

JEWISH ETHNOCENTRISM: AN INVESTIGATION
OF INGROUP LOYALTY AND OUTGROUP EVALUATIONS

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The University of Manitoba

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Sidney Karlinsky

March 1972



ABSTRACT

The research problem under investigation was to study the nature of the relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup evaluations and to determine the effect of other selected variables such as academic major, academic performance, generation Canadian, socio-economic status and frequency of synagogue attendance on the nature of the ingroup-outgroup relationship.

Research findings have indicated that the ingroup-outgroup relationship may take one of three possible forms: a) a positive relationship, b) a negative relationship or, c) no relationship. In sum, this study questions the major proposition of ethnocentric theory, namely, that there exists an inverse relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup rejection.

A theoretical framework was developed, exploring the ingroup-outgroup relationship from a functionalist and reference group theory perspective, stressing the acquisition of both ingroup and outgroup norms as a natural product of the socialization process, through the influence of one's family and primary reference group(s).

A random sample was collected, consisting of 112 Jewish undergraduates at The University of Manitoba, Fort Garry Campus, taken from the larger Driedger Ethnic Identity Research of 1970-71.

Jewish ingroup loyalty was operationalized through the use of two Osgood Semantic Differential scales, one measuring general attitudes toward the respondents' ethnic 'culture' and the other, measuring attitudes toward the respondents' ethnic 'faith.' These scales, in turn, were dichotomized into positive and negative attitudes toward the respon-

dents' ingroup 'culture' and 'faith.' Outgroup evaluations were also dichotomized into positive and negative evaluations on the basis of respondents' attitudes toward twenty selected ethnic and 'racial' groups on a Bogardus Social Distance scale.

It was found in the sample under investigation that there was as hypothesized: a) no relationship between the respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and their outgroup evaluations and, b) no relationship between respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'faith' and their outgroup evaluations. There was, however, a significant positive relationship between the respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith.' Other significant relationships uncovered were: a negative relationship between frequency of synagogue attendance and the respondents; attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith' as well as a negative relationship between the respondents' academic performance and their outgroup evaluations.

More research is needed to clearly delineate the nature of the ingroup-outgroup relationship. The primary suggestions advanced here are: a) the development of reliable indices of ethnic identification, comprised of both attitudinal and behavioral dimensions and, b) construction of a measure of outgroup relatedness, utilizing again, both attitudinal and behavioral dimensions such as general attitude scales accompanied by indicators of such things as concrete outgroup experiences, encounters with prejudice and discrimination, stereotyping, etc.

SIDNEY KARLINSKY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer gratefully acknowledges the assistance of many people who, directly or indirectly, are responsible for the successful completion of this study. The following, however, deserve special attention.

First, I wish to acknowledge my sincere gratitude to Dr. Leo Driedger, my thesis advisor. His great patience, constant encouragement and constructive counsel were greatly appreciated in the writing of this thesis. Dr. Driedger's invitation to work for him as a Research Assistant through his Canada Council Grant not only provided funds, but also the opportunity to utilize some of his data for this thesis.

Second, appreciation is expressed to committee members, Dr. R. Bienvenue and Dr. L. Breen, who offered constructive criticisms and suggestions during the writing of this thesis.

Third, special thanks are extended to L. Finkleman and K. W. Taylor, who generously gave of their time in the design of computer programs for the data analysis section of this thesis.

Finally, I wish to say thank you to my mother, whose unswerving dedication to the typing of my rough drafts enabled me to complete this thesis in good time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I	1
THEORY AND LITERATURE REVIEW	
The Problem	
Review of the Literature	
II	25
A BRIEF SOCIAL HISTORY OF JEWISH SETTLEMENT	
A. Settlement:	
1. Early Period (Before 1880)	
2. Russian - Jewish Immigration Period (1880 - 1905)	
3. 1905 Onward	
B. Residential Segregation	
C. Parochial Education and Language Maintenance	
1. Hebrew Religious Schools	
2. Yiddish Progressive Schools	
3. Yiddish Socialist Schools	
4. Congregational Schools	
D. Endogamy	
E. Mass Media (Newspapers)	
III	49
METHODOLOGY	
Population and Sample	
Instrument	
Hypotheses	
Jewish Ingroup Loyalty	
Outgroup Evaluations	
General Variables	
Statistical Tests	
IV	61
DATA ANALYSIS	
Ingroup Loyalty and Outgroup Evaluations	
Ingroup Loyalty and General Variables	
Outgroup Evaluations and Other Variables	
V	93
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	

TABLE OF CONTENTS - continued

	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY	101
APPENDIX I THE INSTRUMENT	110
Personal Inventory Scale	
Bogardus Social Distance Scale	
Osgood Semantic Differential: Culture	
Osgood Semantic Differential: Faith	

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1 The Numerical Distribution and Density of the Jewish Population of Winnipeg, 1881 - 1961	25
2 Synagogues Established in Winnipeg Since the Beginning of the Jewish Community	29
3 Concentrations of Winnipeg Jews for the North End, West Kildonan and River Heights for the Canada Census, 1951 and 1961	37
4 Per Cent Composition of Jews for the North End, West Kildonan and River Heights for the 1951 and 1961 Canada Census, Winnipeg	38
5 The Current Enrolments for Winnipeg Jewish Schools	44
6 The Decreasing Rate of Male and Female Endogamy as a Per Cent for Manitoba, 1961	45
7 Distribution of Expected Relationships of Jewish Ingroup Loyalty (Culture and Faith) by Outgroup Evaluations and Other Variables, (Generation, Socio-Economic Status, Academic Major, Academic Performance and Frequency of Synagogue Attendance) for Jewish Undergraduate Students	54
8 The Relationship Between Outgroup Evaluations and Expressed Attitudes Toward Ethnic 'Culture' and 'Faith' Among Jewish Undergraduate Students	63
9 The Relationship Between Attitudes Expressed Toward Ethnic 'Culture' and 'Faith' Among Jewish Undergraduate Students	65
10 The Relationship Between Attitudes Expressed Toward Ethnic 'Culture' and 'Faith' and Generation Canadian for Jewish Undergraduate Students	68
11 The Relationship Between Generation Canadian and Frequency of Attendance at Synagogues for Jewish Undergraduate Students	70

LIST OF TABLES - continued

TABLE	Page
12 The Relationship Between Attitudes Expressed Toward Ethnic 'Culture' and 'Faith' and Socio-Economic Status of Jewish Undergraduate Students	72
13 The Relationship Between Attitudes Expressed Toward Ethnic 'Culture' and 'Faith' and Academic Major Among Jewish Undergraduate Students	74
14 The Relationship Between Attitudes Expressed Toward Ethnic 'Culture' and 'Faith' and Academic Performance Among Jewish Undergraduate Students	76
15 The Relationship Between Attitudes Expressed Toward Ethnic 'Culture' and 'Faith' and the Frequency of Synagogue Attendance Among Jewish Undergraduate students. .	78
16 The Social Distance Rankings of Eleven Ethnic and Nine Racial Groups by Socio-Economic Status (SES) for Jewish Undergraduate Students	81
17 The Social Distance Rankings of Twenty Ethnic and Racial Groups by Jewish Undergraduate Students	86
18 The Relationship Between Outgroup Evaluations and the Frequency of Synagogue Attendance Among Jewish Undergraduate Students	87
19 The Relationship Between Outgroup Evaluations and Academic Performance Among Jewish Undergraduate Students. .	88
20 The Relationship Between Outgroup Evaluations and Academic Major Among Jewish Undergraduate Students.	89
21 The Relationship Between Outgroup Evaluations and Socio-Economic Status Among Jewish Undergraduate Students	90
22 The Relationship Between Outgroup Evaluations and Generation Canadian for Jewish Undergraduate Students . . .	91
23 Gamma Matrix for the Degree of Association Between Dependent and Independent Variables for Jewish Undergraduate Students	92

CHAPTER I

THEORY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The Problem

The purpose of this study will be to: a) ascertain the relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup evaluations in a sample of Jewish undergraduate students and, b) determine the effect of selected variables (academic major, academic performance, generation Canadian, socio-economic status and frequency of synagogue attendance) on the ingroup-outgroup relationship.

Most of the major problems related to the concept of ethnocentrism ethnocentric theory have been summarized and stated (Campbell and LeVine, 1965; Merton, 1957 and Rothman, 1965). These researchers feel that it is far from self-evident that the postulated inverse relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup rejection follows the classic Sumnerian-Adorno formulation (Adorno et al., 1950 and Sumner, 1906). If it does, it can be tested empirically. What may be questioned, however, is whether, this is the only pattern that connects the inner cohesion of groups in their outgroup relation, (Merton, 1957).

Rothman (1965), introduced research that found both a positive ingroup-outgroup relationship and his own research findings of no relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup orientations.

In other words, this study questions the major proposition of ethnocentric theory, as it has been traditionally understood since Sumner (1906), that there exists an inverse relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup rejection.

Review of the Literature

The concept of ethnocentrism was introduced by Sumner (1840-1910) and first appeared in Sumner's book Folkways in 1906. Both Gregor (1963) and Druckman (1968) have attested to the fact that the concept of ethnocentrism has functioned as an integral part of sociological theory at least since the time of Gumpowicz (1838-1909).

What is ethnocentrism? The classic statements about ethnocentrism are found in Sumner's book Folkways (1906). Sumner (1906: 13) noted that:

Ethnocentrism is the technical name for this view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and related with reference to it. Folkways correspond to it to cover both the inner and outer relation. Each group nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts itself superior, exalts its own divinities, and looks with contempt on outsiders. Each group thinks its own folkways the only right ones, and if it observes that other groups have other folkways, these excite its scorn. Opprobrious epithets are derived from these differences... For our present purpose the most important fact is that ethnocentrism leads a people to exaggerate and intensify everything in their own folkways which is peculiar and differentiates them from others. It therefore strengthens the folkways.

In Folkways there is to be found the first mention by Sumner of the we-group (ingroup) and others-groups (outgroups), in connection with the concept of 'primitive society':

The conception of 'primitive society' which we ought to form is that of small groups scattered over a territory...A group of groups may have some relation to each other (kin, neighbourhood, alliance) ...which draws them together and differentiates them from others. Thus a differentiation arises between ourselves, the we-group, or ingroup, and everybody else, or the others-groups, outgroups. The insiders in a we-group are in a relation of peace, order, law, government...to each other. Their relation to all outsiders, or others-groups, is one of war and plunder...Sumner (1906: 12)

Finally, in Folkways, Sumner (1906: 12-13) goes on to write of the 'sentiments in the ingroup towards the outgroup':

The relation of comradeship and peace in the we-group and threat of hostility and war towards others-groups are correlative to each other. The exigencies of war with outsiders are what make peace inside...Thus war and peace have reacted on each other and developed each other, one within the group, the other in the intergroup relation...Sentiments are produced to correspond. Loyalty to the group, sacrifice for it, hatred and contempt for outsiders, brotherhood within, warlikeness without--all grow together, products of the same situation...

This rigid ingroup loyalty-outgroup rejection postulated by Sumner (1906) was greatly elaborated by Adorno et al., (1950) and especially by Levinson (1950). Adorno (1950) saw ethnocentrism as: thinking generally in ingroup - outgroup terms; seeing one's own group as categorically different from groups to which one does not belong, and speaking of one's own and other groups in stereotyped terms.

Levinson (1950) viewed ethnocentrism as: provincialism, cultural narrowness, a tendency to be 'ethnically centered,' rigid in both the acceptance of the culturally 'alike' and in rejection of the 'unlike.' Levinson (1950: 102) indicated that:

Ethnocentrism...refers to a relatively consistent frame of mind concerning 'aliens' generally; it has to do not only with the numerous groups to which the individual has hostile opinions but, equally important, with groups toward which he is positively disposed.

Levinson (1950: 146) clearly indicated how he conceived of ethnocentrism when he wrote:

The social world as most ethnocentrics see it is arranged like a series of concentric circles around a bull's eye. Each circle represents an ingroup - outgroup distinction; each line serves as a barrier to exclude all outside groups from the center, and each group is in turn excluded by a slightly narrower one...

Many other social scientists have discussed ethnocentrism and some of these will be discussed here. Ethnocentrism has been termed a 'behavioral syndrome' (Levinson, 1950; Merton, 1957; Gregor, 1963;

Druckman, 1968 and Seelye and Brewer, 1970). Bierstedt (1957) viewed ethnocentrism as the tendency to see others as foreigners, never ourselves.

Ethnocentrism may be seen as one alternative response pattern to minority group status (Stonequist, 1937; Child, 1953; Lewin, 1948; Cahnman, 1949; Davie, 1949; Berry, 1951; Rinder, 1953; Seward, 1954 and Rothman, 1965). The above researchers utilized basically the same threefold classification scheme of: 1) the classic ingroup - outgroup pattern of ethnocentrism, 2) accommodation and, 3) assimilation.

The major proposition of ethnocentric theory, positing an inverse relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup rejection, (Adorno et al., 1950 and Sumner, 1906) has been challenged by a number of researchers (Lewin, 1948; Sarnoff, 1951; Prothro, 1952; Trent, 1953; Merton, 1957; Swartz, 1961; Catton and Hong, 1962; Westie, 1964; Noel, 1964; Williams, 1964; Campbell and Levine, 1965 and Rothman, 1965). Some of these will be dealt with here.

Prothro (1952) found some evidence to indicate that ethnocentrism varies with different groups, looking at Southern whites reaction to Negroes and other groups.

Merton (1957) cautions the reader to keep in mind that membership groups are not co-terminus with ingroups, as Sumner may seem to have implied. Merton (1957: 297-298) placed Sumner in a somewhat different perspective than he is usually viewed when he wrote:

Lacking any but the most primitive conceptions of psychology Sumner too soon and without warrant concluded that deep allegiance to one group generates antipathy (or, at least, indifference) toward other groups. Coming out of the evolutionary tradition of social thought with its emphasis on society as well as nature red in tooth and claw, Sumner described an important

but special case as though it were the general case. He assumed ...that intense loyalty to a group necessarily generates hostility towards those outside the group...

Both Swartz (1961) and Williams (1964) see numerous well-documented instances where some appreciation of outgroup values and practices are held simultaneously with a positive ingroup loyalty. Swartz (1961), on the basis of cross-cultural research, found what he called "negative ethnocentrism," referring to a negative estimation certain groups have of themselves based on their own standards. Williams (1964) adds that the above is negative ethnocentrism only in admitting certain points of inferiority and need not result in a general devaluation of one's own group. The basic position adopted by both Swartz (1961) and Williams (1964) is that the individual has a selective relationship both toward the ingroup and the outgroup, i.e., both positive and negative attitudes are present in these selective loyalties.

Controversy continues among social scientists as to the universality of ethnocentrism. Catton (1964) noted that, from the abundant examples that Sumner provided, he implied that ethnocentrism was a universal human phenomenon. There are others who feel ethnocentrism is universal (Berry, 1951; Campbell and LeVine, 1965; Druckman, 1968; Gregor, 1963; Seelye and Brewer, 1970; Walter, 1952). However, there are also those (Catton, 1960-61; Sherif and Sherif, 1953; Simpson and Yinger, 1953; Swartz, 1961; Wagley and Harris, 1958 and Williams, 1964) who have disputed the universality of this concept.

After a review of available literature on the ingroup - outgroup relationship, it is the contention of this writer, along with Rothman (1965), that studies discussing the relationship between ingroup loyalty

and outgroup evaluations are very few in number and often have no direct bearing on the subject area. However, these studies appear to comprise three distinct types:

Type A - those which show a positive correlation between ingroup loyalty and outgroup evaluations

Type B - those which show a negative correlation between ingroup loyalty and outgroup evaluations

Type C - those which show no consistent relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup evaluations

Type A studies (positive ingroup - outgroup relationship) includes research done by Lewin (1948); Sarnoff, 1951; Trent (1953) and Noel (1964). Lewin (1948) posed as his major, and according to Rothman (1965), probably most controversial hypothesis, that a minority individual with a definite ingroup identification will have formed more positive attitudes toward outgroups than those with a lesser degree of ingroup identification. Sarnoff (1951) studied the degree to which Jews accepted anti-Semitic stereotypes and found those low on anti-Semitism--high ingroup identity, maintained more appropriate relationships in the face of outgroup hostility, and generally, perceived the outgroup in a more realistic manner. Rothman (1965) quoted from research carried out by Trent (1953) on self-acceptance among Negro children, finding the most self-accepting, generally, expressed significantly more positive attitudes toward both Negroes and whites than those who were least self-accepting. Noel (1964) found ingroup loyalty to be positively correlated to outgroup evaluations.

Type B studies (negative ingroup - outgroup relationship), i.e., the classic Sumnerian-Adorno formulation. These studies include those

who tested the hypothesis and found it to be valid (Chein and Hurwitz, 1950; Radke and Lande, 1953; Adelson, 1953a and 1953b; Pearl, 1954; Sullivan, 1954; Clinard and Noel, 1958; Seelye and Brewer, 1970) as well as those who merely accept this relationship as a valid one (Berry, 1951; Walter, 1952; Simpson and Yinger, 1953; Bierstedt, 1957; Gregor, 1963; Rosenblatt, 1964 and Druckman, 1968). Some of those who tested the relationship will be discussed here.

Chein and Hurwitz (1950) conducted an early empirical study of Jewish identification, finding that with decreased identification, there is an increased interest in the outgroup and a desire to participate in outgroup affairs. Other studies (Radke and Lande, 1953; Adelson, 1953a and 1953b; Rinder, 1961) linked ingroup identification to authoritarianism. These studies found that those with high ingroup identification were reluctant to establish outgroup relationships. Antonovsky (1956) and Grossack (1957), the former, studying Jewish identification and the latter group belongingness among Negroes, both found that those with strong group loyalties showed negative outgroup evaluations.

Type C studies: (no consistent relationship, either positive or negative between ingroup loyalty and outgroup rejection) include those studies done by Lazerwitz (1953); Allport (1954); Fishman (1955); and Rothman (1965). Lazerwitz (1953) related Jewish identification to ingroup preference and social distance toward outgroups, and found no consistent relationship. Fishman (1955), focused on Jewish adolescents receiving various types of parochial education finding no significant differences in outgroup attitudes among these students. Rothman (1965), studied the nature of the ingroup - outgroup relationship, collecting

data from some 200 Jewish adolescents. His conclusions were rather clear-cut in support of the hypothesis of no essential relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup relatedness.

Thus, after a thorough review of the literature on the nature of the ingroup - outgroup relationship, two conclusions become evident:

- a) that whatever the relationship, its essential nature is complex, and
- b) that a measure of support can be legitimately claimed for any of the three hypotheses previously listed - that of a positive, negative, or no relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup relatedness. Therefore, a definitive substantiation of any one of them is lacking. It is hoped that the present research study will contribute in some way to a further clarification and elaboration of this complex issue.

After Sumner (1906), the next major elaboration of the concept of ethnocentrism came from the Berkeley research team - Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford in 1950. Their work culminated in the controversial book entitled: The Authoritarian Personality. This was the perspective of rigid ingroup loyalty accompanied by an equally rigid rejection of outgroups. The original E- (ethnocentrism) scale was utilized by Adorno et al., (1950) as an outgrowth of a psychoanalytically inspired investigation of anti-semitic and proto-fascist attitudes, Kirscht and Dillehay (1967). This study resulted in a major part of the concept of authoritarianism being composed of ethnocentric attitudes.

Numerous social scientists since Sumner (1906) have referred to ethnocentrism as a functional aspect of man's relation to culture (Allport, 1954; Berry, 1951; Catton, 1960-61; Gregor, 1963; Rosenblatt, 1964; Rothman, 1965; Sherif and Sherif, 1956; Simpson and Yinger, 1953;

Sullivan, 1954; Williams, 1964). Ethnocentrism may be viewed as functional to the extent that it creates, promotes and enhances group solidarity, cohesion and integration; focuses group energies and loyalties and provides rewards for loyal group members; promotes conformity to group norms, social control and discipline through the use of sanctions applied to those who deviate from group values and norms. In addition, Rosenblatt (1964) has suggested that ethnocentrism may increase group stability, decrease the likelihood of assimilation and, in general, serve to produce long-term survival of the group as an entity.

Others (Allport, 1954; Pearl, 1954; Rosenblatt, 1964; Sullivan, 1954) have attested to the psychological functionality of ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism may be functional to the extent that it satisfies many of the psychic needs of the individual as well as those of the group, including: the need to think well of oneself; needs for the familiar; needs for affiliation with something relatively unique, strong or enduring; needs for affiliation with some cause; needs to be related to something supra-individual; needs for affiliation with other individuals similar to one; the belongingness need and needs for cognitive efficiency or simplicity by categorizing outgroups (stereotyping). In addition, Pearl (1954) and Sullivan (1954) have indicated that ethnocentrism is meaningfully related to the self-concept and that it is functional for personality organization.

Ethnocentrism may be viewed as a natural product of the socialization process (Allport, 1954; MacIver and Page, 1949; Sherif, 1953; Sherif and Sherif, 1956; Simpson and Yinger, 1953; Walter, 1952 and Williams, 1964), through the internalization of group norms both toward

one's own ingroup, and toward outgroups in general.

Allport (1954: 18) pointed out the naturalness of ethnocentrism in enabling people to function effectively within a society.

Everywhere on earth we find a condition of separateness among groups. People mate with their own kind. They eat, play, reside in homogeneous clusters. They visit with their own kind, and prefer to worship together. Much of this automatic cohesion is due to nothing more than convenience. There is no need to turn to outgroups for companionship. With plenty of people on hand to choose from, why create for ourselves the trouble of adjusting to new languages, new foods, new cultures, or to people of a different educational level?

It is not that we have class prejudice, but only that we find comfort and ease in our class, or race, or religion to play, live, and eat with, and to marry.

It is not always the dominant majority that forces minority groups to remain separate. They often prefer to keep their identity, so that they need not strain to speak a foreign language or to watch their manners.

The initial fact therefore, is that human groups tend to stay apart. We need not ascribe this tendency to a gregarious instinct, to a 'consciousness of kind' or to prejudice. The fact is adequately explained by the principles of ease, least effort, congeniality, and pride in one's own culture.

Williams (1964) feels that we are all ethnocentric due to the needed anchorage that group belongingness gives to the individual, and that without such stable relationships, the individual would become insecure, anxious and uncertain of his identity. The family experience, through socialization, teaches the minority individual appropriate norms both toward his own ingroup and outgroups in general. In order to receive emotional support from the group, the individual is obliged to follow the opinions of other group members, thereby conforming to the group's norms and values. Sherif (1953), feels ethnocentrism to be natural in the sense that when group values are learned and internalized by each individual member, they become a part of his personal identity - or his self. Others, including (Allport, 1954; Simpson and Yinger, 1953;

Walter, 1953 and Williams, 1964) view the individual as socialized to the beliefs of his group, thereby judging the beliefs and actions of other groups as unnatural. Rosenblatt (1964) believes ethnocentrism is, to some extent inevitable, as an outcome of the learning of ingroup standards.

Minority group identification, in this study will follow the usage of the term, according to Rothman (1965). His usage is that of a process that is sociologically connected. Minority, or ethnic group identification is a complex, multi-dimensional concept that has not, to date, been clearly delineated in the literature. As a result, in this study an attempt will be made to develop a useful framework from which to view this concept. Unfortunately, it is not entirely satisfactory. Elmer (1954) saw the usefulness of identification as a 'social' concept --a group membership concept, where the individual internalizes the norms of the group around him and these in turn, influence his attitudes and behavior.

The perspective of reference group theory utilized here has been drawn largely from the work of Sherif (1953) and Sherif and Sherif (1956) and, secondarily, to research done by Merton and Kitt (1950) and Kuhn (1964). Following Merton and Kitt (1950), a reference group is a social group with which an individual feels identified and to which he aspires to relate his identity. A person derives from his reference groups, his norms, attitudes and values and the social objects these create. Reference group theory aims to systematize the determinants and consequences of these processes of self-appraisal and evaluation in which the individual takes the standards of others as a comparative frame of reference,

thus shaping his perception of social reality.

The reference group seems to have an 'attitude-formation' function where norms and standards of reference are internalized by the individual as parts of his ego (Sherif, 1953; Sherif and Sherif, 1956). Sherif and Sherif (1956) looking at reference groups, view intergroup behavior as primarily the matter of individual group member participation within the ingroup's "social distance scale." These relations among individuals must be standardized as norms toward outgroups before they are reflected as ingroup attitudes by the group's membership. The ingroup thus delineated becomes endowed with a host of positive qualities and individuals in the group tend to reify these qualities through the internalization of group norms. Outgroups and their individual members are then assigned either positive or negative qualities, i.e., often negative. Over time, these outgroup descriptions take their place in the repertory of group norms as a scale of "social distance" and tend to persist through the transmission of these norms to new group members.

Ethnocentrism may also possess possible dysfunctions (Levinson, 1950; Kent and Burnight, 1951; Walter, 1952; Simpson and Yinger, 1953; Allport, 1954; Sherif and Sherif, 1956; Bierstedt, 1957; Wagley and Harris, 1958; Catton, 1960-61; Rothman, 1965; Hughes, 1961; Rosenblatt, 1964; Campbell and Levine, 1965 and Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969). Levinson (1950: 147) noted that:

...It is as if an ethnocentric individual feels threatened by most of the groups to which he does not have a sense of belonging: if he cannot identify, he must oppose; if a group is not acceptable, it is 'alien'...

Both Levinson (1950) and Theodorson and Theodorson (1969) feel that the ethnocentric need for an outgroup prevents identification with a common humanity and stems from the ethnocentrists' inability to approach individuals 'as individuals' and to treat each individual only as a specimen of the reified group. Allport (1954) and Rothman (1965) feel that strong minority group identification tends to leave few communication channels open to the outside world and thus may lead individuals to exaggerate group differences and the reasons for them. Others (Walter, 1952; Simpson and Yinger, 1953 and Sherif and Sherif, 1956) view ethnocentrism as a particular manifestation of group prejudice. Catton (1960-61), saw ethnocentrism as that which frequently contributes to group conflicts when 'alien' outgroup values are perceived by the ingroup's members as a threat to the integrity of their group. Hughes (1961), saw a dysfunction of ethnocentrism when the minority group individual's think so exclusively in terms of their own group's norms and value system that they possess no set of "conceptual tools" or reference points for objectively comparing or discussing the relative merits of other groups. Sumner (1906) indicated that ingroup members use negative stereotypes to describe outgroups. This conclusion was verified by Campbell and Levine (1955) through their cross-cultural research.

In summary, ethnocentrism, in its classic sociological formulation of a rigid ingroup-outgroup pattern of social relationships, an ideology permeating all decisions, where strong ingroup loyalty is accompanied by a generalized rejection of outgroups (Adorno et al., 1950; Sumner, 1906) will not be accepted. Instead, the nature of the ingroup-outgroup relationship will be subjected to empirical verification.

The position taken here is that ingroup loyalty, may be viewed as a functional aspect of man's relation to culture, with some possible dysfunctions. This ingroup loyalty occurs as a 'natural' product of the socialization process and, through one's family and primary reference group the individual acquires and internalizes a standardized set of norms toward both his minority ingroup and toward outgroups in general. This is a culturally and socially shaped loyalty that predisposes the individual toward the familiar, toward one's own ingroup. Within any given minority group, members located at a particular level of ingroup loyalty will possess a multiplicity of different attitudes, feelings, and relationships directed toward outgroups in general and toward their own ingroup, which may include both positive and negative elements. It is quite conceivable, however, that among a group of minority individuals with a strong ingroup loyalty, some would fall into the classic ethnocentric pattern (Adorno et al., 1950; Sumner, 1906) and express varying degrees of hostility toward, and rejection of outgroups. To what degree this pattern exists and indeed, if any pattern exists at all, is the subject of this study. What Sumner (1906) and others described was a very specific response pattern that may or may not take place under certain conditions of strong ingroup loyalty.

Ingroup loyalty has been dichotomized into Jewish undergraduates' attitudes toward: a) their ethnic 'culture' and, b) their ethnic 'faith.' The above usage significantly departs from most other studies on ethnocentrism, where the inverse relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup rejection has been assumed and further, some variant of the original California E-scale has been used as the indicator of

ethnocentrism. The underlying rationale for the 'culture'-'faith' dichotomy will be outlined in the following paragraphs.

The above mentioned dichotomy stems largely from the fact that researchers (Gans, 1956a; Herberg, 1955 and Rothman, 1965) have termed Judaism a "religio-cultural complex," while Janowsky (1948) called Jews a "spiritual-cultural" group. The religious aspect alone is not entirely satisfactory as, currently, there are to be found various categories of secular adherents to the group. Jews, as compared to other 'religious' groups are considerably less observant of practices. Although this point is controversial, many experts would agree that religion is not the key and overriding factor delineating the Jewish group. A strictly religious definition of Jews, therefore, would be incomplete and somewhat misleading to those unfamiliar with the group.

Probably the most fruitful conception of the Jewish group which may be formulated with any degree of certainty is that of an ethnic collectivity, that is, a cultural group whose members share certain customs, mores and living patterns. Rothman (1965) called Judaism a "complex, intermeshed ethnological mosaic." Utilizing the concept 'culture' as this study does, inevitably subsumes certain religious elements, as it is impossible to keep these elements completely apart. Jewish ingroup loyalty connotes involvement with cultural patterns. Other factors enter into this complex picture of Jewish ingroup loyalty, but it is assumed here, for the purposes of this study, that both the 'cultural' and 'faith' elements will provide useful indices of the multidimensional phenomena of Jewish ethnic identification. Respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith' will be

measured by two, ten scale-item Osgood Semantic Differential scales.

It is not implied here that Jewish ethnic identification, being quite complex in nature, can easily be reduced to two dimensions, such as is the case in this study. However, the assumption being made here is that the nature of existence for Jewish Canadians is such that, the Jewish identified person will express ingroup loyalty feelings, in part, through positive attitudes toward both his ethnic 'culture' and 'faith.' These assumptions need to be tested empirically and the intention is to do so as the study proceeds. In summary, this writer holds that, for testing purposes, and to remain within the limited scope of this study, the dimensions of 'culture' and 'faith' used to indicate Jewish ingroup loyalty appears to offer the most generally useful approach to the problem under investigation.

A. Outgroup Evaluations

Outgroup evaluations have been measured by a Bogardus Social Distance scale.

The concept of social distance was first utilized by Simmel, (Kadushin, 1962). Bogardus first published his social distance attitude scale in 1925 and revised it in 1933. The general evaluation of the scale is still a favorable one, despite many criticisms, (Karlinsky and Peters, 1971).

Triandis and Triandis (1962) believe that considerable research on prejudice has been and is a special case of research on social distance. Sherif and Sherif (1956) view the Bogardus scale as being one of the most useful direct devices for 'tapping' the attitudes of one group toward many others. This scale has also been found to be an in-

valuable tool in the study of group conflict, (Pettigrew, 1960). Sinha and Upahyaya (1962) felt that prejudice was partly revealed in social distance responses.

But more importantly, other researchers (Campbell and Levine, 1965; Lazerwitz, 1953 and Rinder, 1953) used Bogardus' scale as an indicator of outgroup evaluations, especially for the latter two, who utilized this scale in conjunction with indices of Jewish ethnic identification. Knopfmacher and Armstrong (1963) used a Bogardus scale as their chief measure of ethnocentrism, along with four selected Likert-type items.

Further, Sherif and Sherif (1956), in their discussion of reference group theory, indicated the importance of the development of standardized group norms, viewing intergroup behavior as primarily the matter of individual group member participation within the ingroup's "social distance scale."

B. General Variables

Generation and Ethnocentrism. The relationship between these two variables is quite complex and problematic in nature, further complicated by the paucity of research that has directly studied this relationship.

Hansen (1938) first stirred interest in the sociological investigation of generation when he presented his principle of "third generation interest," namely, "what the son wishes to forget, the grandson wishes to remember."

Herberg (1955) applied Hansen's principle and indicated that it was in operation for American Protestants, Catholics and Jews. His central thesis was that the grandchildren of immigrant forebears were

returning to their ancestral religious faiths in increasing numbers.

Lenski (1961) collected data from which he was able to empirically test the Hansen-Herberg three-generation model and did not, generally, find a decline from the first to the third generation at religious services. Hence, he concluded that his data suggested a pattern of increasing religious activity with increasing "Americanization." Unfortunately, the number of Jews in Lenski's (1961) Detroit area sample was not of sufficient size to warrant any generalizations concerning generational patterns.

Gans (1956a) and Lazerwitz, and Rowitz (1964) saw a weakening of religious ties, rather than a religious revival, as the probable long-term trend for American Jews. At best, they felt, the third generation would return to a Jewish culture and religion significantly different than that of the first generation. In addition, Lazerwitz and Rowitz (1964) called into question the usefulness of the concept of generation in describing a complex interaction of factors.

Kramer and Leventman (1961) investigated the conflict resolutions of three generations of American Jews, indicating that with each generation, there develops an increasing incorporation of non-Jewish values into its resolutions, and that the further removed the generation from its immigrant forebears, the greater the access to the values of the dominant society.

Nahirny and Fishman (1965) and Fishman (1966) held that, contrary to the principle of "third generation interest," the ethnic heritage ceases to play any viable role in the life of the third generation.

Goldstein and Goldscheider (1968) analysed three generations of

American Jews and concluded that the shift in identification appears to be from Orthodox Judaism among the immigrant generation to Conservative among the second generation and some greater shift toward Reform in the third generation. Almost identical patterns appear when synagogue membership is viewed by generation. The above researchers also felt that group cohesion among Jews is relatively strong and intimately related to generational status. In viewing generational changes, Goldstein and Goldscheider (1968) feel there to be six alternatives: (1) generations show a continual decline in religiosity from the foreign-born through the third generation; (2) a gradual increase in religiosity takes place with distance from the immigrant generation; (3) the second generation declines in religiosity, but later generations increase; (4) the second generation increases in religiosity, but later generations decrease; (5) there is neither decline nor religious revival but general stability in religiosity over generations; (6) the absence of religious revival may imply neither decline nor stability but the development of different patterns of religiosity with length of stay in the country. These alternatives have not, to this date, been subjected to any systematic empirical analysis.

The only study found thus far linking generation directly to ethnocentrism was done by Frenkel-Brunswik (1952), utilizing the California E-scale as the index of ethnocentrism. She found that the majority of subjects expressing ethnocentrism has foreign-born parents.

There appears to be little agreement on how the concept of generation may be most fruitfully conceptualized. Cain (1964) and Ryder (1965) feel that the term has been, and is being abused in most studies.

Bender and Kagiwada (1968), after reviewing the literature on generation, conclude that this variable is complex and fraught with many theoretical and empirical questions remaining to be answered. Concerning what may be called the Hansen-Herberg-Lenski dialogue on generation, the above researchers have put forth as a general question:

...Who returns to what under which conditions of the possible forms and contents of these returns? Individual behavior is meant as well as the processes of returning evidenced by the religio-ethnic group, (Bender and Kagiwada, 1968:368)

Socio-economic Status and Ethnocentrism. The literature does not clearly define the nature of the relationship between the above two variables.

Levinson (1950), using the California E-scale, indicated that the group whose father's earn \$10,000 or more per year is significantly less ethnocentric than all combined lower income levels among his sample.

Frenkel-Brunswik (1950), also using the E-scale concluded that there exists a slight tendency for the lowest and highest income groups to score higher than the middle income group on ethnocentrism, while, within the latter, ethnocentrism seems to decrease as income increases. However, the general conclusion was that the relationship between any economic indices used and ethnocentrism was a tenuous one and did not warrant any definitive conclusions. This study, however, does not make use of the California E-scale, of which the reader should keep in mind. With occupation as the indicator of socio-economic status, Frenkel-Brunswik (1950: 59) stated that:

Ethnocentrism also seems more clearly related to the occupational affiliation of families than to purely economic factors. The

parents and grandparents of unprejudiced children are significantly more often from professional fields...than are ethnocentric children.

Individual ethnocentrism was not highly correlated with specific occupational groupings. No occupational group was consistently high or low for every sample. Several trends may be suggested: 1) A higher percentage of non-ethnocentric families will be found among smaller shopowners. 2) A higher percentage of ethnocentric families among the working class.

Noel (1964) feels that upper class minority persons are more likely to exhibit group disparagement than are lower class persons.

Banton (1967) reported that negative correlations have been found between social status and ethnocentrism.

College Major and Ethnocentrism. Dinin (1963) saw those Jews in search of their identity as young college intellectuals, especially those with a rationalist, empiricist type of orientation. These students have no 'truck' with organized religion of any kind.

Greenberg (1968), views college as a disaster area for Judaism because whatever the nature of the student's commitment, it tends to decline in college. He feels that the universalist, secularist, lifestyle of the campus is highly destructive of Jewish student's remaining ethnic loyalties and where Judaism is identified with the group and ethnocentrism; secularism with the universal concerns. Not surprisingly, Jewish students opt for the secular alternative. The emotional recoil of the Jewish student is intensified by the impact of the intellectual challenge of college. This researcher points to a host of academic areas--Psychology, Philosophy, Anthropology, Sociology--whose working

assumptions and research findings are contradictory to the traditional teachings of Judaism. Further, there is also, associated with the above, the powerful emotional, psychic gain of having been 'wised up' and once traditional assumptions about Judaism have been exposed or undermined, the student may tend to identify everything he has been taught earlier as 'phony' or outdated.

Fein (1968) has indicated that sufficient data on Jewish college students is not available in the necessary scope and variety. He points out the 'space - time dilemma,' i.e., the social space and the intellectual time in which the student sees himself. There has developed, he feels, among Jewish college students the belief that the values of the academic community and a high level of Jewish commitment are antithetical--that the scholar, especially in the social sciences, must divest himself of his parochial, particularistic loyalties, and Jewish identity is seen as such a loyalty. Fein (1968) notes a tension between the academic atmosphere and Jewish identity.

Frimer (1967) feels the college years correspond to a time for 'identity search' and 'conviction formation.' Ideas hitherto cherished as group traditions are now exposed to the competitive ferment and challenge of other systems of thought and commitment and, are often abandoned.

Axelrad (1970) feels that Jewish college students, generally, are not alienated from their Jewishness, but desire to 'get perspective,' to gain fresh perspective on the value systems and identifications that usually are not theirs but those of their parents and the campus atmosphere, especially the influence of social science courses and philosophy, encourage this process.

Academic Performance and Ethnocentrism. Fein (1968) noted that the conflict between the secular values of the university and a high level of commitment to Judaism appear to be clearest among the better academics. He further adds that the Jewish community is decisively middle-class, while the student ethic for many is anti-middle-class. To these students, the Jewish community presents a picture of labyrinthian complexity and silent on most issues of concern to students.

The rationale for using the independent variables academic major and academic performance is that: (a) the sample under investigation is composed entirely of college students and, (b) there is almost no research on how Jewish college students relate to, or feel about their Jewishness, therefore, these two variables served an exploratory function.

Frequency of Synagogue Attendance and Ethnocentrism. A review of available literature in this area reveals that there does exist an association between religion in general, and ethnocentrism, though the underlying dimensions of this relationship are problematic. Shinert and Ford (1958) have summarized the research in this area, focusing on (Sanford, 1944; Levinson, 1949; Adorno et. al., 1950; Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1950; Allport, 1954) and conclude that: those who reject religion and inversely, those with a religious affiliation seem to be more ethnocentric than those without such attachments. Adorno et. al., (1950) felt that subjects with religious affiliations are not, generally, ethnocentric.

In reviewing the literature on frequency of attendance at synagogue and ethnocentrism, few studies were found directly related to

these two variables. Adorno et. al., (1950) found no significant difference between those who attend often and those who seldom attend. Those who do not attend seem to score noticeably lower on ethnocentrism (as measured by the California E-scale). Kramer and Leventman (1961) indicated that for third generation Jews their religious observance has been reduced to an occasional acknowledgement of synagogue and ritual and that sentiment generally exceeds commitment. Lazerwitz and Rowitz (1964) conclude that evidence points to a decline in synagogue attendance from generation to generation. Goldstein and Goldscheider (1968) found a regular pattern of decline in synagogue attendance of one week or more with distance from the immigrant generation and that among third generation Jews there appears to be a greater homogeneity toward less regular synagogue attendance. However, caution should be exercised in interpreting frequency of synagogue attendance because many rituals of Judaism are carried out in the home.

CHAPTER II

A BRIEF SOCIAL HISTORY OF JEWISH SETTLEMENT

The persecution of Jews in Eastern Europe was, to a great extent, responsible for the growth of the Winnipeg and Manitoba Jewish community. Large numbers of Jewish immigrants arrived in Winnipeg following periods of severe persecution. In 1882, it was pogroms in Russia, in the 1890's, persecution in Rumania and, in 1905, oppression in Czarist Russia.

TABLE 1

THE NUMERICAL DISTRIBUTION AND DENSITY OF THE JEWISH POPULATION OF
WINNIPEG, 1881 - 1961^a

Date	Total Population	Jewish Population	Per cent Jews to Total
1881	7,985	21	0.3
1891	25,639	645	2.5
1901	42,290	1,156	2.7
1911	136,035	9,023	6.3
1921	179,087	14,449	8.1
1931	294,162	17,663	6.0
1941	302,024	17,453	5.8
1951	354,069	18,514	5.2
1961	475,989	19,376	4.1

^aRosenberg, Louis, "A Study of the Growth and Changes in the Distribution of the Jewish Population of Winnipeg, 1961. Canadian Jewish Population Studies, Canadian Jewish Community Series, Volume 2 Number 1. Montreal: Canadian Jewish Congress, p.4

As seen in Table 1, the greatest immigration period of Jews to Winnipeg took place between 1901 and 1931 where the Jewish population increased by more than 16,000. The period 1901 - 1911 saw the Jewish

population increase by in excess of 7800, while the increases for the periods 1911 - 1921, and 1921 - 1931, were 5400 and 3200 respectively. The small rate of increase in the Winnipeg Jewish population from 1941 - 1961 can be attributed mainly to the fact that the majority of Jewish immigrants who have made Canada their home after World War II have settled in Montreal and Toronto, where employment opportunities, housing and Jewish community facilities were more attractive to new arrivals in Canada, (Rosenberg, 1961: 6).

A. SETTLEMENT

1. Early Period (Before 1880)

Prior to 1880, there were few Jews in Winnipeg. These people were engaged in the fur trade to St. Paul, Minnesota. In the 1870's, there were several pedlars operating out of Winnipeg, selling various goods to settlers and railway workers across the province (Chiel, 1961).

The reasons for the subsequent coming of the Jews to the Canadian prairies are not altogether clear, but it may be assumed with some accuracy that a small number followed the railway construction and carried on business with the railway workers, when the railhead finally reached Winnipeg, some Jews decided to settle here and carried on their trade, (Herstein, 1964).

Fur dealers were largely from Alsace-Lorraine, while the pedlars were of both German and East European origin. The German Jews followed Reform Judaism, which originated in Germany in 1810 as a means of modernizing traditional orthodox services, (Segal, 1955). These early settlers were anxious to integrate themselves into their new country

and desired to rid themselves of any "foreignness," which proved to be largely unsuccessful.

During 1880 and 1881 a number of Jews arrived with their families, some to Winnipeg, others elsewhere in Manitoba. The Manitoba Census of 1881 indicates that there were thirty-three Jewish families in the province, twenty-one in Winnipeg and twelve scattered throughout other communities. Together with their family members they constituted a total Jewish population of approximately one hundred, (Chiel, 1961).

In actual fact, the permanent Jewish community in Manitoba had its beginnings in 1877 when Edmond Coblentz was the first member of his family to arrive in Manitoba and the first Jew to settle here permanently, (Chiel, 1961).

2. Russian - Jewish Immigration Period (1880 - 1905)

Pogroms on Jews in Russia in 1881 and 1882 were Czarism's response to the revolutionary movement which climaxed in the assassination of Alexander II in 1881, (Herstein, 1964). Russian Jews engaged in a mass exodus and spread into Western Europe, with many finding their way to London, where the already large and established Jewish community responded to their plight by establishing a special committee to care for the refugees and assist them in migrating to North America. It is interesting to note that these Russian pogroms coincided with the opening of the Canadian West for settlement.

In May, 1882 twenty-three Jewish immigrants reached Winnipeg, and they were followed by an additional two-hundred and forty-seven on June 1, 1882. On June 10, 1882, a further seventy immigrants arrived, making three hundred and forty in all, (Chiel, 1961). These Russian

Jews brought with them a tradition of Zionism (a movement for colonization in Palestine and formation of a national Jewish home there), socialism, anarchism and orthodoxy. These new immigrants were deeply-rooted in Jewish cultural and social values, which left their mark on all aspects of Jewish life. The moral force that accompanied them was orthodox worship and their immediate priorities were the establishment of a synagogue, cemetery, and a place of assembly to meet with their friends. These immigrants established the Hebrew Cemetery of Winnipeg --the first Jewish cemetery in the city, (Chiel, 1961).

Their first synagogue, Beth El, was a rented hall. Soon another synagogue, Anshey Sephard Anshy Russia, was started by the orthodox group, who quarrelled with Beth El's membership, (Herstein, 1964). A split took place again and the Dairy Synagogue was established. In 1883, the orthodox group founded the B'Nai Israel Congregation and the Reformed, Beth El, (Herstein, 1964). A cornerstone for the Shaarey Zedek Synagogue was laid on September 3, 1889. In 1893, the B'nai Israel united with several smaller synagogues and built the Rosh Pina Synagogue. This congregation, traditional and orthodox, appealed to a large group of Jews, especially to the new immigrants, (Herstein, 1964). In 1904, the Holy Blossom Congregation was formed and later renamed Shaarey Shomayim Congregation. Meanwhile, orthodox Jews built a large synagogue, Beth Jacob, in 1904 in the North-end of the city to accommodate the Jewish population which moved northward to the area immediately North of the Canadian Pacific Railway's main line, (Herstein, 1964).

3. 1905 Onward

TABLE 2

SYNAGOGUES ESTABLISHED IN WINNIPEG SINCE THE BEGINNING OF THE JEWISH
COMMUNITY^a

Synagogue	Year Established
Beth El	b
Dairy Synagogue	b
Anshey Sephard Anshey Russia	b
Stable Synagogue	b
B'nai Israel	1883
Beth El	1884
Beth El of Israel	1887
Shaarey Zedek	1890
B'nai Israel	1890
Rosh Pina	1893
Holy Blossom	1904
Beth Jacob	1904
B'nai Abraham - Schultz St.	1906
B'nai Zion - Charles St.	1906
Shaarey Shomayim	1907
Adas Yeshurun - McGregor St.	1907
Kildonan Synagogue - Lillian Ave.	1912
Shaarey Zedek	1913
Tifferes Israel - Powers St.	1913
Tifferes Israel - Manitoba Ave. ^c	1913
Chevra Mishnayos - Stella Ave.	1913
Synagogue - Newton Ave.	1915
Shaarey Zion - Aikins St.	1917
Alteres Israel - Magnus Ave. ^c	1919
Lubavitcher - Magnus Ave.	1922
Fort Rouge Hebrew Congregation - Nassau St.	1922
Ashkenazi Synagogue - Burrows Ave. ^c	1930
Beth Judah	1932
Shaarey Zedek - Wellington Crescent ^c	1950
Rosh Pina - Matheson Ave. ^c	1951
Adas Yeshurun (Herzlia) Synagogue - Brock & Corydon ^c	1955
B'nai Abraham - Enskillen Ave. ^c	1958
Chevra Mishnayos - Jefferson Ave. ^c	1963

^aAdapted from Herstein (1964:180) and Chiel (1961:87)

^bDates not available

^cThose synagogues in existence today

Events in Russia between 1904-05 such as the Russo-Japanese War, revolution, counter-revolution and pogroms set off another wave of mass emigration similar to the one of 1882. Many of these Russian Jews had already received reports about life in Canada from kin and friends and as a result, many of these refugees came to Canada and a number found their way to Winnipeg.

In the period 1905-21* Canadian immigration laws were such that there was a steady flow of immigration from Eastern Europe. There was practically no immigration between 1914-18* because of the war. However, with the end of World War I and the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia (1917-19), conditions for Jews continued to be anti-Semitic.

From 1917-21*, despite the fact that the Revolution changed the Russian government, Jews were subjected to the same degrading conditions that caused previous mass immigrations to Canada. In sum, despite the ideology that the new Communist government proclaimed, the mass of Russian people were still virulently anti-Semitic.

Another contributory factor to immigration to Canada was that Jews lived in a relatively small area in Russia called the "Pale"* (which was that area designated by the government where Jews were allowed to live). Poland was also included in this area of the Pale due to extensive boundary changes over the years.

From 1921-24*, Canadian Immigration laws worked to hold down Russian immigration. Some Jews, however, did arrive from Russia during the period 1921-31.

*interview exerpt

From 1931-45* almost the only kind of immigration that took place were certain German Jews who had enough money and were sponsored by kin or friends in Winnipeg.

From 1945-52* it is estimated that approximately 1,000 Jews, survivors of the Nazi holocaust in Europe, came from refugee camps and made their way to Winnipeg, again through kinship ties and friends.

Religious Institutions

The orthodox element of the recent arrivals strengthened Jewish religious life. In 1907, the orthodox congregation, Beth Jacob, brought into Winnipeg the first ordained Rabbi, who soon became the Chief Rabbi of Winnipeg. In 1913, the Shaarey Zedek and Shaarey Shomayim, ideologically akin, merged and became the Shaarey Zedek, (Herstein, 1964).

As the Jewish population grew a number of smaller congregations were established, located in the North-end of Winnipeg. These were orthodox and catered to members of their own generation. The rigidity of orthodoxy allowed no flexibility for adaptation to changing conditions and existed in conflict with the outside stream of life to which their children were exposed. In time, death thinned their ranks and many of these synagogues ceased to exist. Of the fifteen orthodox synagogues founded between 1906 and 1932, only seven remain today, (Chiel, 1961).

As older synagogues went out of existence, others, located in newer sections of the city were established. In the North-end, the center of concentration of Winnipeg's Jewish population moved steadily

*interview excerpt

northward, and with each successive move, synagogues were established in the new neighbourhoods. The last synagogue to be established in North Winnipeg was the Rosh Pina, completed in 1951, (Chiel, 1961). The Jewish population of West Kildonan has grown steadily and the B'nai Abraham Congregation was established in 1958. The last synagogue established in Winnipeg was the Chevra Mishnayos in the Garden City area of West Kildonan in 1963.

The South-end Jewish community in River Heights and Tuxedo, especially River Heights, has experienced a rapid growth similar to that of West Kildonan and, a new synagogue, Shaarey Zedek was established in 1950. The last River Heights synagogue built was the Adas Yeshurun, i.e., the Herzlia, in 1955, (Herstein, 1964).

Communal Institutions

The deep-rooted traditions of the Russian Jews brought forth a plethora of different organizations and associations. East European Jews brought with them traditions of community self-help and were instrumental in the development of benevolent societies, (Herstein, 1964). When mass immigration was at its peak, these societies were the most important units of community organization, (Herstein, 1964:25). Organizations were established such as the Hebrew Sick Benefit Society (1906); Young Men's Hebrew Association (1919); North-End Relief Society (1911); the Hebrew Progressive Aid Society (1914) and the Free Jewish Dispensary (1915).

World War I created additional needs to be looked after by charity and Winnipeg Jews participated in, and contributed to, the Patriotic

Fund, which looked after relatives left behind by servicemen. In addition, Jews assumed the obligation of helping the oppressed, needy Jews in Europe who were uprooted by the war, (Herstein, 1964).

The year 1915 was a time of consolidation of Jewish organizations. The United Relief of Winnipeg resulted from the union of the two rival charity institutions--the North-End Relief Society and the United Hebrew Charities, (Herstein, 1964). It was in existence until 1937, when it was absorbed by the all-embracing Jewish Welfare Fund, an organization that introduced fund-raising on a federated basis, and allocated money for various institutions and causes, (Herstein, 1964). The Jewish Welfare Fund operates on much the same basis today, eliminating a multiplicity of financial campaigns, duplications and waste and co-ordinating many different institutions and organizations.

It was also in 1915 that Winnipeg Jewry vigorously pursued the creation of a Jewish Congress to represent all Jews, and this same year saw the beginning of the democratically elected Canadian Jewish Congress, which came into being in 1919, (Herstein, 1964:31-32). The Canadian Jewish Congress has its headquarters in Montreal, with branches in many Canadian cities and plays a very active role in the Winnipeg Jewish community.

An important welfare concern of the Jewish community was the care of the aged. Old Folks' Homes for Jews were established in 1912 and 1919 and the present modern building was constructed in 1940 and has been renovated and enlarged in recent years--Sharon Home For the Aged, (Herstein, 1964).

Medical care for poor Jews was of paramount concern to the Jewish

community. In 1926 a free clinic, on a modest scale, was established. But the need for an adequate free clinic and dispensary was so great that funds were raised and a building constructed in 1929, marking the beginning of the Mount Carmel Clinic, (Herstein, 1964). The clinic is still very much in operation today and provides free medical care and some prescriptions for needy Jews and non-Jews.

Jewish Social Welfare Organizations* started from a tradition of Jews helping other Jews and changed in form over the years to correspond with the changes that occurred as a result of the acculturation of second generation Jews. In the early 1940's, Winnipeg Jews, along with their American counterparts became aware of the need for a re-definition of goals. This was in direct response to the knowledge that genocide was taking place in Europe, although this was not generally acknowledged by either the Canadian, American or British governments. This resulted in a decision to establish the kind of organization that would embrace the needs of local Jews as well as the needs of European Jews and was called, Overseas Needs. Re-organization took place and an "umbrella" organization was established to raise funds and began as the Jewish Welfare Fund. This organization originally looked after the funding for other local Jewish agencies and educational institutions. The Jewish Welfare Fund is still in existence today. However, at present, the largest community organization, embracing all local needs, raising money for Israel and overseas needs, is the Combined Jewish Appeal.

B. RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION

By segregation, this writer means the ecological process involv-

*interview exerpt

ing the voluntary or involuntary separation of residence areas on the basis of race, religion, or ethnic characteristics--the clustering together of people with similar characteristics in residential areas, (Gist and Fava, 1956 and Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969). According to Darroch and Marston (1969:71):

Residential segregation is a key aspect of the social organization of the city. The spatial distance between social groups (such as ethnic groups or social classes) is not only a manifestation of urban social structure but, as a form of differentiation itself, directly affects the nature of social interaction and exchange...

On the basis of Winnipeg census research (Driedger and Church, 1972) there was evidence for both the 1951 and 1961 Canada Census for Winnipeg that, Jews in the metropolitan area were concentrated in three distinct areas--the North End (census tracts 1-12), West Kildonan (census tracts 72, 73 and 74) and, River Heights (census tract 48).

It should be noted that only a very crude descriptive analysis of segregation and ethnic concentration will be presented here and the discussion is intended only to provide the reader with an indication of the influence of the close social environment present as a direct result of these three areas of segregation.

Looking at Tables 3 and 4, it may be readily seen that substantial changes have occurred in the concentrations of Winnipeg Jews from the 1951 to the 1961 census periods, although the Jewish population has only increased by approximately thirteen hundred. In this ten year period, Jews have steadily moved out of older housing areas located in the North End to newer residential areas not yet developed in 1951. In 1951, 68 per cent of Winnipeg's Jews resided in the North End of the

city as compared to 34 per cent in 1961. West Kildonan, in 1951 contained only 12 per cent of the Jews in Winnipeg, while in 1961 this has increased to 32 per cent. For River Heights in 1951, only 1 per cent of Winnipeg's Jews lived in this area as compared to 17 per cent in 1961.

Viewing these concentrations by census tracts, the North End in 1951 contained 19 per cent of Winnipeg Jews, while in 1961 this figure dropped to 9 per cent. For West Kildonan in 1951, Jews comprised 20 per cent of the census tract population whereas in 1961 they made up 30.5 per cent. River Heights, on the other hand, reflected a census tract population of Jews in 1951 of 21 per cent, as compared to 28 per cent for 1961.

Since the 1951 census, a new residential area, Garden City (part of West Kildonan), with some very high middle and upper class socio-economic status areas will, in all likelihood, for the 1971 census reflect still higher concentrations of Jews in the West Kildonan area.

Tuxedo, a high socio-economic status area (adjacent to River Heights) has seen a considerable amount of expansion since the 1961 census. This area had, for many years been "closed" to Jews and, recently, many Jews have been moving to this area. This area will likely reflect a considerable concentration of Jews for the 1971 census.

It will certainly be of interest to see what patterns of segregation for both Garden City and Tuxedo emerge for the 1971 census. Until the new census becomes available, however, the above statements about these two areas should be interpreted cautiously.

TABLE 3

CONCENTRATIONS OF WINNIPEG JEWS FOR THE NORTH END, WEST KILDONAN AND RIVER HEIGHTS FOR THE CANADA
CENSUS, 1951 AND 1961^a

1951 NORTH END				1961 NORTH END		
Census Tract	Jewish Population	Total Census Tract Population	Percent Jews by Census Tract	Jewish Population	Census Tract Population	Percent Jews by Census Tract
1	10	3032	-	77	6972	1.1
2	22	1358	1.6	185	4291	4.3
3	18	7004	-	29	7399	-
4	21	3699	-	10	3495	-
5	1460	8972	16.2	389	8904	4.3
6	1813	9364	19.4	672	9200	7.3
7	1483	6333	23.4	1170	6466	18.1
8	1394	3236	43.1	920	3262	28.2
9	1821	3962	45.9	892	4218	21.1
10	1650	6010	27.4	421	5796	7.3
11	40	2169	1.8	9	1688	-
12	403	3931	10.2	237	3857	6.1
13	2254	5129	43.9	1527	5364	28.5
Totals	12839	64199	19.3	6536	70912	9.2
1951 WEST KILDONAN				1961 WEST KILDONAN		
72	15	594	2.5	1599	4894	32.6
73	1500	6628	22.6	3715	10969	33.8
74	626	3532	17.7	819	4214	19.4
Totals	2141	10754	19.9	6133	20077	30.5
1951 RIVER HEIGHTS				1961 RIVER HEIGHTS		
48	238	1149	20.7	3265	11485	28.4

^aCensuses of Canada

TABLE 4

PER CENT COMPOSITION OF JEWS FOR THE NORTH END, WEST KILDONAN AND RIVER HEIGHTS FOR THE 1951 AND 1961 CANADA CENSUS, WINNIPEG^a

Census Areas	1951 Census	1961 Census
	Per cent	Per cent
North End	68.4	33.7
West Kildonan	11.8	31.6
River Heights	1.3	16.8
Totals	81.5	82.1

^aCensuses of Canada

C. PAROCHIAL EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE

The new immigrants were keenly interested in a Jewish education for their children. Free public schools did not constitute a threat but rather a "boon," representing equal educational opportunities which they had not received in their native Poland and Russia. Those who could afford the fees engaged a private Hebrew instructor, a "melamed," or sent their children to a private school or "cheder" for basic religious instruction, (Herstein, 1964). These, however, proved to be inadequate for the growing needs and ideologically divergent factions within the growing Jewish community. The first Jewish school, was established in 1884 and began with an enrolment of twelve students, (Chiel, 1961:94), with Yiddish being the language of instruction. Meanwhile, another religious school had been opened by the English-speaking leaders of Beth El congregation. Although there were less than five hundred Jewish residents in Winnipeg, two completely differing school systems had been established. This proved to be a foreshadowing of future schisms in the community over

the proper form and curriculum that Jewish education in Winnipeg should follow.

A Hebrew school was established by the Shaarey Zedek Synagogue as early as 1891. In time, Hebrew Religious Schools, Yiddish Progressive Schools, Yiddish Socialist Schools, and Congregational Schools were founded--each reflecting a definite ideology of the members of its sponsoring groups, (Herstein, 1964).

Since its inception, Winnipeg's Jewish community has been characterized by numerous disagreements. Differences existed between wealthier "old timers" and poorer "greenhorns," Ashkenazic and Sephardic, religious orthodox and religious "modernists," religious and non-religious or anti-religious, Zionists and non-Zionists or anti-Zionists, Hebraists and Yiddishists, Socialists and Communists, Stalinists and Trotskyites. These differences were, over time, reflected in the various programmes adopted by the Jewish schools. However, despite these many splits, the Winnipeg Jewish community has managed to retain a well-organized structure and built many fine educational institutions, (Herstein, 1964:3).

1. Hebrew¹ Religious Schools

These are Jewish schools where the language of instruction is

¹ Hebrew has been the language of the Jewish people since ancient times. After the destruction of the second temple (70 A.D.) Hebrew remained the language of liturgy and the literature. In the diaspora (the distribution of the twelve tribes of Israel), Jews developed vernacular languages and all of these are written and printed in Hebrew characters.

Throughout history, the knowledge of Hebrew has always been an essential requirement of Jewish education--the study of the Bible in the original and a good reading knowledge of the Hebrew prayers. For many centuries, Hebrew was mainly used for literary purposes and as the language of worship. Hebrew was the important link that held the Jewish people together for the many centuries of their difficult existence in the diaspora. Hebrew is now the language of the state of Israel, (Herstein, 1964:45-56).

Hebrew, or in which stress is laid upon Hebrew. Religious studies form the basis of the curriculum of these schools.

Talmud Torah

Jewish immigrants of the pre-1882 era sent their children to public schools where no Yiddish or Hebrew could be learned. The Russian Jews who came after 1882 were deeply committed to a Jewish education to supplement the secular studies of the public schools. In 1883, Beth El congregation established a Sabbath School, (Herstein, 1964). Economic conditions prevented many orthodox parents from giving their children Hebrew instruction and great numbers of children received no parochial education. To alleviate this vacuum, the Shaarey Zedek Hebrew School was established in 1891, but soon ceased to function.

The influx of new immigrants from Rumania in the late 1890's increased the Winnipeg Jewish population and added additional children who received no parochial education. Leaders set themselves the task of establishing a Talmud Torah, to be a communal institution where no one would be barred because of inability to pay tuition fees, (Herstein, 1964). A school was started in 1891 and named the King Edward School, where the curriculum was strongly orthodox, (Herstein, 1964). However, the Zionists and Orthodox quarrelled and the school closed within a short period of its opening. Also, the population had shifted out of this area to the North-end of the city about this time, (Herstein, 1964).

In 1906, the Zionists started the B'nai Zion Synagogue with a Hebrew school. Soon enrolment became too large and in 1907 it offered to share Hebrew education with the entire community and the Winnipeg Free School--Talmud Torah was established, (Herstein, 1964). It had a

curriculum of religious Hebrew education. In 1913 a larger building was constructed and a Board of Education established to arbitrate any disputes that may arise. In 1913 a branch of the school was started for those living north of the central school in the Adas Yeshurun Synagogue, and in 1918, 1920 and 1921 additional branches were opened in several areas throughout the city, (Herstein, 1964). New structures were opened again in 1923 and 1925. A new building to accommodate the needs of North Winnipeg and West Kildonan was built in 1954 and is still in operation today.

Herzlia Academy

The Jewish population in River Heights continued to increase and there was a great need to establish Jewish schools for their children. Parents favoring a Progressive Yiddish Education started, in 1953 a branch of the Peretz School--The River Heights School for Jewish Children, (Herstein, 1964). Also, some sixty-five children attended a branch of the Talmud Torah opened in River Heights. In 1954 a merger of the two schools took place, and the Herzlia Academy was established with a Hebrew curriculum. This school has now amalgamated with the Shaarey Zedek Religious School and only operates a night school, (Herstein, 1964: 92).

Joseph Wolinsky Collegiate

In 1959, another building was added to the Talmud Torah--this was the home of the Joseph Wolinsky Collegiate, which operates as the high school section of the Talmud Torah. In addition to Hebrew studies, its English section carries on the regular high school curriculum. The

students attending this school, therefore, must do well enough in their studies to handle a double course load. Graduates of this school can enter Jewish Theological Seminaries or become Hebrew teachers, (Herstein, 1964).

Maimonides College

This is an institution of advanced Hebrew studies established in 1950. It is a four year course, on a high school level, carried out in Hebrew, (Herstein, 1964). Upon completion, graduates may enter either the teaching profession or a Jewish Theological Seminary.

2. Yiddish² Progressive Schools

These were schools where the language of instruction was Yiddish. These schools were, generally, secular, nationalist and socialist in ideology. Since Yiddish was the language of the Jewish masses, Yiddish was to be used to spread the socialist message. The influx of Jewish immigrants to Winnipeg between 1905 and 1910 brought youths who were socialists with a revolutionary outlook on the world and Jewish problems, (Herstein, 1964). The National Radical School was opened in 1914, and re-named the I.L. Peretz School in 1915, (Herstein, 1964). The curriculum was secular and carried out in Yiddish. In 1930, a few unhappy teachers left the Peretz School and established their own school, the Folk School, where equal time was to be devoted to Hebrew and Zionists

²Yiddish is believed to date back to the tenth or eleventh century. It was the language of Jews in the German provinces of the Rhineland who spoke a local German dialect intermingled with Hebrew expressions. When Jews settled in Poland, the Ukraine and other East European countries, many slavic words were adopted and included in the language. This mixture of languages, printed and written in Hebrew characters, became the vernacular of Jews in the Western world, (Herstein, 1964:46).

principles. This school carried on until 1944, when it re-united with the Peretz School under the new name of the I.L. Peretz Folk School, (Herstein, 1964). The enrolment of the school has steadily dropped and a few years ago, the building on Aikins in the North-end was vacated and a smaller school was established in Garden City, the Peretz School.

3. Yiddish Socialist Schools

A splinter group who broke away from the Radical School in 1917 organized the Liberty Temple Association, inaugurating the Workers' Forum, (Herstein, 1964). This group was very much influenced by the Russian Revolution and its support came from the radical Jewish working masses who were not satisfied with the current Jewish educational services. A school was opened in 1916 but soon closed. In 1917 another school opened but it was closed within a year. The Arbeiter Ring School opened its doors in 1921 to be supported by class-conscious socialist working men, (Herstein, 1964). Dissention arose and the school's name was changed to Arbeiter Ring Liberty Temple School. In 1937 it was forced to close, (Herstein, 1964:124-125).

When the Arbeiter Ring withdrew from the Arbeiter Ring Liberty Temple School, leftists assumed control, injected Marxian interpretations and re-named the school Liberty Temple School. In 1940 its name was changed to Sholem Aleichem School, (Herstein, 1964). There was much anti-Communist feeling directed by the Jewish community toward this school and the school ceased to function in 1963, after its funds were cut off by the Jewish Welfare Fund, (Herstein, 1964:130).

4. Congregational Schools

These are Jewish schools, similar to the Hebrew Religious schools,

but are operated through individual synagogue congregations usually, primarily for the children of members.

The Shaarey Zedek Congregation was the first to devote itself to Jewish education in Winnipeg, but gave this up when the Talmud Torah was established. Classes were begun after the completion of the new Shaarey Zedek Sunagogue in 1950. Enrolment soon increased to the point that a new school building, separate from the synagogue was established and is still in operation today. After the Rosh Pina Synagogue was built in 1952 a Hebrew school was started, the Rosh Pina Hebrew School was started and is still in operation today.

TABLE 5
THE CURRENT ENROLMENTS FOR WINNIPEG JEWISH SCHOOLS, 1972^a

School	Pupils	Teachers	
		English	Hebrew
Talmud Torah	640	30	30
Peretz School	250	7	8
Rosh Pina Hebrew School	140	-	8
Herzlia ^b	120	-	9
Ramah School ^c	418	11	11
Totals	1568	48	66

^aData obtained from personal conversations with officials from each of the above schools.

^bHerzlia operates a night school only.

^cRepresents Shaarey Zedek Hebrew School

D. ENDOGAMY

This refers to the custom requiring marriage within one's own

group. This has always been a vitally important mechanism employed by Jews to avoid the assimilation of the group. The rate of endogamy will provide an indication of to what degree members of the group are still bound to the group's cultural heritage and social networks. As seen in Table 6, the data reported by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism 4, 1969 indicated that the rate of male and female endogamy for Manitoba's Jews in 1961 was significantly higher than for any of the other groups listed. This rate for Jewish males and females was 92.8 per cent and 96.8 per cent, respectively, indicating that extensive social networks are very much in operation within the Winnipeg Jewish community.

TABLE 6

THE DECREASING RATE OF MALE AND FEMALE ENDOGAMY AS A PER CENT FOR
MANITOBA, 1961^a

MALE			FEMALE		
Rank	Group	Per cent	Rank	Group	Per cent
1	Jewish	92.8	1	Jewish	96.8
2	British	77.4	2	British	79.1
3	Dutch	72.9	3	Asiatic	78.8
4	Asiatic	70.6	4	Dutch	74.1
5	Ukrainian	68.7	5	Ukrainian	65.4
6	German	63.4	6	Italian	62.9
7	French	62.9	7	German	61.7
8	Italian	57.8	8	French	58.3
9	Other European	50.4	9	Other European	53.6
10	Russian	46.9	10	Russian	47.7
11	Polish	44.6	11	Polish	45.4
12	Scandinavian	35.3	12	Scandinavian	34.6

^aRoyal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism 4, 1969. Ottawa: Queen's Printer, p. 295.

E. MASS MEDIA (NEWSPAPERS)

Jews have always been a highly literate people, interested in analysing and interpreting events. Manitoba's Jews decided quite early that they should have a press of their own. There existed a very real need for a Yiddish newspaper in Manitoba to provide information about news in the Jewish world, and for the interpretation of world events and local news in order to forge a communication link with the old world, to guide, to interpret, to exhort and to teach; (Chiel, 1961: 123).

The first newspaper to appear was the Echo in 1906, which operated for only a few months, (Chiel, 1961). The next venture was undertaken in 1910 when the Jewish socialists of Winnipeg began the Winnipeg Courier, a pamphlet containing socialist-oriented articles and carrying on political campaigns for socialist candidates. Liberal supporters, at the same time, published a Yiddish pamphlet entitled the Free Voice, (Herstein, 1964). At the conclusion of this political campaign both these publications ceased to exist.

The next newspaper to appear on the Winnipeg scene was the Canadian Israelite in 1910, (Chiel, 1961). It was converted in 1914 from a weekly to a daily, and at this time, was the only Yiddish daily in Canada. The name of the paper was changed to the Israelite Press in 1954, (Chiel, 1961). This newspaper had a powerful influence in moulding Jewish opinion in Manitoba and Western Canada and spoke out boldly, always strongly advocating Jewish rights and came to be accepted as representative of Jewish opinion by both local and national leaders, (Chiel, 1961). In 1920, the editors of the Canadian Israelite decided

to issue an Anglo-Jewish weekly, the Guardian, but after six months it was decided to concentrate exclusively on the Yiddish language.

However, there was an ever growing number of Jews who had grown up in Canada and who read English more fluently than they did Yiddish, and an eager readership existed for a new Anglo-Jewish publication, (Chiel, 1961). In 1927 another Anglo-Jewish weekly, the Western Jewish News was established. This newspaper, along with the Israelite Press, have maintained fairly good circulations and interested readers in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Winnipeg, which contains virtually all of Manitoba's Jewish population, has maintained and continues to maintain a dynamic Jewish cultural and community life. The Jewish community has been strong in its Jewish affiliations and secure in its relationship to the non-Jewish world. It was largely the Eastern European Jews, through their numerical supremacy, that provided the tremendous enthusiasm and influence that made them the dominant immigrant group in Manitoba, (Chiel, 1961). These Jews determined the direction in which the Jewish community was to take and is taking to this day. Most of these immigrants were deeply-rooted in Jewish life and they transplanted these traditions to their new Canadian homes.

Manitoba's multi-ethnic population (French-Canadian, Icelandic, Mennonite, Ukrainian, Polish, etc.), who were permitted to maintain their religious and cultural traditions and established their own parochial schools, served as a clear example to Manitoba's Jews, who were also encouraged to preserve their own ethnic heritage.

Today, a large majority of the adult Jewish community are Canadian-

born. By and large, these people identify positively with Jewish life and have continued to support the many Jewish institutions created by their parents and grandparents. There is much coordinated activity in today's Jewish community in contrast to the great zeal and enthusiasm of the early East European immigrants, but community effort and involvement is still at a high level.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Population and Sample

The population consisted of all full or part-time Jewish undergraduate students attending day classes at The University of Manitoba, Forth Garry campus (including University College, St. John's College or St. Paul's College). Only those students in years I, II, and III of the academic program were included in the population.

The sample of Jewish undergraduate students used in this study were taken from the larger University of Manitoba Ethnic Survey sample (N= 1560) collected by the Ethnic Identity Research Team during the 1970-71 academic session (Driedger, 1971). The sample consisted of all undergraduate students attending classes in slots eleven and twelve. These slots were randomly selected.

A total of 114 questionnaires were returned by undergraduate students of Jewish background. Two of these were rejected because of inadequate completion, leaving a final sample size of 112.

Of the usable questionnaires, the largest majority were completed under classroom administration, while a small number were taken home by students, completed and returned to the classroom.

Instrument

The instrument utilized was a seven part, forty minute structured questionnaire. The questionnaire (see Appendix I) was designed by the Driedger Ethnic Identity Research Team to obtain information on the respondents' evaluations of their own and other ethnic and religious groups.

The questionnaires were administered to undergraduate students attending day classes at The University of Manitoba during the 1970-71 academic session. In all cases, students were notified that participation in the Ethnic Survey was of a strictly voluntary nature and that all data collected would be treated confidentially.

The questionnaires were administered in one of two ways: 1) Classroom--where a member of the Research Team administered questionnaires during a regular classroom period, giving necessary instructions, and collecting completed questionnaires at the conclusion of the period, 2) Take home--questionnaires were distributed with an attached cover letter containing detailed instructions and collected during the next scheduled classroom meeting (in those cases where it was not possible to use a classroom administration procedure) such as Introductory Biology and Psychology classes, where television lectures were taking place.

The parts of the questionnaire used for this study included: 1) a Personal Inventory Scale (Part I), 2) a modified Bogardus Social Distance Scale (Part II) and, 3) two sets of Osgood Semantic Differential scales (Part VI), using the concepts 'culture' and 'faith' (see Appendix I).

Hypotheses

On the basis of the literature review, the writer developed fifteen hypotheses. The first hypothesis deals with the major aspect of this study, the over-all association between Jewish ingroup loyalty, as measured by the respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith,' and outgroup evaluations, as measured by social distance responses toward twenty selected outgroups. The next two hypotheses

deal with 'culture' and 'faith,' and the associations of each with out-group evaluations. The next two hypotheses look at two separate aspects of the relationship between the two elements of ingroup loyalty--'culture' and 'faith.' The next five hypotheses reflect on the relationship between the variables: generation Canadian, socio-economic status, academic major, academic performance, frequency of attendance at synagogue and 'culture' and 'faith.' The next hypothesis deals with the association between the variables frequency of attendance at synagogue and generation Canadian. The last four hypotheses deal with selected aspects of Jewish respondents' social distance rankings and evaluations. A separate discussion of each of the variables utilized in this study will follow later.

- Hypothesis 1 Jewish undergraduate students will show no consistent relationship (either positive or negative) between ingroup loyalty and outgroup evaluations.
- Hypothesis 2 Jewish undergraduate students will evaluate their ethnic 'culture' positively while manifesting negative outgroup evaluations.
- Hypothesis 3 Jewish undergraduate students will show no consistent relationship between their 'faith' orientations and their outgroup evaluations.
- Hypothesis 4 Jewish undergraduate students will indicate a negative relationship between the two elements of ingroup loyalty ('culture' and 'faith').
- Hypothesis 5 For Jewish undergraduates, 'culture' will elicit consistently positive responses whereas, 'faith,' will be evaluated in a more negative manner.
- Hypothesis 6 First generation Canadian Jewish students will show positive attitudes toward both their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith,' while third generation Jewish students will evaluate their ethnic 'culture' positively and their 'faith' negatively.
- Hypothesis 7 The frequency of attendance at synagogue will be lower

for the third generation than for either the first or second generation among Jewish undergraduate students.

- Hypothesis 8 Jewish undergraduate students coming from low socio-economic status families will manifest positive attitudes toward both their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith,' in contrast to those students from high socio-economic status families, while those students in the middle category of socio-economic status will evaluate their ethnic 'culture' positively while showing negative 'faith' evaluations.
- Hypothesis 9 Jewish undergraduates in their first year (no declared major) will show positive attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and negative evaluations of their ethnic 'faith,' while students with Social Sciences - Humanities majors will manifest negative attitudes toward both their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith' in contrast to those students with a 'Professional' type of course orientation.
- Hypothesis 10 Jewish undergraduate students with low academic performance will manifest positive attitudes toward both their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith' in contrast to those students with high academic performance, while those students in the middle range of academic performance will show positive attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and negative attitudes toward their ethnic 'faith.'
- Hypothesis 11 Jewish students with a high frequency of attendance at synagogue will show positive attitudes toward both their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith' in contrast to those students with a low frequency of attendance, while those in the middle range of synagogue attendance will manifest no consistent relationship between their frequency of synagogue attendance and either positive or negative attitudes toward either their ethnic 'culture' or 'faith.'
- Hypothesis 12 For Jewish undergraduate students, low, medium and high socio-economic status groups will respond in similar fashion to the social distance rankings of the groups.
- Hypothesis 13 For Jewish undergraduate students, there will be more social distance expressed toward 'racial' groups than toward ethnic groups on the social distance scale.
- Hypothesis 14 Jewish undergraduate students will consistently indicate greater social nearness toward their own group than toward any other on the social distance scale.
- Hypothesis 15 Jewish undergraduate students will rate Germans in the

most negative fashion, followed closely by Canadian Indians and Eskimos, which will likewise be rated negatively.

Table 7 indicates a visual summary of the expected relationships between the variables. The expected relationships were postulated on the basis of the literature review. A discussion of the variables will follow.

Jewish Ingroup Loyalty

Jewish ingroup loyalty is theoretically defined as, loyalty toward the ingroup expressed as positive attitudes by the respondents' toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith.' It is assumed here that, positive ingroup loyalty is functional toward the continued maintenance of the Jewish group and conversely, that negative attitudes are dysfunctional to continued group maintenance.

Ingroup loyalty is operationally defined as positive attitudes expressed by respondents toward both their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith' measured by two ten scale-item Osgood Semantic Differential scales (see Appendix I). These scales measure the individuals' reactions to semantic objects in terms of bipolar scales defined with contrasting adjectives at each end. As a result of numerous ratings and factor analyses, replications of this procedure have established the stability of three dimensions of meaning: 1) evaluative, 2) potency and 3) activity. Semantic Differential research involves using seven-point, bipolar adjective rating scales. Research indicates that a means comparison is the preferred procedure in most Semantic Differential studies, (Heise, 1969). The general validity of this scale for measuring attitudes is supported

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF EXPECTED RELATIONSHIPS OF JEWISH INGROUP LOYALTY (CULTURE AND FAITH) BY OUTGROUP EVALUATIONS, AND OTHER VARIABLES (GENERATION, SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, ACADEMIC MAJOR, ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE AND FREQUENCY OF SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE) FOR JEWISH UNDER-GRADUATE STUDENTS

(Independent) Variables	(Dependent) Variable	JEWISH INGROUP LOYALTY			
		Ethnic 'Culture'		Ethnic 'Faith'	
		Negative	Positive	Negative	Positive
A. Outgroup Evaluations					
	Negative		X		X
	Positive				
B: General Variables					
'Generation Canadian'					
	First		X		X
	Second (Mixed)	X		X	
	Third		X	X	
'Socio-Economic Status'					
	High	X		X	
	Medium		X	X	
	Low		X		X
'Academic Major'					
	Year I		X	X	
	Social Sciences - Humanities	X		X	
	Professional		X		X
'Academic Performance'					
	High	X			
	Medium		X		
	Low		X		
'Synagogue Attendance'					
	High		X		X
	Medium		X	X	
	Low	X		X	

X Expected Relationships

by the fact that it yields results when it is so employed and by studies which have compared Semantic Differential measurements with attitude measurements on the traditional scales (such as Likert, Thurstone) etc. (Heise, 1969).

Mean scores on each of the two Semantic Differential scales were computed, and those respondents falling below the group mean were categorized negative in their 'culture' and 'faith' attitudes, while those who scored above the mean as positive. The group mean for the ten 'culture' scales was 50.2 and 49.0 for the 'faith' scales. The seven-point Semantic Differential scales were scored with one being the most positive and seven, the most negative.

The ten scales chosen for this study out of the original twenty-five were made on the basis of: (a) their interpretability as positive-negative in terms of the Jewish 'culture' and 'faith,' (b) their ease of interpretation as functional-dysfunctional toward the continued maintenance of the Jewish group and, (c) as a result of a factor analysis done on both sets of scales for the sample under study. All ten scale-items chosen fell within the "evaluative" dimension of meaning as a direct result of the original twenty-five scale-items, being heavily weighted toward this one factor.

Bipolar adjectives represent a simple economical means for obtaining data on people's reactions and ratings on bipolar adjectives tend to be correlated, (Heise, 1969). Further, Heise (1969) has indicated that group means are highly reliable and stable even when the samples of subjects are as small as thirty. It should be kept in mind that it was a pragmatic decision to utilize the Semantic Differential,

for the construction of an index to meaningfully represent the multidimensional aspects of ethnic identification goes beyond the scope of this study.

A. Outgroup Evaluations

The outgroup evaluations of Jewish undergraduate students is operationally defined by responses toward eleven ethnic and nine 'racial' groups on a modified Bogardus Social Distance scale. The Bogardus scale measures the degree to which the twenty outgroups mentioned above are accepted or rejected in terms of seven possible degrees of social intimacy (see Appendix I). They were scored with one (would marry) as the most favorable and seven (would bar from the country) as the most unfavorable. This scale is essentially a technique for scaling attitudes to measure the social-psychological distance between a person and various ethnic and nationality groups.

This scale was chosen for its ease of administration and wide adaptability. The Bogardus scale offers a simple means to obtain simultaneous responses to a considerable number of groups.

Scores ranging from a mean of 1.00 to 1.94 for the twenty outgroups were scored as positive in outgroup evaluations, while scores of 1.95 or better as negative in outgroup evaluations.

Although scores on a Bogardus scale do not in any way constitute a completely adequate index of outgroup orientations and evaluations, it was felt to be useful for the limited scope of this research study.

B. General Variables

Generation Canadian: Operationally, the generation Canadian of

respondents' was determined by the birthplace of the respondent and parents. To determine the generation of the respondent the following criteria were employed: first generation Canadian was one who is foreign-born with foreign-born parents; second generation Canadian one who is native-born of foreign-born or "mixed" parentage (where one parent is Canadian-born and one parent European-born); third generation Canadian was one who is native-born of native-born parents, (Nahirny and Fishman, 1966).

Socio-economic status: Operationally, socio-economic status was based on the occupation of the respondents' father, measured by Blishen's socio-economic index (1967), ranking occupations in terms of education and income. Warner et al., (1949) and Kahl and Davis (1955) and many others have indicated that of the three primary indicators of socio-economic status--occupation, education and income--that occupation is the best single indicator. The following criteria were employed to differentiate the respondents: high socio-economic status (Blishen categories 1 and 2), medium socio-economic status (Blishen categories 3 and 4) and, low socio-economic status (Blishen categories 5 and 6).

Academic major is operationally defined as the respondents' major area of study. These study areas were roughly categorized as: 1) Year I--first year students with no declared major area, 2) Social Sciences--Humanities--Psychology, Anthropology, Sociology, Economics, Political Science, English, Classics, Philosophy, etc., 3) Professional--Social Work, Nursing, Engineering, and 4) Science--Microbiology, Botany, Zoology, Chemistry, Physics, etc.

Academic performance was operationally defined according to the

respondents' grade-point averages, expressed in one of three ways--as a per cent, letter grade or actual grade-point average. In the first two cases, these were converted to roughly equivalent grade-point averages. Performance was trichotomized according to the following criteria: high academic performance as a 3.5 to 4.0 grade-point, medium performance as 2.50 to 3.49 and, low performance, below a 2.5 grade-point average.

Frequency of synagogue attendance was operationally defined according to self-reported 'actual' frequencies of attendance. This was classified as: high frequency of attendance--every week, about twice a month and about once a month; medium frequency--several times a year; and low frequency--no attendance and about one a year or less.

Statistical Tests

The statistical measure to determine the level of association between the ordinal variables (outgroup evaluations, academic major, academic performance, generation Canadian, socio-economic status, frequency of synagogue attendance) and, the ordinal variable - (ingroup loyalty as 'culture' and 'faith') was Gamma (Anderson and Zelditch, 1968; Freeman, 1965; Goodman and Kruskal, 1954 and Mueller, Scheussler and Costner, 1970).

Gamma was developed by Goodman and Kruskal (1954). It is possible to give Gamma a "Proportional Reduction in Error" (P.R.E.) interpretation, which is the degree to which error may be reduced through introduction of the independent variable in relation to the dependent variable, as compared to knowledge of the dependent variable alone, (Costner, 1965). Association is understood as a matter of "guessing" values of

one variable on the basis of values of another. With ordinal scales the primary problem is that of guessing order. The problem may be conceptualized as the degree to which an individual's rank in one ordinal scale is predictable from his rank in another. The degree of association is dependent on the amount of same order "agreement" or, opposite order "inversion" of the scales.

Gamma is a measure selectively responsive to the degree of association between two sets of ordered categories. It may be applied to a cross-tabulation of any size. Gamma is "margin-free" in that its range of values from -1.00 to +1.00 is not limited by marginal frequencies. Although marginal frequencies do not affect the magnitude of Gamma, they do affect the proportion of pairs involving ties. Since Gamma is based on the predictability of order for untied pairs only, the concentration of marginal distribution in a few categories reduces the number of untied pairs.

Where paired distribution of scores were available, as in the use of 'culture' and 'faith' and outgroup evaluations, Pearson r 's were calculated, involving correlation coefficients. In addition, r 's were calculated for each of the relationships between the variables as r provides a much more conservative estimate of the degree of association.

For each of the relationships between all of the variables either a Chi-square of Yates' Correction for Continuity (where table entries are five or less) was calculated. The value of chi-square is not affected by rearrangements of the rows or columns. Chi-square was used as a means to test statistical significance for contingency tables.

While this chapter has focused on the research design of the

study, the next chapter will discuss the research findings.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

The following chapter is divided into three sections. The first section of this chapter discusses the correlation between the two indicators of ingroup loyalty - ('culture' and 'faith') and their correlation with the variable, outgroup evaluations. The second section discusses the association between each of the six variables (outgroup evaluations, academic major, academic performance, socio-economic status, generation Canadian and frequency of synagogue attendance) with the variable, ingroup loyalty. In addition to this, each variable was examined for a possible significant relationship with outgroup evaluations as well as any significant relationships among the other variables. The third and final section involves analyses of hypotheses specifically concerned with the Bogardus Social Distance scale.

Ingroup Loyalty and Outgroup Evaluations

It was stated in hypothesis one that, Jewish undergraduate students would show no consistent relationship (either positive or negative) between the respondents' ingroup loyalty and their outgroup evaluations. As seen in Table 8 this hypothesis has been confirmed. There is a slight negative, but no significant relationship between the respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith' and their outgroup evaluations.

These findings substantiate the research of social scientists (Fishman, 1955; Lazerwitz, 1953 and Rothman, 1965) who found no consistent relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup evaluations.

Also supported is the skepticism regarding the postulated uniform co-occurrence of ingroup loyalty and outgroup rejection voiced by others (Campbell and Levine, 1965; Merton, 1957; Swartz, 1961 and Williams, 1964).

The findings reported here cast doubt on both those types of studies which found: (a) a positive ingroup-outgroup relationship (Lewin, 1948; Noel, 1964; Sarnoff, 1951 and Trent, 1953) and more importantly, (b) a negative relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup rejection, the classic, rigid Sumnerian-Adorno formulation substantiated by others (Adelson, 1953a and 1953b; Chein and Hurwitz, 1950; Clinard and Noel, 1958; Pearl, 1954; Radke and Lande, 1953; Seelye and Brewer, 1970 and Sullivan, 1954) and also, those who "accept" the inverse relationship as valid (Berry, 1951; Bierstedt, 1957; Druckman, 1968; Gregor, 1963; Rosenblatt, 1964; Simpson and Yinger, 1953 and Walter, 1952).

Hypothesis two stated that Jewish undergraduate students will evaluate their ethnic 'culture' positively while manifesting negative outgroup evaluations. As seen in Table 8 the hypothesis has not been confirmed. There is a slight negative, but not significant relationship between the respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and their outgroup evaluations.

As indicated in hypothesis three, Jewish undergraduate students will show no consistent relationship between their 'faith' attitudes and their outgroup evaluations. This hypothesis has been confirmed. There is a slight negative, but not significant relationship between the respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'faith' and their outgroup

TABLE 8

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OUTGROUP EVALUATIONS AND EXPRESSED ATTITUDES TOWARD ETHNIC CULTURE AND FAITH AMONG JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variable	CULTURE			FAITH						
	Negative Number	Percent	Positive Number	Percent	Totals	Negative Number	Percent	Positive Number	Percent	Totals
Outgroup Evaluations	Negative	8 (22.9)	27 (77.1)	35		10 (23.8)		32 (76.1)	42	
	Positive	26 (38.2)	42 (61.8)	68		24 (39.3)		37 (60.7)	61	
Totals	34 (33.0)		69 (67.0)	103		34 (33.0)		69 (67.0)	103	

Gamma = -0.35
 r = -0.15
 p = \nearrow .05

Gamma = -0.35
 r = -0.16
 p = \searrow .05

evaluations.

Table 8 will indicate the relationship between Jewish undergraduate students outgroup evaluations and their expressed attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith.'

Hypothesis four designated that Jewish undergraduate students will indicate a negative relationship between the two dimensions of the variable ingroup loyalty - ('culture' and 'faith'). As seen in Table 9, this hypothesis has not been confirmed. There is a highly significant positive relationship between the respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith.'

On the basis of a literature review on Jewish college students, many experts (Fein, 1968; Feldstein, 1970; Frimer, 1967 and Greenberg, 1968) agree that most Jewish college students, by and large, seem to be confused about their ethnic identity and skeptical of traditional religious beliefs. It has been stated that the secularist life-style of the university is destructive to Jewish ethnic loyalties and that there exists a feeling amongst Jewish students that the values prized by the academic community and strong religio-ethnic feelings are antithetical. In summary, evidence has pointed to a rejection of institutionalized religion by college Jews. However, on the basis of the findings reported in Table 9, the above views have not been substantiated.

Instead, the findings reported here seem to point in the direction of Fishman's (1960) findings, that identification for young college Jews may be much more basically and uncomplicatedly Jewish than was the case a generation ago. However, it should also be kept in mind that young college Jews may be identifying with a "Jewishness" altogether

TABLE 9

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES EXPRESSED TOWARD ETHNIC CULTURE AND
FAITH AMONG JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variable	FAITH				Totals
	Negative		Positive		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Culture	Negative	28		7	35
			(80.0)		(20.0)
	Positive	14		55	69
			(20.3)		(79.7)
Totals	42		62		104
		(40.4)		(59.6)	

Gamma = 0.88
r = 0.57
p = <.001

different than that of their parents and grandparents, (Axelrad, 1970; Gans, 1956a and Lazerwitz and Rowitz, 1964).

Landis (1962) has indicated that many Jewish young people may be opting for what he calls the "secular alternative" to Jewish life, namely, that of distinguishing between Jewishness as an 'ethnic identity' and Judaism as a 'faith,' adopting a "neutralist" position, wherein certain aspects of both dimensions are accepted.

Frimer (1967), on the other hand, sees the acceptance of Judaism as a faith in a somewhat different perspective. He sees a greater humility among college students, where reason and the scientific method are no longer absolute monarchs over 'truth,' where these two sources of knowledge do not happen to exhaust all of reality. A person's religion is no longer attacked or mocked as in yesteryear. Today, this

would be almost universally condemned as in poor academic taste. Faith as a personal category, he feels, is accepted and respected. However, any attempt to introduce it as a canon for 'truth' will be met with great resistance. Frimer (1967) adds further that, the world of the student is decidedly a secular society, but it is not secularistic. Today's student, even the disbeliever, may not want to commit himself to that which he cannot prove, yet he simultaneously shares with his peers a suspicion about all absolute 'isms,' including atheism.

As stated in hypothesis five, for Jewish undergraduates, 'culture' will elicit consistently positive responses, whereas, 'faith' will be evaluated in a more negative manner. As seen in Table 9, this hypothesis has been confirmed.

It was indicated in hypothesis six that, first generation³ Canadian Jewish students will show positive attitudes toward both their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith,' while third generation Jewish students will evaluate their ethnic 'culture' positively and their 'faith' negatively. This hypothesis was not confirmed. As seen in Table 10, the analysis of the data shows no relationship between the respondents' 'culture' and 'faith' evaluations and their generation Canadian. Table 10 also shows that in attitudes toward 'culture' and 'faith' the first generation is strongly positive in both 'culture' and 'faith' evaluations. For second generation, there is a drop in positive 'culture' attitudes and negative 'faith' evaluations. Third generation students, however, have increased positive attitudes over that of the second gen-

³Due to the paucity of research information on second generation Jews, those of "mixed" parentage where one parent is Canadian-born and one is European-born, it was felt that hypotheses would be premature at this time.

eration toward 'culture' and 'faith.'

These findings do not confirm some studies (Kramer and Leventman, 1961; Nahirny and Fishman, 1965 and Fishman, 1966) which show that with each generation an increasing incorporation of non-Jewish values is developed, and that the ethnic heritage ceases to play any viable role in the life of the third generation. These findings do, however, point to one of the alternatives suggested by Goldstein and Goldscheider (1968) in viewing generational change, specifically, that a gradual increase in 'religiosity' (only indicated here by general 'faith' attitudes) takes place with distance from the immigrant generation. However, a better test would be provided by using an established index of religiosity such as that developed by Glock and Stark (1966), and others.

Another interesting group under study was that of second generation Jewish respondents (students of 'mixed parentage' where one parent was born in Canada and the other, born in Europe). It is unfortunate, as Lazerwitz and Rowitz (1964) have pointed out, that there is such a distinct lack of research available on this second generation group. In the findings reported here, second generation respondents evaluated their ethnic 'culture' positively, three-fifths (25) of the respondents did so, while slightly better than one-half (25) evaluated their 'faith' negatively. Toward 'faith,' second generation respondents were the most negative of the three generations.

It was suggested in hypothesis seven that, the frequency of attendance at synagogue will be lower for the third generation than for either the first or the second generation. This hypothesis has not been confirmed. As seen in Table 11, there is no relationship between the

TABLE 10

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES EXPRESSED TOWARD ETHNIC CULTURE AND FAITH AND GENERATION CANADIAN FOR JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variable	CULTURE				FAITH				Totals	
	Negative		Positive		Negative		Positive			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Generation Canadian	First	6	(26.1)	17	(73.9)	7	(30.4)	16	(69.6)	23
	Second	10	(40.0)	15	(60.0)	13	(52.0)	12	(48.0)	25
	Third	19	(33.9)	37	(66.1)	22	(39.3)	34	(60.7)	56
Totals	35	(33.7)	69	(66.3)	42	(40.4)	62	(59.6)	104	

Gamma = 0.06
 $X^2 = 1.042$
 df = 2
 p = $>.05$

Gamma = 0.04
 $X^2 = 2.374$
 df = 2
 p = $>.05$

respondents' generation Canadian and their frequency of synagogue attendance. In examining frequency of attendance at synagogue by generation, the differences are so small that any trends are extremely difficult to interpret. There appears to be an increase in those who attend often in the third generation over the second generation, while those with a medium frequency of attendance (where one-half the respondents are found) seems to decrease in the third generation as compared to the second. For low and non-attenders, third generation remains constant with that of the second generation.

The findings reported here, although not significant, do not seem to substantiate what Kramer and Leventman (1961), Lazerwitz and Rowitz (1964) and Goldstein and Goldscheider (1968) concluded. Kramer and Leventman (1961) indicated that for third generation Jews, their religious observance had been reduced to an occasional acknowledgement of synagogue and ritual, while Lazerwitz and Rowitz (1964) conclude that evidence points to a decline in synagogue attendance from generation to generation. Goldstein and Goldscheider (1968) found a regular pattern of decline in synagogue attendance with distance from the immigrant generation. They also found that among third generation Jews there appears to be a greater homogeneity toward less regular synagogue attendance.

These findings do suggest, however, that there may be some truth to the principle of "third generation interest," suggested by Hansen (1938), which Herberg (1955) and Lenski (1961) later utilized. That is, the further removed from the immigrant generation, specifically those in the third generation, the stronger the interest and participation in

TABLE 11

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GENERATION CANADIAN AND FREQUENCY OF ATTENDANCE
AT SYNAGOGUE FOR JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variable	FREQUENCY OF SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE						Totals
	High		Medium		Low		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Generation Canadian	First	5		8		10	23
			(21.7)		(34.8)		(43.5)
	Second	1		15		9	25
		(4.0)		(60.0)		(36.0)	
	Third	13		29		20	56
		(12.5)		(51.8)		(35.7)	
	Totals	19		52		39	104
		(12.5)		(50.0)		(37.5)	

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Gamma} &= -0.03 \\ \chi^2 &= 4.898 \\ \text{df} &= 4 \\ p &= >.05 \end{aligned}$$

the affairs of the minority group - that the grandchildren of immigrant forebears are returning to their ancestral faiths in increasing numbers. Axelrad (1970), Gans (1956a) and Lazerwitz and Rowitz (1964) feel that if there is a return in the third generation of 'Jewishness,' it may be to an identification and religious life altogether different from the earlier patterns established by parents and grandparents.

However, it should be noted that any conclusions on the basis of the findings reported here would be premature and will therefore be left to future studies.

Hypothesis eight has indicated that Jewish undergraduate students coming from low socio-economic status families will manifest positive

attitudes toward both their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith,' in contrast to students from high socio-economic status families, while students in the middle category of socio-economic status will evaluate their ethnic 'culture' positively while showing negative 'faith' evaluations. This hypothesis was not confirmed. As seen in Table 12 there is a slight negative, but not significant relationship between the respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith' and their socio-economic status.

As previously noted, the only research findings thus far uncovered deal with socio-economic status as it relates to the California E-scale, as the indicator of ethnocentrism (Frenkel-Brunswik, 1952, and Levinson, 1950). As a result, it is difficult to generalize the findings reported here to any previous research.

As seen in Table 12, approximately three-fifths (35) of the low socio-economic status respondents were positive in their 'culture' and 'faith' evaluations, while those students of high socio-economic status were the most positive of the three socio-economic status groups in their 'culture' and 'faith' evaluations. Those with medium socio-economic status, while somewhat more positive in attitudes toward 'culture,' were the most negative toward their ethnic 'faith' of the three groups, although about half were for and half against it.

In hypothesis nine it was stated that, Jewish undergraduates in their first year, with no declared major, will show positive attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and negative evaluations of their 'faith' while those students with Social Sciences - Humanities majors will manifest negative attitudes toward both their ethnic 'culture' and

TABLE 12

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES EXPRESSED TOWARD ETHNIC CULTURE AND FAITH AND THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variable	CULTURE				FAITH				Totals
	Negative		Positive		Negative		Positive		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Socio-economic Status	High	4 (16.7)	20 (83.3)	6 (25.0)	18 (75.0)	24			
	Medium	17 (41.5)	24 (58.5)	20 (48.8)	21 (51.2)	41			
	Low	13 (37.1)	22 (62.9)	15 (42.9)	20 (57.1)	35			
Totals	34 (34.0)	66 (66.0)	41 (41.0)	59 (59.0)	100				

Gamma = -0.24
 $X^2 = 4.385$
 df = 2
 p = $>.05$

Gamma = -0.19
 $X^2 = 3.615$
 df = 2
 p = $>.05$

'faith,' in contrast to those students with a 'professional' type of course orientation. As seen in Table 13, there is no relationship between the respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith' and their academic major. This hypothesis was only partially confirmed.

The variable, academic major, served an exploratory function insofar as the sample under investigation was composed entirely of university students and no literature was found linking this variable to either ingroup or outgroup attitudes.

Those students in first year with no declared major represent such a diverse group that any conclusions presented here would not be very meaningful. Again, due to a lack of a sufficient sample size to differentiate between Social Sciences and Humanities and break these general orientations up into finer sub-categories, any conclusions are, at best, tentative. As seen in Table 13, both first year students and those with a 'professional' orientation were quite positive in both their 'culture' and 'faith' attitudes, while for Social Sciences - Humanities majors, there is a tendency to be the least positive of the groups listed in their attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith.'

The findings of Dinin (1963) appear to be partially substantiated. He noted that Jews in search of their ethnic identity were young college intellectuals, especially those with a rationalist, empiricist type of orientation. Greenberg (1968) pointed to the secularist life-style of the campus as destructive to ethnic loyalties. His conclusions regarding the Social Sciences and to a lesser extent the Humanities, seem to be substantiated to a certain degree by the findings reported here.

TABLE 13

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES EXPRESSED TOWARD ETHNIC CULTURE AND FAITH AND ACADEMIC MAJOR AMONG JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variable	CULTURE				FAITH				Totals
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Year I	8	(25.8)	23	(74.2)	11	(35.5)	20	(64.5)	31
Social Sciences- Humanities	13	(40.6)	19	(59.4)	15	(46.9)	17	(53.1)	32
Professional	8	(32.0)	17	(68.0)	8	(32.0)	17	(68.0)	25
Academic Major Science	2	(32.2)	7	(68.0)	3	(33.3)	6	(66.7)	9
Totals	31	(32.0)	66	(68.0)	37	(38.1)	60	(61.9)	97

Gamma = -0.03
 $\chi^2 = 2.037$
 df = 3
 p = $>.05$

Gamma = 0.05
 $\chi^2 = 1.165$
 df = 3
 p = $>.05$

Greenberg (1968) further noted that, the assumptions found in certain academic disciplines such as Sociology, Psychology, Anthropology, etc., are contradictory to the traditional teachings of Judaism as well as other religions. Fein (1968), alluded to a much more general phenomenon when he noted that among many Jewish college students, there is found the belief that the values held in high esteem by the academic community and a strong ingroup loyalty are antithetical.

Perhaps students majoring in the Social Sciences and Humanities, because of the nature of their disciplines and a smaller number of lecture hours than students in the 'professional' faculties, have more opportunity to reflect on what being a Jew means to them, especially in discussions with their college peers. For these students, especially those in the Social Sciences, Jewish traditions and values are exposed to the competitive ferment and challenge of other systems of thought and commitment.

Hypothesis ten indicated that, Jewish undergraduate students with low academic performance will manifest positive attitudes toward both their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith' in contrast to those students with a high academic performance, while those students in the middle range of academic performance will show positive attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and negative attitudes toward their ethnic 'faith.' As seen in Table 14, there is no relationship between the respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith' and their academic performance. This hypothesis has not been confirmed.

With such a small number of cases for both high and low academic performance, it is difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions. This

TABLE 14

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES EXPRESSED TOWARD ETHNIC CULTURE AND FAITH AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE
AMONG JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variable	CULTURE				FAITH				Totals	
	Negative		Positive		Negative		Positive			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Academic Pervormance	High	8	(44.4)	10	(55.6)	9	(50.0)	9	(50.0)	18
	Medium	15	(32.6)	31	(67.4)	16	(34.8)	30	(65.2)	46
	Low	5	(38.5)	8	(61.5)	7	(53.8)	6	(46.2)	13
Totals	28	(36.4)	49	(63.6)	32	(41.6)	45	(58.4)	77	

Gamma = 0.10
 $\chi^2 = 0.813$
 df = 2
 p = $>.05$

Gamma = 0.00
 $\chi^2 = 2.205$
 df = 2
 p = $>.05$

independent variable, academic performance (based on respondents' self-reports) was utilized along with academic major, as exploratory variables.

The findings reported here add some additional insights to the conclusions reached by Fein (1968), that, the conflict between the secular values of the university and a high level of commitment to Judaism appear to be clearest amongst the better academics. The high academic performers were the least positive of the three groups toward their ethnic 'culture' and were split in their 'faith' evaluations (where one-half responded positively and one-half negatively).

In hypothesis eleven it was pointed out that, Jewish students with a high frequency of synagogue attendance will show positive attitudes toward both their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith,' in contrast to those students with a low frequency of attendance, while those in the middle range of attendance will manifest no consistent relationship between their frequency of attendance and either positive or negative attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith.' This hypothesis was partially confirmed. As seen in Table 15, there were significant negative relationships between the respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith' and their frequency of attendance at synagogue.

Before proceeding with the interpretation of the findings reported in Table 15, this writer feels that a few words of caution are in order. First of all, comparisons, as they are often made, between frequencies of church attendance for Protestants and Catholics and frequencies of synagogue attendance for Jews, may be misleading. Dealing as this study

TABLE 15

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTITUDES EXPRESSED TOWARD ETHNIC CULTURE AND FAITH AND THE FREQUENCY OF SYNAGOGUE AMONG JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variable	CULTURE				FAITH				Totals	
	Negative		Positive		Negative		Positive			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Frequency of Synagogue Attendance	High	2	(15.4)	11	(84.6)	1	(7.7)	12	(92.3)	13
	Medium	15	(28.8)	37	(71.2)	15	(28.8)	37	(71.2)	52
	Low	18	(46.2)	21	(53.8)	26	(66.7)	13	(33.3)	39
Totals	35	(33.7)	69	(66.3)	42	(40.4)	64	(59.6)	104	

Gamma = -0.41
 $\chi^2 = 5.210$
 df = 2
 p = $\angle .10$

Gamma = 0.71
 $\chi^2 = 19.836$
 df = 2
 p = $\angle .001$

does, with a sample of Jewish college students, further complicates the issue. The major difficulty in interpreting frequency of synagogue attendance lies in the fact that, by themselves, these frequencies are not a good indicator of 'religiosity.' Many of the prescribed rituals of Judaism are carried out in the home. For example, the lighting of the Sabbath candles and the saying of special prayers, Passover rituals, the observance of the dietary laws etc. Another major difficulty is found in the assignment of respondents into categories of high, medium and low frequencies of synagogue attendance. Half of the respondents fell into the category of medium frequency, indicating that they attend synagogue three or more times per year. It does well to keep in mind that if the frequency of synagogue attendance is restricted to this small number it probably reflects the fact that the individuals concerned are most likely only attending services during the High Holy Days, i.e. Rosh-Hashannah and Yom Kippur, or least likely, may only include confirmations (male and female) and weddings.

Lasker (1971) has recently studied the motivations behind attendance at services during the High Holy Days. This would involve attendance at synagogue anywhere from one or twice to as many as seven or eight times, and would also, interestingly enough, include some of those respondents falling into the category of high frequency of attendance. Among those Jewish activities which are most widely carried on by Jews, attendance at High Holy Day services ranks very high, where a large number of Jews everywhere, make every effort to participate in such services regardless of cost to them in terms of time, money, energy and convenience, Lasker (1971). In the case of Jewish university students,

attendance at part or all of these services usually entails the missing of lectures (depending on what days of the week these High Holy Days fall upon). Lasker (1971) believes that those who attend these services are motivated by a desire to express their Jewishness, to identify with the Jewish people and to carry on Jewish tradition, and further, that these services are looked upon as a positive experience that is both impressive and meaningful. The above researcher feels that the most significant aspect is the sense of fellowship experienced with the others present, and the involvement in perpetuating an important and beautiful expression of Jewish tradition. Prayers offer an opportunity to express hopes for a better world.

It is also a viable possibility that many attenders, both in the middle and high frequency range may be succumbing to family pressure in attending synagogue services during these particular Holy Days, as they are considered the most important and holy of all the holy days in Judaism. It also affords a time when an individual has the opportunity to carry on a minimal degree of Jewish identification even though that person has not been involved at all in any other aspects of Judaism or "Jewishness" prior to these Holy Days.

Hypothesis 12 indicated that, for Jewish undergraduate students, low, medium and high socio-economic status groups will respond in similar fashion to the social distance rankings of groups. As seen in Table 16, this hypothesis has been partially confirmed. Socio-economic status groups have, in fact, responded in similar fashion to the rankings of groups, as indicated in Table 16.

The findings reported here appear to also partially confirm the

TABLE 16

THE SOCIAL DISTANCE RANKING OF ELEVEN ETHNIC AND NINE RACIAL GROUPS BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC (SES) FOR JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

	HIGH SES ^a			MEDIUM SES ^b			LOW SES ^c		
	Rank	Group	Mean	Rank	Group	Mean	Rank	Group	Mean
Ethnic	1	Jewish	1.12	1	Jewish	1.05	1	Jewish	1.00
	2.5	British	1.17	2	American	1.34	2	American	1.42
	2.5	American	1.17	3	British	1.44	3	British	1.47
	4	Scandinavian	1.62	4.5	Dutch	1.68	4	Dutch	1.68
	5	French-Canadian	1.75	4.5	French-Canadian	1.68	5	Scandinavian	1.69
	6.5	Dutch	1.83	6	Scandinavian	1.85	6	French-Canadian	1.72
	6.5	Italian	1.83	7	Italian	1.88	7	Russian	1.76
	8	Polish	2.04	8	Polish	1.98	8	Polish	1.83
	9	Ukrainian	2.25	9	Ukrainian	2.05	9.5	Italian	1.86
	10.5	Russian	2.58	10	Russian	2.10	9.5	Ukrainian	1.86
	10.5	German	2.58	11	German	2.44	11	German	2.11
Racial	1	Negro	2.00	1	Negro	1.95	1.5	Negro	2.00
	2	West Indian	2.13	2.5	Indian (India)	2.10	1.5	Japanese	2.00
	3	Japanese	2.21	2.5	Japanese	2.10	3	Chinese	2.06
	4	Mexican	2.25	5	Chinese	2.12	4	Mexican	2.08
	5	Indian (India)	2.29	5	Filipino	2.12	5	Filipino	2.11
	7	Chinese	2.33	5	Mexican	2.12	6	Eskimo	2.14
	7	Filipino	2.33	7	Indian (Canada)	2.15	7	West Indian	2.15
	7	Indian (Canada)	2.33	8	West Indian	2.17	8	Indian (India)	2.17
	9	Eskimo		9	Eskimo	2.19	9	Indian (Canada)	2.33

^aN = 24^bN = 41^cN = 36 except for Russian West Indian and Indian (India), where N = 34

research of Landis, Datwyler and Dorn (1957) who concluded that social class affiliation is a major factor in determining the type of social distance response and that like social class groupings respond in similar fashion to the ranking of groups on Bogardus' scale of social distance.

In examining the rankings and mean scores attributed to groups in Table 16, it should be kept in mind that all scores of 1.95 and higher have been operationally defined as negative outgroup evaluations. This procedure, however, may be somewhat suspect, as the dichotomizing of respondents above and below a mean of 1.95 created problems. Is a Jew who would not marry a Gentile, but would have one as a close friend or work beside such an outgroup member, necessarily negative in his outgroup evaluation? The latter is precisely what this study has done, and is also why the results obtained from this study may be misleading.

Rankings for the low socio-economic status group do not appear to differ substantially from either the high or medium socio-economic status groups.

The findings for both high and medium socio-economic status groups seem to point in the direction of research carried out by Ames and Sakuma (1969), who factor analysed social distance scales. These researchers found a: 1) "Northern European" factor--Scandinavians, Italians; 2) "Anglo" factor--British, American; 3) "Slavic" factor--Russian, Polish, Ukrainian; 4) "Oriental" factor--Japanese, Chinese, Filipino and 5) a "Minority Group" factor--Mexicans, Indians (East Indian and Native Indian) and Negroes.

Reflecting on the evaluation of the so-called 'racial' groups

as seen in Table 16, it is evident that across socio-economic lines, Negroes are consistently ranked the most favorably, with the slight exception of the low socio-economic status group where both Japanese and Negroes were ranked identically as most favorable. This favorable ranking of Negroes is much different than for findings among United States respondents'. An important factor unique to the Canadian experience may be that the Black students encountered most frequently are West Indians who are well educated, usually of a higher socio-economic status and quite articulate.

In Canada, very few Negroes are of the middle class, and those few who have become successful professional men and women have, on the whole dispersed themselves into the Canadian community achieving the assimilation they sought. Jewish Civil Right Organizations, such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith have long been and still are, very much identified with promoting Negro causes.

When looking at the two Black groups--Negroes and West Indians, it is obvious that Jewish respondents are making a distinction between the two. This is indicated by the more favorable responses toward the group designated as "Negroes" across all three socio-economic groups. The reasons for this distinction are not entirely clear and should be investigated much more closely than was possible in this study.

Japanese, Chinese and Filipino seem to be evaluated in very similar fashion, and, without performing a factor analysis, seem to form what Ames and Sakuma (1969) referred to as "Oriental" factor. Across socio-economic lines, Japanese are rated the most favorably of these three groups. The Chinese group may represent a special case, due

largely to their high visibility and fairly large numbers on campus. These Chinese students are generally excellent students, especially in the Sciences and Engineering. Again, the scores given to this group may be a reflection of job competition with "foreigners" or, possibly, a negative identification with Chinese Communism, for many of these students are from Hong Kong. There are fewer Japanese in Canada and, generally, this group seems to be higher in socio-economic status than either Chinese or Filipinos, the latter being the most recently arrived immigrant group to Canada.

Focusing upon Canada's Native Peoples, the Indians (Metis) and Eskimos, for both high and medium socio-economic status groups, these two groups are rated least favorably or very nearly so of all other 'racial' groups. For low socio-economic status respondents, Canadian Indians are ranked lowest on the scale, while Eskimos are ranked slightly more favorably. The reasons for this difference among low socio-economic status respondents seems to indicate the existence of a certain degree of 'prejudice' against Canada's largest "colored" group. Canadian Indians and Metis represent a highly visible minority group, especially so in Winnipeg, which has the largest population of Indians of any city in Canada. This group is one of low status where members are out of the mainstream of Canadian society (Sheffe, 1970) and looked upon by many Canadians as simply an "eyesore" that should be removed (back to government reservations).

Eskimos, however, represent a more perplexing problem for analysis. Very few Canadians have had any concrete experiences with Eskimos. They, too, are a group out of the mainstream of Canadian society, and

this writer speculates that, were they suddenly to appear in large numbers in any Canadian city, their physical appearance would not be in their favor.

As specified in hypothesis thirteen, for Jewish undergraduate students, there will be more "social fairness" expressed toward 'racial' groups than toward ethnic groups on the social distance scale. As seen in Table 17, this hypothesis has been confirmed (with the exception of three groups--Ukrainians, Russians and Germans, which may be explained, in the case of Ukrainians and Russians through a long history of animosity between Jews and these two groups, such as virulent anti-Semitism, pogroms, quotas and persecutions. The negative evaluations of Germans can be explained by the Nazi holocaust--the extermination of six million Jews by the Nazis during World War II, which will never be erased from the minds of Jews around the world.

These findings, generally, support the research of Triandis and Triandis (1960) as well as Ames and Sakuma (1969), who concluded that 'race' was the most important determiner of social distance.

Hypothesis fourteen suggested that, Jewish undergraduate students will consistently indicate greater social nearness toward their own group than toward any others on the social distance scale. As seen in Table 17, this hypothesis has been confirmed and substantiates the findings of Bogardus (1967) as well as numerous others.

As indicated in hypothesis fifteen, Jewish undergraduate students will rate Germans in the most negative fashion, followed closely by Canadian Indians and Eskimos, which will likewise be rated negatively. Table 17 indicates that this hypothesis has been substantiated. Out of

TABLE 17

THE SOCIAL DISTANCE RANKINGS OF TWENTY ETHNIC AND RACIAL GROUPS BY JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Rank	Group	Mean
1	Jewish ^a	1.05
2	American ^a	1.33
3	British ^a	1.38
4	Dutch ^a	1.66
5	French-Canadian ^a	1.70
6	Scandinavian ^a	1.74
7	Italian ^b	1.84
8	Polish ^b	1.92
9	Negro ^a	1.97
10	Ukrainian ^c	2.03
11	Russian ^c	2.06
12	Japanese ^a	2.07
13	Mexican ^a	2.12
14.5	Chinese ^a	2.13
14.5	West Indian ^d	2.13
16.0	Filipino ^a	2.15
16.0	Indian (India) ^c	2.15
17.0	Eskimo ^a	2.22
18.0	Indian (Canada) ^a	2.24
19.0	German ^b	2.36

^aN = 109

^bN = 108

^cN = 107

twenty groups, Germans were ranked last, while Eskimos and Canadian Indians were ranked eighteenth and nineteenth, respectively.

As seen in Table 15, although there is a significant negative relationship between the respondents' attitudes toward their ethnic 'culture' and 'faith' and their frequency of synagogue attendance, there is a slight positive but not significant relationship between the respondents' outgroup evaluations and their frequency of synagogue attendance. Shinert and Ford (1958), summarizing the research of others (Sanford, 1944; Levinson, 1950; Adorno et al., 1950; Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1950 and Allport, 1954), suggested that those who reject relation seem to be

less "ethnocentric" and, inversely, those with a religious affiliation seem to be more "ethnocentric" than those without such attachments.

These findings have not been substantiated here.

The findings reported here in Table 18 do however, point in the direction of Adorno et al., (1950) insofar as there is no significant difference between those who attend services often and those who seldom attend. Those who do not attend seem to score noticeably lower on ethnocentrism, where the low attenders (including those who do not attend) are the most positive of the three categories in their outgroup evaluations.

TABLE 18

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OUTGROUP EVALUATIONS AND THE FREQUENCY OF SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE AMONG JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variable	OUTGROUP EVALUATIONS				Totals
	Negative		Positive		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
High	5		8		13
		(38.5)		(61.5)	
Medium	19		32		15
		(37.3)		(62.7)	
Low	10		29		39
		(25.6)		(74.4)	
Totals	34		69		103
		(25.6)		(74.4)	

Gamma = -0.21
 $\chi^2 = 1.548$
 df = 2
 p = $>.05$

As Table 19 indicates, there is a significant negative relation-

TABLE 19

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OUTGROUP EVALUATIONS AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE
AMONG JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variable		OUTGROUP EVALUATIONS				Totals
		Negative		Positive		
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Academic Performance	High	1		17		18
			(5.6)		(94.4)	
	Medium	15		30		45
			(33.3)		(66.7)	
	Low	6		7		13
			(46.2)		(53.8)	
	Totals	22		54		76
			(28.9)		(71.1)	

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Gamma} &= -0.58 \\ \chi^2 &= 7.080 \\ \text{df} &= 2 \\ p &= <.05 \end{aligned}$$

ship between the respondents' outgroup evaluations and their academic performance. This writer has thus far been unable to locate any literature dealing with the relationship between these two variables. Any generalizations are difficult due to the small cell frequencies found in both the high and low categories of academic performance. To make any meaningful statements about this relationship, academic performance would have to be related to a battery of I.Q. tests or intelligence measures and this, in turn, related to a better measure of outgroup evaluations (both attitudes and behavior). It is indeed unfortunate, as Fein (1968) and others have pointed out, that there is such a paucity of research information available on Jewish college students.

Perhaps this data is an indication, albeit a crude one, of tension present on today's college campuses, where students who obtain lower grades feel more threatened. These students may seize upon various outgroups that they are perhaps in frequent contact with on campus, who seem to be able to compete well and find jobs, and then use these groups as 'scapegoats' upon which to vent their anger and hostility.

As seen in Table 20, there is a slight positive but not significant relationship between the respondents' outgroup evaluations and their academic major. These findings are difficult to interpret, as indicated earlier, due to: a) the small cell frequencies for each of the groups, b) the large, amorphous group of first year college students with no declared academic major and, c) the Social Sciences-Humanities and 'Professional' categories are too large and diverse.

TABLE 20

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OUTGROUP EVALUATIONS AND ACADEMIC MAJOR AMONG JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variable	OUTGROUP EVALUATIONS				Totals
	Negative		Positive		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Year I	13		18		31
		(41.9)		(58.1)	
Academic Major	8		23		25
Social Sciences-Humanities		(25.8)		(74.2)	
Professional	8		17		25
Science ^a	2		7		9
		(22.2)		(77.8)	
Totals	31		65		96
		(32.3)		(67.7)	

^aNo hypotheses were made on Science majors

Gamma = 0.19 $\chi^2 = 2.333$ df = 3 p = $>.05$

First year students appear to be the least positive in their outgroup evaluations with approximately three-fifths (31), followed by those with a 'Professional' course orientation, and Social Sciences-Humanities majors, the most positive of the three groups. In summary, due to the nature of the above classification scheme, any results obtained would have been difficult to interpret.

As seen in Table 21, there is a slight positive but not significant relationship between the respondents' outgroup evaluations and their socio-economic status background. Generally, all three categories of socio-economic status were quite positive in their outgroup evaluations, the lowest group being those of high socio-economic status, where three-fifths (23) of the respondents evaluated outgroups in a positive manner.

TABLE 21

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OUTGROUP EVALUATIONS AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AMONG JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variable		OUTGROUP EVALUATIONS				Totals
		Negative		Positive		
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Socio-economic status	High	9	(39.1)	14	(60.9)	23
	Medium	15	(36.6)	26	(63.4)	41
	Low	8	(22.9)	27	(77.1)	35
Totals		32	(32.3)	67	(67.7)	99

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Gamma} &= 0.25 \\ \chi^2 &= 2.261 \\ \text{df} &= 2 \\ p &= >.05 \end{aligned}$$

Table 22 shows no relationship between the respondents' outgroup evaluations and their generation Canadian. All three generations appear to evaluate outgroups in a consistently positive manner, the lowest being the third generation, of which greater than two-thirds (55) are positive in their outgroup evaluations. This may reflect the fact that, since the primary period of socialization was in Canada, these Jewish respondents have internalized the idea of a multi-ethnic Canadian society and follow the Canadian government's official policy of cultural pluralism.

TABLE 22

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OUTGROUP EVALUATIONS AND GENERATION CANADIAN FOR JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variable	OUTGROUP EVALUATIONS				Totals	
	Negative		Positive			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Generation Canadian	First	7	(30.4)	16	(69.6)	23
	Second	8	(32.0)	17	(68.0)	25
	Third	19	(34.5)	36	(65.5)	55
Totals	34	(33.0)	69	(67.0)	103	

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Gamma} &= -0.07 \\ \chi^2 &= 0.139 \\ \text{df} &= 2 \\ p &= >.05 \end{aligned}$$

Table 23 indicates the degree of association found in the sample under study between all of the variables using the P.R.E. measure "Gamma."

TABLE 23

GAMMA MATRIX FOR THE DEGREE OF ASSOCIATION BETWEEN DEPENDENT AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES FOR JEWISH UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Variables	Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Major	1		.16	-.14	.04	.13	.19	-.03	.05
Performance	2			-.10	-.17	-.14	-.58**	.10	.00
Generation	3				-.24	-.03	-.07	-.06	-.04
Socio-economic status	4					.14	.25	-.24	-.19
Synagogue attendance	5						.21	-.41*	-.71**
Outgroup evaluations	6							-.35	-.35
Culture	7								.88***
Faith	8								

*p = .10
 **p = .05
 ***p = .001

Chi-square values were also calculated to evaluate any possible statistical significance between the variables.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

As hypothesized in this study we found no particular relationship (either positive or negative) between Jewish ingroup loyalty and outgroup evaluations. It supports neither the contention of a positive ingroup-outgroup relationship (Lewin, 1948; Noel, 1964; Sarnoff, 1951 or Trent, 1953) or, conversely, a negative or inverse ingroup-outgroup relationship (Adelson, 1953a, and 1953b; Adorno et al., 1950, Berry, 1951; Bierstedt, 1957; Chein and Hurwitz, 1950; Clinard and Noel, 1958; Druckman, 1968; Gregor, 1963; Pearl, 1954; Radke and Lande, 1953; Rinder, 1958; Rosenblatt, 1964; Seelye and Brewer, 1970; Simpson and Yinger, 1953; Sumner, 1906 and Walter, 1952).

The findings reported in this study do, however, substantiate to a certain degree the findings of others (Fishman, 1955; Lazerwitz, 1953 and Rothman, 1965) who hypothesized no essential relationship between ingroup loyalty and outgroup evaluations. Further, the findings presented give added credence to the doubts expressed by Merton (1957) and Campbell and Levine, (1965) that a negative ingroup-outgroup relationship is far from self-evident, and needs to be demonstrated empirically.

The present study suggests that measuring ingroup loyalty and outgroup evaluations only on the basis of general attitude scales, that of the Osgood Semantic Differential and the Bogardus Social Distance scale, are inadequate in describing and measuring the nature of the ingroup-outgroup relationship expressed by a particular minority group.

It is the contention of this writer, along with Rothman (1965)

and others that a minority group members' outgroup orientation is determined by a wide variety of factors, including: the strength of the family relationship during the child's formative years; the self-image; parental outgroup attitudes existing in the respondents' community--the schools, the churches and synagogues; the attitudes of peers and significant other outside of the immediate family circle; specific or concrete outgroup experiences; the intensity of one's feelings of ethnic loyalty or identification. It is very likely that the interrelationships of all these and other influences as well as their combined impact on the minority group individual which structures attitudes toward and relationships with the outgroup(s).

Further, within any given group of minority group members (Jews at a particular level of ingroup loyalty) there will be found a multiplicity of different attitudes and relationships directed toward the outgroup. A group of highly identified minority group members would probably include some who fall into the negative ingroup-outgroup pattern of Adorno et al., (1950) and Sumner (1906) - that of ethnocentrism as it has been traditionally understood. However, it would also include many others who deviate from this pattern to a considerable extent and do not link a strong group loyalty with dislike or contempt for other groups.

A number of cautions should be noted in the interpretations of the findings reported here of no essential ingroup-outgroup relationship. Firstly, a fundamental difficulty encountered in this study, as in many others of this type, was how to most fruitfully conceptualize the Jewish group in order to establish a meaningful measure of ingroup loyalty. There is no widely accepted definition to be found of the Jewish group,

and for any particular attempted definition one finds a myriad of exceptions and variations including, Jewishness as an ethnic identity, Judaism as a religion, etc. Even for the Jewish individual to define the group in his own mind often presents a difficult chore. Unfortunately, there is no widely accepted index of Jewish identification in the literature at this time. Since the construction of a scale to measure ethnic identification was beyond the scope of this study, Jewish ingroup loyalty was dichotomized into the respondents' attitudes toward Jewish 'culture' and 'faith,' in keeping with the designation in the literature of Judaism as a "religio-cultural complex." The measures utilized in this study represent a very partial index of Jewish ethnic identification. It is hoped however, that these measures will provide a meaningful index of Jewish ingroup loyalty. Jewish ethnic identification, as recent researchers have pointed out (Lazerwitz, 1971) should be treated as a multidimensional phenomenon.

Secondly, a major difficulty arose in conceptualizing the variable, outgroup evaluations. Specifically, the problem was that of establishing meaningful "cut-off points" for positive and negative outgroup evaluations, as measured on the Bogardus Social Distance scale. The dichotomizing of respondents above and below a mean of 1.95 created problems. Is a Jew who would not marry a Gentile, but would have one as a close friend or work beside an outgroup member, necessarily negative in outgroup evaluation? The latter, in fact, is precisely what this study has done and is also why the results obtained from this study may be misleading. Again, this points to the reasons why other measures, both attitudinal and behavioral, should be utilized in testing the nature of

the ingroup-outgroup relationship. The selection of appropriate indicators, both for ingroup loyalty and outgroup evaluations, unfortunately, has not been resolved in this study and remains to be more clearly delineated in future research.

This study has proceeded from a social-psychological frame of reference in that it has examined Jewish ingroup loyalty and outgroup evaluations in terms of the respondents' general attitudes. With increased minority group identification, as Rothman (1965) and others have indicated, there may follow institutionalized means of expressing group aspirations and concerns for the future. Accompanying the growth of substantive institutional life, there often occurs the simultaneous development of residential segregation patterns, in part to maintain and support the minority group's institutions, thus drawing the group more closely inward and, as a result, curtailing the frequency of outgroup contacts. Intensified ingroup identification may foster geographical separateness and increased social distance among groups.

There may be, as Rothman (1965) points out, valid, even compelling reasons to emphasize ethnic identification. It may be functional, either psychologically, or from a conflict perspective (Cosser, 1956; Marx, 1964 and Simmel, 1955) to preserve the group, and thereby aid in its ultimate survival as a religio-cultural entity; by psychologically strengthening ingroup members' so that they more effectively may withstand the shock of prejudice and; to permit the dissemination to group members the unique system of values and the contributions that the group may make to society. However, among these reasons should be excluded that of improving outgroup relations. Nor should a strong ingroup identification be discour-

aged necessarily for fear of producing negative feelings toward outgroups. It has been indicated here empirically that, ingroup loyalty, seemingly, has no significant bearing on a minority individual's outgroup evaluations.

In viewing minority group identification or, ingroup loyalty, one must consider the complex problem of how the minority individual adjusts to his group belongingness. This involves, as Rothman (1965) and others have noted, a psychological "coming to-terms," in deciding which of the two major reference groups that make up his social world should receive his primary allegiance. Ultimately, each individual must make this difficult choice and suits it to his particular circumstances. Often this adjustment will involve constructing a workable balance between either an exclusive allegiance to the minority group or to the outgroup (representing society at large). The particular choice that an individual will ultimately make will be partly decided by the way he perceives the place that his minority group should occupy in the society in which he resides.

It is the feeling of this writer that the theoretical perspective employed in this study, the functional-dysfunctional aspects of ingroup loyalty, emphasizing the 'naturalness' of the development of 'belongingness needs' and, the role of the socialization process in the development of ingroup-outgroup attitudes through one's primary reference groups, may be fruitfully retained as part of a larger explanatory model in the ultimate development of a theory of minority ingroup-outgroup attitudes and orientations.

This study, it is felt, has made several important contributions,

other than theoretical, to a better understanding of a useful framework in which to investigate various aspects of minority group relations. These were: a) an extensive literature review pertaining to the concept of ethnocentrism, ethnocentric theory and, the nature of the ingroup-outgroup relationship, b) utilizing Osgood Semantic Differential scales, opening up new possibilities for measuring different aspects of ingroup loyalty and outgroup evaluations, c) along with Peters (1971), the utilization of a sample of Canadian minority group college students, especially in regard to data obtained on the Bogardus Social Distance scale (of which there has been almost no Canadian data to date). This becomes significant when we consider the very different response pattern generated by this sample of Jewish college students with regard to evaluations made of Germans and Negroes.

Future Research

Many additional avenues of research are suggested by the results obtained in this study. In the first place, the findings were based on a study of one particular minority group, the Jews. It would be necessary to determine whether the same relationship between the variables would hold for other minority groups as well. In addition, even within the Jewish group, it would be necessary to conduct tests of other parts of the country, taking a sample of adults as well as college students and a larger sample than the one presented here, before drawing any definitive conclusions regarding the Jewish minority group in general.

Further research should be undertaken with the primary aim of establishing an index of ethnic identification, specifically, multi-dimensional indices, as Lazerwitz (1971) has recently done. Such an

index would contain both attitudinal and behavioral dimensions. This index could then be correlated with attitudinal and behavioral dimensions of the outgroup orientation or relationship. When this has been accomplished, researchers would then be in a position to empirically validate the nature of the ingroup-outgroup relationship. As indicated earlier, this study has revealed some of the inherent difficulties in utilizing only general attitudinal scales in testing the ingroup-outgroup relationship.

An intensive community study on the Winnipeg Jewish community should be undertaken, based on census data, survey material, historical documents, personal interviews, and participant observation. Potentially fruitful areas for sociological investigation may be: a) an analysis of residential segregation for Winnipeg Jews, utilizing the 1941, 1951, 1961 and 1971 census material and comparing this with similar indices for the Jewish communities of Montreal and Toronto (which constitute the Canadian cities with the largest Jewish populations), b) a study of Jewish parochial education in Winnipeg, focusing on a sample of high school students and their ethnic identification and comparing and contrasting this with a sample of Jewish high school students in the public school system and, c) an investigation of Jewish - Gentile intermarriage for Winnipeg, focusing on friendship patterns, area of residence, dating behavior for high school and college students, parental attitudes toward the above factors, etc. In summary, in light of the size of the Winnipeg Jewish community (estimated at approximately 22,000), and the fact that it is the third largest Jewish community in Canada, after Montreal and Toronto, there is a surprising lack of sociological data available.

More intensive research needs to be undertaken on the effects of generational status on the assimilation process. Especially for the unique second, or "mixed" generation group, where one parent is Canadian-born and one parent is European-born. Almost no data is currently available on this group. Interest here would be focused on the country of primary socialization of both respondents and parents.

Additional research is required to investigate the status of the three traditional branches of Orthodox, Conservative and Reform Judaism, and the perception and meaning attached to these labels by both adult and younger members of the Jewish community. The findings of this study revealed that Jewish university students, with few exceptions, did not indicate in the spaces provided on the survey instrument, what branch of Judaism they felt themselves to be affiliated with.

Lastly, this writer finds it surprising that there is a real paucity of research information available about any sociological or psychological aspects of Jewish college students, either in Canada or the United States, especially so with regard to how they perceive their 'Jewishness' or psychologically relate and adjust to their ethnic identity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adelson, J.
1953a "The Ideology of Authoritarian Jews." *American Psychologist* 5 (August): 320-329.
- 1953b "A Study of Minority Group Authoritarianism." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 49,4 (October): 477-485.
- Adorno, T.W., E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D.J. Levinson and R.N. Sanford
1950 *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper.
- Allport, Gordon W.
1954 *The Nature of Prejudice*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Ames, R.G. and A.F. Sakuma
1969 "Criteria for Evaluating Others: A Re-Examination of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale." *Sociology and Social Research* 54 (October): 5-24.
- Anderson, Theodore R., and M.R. Zelditch, Jr.
1968 *A Basic Course in Statistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Antonovsky, Afion
1956 "Toward a Refinement of the Marginal Man Concept." *Social Forces* 37 (October): 57-62.
- Axelrad, Albert S.
1970 "The Jewish Student and the Changing Campus." *Jewish Digest* (November): 1-9.
- Banton, Michael
1967 *Race Relations*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Bender, Eugene I. and George Kagiwada
1968 "Hansen's Law of Third-Generation Return and the Study of American Religio-Ethnic Groups." *Phylon* 29 (Winter): 360-370.
- Berry, Brewton
1951 *Race Relations*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Bettleheim, Bruno and Morris Janowitz
1950 *The Dynamics of Prejudice*. New York: Harper.
- Bierstedt, Robert
1957 *The Social Order*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bogardus, Emory S.
1967 *A Forty Year Racial Distance Study*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press.

- Bottomore, T.B. and M. Ruebel (eds.)
1964 Karl Marx. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cahnman, Werner J.
1949 "Attitudes of Minority Youth: A Methodological Introduction."
American Sociological Review 14 (August): 543-548.
- Cain, Leonard D., Jr.
1964 "Life Course and Social Structure," in R.E.L. Faris (ed.)
Handbook of Modern Sociology. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Campbell, Donald T. and Robert A. Levine
1965 "A Proposal for Cooperative Cross-Cultural Research on
Ethnocentrism." Journal of Conflict Resolution 5: 82-108.
- Catton, William R. Jr.
1960-61 "The Functions and Dysfunction of Ethnocentrism: A Theory."
Social Problems 8,3 (Winter): 201-211.
- Catton, William R. Jr. and S.C. Hong
1962 "The Relation of Apparent Minority Ethnocentrism to Majority
Antipathy." American Sociological Review 27 (April): 178-191.
- Chiel, Arthur A.
1961 The Jews in Manitoba. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Chein, J. and J. Hurwitz
1950 "A Study of Minority Group Membership: The Reactions of Jewish
Boys to Various Aspects of Being Jewish." American Psycholo-
gist 4: 260-261.
- Child, Irwin L.
1943 Italian or American? The Second Generation in Conflict. New
Haven: Yale University Press.
- Clinard, Marshall B. and Donald L. Noel
1958 "Role Behavior of Students in a Non-Segregated University
Situation." Journal of Negro Education 27 (Spring): 182-188.
- Coser, Lewis
1956 The Functions of Social Conflict. New York: Free Press.
- Costner, Herbert L.
1965 "Criteria for Measures of Association." American Sociological
Review 30,3 (June): 341-353.
- Darroch, A. Gordon and Wilfred G. Marston
1969 "Ethnic Differentiation: Ecological Aspects of a Multidimen-
sional Concept." International Migration Review 4: 71-95.
- Davie, M.R.
1949 Negroes in American Society. New York: McGraw Hill.

- Dinin, Samuel
 1963 "The Quest for Identification." Journal of Jewish Communal Service 40,1 (Fall): 26-32.
- Dominion Bureau of Statistics
 1951 Census of Canada. Bulletin #C-92.
 1961 Census of Canada. Bulletin #C-92-559.
- Driedger, Leo
 1971 "Ethnic Identity and Social Structure." Unpublished manuscripts and data. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- Driedger, Leo and Glenn Church
 1972 "Ethnic Residential Segregation and Ecological Mobility: A Comparison of Winnipeg Minorities." Unpublished paper, to be presented to the 1972 Annual Meeting of the Mid-West Sociological Society in Kansas City, April 20-22.
- Druckman, Daniel
 1968 "Ethnocentrism in the Inter-Nation Simulation." Journal of Conflict Resolution 12,1 (March): 45-68.
- Elmer, Glaister A.
 1954 "Identification as a Social Concept." Sociology and Social Research 39 (November): 103-109.
- Fein, Leonard J.
 1968 "Dilemmas of Jewish Identity on the College Campus." Judaism 17,1: 10-21.
- Fishman, Joshua A.
 1965 "Negative Stereotypes Concerning American Minority Children Receiving Various Types of Minority-Group Education." Genetic Psychology Monographs 51: 107-182.
 1966 Language Loyalty In The United States. The Hague: Mouton and Company.
- Freeman, Linton C.
 1965 Elementary Applied Statistics. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Frenkel-Brunswik, Else
 1952 "Interaction of Psychological and Sociological Factors in Political Behavior." American Political Science Review 46 (March): 44-65.
- Frimer, Norman E.
 1967 "The Campus-Flux and Tension." Tradition 9,3 (Fall): 5-34.

- Gans, Herbert J.
 1956a "American Jewry: present and future." *Commentary* 21 (May): 422-430.
- 1956b "American Jewry: present and future." *Commentary* 21 (June): 555-563.
- Gist, Noel P. and Sylvia F. Fava
 1964 *Urban Society*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Glock, Charles Y. and Rodney Stack
 1966 *Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goldstein, Sidney and Calvin Goldscheider
 1968 *Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Government of Canada
 1969 *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Book IV*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Greenberg, Irving
 1968 "Jewish Survival and the College Campus." *Judaism* 17,3: 259-282.
- Gregor, A. James
 1963 "Ethnocentrism Among the Australian Aboriginies: Some Preliminary Notes." *Sociological Quarterly* 4,2: 162-167.
- Grossack, Martin M.
 1957 "Group Belongingness Among Negroes." *Journal of Social Psychology* 43: 167-180.
- Hansen, Marcus Lee
 1952 "The Problem of the Third Generation Immigrant." *Commentary* 14 (November): 492-500.
- Heise, David R.
 1969 "The Semantic Differential and Attitude Research." in Cene P. Summers (ed.) *Attitude Measurement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Herbert, Will
 1955 *Protestant - Catholic - Jew*. New York: Doubleday.
- Herstein, Hymie H.
 1964 "The Growth of the Winnipeg Jewish Community and the Evolution of Its Educational Institutions." Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, Faculty of Education.

- Hughes, Everett C.
1961 "Ethnocentric Sociology." *Social Forces* 40,1 (October): 1-4.
- Hyman, Herbert and Paul B. Sheatsley
1954 "The Authoritarian Personality: A Methodological Critique,"
in R. Christie and M. Jahoda (eds.) *Studies in the Scope and
Method of the Authoritarian Personality*. Glencoe, Ill.
- Janowsky, Oscar I.
1948 *The JWB Survey*. New York: Dial Press.
- Kadushin, Charles
1962 "Social Distance Between Client and Professional." *American
Journal of Sociology* 67: 517-531.
- Kahl, J.A. and J.A. Davis
1955 "A Comparison of Indexes of Socio-Economic Status." *American
Sociological Review*. 20: 317-325.
- Karlinsky, Sidney and Jacob Peters
1971 "A Study of Undergraduate Social Distance Reactions Toward
Selected Ethnic, Racial and Religious Groups." Unpublished
manuscript.
- Kent, Donald P. and Robert C. Burnight
1951 "Group Centrism in Complex Societies." *American Journal of
Sociology*. 57 (November): 256-259.
- Kirscht, J.P. and R.C. Dillehay
1967 *Dimensions of Authoritarianism: A Review of Research and
Theory*. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press.
- Knopfelmacher, Frank, and Douglas B. Armstrong
1963 "The Relation Between Authoritarianism, Ethnocentrism and
Religious Denomination Among Australian Adolescents." *The
American Catholic Sociological Review* 14,2 (Summer): 99-114.
- Kramer, Judith R. and S. Leventman
1961 *Children of the Gilded Ghetto: Conflict Resolutions of Three
Generations of American Jews*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kuhn, Manford H.
1964 "The Reference Group Reconsidered." *Sociological Quarterly*:
5-21.
- Landis, Joseph C.
1962 "Secular Jewishness, The Fourth Dimension of Jewish Life."
Journal of Jewish Communal Service 39,1 (Fall): 83-90.
- Lasker, Arnold A.
1971 "Motivations for Attending High Holy Day Services," *Journal
for the Scientific Study of Religion* 10,3 (Fall): 241-248.

- Lazerwitz, Bernard
1953 "Some Factors in Jewish Identification." *Jewish Social Studies* 15 (Winter): 301-309.
- 1971 "The Components and Consequences of Ethnic Identification." Unpublished paper. Columbia: University of Missouri Survey Research Center.
- Lazerwitz, Bernard and L. Rowitz
1964 "The Three Generations Hypothesis." *American Journal of Sociology* 69 (March): 529-538.
- Lenski, Gerhaard
1961 *The Religious Factor*. New York: Doubleday.
- Lewin, Kurt
1948 "Self-Hatred Among Jews, in Kurt Lewin (ed.) *Resolving Social Conflicts*, New York: Harper.
- Lundberg, George A. and L. Dickson
1952 "Selective Association Among Ethnic Groups in a High School Population." *American Sociological Review* 17: 23-24.
- MacIver, R.M. and C. Page
1949 *Society: An Introductory Analysis*. London: Macmillan.
- Meuller, John H., Karl F. Scheussler, and Herbert L. Costner
1970 *Statistical Reasoning in Sociology*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Merton, Robert K. and Alice S. Kitt
1950 "Contributions to the Theory of Reference Group Behavior." in Robert K. Merton and Paul F. Lazarsfeld (eds.) *Studies in the Scope and Method of the American Soldier*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Merton, Robert K.
1957 *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Nahirney, Vladimir C. and Joshua A. Fishman
1965 "American Immigrant Groups: Ethnic Identification and the Problem of Generations." *Sociological Review* 13 (November): 311-323.
- Noel, Donald L.
1964 "Group Identification Among Negroes: An Empirical Analysis." *Journal of Social Issues* 20,2 (April): 71-84.
- Pearl, D.
1954 "Ethnocentrism and the Self-Concept." *Journal of Social Psychology* 40: 137-147.

- Peters, Jacob
1971 "The Association of Religious Affiliation, Socio-Economia Status, Generation and Segregation With German Ethnocentrism." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Sociology. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F.
1960 "Social Distance Attitudes of South African Students." Social Forces 38 (March): 246-253.
- Prothro, E. Terry
1952 "Ethnocentrism and Anti-Negro Attitudes in the Deep South." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 47: 105-108.
- Radke, Marian J. and B. Lande
1953 "Personality Correlates of Differential Reaction to Minority Group Belonging." Journal of Social Psychology 38 (November): 253-272.
- Rosenberg, Louis
1961 "A Study of the Growth and Changes in the Distribution of the Jewish Population of Winnipeg, 1961." Canadian Jewish Population Studies, Canadian Jewish Community Series, Vol. 2, No. 1. Montreal: Bureau of Social and Economic Research, Canadian Jewish Congress.
- Rosenblatt, Paul C.
1964 "Origins and Effects of Group Ethnocentrism and Nationalism." Journal of Conflict Resolution 8: 131-164.
- Rothman, Jack
1960 "In-Group Identification and Out-Group Association: A Theoretical and Experimental Study." Journal of Jewish Communal Service 37 (Fall): 81-93.
1965 "Minority Group Identification and Inter-Group Relations: An Examination of Kurt Lewin's Theory of Jewish Group Identity." Ann Arbor, Michigan: Research Institute for Group Work in Jewish Agencies.
- Sanford, R.N.
1944 "A Scale for the Measurement of Anti-Semitic Tension." Journal of Psychology 7: 339-370.
- Sarnoff, Irving
1951 "Identification with the Aggressor: Some Personality Correlates of Anti-Semitism among Jews." Journal of Personality 20 (September): 199-218.
- Seelye, H. Ned and Marilyn B. Brewer
1970 "Ethnocentrism and Acculturation of North Americans in Guatemala." Journal of Social Psychology 80 (April): 147-157.

- Segal, Charles M.
1955 Fascinating Facts About American Jewish History. New York:
Twayne Publishers.
- Seward, Georgene H.
1954 "Learning Theory and Identification: V. Some Cultural Aspects
of Identification." Journal of Genetic Psychology 84 (June):
229-236.
- Sheffe, Norman (ed.)
1970 Issues For The Seventies: Canada's Indians. Toronto: McGraw-
Hill
- Sherif, Muzafer and Carolyn W. Sherif
1953 Groups in Harmony and Tension. New York: Harper.

1956 An Outline of Social Psychology. New York: Harper.
- Shinert, Gregory and Charles E. Ford
1958 "The Relation of Ethnocentric Attitudes to Intensity of
Religious Practice." Journal of Educational Sociology 32
(October): 157-162.
- Simpson, George E. and J. Milton Yinger
1953 Racial and Cultural Minorities. New York: Harper and Row.
- Sinha, A.K.P. and O.P. Uphyaya
1962 "Eleven Ethnic Groups on a Social Distance Scale." Journal
of Social Psychology 57: 49-54.
- Stonequist, Everett B.
1937 The Marginal Man. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Sullivan, P.L. and J. Adelson
1954 "Ethnocentrism and Misanthropy." Journal of Abnormal and
Social Psychology 49: 246-250.
- Sumner, William Graham
1906 Folkways. New York: Ginn and Company.
- Swartz, Marc J.
1961 "Negative Ethnocentrism." Journal of Conflict Resolution
5,1 (March): 75-81.
- Theodorson, G.A. and A.C. Theodorson
1969 Modern Dictionary of Sociology. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Triandis, Harry C. and Lee M. Triandis
1960 "Race, Social Class, Religion and Nationality as Determinants
of Social Distance." Journal of Abnormal and Social
Psychology 61 (January): 110-118.

- Wagley, Charles and Marvin Harris
1958 Minorities in the New World. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Walter, Paul F.
1952 Race and Culture Relations. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Warner, W.L., M. Meeker and K. Ellis
1949 Social Class in America. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Westie, Frank R.
1964 "Race and Ethnic Relations." in R.E.L. Faris (ed.) Handbook of Modern Sociology. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Williams, Robin M. Jr.
1964 Strangers Next Door. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

APPENDIX I

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

ETHNIC SURVEY

THIS QUESTIONNAIRE HAS BEEN DESIGNED TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ON YOUR ATTITUDES AND FEELINGS TOWARD YOUR OWN AND OTHER ETHNIC GROUPS. ALL DATA OBTAINED WILL BE TREATED CONFIDENTIALLY. YOUR CO-OPERATION IS GRATEFULLY APPRECIATED.

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

Number _____ Place _____

Date _____ Time _____

Slot _____ Section _____

Administered by _____

Coded by _____

PART 1

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS USING A CHECK MARK WHERE POSSIBLE. PRINT ALL OTHER RESPONSES CLEARLY.

1. Present year enrolled in: _____.
2. Your major: _____: 3. Your minor: _____.
4. Your academic performance: _____.
(average letter grade)
5. Age: _____.
6. Place of birth: _____, _____.
(country) (city/town)
7. Sex: Male _____, Female _____.
8. Your religion: _____, _____.
(denomination) (branch)
9. Your ethnic group, other than Canadian: (Check one)
 British _____, French _____, German _____,
 Italian _____, Jewish _____, Polish _____,
 Scandinavian _____, Ukrainian _____, Other _____.
 (specify)
10. Present residence: _____ at
(street/avenue/bay)
 _____; in postal zone number _____.
 (nearest cross street/avenue/bay)
11. Length of time you lived:
 - a. At present address _____.
(years)
 - b. In Metro Winnipeg _____.
(years)
 - c. Outside Metro Winnipeg: Urban _____ Rural _____.
(years) (years)
12. Father's occupation: _____.
13. Father's place of birth: _____, _____ or _____.
(country) (city/town) (rural)

- 14. Father's father's country of birth: _____.
- 15. Father's mother's country of birth: _____.
- 16. Years or grades father attended school: _____.
- 17. Years of vocational training: (if applicable) _____.
- 18. Father's religion: _____, _____.
(denomination) (branch)
- 19. Mother's present occupation: _____.
(including housewife)
- 20. Mother's place of birth: _____, _____ or _____.
(country) (city/town) (rural)
- 21. Mother's father's country of birth: _____.
- 22. Mother's mother's country of birth: _____.
- 23. Mother's last grade or year of formal education completed: _____.
- 24. Years of vocational training: (if applicable) _____.
- 25. Mother's religion: _____, _____.
(denomination) (branch)
- 26. Estimate your total family income:
Under \$ 5,000 _____ \$ 5,000 to 9,999 _____
\$10,000 to 14,999 _____ \$15,000 to 19,999 _____
\$20,000 or more _____

PART II

INSTRUCTIONS: PLACE CHECK-MARKS BESIDE THE NUMBERS WHICH BEST DESCRIBE YOUR REACTIONS TO THE FOLLOWING GROUPS. MARK EACH GROUP EVEN IF YOU DO NOT KNOW IT. THE SCALE TO BE USED IS THE FOLLOWING:

	Would marry into group	Would have as a very close friend	Would have as a next door neigh- bor	Would work beside a mem- ber at job	Would have as speaking acquain- tance	Would have as visitor only to my nation	Would debar from my nation
*AMERICAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*BRITISH	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*DUTCH	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*FRENCH-CANADIAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*GERMAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*ITALIAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*JEWISH	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*POLISH	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*RUSSIAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*SCANDINAVIAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*UKRAINIAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*CHINESE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*ESKIMO	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*FILIPINO	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*INDIAN (CANADIAN)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*INDIAN (INDIA)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*JAPANESE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*NEGRO	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*MEXICAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
*WEST INDIAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
ANGLICAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
ATHEIST	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
BAPTIST	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
FUNDAMENTALIST	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
GREEK ORTHODOX	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
LUTHERAN	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
MENNONITE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

PART II - continued

	Would marry into group	Would have as a very close friend	Would have as a next door neigh- bor	Would work beside a mem- ber at job	Would have as speaking acquain- tance	Would have as visitor only to my nation	Would debar from my nation
PENTECOSTAL	1 <u> </u>	2 <u> </u>	3 <u> </u>	4 <u> </u>	5 <u> </u>	6 <u> </u>	7 <u> </u>
ROMAN CATHOLIC	1 <u> </u>	2 <u> </u>	3 <u> </u>	4 <u> </u>	5 <u> </u>	6 <u> </u>	7 <u> </u>
UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC	1 <u> </u>	2 <u> </u>	3 <u> </u>	4 <u> </u>	5 <u> </u>	6 <u> </u>	7 <u> </u>
UNITED CHURCH	1 <u> </u>	2 <u> </u>	3 <u> </u>	4 <u> </u>	5 <u> </u>	6 <u> </u>	7 <u> </u>

PART VI

INSTRUCTIONS: THE PURPOSE OF THIS INSTRUMENT IS TO MEASURE THE REACTIONS OF OF VARIOUS PEOPLE TOWARD DIFFERENT CONCEPTS BY HAVING THEM JUDGE EACH CONCEPT AGAINST A SERIES OF DESCRIPTIVE SCALES. IT IS YOUR FIRST IMPRESSIONS, THE IMMEDIATE "FEELINGS" ABOUT THE CONCEPT WE WANT, WORK FAST BUT NOT CARELESSLY. MAKE ONLY ONE CHECK-MARK ON EACH SCALE.

Here is how to use these scales:

1. If you feel that the concept is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair x : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : unfair

or

fair ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : x : ____ : unfair

2. If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space or near the middle.

safe ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : dangerous

Which religion do you belong to? _____, _____.
 (denomination) (branch)

RESPOND BELOW TO THE FAITH OF YOUR GROUP.

CONCEPT 2: FAITH

	VERY MUCH	SOME- WHAT	VERY LITTLE	NEU- TRAL	VERY LITTLE	SOME- WHAT	VERY MUCH	
1. passive	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	active
* 2. practical	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	impractical
* 3. unfriendly	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	friendly
* 4. interesting	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	boring
* 5. important	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	unimportant
* 6. tedious	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	exciting
7. growing	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	declining
* 8. happy	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	sad
9. static	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	dynamic
10. progressive	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	traditionalistic
*11. good	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	bad
12. emotional	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	rational
13. fast	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	slow
14. intellectual	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	unintellectual
15. flexible	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	rigid
16. simple	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	complex
*17. worthless	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	valuable
18. rugged	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	delicate
*19. dishonest	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	honest
20. submissive	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	domineering
21. poor	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	wealthy
22. competitive	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	cooperative
23. strong	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	weak
24. humanistic	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	materialistic
*25. unpleasant	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	___:	pleasant

How would you rate your over-all feeling about your faith?

Completely
Satisfied With
It

___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___:

Totally
Disatisfied
With It