

https://dspace.org/

The Jewish day school matriculate

Kark, Gertrude

2015-04-23
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/17522

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

grouped into handwork, including various needlecraft, pottery, carpentry and woodwork; literary pursuits such as reading, book-collecting, public-speaking and writing; artistic activities such as painting, participation in theatrical presentations, art and music appreciation and photography; part-time studies including the study of languages, psychology, archaeology; special collections such as philately and numismatics. Two parents declared that their work was their hobby.

It is notable that 61% KDHS compared with 50% Control Group parents recorded having no hobbies whatsoever. Of the remaining parents it was generally found that most had more than one hobby. Gardening was the favourite, the numbers in both Groups being almost equal, with reading being the second favourite, the numbers being somewhat higher in the Control Group. Control Group parents showed a greater interest in music and in handwork than those in the KDHS Group.

(x) Interest in Sport.

The South African climate stimulates an out-of-doors life and an interest in sport to a far greater extent than in many other countries, and certainly those European countries in which the parent or grandparent generation of the matriculates spent their early lives. Participation in most forms of outdoor sport, particularly tennis, swimming, football or rugby, hockey, netball, cricket and athletics, is an integral part of the school life of most scholars. The interest of their parents in sporting activities, whether as active participants - golf, bowls, tennis and swimming being the most popular sports in the Johannesburg area, or as onlookers, must influence to some extent their home lives and their influences over their children. For this reason, they were asked to state their interests. It was found that 25% of KDHS and 23% of Control Group pairs of parents took no interest whatsoever in sport; 13% of KDHS and 33% of Control Group pairs of parents played at least one out-of-doors game, and 31% pairs of parents of KDHS matriculates, by contrast with 22% of Control Group pairs of parents did watch various sporting activities.

2. Grandparents of Matriculates.

Parents were asked for data concerning their own parents, because it is not uncommon in the Jewish community to find that grandparents exercise a considerable degree of influence over their grandchildren.

In a number of discussions, the investigator was told that much of the data asked for was not known, and that this would account for the large No Response returns. The only information to be recorded is that only 7% of all grandparents were born in South Africa, all of them with the exception of one, being females.

The home language of most grandparents was Yiddish, but very few were unable to converse fairly freely in English with their grandchildren.

More than sixtysix and two-thirds percent of grandparents were deceased by 1969.

From conversations, the investigator got the impression that the big majority of grandparents had not migrated to South Africa and were never in personal, direct contact with their grandchildren who constitute the Group of matriculates.

3. Communal Activities.

The parents were asked about their membership of Jewish Communal, General Communal (non-sectarian), Zionist, and Civic Organisations. The questionnaire sent to the parents (Appendix III p.143 shows the specific organisations which were listed, in addition to which, space was provided for organisations which might have been omitted. The Jewish Communal bodies included charitable, religious, and cultural organisations, in addition to the S.A. Jewish Board of Deputies, the national, officially-recognised spokesman for the Jewish community of South Africa. General Communal (non-sectarian) organisations, included social services, cultural and educational bodies. The last category

included Parent Teachers' Associations, which provided most of the numbers listed in Table A (xv) on the following page.

The third major group, Zionist Organisations, could be divided into those primarily geared to fund-raising for specific categories of work in Israel; others which combine educational and fund-raising programmes, and others whose function is solely educational. The S.A. Zionist Federation, the over-all national Zionist policy-making Body, and the Zionist groups which are ideologically affiliated to the political Parties in Israel, but do not participate in political affairs either in Israel or South Africa, are also listed in this section. The fourth major Group, namely, Civic Organisations, specified participation in the work of municipal bodies.

A very small number of parents added to the list provided, their membership of South African political organisations. A slightly larger number recorded membership of professional bodies associated with their daily work.

Table A (xv) entitled "Parents' Activities" on the following page provides an analysis of replies of the parents to the questions discussed above.

TABLE A (xv) PARENTS' ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITIES	KDHS (TOTAL 32 FAMILIES)	CONTROL GROUP (TOTAL 60 FAMILIES)
i. Jewish Communal		
Charitable	31	66
Religious	24	27
Jewish Cultural	5	3
S.A. Board of Jewish Education	6	4
S.A. Jewish Board of Deputies	5	8
Jewish ex-Service League	1	7
ii. General Communal		
Social Services	3	11
Educational (incl. PTA Groups)	17	23
Cultural	2	10
SAWA	1	1
iii. Zionist		
Fund-raising	17	32
Educational plus Fund-raising	27	17
Educational	2	7
Zionist Political	2	5
S.A. Zionist Federation	1	3
iv. Civic		
Municipal	0	1
v. Political (South African)	1	2
vi. Professional	2	14

The above figures show that more KDHS families were involved in all aspects of Jewish communal organisations, apart from a lesser involvement in the Jewish ex-Service League, and approximately the same in

charitable organisations. On the other hand, the KDHS families were less involved in general communal, social service and cultural organisations and more in educational bodies. The differences in involvement with Zionist, civic, political and professional associations were smaller.

It was noted, although not recorded in the above Table, that 5 KDHS and 12 Control Group families did not record any involvement whatsoever in any of the items listed in the Table. There was no significant difference between the two Groups insofar as total non-participation is concerned.

4. Attitudes Towards Israel.

Attitudes towards or ties with Israel may be considered in terms of ideological affiliations; financial support of various welfare organisations functioning in Israel, the degree of which cannot be determined statistically; or in terms of bonds resulting from family associations.

An attempt was made to consider the ideological affiliations of the parents of both Groups in the same manner as in the questionnaire sent to the matriculates. The same set of 10 statements was presented to the matriculates in their questionnaire (Appendix I p. 132) and the parents' (Appendix III p. 146). The extent of their agreement with the statements was to be measured in a rating from 5 down to 1 points. For purposes of analysis 5 and 4, that is to say, 'strongly agree' and 'agree' were combined and 2 and 1, 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' were combined so that three ratings resulted from which chi-square analysis was done wherever possible. Table A(xvi) entitled "Reactions to Israel", shows the results of analysis of the replies of the KDHS and the Control Group parents.

TABLE A (xvi) PARENTS' REACTIONS TO ISRAEL

STATEMENTS	REPLIES
(a) Israel is the spiritual home of all Jewry	84% KDHS; 83% Control agree; 13% KDHS uncertain; 7% Control disagree.
(b) The status of the Jews has been enhanced by the establishment of the State of Israel	90% KDHS; 92% Control agree; 0 disagree; 0 uncertain; 10% KDHS; 8% Control No Response*
(c) I would unconditionally like to make my home in Israel	X^2 = 4.861 d.f. 2 P > 0.05 N/S
(d) I am willing to undertake voluntary work for the benefit of Israel because I believe that the continuity of the Jewish people depends upon the progress of Israel	X^2 = 0.378 d.f. 2 P > 0.05 N/S
(e) Expressions of solidarity with Israel in no way reduces a person's loyalty to his country of origin	85% KDHS; 77% Control agree; 4% Control disagree; 10% KDHS; 6% Control uncertain; 4% KDHS; 12% Control No Response*
(f) Israel must manage her affairs without expecting support, either financial or manpower, from Diaspora Jewry	92% KDHS; 85% Control disagree; 2% KDHS uncertain; 2% KDHS; 5% Control agree.
(g) I would choose to live in Israel under any circumstances	15% KDHS; 5% Control agree; 31% KDHS; 25% Control uncertain; 41% KDHS; 53% Control disagree; 13% KDHS; 17% Control No Response*
(h) The establishment of the State of Israel has made life more difficult for Jews in the Diaspora	X^2 = 1.720 d.f. 2 P > 0.05 N/S
(i) I would consider moving to Israel if I could be assured of the same living standard as I have in this country	X^2 = 0.604 d.f. 2 P > 0.05 N/S
(j) One can be a good Jew without associating oneself with Israel in any way	X^2 = 2.700 d.f. 2 P > 0.05 N/S

* It is possible that the No Response reactions to this Statement equate with 'Disagree', but this was not investigated further.

Table A (xvi) shows that the reactions of the parents of both Groups appeared to be almost identically the same.

The replies to the direct question: "Would you care to make your home in Israel" are shown in Table A (xvii).

TABLE A (xvii) WOULD YOU (PARENTS) CARE TO MAKE YOUR HOME IN ISRAEL

GROUP	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	UNCERTAIN	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
KDHS	9 28%	4 13%	14 44%	5 15%	32 100%
Control	10 17%	21 35%	23 38%	6 10%	60 100%

$X^2 = 6.491$ d.f. 2 $P < 0.01^*$, i.e., a degree of significance is shown at the 1% level.

Enquiry was made about family associations in Israel. Table A(xviii) shows the numbers of parents whose own homes had been transferred to Israel by 1968; and the numbers of their children, relatives and close friends who had settled there. These figures are of interest because it can be assumed that those parents who have children living in Israel, will feel more closely associated with the country than those who do not. Similarly, it can be anticipated that such parents would be more likely to visit the country than those who have no children living there. To a less marked degree the same can be anticipated when people have other relatives or close friends who have immigrated to Israel. Table A(xviii) also shows the numbers of families which claimed to have no ties whatsoever with Israel.

TABLE A (xviii) PARENTS' TIES WITH ISRAEL

GROUP	CHILDREN LIVE THERE	RELATIVES/ FRIENDS THERE	LIVE THERE THEMSELVES	NO TIES	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
KDHS	8 28%	18 49%	1 1%	7 22%	0	32 100%
Control	3 5%	40 67%	2 3%	14 23%	1 1%	60 100%

From Table A (xviii) it is observed that one pair of KDHS and 2 of Control Group parents had settled in Israel by 1968. Twentyeight percent KDHS compared with 5% Control Group of families had children living there, whilst 49% KDHS and 67% Control Group had relatives and close friends there. More or less the same percentages, i.e., 22% KDHS and 23% Control Group families claimed to have no ties with Israel whatsoever.

5. Reactions to Schools.

The investigator considered it important to learn as much as possible about the attitudes of the KDHS parents towards the school, and their reactions, in retrospect, to their children's participation in the initial experiment.

At the same time it was felt that equally useful information might result from the reactions of the Control Group parents, who had not accepted the opportunity to enrol their children at KDHS.

With these ideas in mind, this section of the parents' questionnaire was divided into two parts. First, parents were asked to indicate which of a number of stated reasons had decided them in their choice of school. The second part of the enquiry took the form of the identical question which the matriculates themselves had been asked. Eight reasons in favour of sending a child to KDHS in 1970 and 5 against, were listed. The respondents were asked to tick the statements with which they were in agreement. In this way, it was possible to ascertain the numbers (and their reasons) in favour, against, and uncertain, of sending their children to KDHS in 1970. It should be explained that the year 1970 was taken merely because the questionnaire was sent out in 1968/69 and the idea was to project into the future.

(i) Reasons for Choice of School.

The answers to this question (see Appendix III p. 146) and Appendix IV p.151) should provide information, both as to the parents' wishes

for part of the education of their children, and also their assessments of the schools at which they had decided to enrol their children. It must be mentioned, however, that under normal circumstances, children attending a Government school would enrol at the school directed by the Transvaal Education Department. This would be the nearest Government school providing instruction through the medium of the child's home language.

It was not possible to phrase the questions in this section in identical terms for both KDHS and Control Group parents. Attention is drawn to the differences in Appendix IV p.151. Nor was direct comparison of the two sets of findings possible. Therefore, the questions and answers are listed separately on the following page, showing the highest percentage returns, down to the lowest.

The figures in Table A(xix) on the following page show, without question, that the primary reasons which encouraged parents to send their children to KDHS were associated with the study of Jewish matters as part of the normal daily programme - the Hebrew language, a Jewish way of life, religious and Judaic instruction - to complement the instruction given in the home.

After that, followed the conviction that attendance at a Jewish school would facilitate adult integration into the life of the general community. It is recalled that this point of view was strongly held by the late Rabbi Kopul Rosen.

Other considerations were social benefits, accessibility to the scholar's home, protection of the scholar from prejudicial behaviour of its class-mates. The inclusion of instruction for the Barmitzvah or Batmitzvah ceremony at school, the standards of general teaching in the school and the attendance at a 'private' school were minor factors.

TABLE A (xix) KDHS PARENTS' REASONS FOR CHOICE OF SCHOOL

REASONS	TOTAL 32 FAMILIES	
	NUMBER	PERCENT
(e) We wanted instruction in Hebrew to be part of the daily school programme.	26	81
(b) We believed that the school would supplement the Jewish home life which we provided.	21	66
(f) We wanted religious/Judaic instruction to be part of the daily school programme.	20	63
(h) We thought the school would provide the Jewish knowledge which we believed ourselves inadequate to impart.	19	59
(l) We believed that separate development during school-going years would make integration into the general adult community much easier.	8	25
(j) We felt that social benefits would result from attendance at the school.	6	19
(a) Accessibility to home.	4	13
(k) We felt that attendance at the school would protect our child from possible prejudices to which children attending other schools might be subjected.	3	9
(o) No vacancy at nearest Government school.	3	9
(p) Sent automatically from KDHS Primary School.	1	3
(g) We wanted our child to be prepared for Bar/Batmitzvah as part of his/her daily school programme.	1	3
(c) It was, at the time, the least expensive of the private schools.	nil	nil
(d) We understood that the school provided the best opportunities for scholars to obtain the highest possible matriculation results.	nil	nil
(i) Financial reasons.	nil	nil
(m) We lived in the country and felt that the school would provide the most suitable boarding facilities.	nil	nil
(n) Other reasons, or comments.		

TABLE A (xx) CONTROL GROUP PARENTS' REASONS FOR CHOICE OF SCHOOL

REASONS	TOTAL 60 FAMILIES	
	NUMBER	PERCENT
(a) Accessibility to home	44	73
(i) We believed that our child should, from the earliest possible age, learn to mix with children from other sections of the community.	37	62
(c) We preferred a 'government' to a 'private' school.	21	35
(d) We understood that the school provided the best opportunities for scholars to obtain the highest possible matriculation results.	20	33
(b) We believed that the Jewish home life which we provided did not require to be supplemented.	19	32
(e) We thought it more advisable to provide after-school tuition in Hebrew language and Jewish affairs, than to have them included in the routine daily school programme.	17	28
(f) We did not think it necessary for our child to be given any specifically 'Jewish' instruction.	13	22
(g) Financial reasons.	13	22
(h) We felt that social benefits would result from attendance at the school.	6	10
(j) Parent's school.	2	3
(k) Good reputation of the school.	2	3
(l) Sent automatically from feeder school	1	1.5

The answers of the Control Group parents as to their reasons for sending their children to the Control schools, show that accessibility to home was the main reason. As has been recorded elsewhere, parents normally had no choice as to which government school their child would attend. The figure of 73% may therefore have had little to do with

parental choice, but may have been governed almost entirely by Transvaal Education Department regulations. The highest percentage came from the expression that children should 'learn to mix at an early age' and was clearly intended, within the context of the questionnaire, to be a criticism of KDHS. In fact, most parents answering this question, had obviously assumed that they were being asked, albeit indirectly, to voice their criticisms or opinions of KDHS.

It is notable from a comparison of Table A(xix) referring to KDHS parents' replies and Table A(xx) referring to Control Group parents' replies, that there was considerable difference of reactions in regard to four common reasons. The matter of accessibility to the home has already been commented upon. Whereas no KDHS parents, at this stage, gave the standard of teaching at the school as a reason for sending their children there, 33% of Control Group parents did so. The brief account of the two schools constituting the Control Group in Chapter 5 makes it understandable that this could be the case. Whereas no KDHS parents gave financial considerations as a reason for sending their child to KDHS, 22% of Control parents did so. This raises the question as to whether an implication might be that, had the finances been available, they might have sent their children to the KDHS. However, it should be mentioned that during the period under consideration in this study, the fees of the KDHS were minimal. The fourth common reason, namely, 'social benefits' showed a 19% return from KDHS and a 10% return from Control Group parents. However, as there were different interpretations of what had been intended by 'social benefits' no worthwhile comment can be made on these figures.

For the rest, it is clear from the parents' replies that the Control Group parents were apparently not very interested in providing their children with much Jewish education. Or, possibly, it may be that they wished to keep separate their General and Judaic studies.

(ii) Opinions of the KDHS.

Turning now to the second part of the enquiry about the attitudes of the parents to KDHS, Tables A(xxi) and A(xxii) provide the analysis of the replies in favour and against sending children to KDHS in 1970.

TABLE A(xxi) DISTRIBUTION OF PARENTS' POSITIVE ANSWERS

REASONS	KING DAVID HIGH SCHOOL TOTAL 32	100%	CONTROL GROUP TOTAL 60	100%
(a) the high standards of teaching.	16	50%	29	48%
(b) the comparatively small classes.	12	38%	16	27%
(c) the range of extra-curricular cultural facilities provided by the school.	14	44%	16	27%
(d) the inclusion of Hebrew language and Jewish studies in the curriculum.	28	88%	29	48%
(e) the religious influence	14	44%	9	15%
(f) the fact that it is a Private School.	2	6%	1	2%
(g) the need to protect our children from the possible prejudices to which children attending other schools might be subjected.	1	3%	5	8%
(h) the social benefits.	2	6%	5	8%

TABLE A(xxii) DISTRIBUTION OF PARENTS' NEGATIVE ANSWERS

REASONS	KING DAVID HIGH SCHOOL TOTAL 32	100%	CONTROL GROUP TOTAL 60	100%
(i) the Jewish High School is a form of separatism with which I do not agree.	2	6%	30	50%
(j) attendance at a Jewish school makes the integration of the pupil into the general community difficult.	1	3%	18	30%
(k) too much pressure is brought to bear on the children to try to achieve results beyond the capacities of some of them.	2	6%	13	22%
(l) parents are too heavily taxed, over and above the actual school fees.	4	12%	13	22%
(m) the children are greatly influenced by others coming from wealthy homes, so that they become too demanding.	4	12%	13	22%

Six KDHS and 20 Control Group parents expressed uncertainty as to whether they would wish to send their children to KDHS in 1970. This uncertainty took the form of expressing agreement with some of the positive statements shown in Table A(xxi) and also with some negative statements in Table A(xxii).

It is also noted that a much higher percentage of opinion in favour of sending children to KDHS was found in the KDHS parents' group than in that of the Control parents.

There was a conspicuously marked difference in the numbers of positive responses to statement (d) by the KDHS and Control Group parents. This may, in fact, have been a crucial factor in the choice of schools. Whereas only 48% of the Control Group parents, compared with 88% of the KDHS parents favoured this reason, it, together with statement (a) ranked highest in the choices of the Control Group parents. On the other hand, attention is recalled to the earlier comment that, either the Control Group parents were not very interested in providing their children with instruction in the Hebrew language and Jewish studies, or they may have wished to keep separate their children's general and Judaic studies.

The percentage responses by both Groups of parents to items (f), (g) and (h) were small and did not reveal any significant differences between the two Groups. The responses did, however, demonstrate that the factors described in these three items did not play more than a very small part in influencing the choice of school.

Turning to Table A(xxii), it is to be noted that items (i) and (j) are based on general opinions, and therefore agreement or otherwise with them can be accepted as rational reactions by those with and those without experience of KDHS. Items (k), (l) and (m), however, raise issues that are derived from personal experience and the reactions of the KDHS Group can be accepted as having a legitimate basis, but the reactions of the Control Group parents are suspect. It is worthy of note here that the reactions of the Control Group indicating choice away from KDHS for reasons (k), (l) and (m) were consistent.

Very few KDHS parents agreed with items (i) and (j) which, in fact, are closely related to one another. By contrast, a relatively high proportion of the Control Group based their decisions on these issues. This contrast is indicative of another crucial aspect of the basic stimuli to the different choice of schools by the two Groups.

There were a few parents who gave a response to the effect that they would choose KDHS for their children, and at the same time also responded to points raised in Table A(xxii), implying that they would not choose KDHS. This contradiction in attitude has been abstracted and placed into the results described as 'Indecisive'.

The low number of parents' responses, particularly from those of the KDHS matriculates, is again emphasised. It is most regrettable that, for this reason, a comparative study of parents' and matriculates' responses could not be made.

- - - - - -

GLOSSARY

Aliyah (s.), aliyot (pl.) - "ascent". In this thesis it refers to the immigration of Jews to Israel. A wave (or mass) immigration is called an 'aliyah'.

Barmitzvah (m), Batmitzvah (f). - (see page 55 of text).

Cheder (s.), chedarim (pl.) - "room" (s), "classroom" (s).

Chevra Kadisha - The Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society. The main function of this organisation is to handle the burial of the dead. It also undertakes social welfare activities, primarily by helping the needy.

Eretz Israel (or Yisrael) - the Land of Israel.

Eretz - the land.

Hebrew Teachers' Seminary - A training school or college for potential Hebrew teachers.

Haskalah Movement - Haskalah means "intelligence" from the Hebrew root "sechel". It is applied to the Movement to 'enlighten' the Jews, which began in the mid-eighteenth century in Germany and then spread to Eastern Europe.

Jewish Board of Deputies - the official spokesman for the South African Jewish community.

Jewish Agency - Since the establishment of the State of Israel, the Jewish Agency has the status of an international non-governmental body which functions as the co-ordinator of all Jewish overseas efforts in Israel. A 1952 Israel Status Law refers to "The World Zionist Organisation, which is also the Jewish Agency for Palestine" and continues ".... deals .... with immigration and directs the projects of absorption and settlement in the State.."

Kashrut (n.), kosher (adj.) - Hebrew from kashor "fit" - Regulations determining the Jewish dietary laws.

KDHS - King David High School. In this thesis KDHS refers to the original Jewish Day School established in Linksfield, Johannesburg, and does not include the more recently-established school in Victory Park, Johannesburg.

Kiddushin - (Hebrew = "Betrothals"). The seventh and last tractate in the Mishnah Order of Nashim (women). It deals with the regulations concerning betrothal and includes prohibited marriage.

Matriculate (s.) - refers to the young man or woman who has passed the officially-recognised matriculation examination or its academic equivalent.

Matriculation Examination - Scholars attending the "Government" schools under the jurisdiction of the Transvaal Education Department, and some of the "Private" schools write an examination at the conclusion of Standard 10, which is officially entitled the "Transvaal Matriculation Exemption Examination". Subsequent to the period included in this investigation, some schools have been chosen to experiment with a form of final examination which does not include the writing of a public examination.

Midrash (n.) - the finding of new meanings, in addition to the literal one, in the Scriptures, through the use of traditional rules.

Mishna - The code of oral Jewish Law.

South African Board of Jewish Education - the Body which draws its authority and finances from the S.A. Jewish community. It is responsible for the raising of funds, the controlling of the organisation and policy, and the administration of the various types of Jewish educational systems, including the King David Jewish Day Schools in Johannesburg.

Shtetl - a Yiddish word meaning 'small town' or 'village'.

South African Jewish Board of Deputies - the representative Body of S.A. Jewry.

South African Zionist Federation - the co-ordinating Body of all Zionist activities in the Republic of South Africa. It is responsible for carrying out the policy laid dow by the Biennial S.A. Zionist Conference, and it is the representative Body of South African Zionism.

Sephardi, Sepharadi (s.), Sephardim (pl.) - the name given to the Jews of Spain and thereafter to their descendants wherever they have been resident. The term was used particularly for the Jews who were expelled from Spain in 1492.

Talmud Torah - a part-time school where Jewish studies are taught.

Talmud (n.), Talmudic (adj.) - "Teaching". The name was originally applied to each of two compilations known respectively as the Babylonian T. and the Palestinian T. in which are collected the records of academic discussion and of judicial administration of the Jewish Laws.

Tikvat Israel - 'The Hope of Israel'.

Torah Im Derech Eretz - 'The Jewish Law together with secular knowledge'.

Torah - Teaching, Law. In Jewish tradition it has the broad meaning of both oral and written Law, together with every exposition of this Law. In its narrow context, it refers to the Pentateuch.

Tractate Peah a - Tractate refers to the volumes of the Talmud which are divided broadly into subject matter, but frequently include items which are not pertinent to the subject matter.

Peah is the name of a tractate in the Talmud which deals primarily, but not exclusively, with agriculture.

a is the number given to the first page of each tractate.

Ulpan (s.), Ulpanim (pl.) - 'Studio', derived from a Talmudic word meaning 'instruction'. The name is given to a type of residential language-teaching unit initiated in Israel in 1949.

White children - a phrase which is used colloquially in South Africa in contrast to 'Black' or 'Bantu' children.

World Zionist Organisation - was founded in 1897 to secure the re-establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine. It has continued to function within limited spheres since the establishment of the State of Israel (see Jewish Agency).

Yeshiva (s.), Yeshivot (pl.) - Jewish traditional school, devoted primarily to the study of the Talmud and Rabbinic literature. Most of the Yeshivot established in Israel since 1948, maintain a secular programme of studies, concurrently with the grounding in Talmudic scholarship.

- - - - - -

LIST OF REFERENCES AND OTHER SOURCES

ADAR, ZVI. (1965).
Jewish Education in South Africa. A Report. Jerusalem.

AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOKS. (1914 - 1970).

BEN HORIN, M. (1960).
"Major Writings in American Jewish Education."
In: Jewish Education. Vol. 30 No. 3. 1960.

BEHR, A.L. and MACMILLAN, R.G. (1966).
Education In South Africa. Pretoria. J.L. Van Schaik.

BOYCE, A.N. (1968).
Legacy of the Past. Johannesburg. Juta & Co.

BREMBECK, COLE S. (1966).
Social Foundations of Education. Philadelphia.
John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

CARTWRIGHT, A.P. (1962).
The Gold Mines. Johannesburg. Purnell & Sons (S.A.) Pty. Ltd.

CATTELL, R.B. (1950).
Introduction to Personality Study. London. Longmans.

CHOMSKY, W. (1957).
Hebrew: the Eternal Language. Philadelphia.
Jewish Publication Society of America.

COETZEE, J. CHR. (1930).
Problems of Educational Politics. Cited in
Behr and MacMillan. q.v.

COHEN, ISRAEL. (1925).
"Jewish Pioneers of British Dominions."
In: The Real Jew. ed. H. Newman. London. A. & C. Black, Ltd.

COHEN, JACK J. (1964).
Jewish Education in Democratic Society. New York.
Reconstructionist Press.

COX, EDWIN. (1966).
Changing Aims in Religious Education. London.
Routledge and Kegan Paul.

DAVIS, C. (1964).
The Making of a Christian. London. Sheed & Ward.

DAVIS, CHARLES. (1965).
"Article." In: Crisis for Baptism. ed. Basil S. Moss.
London. SCM Press.

DEWEY, ROBERT D. (1968).
A Manual for Confirmation Education. Philadelphia.
United Church Press.

DUSHKIN, A.M. (1918).
Jewish Education in New York City. New York.
Bureau of Jewish Education.

DUSHKIN, A.M. and ENGELMAN, U.Z. (1959).
Report of the Commission for the Study of Jewish
Education in the United States. Vol. 1. New York.
American Association for Jewish Education.

DUSHKIN, A.M. and FRANKENSTEIN, C. eds. (1963).
Studies in Education. Vol. XIII.
Scripta Hierosolymitana. Jerusalem. Magnes Press.

GAMORAN, E. (1924).
Changing Concepts in Jewish Education. New York. MacMillan.

GITLIN, MARCIA. (1950).
The Vision Amazing. Johannesburg. Menorah Book Club.

GLAZER, NATHAN. (1956).
"The Jewish Revival in America." In: Commentary.
Vol. 21 No. 1. New York. American Jewish Committee.

GOLOVENSKY, D.I. (1954).
In Group and Out Group Attitudes of Young People in a Jewish Day School Compared with an Equivalent Sample of Pupils in Public Schools. Unpublished Doctoral
Pupils in Public Schools. Unpublished Doctoral
Dissertation. New York University.

GOSS, I. (1961).
Adventure of Jewish Education. Johannesburg. S.A.
Board of Jewish Education.

GOSS, I. (1969).
Minutes. 15th National Education Conference of the
S.A. Board of Jewish Education. Johannesburg.

GREENSTONE, JULIUS H. (1914/15).
"Jewish Education in the United States."
In: American Jewish Year Book. New York. American Jewish
Committee.

HALLOWITZ, G. (1959).
Jewish Day Schools in the U.S. Unpublished Dissertation
for Degree of D. Ed. in Educational Administration in the
Graduate Division of the University of California.
Ann Arbor, Michigan. University Microfilm.

HANS, N. (1963).
Comparative Education. 3rd ed. International Library
of Sociology and Social Re-Construction. London.
Routledge & Kegan Paul.

HERMAN, S.N. (1945).
The Reaction of Jews to Anti-Semitism. Johannesburg. University of the Witwatersrand Press.

HERMANN, L. (1935).
A History of the Jews in South Africa. Johannesburg. Jewish Board of Deputies.

HILEWITZ, A. (1970).
Personal Communication.

HIMMELFARB, MILTON. (1960).
"Reflections on the Jewish Day School." Vol. 30 No. 1. In: Commentary. New York. American Jewish Committee.

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD CLASSIFICATION OF OCCUPATIONS. (1958).
Geneva. I.L.O.

JANOWSKY, OSCAR, I. ed. (1967).
The Education of American Jewish Teachers.
Boston. Beacon Press for The Philip W. Lown Center for Contemporary Jewish Studies.

JOSEPHUS. (1964).
Trans. Whiston, W. "Flavius Josephus Against Apion." In: Complete Works. Michigan. Kregel Publ.

KAPLAN, MORDECAI, M. (1957).
"The Jewish People in Search of an Ideology." In: The Reconstructionist. Vol. 23 No. 16. New York. The Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation.

KARK, G. (1966).
Techniques Used in the State of Israel to Facilitate and Expedite the Acculturation of Adults, with Special Reference to Immigrants from Underdeveloped Countries (1948-1964)."
Unpublished Dissertation for B.Ed. Johannesburg. University of the Witwatersrand.

KING DAVID 20TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION. (1968).
"Brochure." Johannesburg. S.A. Board of Jewish Education.

KLAPERMAN, GILBERT. (1955).
The Beginnings of Yeshiva University.
Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. New York.
Yeshiva University.

KLEWANSKY, I. (1969).
Personal Communcation.

KURZWEIL, Z.E. (1964).
Modern Trends in Jewish Education. New York. Thomas Yoseloff.

LAND, D.J. (1968).
The Jewish High School Pupil - a motivational study with special reference to King David High School. Unpublished Dissertation for Bachelor of Education. Johannesburg. University of the Witwatersrand.

LEIBOWITZ, LEA. (1966).
The History and Development of Jewish Education in the Transvaal. Unpublished Dissertation for Bachelor of Education. Johannesburg. University of the Witwatersrand.

LEWIN, KURT. (1948).
Resolving Social Conflicts. New York. Harper & Row.

MAKER, D.A. (1966).
Confirmation - An Analysis and Assessment. A Thesis presented to the Faculty of Divinity. Grahamstown. Rhodes University.

MASSERMAN, PAUL and BAKER, Max. (1932).
The Jews Come to America. New York. Bloch Publ. Co.

MISHEIKER, R. (1966).
Transcript of All Proceedings at the National Conference of Jewish Day Schools. Unpublished. Johannesburg. S.A. Board of Jewish Education.

NEW CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPAEDIA. (1967). New York. McGraw-Hill.

OPPENHEIM, A.N. (1966).
Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. London. Heinemann.

OTTOWAY, A.K.C. (1960).
Education & Society. London. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

PARK, ROBERT E. and MILLER, H.A. (1925).
Old World Traits Transplanted. Society of Social Research. Chicago. University of Chicago.

PARKES, J. (1954).
End of an Exile. London. Vallentine, Mitchell.

PEARSON, E.S. and HARTLEY, H.O. eds. (1956).
Biometrika Tables for Statisticians. Vol. I. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

PINSKY, IRVING I. (1961).
A Follow-up Study of the Graduates of one of the oldest existing American Jewish Day Schools: the Rabbi Jacob Joseph School. Unpublished Dissertation for D. Ed. New York. Yeshiva University. Graduate School of Education.

POLLAK, G. (1962).
"The Jewish Day School Graduate."
In: The Jewish Spectator. Vol. 27 No. 2. (Summary of unpublished Doctoral Dissertation "Graduates of the Jewish Day Schools: a follow-up Study." New York. Jewish Spectator.

REIFF, ANN. (1965).
An Investigation into the Differences in Personal Adjustment between a Group of Jewish Children Educated in a Jewish Day School, and a Similar Group of Jewish Children Educated in other Local Schools. Unpublished Dissertation. Pretoria. UNISA.

ROSEN, KOPUL. (1960).
The Case for the Jewish Day Schools. Pam. Johannesburg. S.A. Board of Jewish Education.

ROTH, CECIL. (1959).
The Standard Jewish Encyclopaedia. London. W.H. Allen.

SACHS, L. (1967).
"Speech." In: Pam. The Judge Kuper Foundation Trust. Johannesburg. S.A. Board of Jewish Education.

ST. JOHN, ROBERT. (1952).
Tongue of the Prophets. New York. Doubleday & Co. Inc.

SANDLER, N. (1970-71).
Personal Communication.

SARON, G. and HOTZ, L. eds. (1955).
The Jews in South Africa. Cape Town. Oxford University Press.

SCHARFZTEIN, Z. (1947).
History of Jewish Education in Modern Times. Vol. II. New York. Ogden Press.

SCHIFF, A.I. (1966).
The Jewish Day School in America. New York. Jewish Education Committee Press.

SILVERMAN, SIMON S. (1953).
The Psychological Adjustment of All-Day School (Yeshiva) Students: a Psychological Study of 7th and 8th Year All-Day School Students Compared with 7th and 8th Year Students Attending Public Schools. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation Series. Public. No. 10,616. Ann Arbor, Michigan. University Microfilms.

SMITH, G. MILTON. (1961).
A Simplified Guide to Statistics for Psychology & Education. 3rd. ed. New York. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

SOUTH AFRICAN BOARD OF JEWISH EDUCATION.
Minutes, Reports, Speeches, etc. Unpublished. Johannesburg. S.A. Board of Jewish Education.

SOUTH AFRICAN DEFENCE FORCE. WITWATERSRAND COMMAND. (1970).
Personal Communication.

SPENCE, HARTZEL. (1958).
"The Story of Religion in America: the Jews." In: Look. May 13th. New York. Look Publ.

STEIN, F. (1965).
A Comparative Study of the Educational System of Israel. Unpublished Dissertation for Bachelor of Education. Johannesburg. University of the Witwatersrand.

WEISS, SAMUEL A. (1957).
"Emotional Security in Jewish Children. In: The Jewish Parent. 3rd December. New York. The Jewish Parent.

WILSON, JOHN. (1971).
Education in Religion and the Emotions. London. Heinemann.

WILSON, J., WILLIAM, N. and SUGARMAN, B.N. (1967).
Introduction to Moral Education. Harmondsworth. Penguin.

WIRTH, L. (1926).
The Ghetto. Ph. D. Thesis. Chicago. University of Chicago. Department of Sociology.

ZLOTNICK, J.L. and MIEROWSKY, D. (1944).
Summary of Report of Commission to Investigate the Revision of the Syllabus for Hebrew Schools. Unpublished. Johannesburg. S.A. Board of Jewish Education.

- - - - -

Author Kark G
Name of thesis The Jewish Day School Matriculate 1972

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.

Author Kark G
Name of thesis The Jewish Day School Matriculate 1972

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.