



HISPANIC ATTITUDES TOWARD JEWS

Tom W. Smith

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

HISPANIC ATTITUDES TOWARD JEWS

Tom W. Smith

The American Jewish Committee protects the rights and freedoms of Jews the world over; combats bigotry and anti-Semitism and promotes human rights for all; works for the security of Israel and deepened understanding between Americans and Israelis; advocates public policy positions rooted in American democratic values and the perspectives of the Jewish heritage; and enhances the creative vitality of the Jewish people. Founded in 1906, it is the pioneer human-relations agency in the United States.

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

CONTENTS

Dr. Tom W. Smith is director of the General Social Survey at the National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago.

Foreword	v
Hispanic Attitudes toward Jews	
Introduction	1
Explanations	1
Data	5
Summary and Directions for Future Research	10
Tables	12
Appendices	16
References	24

Copyright © 2007 American Jewish Committee
All Rights Reserved
Publication date: April 2007

FOREWORD

With the exponential growth of the Latino community, now the largest ethnic minority in the United States, American Jews—and Americans in general—have good reason to care about the attitudes this highly diverse group holds toward Jews.

To help us better understand this important ethnic group and coalitional partner, Dr. Tom Smith, the director of the General Social Survey (GSS) conducted by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago, has surveyed the literature and examined the research on Hispanic attitudes toward Jews. He notes that while there are “large differences in socio-economic status, religion, immigration status, and historical experiences” that separate the two communities, nevertheless, “a majority of Hispanics and Jews end up on the same side of most issues.”

Dr. Smith examines a number of studies that have found negative attitudes toward Jews to be more common among Hispanics than among non-Hispanics, and suggests that the pattern is more complex and the differences more modest than the studies based on negative stereotyping would indicate. “The results support the hypothesis that Hispanics have less contact with Jews than non-Hispanics do, and that this leads to more negative assessments, but either sample sizes are too small and/or variables are lacking to test formally this explanation,” he states.

Therefore, he recommends further research, with larger samples of Hispanics, so that subgroups can be analyzed, the level of intergroup contact taken into consideration, and the characteristics of the current community more accurately assessed. As well, he suggests including positive as well as negative stereotypes to correct against the tendency to say “yes” to a long list of questions. He also

points to the need for further investigation into the specific country of birth of the respondents and their parents, the country raised in, and the religion raised in and that currently practiced. In addition, further research might take into consideration the class background and urban vs. rural origins of Hispanic immigrants, who come from very stratified societies that differ greatly in their varied sectors as to exposure to “others.”

The American Jewish Committee for a large part of its history has worked to build coalitions with Hispanic/Latino communities in this country in pursuit of common goals. It has also been actively involved in fostering closer relations with all nations in the hemisphere and supporting a democratic and prosperous Latin America. The creation two years ago of the Latino and Latin American Institute was a de facto recognition of the importance of the welfare of the Americas as a strategic and humanitarian consideration for the U.S., of the significance of Jewish life in the region, and of the close ties developed between many Latin American countries and the State of Israel since its founding.

From supporting comprehensive immigration reform to jointly advocating for access of students to higher education, from journeying together to Israel or to Latin America to learning about each other's origins, cultures and current concerns, Latinos and Jews have shown a growing interest in a Latino-Jewish partnership. Through work at the chapter level in many locales—Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, San Diego, Westchester, Houston, Miami—and at the national level, AJC has nurtured relationships between people and between communities.

All these fruitful avenues for research, programmatic initiatives, and collaborative efforts highlight the opportunity for fruitful outreach and bridge-building between the Latino and Jewish communities, an enterprise in which the American Jewish Committee has taken a leadership role since the 1970s. These efforts demonstrate, as does this study, that the local is truly global, and that communities that were once distant are now in closer proximity.

Dina Siegel Vann

Director, Latino and Latin American Institute

HISPANIC ATTITUDES TOWARD JEWS

Introduction

In recent years there has been increased concern that Hispanics are more likely to have negative views about Jews than do non-Hispanics, and that foreign-born Hispanics are especially prone to unfavorable assessments of Jews. This report examines Hispanic attitudes toward Jews and considers: 1) explanations that have been offered for greater negativity toward Jews by Hispanics, in general, and foreign-born Hispanics, in particular, 2) a wide range of empirical studies comparing the views of Hispanics and non-Hispanics toward Jews, and 3) what research is needed to more fully understand the role of Hispanic ethnicity in shaping attitudes toward Jews.

Explanations

Both external explanations having to do with Hispanic culture in countries of origin and internal explanations having to do with Hispanic society in the United States have been advanced to account for more negative views toward Jews by Hispanics than by non-Hispanics. External explanations have a strong appeal, since they might explain both the differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanics in the U.S. as well as the differences between foreign- and U.S.-born Hispanics.

The prime external explanation that has been offered for the less positive evaluation of Jews by Hispanics in general and foreign-born Hispanics in particular is that they have been exposed in Latin America to a more traditional and more anti-Semitic form of Catholicism than prevails in the U.S. (Dinnerstein, 2004; Lavender,

2002; Stern, 2006; Suro, 2002; Thavis, 2004). The Anti-Defamation League's national director Abraham H. Foxman has argued (ADL, 2002a, p. 1) that the greater anti-Semitism of Hispanics "is a reflection of what is learned about Jews in the schools, churches, and communities of Hispanic nations." Likewise, Kenneth S. Stern, the American Jewish Committee's expert on anti-Semitism, has noted: "Hispanics come predominately from the heavily Catholic societies in Latin America where the teachings of Vatican II have not penetrated as well as in other countries" (2006, p. 152).

A second exogenous explanation has been the influence of fascist political movements in Latin America, such as the Peronists in Argentina (Deutsch, 1986; Elkin and Merckx, 1987; Feldstein and Acosta-Aizuru, 2003; Grugel, 1985). The impact of this factor may be limited by the fact that those Latin American countries with the strongest fascist movements have contributed relatively few immigrants to the U.S.

The final external explanation is that Jews make up such a small share of the population in most Latin American countries that most Hispanics are not personally familiar with Jews (DeSipio, 2003; Elkin, 1980; Elkin and Merckx, 1987; Levitz, 1954; Sheinin and Barr, 1996). This means that Jews are seen as outsiders and not compatriots (Ruiz, 2002), that the lessons of the Holocaust have had relatively little impact in these societies (Lavender, 2002; Suro, 2002), and that traditional stereotypes such as Jews being responsible for the death of Christ can thrive without personal contacts to counter the negative images.

Of course, these external explanations could interact with one another and complement each other.

Internal explanations center around two factors: group conflict, especially at the community level, and socio-demographic and attitudinal differences that separate the Hispanic and Jewish communities in the U.S.

First, community conflicts have sometimes split Jews and Hispanics. Examples of community conflict include contention in Miami over ethnic succession in neighborhoods, political disputes

between Republican-leaning Cubans and Democratic-oriented Jews, and disagreements over U.S. policy toward Castro (Bettinger-Lopez, 2000; DeSipio, 2003; Lavender, 2002; Shaw, 1992); and in New York City controversy over such matters as the Seward Park Extension, housing in Williamsburg, and the mayoral candidacy of Fernando Ferrer (Beinart, 2002; Kamasaki, 2002; Tomasky, 2002; Turner, 1984). In Los Angeles, community and political alliances between Jews and Hispanics have sometimes been strong and at other times weak (Sonenshein, 1986; 2002; Windmueller, 1999). In Chicago, the two communities have had relatively little contact with each other, and as a result, there has been relatively little in the way of either cooperation or conflict (DeSipio, 2002).

However, there is general consensus that such conflicts have not been serious or sustained. Moreover, counterbalancing such disagreements, there have been several successful initiatives to build bridges between the Hispanic and Jewish communities. As part of a general strategy of building coalitions with other racial, ethnic, and religious minorities that have also been the targets of bigotry and discrimination, Jewish organizations have forged alliances with various Hispanics groups (Schaffer, 2002; Stern, 2006, p. 152, 202). The American Jewish Committee has been involved in outreach to the Hispanic community since the 1970s (AJC, 2007) and a number of Jewish-Hispanic alliances have been formed in various cities: among others, the San Diego Latino-Jewish Coalition, the Latino-Jewish Policy Forum in Los Angeles, and the Latino and Jewish Alliance in Westchester (AJC, 2007; Harrison, 2006), the latter no longer operative. In Chicago the Alliance of Latinos and Jews, nurtured and later spun off by AJC, has flourished since the 1990s by building relationships between people. Nationally, the first-ever Latino-Jewish Leadership Summit was held in March 2001, and this led to the formation of the National Latino-Jewish Leadership Council in March 2003 (AJC, 2007; AJC, 2002; Rosenberg, 2002).

Second, both demographically and socially, notable gulfs separate Jewish and Hispanic Americans. As Smith (2005b) has shown, compared to other ethnic and religious groups in America, Jews are

distinctive in both their socio-demographic profile and in their attitudes and values. Demographically, Jews are the best educated and highest income group, while Hispanics tie for second lowest on education and fourth lowest on income. They also show large differences on many other demographic profiles, such as religion, immigration status, and age. Furthermore, the differences suggest that the Hispanic and Jewish communities might have limited interaction with each other and little opportunity to nurture friendships and cooperation based on harmonious interpersonal contacts.

Regarding attitudes and values, Jews differ more from Hispanics than they do from Americans in general (across all examined issues by an average of 13.9 percentage points vs. 11.4 percentage points) (Smith, 2005b). Of the fourteen ethnic groups compared to Jews, Hispanics were the eleventh most distant, with only Asians, Native Americans, and Blacks differing more from Jews. Jews and Hispanics show the biggest differences on:

1. issues such as believing in God and Bible inerrancy, abortion rights, euthanasia and suicide, values important for children, lack of education as a cause of racial inequality, confidence in unions, governmental spending priorities, and civil liberties;
2. behaviors such as socializing with family and newspaper reading; and
3. economic outlooks, such as financial satisfaction and prospects for one's children (Smith, 2005b).

Similarly, a survey by the Foundation for Ethnic Understanding (2001) found that Jewish and Hispanic opinions diverge on the issues of bilingual education and faith-based initiatives.

Hispanics and Jews show the greatest agreement on general political orientation (Beinart, 2002) with Jews and Hispanics being the second and third groups most likely to identify as Democrats, first and fourth on self-labeling as "liberal," and fourth and third as most likely to have voted for Bill Clinton for president (Smith, 2005b). Thus, in the oft-quoted comparison of Milton Himmelfarb (Fein, 2005), "Jews earn like Episcopalians, but vote like Puerto Ricans."

Large differences in socio-economic status, religion, immigration status, and historical experiences combine to separate Hispan-

ics and Jews and contribute to major differences of attitudes and values. Yet a majority of Hispanics and Jews end up on the same side of most issues (Smith, 2005b), and on some dimensions, such as politics and support for socio-welfare policies, the two communities are quite close.

In sum, a number of external and internal explanations for Hispanics having more negative views toward Jews than non-Hispanics have been proposed. These include the role of: 1) anti-Semitic elements in Latin American Catholicism; 2) fascist political movements in Latin America; 3) little positive exposure to the Jewish community in both Latin America and the U.S.; and 4) socio-demographic and attitudinal differences separating the Hispanic and Jewish communities in the U.S. These should form hypotheses to be tested with empirical data.

Data

Prior to surveys in 2002 and 2005 sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League, Hispanic ethnicity had not generally been identified as associated with anti-Semitism (Cohen, 2005; DeSipio, 2002; Sanchez, 1984; Smith, 1996). Those surveys found both that Hispanics in the United States are more likely to hold negative views of Jews than non-Hispanics are and that foreign-born Hispanics are more likely to express unfavorable sentiments about Jews than U.S.-born Hispanics are (ADL, 2002a; ADL, 2002b; ADL, 2005; Marttila, 2005). The appreciable magnitude of the negative views of Jews expressed by Hispanics in general and foreign-born Hispanics in particular and the rapid growth of the Hispanic population in the U.S. has led to major concern over this newly identified node of anti-Semitism (ADL, 2002a; ADL, 2002b; ADL, 2005; Dinnerstein, 2004; Kamasaki, 2002).

As Table 1 (page 13) indicates, Hispanics are more likely to score in the ADL's "most anti-Semitic" category than are Americans as a whole: 35 percent for Hispanics and 17 percent for all in 2002, and 29 percent for Hispanics and 14 percent for all in 2005.¹ In 2002 Hispanics were more likely than Americans as a whole to give negative evaluations of Jews on all eleven items that make up the

ADL anti-Semitism scale. The differences between Hispanics and “all” ranged from 8 to 28 points and averaged 13.9 percentage points. No figures for individual items are available for 2005. For a description of these studies, see Appendix A: Surveys (page 17) and for the items used see Appendix B: Question Wordings (page 20).

Also, Table 1 shows that foreign-born Hispanics have higher anti-Semitism scores than U.S.-born Hispanics. In 2002, 44 percent of foreign-born Hispanics were in the most anti-Semitic group vs. 20 percent of those born in the U.S. In 2005 the most anti-Semitic levels were 35 percent for the foreign-born and 19 percent for the U.S.-born.

For 2002, but not 2005, there are figures for the foreign- and U.S.-born Hispanics for the eleven scale items and a twelfth item on whether Jews are responsible for the death of Christ. Across these twelve items, foreign-born Hispanics are more likely to give a negative assessment of Jews in eleven cases with an average difference of 15.4 percentage points.

A striking pattern is that while the average difference between foreign- and American-born Hispanics on the first ten scale items and the nonscale item on the death of Christ that assert negative traits for Jews is 16.7 points, the eleventh scale item, which is positively oriented toward Jews, shows no difference between these two groups of Hispanics.

A possible explanation for this pattern is that foreign-born Hispanics, many presumably interviewed in Spanish, are exhibiting an acquiescence or yea-saying response set. This pattern results when respondents default to accepting items by selecting responses like “agree” or “probably true” (Cheung and Rensvold, 2000; Javeline, 1999; Tourangeau, Rips, and Rasinski, 2000). This phenomenon could occur among foreign-born Hispanics because of a) greater deference to the interviewer; b) less familiarity with the stereotypes being asked about; c) some aspect of the unknown Spanish-lan-

guage terms used; d) for other reasons; or e) due to a combination of factors. Without the case-level data and full documentation, this possibility cannot be fully tested, but it raises concern that some or all of the foreign-born vs. U.S.-born difference could be merely a measurement artifact.

Table 2 (pages 14-15) presents thirty-four items from five other studies that compare Hispanics and non-Hispanics on their attitudes toward, knowledge about, and contact with Jews. For a description of these studies, see Appendix A: Surveys (page 17) and for the items used, see Appendix B: Question Wordings (page 20). The three contact questions clearly show that Hispanics are less likely to know or have contact with Jews than non-Hispanics are (see also DeSipio, 2002). For example, on the General Social Survey 48 percent of Hispanics personally know someone who is Jewish compared to 59 percent of non-Hispanics.

The two knowledge items from the Holocaust survey show no significant difference in information about World War II concentration camps or the number of Jews killed by the Nazis between Hispanics and non-Hispanics (Table 2). Because lack of knowledge about a topic often leads to “don’t know” responses on related opinion questions, the issue of Holocaust knowledge was explored further by looking at whether Hispanics and non-Hispanics differed on don’t know (DK) levels to attitude questions. The results were quite mixed. On the Holocaust survey the mean number of DK responses across ten attitude items was significantly higher (prob. = .003) for non-Hispanics (0.98) than for Hispanics (0.39). On the three Taking America’s Pulse II and III attitudes items (see Appendix B: Question Wordings, page 20), Hispanics showed higher DK levels than non-Hispanics did. In 2000 the average DK level was 17.1 percent for Hispanics and 7.2 percent for non-Hispanics, and in 2005 it was 25.3 percent for Hispanics and 13.9 percent for non-Hispanics. On the GSS there were no meaningful differences, with the average DKs across seven items being 6.7 percent for Hispanics and 6.5 percent for non-Hispanics. Thus, despite less contact with Jews and the common assumption that Hispanics know less about

1. Figures for non-Hispanics were not reported, but they would be about 15 percent in 2002 and 12 percent in 2005.

the Holocaust than do non-Hispanics, Hispanics do not differ from non-Hispanics in knowledge or opinion.

For the twenty-nine attitudinal items about Jews, twelve showed no statistically significant differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanics, three indicated that Hispanics expressed more positive opinions toward Jews than non-Hispanics did, and fourteen found that Hispanics had less positive views about Jews than non-Hispanics had (Table 2).

Of the three questions on which Hispanics were more favorable than non-Hispanics, only one difference was notable. Eighty-nine percent of Hispanics, but only 79 percent of non-Hispanics backed teaching about the Holocaust in schools. The other differences were small and inconsistent across studies. More Hispanics than non-Hispanics believe that Jews suffer from a great deal of discrimination on Taking America's Pulse III (TAP III), but not on TAP II, and the Holocaust survey finds that Hispanics are more likely to agree that Jews have too much influence, but TAP II and TAP III show the opposite pattern.

Of the fourteen items on which non-Hispanics were more positive toward Jews than Hispanics were, the largest differences were all related to less contact that Hispanics have with Jews. Hispanics were less likely than non-Hispanics to feel close to Jews (-10.3 percentage points on TAP II and -25.1 points on TAP III), to say that Jews were the group they had the most in common with (-14.7 points), and to indicate that Jews were not the group they had the least in common with (-13.7 points). Other notable differences involved Hispanics having less sympathy toward Jews than non-Hispanics did (-6.4 points) and in favoring Jews as neighbors (-5.6 points). Smaller, but still statistically significant differences appear on continuing remembrance of the Holocaust, the likelihood of Jews suffering from another extermination attempt, sympathy toward Israel, and Jewish contributions to America.

Another group of differences are inconsistent or potentially ambiguous. First, the GSS shows non-Hispanics having warmer feelings toward Jews than Hispanics have (62 degrees vs. 54 degrees), but the America National Election Studies (ANES) show no statisti-

cally significant difference (64 degrees vs. 65 degrees). In addition, the ANES show no difference in warmth toward Jews in earlier years (1988: Hispanics, 61.9 degrees, non-Hispanics, 62.7 degrees; and 1992: Hispanics, 65.8 degrees, non-Hispanics, 64.3 degrees). Second, as noted above, studies differ on whether Hispanics or non-Hispanics are more likely to think that Jews have too much influence. Finally, non-Hispanics were more likely than Hispanics to rate Jews as wealthier and more intelligent than Whites in general, while Hispanics rated Jews as less wealthy and less intelligent than Whites. But while this means that Jews were rated less positively by Hispanics, these otherwise positive judgments could be the basis for negative sentiments about Jewish wealth and domination; thus these positive images could sometimes have negative consequences (Smith, 1996; 2001).

Finally, some research on the 2000 election which involved a Jewish vice-presidential candidate on the Democratic ticket has cast doubt on there being a strong connection between Hispanic ethnicity and negative views of Jews. Kane, Craig, and Wald (2004) found that minority voters in Florida (Blacks and Hispanics combined) were not more likely to show an anti-Lieberman bias than White voters were. Likewise, Cohen (2005) found that Hispanic ethnicity was unrelated to evaluations of vice-presidential candidate Joseph Lieberman.

In sum, these additional studies support the finding of the ADL surveys that Hispanics are likely to hold more negative attitudes toward Jews than non-Hispanics have, but suggest that the pattern is more complex and more modest than shown by the stereotype-probing items on the ADL survey.

The limited data comparing U.S.- and foreign-born Hispanics in these additional surveys fail to corroborate the strong finding from the ADL surveys that foreign-born Hispanics are more anti-Semitic than U.S.-born Hispanics. As Table 3 shows, only one of the thirteen items indicated less positive views toward Jews by foreign-born Hispanics than by U.S. Hispanics. The rest show no statistically significant differences.

In addition, while it was not possible to compare foreign- and U.S.-born Hispanics on the America National Election Studies surveys (ANES) because the nativity question was not asked, it was possible to compare Hispanics with both parents U.S.-born vs. one or more foreign-born parents. This comparison showed no difference in warmth toward Jews by immigrant generation (Parents U.S.-Born = 64.5 degrees; Parents Not Both U.S.-Born = 66.0 degrees; prob. = 0.616-ns).

However, the limited numbers of Hispanics overall and of foreign-born Hispanics in particular make these results far from definitive.

Summary and Directions for Future Research

Existing research supports the conclusion that Hispanics hold more negative views of Jews than non-Hispanics do, but the extent of that difference and its pattern are unclear. Only the ADL surveys indicate large and consistent differences. The five other studies show more mixed results, with as many questions showing no difference or a positive leaning among Hispanics as showing statistically significant negative differences (15 vs. 14 on attitudes and 17 vs. 17 when knowledge and contact items are included). The Lieberman studies also fail to indicate that Hispanic ethnicity had an anti-Jewish impact.

The existing data do not permit a systematic testing of the various hypotheses for Hispanics tending to have more negative views of Jews than non-Hispanics have. Nor do they allow for examining the differences between foreign- and U.S.-born Hispanics. Sample sizes are often small, the range of both dependent and independent variables limited, and some key data sets not available for analysis.

The results support the hypothesis that Hispanics have less contact with Jews than non-Hispanics do, and that this leads to more negative assessments, but either sample sizes are too small and/or variables are lacking to test formally this explanation. The data do not lend support to the idea that unfamiliarity with the Holocaust might nurture negative views of Jews, but again this relationship cannot be fully evaluated.

The finding that foreign-born Hispanics are more anti-Semitic than U.S.-born Hispanics is strongly supported by the two ADL studies, but receives little support from the limited comparisons available from the other studies. Moreover, there is an indication from the ADL surveys that acquiescence bias might explain some or all of the difference between foreign- and U.S.-born Hispanics. Unfortunately, case-level data from the ADL surveys are not available to conduct analyses to explore this possibility further. In addition, the external hypotheses related to Latin American Catholicism, fascist political movements, and lack of exposure to Jews in country of origin cannot be tested since needed variables are lacking, sample sizes are too small, and/or the data are not available for analysis.

To secure a better understanding of Hispanic attitudes toward Jews, research needs to be expanded in several ways. It should:

1. include larger samples of Hispanics, so that multivariate models and theory-driven subgroup analysis can be conducted;
2. interview in Spanish as well as in English so that the country-of-birth and assimilation hypotheses can be more fully tested;
3. cover a wide range of attitudes that include ADL stereotype questions, positively-oriented stereotype items to guard against acquiescence bias, and other questions on such matters as intergroup warmth and closeness, positive contributions by groups, experiences of discrimination, and knowledge about groups; and
4. include items of the following measures to explain more fully Hispanic attitudes toward Jews:
 - a. level and nature of intergroup contact and familiarity, to examine the group-contact hypothesis,
 - b. religion raised in and current religion, to test the role of religion in general and Catholicism in particular,
 - c. specific country of birth of both respondents and their parents and country raised in, to be used in the assimilation analysis and to examine country-specific effects, and
 - d. characteristics of current community, to investigate aggregate-level effects, such as the impact of living in Hispanic vs. mixed neighborhoods.

Table 1
Attitudes toward Jews on ADL Surveys

2002	Respondents Agree, by Percent		
	All	Hispanics Born in U.S.	Hispanics Foreign-born
Most Anti-Semitic on Scale	17	35	20
Jews Stick Together	50	61	56
Jews Loyal to Israel	33	46	40
Jews Like to Be at Head	35	44	41
Jews Care for Own Kind	16	44	26
Jews Too Much Business Power	24	42	26
Jews Use Shady Practices	19	37	22
Jews So Shrewd	17	34	23
Jews Have Irritating Faults	20	32	22
Jews Control Wall Street	20	30	21
Jews Too Much Power in U.S.	20	29	21
Jews not as Honest in Business	14	22	22
Jews Responsible for Christ's Death	—	—	26
2005			
Most Anti-Semitic on Scale	14	29	19
			35

— = Not available

Source: For a description of these studies, see Appendix A: Surveys, page 17, and for the items used, see Appendix B: Question Wordings, page 20.

Table 2
Attitudes, Knowledge, and Contact Regarding Jews by Hispanics and Non-Hispanics on Various Surveys

Survey	Item	Hispanics	Non-Hispanics	Prob.
TAPI	Have Contact with Jew	36.8%	52.4%	.000
	Feel Close to Jews	26.0	37.3	.000
	Jews Don't Have Too Much Influence	82.8	87.4	.018
	Jews Suffer a Great Deal of Discrimination	15.1	14.5	ns
TAPII	Have Contact with Jew	33.3	53.4	.000
	Feel Close to Jews	16.1	41.2	.000
	Jews Don't Have Too Much Influence	82.4	86.2	.000
	Jews Suffer a Great Deal of Discrimination	18.6	13.6	.000
Holocaust	Knowing Concentration Camps	53.2	54.2	ns
	Knowing Six Million Jews Killed	33.6	33.3	ns
	Essential to Know about Nazi Exterminations of the Jews	38.3	32.1	ns
	For Keeping Remembrance	79.3	79.9	.026
	For Teaching about Nazi Exterminations	89.0	78.6	.021
	Jews Very Likely to Suffer Another Extermination Attempt	10.8	13.1	.041
	Agree Needed as Refuge for Jews	64.4	57.3	ns
	Disagree that Jews Exploiting the Nazi Extermination Attempt	65.4	62.6	ns
	Very+Somewhat Sympathetic toward Jews	49.4	55.8	.000

Survey	Item	Hispanics	Non-Hispanics	Prob.
GSS	Very+Somewhat Sympathetic toward Israel	48.7%	50.8%	.001
	Anti-Semitism is Very+Somewhat Serious	72.7	66.3	ns
	Disagree that Jews Have Too Much Influence	43.2	40.6	.026
	Personally Know	47.7	59.3	.000
	Jews Made Important Contribution	46.1	50.3	.013
	Most in Common with Jews	0.5	15.2	.000
	Not Least in Common with Jews	74.9	88.6	.000
	Favor Jews Neighbors	28.8	34.4	ns
	Favor Relative Marrying a Jew	36.2	36.0	ns
	Average Temperature toward Jews	54.2	61.8	.002
	Mean Difference on Family	0.55	0.46	ns
	Mean Difference on Intelligence	- 0.16	0.05	.028
	Mean Difference on Wealth	- 0.32	0.31	.000
Mean Difference on Hard Work/Laziness	0.17	0.22	ns	
Mean Difference on Fair/Equal Treatment	- 0.09	0.02	ns	
Mean Difference on Violence	0.26	0.51	ns	
ANES	Average Temperature toward Jews	64.2	64.7	ns

ns = not statistically significant at the .05 level

Source: For a description of these studies, see Appendix A: Surveys, and for the items used, see Appendix B: Question Wordings.

Table 3
Differences between Foreign- and U.S.-Born Hispanics on GSS

Item	Born in U.S.	Foreign Born	Prob.
Personally Know Jews	47.2%	48.1%	ns
Jews Made Important Contribution	44.9%	47.2%	ns
Most in Common with Jews	0.0%	1.0%	ns
Not Least in Common with Jews	69.8%	80.0%	ns
Favor Jews Neighbors	34.4%	23.0%	ns
Favor Relative Marrying a Jew	37.9%	34.6%	.035
Average Temperature toward Jews	68.8	85.1	ns
Mean Difference on Family	-0.105	-0.001	ns
Mean Difference on Wealth	-1.067	-0.806	ns
Mean Difference on Intelligence	0.232	0.050	ns
Mean Difference on Hard Work/Laziness	-0.867	-0.313	ns
Mean Difference on Fair/Equal Treatment	-0.993	-0.458	ns
Mean Difference on Violence	1.058	0.590	ns

Source: For a description of these studies, see Appendix A: Surveys, pg. 17, and for the items used, see Appendix B: Question Wordings, pg. 20.

Appendix A: Surveys

Data in this report are drawn from the following surveys: the 2002 and 2005 Surveys of American Attitudes towards Jews in America conducted for the Anti-Defamation League; the 2000 and 2005 Taking America's Pulse Surveys II and III (TAP II and TAP III), conducted for the National Conference for Community and Justice; the 2005 Memory of the Holocaust Study, conducted for the American Jewish Committee; the 2000 and 2004 General Social Surveys, conducted by the National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago; and the 2000, 2002, and 2004 America National Election Studies (ANES) conducted by the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan (with some use of the 1972, 1974, 1976, 1988, and 1992 election studies as well). These studies are described below:

The Surveys of American Attitudes towards Jews in America were conducted for the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) by the Marttila Communications Group (ADL, 2002a; 2002b; 2005; Marttila, 2005). Both the 2002 and the 2005 polls were random-digit-dialing telephone surveys of adults in households with telephones. The first poll was conducted April 26-May 6, 2002. It had 1,000 respondents with oversamples of 300 Hispanics, 300 Blacks, and an unstated number of non-Hispanics. The method for oversampling Hispanics was not reported. Interviews of Hispanics were in either English or Spanish. The second poll was conducted March 18-25, 2005. It had 1,600 respondents with an unstated number of Hispanics and non-Hispanics. Languages of interviews are not indicated.²

The Taking America's Pulse II Survey (TAP II) was conducted for the National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ) by Princeton Survey Research Associates (PSRA) (Smith, 2000). It was a random-digit-dialing telephone survey of adults in house-

holds with telephones. It was conducted between January 20 and March 19, 2000. Oversamples of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians were collected, giving a total of 995 non-Hispanic Whites, 709 non-Hispanic Blacks, 572 Hispanics, 198 Asians, and 110 of other and mixed races. In this analysis, the samples were weighted to represent the proportions occurring in the general population. Hispanics were interviewed in either English or Spanish.

The Taking America's Pulse III Survey (TAP III) was conducted for the National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ) by Princeton Survey Research Associates (PSRA) (Smith, 2006). It was a random-digit-dialing telephone survey of adults in households with telephones. It was conducted between January 13 and March 30, 2005. Oversamples of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians were collected giving a total of 942 non-Hispanic Whites, 677 non-Hispanic Blacks, 630 Hispanics, 200 Asians, and 109 of other and mixed races. In this analysis the samples were weighted to represent proportions in the general population. Hispanics were interviewed in either English or Spanish.

The Memory of the Holocaust Study was administered in the United States and six other countries (Austria, France, Germany, Poland, and the United Kingdom) (Smith, 2005a). Only the U.S. survey is used here. It was a random-digit-dialing telephone sample of adults living in households with telephones stratified by region. It was conducted by TNS in March-April 2005. There were 124 Hispanics and 867 non-Hispanics. Languages of interviews are not indicated.

The General Social Surveys (GSSs) were conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago (Davis, Smith, and Marsden, 2007). They were multistage, area probability samples of adults living in households. Most interviews were in person supplemented with some telephone interviewing. On the 2000 GSS, the intergroup-relations questions were asked of 119 Hispanics and 1,264 non-Hispanics. On the 2004 GSS, the items were asked of 89 Hispanics and 771 non-Hispanics. Hispanics were interviewed in English.

2. For a discussion of earlier surveys in the Anti-Defamation League series, see Smith, 1993.

The American National Election Studies (ANES) were conducted by the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan (www.electionstudies.org). They were multistage area probability samples of adults living in households. Most were in-person interviews. The numbers of Hispanics and non-Hispanics answering the Jewish thermometer question were as follows: 1972—22/1,943; 1974—39/2,079; 1976—94/1,546; 1988—126/1,495; 1992—167/1,961; 2000—101/1,297; 2002—85/1,172; 2004—92/920. There was some Spanish interviewing in 1988 and 1992.

Appendix B: Question Wordings

ADL Scale

I am going to read a list of statements about Jews. For each one, please tell me whether you think it is probably true or probably false:

1. Jews stick together more than other Americans.
2. Jews always like to be at the head of things.
3. Jews are more loyal to Israel than America.
4. Jews have too much power in the U.S. today.
5. Jews have too much control and influence on Wall Street.
6. Jews have too much power in the business world.
7. Jews have a lot of irritating faults.
8. Jews are more willing than others to use shady practices to get what they want.
9. Jewish businesspeople are so shrewd that others don't have a fair chance at competition.
10. Jews don't care what happens to anyone but their own kind.
11. Jews are just as honest as other businesspeople.

Under ADL coding rules, saying that items 1-10 are "probably true" or that item 11 is "probably false" counts as an anti-Semitic sentiment. When the total score is computed, 0-1 anti-Semitic agreements yield an overall categorization as "not anti-Semitic," a score of 2-5 is considered as "middle," and a score of 6+ as "most anti-Semitic."

A twelfth item that is not part of this scale determines whether people support the assertion that "Jews were responsible for the death of Christ."

Taking America's Pulse II and III

Here are some groups that have been in the news. Please tell me how close you feel to each of them: very close, close, neutral, far, very far, or don't you know enough about the group to say?

Jews

I want to ask how much discrimination there is against different groups in our society today. Would you say there is a great deal of discrimination, some discrimination, only a little, or none at all against_____?

Jews

Do you feel that the following groups have too much influence, too little influence, or the right amount of influence in our society today?

Jews

Now thinking of some more groups, do you now have contact or not with a person who is _____

Jewish

Holocaust Survey

From what you know or have heard, what were Auschwitz, Dachau, and Treblinka?

Approximately how many Jews in all of Europe were killed by the Nazis during the Second World War? 25,000; 100,000; 1 million; 6 million; 20 million

In your view, how important is it for all American people to know about and understand the Nazi extermination of the Jews during the Second World War? Is it essential, very important, only somewhat important, or not important?

Some people say that sixty years after the end of the Second World War, it is time to put the memory of the Nazi extermination of the Jews behind us. Others say that we should keep the remembrance of the Nazi extermination of the Jews strong even after the passage of time. Which opinion comes closest to your own?

Do you think that teaching about the Nazi extermination of the Jews during the Second World War should be required in America's schools?

Are your own feelings about Jews very sympathetic, somewhat sympathetic, somewhat unsympathetic, very unsympathetic, or neutral?

Are your own feelings about Israel very sympathetic, somewhat sympathetic, somewhat unsympathetic, very unsympathetic, or neutral?

In your view, how likely is it that the Jewish people could be subject to another extermination attempt somewhere in the world in the coming years? Very likely, somewhat likely, or not very likely?

Do you think that anti-Semitism in the United States is a very serious problem, somewhat of a problem, or not a problem at all?

Please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement:

Jews are exploiting the memory of the Nazi extermination of Jews for their own purposes.

Please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement:

Now, as in the past, Jews exert too much influence on world events.

Please tell me whether you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statement:

The Nazi extermination of the Jews makes clear the need for the State of Israel as a place for Jews in times of persecution.

General Social Surveys:

Since the beginning of our country, people of many different races, nationalities, and religions have come here and settled. As I name some of these groups, please tell me if the group has made the most important positive contributions to this country, an important contribution, some contribution, or little positive contribution to this country?

Jews

Just your best guess—what percentage of the United States population is each group?

Jews

In the next 25 years, which of these groups do you think will increase their share of the population by a lot, which will increase by a little, which will stay the same, which will decrease by a little, and which will decrease by a lot?

Jews

Just your best guess—what percentage of the people who live in your local community is each group?

Jews

Do you personally know any ...

Jews?

If personally knows Jews:

Now, I'm going to ask some questions about these people you personally know.

Do you know any of these Jews from when you went to school or college?

Do you know any of these Jews from the community where you now live?

Do you know any of these Jews as a relative?

Do you know any of these Jews from the place where you work?
Are any of these Jews people that you feel close to?

Of these groups—Whites, Blacks, Jews, Hispanics and Latin Americans, Asian Americans—if you had to say, which one (other than your own) do you feel you have the most in common with?

Of these groups—Whites, Blacks, Jews, Hispanics and Latin Americans, Asian Americans—if you had to say, which one (other than your own) do you feel you have the least in common with?

I'd like to get your feelings towards groups that are in the news these days. I will use something we call the feeling thermometer and here is how it works:

I'll read the names of groups and I'd like you to rate that group using the feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that you feel favorable and warm toward the group. Ratings of 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorable towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group.

If we come to a group whose name you don't recognize, you don't need to rate that group. Just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

If you recognize the name, but you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward the group, you would rate the group at the 50 degree mark.

Jews

Now I have some questions about different groups in our society. I'm going to show you a seven-point scale on which the characteristics of people in a group can be rated. In the first statement a score of 1 means that you think almost all of the people in that group are "rich." A score of 7 means that you think almost everyone in the group is "poor." A score of 4 means that you think that the group is not towards either end, and of course, you may choose any number in between that comes closest to where you think people in the group stand.

A. Rich ... Poor

The second set of characteristics asks if people in the group tend to be hard-working or if they tend to be lazy.

B. Hard-working ... Lazy

The next set asks if people in each group tend to be violence-prone or if they tend not to be prone to violence.

C. Violence-Prone ... Not Violence-Prone

Do people in these groups tend to be intelligent or tend to be unintelligent?

D. Unintelligent ... Intelligent

In the next statement a score of 1 means that you think almost all of the people in the group have a "commitment to strong families." A score of 7 means that you think almost everyone in the group "lacks a commitment to strong families." A score of 4 means that you think that the group is not towards one end or the other, and of course, you may choose any number in between that comes closest to where you think people in the group stand.

E. Commitment to Strong Families ... Lacks Commitment to Strong Families

In the next statement a score of 1 means that you think almost all of the people in the group have a "commitment to fair and equal treatment of all groups in society." A score of 7 means that you think almost everyone in the group "lacks a commitment to the fair and equal treatment of all groups in society." A score of 4 means that you think that the group is not towards one end or the other, and of course, you may choose any number in between that comes closest to where you think people in the group stand.

F. Commitment to Fair and Equal Treatment ... Lacks Commitment to Fair and Equal Treatment

Jews were one of the groups asked about for each of these questions on ethnic images.

American National Election Studies:

We'd also like to get your feelings about some groups in American society. When I read the name of a group, we'd like you to rate it with what we call a feeling thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees-100 degrees mean that you feel favorably and warm towards the group; ratings between 0 and 50 degrees mean that you don't feel favorably towards the group and that you don't care too much for that group. If you don't feel particularly warm or cold toward a group, you would rate them at 50 degrees. If we come to a group you don't know much about, just tell me and we'll move on to the next one.

Jews

References

- American Jewish Committee. 2002. *Latinos and Jews: Old Luggage, New Itineraries*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- . 2007. "Ethnic Partners: Hispanic/Latino." <http://www.engagingamerica.org>.
- Anti-Defamation League. 2005. "ADL Survey: Anti-Semitism Declines Slightly in America." Press release, April 4. <http://www.adl.org>.
- . 2002a. "Anti-Semitism in America, 2002." Anti-Defamation League report, June 11. <http://www.adl.org>.
- . 2002b. "Anti-Semitism on the Rise in America." Press release, June 11. <http://www.adl.org>.
- Beinart, Peter. 2002. "New Bedfellows." In *Latinos and Jews: Old Luggage, New Itineraries*, 1-11.
- Bettinger-Lopez, Caroline. 2000. *Cuban-Jewish Journeys: Searching for Identity, Home, and History in Miami*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Cheung, Gordon W. and Roger B. Rensvold. 2000. "Assessing Extreme and Acquiescence Response Sets in Cross-Cultural Research Using Structural Equation Modeling." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 31, 187-212.
- Cohen, Jeffrey E. 2005. "The Polls: Religion and the 2000 Presidential Election: Public Attitudes toward Joseph Lieberman." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 35, 389-402.
- Davis, James A., Tom W. Smith, and Peter V. Marsden. 2007. *General Social Surveys, 1972-2006: Cumulative Codebook*. Chicago: NORC.
- DeSipio, Louis. 2003. "Cuban Miami: Seeking Identity in a Political Borderline." *Latin American Research Review* 38: 207-19.
- . 2002. "More than Passing Acquaintances: Latinos and Jews in Chicago." In *Latinos and Jews: Old Luggage, New Itineraries*, 102-12.
- Deutsch, Sandra McGee. 1986. "The Argentine Right and the Jews, 1919-1933." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 18: 13-134.
- Dinnerstein, Leonard. 2004. "Is There a New Anti-Semitism in the United States?" *Society* 41 (Jan./Feb.): 53-58.
- Elkin, Judith Laikin and Gilbert W. Merx, eds. 1987. *The Jewish Presence in Latin America*. Boston: Allen & Unwin.
- Elkin, Judith Laikin. 1980. *Jews of the Latin American Republics*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Fein, Leonard. 2005. "Matters of Distinctions." *Forward*, June 3. <http://www.forward.com>.
- Feldstein, Federico Pablo and Carolina Acosta-Aizuru. 2003. "Argentinean Jews as Scapegoat: A Textual Analysis of the Bombing of the AMIA." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 27: 152-70.
- Foundation for Ethnic Understanding. 2001. "Latino-Jewish Project." <http://www.feu.org>.
- Grugel, Jean. 1985. "Nationalist Movements and Fascist Ideology in Chile." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 4: 109-22.
- Harrison, Donald H. 2006. "Immigration Looms Large as Concern as Latino-Jewish Coalition Dialogues." March 8. http://www.jewishinsightseeing.com/dhh_weblog/2006-blog/2006-03/2006-03-08-jewish-latino_dialogue.htm.
- Javeline, D. 1999. "Response Effects in Polite Cultures: A Test of Acquiescence in Kazakhstan." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 63: 1-28.
- Kamasaki, Charles. 2002. "Divergent Understandings or Conflicting Interests? Latinos and Jewish Policy Differences." In *Latinos and Jews: Old Luggage, New Itineraries*, 45-57.
- Kane, James G., Stephen C. Craig, and Kenneth D. Wald. 2004. "Religion and Presidential Politics in Florida: A List Experiment." *Social Science Quarterly* 85: 281-93.
- Lavender, Abraham D. 2002. "A History of Jewish and Hispanic Interaction in Miami-Dade County, Florida." In *Latinos and Jews: Old Luggage, New Itineraries*, 69-101.
- Levitz, Jacob. 1954. "The Jewish Community in Mexico: Its Life and Education, 1900-1954." Ph.D. diss., Dropsie College.
- Marttila Communications Group. 2005. "American Attitudes towards Jews in America: An Anti-Defamation League Survey." March.
- Rosenberg, Mica. 2002. "National Groups Aim to Build Latino-Jewish Political Coalitions." <http://www.ujc.org>.
- Ruiz, Jean-Pierre. 2002. "Sharing Histories and Hopes: Latinos and Jews in the United States." In *Latinos and Jews: Old Luggage, New Itineraries*, 33-44.
- Sanchez, Angel Anthony. 1984. "Mexican and Jewish-American Students: Attitudes and Interaction." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.
- Schaffer, Ann V. 2002. "Latinos and Jews: The Inescapable Network of Mutuality." In *Latinos and Jews: Old Luggage, New Itineraries*, 129-47.
- Shaw, Martin. 1992. "The Jews of Greater Miami: An Historical Perspective." Ph.D. diss., Florida Atlantic University.
- Sheinin, David and Lois Baer Barr. 1996. *The Jewish Diaspora in Latin America: New Studies in History and Literature*. New York: Garland.
- Smith, Tom W. 1993. "Actual Trends or Measurement Artifacts: A Review of Three Studies of Anti-Semitism." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 57: 380-93.
- . 1996. "Anti-Semitism in Contemporary America: A Review." *Research in Micropolitics* 5: 125-78.
- . 2000. *Taking America's Pulse II: NCCJ's 2000 Survey of Intergroup Relations in the United States*. New York: National Conference for Community and Justice.
- . 2001. *Intergroup Relations in a Diverse America*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- . 2005a. *The Holocaust and Its Implications: A Seven-National Comparative Study*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- . 2005b. *Jewish Distinctiveness in America: A Statistical Portrait*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- . 2006. *Taking America's Pulse III: Intergroup Relations in Contemporary America*. New York: National Conference for Community and Justice.

- Sonenshein, Raphe. 1986. "Biracial Coalition Politics in Los Angeles." PS 19: 582-90.
- Sonenshein, Raphael J. 2002. "When Ideologies Agree and Interests Collide: What's a Leader to Do? Prospects for Coalition in Los Angeles." In *Latinos and Jews: Old Luggage, New Itineraries*, 113-28.
- Stern, Kenneth S. 2006. *Antisemitism Today*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Suro, Roberto. 2002. "Two Peoples on a Journey." In *Latinos and Jews: Old Luggage, New Itineraries*, 12-32.
- Thavis, John. 2004. "Jewish Leaders Fear Anti-Semitism among Hispanic Immigrants." Catholic News Service, July 1. <http://www.catholicnews.com>.
- Tomasky, Michael. 2002. "Latino-Jewish Relations in New York." In *Latinos and Jews: Old Luggage, New Itineraries*, 58-68.
- Tourangeau, Roger, Lance J. Rips, and Kenneth Rasinski. 2000. *The Psychology of Survey Response*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, Joan Alyne. 1984. "Building Boundaries: The Politics of Urban Renewal in Manhattan's Lower East Side." Ph.D. diss., City University of New York.
- Windmueller, Steven. 1999. "Rethinking Latino-Jewish Relations in Los Angeles." *Jerusalem Letter* 407 (June): 1-6.



American Jewish Committee

The Jacob Blaustein Building

165 East 56 Street

New York, NY 10022

The American Jewish Committee publishes in these areas:

- Hatred and Anti-Semitism • Pluralism • Israel*
- American Jewish Life • International Jewish Life • Human Rights*

April 2007 \$2.50

www.ajc.org