

A CORRELATION STUDY OF JEWISH EDUCATION AND *HASHKAFAH* AMONG COLLEGE-AGE JEWISH STUDENTS

Yitzchak Meir Goodman

This essay will serve as a synopsis of my doctoral research,¹ as reported at the Conference on Research in Jewish Education at the Hebrew University in June, 1980, with some additional detail and elaboration. The research was conducted among over 500 college-age students, the majority of whom had received Hebrew Day School education in Orthodox institutions. The primary goal of the study was to establish the possible correlation of students' Jewish education with their religious attitudes, although some other selected socio-economic and family background factors were also considered.

The Day School movement developed quite rapidly in the United States in the post-World War II period, at first in the Orthodox communities, and eventually in the Conservative and Reform movements as well. Records indicate this growth to have been from about 69 schools in 1945 to 344 in 1971,² and currently well over 500. Obviously, the lay leaders and philanthropists who build them and the educators who staff them, consider these schools valuable and effective in transmitting Judaism to Jewish boys and girls. However, there were no studies to demonstrate their effectiveness, and some writers even presume that such

1. Isaac M. Goodman. *Jewish Education and Religious Attitudes: A Correlation Study of College-Age Jewish Students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation (Yeshiva University, 1978).

2. Hillel Hochberg, "Trends and Developments in Jewish Education," *American Jewish Yearbook*, LXXIII, 1972, p. 202.

schools have no real value at all in making students more religious.³ The historian of the American Day School Movement, Alvin Schiff, claims that indications are that long-range effects are salutary, but admits that “this is only an assumption, since little research has been done in this area.”⁴ Thus, research literature supported the need for such a study.

Previous Research

Almost all research on Day School students focuses on psychological aspects of their adjustment, anxiety, and personality. Two exceptions are the studies conducted by Pinsky⁵ and Pollak.⁶ The former did his research on the graduates of the Jacob Joseph School in New York City, by means of a mailed questionnaire. Only 340 responded of the 760 who were contacted. Pinsky’s finding that the graduates of this Yeshiva retain, by a large majority, the Orthodox practices that the school teaches, e.g. the observance of Shabbat, kashrut, etc., must be significantly qualified. This is due, of course, to the fact that a majority of those contacted (420 graduates) did not bother to respond to the questionnaire, and it may be logically presumed that less-observant alumni were more likely to ignore the request for information. Further limitations of his study are that 1) his questionnaire did not attempt to probe fundamental religious attitudes comprehensively, and 2) his data reflected, at best, results for the graduates of one school only.

Pollak also mailed questionnaires to Day Schools graduates, to investigate their religious practices, and their interest and participation

3. Stanley Elam. “What do Parochial Schools Accomplish?” *Phi Delta Kapan*, XLV, 3 (Dec., 1963), pp. 121–22.

4. Alvin I. Schiff. “An Appreciation of the Jewish Day School in America,” *Jewish Education*, XXXVII, 1–2 (Winter, 1967), p. 74.

5. Irving Pinsky. *The Graduates of Rabbi Jacob Joseph School — A Follow-up Study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation (Yeshiva University, 1961).

6. George Pollak. *Graduates of the Jewish Day Schools: A Follow-up Study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation (Western Reserve University, 1961).

in Jewish studies and affairs. He received 166 responses for analysis, which represented a thirty-five percent response. Of these, only 70 had attended a Yeshiva High School. Like Pinsky, he did not attempt a serious measurement of fundamental Orthodox attitudes, nor did he separate the elementary school graduates for contrastive analysis with the Yeshiva High School graduates.

One study which took Orthodox religious attitudes into account was done by Menachem Brayer,⁷ whose primary goal was the study of the achievement of Hebrew High School students. His attitude inquiry was a brief aside to the basic dissertation, the instrument used was not comprehensive, nor was it tested for reliability and validity.

It was thus quite clear that a thorough investigation of religious attitudes of Yeshiva Day School and High School graduates had not yet taken place.

There were, however, studies which undertook to measure "religious attitudes" as understood by their authors. Indeed, how does one define the term "religious attitude"? Gordon Allport defines the term "attitude" as follows: "...a mental and neural state of readiness ...exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's responses to all objects and situations with which he is related."⁸

The interest in this study was in the readiness of young Jews to translate their study of Judaism into their daily lives, as a directive influence. This is best brought out by the Hebrew term *hashkafah*, which is similar to the idea of a religious *weltanschauung*. To a religious Jew, *hashkafah* is reflected not only in general attitude and verbal opinions and expressions, but in daily life as it is lived, and by how ethical and moral dilemmas are faced and solved. Only when students have not only acquired various religious practices and acts, but have internalized them and their full meaning and significance as essential and non-negotiable parts of their daily lives, can they be said to have developed a

7. Menachem Brayer. *The Measurement of Achievement in Hebrew Language in the Hebrew High School of New York with Reference to Attitudes Towards Judaism*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation (Yeshiva University, 1958).

8. Gordon W. Allport. "Historical Background of Modern Social Psychology," in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 2nd ed., vol. 1, edited by Gardner Lindzey, (Reading, 1969), p. 63.

strong *hashkafah*. Furthermore, in view of the fact that the major group upon which this study was focused was the Day School graduate primarily of Orthodox institutions, religious attitude had to be understood from the Orthodox point of view to have any meaning in studying such students. The review of the literature on religious attitudes among Jews had to consider whether any reliable and valid questionnaire existed that could accomplish the task, as outlined by the considerations enumerated above.

It was found upon investigation that no such instrument was available. All existing attitude studies measured, in effect, various levels of Jewish identification: i.e., likes and dislikes, acceptance or rejection of the synagogue, Hebrew School, the idea of God, etc. Nobody had undertaken the measurement of Orthodox *hashkafah* in its broad sense. For this reason, amazing results were reported by some researchers who studied American Jewish youngsters. Thus, Birnbaum found no significant difference in "religious attitudes" between graduates of Orthodox Day Schools and of Reform Sunday Schools, among the college students he tested!⁹ Such an astonishing result is actually comprehensible when we note that his measuring instrument was the Geismar Scale of Jewish Identification,¹⁰ and Franzblau's questionnaire.¹¹ The latter was concerned exclusively with sophisticated theological concepts of God, a fault pointed out by other researchers.¹² Geismar's scale, as indicated by the title, only measures identification, a far less substantial concept than "religious attitude." His item on kashrut, e.g. is worded thus: "The dietary laws should be respected by all Jews." Even the ham-eating Jew can

9. H. Birnbaum. *A Study of Religious Attitudes, Beliefs and Observances of Jewish Pupils with Varying Religious Educational Experiences*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of Maryland, 1963).

10. Ludwig Geismar. "A Scale for the Measurement of Ethnic Identification," *Jewish Social Studies*, XVI, 1 (Jan., 1954), pp. 33-60.

11. Abraham N. Franzblau. *Religious Belief and Character among Jewish Adolescents*. Doctoral dissertation, (New York: Columbia University, 1934).

12. Aaron Soviv. "Self-Acceptance of Jewishness by Young Jewish People," *Jewish Education*, XXVI, 1 (Summer, 1955), pp. 22-31.

“respect” kashrut (e.g. for his grandparents), but this is not a true test of real *hashkafah*, as understood by an Orthodox Jew. How different might Birnbaum’s findings have been had the students been asked whether they “consistently observed” the Jewish religious dietary laws!

Many other studies of this general type exist, but are obviously almost meaningless for the purpose of studying Day School graduates. The teachers and administrators of Yeshivot expect far more from their students than “respect” for kashrut (or, to cite another typical example from a similar study, “confidence that American Jewry will manage to survive”). Acceptance of such statements by a Day School graduate will tell very little about the extent to which he has accepted and internalized the instruction of his teachers.

Therefore, the creation of an instrument for the comprehensive measurement of Orthodox *hashkafah* had to be undertaken. With such an instrument, Day School graduates on different levels could be studied and compared with others who had no Day School experiences, in order to correlate *hashkafah* with Jewish education.

Furthermore, other decisions were reached in consultation with the dissertation committee regarding procedure for the research. For example, it was decided to direct the study to college-age students so that it would serve in some measure as a follow-up study for those who had ended their Jewish education prior to or simultaneously with entry to college. Other variables to be included in the study would be: the education and Orthodox religious observance level of the parents; their birthplace; family’s socio-economic level; and the sex and age of the respondents. The hypotheses were that Jewish education is related to *hashkafah*; religious observance is related to *hashkafah*; other background factors are related to *hashkafah*.

The Research Instrument

The *hashkafah* questionnaire was formulated under the guidance of ten distinguished experts, chosen on the basis of these criteria: a) a Rabbinic degree from an American Orthodox seminary; b) a graduate degree in any other field of study (M.A. or Ph.D.); c)

personally Orthodox in private life. The judges were (alphabetically) Meyer Feldblum, Irving Greenberg, Mayer Herzkovics, Norman Lamm, Aharon Lichtenstein, Israel Miller, Emanuel Rackman, Leonard Rosenfeld, Isaac Suna, and Moses Tendler. Eight of these Rabbis had Ph.D. degrees at the time.

After revisions and consultations spanning several years, a sixty-item questionnaire resulted containing 23 Orthodox statements, 17 Liberal-Jewish statements (i.e. acceptable to Conservative and/or Reform Jews), 12 Christian statements (i.e. showing Christian influence in thinking, but not directly and overtly Christian), and 8 atheistic statements. Response to the items was by the use of a q-sort sheet (see Appendix) in which the numbers of the statements had to be recorded in bell-shaped columns from strongest agreement to strongest disagreement. The final scoring sheet thus represented a miniature picture of a respondent's *weltanschauung* — in terms of religious thinking — and was thus far more meaningful than the standard manner of responding to items by noting strongly agree, agree, etc., for each one. In addition to the use of these judges, other techniques for validation were employed, e.g. questioning non-Orthodox students in their Rabbinic seminaries, and consulting Christian professors at Protestant and Catholic seminaries regarding the “Christian” statements.

A reliability test of the q-sort was conducted with 15 respondents using the test-retest method in a two-week interval. This yielded a reliability coefficient of .855, which is most satisfactory in statistical research. Additionally, a religious observance index was devised in consultation with five Orthodox Rabbis of synagogues. Finally, a detailed biographical questionnaire was developed to gain full information on the background of the respondents and their parents.

Administration and Procedure

The complete questionnaire was administered to 564 respondents, mostly in 1968. Since their participation was solicited either at a Jewish summer camp, a Jewish campus club, or at a Jewish school, all respondents can be said to have identified Jewishly in some positive way. A random sampling method was used, but modified to assure that a majority of the respondents would be of Day School background, yet of diverse types (modern to

“extreme” Orthodox). Due to respondent errors, 49 questionnaires had to be discarded, leaving 515 suitable for computer analysis.

Examination of the statistical data shows the following relevant facts about the participants: 1) the male-female ratio was 58% to 42%; 2) over 80% of the respondents were American-born; 3) about 2/3 were Day School graduates, a majority of whom had completed a Yeshiva High School education; 4) 80% of them were attending college, and most of the remainder were in Orthodox seminaries, devoting themselves completely to Jewish or Rabbinic studies; 5) their families were fairly evenly divided among the five levels of socio-economic status as classified by Hollingshead,¹³ except for a small six percent on the lowest level; 6) both in Jewish education and in Orthodox religious observance, the average student level was higher than the average level of the parents among these 515 respondents.

The respondents were divided into eight groups according to the intensity of their Jewish education, with ratings based on consultations with three experts in Jewish education. Religious observance was scored from a low of zero to a high of nine in one-step intervals. For the determination of statistical significance, both the analysis of variance and the correlation matrix were used. The former, which produces what is called an F-score, is a statistical method of measuring whether groups divided by any criterion chosen by the researcher differ one from the other in a way that is statistically significant. In the correlation matrix, which gives an r-score, the researcher prepares the different groups' data in pre-arranged order which attempts to predict the results based on the hypothesis which the study is investigating. For example, if 10,000 people were divided into 10 groups of 1000 each based on their greater or lesser use of tobacco for a correlation study of smoking and lung cancer, and a researcher were to feed the information into a computer using no system of pre-arranging his groups, he could only get an F-score. If he calls the low-smoking group number “1”, and proceeds in precise order, with the highest smoking group as number “10”, he can get an r-score, which he then checks to see if it is statistically significant.

13. August Hollingshead and Frederick Redlich. *Social Class and Mental Illness*, (New York, 1958), pp. 398-407.

Since some researchers prefer the F-score, and others feel that for a correlation study an r-score is best, both scores were computed. Also, the five percent level of significance was adopted for this study, i.e. if the differences found among the groups might have resulted by pure chance less than 1 in 20 times, the groups are considered significantly different, and chance is presumed not to have been operating. This five percent level is the one most often adopted in statistical research.

In the *hashkafah* 60-item q-sort, the maximum Orthodox score was 76, while the lowest possible one was 154. There was clear evidence from several indicators that scores in the 80's reflected fairly strong Orthodox attitudes, although there was a wide difference between an 81 and an 89 score. There was also evidence that scores in the 90's reflected some Orthodox tendency or residue of influence, while scores of 100 and above showed total divergence from Orthodox thinking.

Findings

As indicated in Table 1, the major goal of this study, to find the relationship between Jewish education and *hashkafah*, was achieved. The F-score and the r-score are significant at the one percent level, and indicate a moderately strong relationship, supporting the primary hypothesis. Further analysis was undertaken by making multiple comparisons (t-scores) between different levels of Jewish education as related to *hashkafah*. Table 2 shows significant differences between several groups, e.g. students with minimum levels of Jewish education compared with graduates of afternoon Hebrew Schools; graduates of Elementary Day Schools compared with those who attended afternoon schools even on their highest levels, etc. This table thus offers further support to the hypothesis that increased Jewish education (typically in Day Schools) correlates with a stronger *hashkafah*.

The hypothesis that Orthodox religious practice and observance are related to religious attitudes was also borne out by the data as presented in Tables 6M and 6F, wherein males and females were scored separately. In both cases, the F-scores and r-scores were quite high, showing a strong relationship to *hashkafah*. This was logically expected, presuming the validity of the

q-sort as a measure of one's religiosity in both theory and practice. The only other worthwhile relationships to *hashkafah* found in the study were the religious observance levels of the mother and father. The final four variables in the following table, while registering statistical significance, are too small to be considered truly significant in any practical way:

	F-score	r-score
Personal religious observance — females	119.917	.8400
Personal religious observance — males	75.779	.7333
Jewish educational level attained	54.859	.6335
Mother's religious observance level	33.030	.5195
Father's religious observance level	32.070	.5143
Father's Jewish educational level	7.330	.2764
Different types of post-high school education of Yeshiva High School graduates	3.700	.1620
Parents' birthplace	9.598	.1861
Mother's Jewish educational level	3.951	.1162

Among some of the important limitations of the study are:

- 1) It was conducted primarily among New Yorkers whose Jewish educational level may be higher than that of students elsewhere in the United States;
- 2) The students supplied all data about their parents, with no way to confirm the accuracy of their ratings and evaluations;
- 3) It had to be presumed that respondents were honest about themselves, with no opportunity for outside confirmation, based on anonymity;
- 4) Of necessity, the q-sort left out basic areas of life relevant to a total religious attitude, e.g. items about general ethics and morality. These were deleted since they are acceptable to all Jews equally, whether Orthodox, Conservative, or Reform. Hence, acceptance of them could not be scored appropriately;
- 5) Finally, this study provides no information regarding students who choose not to be identified in any Jewish setting at all. It was presumed that no worthwhile information could be obtained by comparing Day School graduates with college students who have

no desire to identify Jewishly in some religious, social, or Zionist context.

Discussions and Conclusions

A) Having measured a moderately strong relationship between an increased Jewish education and stronger *hashkafah*, the question remains whether this is a cause-and-effect relationship. In this area, only opinions, rather than scientific statements, are possible. The probability is that a purely scientific cause-and-effect study of relationship between Jewish education and Orthodox *hashkafah* will never be carried out. Such a goal had been envisioned by the American Association for Jewish Education and was later abandoned as impractical.

Statistical studies will probably remain the only means of studying this question. It would appear reasonable to argue that the measured relationship found here — particularly in view of the greater religiosity of students than their parents (implying that parental influence is not the key factor) — is to some significant degree one of cause-and-effect, even if not proven or measurable by laboratory methods. Nobody has ever seriously claimed that schools which teach a particular skill, e.g. medicine or law, do not contribute significantly to students' mastery of these subjects. Yet, because a committed Orthodox way of life and thinking reflects an act of personal commitment and choice rather than mastery of information, it has been claimed that these decisions cannot be imparted through the educational process. Nevertheless, the Yeshiva curriculum, whether elementary level or above, includes material and guidance to direct students not only to discover and acquire information, but also to put into practice the tenets and teaching of the Jewish religion. Is it not reasonable, considering the statistical evidence now uncovered of a significant relationship, to at least place the burden of proof upon those who deny *any* cause-and-effect? Is it not realistic to propose that the Orthodox Jewish world — which built and sustained at great sacrifice Jewish centers of learning wherever Jews congregated for the past two thousand years in the firm belief that it was through these spiritual centers that their people would survive the Diaspora — was actually correct in its appraisal?

Correct or not, from a scientific point of view, the fact remains that all these conjectures remain, as stated earlier, private opinions only. In scientific terms, this study provides only a correlation of Orthodox Jewish study and *hashkafah*, and those who examine it must be left to draw their own conclusions and act upon them as they see fit.

B) The students at the James Striar School of Yeshiva University, as shown in Table 1, scored a mean *hashkafah* level of 82.480, comparable to Yeshiva High School graduates who remain afterwards in Rabbinical Seminary. Yet, most of these students had minimal levels of Jewish educational experience before their admission to this program. The high scores they attained would seem to indicate that great personal commitment and motivation can assist students to develop high *hashkafah* levels after relatively short exposure to formal Jewish education. This seems to indicate the potentially great value in developing and sponsoring more Jewish schools with preparatory departments designed especially for late-comers who leave the public schools after several years of education with a newly discovered interest in Judaism.

C) With the exception of the seventeen seminarians not attending secular college classes (whose mean *hashkafah* score was 79.882), the highest mean scores attained by the most Orthodox groups (both in education and practice) were in the low 80's. In view of the scoring technique used in this study, these scores did not result by respondents indicating "agree" rather than "strongly agree," but by their choosing non-traditional or Christian statements as PREFERABLE to Orthodox ones. A random sampling of their scoring sheets showed a preponderance of Christian statements as being found preferable to certain Orthodox ones. In view of the advanced educational standing of these respondents, combined with high scores in personal Orthodox observance, this result appears to indicate weakness in understanding some of the fundamental Jewish opinions, particularly as pertains to distinguishing Judaism from certain Christian opinions. This finding supports the cry of Duker¹⁴ and other educators for

14. Abraham G. Duker. "A Survivalist View," in *Acculturation and Integration*, Judd Teller, editor (New York, 1965), pp. 158-61.

curricular materials in Jewish schools prepared specifically to counter Christian dogma and influence.

D) By using the sixty-item *hashkafah* q-sort, many worthwhile projects might be undertaken in Jewish research, e.g. a) comparisons of different Yeshiva High Schools; b) studying participants in social-educational programs such as NCSY, etc., to determine the measure of success of these programs; c) studying camps which sponsor Judaism programs, with tests administered before and after; d) comparing students of different Orthodox seminaries in their *hashkafah*; etc.

E) The most significant contribution of this study has been the discovery and measurement of a moderately strong relationship between increased Orthodox Jewish education and stronger Orthodox religious attitude (by the use of a newly created instrument for the purpose, which was tested scientifically and rated as valid and reliable). This finding strengthens the argument of those who sponsor, encourage and fund the growth and development of Jewish Day Schools as the best means of insuring the continued survival of the Jewish people in the United States, in a traditional and meaningful Jewish way of life.

Appendix

The Q-sort

(Recorded here as they were presented to respondents, the order done by random selection. The code letters at the end of each statement are for Orthodox, Liberal, Secular, or Christian — O, L, S, C.)

1. The greatest hope for the future of American Jewry lies in the growth of Reform Jewry. (L)
2. The only value of religion is that it offers some sort of comfort to the poor, common masses. (S)
3. The belief in reward or punishment after death is unacceptable. (S)
4. Hebrew should not be the preferred language for prayer for American Jews. (L)

5. Prayer at home is preferable to prayer in a synagogue where men and women sit together. (O)
6. In contrast to Judaism and some other faiths, Christianity may be defined as a "universal" religion. (C)
7. In the Torah ("Old Testament"), God is depicted primarily as a God of stern and strict justice. (C)
8. By his very nature, man is born in a state of sin. (C)
9. A proper synagogue is one in which the sexes are separated by a partition. (O)
10. A person should strive to "turn the other cheek" in dealing with his opponents. (C)
11. The principal purpose of the Messiah is to forgive all our sins. (C)
12. Head-covering for males should not be required at synagogue services. (L)
13. A positive step forward in modernizing Judaism are changes in synagogue arrangements, such as having the cantor face the congregation. (L)
14. The idea that man has a soul which lives on after his death should be rejected. (S)
15. Every Jew should study the Torah daily, on some level, as a basic obligation. (O)
16. It is possible that at some early period, a Jewish folk-custom existed of using blood in Passover matzoh or wine. (C)
17. No person can be righteous enough to earn salvation by the good deeds he does. (C)
18. Religious faith is only the expression of deep psychological needs. (S)
19. God revealed Himself at Sinai to the Jews, to give them an eternal Torah, which included both written and oral teaching.
20. The Biblical story of Noah and his ark is an account of an actual occurrence. (O)
21. All religions arose from ancient superstitions. (S)
22. Jews should observe the Sabbath according to the rulings of our codes of Jewish law. (O)
23. The Rabbinate should elect a Rabbi as the supreme religious authority, whose decisions would be binding on all Jews everywhere. (C)
24. To this very day the Jews are, as the Torah states, God's "chosen People." (O)

25. Striking a match on the Sabbath is a serious violation of Jewish law. (O)
26. It is about time that the traditional Jewish prayers were drastically reduced. (L)
27. Attendance at religious services of another faith in its house of worship, even as an observer, is improper. (O)
28. While Jesus cannot be recognized by the Jews as the Messiah, he should be considered one of the great teachers of Israel. (L)
29. A non-believing Jew can live as good and ethical a life as a religious Jew. (S)
30. "Love thine enemy" marks an ethical advance over the earlier principle of "love thy neighbor." (C)
31. If a student must profane the Sabbath to keep up with his education, he should give up his studies. (O)
32. The three daily prayers are an essential practice of Judaism for males. (O)
33. When a Rabbi cannot prevent a mixed marriage, it is better that he, rather than a Christian minister, perform the wedding ceremony. (L)
34. Man invented God and religious ritual to fulfill his own needs. (S)
35. One can be a good Jew without observing the kosher laws. (L)
36. Orthodox Jews have made a great contribution to the American Jewish community, by developing their Day Schools. (O)
37. Jews should avoid and denounce any theological dialogue with the Christian community. (O)
38. In the last fifty years, Conservative Judaism has done more for American Jews than Orthodox Judaism. (L)
39. The Five Books of Moses are the revealed words of God. (O)
40. The Jewish people will ultimately be redeemed by the Messiah. (O)
41. A religious person must always strive to convert people of other faiths to his religion. (C)
42. The dietary laws (kashrut) should be observed by all Jews, at home and away from home. (O)
43. The Codes of Jewish Law, which organized and codified the Talmudic interpretations of the Torah, are the basic authorities in Judaism. (O)
44. Every religion, by self-definition, must claim that there is no salvation to followers of other faiths. (C)

45. All laws of the Torah are valid, including those which we do not understand at all. (O)
46. The Land of Israel is holy and sacred, as expressed in the Torah. (O)
47. Mourners should not be discouraged from buying expensive coffins and fine clothing for the dead, if they feel it is correct and proper. (L)
48. Prayers for the restoration of animal sacrifices in the Temple should be discontinued. (L)
49. Observance of the second day of Jewish festivals may be discarded in modern times. (L)
50. Organ music, because of its beauty, should be a part of the Sabbath services. (L)
51. Two or three days of "shiva" should be quite sufficient nowadays for mourners. (L)
52. Unlike the accepted practice of circumcision, the "pidyon ha-ben" (the redemption of the first-born) has lost its meaning in modern times. (L)
53. The modern custom of mourners wearing a black ribbon is preferable to the rending of garments. (L)
54. The laws of ritual immersion (mikva) for women have great value for our generation. (O)
55. The text of the Torah, as given through Moses, was carefully guarded throughout the ages from tampering and editing. (O)
56. Man's physical body is the enemy and antagonist of his spiritual soul. (C)
57. The concept of reward and punishment, in an existence after death, is a cardinal principle in Judaism. (O)
58. Prophets who denounced animal sacrifices in the Temple represented an advance over the Torah of Moses. (L)
59. Ritual slaughter of animals, as a religious activity of the Jewish people, should not be tampered with by civil legislation. (O)
60. Man, like the animal, is a natural product of evolution; thus the distinction between body and soul is an imaginary conception. (S)

Research Project 613

Instructions for SCORING SHEET

The 60 cards you have received express a wide range of opinions on religion, philosophy, ethics, etc. You will probably agree with some and disagree with others. Each statement has been assigned a number arbitrarily, to make it easy for you to indicate your opinion about it on the scoring sheet. Please follow the recommended procedure step-by-step for the fastest and best results:

1. Arrange the cards in three piles: on the right-hand side (pile A) place the cards expressing opinions with which you agree; on the left-hand side (pile C) place the cards expressing opinions with which you disagree; in the middle (pile B) place the cards about which you are uncertain. The amount of cards in each pile is PURELY A MATTER OF OPINION.
2. From pile A (agreement), select the *ONE* card with which you MOST STRONGLY agree, record the number on the scoring sheet, column no. 1, and turn the card face down. Select the next THREE with which you most strongly agree, record the numbers in column no. 2, and turn face down. (NOTE — The order of recording numbers WITHIN A COLUMN makes NO DIFFERENCE.) Follow this selection procedure using column no. 3 (limited to 7 statements), column no. 4 (limited to 12 statements), etc., until all the cards with which you agree have been recorded by number. You MAY finish with this pile ANYWHERE along the line, even in MIDDLE of a column.
3. When this happens, start with pile C (disagreement), selecting the *ONE* statement with which you MOST STRONGLY disagree, record the number in column no. 9, and turn face down. Continue by the same process to column no. 8 (limit of 3 statements), column no. 7 (limit of 7 statements), etc., until pile C is exhausted. Again, you may finish with this pile anywhere along the line, or in middle of a column.
4. Now, try to reach decisions about the items in pile B, and record the numbers to the right if you tend to agree, and to the left if you tend to disagree. The strength of your feeling about an item should determine how far over to the left or right you record the number. Those about which you are ABSOLUTELY UNCERTAIN, will line up in middle of the other two groups, probably at, or next to, column no. 5. Fill in the

remaining blank spaces with the numbers of the remaining items. **DO NOT BE DISTURBED** if you must record them in a column partially taken up by items with which you had agreed or disagreed. Your scoring sheet will nevertheless represent a record of your opinions in gradual progression from one feeling to the other.

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PATIENCE
AND CO-OPERATION.**

(Unless specifically requested to do otherwise, please ignore the spaces below.)

Table 2
T Values for Multiple Comparisons of Groups Found in Table 1

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	<u>3.15</u>						
2		.90	<u>3.607</u>				
3			<u>2.286</u>				
4				1.972	<u>2.872</u>		
5					1.784	<u>2.519</u>	
6						.597	1.442
7							1.789

KEY

1% level: _____

2% or 5% level: _ _ _ _

Table 6M
Religious Observance Correlated with *Hashkafah* - Males Only

Group	Items Observed	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
1	up to 2	10	130.100	5.734
2	from 3 to 5	18	144.277	10.733
3	from 6 to 8	37	104.000	12.785
4	from 9 to 11	28	95.107	15.316
5	from 12 to 14	40	85.975	9.242
6	from 15 to 16	44	81.795	5.106
7	17	37	80.351	3.960
8	all 18	87	80.781	8.910

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
A-Between diff. rel. obsv. levels	49009.344	7	7001.334	75.779
Within	27070.610	293	92.391	
Total	76079.954	300	253.599	

Correlation coefficient:-.7333

Table 1
Eight Levels of Jewish Education Correlated
to Students' *Hashkafah*

Group	N	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
1. (CC30-0, 1, and 2 combined): minimum Jewish educational levels	30	119.966	16.926
2. (CC30-3): afternoon Heb. Sch. grads.; day school for 3 to 4 yrs.; or equivalent	39	106.897	16.688
3. (CC30-5; CC7 - 1 or 2): Heb. high school grads., (non-Yeshiva)	21	102.857	16.054
4. (CC30-5; CC7 - 3 or 4): elementary day school grads., with no further Jewish Education	24	92.000	14.958
5. (CC30-7): Yeshiva High School grads., with no further Jewish Education	124	86.669	11.395
6. (CC30-from 0 to 4; CC28 - 1): non-day school students in Yeshiva Univ. JSS Program	25	82.480	5.499
7. (CC30-8): continuous Jewish Education to two years past high school	155	83.374	10.054
8. (CC30-9): continuous Jewish Education over two years past high school (in Rabbinical Seminary)	39	80.358	5.859

Source	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F
A - Between diff. educa. levels	54826.064	7	7832.294	54.857
Within	64106.085	449	142.775	
Total	118932.149	456	260.816	

Correlation coefficient: -.6335