



The Intelligence of Applicants for Admission to Jewish Day Schools

Author(s): Boris M. Levinson

Source: *Jewish Social Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 3/4 (Jul. - Oct., 1957), pp. 129-140

Published by: [Indiana University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4465552>

Accessed: 20-01-2016 21:31 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/4465552?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Indiana University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Jewish Social Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE INTELLIGENCE OF APPLICANTS FOR ADMISSION TO JEWISH DAY SCHOOLS*

By BORIS M. LEVINSON

THE JEWISH Day School (All Day School) is a religious school supported mainly by parents and friends, offering a combined program of Jewish and general studies.¹ The Day School movement has been undergoing rapid expansion for the past two decades. New schools are springing up in various communities and old ones are in the process of enlarging their facilities. In 1956, it was estimated that there were in the United States 217 Day Schools, with some 50,000 pupils.² Such rapid expansion raises many problems, including the crucial one of relationship between learner and curriculum. It may be that there is a tacit assumption on the part of some of the leaders of the movement that the Day School pupils represent a more or less homogeneous body, and that, with a few exceptions, almost any child can profit from the instruction. Other educators are aware of differences among pupils. They want to know what provisions the Day School should make so that

* The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance of his students who collected and tabulated most of the data and of the principals and administration of the following schools: Akiba Hebrew Academy, Bronx, N. Y.; Beth Hillel Hebrew Institute, New York; Bialik School, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Hebrew Institute of Borough Park, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Hebrew Institute of Long Island, Far Rockaway, N. Y.; Hebrew Institute of Rockland County, Monsey, N. Y.; Manhattan Day School, New York, N. Y.; Ramaz School, New York, N. Y.; Shulamith School for Girls, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Westchester Day School, Mamaroneck, N. Y.; Yeshiva of Central Queens, Queens, N. Y.; Yeshiva of Crown Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Yeshiva Dov Revel, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Yeshiva of Flatbush, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Yeshiva Magen David, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Yeshiva Ohel Moshe, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Yeshiva of Passaic, Passaic, N. J.; Yeshiva of Plainfield, Plainfield, N. J.; Yeshiva Rabbi Israel Salanter, Bronx, N. Y.; Yeshiva Rabbi Moses Soloveichik, New York, N. Y.; Yeshiva Rambam, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Yeshiva Torah V'Emunah, Bronx, N. Y.; and Yeshivat Yavne, Elizabeth, N. J.

¹ For a short summary of the history of the Day School movement until 1951, see Silverman, Simon S., "Psychological Adjustment of All-Day School Students," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1953, pp. 1-17.

² The estimated enrollment in the Day School was in 1935 — 3,000; 1944 — 9,000; 1948 — 20,000; 1953 — 30,000; 1956 — 50,000. Torah Umesorah, Department of Public Relations, *Facts and Figures on the Growth of Hebrew Day Schools* (New York 1954), p. 3.

It is difficult to secure exact figures. Dr. Joseph Kaminetsky, Director of Torah Umesorah, a central body of the Day Schools, wrote to me on September 19, 1956, that "there has been no real statistical study of Day Schools for the past few years. At the present time, I would say that there are about 217 Day Schools in the United States, with a total amount of about 50,000 pupils."

Dr. Uriah Z. Engelman, of the American Association for Jewish Education, opined in a telephone conversation on September 26, 1956, that the increase since the end of 1953 was from 10 to 15 percent.

their graduates will develop into well informed, socially adjusted and happy boys and girls with worthwhile ideas and attitudes.³

This study will attempt to cast light on some of these problems. A knowledge of the abilities and intellectual level of the children applying for admission to the Day School may help in setting up proper curriculum objectives.

Limitations of Study

This study is limited to applicants to Day Schools adhering to the principles of the National Commission for Yeshiva Education.⁴ These are: "Study of Torah from original sources, the application of the studies to daily religious practice, the centrality of Eretz Israel in the curriculum, and the basic role of the Hebrew language in the teaching of the Hebrew subjects."⁵ This sampling does not claim to represent the entire Jewish school population or even those children attending yeshiva Day Schools with a different educational emphasis.⁶ Only applicants for admission to the kindergarten and the

³ Cf. Axelrod, Herman C., "Correlation in the Jewish Day School," *The Jewish Parent*, VI, no. 5 (1955), pp. 4-5; *Idem*, "Trends in the Newer Day Schools," *Jewish Education*, XXIV (1954), p. 39; Cohen, Jack J., "New Emphases in Jewish Education," *ibid.*, XXVI (1955), pp. 14-15; Dinin, Samuel, "Issues Facing the Jewish School," *ibid.*, p. 20; Fishman, Joshua A., "Evaluation of Results in Current American Jewish Education," *ibid.*, XXIV (1954), p. 25; Levinson, Boris M., "Child Guidance in the Day Schools," in *Proceedings of the First Annual Conference of the National Council of Day School Principals, April, 1955*. Mizrahi National Education Committee and Department for Torah Education and Culture of the Jewish Agency (New York 1956), p. 6; *Idem*, "Building the Right Attitude Toward Intensive Jewish Education," *The Jewish Parent*, III, no. 4 (1952), p. 5; Lurie, Rose C., "The Repudiation of Essentials," *Jewish Education*, XXVI (1955), p. 48; and Silverman, Simon S., *op. cit.*, p. 20.

⁴ The National Commission for Yeshiva Education is sponsored by the Mizrahi National Education Committee and the Torah Education and Culture Department of the Jewish Agency. "This Commission was set up to represent the professional and lay leadership and parents of the yeshiva movement in the United States in all educational, administrative, financial and public relations matters relating to yeshiva movement and to establish close relationships with Federal, state and local educational agencies as well as with Jewish communal agencies. The Commission consists of four departments; one each for principals, teachers, Board members and parents of yeshivos. Each department has its own specific goals and functions and its own organizational set up to carry out these functions. Each department also sends representatives to the National Commission which thus represents all elements active and interested in the yeshiva." Personal communication from Isidor Margolis, Executive Director, Mizrahi National Education Commission, October 2, 1956.

⁵ Margolis, Isidor, "Introduction," in *Proceedings . . .* (as in note 3), p. 4.

⁶ The Day Schools may be classified into five types: 1) The Talmudic yeshiva where emphasis is placed upon the study of Talmud and the language of instruction of the Jewish subjects is Yiddish; 2) The Hebraic yeshiva where a broad program of studies in the Bible and Talmud is offered and the language of instruction is Hebrew. The schools studied are in this category; 3) The progressive Day School offering an intensive integrated program of general as well as Jewish subjects; 4) The national-secular day school where Hebrew and Yiddish are taught and emphasis is placed on culture, customs, and the Bible; and 5) The Hasidic yeshiva where the curriculum is similar to the Talmudic one, but greater emphasis is placed upon religious practices. The methods of instruction are those traditionally employed in the yeshivot of pre-war Poland and Hungary. Cf. Axelrod, Herman C., "Trends in the Newer Day Schools," in *Jewish Education*, XXIV (1954), p. 39.

first grade whose maximum age was six years and eleven months were included in the sample. The revised Binet Scale was to be administered to all applicants by qualified examiners.⁷

Previous Research

Numerous studies on the intelligence of the Jews have been summarized by Maller,⁸ Brill,⁹ and Nardi.¹⁰ These indicate the superior intelligence of Jewish children. However, very few studies deal with the intelligence of yeshiva children, and particularly with those of pre-school age. No study could be found in the literature dealing with the problem delineated here. Nardi sampled nine All-Day schools, three of the third, progressive, type and six yeshivoth. The progressive schools had 326 pupils who had taken the Stanford-Binet. The average IQ was 121.3. The yeshiva type schools had 886 pupils, 432 of whom had Binet tests and the rest group tests, Pintner General Ability Tests and Otis Group Tests. The average IQ in these groups was 117.2.¹¹

Brown made a study of 335 second generation Jewish children attending public school kindergartens in Minnesota. He found the average IQ to be 108.3.¹²

The writer made a comparative study of intelligence of 770 pre-school children who were candidates for admission to New York City yeshiva schools. He found that the average IQ of the boys (484) was 112.8 and of the girls (286) was 113.6.¹³

Procedure

A list of sixteen New York City schools with 6,845 pupils whose curricula adhered to the set standards of the Mizrahi National Education Commission, was submitted to the writer by Rabbi Leonard Rosenfeld, Director of the Department of Yeshivoth of the Jewish Education Committee of

⁷ Cf. Terman, Lewis M., and Merrill, Maud A., *Measuring Intelligence* (New York 1937).

⁸ Maller, Julius B., "Studies in the Intelligence of Young Jews," *Jewish Education*, II (1931), pp. 29-39.

⁹ Brill, Moshe, "Studies of Jewish and Non-Jewish Intelligence," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXVII (1936), pp. 331-52.

¹⁰ Nardi, Noah, "Studies in Intelligence of Jewish Children," *Jewish Education*, XIX (1948), pp. 41-44.

¹¹ Nardi, *op. cit.*, p. 45. Nardi uses the term "Academy type" for the progressive schools. Cf. note 6.

¹² Brown, Fred, "A Comparative Study of the Intelligence of Jewish and Scandinavian Kindergarten Children," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, LXIV (1944), p. 75.

¹³ Levinson, Boris M., "A Comparative Study of the Intelligence of Jewish Pre-school Boys and Girls of Orthodox Parentage," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, XC (1957), pp. 17-22.

New York.¹⁴ Of these, eleven schools with a population of 4,914 (71.8%) administered the Revised Stanford-Binet. The other five schools with a pupil population of 1,931 (28.2%) either administered group intelligence tests to all pupils (two schools with 633 pupils), or administered the Revised Stanford-Binet or group tests (1,298 pupils) when needed. These five schools were eliminated from the sampling. The writer then contacted other Day Schools and finally substituted two New York City yeshivoth and three suburban yeshivoth, with 580 pupils. The total population of the sixteen schools sampled was 5,494.

Seven of the schools had previously established cooperative relationships with the Educational Advisement Center of Yeshiva University.¹⁵ Thus records of tests administered to their applicants for admission for the last few years were on file. The other nine schools were contacted and the necessary data secured. Some of the sixteen schools were old-established institutions whose graduates are now serving as principals. Others have been recently organized and did not have all the grades.

The sample of pre-school children secured also varied from school to school. In some cases results of pre-school admission tests for several years were available, while in others only the IQ's of the current class were at hand. This research was carried on under the assumption that the data secured in recent years or accumulated over a number of them was representative of the schools involved.

The writer has no information regarding the nativity of the parents of the sample, or whether a language other than English was spoken at home; and, therefore, cannot state whether these children were bilingual or not. Our final sample consisted of 2,083 children or 38% of the total population.

A question arises as to the validity of the Binet type of test for children who may be bilingual since no qualified examiner would administer the Revised Stanford-Binet to a child with a poor command of English. A performance test would be administered instead. The ratings based upon these examinations were not included in our study. Conceivably bilingualism at this age may have lowered the intelligence scores of foreign born children to an unknown degree. It also may have affected the intelligence ratings of a certain number of native-born children from bilingual homes. Findings conflict as to the relationship between the degree of bilingualism and intellectual functioning of children.¹⁶ To the writer's knowledge, no published study is available regarding the effect of bilingualism on the intelligence rating of

¹⁴ Personal Communication from Rabbi Leonard Rosenfeld, Oct. 5, 1955.

¹⁵ The Educational Advisement Center of Yeshiva University provides facilities such as diagnosis and remediation of educational disabilities, vocational guidance, and school readiness examinations.

¹⁶ Cf. Axelrod, Herman C., "Bilingual Background and Its Relation to Certain Aspects of Personality of Elementary School Children," unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Yeshiva University (1951), pp. 12-20.

native born Jewish children, age four years six months to six years eleven months. However, the tentative conclusion, from research now in progress, is that the intelligence ratings of native born bilingual pre-school Jewish children is lower than that of monolingual Jewish children.¹⁷ Research has revealed that bilingualism did affect the verbal intelligence scores of Italian children from two years six months to four years five months¹⁸ and that it did not affect the verbal intelligence scores of Jewish children, age nine to fourteen.¹⁹

A question may be raised as to whether the sample was not a biased one, since parents knew that their children would be exposed to an intelligence test and might possibly have kept home the obviously defective child. Undoubtedly, this did occur in some instances, but this point is not relevant to our research. Those who do not apply are not part of the school population, present no problem to the schools and are therefore not the concern at the moment.

TABLE 1
MEAN IQ'S OF PRE-SCHOOL CANDIDATES FOR ADMISSION
TO MODERN HEBREW DAY SCHOOLS

<i>School</i>	<i>Pupils</i>	<i>Sample</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Range</i>
A.....	45	10	106.60	10.14	92-123
B.....	47	17	117.65	9.07	108-134
C.....	83	81	119.32	12.56	88-153
D.....	170	58	119.48	11.91	91-148
E.....	189	82	119.40	15.46	81-171
F.....	235	163	116.84	13.62	84-152
G.....	285	47	102.45	10.59	81-133
H.....	303	57	121.59	12.61	94-151
I.....	333	191	113.22	13.76	74-144
J.....	410	29	113.79	11.67	95-137
K.....	429	354	111.78	13.57	80-157
L.....	441	322	113.08	11.26	74-151
M.....	495	79	112.09	13.97	89-161
N.....	518	310	111.71	13.42	58-158
O.....	710	179	116.05	13.76	83-154
P.....	801	104	120.38	12.48	100-162
	5494	2083	114.88	12.87	58-171

¹⁷ A study of 81 native born Jewish children, age 4 years 6 months to 6 years 11 months, indicated that the IQ of the 21 monolingual children was 120.9 and of the 60 bilingual children was 110.7. Incidentally 16.1% of the parents of this sample were professionals.

¹⁸ Cf. Darcy, Natalie T., "The Effect of Bilingualism Upon the Measurement of the Intelligence of Children of Pre-school Age," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXXVII (1946), pp. 21-44.

¹⁹ Cf. Pintner, Rudolph and Arsenian, Seth, "The Relation of Bilingualism to Verbal Intelligence and to School Adjustment," *Journal of Educational Research*, XXXI (1937), pp. 255-63.

Table 1 shows the mean²⁰ IQ's of the various schools in the sample. We note that the mean IQ varies from a low of 102.45 to a high of 121.59. The range²¹ in IQ's in the schools is 58–171. The mean IQ is 114.88. It is to be recalled that some of these children were not admitted to the schools, and, therefore, the actual intelligence of the pupils in attendance is considerably higher.²²

The average IQ of 114.88, representative of the intelligence of the pre-school applicant at the modern Hebrew yeshivoh, was arrived at as follows: The mean IQ of each school was multiplied²³ by the total population of the school. These sums were added and divided by 5,494, the total number of pupils in the sampled schools. The standard deviation²⁴ of 13.70 was secured by a modification of the above procedure. If we are to correct our IQ's on the basis of McNemar's adjustment for variability differences at age 4–10 to 6–6 (the vast majority of our IQ scores are within this age range), the corrected IQ (based upon mean 115) would be 118.²⁵ This compares favorably, when the factor of bilingualism is considered, with the performance on the group Kuhlman-Anderson Intelligence Test²⁶ of a representative group of 378 *fourth* grade pupils, representing sixteen independent private schools. Many of these schools select their pupils on the basis of mental ability and achievement. Because these schools charge tuition fees, most of their pupils come from higher socio-economic levels. These children had a mean IQ of 119.3 with a Standard Deviation of 12.4.²⁷

²⁰ The mean is popularly known as the average. It is the sum of all scores divided by the number of cases.

²¹ The range is the difference between the highest and lowest values in a distribution.

²² After the completion of this study, the writer received the intelligence ratings for certain classes of schools G and O. School G administered the Pintner Intermediate Test, Form A, to 172 pupils from grades 2 to 8. The average IQ was 105. This compares very favorably to the pre-school IQ of 102.45. School O administered the Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests Alpha and Beta, Forms A and B, in the latter part of 1955, to 569 pupils from grades 2 to 9. The average IQ was 118. This again compares favorably to the pre-school IQ of 116.05.

²³ In order to weight the sample obtained from each school in accordance with its population, the writer assumed that the larger the population of the school, the larger was the pre-school population it could draw upon. To do otherwise, would tend to bias the average in favor of the schools which submitted a larger sample.

²⁴ The standard deviation is a measure of variability or dispersion of test scores. In a normal distribution, the distance of the standard deviation above and below the mean includes approximately two-thirds of the cases. For formula for standard deviation of combined distributions, *cf.* Guilford, Joy P., *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education* (New York 1950), 2nd Ed., p. 111.

²⁵ *Cf.* McNemar, Quinn, *The Revision of the Stanford-Binet Scale* (New York 1942), p. 173.

²⁶ *Cf.* Educational Test Bureau, *Kuhlman-Anderson Intelligence Tests* (Philadelphia 1947). This is a group test.

²⁷ North, Robert D., "Relationship of Kuhlman-Anderson IQ's and Stanford Achievement Test Scores of Independent School Pupils," in *1956 Achievement Testing Program in Independent Schools and Supplementary Studies. Educational Records, Bulletin no. 68* (1956), p. 54.

TABLE 2
PERCENTILE CHART
DISTRIBUTION OF INTELLIGENCE OF PRE-SCHOOL
APPLICANTS FOR ADMISSION TO JEWISH DAY SCHOOLS

The Child Whose IQ is:	Equals or Exceeds	The Child Whose IQ is:	Equals or Exceeds
148.....	99 percent	116.....	56 percent
147.....	98	115.....	53
146.....	98	114.....	50
145.....	98	113.....	46
144.....	98	112.....	43
143.....	98	111.....	40
142.....	97	110.....	37
141.....	97	109.....	34
140.....	97	108.....	31
139.....	96	107.....	28
138.....	96	106.....	25
137.....	95	105.....	23
136.....	94	104.....	21
135.....	94	103.....	19
134.....	93	102.....	16
133.....	92	101.....	14
132.....	91	100.....	13
131.....	90	99.....	10
130.....	88	98.....	9
129.....	87	97.....	8
128.....	85	96.....	7
127.....	82	95.....	5
126.....	80	94.....	5
125.....	79	93.....	4
124.....	78	92.....	3
123.....	75	91.....	3
122.....	73	90.....	3
121.....	70	89.....	2
120.....	68	88.....	2
119.....	67	87.....	2
118.....	63	86.....	1
117.....	60		

Table 2 presents the percentile distribution of the intelligence²⁸ of applicants to modern Hebrew schools. This is based upon a tabulation of 1,593 IQ scores in the following twelve schools: B, C, D, E, F, H, I, J, L, N, O, P. These schools were selected because the combined average IQ's of the sample of their population, as well as their standard deviations, approximated that of the general population. It was felt, therefore, that the percentile distribution of IQ's obtained would approximate that of the entire pre-school population of the schools. As a matter of fact, the mean of this distribution is 114.96 which compares favorably with 114.88, the mean of

²⁸ A percentile is a point below which a given percentage of all scores are located.

the entire population. The standard deviation is 13.43 as compared with the standard deviation of 13.70 for the entire population. We note that the 50 percentile occurs at IQ 114. This is due to the fact that the distribution of scores is not a normal one and is skewed to the right.

TABLE 3

A COMPARISON OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF INTELLIGENCE OF APPLICANTS FOR ADMISSION
TO JEWISH DAY SCHOOLS AND THAT OF THE GENERAL POPULATION

<i>IQ</i>	<i>Classification</i>	<i>Yeshiva Population Percent *</i>	<i>General Population Percent **</i>
140 and above.....	Very Superior.....	3.4	1.33
120—139.....	Superior.....	29.8	11.3
110—119.....	High Average.....	32.8	18.1
90—109.....	Normal or Average.....	31.6	46.5
80—89.....	Low Average.....	2.1	14.5
70—79.....	Borderline Defective.....	0.3	5.6
30—69.....	Mentally Defective.....	0.0	2.63

* The percentages are approximate since the number of borderline defectives and mentally defectives is undoubtedly higher in the Jewish population than indicated in the table.

** Merrill, Maud A., "The Significance of IQ'S on the Revised Stanford-Binet Scale," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXIX (1938), p. 650.

Table 3 shows a comparison of the intelligence of the applicants for admission to modern yeshivoth as compared to that of the general population. This is based upon the distribution of 1,593 IQ scores.

We note the superiority of the Jewish pre-school child as compared with the general population. However, this is not the school's only interest. The directors of the school may also wish to know how the child compares to the pupils with whom he will work, either cooperatively or competitively, that is, his academic potential. A child's academic aptitude varies, depending upon the group with whom he works, and the subject matter he has to master. Within broad limits, the academic aptitude of the child attending the public school will correspond to his intelligence rating. The situation is entirely different for a child attending the modern Jewish Day School. He may be of superior general intelligence, yet be of low average, or average academic ability, depending upon the yeshiva school he is attending. It is to be remembered, that the intelligence level is not the sole determining factor of scholastic achievement, and that the child's motivation, attitudes, drives, and goals must also be considered.²⁹

²⁹ Cf. Levinson, "Child Guidance . . .," as in note 3.

According to Merrill³⁰ any score within ten points (90–109) of the IQ of the average (IQ 100) is within the normal or average range. This, according to Symonds,³¹ is between 27 and 71 percentiles of the distribution. Following the same reasoning, we may say that any Day School children who have IQ's between 105 and up to and including 124³² (23 to 78 percentiles) are within the average. Those with IQ's of less than 105 are below average, and those with IQ's of 125 or more, above the average of the group. These IQ limits are merely suggestive and need not necessarily be adopted by everyone or interpreted literally.

TABLE 4

ACADEMIC APTITUDE OF APPLICANTS FOR ADMISSION TO JEWISH DAY SCHOOLS

IQ	Percentage	Classification
135 and above	6	Superior
125–134	15	High Average
105–124	56	Average
98–104	18	Low Average
94 and below	5	Inferior

Table 4 shows the academic aptitude of Day School applicants. This is a rough approximation of the academic potential of the children in view of the fact that our scores are not distributed normally.³³ It is suggested that psychologists should include a statement on both academic aptitude and general intelligence in their findings.

Implications for the Day School

The great range in the mean IQ's of the sampled schools and in the applicants to these schools, raises serious problems. The wide range in the ability of the applicants to the higher IQ schools indicates that even there the

³⁰ As in note ** to Table 3.

³¹ Symonds, Percival M., in Pintner, Rudolph, Dragositz, Anna, and Kushner, Rose, *Supplementary Guide for the Revised Stanford-Binet Scale. Applied Psychology Monographs*, no. 3 (1949), p. 135.

³² Statistics vary on the actual percentile distribution of IQ's. Symonds' table is used in clinics throughout the country. However, according to Merrill, (Table 1, Percentage of Distribution of IQ's on the Old and the New Scales) IQ 90 is at the 20 percentile and IQ 111 at the 66.6 percentile (no percentile is given for IQ 109 or 110). *Op. cit.*, p. 642.

Our distribution is not a normal one. Consequently, the results cannot correspond to theoretical expectations, and the IQ limits we set are somewhat arbitrary. If we were to adopt the limits of 27 to 71 percentiles as the average, corresponding to IQ's 107 to 121, we would have narrowed the range of average ability to 42% of the cases. On the other hand, setting the average range as being within ± 1 SD would give us IQ's 102 to 128 as being within the average, and would include 69% of the cases. The limits we adopted give us 56% of cases within the average.

³³ It would be advisable, in view of the range in average IQ's, that each school set up its own norms of academic aptitude.

need exists for proper classification and grading of the pupils. Obviously, the schools cannot all follow the same curriculum, nor can all children in these schools subsist on the same educational fare. It seems that this wide range in ability should cause careful soul searching on the part of the administrators of those Day Schools that have not adopted some form of homogeneous classroom grouping. Almost every Jewish child, no matter how limited intellectually, can profit to some extent from attending a Day School, if taught the kind of subject matter that he can master. But, if an undifferentiated double program is offered, directed toward the average of the pupils (IQ 105 to 124), the children with an IQ of less than 105 (23% of the population) will not be able to do satisfactory work without undue exertion. These scholastic difficulties will be exacerbated for approximately 5% (below IQ 95) of the children. In spite of hard work, they will be unable to secure even a modicum of recognition through scholastic achievement. They will become frustrated and unhappy. Some will drop by the wayside.³⁴ However, if placed in the public schools, these children would progress and be within the average of their classmates.

An undifferentiated curriculum, directed to the average of the group, will also fail to meet the needs of the child with high average, superior, and very superior academic ability (IQ's of 125 and above). We note in Table 3 that approximately 3.4% of the children have IQ's of 140 and above, which compares to 1.3% for the general population.³⁵ This disproportionate number of Jewish children in the intellectually gifted category indeed was commented upon a long time ago by Hollingworth³⁶ and Terman.³⁷ Those children with superior academic aptitude should have an opportunity to develop their talents fully through an enriched curriculum.

Why Higher IQ's among Jews

The obtained mean IQ of 114.8 for our group is similar to the one McNemar obtained for children whose parents were professionals. He found, in the age group 2-5.5 and 6-9, the average IQ of the child whose father was a professional to be 114.8 and 114.9 respectively.³⁸ Most of the children in our sample did not have professional parents. How can these findings be explained? Have the Jews inherited superior intellectual gifts? Not at all. The writer feels that these findings may be interpreted simply on the following basis: (1) standardization of the test; (2) superior verbal ability of

³⁴ Cf. Levinson, "Child Guidance . . .," as in note 3, p. 7.

³⁵ As in note 31.

³⁶ Cf. Hollingworth, Leta S., *Gifted Children: Their Nature and Nurture* (New York 1929), p. 70.

³⁷ Terman, Lewis M., and Oden, Melita, *The Gifted Child Grows Up* (Stanford 1948), p. 14 (Vol. IV of *Genetic Studies of Genius*).

³⁸ As in note 25, p. 38.

the Jewish child; (3) culture of the Jewish home; and (4) attitude of the Jewish parents toward their children and their constant and insistent motivation toward intellectual achievement.

According to Terman³⁹ the average IQ of 100 was derived by averaging in the scores of children of day laborers (6.6%), slightly skilled trades and other occupations requiring little ability (9.4%) and farmers (14.9%). A perusal of the occupations of the parents of our sample indicated that the above groups were conspicuous by their absence. It is precisely these which have the lowest average intelligence in the general population. The omission of these occupations from the sample would serve to raise the IQ of any population group. Furthermore, we must remember that the IQ scores of the obviously defective children were included during the standardization of the test. These were not included for our group. According to Merrill, about 2.63%⁴⁰ of the population is in the mentally defective category. This exclusion would also serve to raise the average IQ of the sample.

It is well known that because of cultural pressures Jews excel in verbal tasks and do less well in any situation requiring manipulation or visualization of three dimensional objects or sensori-motor coordination.⁴¹ As a matter of fact, the children in our sample who do not have the same cultural background as the other pupils and who, therefore, do not experience these pressures, have correspondingly lower IQ's.⁴² The Revised Stanford-Binet Scale is overloaded with verbal items, even at the pre-school levels.⁴³ This would favor a better intelligence rating for Jewish children.

The traditional Jewish home is book-centered with great emphasis on formal education. The Jewish child, therefore, is impressed by his parents' attitudes and tries to do as well as he can in the very tasks which are appreciated and rewarded by them. Either implicitly or explicitly he is motivated to accept an intellectual problem as a worthwhile challenge. In an intelligence test the Jewish child puts forth his utmost effort and, if necessary, even guesses. He is usually persistent and painstaking in anything that has an intellectual flavor. This, in itself, in view of the maximum motivation, would tend to raise his achievement in an intelligence test.⁴⁴

³⁹ Terman, Lewis M., and Merrill, Maud A., *Measuring Intelligence* (New York 1937), p. 14.

⁴⁰ As in note 30.

⁴¹ Cf. Brown, as in note 12, p. 88; Held, Omar C., "A Comparative Study of the Performance of Jewish and Gentile College Students on the American Council Psychological Examination," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XIII (1941), pp. 410-11; and Wechsler, David, *The Measurement of Adult Intelligence* (New York 1944), p. 147.

⁴² The children in school G (IQ 102.45) do not have the cultural traditions of Eastern European Jewry and therefore, the obtained IQ underestimated their intelligence. Studies of children of the same socio-economic background indicate that their IQ should be at least 107.4. Cf. Levinson, "Note on the David Eells Test of General Intelligence," in *Psychological Reports*, II (1956), p. 242.

⁴³ Cf. as in note 25, p. 142.

⁴⁴ Cf. Levinson, "Rethinking the Selection of Intellectually Gifted Children," *Psychological Reports*, II (1956), p. 128.

The same factor of maximum motivation brings about the superior professional achievements of Jewish men and women. According to Terman, intellectually gifted Jews do better in professional pursuits than do gifted Gentiles of equal potential.⁴⁵ He thinks that they have a higher incentive.⁴⁶ This greater pressure for achievement may also be influenced by the fact that Jewish children are told from early childhood, either directly or indirectly, of the existence of antisemitism and the need for them to be twice as good in order to attain success equal to that reached by non-Jews.

Moreover the traditional Jewish family is child centered and takes great pride in its family life. The child is not only welcomed and accepted, but has realistic goals set for him and is expected to attain them. The entire family is interested in his scholastic progress, and he is judiciously praised when he is successful. This sympathy, interest, and encouragement usually lead toward the freeing of the child's intellectual potential from crippling emotional inhibitions and is thus conducive to achievement of a higher rating on an intelligence test.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Terman and Oden, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

⁴⁶ Terman states that the gifted subjects who are Jewish 'differ little from the non-Jewish except in their greater drive for vocational success, their somewhat greater tendency toward liberalism in political attitudes, and somewhat lower divorce rate.' *Ibid.*, p. 310.

⁴⁷ Cf., Levinson, as in note 13, and, *idem*, "Rethinking the Selection of Intellectually Gifted Children," in *Psychological Reports*, II (1956), p. 128. [A recent publication of interest is, Nulman, Louis, *The Parent and the Jewish Day School* (Scranton, Pa. 1957) — Ed.].