

Discrimination among Jewish and Protestant Children

by

Margaret Birks

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research of McGill University in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts, April 1957.

Acknowledgments

The writer gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Mr. G. H. Penrose, Principal of Roslyn School, Westmount, Montreal, P.Q. Thanks are also expressed to the following postgraduate students of McGill University who assisted in giving the tests to the Roslyn School children: Mrs. Christine Chase, Miss Doreen Hogg, Miss Cynthia Crosby, Mr. Alan Paivio, and Mr. Robert Gardner.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Previous Studies of Prejudice	1
Method	8
Results	12
Discussion	14
Summary	20
Tables	21
References	30

Discrimination among Jewish and Protestant Children

The fact that ethnic and religious prejudice is widespread in our culture has been demonstrated by many social psychological investigations. A study in 1932 (15) and another 18 years later (6) found that Princeton students assigned many of the same stereotyped attributes to different ethnic groups, although fewer of them did so in the later study. For example, Negroes were said to be superstitious and lazy, Germans scientifically minded, Jews shrewd. The same stereotypes had been found among teachers and business men in 1928 (Bogardus, cited by (9)). In 1946 (10) a test was given to students at 8 Eastern colleges in which three fictitious groups, the "Wallonians", the "Pireneans" and the "Danireans" were included among a list of 35 ethnic groups. On the whole, there was a considerable similarity between the prejudiced attitudes towards these fictitious groups and a large majority of the real ones. The investigator found (10) that the patterning of preference for different ethnic groups was uniform throughout the samples studied and was not related to actual contact with these groups. In 1949, college students were tested in South Dakota, where there was an almost total absence of Negroes and Jews, but the prejudice scores of these students were higher than those obtained by another investigator at Harvard, Radcliffe and Dartmouth (26). An exception to some of these findings is a recent investigation which shows a dramatic change between 1942 and 1956 in more favorable attitudes regarding the Negro. In spite of this, the investigators concluded that enough prejudice remains to make immediate prospects for the Negro not

very encouraging though the long-time outlook is more favorable. In general, prejudiced attitudes seem to be widespread throughout the U.S. and, with some exceptions, to be subject to little change over a period of time or from one part of the country to another. This generalization seems to hold even when there is little contact with the group in question.

The attitudes of High School students closely approach those of adults. Children up to 12th grade were tested in a midwestern town where there were no Jewish or Negro children (25) and their statements of dislike of both these minority groups increased with age. A study of the development of stereotypes concerning the Negro was made in a school in Virginia, from 4th to 11th grades, and it was concluded, although no adequate statistical tests were applied, that as age increased, the child gradually learns to apply prejudiced stereotypes (2). A study of ethnic cleavage, as reflected in two High Schools, was made in the Southwest (19). The English-American students and the Spanish-American students both showed a strong tendency to choose associates within their own group. In a boarding school, adolescent boys were asked to choose those they would like as room-mates. Of the three groups represented, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, the Jewish group was consistently the least chosen (8). An interesting follow up study (27, 29) was made by one investigator who had previously given a racial attitudes test to 200 6th grade children (28). Six years later, she tested twelve of this group after graduation from High School. On the basis of a repetition of the attitude test and interviews with each child, she concluded that

little change had occurred during the six year interval, except that the attitudes appeared to approach more nearly those of adults. She concluded that racial attitudes are formed in early childhood and remain fixed. It would seem that among High School students, as among adults, prejudiced attitudes are widely prevalent and persistent.

It is against this background of general ethnic and religious prejudice among adults and adolescents - the socializers and models of the young - that the question of children's discrimination in terms of ethnic and religious characteristics must be considered. If steps are to be taken to counteract prejudice and to reduce inter-group tensions, it is important to know the age at which children begin to show discrimination against those of other ethnic and religious groups. Determining the age when prejudice appears may also suggest what factors are responsible for these attitudes and what efforts can be made to offset them. Less research has been done with children than with adults, and because the former experiments (3, 7, 12, 13, 18, 24) have dealt with subjects differing in age and in ethnic or religious background, the studies are difficult to compare directly.

Previous studies of the onset of discrimination in children can be divided roughly into two groups, those finding ethnic or religious discrimination at the early ages of 3 1/2 to 6 years (7, 12, 13, 18, 24) and those which did not find it until 8 to 10 years of age (3, 5, 20).

These two groups of studies differ not only in their findings but also in their methods, a fact that seems crucial in determining the differences in the results obtained. The investigators who found ethnic or

religious discrimination between 3 1/2 and 6 years used suggestive tests of various kinds, that is tests which brought the facts of religious or ethnic differences to the attention of the children and highlighted the contrast. On the other hand, those who found little prejudice before the age of 10 years used sociometric techniques which did not suggest differences but merely asked the children whom they liked to sit with or whom they liked to work with. The children, in the latter case, were unaware that the investigators were interested in their attitudes towards other religious or ethnic groups.

From the group of studies using suggestive methods, several investigations might be cited as typical. Horowitz (11) tested Negro and White children, 4 to 14 years, in schools in New York, Georgia and Tennessee. He asked them to rank photographs in order of preference. He also asked the children to choose from these photographs desirable companions for various activities. In addition, pictures of two identical groups were shown except that one group consisted of all White children, the other of both Negro and White. The children were asked whether they would like to join in social activities with these groups. Thus the color difference was presented to the children with definiteness. He concluded that prejudice against Negroes begins very early in the life of the child, and that attitudes towards the Negro are chiefly determined by contact with the prevalent attitudes towards Negroes rather than by actual contact with Negroes.

Clark and Clark (cited by (9)) tested Negro children 3 to 7 years of age in an inter-racial school in Massachusetts and also in a segregated

school in Arkansas. The children were offered a choice of White or Negro dolls to play with. 72% in the inter-racial and 62% in the segregated school preferred the white doll. While preference for white dolls does not necessarily indicate preference for white people, again it seems that the technique is forcing a decision regarding race which otherwise might not come spontaneously to the children at this early age. Goodman (7) combined tests of various play techniques involving white and black dolls, and interviews with nursery school children. It is possible that the minority who showed hostility at this early age had racial differences suggested to them by the black and white dolls. Radke, Trager and Davis (24) tested children 5 to 8 years old in 6 public schools in Philadelphia. The children's reactions towards racial and religious groups were obtained through a series of pictures which depicted Negro and White children in play situations, Jewish children leaving a synagogue or Catholic children coming late to school from Mass. The attitudes of the children toward the different ethnic and religious groups were studied by asking the children, "Tell me about this picture." Afterwards, the investigators themselves identified the Negro or White children or the religious symbols in the pictures and then made a "more probing exploration" of the child's interpretation. Before any identification of the religious or racial groups was made for them, only 15% to 21% of the children gave interpretations which were unfriendly or hostile. After identification, there was a marked increase in hostility and rejection. Hostility among Jews and Non-Jews

increased from 14% in kindergarten to 30% in 1st grade and to 44% in 2nd grade.

Opposed to all these studies which found ethnic or religious discrimination at 3 1/2 to 6 years, are the studies of Moreno (20) and Criswell (3) who found little prejudice before 10 years of age, using sociometric techniques. Moreno states, "From about the 5th grade on, Italians choose Italians, Jews choose Jews." Criswell found sex a more important determinant than race in the children's choices up to age 10. Unlike the suggestive techniques which brought ethnic and religious differences to the children's attention, the sociometric tests asked them to choose those with whom they would like to sit or to work. No suggestion was made that race or religion should determine these choices and, according to the results obtained, these racial and religious differences did not affect choices appreciably until age 10.

Gesell (5) while offering no empirical evidence, agrees with Moreno and Criswell that consciousness of race does not develop in the child before the 8th year. He claims that the 10 year old is peculiarly receptive to social information and to prejudices, good and bad.

The results of all the studies showing ethnic or religious discrimination from 3 1/2 to 6 years seem to depend on the suggestion or prompting of these differences, either by the test situation or by the investigator, whereas the sociometric methods, which are free from such suggestions, indicated the onset of prejudice at 8 to 10 years.

The Lambert and Taguchi study (18) of Japanese and Occidental children of nursery school age used techniques different from any of those mentioned.

The children were asked to choose friends to whom to give candy or with whom to be photographed, and the Oriental children in contrast to the Occidental, chose significantly more of their own group. Thus, although the technique used was one of choice and therefore nearer to the sociometric than to the suggestive type tests, the results obtained - discrimination at an early age - agreed with those using suggestive techniques. This can perhaps be explained by the fact that the choices were more meaningful to the children than the more usual sociometric technique. In any case, the results, if confirmed by a larger sample, support those experiments which found discrimination present between 3 1/2 and 6 years.

The present study was designed to test the hypothesis that there is a relationship between the methods of measurement used, the suggestive or the sociometric, and the age at which children show religious discrimination. On the basis of previous studies, the hypotheses were, first, that discrimination would be shown on the suggestive questionnaire at 5 and 6 years; secondly that discrimination on the sociometric test would be shown at 9 and 10 years, but not earlier. It was hoped that the study might provide some information as to the age of onset of religious discrimination in children.

Method

A sociometric test and a suggestive questionnaire were administered to a total of 135 Protestant and 59 Jewish children in a Montreal public school, in the Westmount residential area.

One faculty member and five graduate students of the McGill Psychology Department interviewed individually the 5 and 6 year old children, and wrote down their replies. The children were told that they would play a "question and answer" game and the interviews were held at small tables in an adjoining room in partial view of the classroom. Two graduate students gave the tests to the 9 and 10 year old children who wrote down their replies.

In the sociometric test the children were asked: "Which three children in your class do you like to be with the most?" and "Which three children in your class do you like to be with the least?" The girls' choices were limited to girls, the boys' choices to boys, in order to eliminate the influence of the sex variable, found to be so important by Criswell's study (3).

After the sociometric test was completed, the suggestive test was given. This was in the form of a questionnaire which attempted to determine whether any discrimination was shown toward the Protestant or Jewish groups. The instructions given to the 9 and 10 year old pupils were as follows: "Your school has been asked to help in a study of what Canadian School children think about various religious groups. To do this you are asked to answer some questions. You need not put your name on the papers. You will not be graded on these papers. Your answers will not be read by the teachers. There are no "right" answers. Just write down what you think." The questionnaires listed these questions: "Are you a Protestant?"

"Are you a Jew?" "If you are a Protestant, are you glad you are a Protestant?" "Why?" "If you are a Jew, are you glad you are a Jew?" "Why?" "What do you think Protestants are like?" "What makes you think so?" "What do you think Jews are like?" "What makes you think so?" These same questions were read to the 5 and 6 year old pupils and their answers were written down by the interviewers.

The children's sociometric choices were analyzed for each class, for girls and boys separately, and for girls and boys combined. A two cell Chi-Square test was made on the Protestant and Jewish children's choices computed separately. With this method it was possible to determine whether a Protestant or Jewish group was choosing significantly more of its own than of the other group on Like Choices, or significantly fewer of its own and more of the other group on Dislike Choices. To determine the expected value of Protestants' choices of Protestants, the number of Protestants in the class minus one (since the chooser could not choose himself) was divided by one less than the total number of children in the class, and multiplied by all choices made by the Protestants. Similarly, to determine the expected cell value of Protestants' choices of Jews, the total number of Jews was divided by one less than the total number of children in the class and multiplied by all choices made by the Protestants in the class. For the Jewish choices a similar procedure was followed. For example: In grade 5, there is a total class of 23 Protestant and 9 Jewish boys, and the Protestant boys give a total of 22 first choices. The expected number of choices which Protestants should give to Protestants is $\frac{22}{31} \times 22 = 15.61$.

When two groups were combined, as was the case for boys and girls, the expected value of each cell for each group was computed separately, as described above, and then the expected values of the two comparable cells were added to form the expected value of the combined group cell. The observed values of each two comparable cells were also added, and the 2 cell Chi-Square test was made separately for the Protestant and Jewish groups.

A similar 2 cell Chi-Square test was made to test the significance of Protestant and Jewish choices given (1) by those showing discrimination on the questionnaire and (2) by those who showed no discrimination on the questionnaire. This test could be made without the children's signatures on the papers, since each child's two test papers were clipped together.

Discrimination on the sociometric test was defined as the choice of more of the child's own group and fewer of the other group than would be expected by chance, when making Like Choices, and the choice of fewer of his own group and more of the other when making Dislike Choices.

Discrimination on the suggestive questionnaire was defined as the expression of hostile or disparaging remarks against the other group, or statements regarding the superiority of one's own group. Some examples of the children's answers which were considered as discriminatory follow: 6 year olds, "Not many Jewish people are nice. A boy on our street, he starts fights about nothing - he's Jewish." 9 year olds, "Jews fight nearly all the time. Jews have nicer clothes and are more selfish." "Protestants don't show off so much." 10 year olds, "I think Jews are not as nice as Protestants and they are very rude." "Protestants

are nicer people and smarter because they don't miss school." "I don't like them (Jews) too much, because when I play with them we don't have fun." Some examples of non-discriminatory statements follow: 6 year olds, "Protestants are nice. Jews are like Protestants." "Protestants are nice. I have lots of friends who are Protestants. I like Jews because they're nice too, and they're helpful." 9 year olds, "I was born a Jew and I like what I was born. Protestants are nice, just like most everyone. Jews are very nice people." "It doesn't matter what religion you are as long as you are nice." 10 year olds, "I think Jews are very nice. Just because they have a different religion it doesn't matter." "Jews are very friendly and they know their Bible stories well." "Playing with Protestants it is the same as playing with Jews. The only difference is religion."

The judges were a faculty member and three postgraduate students of the Psychology Department of McGill University, who each judged the questionnaires separately. In the three cases where votes for discrimination and non-discrimination were equal, the judges met together and reached a majority agreement on each paper.

Results

Sociometric Test

The children's choices at the 5, 6, 9, and 10 year age levels will be given. Since a separate analysis of boys' and girls' choices showed no consistent trend, the two sets of data were combined (see Table 1). The separate results may be found in Table 2.

Considering first the choice of classmates as "liked", both Jewish and Protestant 5 year old children liked significantly more of their own group when both their first choice and their three choices are considered, and the significance in every case was at $<.01$ level of confidence (see Table 1). At the 6 year age level, both Jewish and Protestant children liked as many of the other groups as of their own. They chose approximately the number of each group which would be expected by chance. Among 9 year old children, both Protestant and Jewish groups chose significantly more of their own group and the significance for both first and three choices was at $<.01$ level. The 10 year old Protestants chose significantly more Protestants at $<.01$ level, when first or three choices are considered, while the Jewish children's choices did not depart from chance expectancy.

When consideration is given to classmates "disliked", Jewish children did not choose differently from chance in any of the four age groups, for either first or three choices (see Table 1). Protestant choices showed no significant departure from chance among 5 and 6 year olds, but at the 9 year age level, Protestants chose significantly more Jewish classmates as "disliked" for both first and three choices

($p = .02$ and $.001$ respectively). Again, among 10 year old children, Protestants disliked significantly more Jewish classmates when consideration is given to the three choices permitted them ($p = < .01$).

The Suggestive Questionnaire

When discrimination, as expressed in the questionnaires was considered, it was found that no Jewish child expressed discrimination at any of the four age levels (see Table 3). The percentage of Protestant children who expressed discrimination increased from 0% at 5 years and 5% at 6 years, to 23% at 9 years and 27% at 10 years (see Table 3).

Relationship Between Sociometric and Suggestive Questionnaire Tests

A Chi-Square test showed a negative relationship between discrimination in sociometric choices and discrimination on the questionnaires. Those expressing discrimination on the questionnaire showed less discrimination in their sociometric choices than did those who failed to express discrimination on the questionnaire (see Table 4). Separate results for boys and girls are given in Table 5.

Discussion

This study supports the previous investigations which found discrimination among children at the 5 year age level (7, 12, 18, 24) and disagrees with those which found the onset of prejudice at approximately 10 years (3, 20). It also supports the general hypothesis that there is a relationship between the type of test used and the results obtained. However, the specific hypothesis that a suggestive type of test will elicit prejudice in children at 5 years whereas a sociometric one will not elicit it before approximately 10 years, was not supported. Rather the contrary was demonstrated in this study. The children showed discrimination at 5 years of age on the sociometric test and at 9 years of age on the suggestive questionnaire.

The fact that discrimination at 5 years was expressed only in choosing friends and not in choosing those they disliked, or in answering the questionnaire seems to indicate that, at this early age, discrimination consists in preference for one's own group rather than in hostility against an "outgroup".

No discrimination was found at 6 years on the sociometric test, and one child only expressed discrimination on the questionnaire. The absence of discrimination among both the 6 year old Jewish and Protestant children in contrast to the presence of discrimination in both these groups at 5 years was an unexpected finding and one not supported by previous research.

This investigation supports the previous sociometric studies so far as the presence of discrimination at 9 and 10 years is concerned, but it

disagrees with their finding that this is the approximate age when prejudice first appears.

At 5 and 6 years the pattern of prejudice was similar for both religious groups. At 5 years, both Protestant and Jewish children preferred their own group but there was no dislike of the other group. At 6 years, neither group showed discrimination in either preferences or dislikes.

At 9 and 10 years, the pattern of prejudice for the Protestant children was very different from that of the Jewish children. At 10 years, Jewish children have ceased to choose more friends within their own group, as they did at the 9 year age level. They did not show dislike of Protestants at either 9 or 10 years. The Protestant group, on the other hand, showed dislike of Jews as well as preference for their own group at both these ages.

Much more research must be done on religious and ethnic discrimination in children before any definite answers can be given to the questions raised by this study. A few possible explanations of the findings can be attempted but these must be considered conjectures awaiting further research for confirmation.

One reason that 5 year old children chose more friends in their own religious group may be the more frequent contacts that very young children have with those of their own religious affiliation before going to kindergarten. No empirical studies have been encountered which consider this possibility. However, Morse and Allport (21) have emphasized the importance of the "social structures" within our society as

factors in discrimination and exclusion. They feel that too much importance has been placed on personality needs as determining factors. These personality factors, they claim, are dependent "for their very opportunity for inter-ethnic expression" on these underlying "collective structures". Examples of such structures in the Christian communities might be church organizations, clubs which exclude Jews, social events associated with Christmas. Among Jews there are the special schools for Jewish children, the synagogue and Jewish holidays. These structures, in so far as they separate the Christian and Jewish parents, would also serve indirectly to restrict very young children to playmates of their own religious group.

At a more psychological level, Mowrer (22) emphasizes the importance of identification in the child's early development as a means of taking over the values and attitudes of the parents. He quotes Freud's statement that, "The superego of the child is not really built upon the model of the parents but on that of the parents' superego; it takes over the same content; it becomes the vehicle of tradition and of all the age-long values which have been handed down in this way from generation to generation." The satisfaction of the child's early, basic needs as well as the approval he later receives, are associated with the mother and other important persons in his infantile environment. They become symbols of reward and reinforcement to the child, who identifies himself with them. Davitz (4) suggests that "as a function of early developmental identification and later training in rewarded imitation, the child acquires a generalized need or secondary drive to be similar to those individuals he values."

For this reason, one might suppose that a child first encountering the strange new environment of kindergarten would be likely to seek playmates similar to these "valued persons" with whom he has identified.

One possible reason that discrimination was not found on the suggestive questionnaire at 5 years, although it was shown in 5 year old children's sociometric choices, may have been the absence of photographs, pictures or symbols which were used in previous studies as aids in the differentiation of groups (7, 12, 24). If, for example, a child did not understand the meaning of the word "Protestant", he was unable to answer the questions.

It is more difficult to find an explanation for the absence of discrimination among 6 year old children, who chose as many friends without as within their own religious group. One might speculate that these children have passed the first insecure stage when identification with valued persons provides the motivation for seeking friends who resemble these early associates. They may therefore be freer to seek out new friends on the basis of congeniality and similar interests. They may still be relatively free from the social pressures and prejudices which are widespread in the culture.

When discrimination among 9 and 10 year old children is considered, it may well be that the prejudiced attitudes present in our society have been learned by this age. A recent review of the literature (9) stresses the instrumental value of acquiring appropriate attitudes. "The process of development of inter-group attitudes after the nursery school years is complicated and difficult to describe. From one point of view it can be regarded as a process of differentiation, in which the child gradually

learns the specific stereotypes that are applied by adults in his environment to members of a given group and the specific kinds of treatment that members of that group are supposed to receive in varying situations."

The particular problem of the minority child is seen in two significant facts. Firstly, the Jewish children changed from preference of their own group at 9 years to an equal preference for both groups at 10 years. Secondly, the Jews showed no dislike of Protestants at any age. These facts suggest that the Jewish child may be aware of his minority status and may be seeking a place for himself within the larger majority group. Not only does he not express antagonism but he is choosing as many friends among Protestants as among Jews.

Probably the finding most difficult to explain is the negative relationship between sociometric choices and discrimination on the questionnaire. If we may make the assumption that replies on the questionnaire indicate a child's "attitude" and that his sociometric choices indicate "behavior", many social psychologists have noted that prejudiced attitudes do not necessarily imply prejudiced behavior (1, 9, 23). Queener (23), as a typical example, defines an attitude as "some degree of readiness to behave in a given manner towards a group or an institution." Before an attitude elicits overt behavior, the "readiness", in terms of alertness to perceive, motivation to respond and experience in responding, must be present, as well as a situation which is sufficiently rewarding for the behavior. This theory, while it may account for children expressing discrimination on the questionnaire but failing to show it in their sociometric choices, does not explain why some children expressed no discrimination on the questionnaire but did show it in their sociometric

choices. Merton (cited by (9)), has attempted a fourfold typology of individuals. His "unprejudiced discriminator" and "prejudiced non-discriminator" would correspond to the children whose sociometric choices disagreed with their questionnaire answers. But these types are admittedly more rational than empirical ones. The present findings seem to indicate that it is very difficult to predict from a child's expressed attitudes whether he will behave in a discriminatory manner. They might even suggest that expressing anti-Jewish opinions releases some of the hostility within the child, and he is then able to interact with children of both groups on an equal, friendly basis. The child who does not express hostility may be more likely to show it in his sociometric choices.

If further research substantiates the finding that 6 year old children are relatively free from discrimination, this may be an appropriate age at which to introduce some of Radke's (24) suggestions. She claims that good relations between groups do not develop automatically, that it does no good to ignore religious differences; and that the "specific learning needed is the kind which faces cultural diversities in the form and in the situations in which the child experiences them, and which provides him with the information and attitudes and social techniques to meet these situations."

Summary

A sociometric test and a suggestive questionnaire were administered to Protestant and Jewish children of 5, 6, 9, and 10 years of age in a Montreal public school.

Contrary to the findings of previous studies, the onset of discrimination occurs at the 5 year age level when measured with a sociometric technique and at the 9 year age level when measured with a suggestive questionnaire.

This study shows discrimination in choosing friends appearing among both Protestant and Jewish children at 5 years of age, disappearing at 6 years, and reappearing at 9 years, with Protestants only showing it at 10 years.

At 9 and 10 years of age, Protestants showed more dislike of Jews than of Protestants, both through their choices and on the questionnaire. Jewish children showed no dislike of the Protestant group at any of the four age levels.

A negative relationship was found between sociometric discrimination and discrimination expressed on the questionnaire. Those showing no discrimination on the questionnaire chose significantly more friends within their own group than did those who showed discrimination on the questionnaire.

The findings were discussed and attempts were made to interpret them.

Table 1

Significance of Sociometric Choices as Determined Within

Protestant and Jewish Groups Separately

(Entries are Chi-Square values with 1 df¹)

<u>Ages</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>LIKES</u>				<u>DISLIKES</u>			
		<u>1 Choice</u>		<u>3 Choices</u>		<u>1 Choice</u>		<u>3 Choices</u>	
		<u>Prot.</u> <u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>
5 years	18	11	6.86**	7.38**	8.50**	8.75**	-2.76	-.04	-.70
6 years	21	12	.96	.81	1.39	.45	-.02	.10	.24
9 years	48	21	9.73**	8.10**	27.50***	42.57***	5.53*	-.78	18.57***
10 years	48	15	7.44**	1.78	22.89***	1.52	.001	.012	8.04**
Total	135	59							

¹The first entry, 6.86, indicates that Protestants liked significantly more of their own religious group. A minus sign indicates more dislike choices of own group.

* is significant at .05

** is significant at .01

*** is significant at .001

Table 2

Significance of Sociometric Choices as Determined Within
Protestant and Jewish Groups Separately

(Entries are Chi-Square values with 1 df)⁴

		<u>LIKES</u>				<u>DISLIKES</u>				
<u>Ages</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>1 Choice</u>		<u>3 Choices</u>		<u>1 Choice</u>		<u>3 Choices</u>		
		<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	
<u>Boys</u>										
5 Years	11	3	2.24	8.06**	1.47	5.61*	-.005	-.07	-.01	-.26
6 Years	10	7	.04	0	.58	.002	.01	.14	.13	.99
9 Years	23	10	6.16*	3.87*	16.29***	21.53***	2.57	-.30	4.99*	-.44
10 Years	22	9	1.85	.81	7.38**	.04	.002	.01	5.56*	-.88
<u>Girls</u>										
5 Years	7	8	4.65*	2.15	9.88**	4.50	-5.52	.002	-1.08	-.30
6 Years	11	5	1.69	2.70	.57	.86	-.013	.15	1.60	-1.32
9 Years	25	11	2.94	2.96	9.76**	20.60***	2.25	-.13	13.58***	-.002
10 Years	26	6	5.31*	.25	15.69***	4.58*	.03	.25	2.26	-.07

* is significant at .05

** is significant at .01

***is significant at .001

Table 3

Number of Protestants and Jews Expressing
Discrimination on the Questionnaire

<u>Protestants</u>				<u>Jews</u>		
<u>Age</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>No. Discrim.</u>	<u>% Discrim.</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>No. Discrim.</u>	<u>% Discrim.</u>
5 Years	18	0	0	11	0	0
6 Years	21	1	.05	12	0	0
9 Years	48	11	.23	21	0	0
10 Years	48	13	.27	15	0	0

Table 4

Sociometric Choices and (1) Questionnaire Discrimination (D); and
(2) Questionnaire Non-Discrimination (Non-D)

(Entries are Chi-Square values with 1 df)

<u>Ages</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>LIKES</u>				<u>DISLIKES</u>			
		<u>1 Choice</u>		<u>3 Choices</u>		<u>1 Choice</u>		<u>3 Choices</u>	
		<u>D.</u>	<u>Non-D.</u>	<u>D.</u>	<u>Non-D.</u>	<u>D.</u>	<u>Non-D.</u>	<u>D.</u>	<u>Non-D.</u>
9 Years	11 37	1.42	7.41**	2.83	23.48***	.16	5.95*	.34	20.07***
10 Years	13 35	2.78	3.93*	9.49**	13.18***	.08	-.0002	3.02	4.59*

* is significant at .05

** is significant at .01

***is significant at .001

Table 5

Relationship Between Sociometric Choices and

(1) Questionnaire Discrimination (D) and

(2) Questionnaire Non-Discrimination (Non-D)

(Entries are Chi-Square Values with 1 df)

<u>Ages</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>LIKES</u>				<u>DISLIKES</u>				
		<u>One Choice</u>		<u>3 Choices</u>		<u>One Choice</u>		<u>3 Choices</u>		
		<u>D.</u>	<u>Non-D.</u>	<u>D.</u>	<u>Non-D.</u>	<u>D.</u>	<u>Non-D.</u>	<u>D.</u>	<u>Non-D.</u>	
9 Year Boys	7	16	.26	5.60*	3.36	12.03***	-.10	3.94*	-.0005	7.89**
9 Year Girls	4	21	.57	1.71	.001	10.62***	.12	1.56	1.48	11.22***
10 Year Boys	5	17	.87	.59	3.59	3.79	.003	-.06	.42	4.73*
10 Year Girls	8	18	.95	3.34	4.81*	9.76**	.01	.004	2.29	.36

* is significant at .05

** is significant at .01

***is significant at .001

Table 6

Religious Designation of Subjects and of Total Population
from Which Sociometric Choices Were Made

	<u>Choosers</u>		<u>Total Class</u>	
	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>
10 Year Boys	22	9	23	9
10 Year Girls	26	6	29	7
9 Year Boys	23	10	24	10
9 Year Girls	25	11	27	11
6 Year Boys	7	6	7	6
6 Year Girls	8	3	8	4
6 Year Boys	3	1	7	8
6 Year Girls	3	2	9	2
5 Year Boys	11	3	17	5
5 Year Girls	7	8	8	11
<hr/>				
Total	135	59	159	73

Table 7

Number of Sociometric LIKE CHOICES given to
Protestant and Jewish Children

<u>Ages</u>	<u>First Choice</u>				<u>Three Choices</u>			
	<u>Protestant</u> <u>Choosers</u>		<u>Jewish</u> <u>Choosers</u>		<u>Protestant</u> <u>Choosers</u>		<u>Jewish</u> <u>Choosers</u>	
	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>
10 Year Boys	19	3	5	4	55	8	20	7
10 Year Girls	26	0	4	2	76	1	11	7
9 Year Boys	22	1	4	6	64	5	10	20
9 Year Girls	22	3	5	6	64	9	12	21
6 Year Boys	3	4	4	2	12	9	11	6
6 Year Girls	8	0	1	2	19	5	6	3
6 Year Boys	2	1	0	1	4	3	0	3
6 Year Girls	2	1	1	1	6	3	4	2
5 Year Boys	11	0	0	3	27	4	4	5
5 Year Girls	6	1	1	7	14	4	5	19

Table 8

Number of Sociometric DISLIKE CHOICES given to
Protestant and Jewish Children

<u>Ages</u>	<u>First Choice</u>				<u>Three Choices</u>			
	<u>Protestant</u>		<u>Jewish</u>		<u>Protestant</u>		<u>Jewish</u>	
	<u>Choosers</u>		<u>Choosers</u>		<u>Choosers</u>		<u>Choosers</u>	
	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>
10 Year Boys	16	6	7	2	37	28	16	9
10 Year Girls	20	6	5	1	52	20	14	3
9 Year Boys	12	11	6	4	34	27	19	10
9 Year Girls	13	11	7	4	34	35	23	9
6 Year Boys	4	3	4	2	9	8	12	5
6 Year Girls	4	3	2	1	9	11	3	5
6 Year Boys	1	1	1	0	3	2	1	0
6 Year Girls	3	0	2	0	5	1	6	0
5 Year Boys	9	2	1	1	19	5	4	1
5 Year Girls	5	0	4	4	6	4	8	14

Table 9

Sociometric Choices by Questionnaire Discriminators (D)
and by Questionnaire Non-Discriminators (Non-D)

		<u>LIKES</u>				<u>DISLIKES</u>			
<u>Ages</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>One Choice</u>		<u>3 Choices</u>		<u>One Choice</u>		<u>3 Choices</u>	
		<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>	<u>Prot.</u>	<u>Jew</u>
<u>10 Year Boys</u>									
Prot.									
D.	5	5	0	12	0	3	2	9	6
Non-D.	17	14	3	43	8	13	4	28	22
Jewish									
D.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-D.	9	5	4	20	7	7	2	16	9
<u>10 Year Girls</u>									
Prot.									
D.	8	8	0	24	0	6	2	15	8
Non-D.	18	18	0	52	1	14	4	37	12
Jewish									
D.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-D.	6	4	2	11	7	5	1	14	3
<u>9 Year Boys</u>									
Prot.									
D.	7	6	1	19	2	5	2	13	5
Non-D.	16	16	0	45	3	7	9	21	22
Jewish									
D.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-D.	10	4	6	10	20	6	4	19	10
<u>9 Year Girls</u>									
Prot.									
D.	4	4	0	9	3	2	2	6	6
Non-D.	21	18	3	55	6	11	9	28	29
Jewish									
D.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-D.	11	5	6	12	21	7	4	23	9

References

1. Allport, G. W. The nature of prejudice. Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
2. Blake, R. & Dennis, W. The development of stereotypes concerning the negro. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1943, 38, 525-531.
3. Criswell, J. Racial cleavage in Negro-White groups. Sociometry, 1937, 1, 81-89.
4. Davitz, J. R. Social perception and sociometric choice of children. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1955, 50, 173-176.
5. Gesell, A. & Ilg, F. The child from five to ten. New York: Harper & Bros., 1946.
6. Gilbert, G. M. Stereotype persistence and change among college students. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1951, 46, 245-254.
7. Goodman, M. E. Race awareness in young children. Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1952.
8. Goodnow, R. E. & Tagiuri, R. Religious ethnocentrism and its recognition among adolescent boys. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1952, 47, 316-320.
9. Harding, J., Kutner, B., Proshansky, H., & Chein, I. Prejudice and ethnic relations. Chapter 27 in Lindzey, G. (Ed.) Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
10. Hartley, E. Problems in prejudice. New York: King's Crown Press, 1946.
11. Hartley, E. L., Rosenbaum, M., & Schwartz, S. Children's use of ethnic frames of reference. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1948, 26, 367-386.

12. Horowitz, E. L. The development of attitudes toward the Negro.
Archives of Psychol., 1936, 28, #194, 5-47.
13. Horowitz, E. L. & Horowitz, R. E. The development of social attitudes in children. Sociometry, 1937, 1, 301-338.
14. Hyman, H. H. & Sheatsley, P. B. Attitudes toward desegregation.
Scientific American, Dec. 1956, 35-39.
15. Katz, D. & Braly, K. W. Racial stereotypes of 100 college students.
J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1933, 28, 280-290.
16. Katz, D. & Braly, K. W. Racial prejudice and racial stereotypes.
J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1935, 30, 175-193.
17. Klineberg, O. Social psychology. New York: Holt, 1954.
18. Lambert, W. E. & Taguchi, Y. Ethnic cleavage among young children.
J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 53, 380-382.
19. Loomis, C. P. Ethnic cleavages in the southwest as reflected in two high schools. Sociometry, 1943, 6, 7-26.
20. Moreno, J. L. Who shall survive? Washington: Nerv. and Ment. Publ. Co., 1934.
21. Morse, N. & Allport, F. The causation of anti-semitism. J. Psychol., 1952, 34, 197-233.
22. Mowrer, O. H. Learning theory and personality dynamics. New York: Ronald, 1950.
23. Queener, E. L. Introduction to social psychology. New York: Ronald, 1950.
24. Radke, M., Trager, H. G. & Davis, H. Social perceptions and attitudes of children. Genet. Psychol. Monogr., 1949, 40, 327-347.

25. Radke, M. & Sutherland, J. Children's concepts and attitudes about minority and majority American groups. J. educ. Psychol., 1949, 40, 449-468.
26. Rosenblith, J. F. A replication of "some roots of prejudice." J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1949, 44, 470-489.
27. Zelig, R. Tracing racial attitudes through adolescence. Sociol. soc. Res., 1939, 23, 45-54.
28. Zelig, R. & Hendrickson, G. Racial attitudes of 200 6th grade children. Sociol. soc. Res., 1934, 18, 26-36.
29. Zelig, R. & Hendrickson, G. Factors regarded by children as the basis for their racial attitudes. Sociol. soc. Res., 1935, 19, 225-233.