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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, in-
cluding 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 homo-
genous 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 Rock-
away, 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Simon S., “Psychological Adjustment of All-Day School Students,” Unpublished Doctoral Disserta-
tion, 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,

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 tele-
phone 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 knowl-
edge of the abilities and intellectual level of the children applying for admis-
sion 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 prin-
ciples 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 educa-
tional 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,
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. Mizrachi National Education Committee and Depart-
ment 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

4 The National Commission for Yeshiva Education is sponsored by the Mizrachi 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, Mizrachi National Education Commission, October 2,
1956.


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 Tal-
mudic 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,
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.  

Previous Research

Numerous studies on the intelligence of the Jews have been summarized by Maller, Brill, and Nardi. 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.

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. 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.

Procedure

A list of sixteen New York City schools with 6,845 pupils whose curricula adhered to the set standards of the Mizrachi 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).
New York. 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. 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. To the writer's knowledge, no published study is available regarding the effect of bilingualism on the intelligence rating of

---

15 The Educational Advisement Center of Yeshiva University provides facilities such as diagnosis and remediation of educational disabilities, vocational guidance, and school readiness examinations.
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. Research has revealed that bilingualism did affect the verbal intelligence scores of Italian children from two years six months to four years five months and that it did not affect the verbal intelligence scores of Jewish children, age nine to fourteen.

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

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.


Table 1 shows the mean 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 range 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.

The average IQ of 114.88, representative of the intelligence of the pre-school applicant at the modern Hebrew yeshivoth, was arrived at as follows: The mean IQ of each school was multiplied 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 deviation 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. This compares favorably, when the factor of bilingualism is considered, with the performance on the group Kuhlman-Anderson Intelligence Test 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.

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.
26 Cf. Educational Test Bureau, Kuhlman-Anderson Intelligence Tests (Philadelphia 1947). This is a group test.
Table 2 presents the percentile distribution of the intelligence 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

---

**Table 2**

**Percentile Chart**

**Distribution of Intelligence of Pre-School Applicants for Admission to Jewish Day Schools**

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

---

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Yeshiva Population Percent*</th>
<th>General Population Percent**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140 and above</td>
<td>Very Superior</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120—139</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110—119</td>
<td>High Average</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90—109</td>
<td>Normal or Average</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80—89</td>
<td>Low Average</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70—79</td>
<td>Borderline Defective</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50—69</td>
<td>Mentally Defective</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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.


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

According to Merrill, 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, 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 124 (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 APPTITUDE OF APPICANTS FOR ADMISSION TO JEWISH DAY SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135 and above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125–134</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>High Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105–124</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98–104</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Low Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 and below</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inferior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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
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. 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. This disproportionate number of Jewish children in the intellectually gifted category indeed was commented upon a long time ago by Hollingworth and Terman. 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. 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

---

35 As in note 31.
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 Terman 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% 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. 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. The Revised Stanford-Binet Scale is overloaded with verbal items, even at the pre-school levels. 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.

40 As in note 30.
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.\footnote{45} He thinks that they have a higher incentive.\footnote{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.\footnote{47}

\footnote{45} Terman and Oden, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 14.
\footnote{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.' \textit{Ibid.}, p. 310.