest on earth." (N)

Boys and girls from Catholic schools seem to think they are better than other people going to public schools. (N)

They act snobbish and real big (smoke and drink) most of them. (L)
Usually all affiliations with them haven't been too nice cause they didn't think I was good enough for them because I am a Jew. (L)

Some (not all) boys and girls from Catholic schools because of their high-class superiority attitude. They think they're perfect, etc., etc. (L)

They have an attitude that they are the only people that count. They think that they are the best. (L)

Many of them walk around as if they were there to be honored. (N)

Seven of the 9 comments in the fourth stereotype, inferior, were also made by students from the south side youth group. Two were made by students from the Academy. Inferiority of intelligence, class, morals was attributed to Catholics.

They are low and inferior. (N)

They lack refinement and most often use offensive and obscene language. (L)

Often the Catholic schools have quite a few rough kids attending. They seem very low classed. Many seem rather dumb and vulgar.

They are extremely prejudiced and conceited and their lower morals and drinking habits disgust me sometimes. (L)

Stereotype 5 includes descriptions of negative verbal and physical behavioral patterns on the part of the group in question. Namecalling was assigned to this designation because the namecalling incidents usually included other overt behavioral patterns. There were 10 reports of namecalling incidents.

I find from previous experience that the people I have been called names by are the ones who go to Catholic school. I want to explain that I am not against the Catholic religion in general, just some of the people in the religion. (L)
Because these boys and girls seem to discriminate against (sic) Jews and call dirty names more than any other group. (L)

They call you names and destroy public property. (L)

This group is my constant enemy, name caller and pounder. (to beat up). (L)

They seem to taunt you and call you names—not individually but as a group. They seem to think they're better than we are. (L)

Such behavioral descriptions as pugnacity, troublemaker, hoodlum, ruffian were ascribed to Catholics by 21 of the respondents in this stereotype. Nine statements illustrate the range of these comments.

This is a biased statement. But there are cases where kids from the parochial school in our neighborhood have caused trouble. This has given me and others a bad impression of Catholic schools. I do not in practice hold the fact that a person goes to a Catholic school against him. (L)

My dislike does not stem from their religious affiliation, rather, they are wild and often get into trouble. They are generally disliked even by fellow Catholics attending public school. (L)

Usually they are rough, mean, and have a special dislike for Jews. (L)

Because the people who go to the private Catholic school near my house are mostly delinquents. (boys especially) (L)

They seem to be rough hoodlums without any manners whatsoever. (L)

Because they go around looking for us. (L)

Because I know of a girl who was beat up by a boy attending a parochial school. (N)
Because these kids are terribly against Jewish kids and men and women. And I have seen them beat up many a kid because he was Jewish. (M)

Because I always had fights with them on my way to grammar school. (M)

Five of the 10 statements in the sixth stereotype, religious and cultural differences, stated simply that they had nothing in common with Catholics. The following are typical of one of the most elementary forms of prejudice, "dislike for the unlike."

Because I feel I don't have anything in common with this group. Also I really don't have much chance to learn to like them. (N)

Because they have different ways of doing things and different standards of living. (N)

I do not particularly like them because they seem to be completely different than I and most of my friends. (N)

They do not understand the position of Jews. (M)

Can't talk freely about holidays or other customs because they think we're crazy. (N)

Three students from the Jewish parochial school described their reason for not liking this group as follows:

I think that Catholic boys and girls are very religious as we are and since we have different ideas on religion we would not mix well. (M)

I feel that our beliefs differ too greatly for us to be very friendly. (L)

They seem to think that we are queer and don't know why we pray to G-d and do things according to our religion. (M)

There were 9 admissions of personal dislike for Catholics, in Stereotype 7. Some were the result of unpleasant
personal experiences.

I don't like Catholics. (L)

Some of the people I know in the Catholic schools were very nasty to me. Some of them are bad hypocrites. (N)

They bother me in the public park near my home, because of my religion. (L)

It's not all of them, just a few. I'm very friendly with a girl who went to a Catholic parochial school. Some of them just get on my nerves. (L)

Because they do not like me. (M)

Because they are mean to me. (L)

Because I don't like them. (M)

The 10 respondents who wrote statements in Stereotype 8 indicated a lack of opportunity for contact with Catholics as well as the complaint that Catholics tend to exclude others, particularly Jews.

Either because I rarely see them, or because I never come in contact or share any of my common interest. (L)

I have not associated with them frequently, so I wouldn't know if I would like them or not. (N)

The Catholic students are never very friendly with the Jews and they never meet the Jews because all of them attend their own schools and therefore they have all Catholic friends. (N)

Stick close to each other. (M)

They are clannish and seem to dislike other religions. (L)

They don't seem to care for Jewish people or anyone who isn't Catholic. (L)

Some of the Catholics I have seen wouldn't ever think of associating with anyone except Catholics. (L)
Thirteen respondents did not cite a reason in Question 38. Two other statements relegated to "miscellaneous" wrote "fruits and luffies"; another indicated that the group checked was "not Jewish."

**Stereotypy in Valuations of Protestant Boys and Girls**

In contrast to the 167 statements assigned to boys and girls attending Catholic parochial schools, only 29 were assigned to Protestant boys and girls. Five of these checked both Catholic parochial students and Protestant boys and girls and gave the same reason for not particularly liking them. These first 5 statements are valuations ascribed to both groups in Question 38.

- They don't like us. (L)
- They are all prejudiced. (L)
- Because most of them that I have seen are bums. They have no respect for me and I have none for them. (L)
- I don't like Catholics or Protestants because they hate Jews. (M)
- There is a certain minority among Catholics and Protestants who hate Jews. I must say that I feel resentment and hatred to this minority. (L)

Three additional respondents in Stereotype 1, Anti-Semitic, described Protestants as prejudiced. There were a total of 9 statements of this nature which referred to Protestants in contrast to the 36 for Catholics.

- They are less tolerant. (M)
Might be prejudiced against Jews. (N)

Because they hate "kikes." They can't stand Jews so the feeling is mutual. (M)

There were no statements which could be assigned to the Stereotype 2, Religious indoctrination, for Protestant boys and girls compared to the 23 assigned for Catholics.

Three respondents reported having experiences of fighting and namecalling in Stereotype 3, Negative patterns of behavior. The contrasting number of reports of this type of experience with Catholics is 31.

Because they have called us names. (L)

Because if you walk by a bunch of them, they either call you names, or start trouble. This has happened to me. (L)

Because they always have reason to start a fight if you are Jewish. (L)

Dislike for Protestant boys and girls because of religious and moral differences were cited by two respondents in Stereotype 4.

I feel that they are just different from Jews or other religions. (L)

Boys and girls in public schools and Protestant boys and girls do not always act like good children should. (M)

Five respondents reported simply that they did not like Protestant boys and girls. (The comparable total for Catholics was 9). The following remarks are typical:

Because they do not like me. (L) (Catholics and Protestants.)

Because I don't like them. (L) (Catholics and Protestants.)
I do not particularly like Protestants. (M)

Other evaluations of Protestant boys and girls included 1 student who reported they had an air of superiority (this trait was assigned to Catholics 25 times); 2 students cited lack of contact (as opposed to 9 for Catholics); and 2 additional respondents reported "non-Jewish" as reason for not liking this particular group.

Earlier in Chapter II we noted the significantly lower ratings of Jews on the Remmers' Scale by the north side youth group from the other respondent groups and later in Chapter IV the possible relationship between personally experienced "victimization" and the relatively lower rating of Jews on the Remmers' Scale by the total sample population. These findings were interpreted in the light of Lewin's analysis of similar phenomena as Jewish "self-hatred." He maintains that the Jew takes on the same attitude toward himself that he thinks the anti-Semite has. These reflections concur with Dollard's findings in the frustration-aggression context we have been using.

If the amount of inhibition of various acts of aggression is held relatively constant, the tendency to self-aggression is stronger both when the individual believes himself, rather than an external agent, to be responsible for the original frustration and when direct aggression is restrained by the self rather than by an external agent. 10

These reflections, written over twenty years ago, have been extended in the studies on the authoritarian personality. Joseph

10Dollard et al., op. cit., 53.
Adelson, for one, has examined the ideology and identification processes of members of the Jewish minority. He notes an authoritarian "mode" of defining others which includes intolerance of ambiguity and a propensity for sharp and dichotomous distinctions. The terms of dichotomy differ from person to person. The individual employing it tends to emphasize particular traits as characterizing a Jewish in-group and a Jewish out-group. 11

The dynamism of this "mode" of definition can be seen in the responses of the different Jewish student groups in their responses to question 37(a), (d), and (e). The students at the Academy see Jewish public high school students as "irreligious," "having no morals," "extremely spoiled" and "going against their own people"; public high school students in general are seen as lacking in "refinement," "discipline," and "moral standards"; "delinquent" and "rowdy." In contrast, respondents attending public high schools full-time see those who attend the Jewish parochial school (full-time) as "too religious," "stuffy and too serious," "religious fools," "fanatics," "holier than thou." Perhaps this statement typifies the authoritarian-self-hatred definition most strikingly:

On the whole they are fruits and finks that most non-Jews consider all Jews to be.

Adelson characterizes the authoritarian as a person fearful of conspicuous behavior by Jewish individuals and as one who would

11 Adelson, op. cit., 475-476.
flatten Jewish diversity to a somewhat featureless Babbitttry.12

Stereoty py in the Valuations of Boys and Girls from Public Schools

The group checked most frequently after boys and girls attending Catholic schools were boys and girls attending public schools. Forty of the 46 respondents who checked boys and girls from public schools as a group they did not particularly like were students from the Academy. The general tone of the remarks, as well as the specific references, suggest that the respondents have other Jews in mind. There is no instance of anyone describing boys and girls from this group as anti-Semitic. The emphasis is rather on differences in religious, moral and social values.

Four distinct categorical valuations were discernible in these responses. The first, religious and moral differences, included 14 statements, most of them listed below.

Many of their viewpoints toward religion are different than mine. (L)

Because when Jewish boys and girls attend public school they tend to forget about their own religion and will sometimes go against their own people. (N)

Because when I attended a public summer school I found that most of them do not really care about religion (especially the Jewish ones) and are usually only looking for a good time. (L)

---

12 Ibid., 478.
I do not feel that public school children have as much faith as private school children since they are not taught religion daily. I enjoy being with children who understand the aspects of religion. (L)

They are constantly being swayed from one religion to another. In this they are losing their real own religion. (L)

Many Jewish boys and girls from public school are extremely spoiled and irreligious and self-centered (N) (Written by a public school student.)

Moral differences were expressed as follows:

Boys and girls in public schools and Protestants do not always act like good children should. (M)

A few of them don't have high moral standards. (N)

Some of the people in public schools act very loud and don't seem to have respect for anything. Some of them carry on as if they had no morals. (L)

Lack of discipline, religious or moral basis in life and no purpose to their actions or behaviors. (L)

Many of the kids in public schools don't care much about their religion or they wouldn't be there. They only think of superficial things and their moral standards are quite low. (L)

One Academy student who did not check a specific group wrote:

I have a latent dislike for irreligious Jewish people. Therefore, I don't like Reform or Conservative Jews as a group. However, I could like and do like an individual Reform or Conservative group. (L)

Seven of the respondents noted differences in social behavior in the second group of categorical statements. Four of these were directed toward girls in the public school and were written by girls from the private school.

Most of the girls I met in summer school were not very girl minded. Make-up and tints mattered more. Their conduct especially with boys is amazing. (L)
All they seem to be is boy-crazy. (L)

It isn't so much the boys as the girls. The girls are so fake, and made up. This though has nothing to do with religion and nationality. (L)

More general estimates read as follows:

They are very false kids, they never act normal. They try hard to be sophisticated. (L)

I do not agree with their ideals. (N)

As a general rule, it seems as though students from public schools resent those who seem to take a deeper interest in studies as Jews often do. (L)

An air of superiority was ascribed to public school students by 12 respondents who found them "showy," "snobbish," and swellheaded." The following comments are typical:

Just some of them because I have gone to public school and have seen quite a few of these kids act snobbish and bummy and high and mighty and I hate that. (N)

Some public school kids seem very showy and swellheaded. (L)

They tend to be snobbish toward those that are different. (L)

They walk around with their noses in the air and do very foolish things. (L)

Because they are all snobs and I know some of them and I hate each one. The boys are fresh and I don't trust them. (N)

Overt behavior patterns of public high school students were viewed negatively in the fourth group of categorical valuations by 9 respondents. Here are 5 examples:

They seem very rowdy sometimes. (N)

They lack refinement and most often use offensive and obscene language. (L)
I believe they are too wild for their ages. (L)

I dislike boys and girls from public schools because they are too dirty and act like hoodlums. (M)

Because I feel they are spoiled, selfish and unfriendly to me they appear to be like delinquents. (L)

Four appraisals of public high school students were made by respondents who were themselves public school students. Two maintained that they were "too young"; the other two wrote:

I'm a loner and they bug me. (M)

I don't at all like them. (L)

Stereotyped in the Valuations of Boys and Girls from the Academy

Thirty students reported that they did not like boys and girls attending the Jewish parochial high school. Four distinct categories of statements were derived from the responses to Question 37(c).

The first group of categorical valuations, religious indoctrination and bias, included the 3 statements cited earlier which referred to both Catholic and Jewish students attending religious schools. One additional statement may be included:

All parochial schools including the Academy are not open-minded on many subjects.

Difference in religious emphasis was noted by 8 of the respondents. The first 4 statements were written by students who attend Hebrew high schools on a part-time basis.

Their religious and political beliefs often differ from mine and they are often not tolerant of other groups. (L)
I don't particularly dislike them, but their interests are not the same as mine, for they tend to be too religious, and while this is fine I have found many of them have no other interests. (N)

In their presence I feel (and am) inferior to them—this idea is purely self-put for I know how irreligious I am compared to traditional Orthodox (my father being Orthodox). (N)

Because they are religious fools. (L)

The following were written by students who were not attending any form of religious instruction at the time the investigation was made.

They seem very stuffy and too serious. They do not seem to enjoy anything that is not connected with religion. (L)

They seem to be too deeply involved with their religion. (N)

At times they strike me as being fanatics or if you are not as religious as they are they think you're a horrible person. (N)

Unfavorable personal qualities were attributed to the students attending the Academy by 4 respondents.

Are weaklings. (M)

On the whole they are fruits and finks that most non-Jews consider all Jews to be. (M)

Fruits, luffies. (L)

Many of them are thrown in there without really wanting to be, and so don't have the guts to say so. (L)

Eight students commented that the students from the Jewish parochial school exhibited an air of superiority.

They seem to think they are better in some respects than the average Jews. (L)
They act as if they are better than anyone else. (N)

They keep their noses high and are very stuck up. They will agree and always believe they are right. And they will not fight if pushed. (L)

Holier than thou attitude. (L)

They feel as if they are superior to other Jewish boys and girls not attending . . . . They feel they are learning more and are very snobbish. (L)

Other evaluations of these students included comments that these students stick too close to each other, that they are unfriendly, have different ways of doing things. One Academy student described his peers in the following manner:

Students are sloppily dressed, seem like they've had no upbringing and act like babies. (L)

Stereotypy in the Valuations of Boys and Girls Attending Hebrew High Schools (Part-time)

Of the 10 valuations which were ascribed to boys and girls attending Hebrew high schools on a part-time basis 6 were cited previously (in Stereotype 2 for Catholic parochial school students as well as Jewish Academy students) with reference to students who attend schools of religious instruction. Four comments applied to this group alone. Difference in religious emphasis was noted by two students from the Academy.

This doesn't mean all of these boys and girls, but I find that religious kids look down at you, when you're not as religious as they are. (L)

Because they usually go to Hebrew schools only because their parents make them go. They have no respect for the religion or other people and take everything they have for granted. (L)
Two public school students commented:

Because they should have better ways to spend time. (L)

Are weaklings and assholes. (M)

**Observations of Respondents Who Did Not Check a Group in Question 37**

Since Question 37 was a voluntary rather than forced-choice question not all students checked a particular group. Twenty-two who did not check any group nonetheless volunteered statements. These could be grouped into three categories: Category 1, 7 stated they had no reason to dislike any of the groups listed; Category 2, 6 mentioned that it was the person himself not his group that they would judge; and Category 3, the largest group (9), felt that they could not judge others on the basis of religion. Ten of this total (22) were students from the parochial high school. The following examples are illustrative of Category 1.

Nothing against any of them. (M)

Like them all. (L)

**Category 2**

I like people in every one of the above groups in 37 but some in each group I don't like. (L)

I have not checked any because I don't think it's where the person comes from but the person himself. (N)

No checking but I find many individuals in all groups whom I do not like because of their prejudices. (M)

Two students from the Hebrew High school group in this category registered a protest at this point of the test:
This test is ridiculous. People cannot be grouped into classes. This test assumes that people judge groups and not people which is unfair and invalid. (L)

This test is not valid because it is impossible to make such generalizations. The test immediately assumes that we do not think of people on the basis of individuals. (N)

Category 2

I have checked no particular group. The religion does not matter to me but the persons themselves. (L)

I have nothing against any religion, matter of fact I am friends with kids of other religions. (L)

I cannot say that I don't like any of the above since my close contacts are only in my school, ..., and I don't know many others, I am sorry to say. (L)

I have not checked any group because I have no reason to dislike a person because of what school he goes to or because of their religion. (N)

One should not question the right of anyone to believe firmly in their faith as they should expect not to be questioned. In my opinion racial hatred is the downfall of the world. (L)

I feel anyone has the right to choose their own religion. If they soundly believe in G-d and their religion—they are a credit to the United States. (L)

Expressions of Implied Intolerance

Implied intolerance\textsuperscript{13} toward Catholics and Protestants was measured by the frequency with which respondents rated them on a comparative basis.\textsuperscript{14} The respondents were asked why they

\textsuperscript{13}\textsuperscript{Implied intolerance as defined previously is the expressed anticipation of "victimization" reflecting (or so operating as to predispose the respondent to make) an unfavorable categorical judgment of an out-group.}

\textsuperscript{14}\textsuperscript{Question 34. Place a check in the column which best
thought Catholics and Protestants were "less tolerant than others toward Jews." 15 Their responses provided an opportunity to test an opinion directed toward a group perceived as an "aggressor." Tables 5 and 6 in Chapter III report responses to Question 34(a) and (b) according to the frequency of personally experienced discrimination. We gain a different perspective on these responses by eliminating the "neutral" rating "about the same as others," and analyzing the patterns of response of those who have definite positive (rating a group as "more tolerant") or negative (rating a group as "less tolerant") opinions. Catholics were rated "more tolerant than others toward Jews" by 113 students while 144 rated Protestants this way. Catholics were rated "less tolerant than others toward Jews" by 180 respondents while 68 rated Protestants in the same manner. A breakdown of these totals shows Catholics rated positively 15 (30.6 per cent) times and negatively 34 (69.4 per cent) times by those who experienced "victimization" "many times." Those who experienced "victimization" a "limited number of times" rated them positively 78 (38.1 per cent) times and negatively 127 (61.9 per cent) times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More Tolerant than others toward Jews</th>
<th>Less Tolerant than others toward Jews</th>
<th>About the same as others toward others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Most Catholics</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Most Protestants</td>
<td>1)</td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1535. With regard to the groups you have checked as less tolerant toward Jews, why do you think they are less tolerant?
By contrast, those who reported "never" having experienced discrimination rated Catholics positively 20 (51.3 per cent) times and negatively 19 (48.7 per cent) times. Those who experienced "victimization," then, registered over 60 per cent negative ratings for Catholics. The percentage registered by these same groups for Protestants is very nearly reversed with 60 per cent favoring a positive rating. To speak of the latter in more detail, we find that 20 (60.6 per cent) respondents rated Protestants "more tolerant than others toward Jews" while 13 (39.4 per cent) rated them "less tolerant than others toward Jews" in the "many times" Category. Those who experienced "victimization" a "limited number of times" rated them positively 99 (68.7 per cent) times while 45 (31.3 per cent) rated them negatively. Respondents in the "never" Category rated Protestants positively 25 (71.4 per cent) times and negatively 10 (28.6 per cent) times.

In the cases of actual intolerance analyzed earlier and implied intolerance now under consideration Catholics are most frequently perceived to be the source of frustration by the respondents.

Analysis of the responses to Question 35 indicated some difficulty in understanding the term "tolerant" in Questions 34 (a) and (b). This was evident from the 16 reversals which occurred in the question which followed. Five students who checked Catholics as "more tolerant," then wrote comments which indicated that they regarded them as less tolerant:

Not many Protestants have called me names or openly discriminated against me.
I really can't answer, I just feel that they are liable to dislike the Jew than others.

They lack respect for others beliefs.

Because they pick on Jews just for fun.

Some of my friends are more friendly and nicer than some of the Catholic friends I have.

Six others made reversals but it was difficult to decide which group the commentary was attributed to. These questionnaires were assigned to a category labeled "no reason cited, confused."

Reversals were evident also in another form. Here 5 students checked Catholics as "less tolerant" yet the comment in Question 35 demonstrated that they meant "more tolerant."

Have many friends who are Catholic and they treat me as any other person mentioning nothing of religion. (L)

Catholics have respect for their religion and for others. (L)

It seems as some Catholics are tolerant but some Protestants act very mean toward Jews. (L)

Because they understand better the true meaning of brotherhood. (L)

Both Catholics and Protestants were checked in this reversal.

Because they are God fearing people and are preached upon to love their neighbor. (M)

These were assigned to the "more tolerant" ratings. Included with the favorable ratings toward Catholics which were designated as reversals, 5 additional Academy students checked Catholics as "more tolerant than others toward Jews" and volunteered the following statements:
I think Catholics are more tolerant because they have been persecuted themselves. (L)

Because the Catholics are also a type of minority group. (L)

None were any less tolerant because both have friends of Jews. (L)

A Catholic has to be religious and respects someone who is also very religious. (L)

The Catholics respect us for our religion while many Protestants look down on us. (L)

There were three reversals among the respondents who checked Protestants as less tolerant. The comments in Question 35 suggested that they meant more tolerant. These were relegated to the category "more tolerant than others toward Jews."

Because they are not taught or raised to hate Jews. (N)

They too are also a minority and in many instances have been oppressed as Jews were. (L)

Four students did not check any group in Question 34. Nevertheless, they offered the following comments:

I think an individual not a group is intolerant. It is wrong to generalize and put all persons of a religion into one category. (L)

I think it is on a purely personal basis. (L)

Depends entirely on person and upbringing. (N)

I feel I cannot judge them because I really have never associated with anyone besides Jews. (L)

One Jewish parochial school student added:

I feel that non-observant Jews are less tolerant to their observant fellow-Jews than any other religious group. (L)

Themes contained in the responses to Question 38(a) are
shown in Table 13. Here the respondent was asked to indicate why he thought Catholics were "less tolerant than others toward Jews." Students from the south side youth group accounted for 74 (38.1 per cent) of the statements. The number of statements written by Academy students was 44 (22.7 per cent) followed by 32 (16.5 per cent) from the north side youth group. The Hebrew high school group registered a total of 30 (15.5 per cent) statements while students from the west side youth group recorded 14 (7.2 per cent).

**TABLE 18**

**THEMES PRESENT IN THE RESPONSES OF 194 SUBJECTS TO QUESTION 38(a)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why do you think Catholics are less tolerant than others?</th>
<th>Academy</th>
<th>Hebrew HS Group</th>
<th>Youth Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Don't know--they just are</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Religious differences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Religious indoctrination</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Negative overt behavior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Air of superiority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Jealous of Jews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Historical reasons</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No reason cited</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 1: Don't Know—They Just Are (Total 32)

That this question (38) presented a challenge to the respondent is evident from the type of responses which occurred. Eleven students simply stated "don't know" with varying degrees of conviction. Five typical statements are listed below:

I'm not sure. (N)
Don't know. (L)
I have no idea. (N)
I don't know. It just seems that way. (L)
I don't really know this answer. (L)

Nineteen respondents replied in a manner of not knowing why except to add "they just are."

I don't really know why. But in the society I live in today that's the way they are. (L)

I have no idea why they are less tolerant. It could be they feel Jews have invaded their privacy in what was a Christian world. (L)

I don't know why, since it is unreasonable, but it seems that Catholics are more frequent incitement toward discrimination against Jews. (L)

They are in a sense prejudiced against us. (L)
They just are. I can't really say why. (M)
They do not like Jews. (L)
They just hate Jews. (L)
They are prejudiced against us for no apparent reason. (M)
No special reason. (N)

Theme 2: Religious Differences (Total 26)

Religious differences are expressed in terms of the
nature of religious belief, lack of understanding, intensity of commitment on the part of Catholics, and their assumption of the superiority and exclusiveness of Catholicism.

Because the Jews believe in a different form of religion. (N)

I have always felt that Catholics in some instances are very much against Jews because our religion is so much different than theirs. (L)

The Catholic beliefs are just about the opposite of ours. (L)

Catholic and Jewish ideas of religion have been opposing since the makeup of the Catholic religion. (L)

The religious beliefs are so completely opposite, that it is difficult for compromise. (M)

I think they don't understand our customs and feel we are not making sense in our religion. (L)

They don't understand our religion. (N)

I think they are less tolerant because they don't understand our religion and refuse to try. (L)

They don't understand our religion. (N)

I think they are less tolerant because they don't understand our religion and refuse to try. (L)

They have no idea of Judaism make fun of it. (L)

The references to commitment on the part of Catholics read as follows:

They are very religious themselves. (L)

Because of their strong religious beliefs. (L)

Because their religion is very strong and they believe in it. (L)

Because they are so engrossed in their own religion, they don't like ours. (L)
Many times Jewish people are not able to make friends with Catholics because of their faith. (L)

Because of a more strict belief in things which are against those of my faith. (M)

In their religious zeal for their own beliefs they refuse to accept the beliefs of others and are prejudiced against them. Also their prayers harbor hatred to "non-believers." (L)

Because Catholicism is a more Orthodox form of Christianity and therefore they are further apart from the Jewish beliefs. (N)

Eight of the respondents commented on the air of superiority on the part of Catholics with regard to religious belief.

They often believe that their religion is the only true one. That other religions are wrong. They often are surprised when I tell them that their religion and ours are different ways of reaching the same goal. (L)

They only think that their way of religion is correct and will not even hear of ours. (N)

They believe Catholicism is the only religion. (L)

They think their religion is the only one whereas Protestants at least recognize the Jewish religion. (L)

Because they think theirs is the only religion and don't respect others. (L)

Because they seem to feel that their religion is supreme and that all other religions are inferior. (L)

They feel their religion is superior. (N)

Theme 3: Religious Indoctrination (Total 49)

This theme includes three subdivisions. The first 2 comments listed below are illustrative of a more general opinion that Catholics are taught anti-Semitism. Those which follow become more specific and explicit in designating the sources of
indoctrination such as the home, school, and church. The final statements refer to dogma.

They are brought up to be that way. (L)

Because I know for a fact that more Catholics than Protestants are taught to hate Jews. (L)

They may have been brought up to have specific discrimination taught to them by their parents. (L)

Probably their education at home. (L)

They are brought up that way, because religion is taught more. Their parents breed these ideas of prejudice. (N)

Because of parents. (L)

Four statements referred to the home, 9 to the schools. The following are impressions they have expressed:

They usually have strong prejudices from their parents, friends and schools (parochial). (L)

I feel that they are brought up that way in the home and are taught that way in the Catholic schools as a matter of fact, I know it! (M)

I think they are less tolerant because, from my knowledge, they are taught to hate Jews in their religion classes. (L)

Anti-Semitism is taught in their religious schools. (L)

This is often included as part of their religious education. (M)

At a certain Catholic school in my neighborhood, the nuns taught the kids Jews were bad to associate with. (N)

Fourteen of the responses referred to the teachings of the Catholic Church in general, 16 referred to some aspect of the Crucifixion and Christ.
Maybe it has nothing to do with their religious background or maybe their religion teaches that only Catholics are good people. (L)

The Church tells them to be. (M)

Because of their strict upbringing and the intolerance preached by their parents and ministers. (L)

Because the Church teaches them to hate Jews (indirectly). (M)

I have talked with them and I now know that in the Church they are taught to hate Jews. (L)

Because the Church has more control over their people. (L)

Their rituals and ordeals are usually very strict and they are sometimes not tolerant with people who don't agree with them and aren't as strict. (L)

Because of certain unfavorable references to Jews in the Catholic rite. (N)

They are taught certain religious ideas that directly ridicule Judaism. (M)

Because they are taught that they are so much better, they are even forbidden to visit other churches or temples. (L)

The following comments attribute the lack of tolerance on the part of Catholics to specific aspects of the Church's teaching with regard to Christ.

I believe they (mostly because I do know some nice ones) learn that the Jews killed Jesus and they therefore have that against us but now I think it is lessening because of the new Pope. (L)16

A number of Catholic priests still teach their followers that the Jews killed Christ. (M)

Some seem to think the Jews killed their Saviour. (L)

16 This is a reference to Pope John XXIII.
Catholics feel we made a mistake in not believing in Jesus, feeling we are ignorant. (M)

They are taught that Jews killed their God. (M)

Half of them just don't like us. They say we killed Christ, but I had no part in it. (L)

Because there seems to be a far greater barrier or distance between Catholics and Jews. They are very devout and feel (some do) that the Jews killed Jesus. (L)

Because they feel we, Jews, killed Jesus Christ. (L)

From my information most went to parochial school or Catechism and were taught to "hate" (?) Jews for they were said to kill Jesus. (L)

Many of the Catholics go to Catholic day schools where they are taught that the Jews killed Jesus and are responsible for evil things. (L)

Because in some of their most important Church services there exist "hate Jew sermons" as the killers of God! (M)

The adverse aspect of the role of religion in group relations is pointed out by Sister Jeanine Gruesser in her study of attitudes of Catholic parochial students toward Jews. She wrote:

Thus, while their religious teaching provides them with a most impelling reason for recognizing all peoples as their brothers, many of these Catholic children have permitted their religion to act as a dividing force between themselves and Jews. 17

However, some of the statements attributed to Jews by Catholic students indicate a mutual lack of respect for each others' religion. The following statements were selected at random.

The Jews mock our religion.

Jews are always criticizing Catholics. They say we are stupid to believe in the woman called the Blessed Mother.

Do not respect our religion.

Jewish sarcasm for religion.

Theme 4: Negative Overt Behavior Toward Jews (Total 31)

In an attempt to account for the reason why Catholics were thought to be "less tolerant toward Jews," 31 asserted that they could account for this "fact" in terms of the way Catholics treated Jews. Seventeen of these cite personal experiences and vicarious knowledge, 2 referred back to their responses to Question 27(e). The following statements are illustrative.

Because of people and incidences I know of. (L)

Certain actions and instances I have knowledge of. (M)

My encounters with this group have led me to believe they feel this way.

From my own personal experiences I have found this so. (L)

Because what I know of them, they don't want your company. (L)

Because of several instances in which I have been discriminated against. (M)

I have seen instances where many Catholics have erupted against Jews particularly at sporting events. (L)

I grew up in a neighborhood with a great many Catholics (Negroes, etc.) and sometimes certain remarks were made. (L)

The ones that I have been acquainted with criticized me. (L)
It seems that the Catholic children I know who went to Catholic schools are the ones who discriminate against Jews. I don't know why. (L)

They have insulted me. (L)

I've been chased by both groups. (L) (Protestants and Catholics.)

Twelve of the comments in Theme 4 were of a more general nature.

They just seem to act that way. (L)

Because of the way they act toward us. (M)

They lack respect for another's beliefs. (M)

They pick on Jews just for fun. (L)

Catholics seem to be the first to find something wrong with you and the minute they do they'll call you names. (L)

They have done some discriminating against the Jewish people. Most Catholics think the Jews are against them. (L)

Because in general they seem to shun Jews. (L)

They are always trying to convert you. (L)

**Theme 2: Air of Superiority (Total 7)**

Seven statements mentioned that Catholics were less tolerant toward Jews because they thought Jews were inferior. This was stated explicitly or implicitly by reference to the Catholic's air of superiority.

Because they think Jews are inferior. (L)

They think Jews are inferior. (M)

They feel if we don't go along thinking their ways of life that we are inferior. (L)

They think they are better. (L)
They regard Jews as a class of people lower than themselves or inferior. (N)

They feel they are a lower class and therefore can slight them. (M)

Because they are bullies and think they are better than the Jews. (M)

**Theme 6: Jealous of Jews (Total 6)**

Five statements referred to an attitude of jealousy as an explanation for the negative actions of Catholics toward Jews. Three of them are listed below.

Because they may be jealous of Jews. (L)

Because I think they are jealous of what the Jews have achieved. (L)

Because they hate us because we are better. (L)

**Theme 2: Historical Reasons (Total 2)**

Historical reasons were referred to as a means for explaining Catholic behavior by 5 respondents.

I feel that it is something that probably has been carried over from the Middle Ages--probably superstition. (L)

Throughout history this has been the case and this was often made a religious doctrine until recently. (L)

In medieval times the Church was jealous of Judaism. Some ignorant people still maintain the Church's early prejudice. (L)

Because they have the idea from long ago that Jews aren't nice. (N)

The reason goes back to the Inquisition where Jews were persecuted. (L)
Miscellaneous (Total 8)

This division includes 3 similar responses which explicitly refer to the fact that the respondents personally derived this impression. Two were told or taught it. The last 3 quoted are also unique responses.

It's just a personal feeling which I have derived throughout the years. (L)

I suppose it is my prejudice though I try not to hold them. I have only heard some children of parochial schools react this way. (L)

As a result of a certain idea which has been introduced to me in religious discussion with qualified leadership. (L)

When people are uneducated and wish to be intolerant—they will be. (L) (Catholics and Protestants.)

Because of their publications about Jews and ideas and attitudes. (L)

Jews become Scapegoats. (M) (Catholics and Protestants.)

Because they know the Jewish people better than the Protestants. (N) (Catholics and Protestants.)

No Reason Cited (Total 30)

Thirty respondents did not cite a reason in Question 38 to justify their having checked Catholics as "less tolerant than others toward Jews."

The analysis of responses to the query "why do you think Protestants are less tolerant than others toward Jews?" did not yield the same division of themes as those assigned to Catholics. For one thing, the ascriptions of "religious differences" and "jealous of Jews" did not occur as frequently. The themes
derived from these responses to Question 35(b) are illustrated in Table 19. The highest total of statements, 21 (28 per cent) were accounted for by students from the north side youth group. Academy students followed with 20 (26.7 per cent) statements. Seventeen (22.7 per cent) were written by students from the south side youth group, 9 (12.0 per cent) by the Hebrew high school group and 8 (10.6 per cent) by the students from the west side youth group.

**TABLE 19**

**THEMES PRESENT IN THE RESPONSES OF 75 SUBJECTS TO QUESTION 38(b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why do you think Protestants are less tolerant than others?</th>
<th>Academy</th>
<th>Hebrew HS Group</th>
<th>Youth Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Side</td>
<td>West Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Don't know--they just are</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Their attitude toward Jews</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Religious indoctrination</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Negative overt behavior</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Air of superiority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personal experience</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Majority group prejudice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No reason cited</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 1: Don't Know—They Just Are (Total 11)

These responses are similar to those ascribed to Catholics. They are, however, fewer in number.

Don't know. (N) (This was repeated in 4 questionnaires.)

Because they just have a dislike against Jews. (L)

Because they are very prejudiced against Jews and would do anything against them. (N)

They are less tolerant. (L)

Anti-Semitic. (M)

I don't really know, because of their attitude. (N)

I think that it is just their nature. (L)

Theme 2: Attitudes Toward Jews (Total 5)

In an attempt to account for the Protestants' "intolerance" toward Jews, 4 students suggested certain other attitudes on the part of Protestants.

They seem to sneer at Jews. (N)

They are ignorant. (L)

They don't understand our religion. (N)

Because they may be jealous of Jews. (L)

Because they hate us because we are better. (L)

Theme 3: Indoctrination (Total 3)

The first two statements below were written by respondents who checked both Catholics and Protestants and cited 1 reason.
I have talked with them and I now know that in the church they are taught to hate Jews. (L)

Because the Church teaches them to hate Jews indirectly. (L)

They have been brought up this way. (L)

**Theme 4: Negative Overt Behavior Toward Jews (Total 14)**

The charge of "victimization" was cited most frequently of all the traits ascribed to Protestants. The first 4 responses listed below were attributed to both Protestants and Catholics.

- They pick on Jews just for fun. (M)
- Because they treat us the same. (M) (Both groups.)
- I've been chased by both groups.
- Because they many times openly discriminate against Jews. (M)

The following remarks are directed only toward Protestants.

- They seem to be that way in the way they act. (L)
- Because I've read in other states they don't allow Jews in their restaurants, etc. I really don't know for sure. (L)
- Because of the way they talk and the way they write. (L)
- Because they have been the ones involved with discriminating against Jews in our school. (L)
- Because many Protestants are anti-Semitic and like to cause trouble for the Jews. (L)
- Because many Protestants won't let a Jew have a job. (M)
- Some Protestants act very mean toward Jews. (L)
Theme 5: Air of Superiority (Total 4)

The content of the statements in Theme 5 are similar to those ascribed to Catholics in Theme 5, Table 18.

They think they are better. (L) (Refers to both groups.)

Many Protestants look down on us. (L)

Protestants seem less tolerant toward Jews because I think they feel their belief is superior to ours. (L)

Because they think Jews are inferior. (L) (Both groups.)

They think Jews are inferior. (M)

Theme 6: Personal Experience (Total 6)

Six respondents indicated that they were able to verify their rating of Protestants from a negative personal experience.

Because I have been called names by this group and have been given dirty looks. (L)

Because I have lived among them. (M)

I think they are less tolerant because I have associated with people of the Protestant religion and they have made me feel this way. (N)

Because of my experience with them. (M)

(Because of personal contact with people accusing Jews of practically anything). I'm not sure. (N)

From personal experience with relatives and their friends. Experience has also taught me they are intolerant of most other religions. (M)

Theme 7: Majority Group Prejudice (Total 3)

The fact that Protestants were members of a majority was viewed negatively by 3 respondents.
Because they are the majority they feel they can push around the minority. (N)

They are the largest majority group. (L)

For the fact of the part they played in the past. we've always been a minority group. (L)

Miscellaneous (Total 4)

One respondent revealed that he derived his opinion of Protestants from others. Lack of education and ethical code on the part of Protestants was cited by two other respondents.

From hearing other people's opinions I agree. (N)

Protestants have a lesser code of ethics than Catholics. (N)

Jews became scapegoats. (M) (Cited for Catholics and Protestants.)

When people are uneducated and wish to be intolerant—they will be. (N)

No Reason Cited (Total 23)

Twenty-three respondents did not cite a reason for rating Protestants as "less tolerant than others" toward Jews.

Responses Written by Respondents Who Checked "About the Same as Others."

This response, if checked, was expected to elicit a degree of neutrality. For example, one student who checked it wrote "Catholics and Protestants in general are tolerant, excepting misinformed members." Two others checked it and added "don't know." However, a number of the students included negative comments. Seven of the negative comments referred to both
groups and one was specifically directed toward Catholics. One student after checking both groups wrote in the margin after the expression "about the same as others"—"Low" and commented "Jews become scapegoats." These remarks were assigned to the negative ratings describing Catholics and Protestants in Question 35. However, their rating "same as others" remained the same in Question 34. The negative evaluations cited were jealousy, inferiority, superiority, anti-Semitic, intolerant. They have been quoted above in their respective categories.

Summary

The frustration-aggression hypothesis predicts that the strongest instigation to acts of aggression will be directed against the agent perceived to be the source of frustration. Analysis of the responses designated as actual and implied intolerance indicate that Catholics are most frequently perceived as a source of frustration. The contrast, in terms of frequency of negative ratings between Catholics and Protestants is striking. The data presented illustrates that frequency of "victimization" is related to frequency of expressed intolerance.

Religious differences expressed in terms of lack of understanding, opposition of beliefs, strong commitment on the part of Catholics were cited most frequently as reasons why Jews viewed Catholics negatively. We stated earlier that it was not the task of the investigator to determine the truth or falsity of these attitudes. However, charges of religious indoctrination
on the part of the Catholic home, school and Church were frequent enough to cause concern for the image which these respondents have derived from their experiences.\footnote{During the second session of Vatican Council II, a proposal was made to exonerate Jews from any specific blame for their "role" in the Crucifixion of Christ. Rather it maintained that all mankind is responsible for this act. This proposal was welcomed by leaders of Judaism, Protestantism and Catholicism in the United States. The statements cited in the text demonstrate the divisive nature of certain types of religious emphasis. A number of Jewish students assume that Catholic teaching does predispose Catholics to anti-Semitic actions.}

The valuations which Jewish high school students made of one another confirmed the negative ratings of Jews on the Remmers' Scale noted earlier. There was a mutual intolerance exhibited by those who conform to religious observances and those who do not. Students attending the Jewish parochial high school viewed Jews attending public schools as lacking in "morals," "discipline," and a "religious basis in life." Public school students characterized students from the Academy as "religious fools," "fanatics," and "too serious."
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Restatement of the Problem and Procedure

The existence of a social prejudice, the authors of Frustration and Aggression note, means that those who are prejudiced have been frustrated and that they are expressing their aggression in a fairly uniform manner.\(^1\) Anti-Semitism, one such prejudice, is distinguished both by its uniformity of expression and also by the fact that its occurrence has transcended the particularities of time and place. The possible counter-effects of anti-Semitism have not received the same amount of attention as the prejudice itself. In the preceding chapters we have attempted to take a microscopic view of the effects of anti-Semitism by focusing on a particular group of Jews at a particular time and in a particular society: during November and December of 1962, 762 Jewish high school students living in a large metropolitan area were tested. The evaluation of their responses was guided by a hypothesis which assumed that any individual member of American society can expect to pursue and realize the rights and privileges normally associated with American citizenship. Any attempt to inhibit this pursuit and realization in a society

\(^1\)Dollard et al., op. cit., 151.
which holds the official value of encouraging equality of opportunity is to be considered a deprivation. How are the causes, "real" or "imagined," of these frustrations to be discovered? One avenue of exploration was a study of the possible implications of the religious group membership of the anti-Semite. Religious group identification has been known to act both as a unifying and divisive force. The results of this investigation have shown that religious group membership has definite implications in the identification of the anti-Semite by the respondent as well as the respondent's self-identification. It also plays a part in the anti-Semite's identification of the respondents. Our task is not to determine the validity of these judgments by the "victims" but to note that they exist and that they will influence the conduct of the respondents in some way. The principal hypothesis tested was: the frequency of expressed unfavorable categorical judgments of an out-group, including the expressed anticipation of "victimisation" originating from members of that out-group, is directly related to the frequency of personally and vicariously experienced discrimination and prejudice by the subjects and perceived by them as being attributable to that out-group in past associations.

The 762 subjects of this investigation were drawn from 3 different types of institutions. The first group was comprised of 209 students attending a Jewish parochial academy full-time. One hundred and twenty students attending Hebrew high
school extension classes on a part-time basis made up the second group. The third component of the sample consisted of 433 public high school students who were members of Jewish youth organizations from the south, west, and north sides of the city.

The initial step in the investigation was to test the general level of attitude toward Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and non-church members among the participating groups. The Remmers' Scale for Measuring Attitude Toward Any Defined Group, Form A, was used for this purpose. Scores on this Scale also served as a measure of actual intolerance in the tests of relationship.

Information obtained by means of the Questionnaire on Intergroup Relations was used to ascertain the frequency with which individuals reported personally and vicariously experienced discrimination and prejudice. The main hypothesis was tested by means of two separate breakdowns. On the basis of replies to specific questions the sample population was first divided into three categories representing those who reported personal experience of overt and covert "victimization" "many times," "a limited number of times," and "never." The relationship of these categories with the dependent variables sex, actual and implied intolerance was tested by means of the chi-square technique.

There were two items used to measure actual intolerance: the responses to Question 37(a)-(e) in which the respondent indicated one or more groups that he "did not particularly like;" and the...
negative ratings on the Remmers' Scale. Implied intolerance was indicated by the frequency with which a religious or national group was listed as prejudiced toward Jews;\(^2\) and the comparative ratings of Catholics and Protestants with regard to their relations toward Jews.\(^3\) In order to discern the influence of vicarious experience on attitudes the three major categories of personal "victimization" were extended to include similar categories of diminishing frequency of vicarious "victimization."

This extension yielded a total of nine categories (Chapter III, see page 67 for the model). Tests of relationship between these categories and actual and implied intolerance were also made.

In addition to the tests relating "victimization" and intolerance, the relationship of such variables as sex, religious observance, and contact with Catholics and Protestants with intolerance was also observed. Religious observance was measured by frequency of attendance at religious services. Respondents were categorized by their reports of daily and weekly attendance at services; occasional Sabbath and holiday attendance; and attendance on High Holidays and special occasions only.

An attempt was made to elicit qualitative aspects of association in order to measure further the relation of frequency of contact with Catholics and Protestants and intolerance. To this end reports of intimate "best-friend" relationships were

\(^2\)Question 32.

\(^3\)Question 34(a) and (b).
included in the Category "close" contact. The two remaining Categories "limited" and "minimal" contact were based on diminishing frequency of association.

Finally, the respondents' descriptions of personally and vicariously experienced incidents of discrimination were analyzed in some detail. The expressions of the intolerance expected to follow as a result of experienced "victimization" were also subjected to analysis. These were viewed as "valuations" containing elements of stereotyping and prejudice projected toward a group or groups perceived to be the "cause" of these frustrating incidents experienced by the respondents.

The following conclusions have been drawn from the data obtained in this research.

1. Analysis of the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the group scores on the Remmers' Scale used to test the general level of attitude toward Catholics, Protestants, Jews and non-church members indicated that all groups of Jewish students tested rated non-church members less favorably than members of the three religious groups. Jews were rated most favorably of all although the north side youth group rated them significantly less favorably than did the others. While Catholics were not rated as unfavorably as non-church members, they were rated less favorably than Protestants and Jews. Students from the south side were more negative in their ratings of Catholics than any other group tested. There was no consistent significant
differentiation among the three religious groups but there was a significant differentiation of non-Church members from religious groups.

The absence of differentiation among religious groups and the notable differentiation between non-church members and religious groups may seem unrelated. The same is the case with the apparent contradiction in the relatively favorable rating of Catholics on the Remmers' Scale and their unfavorable rating found later in the QIR. There is, however, a theoretical referent which can serve to explain both of these occurrences. Will Herberg sees Protestantism, Catholicism and Judaism symbolizing three great branches of "American religion" in contemporary society. Being an American virtually demands placing oneself in one of these three "great branches." Once this location is made, identification of self as well as others is made from within the context of a specific branch or from the broader context of religious membership vs. non-membership. The consistent differentiation of non-church members from religious groups as well as their negative rating are made from within the larger context of religion per se vs. non-religion. The relatively favorable ratings of Catholics on the Scale is also made from within the latter context. The frequent negative expressions directed toward Catholics in the QIR are made in the narrower

\footnote{Herberg, op. cit., 52-53.}
comparative context among specific religious groups.

2. The tests of significance by means of the chi-square technique tend to support the first corollary of the principal hypothesis that the frequency of personally experienced discrimination, particularly if it has been experienced "many times," is related to actual and implied intolerance as expressed in the responses on the QIR. This association did not obtain in all of the tests of relationship with actual intolerance on the part of the respondents as indicated by the Remmers' Scale. The chance hypothesis was rejected in the following tests of relationship between "victimization" and intolerance: actual intolerance indicated by the respondent's checking one or more groups that they did not particularly like; frequency of checking boys and girls attending Catholic parochial schools as a group the respondents did not like; and the negative ratings of Catholics on the Remmers' Scale. Rating of Jews and non-church members made a borderline difference. The chance hypothesis was retained in the test relating negative ratings of Protestants and "victimization." The chance explanation was rejected in the three tests of relationship between "victimization" and implied intolerance of other groups. The frequency with which respondents rated Catholics and Protestants negatively as well as the listing of religious and national groups as prejudiced toward Jews was greater than would be expected by chance.

The overall conclusions which can be derived from these
tests indicate that intolerance toward Jews was most frequently expected from Catholics by the respondents. These expectations are influenced by the frequency with which the respondent reports personal experiences of "victimization." Respondents who report never having experienced "victimization" expressed negative verbal opinions of out-group members less frequently than would be expected of their proportion in the population. Analysis of the social characteristics of the respondents reporting incidents of personally experienced discrimination indicates that "victimization" tends to be a function of sex; the amount of contact with non-Jews (i.e., the more frequent the contact the greater the likelihood of unfortunate experiences); and the level of identifiability.

The second corollary of the principal hypothesis is that vicarious experience is also related to actual and implied intolerance. A chi-square test relating the extended categories of personal and vicarious experience of "victimization" with the expressions of actual intolerance toward other groups indicated no significant relationship. In the case of implied intolerance toward out-groups results must be qualified. If one has personally experienced "victimization" "many times," vicarious experience does not reinforce negative opinion. If one has personally experienced "victimization" a "limited number of times," vicarious experience tends to reinforce negative opinion. This was observed in the frequency of negative ratings of
Catholics and in the frequency of listing a religious or national group as prejudiced toward Jews. If one has "never" personally experienced "victimization," vicarious experience does not reinforce negative opinion. These conclusions show that it is the factors of immediate concern to the individual, such as personal experience of "victimization" and the frequency of its occurrence that influence the frequency with which negative opinion of out-group members is expressed.

The conclusions cited above indicate that the first corollary of the principal hypothesis, that personally experienced "victimization" is related to the frequency of expressed actual and implied intolerance, is supported by the evidence at hand. The second corollary, that vicariously experienced "victimization" is related to frequency of expressed actual and implied intolerance is supported only in part by the evidence.

3. The chi-square analyses relating sex with actual and implied intolerance reinforce the principal hypothesis. It was found initially that respondents who have experienced some form of "victimization" "many times" tended to express negative verbal opinions more frequently than those who report this experience a "limited number of times." Those who report "never" having experienced "victimization" do not express negative opinion as frequently as might be expected by chance. The test relating the sex differential and intolerance demonstrates that more boys than girls experienced discrimination and prejudice and
that they in turn check one or more groups as those they "do not particularly like" among Catholics, Jews, and Protestants more frequently than would be expected by chance; more boys than girls checked "boys and girls from Catholic schools" as a group they did not particularly like. Similarly, boys expressed more negative opinions in the case of implied intolerance, indicated by the frequency with which they checked a group as most prejudiced toward Jews and rated Catholics as "less tolerant than others toward Jews." There was no significant difference between boys and girls in their rating of Protestants.

Several things contribute to make boys more frequent subjects of experiences of "victimization" than girls. Traditional emphases within Judaism require a more active participation in religious observance on the part of male subjects. One obvious example is wearing the traditional head covering, the yamelka. This practice was cited most frequently as a source of instigation to aggression by the respondents. In addition to differential religious obligations there is the greater likelihood of out-group contacts for boys than girls.

4. The conclusion with regard to the influence of religious observance is that frequency of attendance at religious services does not influence the frequency of expressed negative opinion. The chance explanation was retained in the tests relating attendance at religious services with actual intolerance indicated by the frequency of checking one or more groups in
Question 37. It was also retained in the cases of implied intolerance centering upon the identification of a specific religious or national group and in those rating Catholics and Protestants as "less tolerant than others toward Jews."

5. The analysis of the influence of contact on prejudice revealed the chance explanation as tenable in two tests of actual intolerance of Catholics and Protestants: the frequency with which students checked boys and girls from Catholic schools and Protestant boys and girls as groups they "did not particularly like" was not related to frequency of contact with these groups. The same held true for negative ratings of Catholics and Protestants on the Remmers' Scale.

In contrast, the chance explanation was rejected in the analysis of the relation of the implied intolerance toward Catholics and Protestants with degree of contact. Both groups were rated on a comparative basis. The rating of Catholics and Protestants as "more tolerant than others toward Jews" is positively related to "close" best-friend associations. However, in spite of the fact that both of these groups were rated "more tolerant" more frequently by respondents having "close" contact, Protestants were rated "more tolerant" more frequently than Catholics; by contrast, Catholics were rated "less tolerant" more frequently than Protestants.

6. Negative valuations were not limited to non-Jews. A mutual intolerance was observed in the valuations of students
attending the Jewish parochial high school and students attending public schools. Religious and moral indifference was attributed to public school boys and girls by respondents attending the Academy whereas those attending public high schools viewed the religious emphasis of the parochial school students negatively. Religious identifiability, then, is a factor in the intolerance of the Jew as well as the anti-Semite. Allport and others have suggested that this type of aggression is built up as a result of being the object of discrimination and that it is directed toward one's own group perhaps because of fear of reprisal.5

7. The examples of personal and vicarious experiences of discrimination are viewed as frustrations induced by the inability of the respondent to realize those expectations normally associated with life in a democratic society because of his Jewish identity. The logical response to such deprivation, the frustration-aggression syndrome predicts, is a variety of aggressive responses. The evidence presented in this investigation supports this assumption. The sources of the frustrations experienced by respondents were themselves aggressive acts indicating frustration on the part of the anti-Semite. The evidence that Catholics (more frequently singled out by the respondents as less tolerant than others toward Jews) actually are the "objects" causing the frustrations is inconclusive. That the

respondents "perceive" them to be the source is quite evident from their "valuations" of Catholics in the answers to the questions testing actual and implied intolerance. One factor which might influence this "perception" is the greater "visibility" of Catholics as opposed to Protestants.

"Victimization" as reported by the Jewish respondents, it has been shown, is a function of sex, out-group contact, and level of identifiability. Identifiability is not based exclusively on religious behavior. The fact that students from the south side youth group account for the second highest total of reports of "victimization" suggests a different type of identifiability based perhaps on "associational visibility" as well as other behavior traits. The aggressive response is dependent upon the immediacy of the personal, rather than vicarious, experience of "victimization" and the frequency of its occurrence.

Will Herberg's contention that religion is the "differentiating element in the context of self-identification and social location," is supported by a number of instances presented in this investigation: the fact that anti-Semitic acts, as reported here, are most frequently directed toward the religiously observant and hence more visible Jew; that the respondents

---

6 Academy students accounted for 30.2 per cent of the total, the south side youth group 25.7 per cent, the north side youth group 17.9 per cent, west side youth group 13.4 per cent, and the Hebrew high school group 12.8 per cent.

7 Herberg, op. cit., 15.
identify Catholics as most frequently anti-Semitic; that the Jewish respondents identify each other on the basis of religious observance; and finally that non-church members are negatively distinguished from the three religious groups. It is possible that this emphasis on religious identification stems from the focus of the test itself—interreligious group relations—where the frame of reference is narrowed for the respondent. Question 32 attempted to establish a broader context to elicit implied intolerance when it asked the respondent to list a "religious or nationality group which seems most often to be prejudiced against Jews." The religious groups mentioned most frequently were: Catholics, 175 times; Protestants and Christians, 39 and 10 times respectively. Non-church members were cited a total of 10 times. The national groups cited were: German-Nazis, 53 times; Arab-Moslem-Egyptians, 21; Negroes, 12 times. There were additional listings of Poles, Russians, Serbs, Mexicans, Italians, etc., with totals of less than 5.

Interfaith tension is seldom limited to religious differences alone. It arises largely from the traditional attitudes of each faith toward the other, attitudes formed in historical situations considerably different from current circumstances. Today tensions are complicated by such factors as members' relative socio-economic positions, length of residence in America, and minority and majority status. Still, the

8Moberg, op. cit., 328.
valuations of Catholics in the preceding expressions of implied intolerance reveal a large number of respondents charging religious indoctrination as the reason why they rate Catholics as "less tolerant than others toward Jews." Whether they are justified or not, these views will be a matter of concern for interested members of both faiths.
A SCALE FOR MEASURING ATTITUDE TOWARD ANY DEFINED GROUP

Form A
Edited by H. H. Remmers

Date __________________

Name (optional) __________________ Sex (circle one) M F

Age __________________ Grade __________________

What occupation would you like best to follow? __________________

Your race __________________ Your nationality __________________

Directions: Following is a list of statements about any group. Place a plus sign (+) before each statement with which you agree with reference to the group listed at the left of the statements. The person in charge will tell you the group to write in at the head of the columns to the left of the statements. Your score will in no way affect your grade in any course.

1. Can be depended upon as being honest.
2. Are far above my own group.
3. Some of our best citizens are descendants from this group.
4. Deserve much consideration from the rest of the world.
5. Command the respect of any group.
6. Are quick to apprehend. (catch on).
7. Are a God-fearing people.
8. Have an air of dignity about them.
9. Are highly emotional. (excitable)
10. Take an exceptional pride in themselves.
11. Are superstitious.
12. Are self indulgent. (usually think only of themselves)
13. Do not impress me favorably.
14. I am not in sympathy with these people.
15. Would likely prove disloyal to our government.
16. Belong to a low social level.
17. Are mentally defective (of inferior intelligence).

Copyright, Purdue Research Foundation, 1960
A SCALE FOR MEASURING ATTITUDE TOWARD ANY DEFINED GROUP

Form A Edited by H. H. Remmers
### Scoring Procedure

The median scale value of the statements endorsed is the attitude score. If an odd number of statements is endorsed, the scale value of the middle item of those endorsed gives the score. For example, if three items are endorsed, specifically items Nos. 2, 3, and 5, the score is the scale value of item No. 3, i.e., 9.2, a highly favorable attitude.

If an even number of items is endorsed, for example items Nos. 9, 10, 11, and 12, the score will be halfway between the scale values for items Nos. 10 and 11 i.e., 5.1, an unfavorable attitude. The indifference point is 6.0. Scores above 6.0 indicate a favorable attitude, scores below 6.0, an unfavorable attitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Value</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire on Intergroup Relations I

Number____

1. (Check One; use X). a) Male____ b) Female____

2. Name of school you attend full time__________________________

3. Grade in school: (Check one; use X)
   a) Freshman____ b) Sophomore____ c) Junior____ d) Senior____
   e) Age at last birthday____

4. Do you attend Hebrew High School? a) Yes____ b) No____
   c) If yes, how many hours per week?________

5. Have you ever attended Hebrew School? a) Yes____ b) No____
   c) If yes, list the number of months or years________

6. Religious affiliation: (Check one)
   a) Orthodox____ b) Traditional____ c) Conservative____
   d) Reform____ e) No affiliation____ f) Don't know____
   g) Other____

7. How often do you attend religious services?
   a) Daily____ b) Sabbath every week and High Holidays____
   c) Sabbath occasionally and High Holidays____ d) Sabbath
classically____ e) High Holidays only____ f) Specialoccasions only____
   g) Other____

8. What is your father's religion?
   a) Jewish____ Specify: 1) Orthodox____
      2) Traditional____
      3) Conservative____
      4) Reform____
      5) No affiliation____
      6) Don't know____
   b) Protestant____
   c) Catholic____
   d) Other____
   e) No affiliation____
   f) Don't know____

9. What is your mother's religion?
   a) Jewish____ Specify: 1) Orthodox____
      2) Traditional____
      3) Conservative____
      4) Reform____
      5) No affiliation____
      6) Don't know____
   b) Protestant____
10. What is your father's occupation? (State exactly what your father does, e.g., High School teacher, shoe salesman, etc.)

b) Does she work full time or part time?

12. Circle the last year of school completed by your father.
   a) Grade school 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
   b) High school 1 2 3 4
   c) College 1 2 3 4
   d) Beyond college or Bachelor's Degree

13. Circle the last year of school completed by your mother.
   a) Grade school 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
   b) High school 1 2 3 4
   c) College 1 2 3 4
   d) Beyond college or Bachelor's Degree

14. To which of the following groups do your two very best friends belong?
   a) Protestants
   b) Catholics
   c) Jews
   d) Greek Orthodox
   e) Jehovah's Witnesses

15. In which of the following groups do you not have any friends?
   a) Protestants
   b) Catholics
   c) Jews
   d) Greek Orthodox
   e) Jehovah's Witnesses

16. Check the frequency with which you come into contact with the following groups:

   a) Protestants
   b) Catholics
   c) People who do not belong to any religious groups

   Most of the time    Often    Once in a while    Never
17. Place a check (X) in front of each of the following religious groups which live in your neighborhood.
   a) _____ Protestants     d) _____ Greek Orthodox
   b) _____ Catholics        e) _____ Jehovah's Witnesses
   c) _____ Jews

17.f. Which of these is the largest group in your neighborhood?

18. How many of your friends attend the school that you attend full time?
   a) All of them_____  
   b) Most of them_____ 
   c) Few of them_____  
   d) None of them_____ 

19. If you belong to a Temple, how many of your friends attend your Temple (Synagogue)?
   a) All of them_____  
   b) Most of them_____ 
   c) Few of them_____  
   d) None of them_____ 

20. How many of your friends attend other Temples (Synagogues)?
   a) All of them_____  
   b) Most of them_____ 
   c) Few of them_____  
   d) None of them_____ 

21. If you did not answer all of them in question 20, how many of your friends attend the churches listed below?

   a) Protestant Church
   b) Catholic Church
   c) Other
   d) Don't know

   All  Most  Few  None

22. Do you belong to any of the clubs sponsored by the school that you attend full time?  
   a) Yes  b) No 

23. Are there any clubs at your school that you do not wish to join?  
   a) Yes  b) No 

23c. If yes, why don't you care to join these clubs?

24. Are you a member of any of the following groups not connected with your school? (Check(X) the ones you are a member of or plan to join.)
   a) fraternity  
   b) sorority  
   c) club  
   d) group
25. If you belong to any of the above groups in question 24, are the members
   a) All Jewish_________  d) None of them are Jewish________
   b) Most of them are Jewish________
   c) A Few of them are Jewish________

26. If you belong to a group (not connected with your school) are there some boys or girls who are not welcome to join it?
   a) Yes______  b) No______
26c. If they are not welcome, what do you think is the reason?


27. Have you ever been openly discriminated against because you are Jewish? (Check one).
   a) Many times______  c) Once______
   b) A few times______  d) Never______
27e. If you have, briefly describe a situation you can remember.


28. Have you ever heard of any specific instance in which any members of your family or close friends were openly discriminated against because they were Jewish? (Check one.)
   a) Many times______  c) Once______
   b) A few times______  d) Never______
28e. If you have, briefly describe a situation you can remember.
29. Have you ever felt that other individuals disliked you because you were Jewish although nothing was openly said or done? (Check one)
   a) Many times  c) Once  
   b) A few times  d) Never

30. Have you ever been called names because you are Jewish? (Check one)
   a) Many times  c) Once  
   b) A few times  d) Never

31. Have you ever heard from any members of your family or close friends that they have been called names because they were Jewish? (Check one)
   a) Many times  c) Once  
   b) A few times  d) Never

32. Is there any particular religious or nationality group which seems most often to be prejudiced against Jews? (Check one)
   a) Yes  b) No
32c. If yes, list the name of that group

33. If you have listed a group, do you think that some of the members of your family feel the same way as you do about this group? (Check one) a) Yes  b) No

34. Place a check (X) in the column which best describes how you would rate the following groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Tolerant</th>
<th>Less Tolerant</th>
<th>About the</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Than Others</td>
<td>Than Others</td>
<td>Same as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward Jews</td>
<td>Toward Jews</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   a) Most Catholics
   1)________________  2)________________  3)__________
   b) Most Protestants
   1)________________  2)________________  3)__________

35. With regard to the groups that you may have checked as less tolerant than others toward Jews, why do you think they are less tolerant?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

36. Have you ever been told not to mix with girls or boys of a particular nationality or religious group? (Check one)
   a) Yes  b) No
36c. If yes, write the name of the particular group in the space following.

37. Place a check (X) after each of the following groups that you do not particularly like.

a) Boys and girls from public schools___(If you check this one, state why in question 38.)

b) Boys and girls from Catholic schools___(If you check this one, state why below in question 38.)

c) Boys and girls from the Jewish Academy___(If you check this one, state why below in question 38.)

d) Boys and girls attending Hebrew High Schools___(If you check this one, state why below in question 38.)

e) Protestant boys and girls___(If you check this one, state why below in question 38.)

38. If you have checked a group or groups above, what is your reason for not liking the group or groups as much as others?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Appendix II

Table A

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS GIVEN TO NON-CHURCH MEMBERS BY THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF SUBJECTS EXPRESSED IN UNITS OF THE STANDARD ERROR OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS (z)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academy</th>
<th>Hebrew High School</th>
<th>South Side Youth Group</th>
<th>West Side Youth Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew High School</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Side Youth Group</td>
<td>2.30&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Youth Group</td>
<td>2.32&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side Youth Group</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Significant at .05 level.

Table B

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS GIVEN TO CATHOLICS BY THE VARIOUS GROUPS OF SUBJECTS EXPRESSED IN UNITS OF THE STANDARD ERROR OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS (z)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Side Youth Group</th>
<th>West Side Youth Group</th>
<th>North Side Youth Group</th>
<th>Academy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Side Youth Group</td>
<td>3.15&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Youth Group</td>
<td>2.08&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Side Youth Group</td>
<td>3.24&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>2.36&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Significant at .01 level.
<sup>b</sup>Significant at .05 level.
Table C

Differences between the mean ratings given to Protestants by the various groups of subjects expressed in units of the standard error of the difference between means (x)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academy</th>
<th>Hebrew High School</th>
<th>South Side Youth Group</th>
<th>West Side Youth Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew High School</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Side Youth Group</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Youth Group</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table D

Differences between the mean ratings given to Jews by the various groups of subjects expressed in units of the standard error of the difference between means (x)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Side Youth Group</th>
<th>South Side Youth Group</th>
<th>West Side Youth Group</th>
<th>Hebrew High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Side Youth Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Side Youth Group</td>
<td>2.02&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Side Youth Group</td>
<td>2.00&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew High School</td>
<td>2.89&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>2.67&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Significant at .05 level.

<sup>b</sup>Significant at .01 level.
Table E

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS GIVEN BY NORTH SIDE SUBJECTS TO VARIOUS RELIGIOUS GROUPS EXPRESSED IN UNITS OF THE STANDARD ERROR OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS (z)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Church Members</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>6.63ᵃ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>7.73ᵃ</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>6.67ᵃ</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ᵃSignificant at .01 level.

Table F

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS GIVEN BY SOUTH SIDE SUBJECTS TO VARIOUS RELIGIOUS GROUPS EXPRESSED IN UNITS OF THE STANDARD ERROR OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS (z)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Church Members</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>5.50ᵃ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>8.50ᵃ</td>
<td>9.00ᵃ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>7.50ᵃ</td>
<td>2.86ᵃ</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ᵃSignificant at .01 level.
### Table G

Differences between the mean ratings given by West Side subjects to various religious groups expressed in units of the standard error of the difference between means (z)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Church Members</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>4.67^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>6.07^a</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>5.77^a</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aSignificant at .01 level.

### Table H

Differences between the mean ratings given by Hebrew High School subjects to various religious groups expressed in units of the standard error of the difference between means (z)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Church Members</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>7.73^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>9.55^a</td>
<td>4.00^a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>9.00^a</td>
<td>2.00^b</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aSignificant at .01 level.

^bSignificant at .05 level.
Table I

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS GIVEN BY ACADEMY SUBJECTS TO VARIOUS RELIGIOUS GROUPS EXPRESSED IN UNITS OF THE STANDARD ERROR OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS (z)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Church Members</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>14.64(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>18.15(^a)</td>
<td>3.10(^a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>15.14(^a)</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>7.06(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Significant at the .01 level.

Table J

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEAN RATINGS BY ALL SUBJECTS COMBINED GIVEN TO VARIOUS RELIGIOUS GROUPS EXPRESSED IN UNITS OF THE STANDARD ERROR OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS (z)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Church Members</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholics</td>
<td>16.00(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>66.67(^a)</td>
<td>20.00(^a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants</td>
<td>18.00(^a)</td>
<td>8.50(^a)</td>
<td>11.76(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Significant at .01 level.
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