Fall 10-2-2012

Jewish Perspectives on Christian Privilege: a Consensual Qualitative Study

Robert Kinney
robert.kinney@student.shu.edu

JEWISH PERSPECTIVES ON CHRISTIAN PRIVILEGE:
A CONSENSUAL QUALITATIVE STUDY

BY

ROBERT S. KINNEY

Committee

Laura Palmer, Ph.D. and Lewis Z. Schlosser, Ph.D., Mentor(s)
Pamela Foley, Ph.D., Chair
Ben K. Beitin, Ph.D.
Cheryl Thompson-Sard, Ph.D.
John Smith, Ed. D.

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
of the Doctor of Philosophy Degree
Seton Hall University

2012

JEWISH PERSPECTIVES ON CHRISTIAN PRIVILEGE:
A CONSENSUAL QUALITATIVE STUDY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICIES

Chapter I:

INTRODUCTION

Since the early 1970's, multicultural issues have been gaining momentum in mental health arenas (Schlosser & Foley, 2008). However, the majority of multicultural research has failed to include religion as a construct of interest. Of the extant literature, limited studies have focused on understanding the intersection of religion and privilege, despite the APA's formal charge to understand religiously based prejudice (APA, 2007; Paloutzain, & Park, 2005; Rosmarin et al., 2009). Hence, there is a need to explore the way marginalized religious groups (e.g., Jews, Muslims, Buddhists) understand and experience Christianity's status in the United States as a privileged social group.

Christians enjoy many privileges that members of non-Christian groups do not (Altman, 2009; Blumenfeld, 2006; Schlosser, 2003; Schlosser et al., 2009; Schlosser & Foley, 2008; Schlosser & MacDonald, 2006; Seifert, 2007). Furthermore, Christian privilege has allowed Christian dominance in the United States to go largely unquestioned and unexamined (Schlosser & Foley, 2008). The power of Christian privilege has become more overt across contexts (e.g., politics, education, healthcare) in

recent decades. As a result, there is a greater need to examine the impact of Christian privilege on non-Christians. One such group is American Jews, a numerically small and diverse group of people who must contend with Christian privilege in their daily lives. In the current study, I sought to understand the impact of Christian privilege among Jews.

Some existing literature has focused on understanding Jewish identity (Altman et al., 2010; Bernstein & Langman, 1999; Friedman et al., 2005; Mael, 1991; Rosmarin et al., 2009). As with other groups, there is much variability within Judaism (Altman et al., 2010; Langman, 1999; Schlosser, 2006). Jewish identity is salient for many, even those that do not adhere to religious practices and identify more with the secular/cultural aspects of being Jewish (Altman et al., 2010; Blumenfeld, 2010; Friedman et al., 2006, Schlosser, 2006). In the current study, I interviewed a sample of non-Orthodox Jews, to better understand how Christian privilege manifests in routine interactions and how issues related to Christian privilege impact their lives and identity. The knowledge gained from this study will foster an understanding of religion and the interplay between them in a culturally pluralistic society.

Non-Orthodox Jews are often overlooked in the literature; thus, in this study I hope to give a voice to a group that has gone largely unexamined. (Blumenfeld, 2006; Langman, 1999; Pargament et. al. 2007). The findings will further the understanding of mental health, coping strategies, and psychosocial costs among American Jews vis-à-vis Christian privilege to illuminate ways practitioners and researchers can approach working with and examining religiously different peoples.

Background of Proposed Study

The Jews are a diverse group of people (Langman, 1999). There are many ways to be Jewish, with varying levels of identification and orthodoxy. Across the population there is variation in the way traditions and faith are valued (Schlosser, 2006). Although Judaism is complex, there are some commonalities in the issues that Jews face including anti-Semitism, the Holocaust, and the invisibility of the Jewish identity (Schlosser 2006).

It is estimated that there are between twelve and seventeen million Jews throughout the world (DellaPergola, Rebhun & Tolts, 2005; Langman 1999; Singer & Grossman, 2005). Approximately six million, nearly half of the world's Jews, comprise 1-3% of the United States population (Langman 1999; Kosmin & Lachman, 1993; National Jewish Population Survey, 2010; Pew, 2010; Singer & Grossman, 2005). A small minority compared to the approximately 78-83% of the United States populations that identify as Christian, Jews make up the third largest religious group in America, with most membership in metropolitan and coastal areas (Schlosser et al., 2009; Schlosser, 2006). Of the approximately six million Jews in the United States, 88% identify as non-Orthodox, (e.g., Conservative, Reform, etc.) and were the focus of the study.

As previously discussed, Jewish identity is complex and fluid (Alba, 2006; Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2005; Klaff, 2006; Langman, 1999; Schlosser, 2006). However, there is some agreement about basic characteristics of American Jewish individuals. Jews originated in Eastern Europe/Western Asia, approximately three millennia BCE (I have chosen to identify time by using the term BCE instead of BC, as BC indicates time in Christian context) and have maintained common genetic factors

across time (Atzmon et al., 2010). Contemporary Jewish identity is bicultural- both American and Jewish (Altman et al., 2010).

Jews have faced oppression throughout American history. The dominant culture's view of Jewry has fluctuated across time, which has impacted past and current Jewish experiences. Across history Jews were generally treated as a "half-breed" race. In colonial times, for example, Jews were not welcome in many colonies and towns. At times, their presence was punishable by death. Prior to the second world war Jews were thought of as a mutt race, not fully grounded in any ethnicity (Blumenfeld, 2006). The Jew as a member of the white majority is a relatively recent phenomenon. During and after World War II, anti-Semitism became less overt and differences between Judaism and Christianity were minimized. Jews were discounted as an ethnic group and efforts to fold Jewish culture into the mainstream changed the face of American Jewry (Langman, 1999). While Jews were allowed to assimilate and acculturate, doing so exacted a steep cost – namely, aspects of their Jewish identity (Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2005).

Statement of Problem and Significance of the Study

Throughout American history, Jewish people have been marginalized and treated as deviants (Langman, 1999; Schoenfeld, 1999). Many Jews opted to integrate into mainstream culture and give up the traditional aspects of Jewish life, termed a "cultural genocide" on behalf of mainstream Christianity (Blumenfeld, 2006). This annihilation has lead to a country that places little value on Judaism as an ethnicity and faith. The Jewish identity is not respected. Christianity is a benchmark, to which all other faiths are

compared. Possibly related, occurrence of religiously based hate crimes has steadily inclined, and anti-Semitism has seen a recent resurgence (Anti-Defamation League, 2009). Although legislative steps have been taken to ensure Jewish people are not discriminated against, anti-Semitism is increasing in America and across the world. Jews continue to be the group most targeted by religiously based crimes (Anti-Defamation League, 2005b; Anti-Defamation League, 2009; Pargament et al., 2007; Simon & Schaler, 2007). However, Jewish issues remain largely unexplored.

Jewish issues may have been under investigated due to the erroneous belief that they are a "model minority" or "white," as there is no visible identification of Jewry for most non-Orthodox American Jews (Friedman et al., 2005; Schlosser, 2006). The lack of research may also relate to the relatively disproportionate amount of Jews in psychology coupled with the relatively low levels of religiosity endorsed by psychologists in comparison to the populations served (Bergin & Jensen, 1990; Bilgrave & Deluty, 1998). Schlosser (2003) believed that the lack of research into religion could be traced to Christian privilege, which functions to keep Jewish issues unnoticed. As an important part of society and the history of psychology, Jewish experience and identity warrant examination.

Jews have had to cope with being marginalized for some time. It is likely that thousands of years of oppression have installed coping strategies to help Jews survive and prosper (Altman et al., 2010; Berman, 1994; Fein, 1988; Langman, 1999; Rosmarin et al., 2009). Adaptive behaviors include an appropriate balance of bicultural identity (i.e., American and Jewish) and community support (Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al.,

2005). Jews are aware of their surroundings and identify times and situations in which appraisal necessitates denial of identity for safety or coping (Altman et al., 2010). When identified, Jews are often expected to educate majority culture, or "act Jewish," and are questioned when behaviors do not align with stereotypes (Altman et al., 2010; Schlosser, 2003, 2006). Contemporary Jews are likely to face more obstacles from non-Jews because they are less likely to feel a connection to the traditions of the faith than Jews of previous cohorts (Friedman et al., 2005; Langman, 1999). Because they are less likely to have a connection to the faith, today's Jews fear anti-Semitism less than previous generations (Friedman et al., 2005; Langman, 1999).

Studies have documented the difficulties Orthodox Jews encounter in culture (Mael, 1991). It is likely that Orthodox Jews face unique difficulties in contending with Christian privilege, as their religious and ethnic identity is visible, especially among men (e.g., yarmulkes). Less research has focused on the issues non-Orthodox Jews encounter on a daily basis. Non-Orthodox Jews face obstacles that are not shared by all members of the group, which may compound issues found in other populations (Altman et al., 2010; Schlosser, 2006).

Mental health issues may present when individuals attempt to behave in a way that does not conform to a Jewish stereotype, "pass" as a non-Jew, or are asked to speak for all Jews or Judaism (Altman et al., 2010; Fein, 1988; Friedman et al., 2005; Rosmarin et al., 2009; Schlosser, 2006). Stereotypes and assumptions could have wide ranging impacts on Jewish mental health. Contemporary Jews are a minority in a majority Christian Country, where there unique issues often go unnoticed. Today's Jews face anti-

Semitism and the reverberations of the holocaust (Schlosser, 2006). Jews may exhibit more paranoia, (i.e., healthy paranoia) due to a long history of oppression and marginality (Langman, 1995; Schlosser, 2006).

Jews that live and work in Christian culture face issues that could impact their mental health (e.g., fear of job loss, hate crimes, and mischaracterization of ethnic origins and religious beliefs are made public). The difficulty non-Orthodox Jews have navigating mainstream culture likely varies depending on contact with Christianity, level of acculturation, and religiosity. To be Christian is the "norm" in America. Christian holidays are regarded as "American" and "secular," regardless of their religious origins and meanings. Some may find it easier to choose to remain silent when approached by an Evangelist or attend work, rather than temple, on the High Holy Days (Schlosser, 2003; Mael, 1991). Non-Orthodox Jews must also deal with being negatively evaluated by Jews and non-Jews alike for being "not Jewish enough." This issue, termed legitimacy testing (The Jewish Daily Forward, 2010), is a unique challenge faced by non-Orthodox Jews (and likely by others in similar positions vis-à-vis more Orthodox members of their religions). As noted by a fellow graduate student, you are a heretic if you are less religious than me, and you are a zealot if you are more religious than me (R. Adisy, personal communication, 2009).

The voice of American Judaism is overlooked and relegated to stereotypes. The United States is the most religiously diverse nation in the world, but it is often referred to as a "Christian nation" (Blumenfeld, 2006) and Christianity is the most common religion (Pew, 2010). Jewish beliefs are often erroneously bundled with Christian beliefs (i.e.,

Judeo-Christian values) – this minimizes Jew's marginality and the different values held by the groups (Friedman et al., 2005; Schlosser, 2006). They inhabit every socioeconomic status, many geographic areas, and differ greatly with regard to their levels of religiosity. Jews have been made to feel shame for their accomplishments, face oppression that goes largely unexamined, and feel more internalized anti-Semitism than previous cohorts (Beaman, 2003; Friedman et al., 2005; Langman, 1999; Schlosser, 2006).

Recent scholarly work has focused on gaining a better understanding of the intersection of privilege and religion (Kinney et al., 2011). Little focus has been paid to understanding the perspectives of those who do not enjoy the benefits of Christian privilege (Clark et al., 2002; Blumenfeld, 2009; Schlosser; 2003). Aware of the aforementioned reality, Schlosser (2003) wrote that discussing Christian privilege was breaking a taboo. The issue is taboo due to pressures; both overt and covert are in place to ensure that dominance remains in the hands of Christianity (Schlosser, 2003). Christian privilege, like other privileges, has been envisioned as a sort of "knapsack" that has many objects inside (Blumenfield, 2006; McIntosh, 1988; Schlosser, 2003). Part of opening and exploring the knapsack of privilege and oppression is developing an understanding of the impact of the privileged, which can be facilitated by hearing from the oppressed.

Much of the existing literature on Christian privilege and the Jewish experience is theoretical or conceptual (Alba, 2006; Altman et al., 2010; Blumenfeld, 2006; Friedman et al., 2005; Klaff, 2006; Schlosser, 2006). I intend to add to the knowledge base of Christian privilege and the Jewish identity through qualitative methods. I will explore their coping strategies and experiences in culture, communities, and workplaces. This

study is designed to fill a gap in the literature by raising awareness of the experience of religious minorities in America - partially uncovering the pain and success they feel while working with, and sometimes without, the support of dominant Christian culture to achieve success and happiness.

Research Questions

1. How do Jews interpret their Judaism in a predominantly Christian culture?

2. What kinds of experiences impact an individual's Jewish identity?

3. How do Jewish individuals view, understand, and experience Christian privilege?

4. What is the individual impact of Christian privilege?

5. How can mental health professionals better support Jewish people?

Conclusions

The main goal of this study is to explore the coping strategies (i.e., behavioral and psychological) employed by American non-Orthodox Jews in handling Christian privilege, (e.g., at work, in relationships, with family) while maintaining a sense of Jewish identity. The knowledge obtained from this research will inform future research and augment the discourse regarding religion in the United States. The information will help Jews, other religious minorities, mental health professionals, and graduate training programs. It is of critical importance to elevate the dialogue regarding religion and oppression to a level in which the oppressed are no longer nameless, faceless, and voiceless. Hearing from a group of non-Orthodox American Jews will add to the understanding of the impact of Christian privilege on those that do not benefit from it.

Giving a voice to the participants will help mental health professionals improve interventions, dismantle oppression and disparities, add to the sociopolitical dialogue, and foster an understanding of all religions and the interplay between them in a culturally pluralistic society.

Definition of Terms

American Jew: Jews who reside in the United States, and spent the dominant portion of childhood in the United States, regardless of ethnicity. This includes Jews of all sects (e.g., Reform, Yeshivish, Modern Orthodox, Ultra-Orthodox, Conservative, etc.).

Anti-Semitism: Aggression toward Jews that can present on an individual, institutional, or societal level (Schlosser & MacDonald-Dennis, 2006).

Christian: Previous research has defined a Christian as anyone who self-identifies as Christian and believes (1) Jesus Christ is lord and savior (2) in the holy trinity (God-Jesus-Holy Spirit), and   the resurrection of Christ (Schlosser, 2003). For the purposes of this study, I will operationally define it as anyone who self-identifies as such.

Christian privilege: As the dominant group, Christians have the ability to create an ethos, in which Christianity is viewed as the norm, thus, creating an environment in which being non-Christian is abnormal (Blumenfeld, 2006; Clark et al., 2002; Schlosser, 2003).

Ethnicity: A group of people with similar characteristics that live in the same region or descended from the same geographic region. Close proximity results similar ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving (Bergen & Jensen, 1990; Fouad & Brown, 2000).

Internalized anti-Semitism: Conflicting or negative thoughts, feelings, and behaviors about one' s Jewish identity. The thoughts and feelings can range from confusion to self-hatred. Behavioral manifestations include disinterest in Jewish activities, denying one's own Jewish identity, and disparaging practicing Jews (Langman, 2000).

Jew: According to Jewish law, a Jew is a person that was born to a Jewish mother or converted to Judaism (Telushkin, 2001). For the purposes of the proposed study, I will operationally define it as anyone who self-identifies as such.

Multicultural Personality: Traits that are stable and include stability in racial or ethnic identity, embracing diversity and spirituality with openness to a diversity of experiences. This person would also have cognitive flexibility and abilities to adapt and work in diverse and multiple contexts. This individual would also be open and willing to advocate (Ponterotto, 2010).

Privilege: Aspects of identity that allow groups to go unexamined and retain a position of power (e.g., white, male, heterosexual, middle-class, Christian, etc.).

Religion: A socially constructed system of ritual behaviors, worship, faith, and tradition that organize and bind people (Dyson et al., 1997; Fukuyama & Sevig, 1999).

Religious Minority: Statistically, all religious groups that are not Christian in the United States (e.g., Atheists, Jews, Muslims, Hindus, etc.).

Secular Jew: A person that identifies as Jewish, but does not take part in any of the religious aspects of the culture (Altman et al., 2010).

Chapter II:

LITERATURE REVIEW

There is limited research that focuses on the experience of religious minorities, which can be traced to the lenses through which religion is viewed and discussed in America and psychology. Jewish people are not usually included in lists of minority groups, *people of color* excludes Jews, and Jewish scholars usually meet some resistance when presenting issues pertaining to multiculturalism (Langman, 1999). In the United States, the discourse around religion is based on assumptions and unexamined beliefs that establish Christianity as normative, thus, religious minorities are seen as abnormal or deviant (i.e., subordinate to and less valuable than Christianity) (Schlosser et al., 2009). Of marginalized religious groups, it has been said that Jews have shouldered the wrath of Christian privilege and oppression throughout American history (Clark et al., 2002). All of the above contributes to an invalidation of the Jewish experience (Langman, 1999).

As recently as 2008, bills have been signed into law that protect religious minorities from hate crimes and some of the impact of anti-Semitism (Anti-Defamation League, 2009). These legislative actions highlight the importance of understanding the

experience of marginalized religious groups. In an effort to explore the impact Christian privilege has on Jews, the literature review that follows will focus on these issues: Jewish identity, the experience of American Jews, anti-Semitism, internalized anti-Semitism, intersections of identities, identity management strategies, oppression and privilege, and sources, impacts, and costs of Christian privilege.

JEWS

There is limited research that focuses on Jews, which may be due to erroneous beliefs that Jews have succeeded, with both power and access (Goldberg, 1996). Judaism is at once an ethnicity, a culture, and a religion, rooted in more than 5,000 years of history. The multifaceted nature of Jewish heritage has yielded a group of people that occupy every social strata and vary in degree of practice, from traditional to non-observant (Langman, 1999; Schlosser; 2006; Schoenfeld, 1999). Of the twelve million Jews worldwide, approximately six million reside in the United States, and make up one to three percent of the population (Altman, et al., 2009, Kosmin & Lachman, 1993; Langman, 1999). American Jews can be divided into three major groups, (1) those who descended from Jews and practice Judaism, (2) those that do not practice, but are of Jewish descent, and (3) those who have converted to Judaism (Schlosser, 2006).

Jewish Identity

American Jewish identity is complex, fluid, personal, and contextual (Altman et al., 2010; Blumenfeld & Klein, 2009; Boyarin & Boyarin, 1993; Friedman et al., 2005; Gans, 1956; Langman, 1999; Naumburg, 2007; Rosen, 2006; Schoenfeld, 1956; Schlosser, 2006). Early inquiries into Judaism assessed it in terms of behavioral and

associational dimensions that were attributed to "good Jews," implying that religious

practices are part of Jewish experience (Altman et al., 2010; Gans, 1956; Steinberg 1965).

Contemporary inquiries into identity incorporate that American Jews have traditions and

commonalities that transcend religiosity (Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2005;

Langman et al., 1999; Schlosser, 2006; Smith, 2009). Jewish people can hold a strong

sense of Jewish identity, but not ascribe to any of the religious aspects of the culture, such

as keeping Jewish law, participating in religious services, or observing Jewish holidays

(Schlosser, 2006).

Many Jewish people do not identify any denominational affiliation, but still retain

a strong sense of Jewishness (Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2005; Langman,

1999). Developmental change and events throughout life influences Jewish identity

formation (Friedman et al., 2005). Variability leads to differences in practice, affiliation,

and observance. Religious Jews may experience Judaism in terms of observance, while

non-observant Jews experience Judaism as personal and communal (Altman et al., 2010;

Friedman et al., 2005; Schlosser, 2006). Some keep the traditional living style of

ancestral Judaism, while others see their Jewishness in terms of political affiliations, most

notably through identification with Israel, while others mix the traditional and

contemporary aspects of Judaism (Friedman et al., 2005). Whether more secular or

devout, Jews can retain a strong cultural identity that consists of conflicting views such as

pride, shame, generativity, and marginality in American culture (Friedman et al., 2005;

Schlosser, 2006). Jewish identity is an ethnicity and a faith, and as such primary Jewish

identity should be delineated into two categories: one that is ethnic and another that is

religious (Schlosser, 2006).

Ethnic Identity

Ethnic identity is stable and contributes to self-concept in minority group membership (Atkinson, 1983; Fischer & Moradi, 2001; Phinney, 1996). Jews report that, although their level of practice and observance fluctuates across time, their sense of being Jewish is enduring (Friedman et al., 2005). This lifelong feeling of Jewishness is present in values, cognitions, relationships and ideas. Individuals are born into the Jewish ethnicity, and maintain that sense of culture, while one can choose to observe or not observe Judaism as a religion.

At the cornerstone of American Jewry are peace and justice, expressed through an emphasis on life, freedom for all, homeostasis between nature, animal, and humans, and *Tikkun Olam* – taking actions to repair the world (Schlosser, 2006). With regards to *Tikkun Olam*, Jews that identify more with religious law may not endorse this value, although it is taught throughout religious education (R. Shapiro, personal communication, 2011). This difference in value is reflected in the American Jewish identity scale, which places *Tukkun Olam* in the cultural domain rather than the religious realm (Friedlander, et al., 2010). Most American Jews value debate, discussion, and education, which has contributed to the variability in the American Jewish perspective on moral and political issues, such as abortion (Langman, 1999; Levitt & Balkin, 2003; Schlosser, 2006).

While valuing multiple perspectives, many American Jews agree on the political issues of Israel. American Jews feel a connection to both the United States and Israel, along with concern for the welfare of each (Altman et al, 2010; Friedman et al., 2005).

The connection and pride are manifested through supporting American projects in Israel,

and traveling there whenever possible (Friedman et al., 2005). While aware of their

minority status, many express pride for America, Israel, and Jewishness (Friedman et al.,

2005).

Research indicates that Jews feel they have a bicultural identity, both Jewish and

American (Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2005). Either identity can become

salient, dependent on the context (Altman, et al., 2010; Clark et al., 2002; Friedman et al.,

2005; Langman, 1999). Each serves as a lens to view the world through. Some see their

American identity as secondary to their Jewish identity, but feel each is equally

important, and ever present (Friedman et al., 2005). Judaism becomes more relevant

when surrounded by non-Jews, while American identity might be the focus during times

of national tragedy or while traveling abroad (Clark et al., 2002; Friedman et al., 2005).

Cognitive factors, such as awareness of oppression and anti-Semitism, also play a

significant role in the expression and understanding of Jewish identity (Altman et al.,

2010; Smith, 1991).

Ethnic Jewish identity is marked by value of communal aspects of life, such as

family and traditions (Schlosser, 2006). Interpersonal relationships, including marriage

within Judaism, are important, as many feel more comfortable and understood in Jewish

company (Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2005). Most are able to express Judaism

within Jewish settings, such as temple or at the Jewish Community Center, but feel less

apt to do so in non-Jewish settings. Continuing to practice and observe Jewish traditions

aids in paying tribute to ancestral Jews that were persecuted and sometimes killed for

their beliefs (Altman et al., 2010).

Religious identity

In contrast to ethnic identity, which is stable across life, religious aspects of Judaism are dynamic (Friedman et al., 2005). At times, the traditions and faith are more important, while at others it is less so. The fluctuation usually occurs surrounding milestones of lifespan development, such as marriage, birth, and death (Friedman et al., 2005). During these times, many Jews want to add religious practices. In a study conducted by Friedman et al., (2005) participants spoke about feeing guilt for not integrating Jewish practices and traditions into daily living. Adding Jewish practice to life takes many different forms, including temple attendance or enrolling children in religious education courses (Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2005).

Although many Jews are affiliated with denominations, some are reluctant to discuss the affiliation because the historical denominational distinctions do not accurately capture individual experiences (Friedman et al, 2005). Many see Judaism as a personal experience. Many Jewish people search for God through individualized spiritual practices (Friedman et al., 2005). The diversity of the American Jewish experience is reflected in the different sects and movements.

Denominations. The denominations of Judaism share some similarities, but each have distinct practices and beliefs (Friedman et al., 2005; Schlosser, 2006). Although there are many movements within Judaism, below I will outline the most common in the United States, as identified by Schlosser, (2006) beginning with the most traditional. *Hasidic* Jews are distinct in their attire: the men wear black hats and women dress

modestly, often shaving their heads and wearing wigs (Schlosser, 2006). They are

steeped in Jewish tradition, first learning to speak Yiddish, then Hebrew, and finally

English. These Jews strictly adhere to the religious lifestyle by keeping kosher and the

Sabbath, and observing the laws of family purity (Schlosser, 2006). They believe the

Torah is literally God's law and live in communities outside of secular culture (Schlosser,

2006). The *Orthodox* follow most or all of Jewish law, such as keeping Sabbath,

observing holidays, and keeping kosher. Their dress is mostly indistinguishable from

secular culture, with the exception of the male yarmulke and women's slightly more

modest attire (Altman et al., 2010; Schlosser et al., 2006). The *Conservative* sect is more

egalitarian, mixing modernity with many traditions. Services are mostly performed in

Hebrew and conservative Jews are more likely to keep kosher (Altman et al., 2010;

Schlosser, 2006). The Conservative movement has a positive outlook on its mingling

with modern culture. *Reconstructionists* keep the traditional aspects of Judaism, and

maintain a progressive ideology (Schlosser, 2006). For example, Reconstructionists were

the first movement to hold *Bat Mitzvahs* for girls (Langman, 1999). Finally, *Reform* is

the most progressive of the major groups, promoting individualism and envisioning

Judaism as a dynamic religion that changes with culture (Altman, 2010; Schlosser, 2006).

With the evolution of the Conservative and Reform movements, the two denominations

now closely resemble one another (Schlosser, 2006).

Reinforcers and Challenges to Maintaining Jewish Identity

　　　　Reinforcers. Maintaining traditions and religiosity through attending services,

going to temple, or holding *Bat/Bar Mitzvahs* helps retain a strong sense of Jewry. These

events and services help individuals reinforce the Jewish identity that live in areas with both high and low Jewish populations, for example, if Jews live in an area with a small Jewish population, it facilitates a connection to the traditions of the faith and other Jews.

A personal connection to Judaism is reinforced by family and community that share similar beliefs, morals, and values (Altman et al., 2010). This allows one to feel confident that their traditions and values will be respected and transmitted (Altman et al, 2010; Friedman et al, 2005). For many, living in a community that has the support of Jewish family and friends is an important asset that adds to comfort and free expression (Altman et al., 2010). Having friends with similar beliefs promotes a sense of commonality with a safe, shared experience.

Challenges. It can be difficult to find reinforcers of Jewish identity. Finding friends and partners with similar experiences can be a chore for this population (Friedman et al., 2005). For that reason, some seek out non-Jewish communities that are tolerant and willing to learn about Jewish issues, and make it a priority to be forthright about beliefs and Jewish ethnicity in non-Jewish company (Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2005).

Jewish minority status can disrupt maintenance of Jewish identity and has taken a psychological toll on the population (Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2010; Langman, 1999). Christian traditions that are part of Americana have no meaning for Jewish people and remind them that they are different from the majority of the population (Altman et al., 2010). This leaves Jews feeling marginal, hurt, and inferior to others (Altman et al., 2010).   Marginality leads Jews to wonder about their fit across cultural

contexts, often asking if they belong or are accepted by the dominant culture. It has led Jews to question their racial identity- aware that they are not fully White and not as marginal as people of color (Alba, 2006; Brodkin, 2000; Langman, 1999; Schlenfeld, 1999). Jews tend to be aware of their differences from others, while uncertain about majority-minority identity (Baile et al., 1998; Blumenfeld & Klein, 2009).

Visibility

The non-Orthodox Jewish identity is invisible, unless one makes their identity known through actions, such as wearing a symbol or vocalizing their identity (Langman, 1999; Schlosser, 2006). Most Jews would not be comfortable disclosing their heritage due to the disparities that are present in the United States (Schlosser, 2006). Jews have been compelled to go unseen by the majority of people.

Jews can experience some, but not all, of the benefits of White privilege (Langman, 1999; Schlosser, 2006). The success afforded to Whites would have been difficult to achieve, unless the distinctions between Judaism and Christianity were weakened, allowing for permeation of the artificial boundary that more overtly oppressed Jews prior to World War II (Alba, 2006). To pass, Jews had to critically look at practices, and shed some traditions that were not accepted by dominant American culture (Alba, 2005, 2006). For the most part, dominant culture persists without noticing individual Jewish identity. This leaves Jews confused about their role in culture, feeling that their issues are not important in America (Blumenfeld, 2006; Blumenfeld & Klein, 2009; MacDonald-Dennis, 2009; Schlosser, 2006).

Intersection of Multiple Identities/Identity Management

As previously discussed, American Jewish identity is bicultural (Altman et al., 2010; Croteau et al., 2002; Friedman et al., 2005). The duality of American Jewish identity can cause value conflict. Jews feel like outsiders in contemporary American culture (Alper and Olson, 2012). People experience conflict when American identity is not congruent with Jewish identity. American culture can be more individualistic, while Jewish culture tends to be more collective (Schlosser, 2006). Jews can feel uncomfortable when their individual wants are not parallel to that of their family (Schlosser, 2006). It can also be difficult to balance bicultural identity and observance due to minority status and lack of reinforcement, as the majority of people are Christian in the United States (Altman et al., 2010). For example, when school is in session during Jewish holidays, families are forced to choose to observe the holiday or send their child to school (Altman et al., 2010). Aware of the bicultural identity, many feel a sense of pride and congruence for both Jewry and American citizenship, while also expressing marginality and inferiority in American culture (Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2005).

Anti-Semitism

Jews have been systematically attacked through violent acts and prohibition of education, travel, and business dealings (Schoenfeld, 1999). Anti-Semitism has existed, in some form, for thousands of years. However, anti-Semitism and its impact have changed over time. The persistent existence of Jewish discrimination and oppression has become part of the Jewish identity (Altman et al., 2010; Cohen; 2010; Friedman et al.,

2005).

Dubbed the world's "Longest Hatred," today's anti-Semitism is qualitatively different than in previous years (Judaken, 2008; Klug, 2003; Moyn, 2009). The act of openly discussing anti-Semitic attitudes, most notably, discussing hostility toward Israel, is growing in popularity (Judaken, 2008; Klug, 2003; Moyn, 2009). Many openly say that Jews are too powerful in the United States government. In reality there are few Jewish people in elected office (Simon & Schaler, 2007). Some Europeans and Americans think that the United States is overly supportive of Israeli issues, which may be related to the erroneous belief that Jews are too powerful in United States government. A large percentage of Europeans and Americans think Israel is the single largest threat to world security, with some countries calling for Israel to be disbanded (Simon & Schaler, 2007).

Recent research indicates that anti-Semitic acts and values are increasing in Europe and United States (Anti-Defamation League, 2005b; Klug, 2003; Paragment et al., 2007; Simon & Schaler, 2007). There has been a surge in the number of journalistic reports that have anti-Semitic themes and reports of hate crimes on college campuses (Cohen, 2010; Marcus, 2007). In 2000, there was dramatic increase in domestic anti-Semitic hate crimes (Simon & Schaler, 2007). In 2007, hate crimes against Jews constituted 66% of religious hate crimes and 12% of all hate crimes (Anti-Defamation League, 2005b). The Anti-Defamation League reported that 2009 hosted the largest number of anti-Semitic crimes since 2000. It is possible that anti-Semitic crimes are higher than the statistics indicate, due to a number of incidents that go under and

misreported (Henry & Jacobs, 1996). Although less widespread and violent than the anti-Semitism that lead to the Holocaust, Jews rank number one as targets of religiously motivated crimes (Kille, 2005a).

  With closer ties to anti-Semitic laws and the holocaust, older American Jews see anti-Semitism as a major world issue (Langman, 1999). These connections and views are often passed to Jewish offspring through more protective parenting styles (Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1997; Schlosser, 2003). Thus, some Jews are over-identified with the persecution they experienced during the Holocaust, and view the world as unsafe or dangerous (Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1997; Schlosser, 2003). This outlook on the world results in heightened levels of paranoia that manifests as constant vigilance that limits expression (Altman et al., 2010; Cohen, 2010; Friedman et al., 2005; Schlosser, 2006).

  The targets of anti-Semitism tend to be more religiously identified Jews (Cohen, 2010; McCoy & Major, 2003; Ontario & Fiske, 2001; Sellers & Shelton, 2003; Shamir & Sagiv-Schifter, 2006). Individuals that are more expressive with their Judaism, such as through wearing a Star of David or through correcting stereotypes publicly, are more likely to have had experiences with anti-Semitism (Cohen, 2010; McCoy & Major, 2003; Ontario & Fiske, 2001; Sellers & Shelton, 2003; Shamir & Sagiv-Schifter, 2006). The anti-Semitism they experience most often presents as derogatory terminology or questioning of religiosity (Friedman et al., 2005). Experiences with anti-Semitism cause Jews to question their responsibility in victimization and feel a sense of diminished self-worth about one's heritage (Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2005).

Internalized Anti-Semitism

Internalized anti-Semitism can be thoughts, feelings, or expressions (Langman 1999, 2000). One with internalized anti-Semitism might have a diminished sense of well-being and have poor opinions of Jews in general (Altman et al., 2010; Schlosser 2006). The cognitions are on a spectrum from confusion to self-hatred. Behavioral manifestations include disinterest in Jewish activities, denying one's own Jewish identity, and disparaging other Jews that are practicing (Langman, 2000). The internalization of anti-Semitism impacts the practices and retention of Jewish identity (Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2005). Those that internalize anti-Semitism are more likely to feel some disdain for Jewish heritage and move away from or avoid Jewish affiliations. Some express feelings of shame for their Jewish heritage, even when alone (Friedman et al., 2005).

Modern non-Orthodox American Jews closely resemble members of dominant culture. Assimilated Jewish people are more ambivalent about their heritage (Friedman et al., 2005). These Jews are more likely to feel some internalized anti-Semitism, because mainstream culture does not regard Judaism as a desirable identity, but rather, hold Christianity as the standard (Friedman et al., 2005; Langman, 1999; Schlosser, 2003). A reform Jew may never wear a sign of their Judaism in public, and feel Judaism is more of a hindrance than something to be proud of (Langman, 1999).

Experiences with anti-Semitism can cause pain and lead one to question safety. To avoid the pain and ridicule, many do not express Judaism outside of Jewish company or deny their identity all together (Blumenfeld & Klein, 2009). This is done most often to

pass as non-Jewish, due to uncertainty of surroundings and of attitudes others hold

toward Jews (Altman et al., 2010). Some may turn from Judaism, in favor of a secular

lifestyle, which will not include the difficulties of Jewish identity. Trends highlight non-

Orthodox Jews favoring non-religious life through intermarriage and celebrating

mainstream Christian holidays, over the Jewish High Holy Days (Cohen, 2007). For

American Jews, conformity has been salvation (Blumenfeld & Klein, 2009).

Christian Privilege

Privilege is gained and transmitted over time, allowing one's actions and beliefs to

persist unexamined (Duncan; 2003; Schlosser, 2003). It is a systemic issue that protects

the power held by the majority groups (e.g., Whites, males, Christians, etc.). Privilege is

marked by an uneven distribution of advantage or benefit given to a group or individual

(Schlosser, 2003).

Privilege and Oppression

Oppression is across contexts and impacts both individuals and systems, as it

pressures groups to act in ways that meet dominant cultural expectations (Frye, 2003). In

institutional forms, it serves to propagate norms (Sue, 1999). If an individual from an

oppressed group acts against societal expectations, the system seeks balance. Forces

within the system pressure the individual to act as expected (Frye, 2003). The pressure

maintains the status quo and contributes to difficulties in correcting social disparities.

Identifying and confronting privilege is a complicated process that can be difficult

for both the privileged and the oppressed (McIntosh, 1988). Gaining an understanding of

the experience of the oppressed and non-privileged is one of the first and best steps in

leveling disparities (Kimmel & Ferber, 2003). When confronted by privilege a member of the privileged group may have difficulty identifying it and become defensive, citing non-privileged identity variables. Oppressors are often unaware of the impact of their actions (Sue, 1999).

Origins, History, and Development of Christian Privilege

Christians experience privilege and have advantages in American culture (Schlosser 2003). Christian privilege, like other privileges, allows Christians to go through life unexamined and unnoticed (Schlosser 2003). Christianity is an expectation, partially because most people in the United States are Christians. Fully 88% of the population, Christians are a larger majority than the White population (Duncan, 2003; Pew, 2011; Schlosser, 2003; Schlosser & Foley, 2008). More than 50% of Christians self-identify as Evangelical (The Pew Forum, 2010; Gallup, 2005). Evangelical Christians understand biblical texts as the errorless word of God and the only authority. Evangelical beliefs are important to note as many non-Evangelical Christians hold similar beliefs, thereby, it is likely that the views of conservative Christianity have a large influence on the current cultural ethos that influences religious discourse (Cumings, Haworth, & O'Neil, 2011; Hyers & Hyers, 2008; Rosik & Smith, 2009).

History. Understanding the history of Christian privilege is part of the process of deconstructing the disparities it causes (Fairchild, 2009; McIntosh, 1988). Christianity was established as a religion surrounding the death of its leader (McGrath, 2006). Described as "post-traumatic" expansion, it has been theorized that the trauma of Jesus' persecution and subsequent death has become the focal point of the religion, and created

an entire population that believes itself to be persecuted (McGrath, 2006). This belief has propelled Christianity to grow at a rate unparalleled in history until recently eclipsed by Islam (McGrath, 2006; Schlosser et al., 2009).

Christians left Europe to escape religiously-based persecution and oppression, in pursuit of an environment suitable for free observance (Schoenfeld, 1999). Upon American settlement, several colonies established state religions and banned others entirely, sometimes punishing non-Christians by death (Blumenfeld, 2006; Duncan, 2003; Fairchild, 2009; Schoenfeld, 1999). In 1776, states began removing religious affiliations, because the newly established federal government resisted endorsing a religion. The founders understood religion as part of government to be oppressive (Duncan, 2003; Fairchild, 2009; Waldman, 2008). However, today's America remains a "Secular nation" dominated by Christianity.

Manifestations. Christian privilege can be seen across communities and contexts. The current calendar, originally designed by the Romans, marks time through a Christian lens, beginning with the birth of Jesus (Blumenfeld, 2006; Schlosser, 2003). School calendars support the Christian holidays, and in many areas of the country non-Christian children have to be absent to observe their holidays (Schlosser & Sedlacek, 2003; Schlosser, 2003; Seifert, 2007). Some states prohibit certain business from taking place on Sundays (e.g., "Blue Laws" prohibit stores from opening or making specific sales) (Blumenfeld, 2006). Religious traditions are entrenched in American pastimes and government practices such as, prayer before sporting events and before lawmakers convene (Schlosser, 2003). While being manifestations of Christian privilege, these

examples serve to keep power in the domain of Christians, effectively disempowering minority religious groups (Schlosser, 2003).

Jewish - Christian Relations. Jews have such a long history with Christian privilege that anti-Semitism has been identified as the oldest manifestation (Clark et al., 2002). Historically, Christians have been reluctant to discuss anti-Semitism (Eckardt & Eckardt, 1970). However, the Holocaust, the formation of Israel, and other anti-Semitic events have forced Jewish and Christian theologians to examine the discourse (D'Costa, 1990). Many researchers and authors have wondered if Jewish-Christian relations will always be marred by anti-Semitic acts. Some have asked if Christianity and the Gospels are inherently anti-Semitic, and have concluded that they are not (Kille, 2004, 2005). It is more likely that anti-Semitic acts are from erroneous beliefs that some ethnocentric Christians hold than that the entire religion is against Judaism (D'Costa, 1990; Feldman, 2007).

Anti-Semitism has been condemned by the major denominations of Christianity. Despite this, prejudice remains high among the devout, with its highest rates among frequent churchgoers, who endorse extrinsic religiousness and believe their religion to be the only truth (Allport, 1966; Allport & Ross, 1967; Hoge & Carroll, 1975; Langman, 1999; Scheepers et al., 2002). Belief in one truth, submission to authority without question, and church attendance co-vary with prejudice and anti-Semitic attitudes (Allport & Ross, 1967; Sheepers et al., 2002). That is, as one forgoes the option to accept and respect other religious beliefs, while seeing their religion as the one and only true faith and frequency of church attendance increase, so does the likelihood that one will

hold anti-Semitic values. When an individual feels other religious beliefs are an attack on their own values, that person may feel it necessary to defend their values with prejudice. Prejudice facilitates self-esteem development and helps group members feel valued by their faith group (Aberson et al., 2000; Paragment et al., 2007).

Maintenance

Christians are the politically powerful numerical majority dominant religious group in the United States (Schlosser, 2003). Schlosser (2003) called the discussion of Christian privilege "breaking a sacred taboo." He believed covert and overt forces exist to ensure privilege is retained by Christians alone. First termed in relation to gender inequalities, the "Nonconscious Ideology" has been applied to Christian privilege (Bem & Bem, 1970; Schlosser, 2003). The nonconscious ideology is a belief that Christian privilege allows one to live life without examination, much like a fish that has never been out of water (Bem & Bem, 1970; Schlosser, 2003). The fish, with no experience of air has no idea that it is surrounded by water, as it has only been wet. Christians in the U.S., like the fish, only know the privilege that comes with Christianity, because that is their only experience. Not only are they unaware of their privilege, but they do not see the impact it has on others. Christianity is seen as normal and assumed in most cases in America (Blumenfeld, 2006; Schlosser, 2003; Schlosser et al., 2009). These beliefs serve to perpetuate a consistent state of affairs (Schlosser, 2003).

Even when made conscious, Christian privilege can be a difficult construct of the privileged to understand (Kinney et al., 2011). Much like Whites find it hard to examine their racism, it can be difficult for Christians to comprehend the impact of their actions

(Schlosser, 2003). Looking at built in beliefs causes discomfort and guilt (Langman, 1999). When Christian privilege is illuminated to Christians, many object, citing their individual experience of persecution (Clark et al., 2002). Some might begin to artificially fragment personal beliefs from "mainstream" Christian beliefs (e.g., describing their denominational or individual beliefs in contrast) (Clark et al., 2002; McIntosh, 1998; Schlosser et al., 2009; Simoni & Waters, 2001). Others may see reasons for Christian privilege, such as numerical majority status, which many believe warrants some level of freedom and special allotment (Kinney et al., 2011). Many see Christianity as the American institution, although the federal government was never established as a Christian state. Some believe the United States democracy should protect Christians over and above marginalized religious groups (Kinney et al., 2011). These and other rationalizations further invalidate the experiences of religious minorities (Schlosser, 2003).

Impact/Costs

Although there are costs to Christians and Christian culture, including negative views held by marginal populations, loss of opportunity for relationships, and decreased diversity, this portion of the manuscript will focus on the costs to marginalized religious populations. There is limited research that focuses on the costs of Christian privilege to marginalized religious groups. Drawing from identified Christian privileges, probable costs to religious minorities include negative stereotypes and limited access to resources, such as missed employment and societal support opportunities (Schlosser, 2003).

When it is assumed that all people are Christian, it offends non-Christians and

contributes to segregation among the religions (Schlosser, 2003). Some states still prohibit certain business dealings on Sundays, effectively restricting religious minorities from being able to make purchases during free time. Like other oppressed populations, negative stereotypes cause pain on an individual and group level (McIntosh, 1988). Minority religious group members are likely concerned about the impact of disclosing their affiliations, and the possible safety issues that it could have (Schlosser, 2003).

Jews Experience of Christian Privilege

It is difficult to comprehend the psychological experience of Christian privilege on the Jewish population. As previously discussed, Jews have shouldered the majority of Christian privilege and currently experience more hate crimes than any other religious group in America (Anti-Defamation League, 2006a; Anti-Defamation League, 2006b; Anti-Defamation League, 2009; Clark et al., 2002; Simon & Schaler, 2007). The awareness of discrimination affects the thoughts, actions, beliefs, and views of Jewish identity (Altman et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2005; Langman, 1999; Schlosser, 2006). Some Jews express a constant feeling of embarrassment for being Jewish (Friedman et al., 2003).

Christian privilege has changed the face of Jewish practice in the United States, as (Schoenfeld, 1999). Jews have been compelled to assimilate into the mainstream (Gans, 1956). They question religious law and shed traditions to gain access to resources held by dominant culture (Mayer, 1979; Schoenfeld, 1999). The longstanding oppression of Jews has resulted in a mentality marked by anxiety, uncertainty, and questioning of status as Jewish Americans (Altman et al., 2010; Berman, 1994; Blumenfeld & Klein, 2009;

Fein, 1988).

Conclusion

Christians are a privileged group, much like Whites, males, and heterosexuals (Schlosser, 2003). There is limited research that focuses on the experience of religious minorities, which can be traced to the way religious issues are viewed in the United States and psychology. The discourse around religion is based on assumptions and unexamined beliefs that establish Christianity as normative. Thus, religious minorities are seen as abnormal or deviant (i.e., subordinate to and less valuable than Christianity) (Schlosser et al., 2009). The beliefs leave religious minorities to wonder about their value and place in society.

Furthering the understanding of religiously based oppression may support the religious dialogue and aide in dismantling oppressive ideologies and systems. Jews have been the group most affected by Christian privilege throughout history (Clark et al., 2002). The above literature review highlights the importance in understanding how religious minorities are impacted by Christian privilege. Jews, with a long history of experienced anti-Semitism and oppression are likely aware of the benefits and costs of Christian privilege. Illuminating the experience of Jews, is a pivotal step in opening dialogue and deconstructing privilege and oppression (Fairchild & Blumenfeld, 2007; Swim et al., 2001; Watt, 2007, 2009).

Chapter III:

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

Because of the limited research on the construct of Christian Privilege, a

qualitative approach was utilized for examining the experiences of Jewish individuals in

the Christian-dominated United States culture. Qualitative methodologies have been

used by an increasing number of scholars in recent decades (Hill et al., 1997, 2005).

Qualitative methods allow researchers to explore previously unexamined phenomenon

using words instead of numbers to provide a rich description of a phenomenon (Hill et

al., 1997, 2005). The study sought to add to the knowledge about the experience of

Jewish individuals through the use of Consensual Qualitative research (CQR).

Consensual Qualitative Research

Consensual Qualitative Research (CQR) was designed in 1997. The originators

wished to investigate phenomenon via qualitative methodologies, but felt a need for more

structure and clarity in conducting qualitative research (Hill et al., 2005). Based in post-

modern theory, qualitative research postulates that reality is an individual experience and

there are multiple valid truths (Hill, Thompson & Williams, 1997; Corey, 2005). CQR has its roots in previous qualitative methodologies, drawing on the strengths of phenomenology, comprehensive process analysis, and grounded theory (Hill et al., 1997).

CQR consists of several components including (1) open-ended questions in an interview format, (2) judges that revisit the data throughout the data analysis process (3) required consensus about data meanings between judges (4) an auditor to check the work of the team and (5) domains, cores, and cross analysis (Hill et al., 1997, 2005). The above steps allow for the consistent collection of rich data across cases, and analysis from multiple perspectives that minimize opportunity for error (Hill et al., 1997, 2005). The research is analyzed by a primary research team, consisting of three researchers, and one independent auditor. Having multiple reviewers ensures the adherence to the participants' narrative as much as possible, and multiple perspectives on the meaning of data that must result in consensus. The auditor is in place to protect the data integrity from the effects of groupthink in the primary team. The analysis by the team results in data that are organized into domains which have themes within and core ideas (e.g., distillations of data) that are created in the cross analysis process. The analysis of data can be divided into three separate and related steps followed by the team (Hill et al., 1997, 2005).

The three steps in CQR are referred to as *Domain creation, developing core ideas*, and *cross analysis*. Domain creation consists of a beginning list of broad categories based on the interview questions. The researchers attempt to fit the data into the domains. After the domains are developed, the researchers distill the raw data (i.e., the interviews) into core ideas. The researchers attempt to use participants' words in the core

ideas whenever possible. The core ideas consist of distillations of the main ideas that are said by participants. The core idea process attempts to make the data more workable, parsimonious, and consistent across interviews (Hill et al., 1997, 2005). Finally, cross analysis is a further extraction from the original interview data. Team members place the data into themes and come to consensus about the amount of consistency across interviews. Data fall into *general, typical*, or *variant* categories and are reported in the final manuscript. The proceeding terms are descriptions of the prevalence across cases (i.e., general n or n-1; typical ½n-(n-1); variant 2n < ½n). Throughout the analysis, data are checked for bias and other issues by the outside auditor (Hill et al., 1997, 2005).

Preserving Scientific Integrity

In the past, qualitative methods have been avoided by researchers because of the perceived lack of scientific rigor. In recent decades, qualitative methods have gained acceptance and reputability in the literature, with some describing it as the fifth force in psychology (Ponteretto, 2002). Recent advances in qualitative methods have opened avenues for new research into phenomena that had gone previously unstudied, possibly due to the difficulty in obtaining data through quantitative methods. Because of the methodical differences, there are special considerations when using qualitative methods. In the following section, I will discuss the ways scientific method will be employed to avoid contamination (i.e., the preservation of integrity).

The designers of CQR saw bias as anything that might make objective data analysis difficult (e.g., personal experience, race, gender, religious orientation, etc.). The data are protected from research bias across the research process. Prior to data collection,

the primary team and auditor are advised to discuss biases related to the construct of interest. Hill advises that the team should be comprised of members that have knowledge of the construct of interest and the auditor should have expertise in both CQR methodology and the construct of interest (Hill et al., 1997, 2005). In the update to CQR, Hill and colleagues (2005) recommend reporting biases so that the reader can interpret findings with additional data. CQR researchers have reported the biases in several different ways across studies (Altman et al., 2010; Blustein, 2010; Davis, 2010; Hill et al., 2005; Isacco & Garfield, 2010; Ming Liu, 2009; Park-Taylor et al., 2008; Sim, 2010). Biases will be reported in the limitations portion of the final manuscript.

Participants and Recruitment

Inclusion Criteria

Inclusion criteria was one of self-identification. Huddy (2003) argues that group membership ought to be identified by the individual (i.e., one should be able to self-identify). Based on previous research on Jewish identity, participants were selected if they had at least one Jewish parent, and identification as Jewish and Conservative, Liberal, Reform, or secular (i.e., non-Orthodox) (Schlosser, 2006; Altman et al., 2010).

Data were collected from 12 volunteer participants. CQR calls for a population that is somewhat homogeneous (Hill et al., 2005) and cautions that research being done on less homogenous populations should seek a larger participant pool. Thus, the research sought to obtain an *n* between 10 and 12. Of the respondents to the solicitation, the first individuals that met the inclusion criteria were selected for participation (i.e., selection was done on a first-come basis). Twelve non-Orthodox Jewish adults (Eight women and

four men) participated in the study. Of the participants 67% were married and 83% had children. Participants ranged in age from 24 to 69 (M = 49.8). Ethnically, participants self identified as Jewish, (50%) or White, (50%). All participants had obtained a bachelor's level education, while eight had achieved graduate degrees. Eight of the participants reported being raised "Jewish," while three were brought up in the Conservative tradition, and one was reared in the Reform tradition. At the time of data collection 50% of participants reported "Jewish" as current affiliation, while two reported Reform, two endorsed Conservative, one identified as Reconstructionist, and one self-identified as Conservadox.

Jewish identity is complex and fluid (Altman, 2010; Blumenfeld & Klein, 2009; Boyarin & Boyarin, 1993; Friedman et al., 2005; Langman, 1999; Schlosser, 2006). Many Jewish people that do not attend temple or keep any of the traditions still report a sense of Jewish identity (Friedman et al., 2005). Participants were selected via self-report as Jewish. Other inclusion criteria included rearing predominantly based in the United States in a non-Orthodox denomination (e.g., secular, reform, conservative, etc.).

Orthodox denominations (e.g., Modern Orthodox, Orthodox, Yeshivish etc.) were screened out of the participant pool. This exclusion is based on the researcher's belief that they likely to have a vastly different experience from that of the approximately 88% of American Jews that have daily contact with Christianity and Christian culture (e.g., at work, on television, etc.). All participants were adults that were employed in non-Jewish institutions at the time of data collection (e.g., all participants were18 years of age or older, not employed in Yeshivas, Temples, Jewish Community Centers, etc.). Their

experience in work would be different than other groups. Participants were asked to indicate their level of education, racial ethnic identity, relationship status, place of employment, denomination, and age.

Confident in the power of this method, Hill et al., (1997) recommends researchers utilize standardized instruments to triangulate the qualitative data. Triangulation aids in supporting researchers' understanding of data. It can also be useful to utilize multiple data methods to build on participants' narratives (Hill et al., 1997). For these reasons, participants were given the *American Jewish Identity Scale* (AJIS See – Appendix C) as part of the initial packet of materials, prior to the interview.

Recruitment

Because of the size of the population and nature of data analysis, a chaining/snowball technique is a reasonable sampling strategy (Meyer & Wilson, 2009). A chaining/snowball sampling ensured that participants would be more likely to participate. As a non-Jew it allowed me to use the endorsement of members of the population and gain trust not usually afforded to outsiders (e.g., it allows the researcher to "borrow" trust that is more easily gained by other members of the group). A letter was sent to possible participants known to the researcher(s) in both paper and digital forms (i.e., mail and e-mail). The letter gave information about the nature of the study and contact information for the principal researcher. The letter closed with a request – (1) contact the principle researcher if interested in participating and/or (2) forward the letter to other potential participants. The primary researcher, upon e-mail contact, confirmed the potential participant's age (18 years of age or older), self-identification as Jewish and

non-Orthodox. Participants that were interested in participating in the study were administered informed consent letter. Once the participant confirmed interest in the study, she or he was supplied with the demographic form, a brief questionnaire (i.e., *American Jewish Identity Scale*), the article prompt, (i.e., Schlosser's *Christian Privilege: Breaking a Sacred Taboo*) and the interview protocol via e-mail. The primary researcher secured the documents and scheduled an appointment for the telephone interview.

Protection of Participants

Participants were made aware of the voluntary nature of the study at both the time of the interview and during recruitment and that they were able to withdrawal at any time, without penalty. Participants were not required to cite a reason for withdrawal. In the recruitment and informed consent letter, participants were informed of the credentials of the principal researcher, reason for the study, and contact information for both the Principal researcher and the faculty advisor (i.e., Lewis Z. Schlosser). If participants presented with concerns about their own psychological well-being, referrals were ready to be provided to mental health professionals. Anonymity could not be guaranteed because of the qualitative nature of the study. However, the researchers did maintain confidentiality. Again, participants were informed about confidentiality, and anonymity.

The individual interviews were recorded and transcribed. The three researchers and auditor were the only individuals who had access to the data. After completion of an informed consent, the participant was informed that if his/her name and/or any identifying information is recorded, it would later be removed from the transcription and the recordings were to be destroyed after the transcription process has been completed.

Instead of using names, each participant was identified by a code number, and the transcripts included no identifying information. Data were kept on the primary researcher's USB drive, which was kept in his lockable office.

Data Collection

The data are the interviews. The interviews are designed to gather rich data that captures the qualitative experiences of the participants. Of the types of data collection employed in this type of qualitative research (i.e., paper and pencil essay style questionnaires, face-to-face interviews, phone interviews, and e-mail interviews) it is the researcher's belief that telephone interviews presented the best option. It was believed likely that most participants will be unable to present for face-to-face interviews. As such, all interviews were done over the telephone. It is likely that participants were more willing to give richer narratives than written surveys, and felt more comfortable than in a face-to-face situation (Anquilino, 2005; Groves, 1990). Using the telephone also allows for more diversification in the participant pools' geographic region, given that a limited number of Jewish people are living outside the northeast coast, western coast, and major metropolitan areas. Some evidence suggests that participants were more likely to participate and give honest responses in a phone interview (Aquilino, 1994; Groves, 1990; Hill et al., 1997, 2005). Although ideal, there are disadvantages to the phone interview format.

Findings thus far are inconclusive about the impact of telephone interviews on rapport. Rapport could suffer as a result of the physical distance between participant and researcher (Smith, 2005; Novick, 2008). Researchers must rely on verbal cues from the

participant, whereas, in other methods, researchers could call on nonverbal cues as well

(Aquilino, 1994; Groves, 1990). However, some research indicates that the quality of

rapport does not suffer (Chapple, 1999; Kavanaugh & Ayres, 1998; Novick, 2008;

Sturges & Hanrahan, 2004). Hill and colleagues (1997; 2005) believe that experienced

researchers can call on their clinical skills and experience as sufficient in building similar

rapport to face-to-face interviews. Given the logistical and financial concerns of

traveling throughout the country to conduct face-to-face interviews, interviews conducted

over the phone are an appropriate and favorable alternative that has been used throughout

the literature (Aday, 1996; Park Taylor et al., 2008; Sturges & Hanrahan, 2004; Sweet,

2002).

Procedure

Participants were supplied an informed consent letter and a one page demographic

questionnaire (i.e., Age, sex, race, educational level, occupation, employment setting,

occupation, relationship status – see Appendix A). Once returned to the principal

researcher, an appointment was set for the telephone interview and participants were

supplied with both the article prompt (Schlosser, 2006, *Breaking the Sacred Taboo)* and a

copy of the interview questions. The interview consisted of a set of questions, supplied

to the participants prior to the interview, which explored their experience of Christian

privilege and managing their Jewish identity in a predominantly Christian culture. All

interviews were conducted by the principal researcher and were approximately 60

minutes in length. Participants were informed of the importance of audio recording

during the interviews, and permission to record was obtained prior to the beginning of the

interview.

Interviews were semi-structured and consisted of the questions in Appendix B. A pilot interview was completed, and the interview protocol was revised based on feedback from the participant and the principal researcher's experience of the participant's responses. As in other qualitative research methods, (Hill et al., 2005) there were no hypotheses prior to data analysis.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using the highly respected and widely utilized CQR method. As in other qualitative methods, a small pool of participants were recruited and participated in interviews. The cases were, then, closely inspected to understand the phenomenon on a deeper level. This in-depth understanding is achieved via a consensual process, in which the findings are sifted out of the data. Crucial to the CQR process, are group consensus. As the process evolves, a satisfying interpretation of the data is achieved and agreed upon by the team members (Hill et al., 1997, 2005). The process is designed to encourage team members to voice individual opinions and interpretations of the data. Because of the qualitative nature of the study, and the possibility of groupthink, an outside auditor checks the primary team's perceptions of the data, to ensure the researchers' biases do not corrupt the data and the analysis is true to the data (Hill et al., 1997, 2005).

Membership

As indicated by Hill and colleagues, (1997; 2005) teams should be comprised of three members and one or two auditors, to encourage multiple perspectives and ensure

the data are not compromised by researcher bias. Team members create domains and core ideas for the cases, through the consensual process. This process creates a close relationship with the team members and the case creates an opportunity for primary team members to make comments about the data across cases and as a whole. Team membership is also designed to use the values and experiences of researchers in the data analysis process. The variety of backgrounds and experiences of the team members are advantageous for the consensus process. The team was comprised of me, (Robert Kinney) a Ph.D. candidate in counseling psychology, (Alexandra Stratyner) a doctoral student in counseling psychology, and an associate professor of counseling psychology (Lewis Schlosser). At the time of the analysis I was twenty-seven year old non-religiously affiliated male, raised in a Protestant Christian-American intact household who married into a Reform Jewish family. The doctoral student was a Christian female, and twenty-three at the time of the study. The professor was a thirty-eight year old Reform Jewish male.   A Jewish, female, counseling psychology professor served as the independent auditor (Julie Ancis). She has expertise in both CQR and the construct of Christian privilege.

Biases

Before beginning the interviews, the research team (primary team and auditor) came together and discussed biases. This discussion included reporting life experiences related to the research process, and discussing ways the members believed the participants would respond to the interview protocol. This illumination of biases is important for minimizing bias in the interview process. It is hoped that this process

would help researchers be more aware of the way their biases that might have come into

the analysis process, thus maximizing objectivity.   The multiple perspectives and bias

discussion helped raise awareness of possible areas independent researchers may have

overlooked (Hill et al., 1997, 2005). It was important to discuss religious history and

interactions with multiple areas of privilege. It was also vital to report values and

perceptions of both Jewish and Christian people. Discussion of biases was not limited to

the initial discussion. Members needed to stay aware of assumptions and biases

throughout the process. Furthermore, team members acted as a check throughout the data

analysis process.

Chapter IV

RESULTS

Analysis of the data lead to the identification of eight domains related to the Jewish perception of Christian privilege and their Jewish identity. The domains are listed below, followed by a table of categories and frequencies in table 1.

(1) Personal Conceptualization of Jewish identity

(2) Impact of Christian Culture

(3) Experience of anti-Semitism Marginalization in Dominant Culture

(4) Coping Strategies for Marginalization

(5) Thoughts and feelings about Christianity

(6) Thoughts about Christian Privilege

(7) Expectations for Helping Professionals

(8) Other

Table 1

Frequencies by Domain and Category

Domain/Category	Frequency/ Number of Cases
Personal Conceptualization of Jewish Identity	
A. Jewishness Means Community	*Typical/7*
B. Jewish Identity is Personally Significant	*Typical/6*
C. Jewishness has Religious and Cultural Components	*Typical/6*
(a) Cultural	*Variant/5*
(b) Religious	*Other/1*
D. Judaism is a Way of Life	*Variant/5*
E. Behavioral Manifestations of Jewish Identity	*Variant/5*
F. Marginalization Yields Increased Sense of Jewish Identity	*Variant/4*
G. Connected to Israel	*Variant/3*
H. Childhood Experiences Impact Current Judaism	*Variant/3*
Impact of Christian Culture	
A. Christian Culture has Negative Impact	*General/12*
B. Moderator of Impact (Reasons for Limited Impact)	*Typical/6*
C. Christian Culture has No Impact	*Variant/4*
D. Christian Culture has a Paradoxical Impact	*Variant/4*
E. Unsure of Impact	*Variant/3*
Experiences of Anti-Semitism/Marginalization in Dominant Culture	
A. Feeling Like an Outsider	*Typical/9*
B. Manifestations of Anti-Semitism	*Typical/8*
(a) Verbal Aggression	*Variant/2*
(b) Ignorance/Microaggressions	*Typical/6*
C. Difficulty In Personal Relationships	*Typical/6*
D. Anti-Jewish Problems in the Workplace	*Typical/6*
E. Minimizes Experiences of Marginalization/Anti-Semitism	*Variant/5*
F. Experiences that Necessitated Concealing One's Jewishness	*Variant/5*
G. Expected to Participate in Christian Activities	*Variant/3*
H. Childhood Experiences	*Variant/2*
I. No Identified Experiences	*None*
Coping Strategies for Marginalization	
A. Concealed Identity	*Typical/8*
B. Reframes Experiences of Marginalization	*Variant/5*
C. Travels in Jew-Affirming Circles	*Variant/5*
D. Uses Education to Cope	*Variant/4*
(a) Education for Others	*Variant/2*
(b) Education for Self	*Variant/2*

E. Advocates for Self	*Variant/3*
F. Repressing Negative Emotions	*Variant/3*
Thoughts and Feelings about Christianity	
A. Negative Feelings/Thoughts	*General/11*
(a) Proselytizing	*Variant/4*
(b) Political	*Variant/3*
(c) History of Oppression	*Variant/3*
(d) Other	*Variant/1*
B. Positive Feelings/Thoughts	*Typical/6*
C. Neutral/Ambivalent	*Typical/6*
D. Qualifies Difference Between Christians and Christianity	*Variant/4*
Thoughts about Christian Privilege	
A. Negative Impact of Christian Privilege	*General/11*
B. Benefits of Christian Privilege	*Typical/10*
C. Effects of Christian Privilege are Mediated by Geographical Region	*Typical/6*
D. Cannot Identify Benefits of Christian Privilege	*Variant/4*
E. No Thoughts Previous to Participation	*Variant/3*
F. Denies or Minimizes Christian Privilege	*Variant/3*
G. Limited Experiences with Christian Privilege	*Variant/2*
H. Does not Agree with Construct of Christian Privilege	*Variant/2*
Expectations for Helping Professionals	
A. Recognize Diversity within the Population	*Typical/9*
B. Gain Basic Knowledge of the History/Traditions	*Typical/8*
C. Understand Jewish Clients Deal with Privilege and Oppression	*Typical/8*
(a) Anti-Semitism Impacts Jewish Clients	*Variant/4*
(b) Christian Privilege Impacts Jewish Clients	*Variant/4*
D. Have a Multicultural Personality	*Variant/3*
E. Understand Importance of Community and Family	*Variant/5*

Personal Conceptualization of Jewish Identity

In this domain, three typical and five variant categories emerges. The typical categories were (A) Jewishness Means Community, (B) Jewish Identity is Personally Significant, and (C) Jewishness has Religious and Cultural Components (in this theme one variant and one 'other' subcategory emerged: (a) Cultural and (b) Religious). The variant categories were (D) Judaism is a Way of Life, (E) Behavioral Manifestations of Jewish Identity, (F) Marginalization Yields Increased Sense of Jewish Identity, (G) Connection to Israel, and (H) Childhood Experiences Impact Current Judaism.

As previously noted, participants typically made statements that suggested Judaism means being part of a community that has a sense of Jewishness, collectiveness, or acceptance of Jewish culture. Eric describes his Jewishness as a connection, saying, "Anytime I learn someone is Jewish, I automatically feel this visceral response, kind of like a connection, a commonality that I don't typically feel with other demographics." Fred described it as both social and the history of his people saying:

> [Judaism means] one – circle of friends. And two – a history
> behind me… I view it mostly as people who I socialize with and
> knowing that generations upon generations live their lives a
> certain way and I'm part of that continuum. Observing different
> rituals, referring to quotations from different passages in Jewish
> writing, respecting past people who struggled to create Judaism
> as a way of life for us.

Participants generally reported that their Jewish identity was of personal

significance. Lacy describes the personal nature of her Judaism below:

>So, basically, my grandmother was a Holocaust survivor but stopped believing in God because her parents were both killed in Vienna by the Nazis. So, she raised my mom and her siblings without much religious background or observance but with SERIOUS dedication and loyalty to being Jewish. I think my mom took that and ran with it in a kind of "hippie" direction - she got to the spiritual part of being Jewish which included some religion and a lot of Jewish traditions being upheld. For me, being Jewish really stems from all of that. It has to do with dedication and loyalty to my ancestors, as well as some spirituality pieces added in, and a lot of tradition keeping...

Generally, participants delineated cultural and religious components of Jewish identity as illustrated by Eric's statements on the subject:

>[Religious components are] pretty not existent. I don't ascribe to the beliefs of the Torah. It is not part of my daily functioning or living. To be honest with you, I don't even know what a lot of the religious beliefs of the faith are, which goes to show you how little, how low of a priority it is for me on a day-to- day basis.

Conversely, Kate illustrated the religious significance of her religiosity stating, "My Judaism is both my ethnicity, my religious identity. It's the way that I frame my world as a person who tries to live by the Torah, to whatever extent that I can, on any given day."

In addition to the aforementioned typical themes, variant categories discussed participants' conceptualization of their Jewishness. Five participants spoke about Judaism as a way of life and behavioral manifestations of their Jewish Identity. While the two variant categories illuminated the impact of childhood experiences on Judaism and that marginalization yields an increased sense of Jewish identity. The final variant category illustrated the importance of connectedness to Israel in the American Jewish experience.

Impact of Christian Culture

In this domain, one general, one typical, and three variant categories emerged. Participants generally reported (A) Negative Impacts of Christian Culture, while they typically reported (B) Moderators of Impact (Reasons For Limited Impact). The variant categories were (C) Christian Culture has No Impact, (D) Christian Culture has a Paradoxical Impact, and (E) Unsure of Impact.

As outlined, participants generally noted the negative impacts of Christian culture throughout development and currently. The events described were varied, and ranged from feeling like an outsider during the "Christmas Season", to feeling guilt and relationship conflict, due to the influence of Christian culture. Kate describes her experience of the impact of Christian culture on her life:

> I think it is kind of constantly being aware that you are the minority,
> is what it feels like…I think it was only as I got older and started
> seeing sort of the cultural impact of Christmas, for example, that I
> felt significantly different. I maybe questioned it for the first time.

Was I missing something? Is it fun being different (Laughs), when

you can't have Christmas? Yeah, I think also seeing people's

perceptions of, "why can't you have a tree? It doesn't mean you

believe in Jesus. Why can't you be like us?" The way my parents

handled it, was ,"No, we don't have a tree." There are Jewish

families that do. The way that my family handled it was that we

were very distinctly Jewish, even though I wasn't raised very

religious…We were Jews, we don't do that.

Donna described her experiences as a mother within Christian culture:

As far as it affecting my life, it's a presence and it's something that

when you live in a community that is primarily Christian, it is there-

you see it - you see crosses, you see things driving down the street

you have to explain them to your children, "Why does it say Jesus

Christ is the Lord on the side of [the highway]?" It is there-

especially in the community we live in. It is definitely present in

our lives.

Unprompted, participants typically provided examples of moderators of the

impact of Christian Culture. These were described as a strong sense of Jewish identity,

along with recognizing that one's social network included other Jews. Jill succinctly

stated "I was around a lot of Jews…I never felt any adverse impact about being Jewish,

in fact, I thought that in many aspects it was a positive."

Four participants reported that Christian culture had no impact on their

functioning (although, previously reported, nearly all participants provided examples of the negative impact of Christian culture). Fred described his reasoning:

I know my place and I'm very careful not to exceed to the status quo and not cause any waves. And the third part of this answer, first is guest, second is work, third part is the frequenting of businesses...how has Christian culture impacted my life...well, in the concept in frequenting businesses there are lots of businesses that are clearly Christian run as bases of their organization structure, and I have never had any reason to think that I was being discriminated against. So, I feel very positive about my relationship in businesses that are mostly Christian culture based…When I'm in an environment that is heavily Christian culture based, there's a heavy Christian culture basis...I watch very carefully what I question and why I question and when I question…So, when I speak and when I create ideas, they had to be within the context and very careful not to stray very far from their context.

Four participants spoke about the paradoxical impact of Christian culture (i.e., the positive impact) is perceived to have. They describe an increased awareness of Judaism in others, which leads to an increased sense of kinship or community. Harriet provides an illustrative example of the aforementioned theme:

Although I grew up in a town where there weren't very many

Jews, we belonged to a synagogue in the next town over that kind

of it brought in the two communities. So, it was a small synagogue,

but it was a very tight knit community, so I always had a feeling of

strength about my Judaism. I always had pride about it and I went

to a religious camp, where we actually did observe the Sabbath,

which was a wonderful experience…

Three of the participants were unsure of the impact of Christian culture. As stated

by Annie, "I don't know that [Christian culture] did alter [my Judaism]."

Experiences of Anti-Semitism/Marginalization in Dominant Culture

In this domain, four typical and four variant themes emerged. The typical themes

were (A) Feeling Like an Outsider, (B) Manifestations of Anti-Semitism, with

subcategories of Verbal Aggression, and Ignorance/Microaggression, (C) Difficulty in

Personal Relationships, and (D) Anti-Jewish Problems in the Workplace. The five variant

categories that emerged were (E) Minimizes Experiences of Marginalization/Anti-

Semitism (F) Experiences that Necessitated Concealing One's Jewishness, (G) Expected

to Participate in Christian Activities, and (H) Childhood Experiences.

Typically, when asked regarding experiences of feeling like an outsider as a Jew,

participants identified specific experiences in which they became keenly aware that they

were not a member of the dominant culture. Ten participants spoke about feeling

marginalized in Christian company or during Christian holiday seasons. Eric described

educational experiences in which he felt like an outsider:

I was pledging a fraternity in college and one of the rules within

the chapter was that whoever the treasurer was had to be Jewish.

That is just- it was very obvious to me that it was an example of

anti-Semitism…So, I don't think it had a direct effect on me, but it

was definitely a time when I felt like an other, like I felt like an

outsider. So, in that regard I kind of felt like there was some

adversity. So, I guess more psychological adversity than tangible.

Kate draws a parallel to cinema:

There is this Woody Allen skit, where he felt like everyone sees

him as this Hassidic Jew in a black hat and payot, even though he

is not like that. I think there definitely was an element of that for

me, not just because I like Woody Allen, especially looking Jewish

and my parents are from [Northeast]. I had a very New York kind

of way about me and I lived in [city name]. Even among Jews

sometimes, but for sure more Christians, there was this feeling of

being loud and different, and having a whole other calendar and a

whole other set of holidays, very different.

Participants typically described manifestations of anti-Semitism, which were

comprised of two subcategories, (a) Verbal Aggression and (b)

Ignorance/Microaggression, which were reported variantly and typically respectively.

While reported less often than microaggressions, Ian described an experience with overt

verbal aggression in a major metropolitan city:

There have been times when people have said things, or I have

even been afraid someone was going to attack me on the subway!

You know, in those instances like that. There was one instance in

particular when [spouse's name] and I were coming home from a

party late at night, and a man got on the subway, and he looked at

me and said "Eat shit and die, you fucking Jew." Those are the

words he said! It was just [spouse's name], and me and this man

sitting on the subway.

More often, ignorance of Judaism or microaggressions were spoke of by
participants. Annie reported hearing statements such as, "'Oh, I didn't know you were
Jewish!'" when her ethnicity is discovered, "As if there is something Jewish looks like."
Six participants spoke about difficulty in personal relationships. Becky stated, "There
were times when my in-laws would say not kind things about Jews in general." Also
under the typical category, participants identified anti-Jewish problems in the workplace.
Annie recalled "A boss who hired me and when I told him shortly after being hired that I
needed to take the high holidays off he got up, shut the door and asked me not to tell
anybody I was Jewish and he was upset."

Variantly, five of the participants minimized their experiences of
marginalization/anti-Semitism. Nearly all of those same participants also identified
experiences of anti-Semitism or feeling like an outsider (a phenomenon that will be
discussed in chapter 5). Five participants identified experiences that were appraised to
necessitate concealing one's Jewish identity. Three participants identified experiences in
which they were expected to participate in Christian activities, while two recalled

childhood experiences.

Coping Strategies for Marginalization

In this domain one typical and five variant categories emerged. The typical category was (A) Concealed Identity. The five variant categories were (B) Reframes Experiences of Marginalization, (C) Travels in Jew-Affirming Social Circles, (D) Uses Education to Cope (subcategories of (a) uses Education for Others and (b) uses Education for Self), (E) Advocates for Self, and (F) Represses Negative Emotions.

Participants in this study typically identified instances in which they concealed their identity. This was done to maintain appearances, minimize scrutiny, or avoid confrontation. Becky said, "If somebody made an anti-Semitic comment or something… it depends on the situation and who said it, but I might just not say anything, just to avoid confrontation and mind my own business."

The first variant category emerged from six participants that described their efforts to reframe experiences of marginalization. Becky reminds herself of the importance of her Jewishness and the pride she feels for her heritage, while Jill contributes the experiences to ignorance and Kate uses humor to cover discomfort. Five participants travel in Jew affirming social circles to cope. Harriet describes her efforts:

> **T**here are things I could be doing, activities or things, that I've just
>
> not chosen to do that would make me feel like an outsider. I guess
>
> most of what I do… none of those situations ever seem particularly
>
> Christian dominated or would feel like my being Jewish has made
>
> me somehow different than everyone else. A lot of things that I do

are connected to my synagogue, so I generally feel that I'm living

in a community. I'm living on a cul de sac with six homes. Four are

Jewish families. One is a mixed marriage of a Jewish woman and

an Italian and she is of my best friends. … I'm in a community and

a lot of our Jewish friends live within a block or two blocks from

where we live and we have a thousand families in our

synagogue…" in [city name].

Five participants comprised a variant category described the use of education for

others/self to cope. Jill uses education for his own coping:

Just reading and learning, but I try to read and educate myself. I try

to go to classes where they teach about interfaith, I've been

learning a lot about parallels between Christianity and Judaism, in

terms of historical background. So I've been doing...there's a lot of

education at my synagogue to teach and it's been not only at the

synagogue, but at a church, both the Catholic Church and, I think,

Episcopalian, so like interfaith learning going on. So, I've been

trying to attend as much as I can of those things, read as many

books as I can. And just seeing greater understanding for things

that I didn't know about like how Jews tried to eliminate some of

the Christian tenets from our own teachings and our own ancient

dogma. So it gives me a little better perspective, but it doesn't

make me feel any better towards the modern church.

Three participants comprised a variant category with data that emerged around advocating for self. Harriet, a social worker, recalled reaching out to her national organization to address scheduling a multicultural event on a High Holy Day. Three participants believe they repress their negative emotions. Fred states, "How has it impacted me? I repress a lot internal thoughts. I always hold myself back."

Thoughts and Feelings about Christianity

In this domain, one general category with four subcategories, two typical categories and one variant category are present. The general category was (A) Negative Feelings/Thoughts, which contained three subcategories of (a) Proselytizing, (b) Political, and (c) History of Oppression. The typical categories were (B) Positive Feelings/Thoughts and (C) Neutral/Ambivalence. The variant category was (D) Qualifies Difference Between Christians and Christianity.

The general categories mostly emerged from questions around the understanding of feelings and relationships with Christians and Christianity. Eleven participants identified negative thoughts or feelings about Christianity. The responses contained variability and lead to three variant subcategories for those who had negative views of the doctrines and actions associated with Christian proselytizing (four participants), negative thoughts or feelings about political ideologies associated with Christianity (three participants), or the history of oppression associated with Christian institutions (three participants). Kate shared her thoughts regarding proselytizing:

Christianity began as a religion that supports and believes in

proselytizing - that's a huge aspect of it, which I personally find

very theoretically problematic (laughs)… I respect people who have faith, but I am also very skeptical of people who misquote the Old Testament or interpret the Old Testament to be referring to things that the Old Testament was not referring to. I'm religiously critical of people that speak in God's name, or in the name of Christianity.

Ian shared his political thoughts/feelings:

I often think of, whenever I think of Christianity, it is very right wing politicians, things like that. That's the kind of image that I often get whenever I think about people who are staunchly Christian. And, that may be small minded of me, but sometimes it is hard for me to make that separation.

Harriet provided her thoughts and feeling about the history of oppression:

I'll be honest and say I have some very negative feelings. It brings up for me again the pogroms, the crusades, which were taught to me in school in a completely different way than the reality that I now know them to be. The holocaust, even knowing that Hitler himself was a Christian, and the church was complicit. And the many, obviously, the people in the communities in Poland and France who helped perpetrate this crime against humanity. So, it does bring up for me a lot of negative feelings. That's why I have a problem with Christmas, for that reason, because I know in our

country that made it kind of a secular holiday, although I'm sure for

many it does, they've kept and maintained the connection to Jesus

Christ, but for me it's a little oppressive… that it kind of permeates

the atmosphere from Thanksgiving on and it's been, sort of been, to

me pushed on everyone whether you...whether it's your holiday or

not, and a lot of people are surprised by, "Why can't you feel the

good feeling?" And for me, it is a reminder of the fact that many of

my people over the centuries were killed in the name of Jesus

Christ, so I don't forget that.

Typically, participants stated they had positive feelings/thoughts regarding Christianity

and Christians. Donna provided the example below:

I think most people that are Christian are good people that want to

help, that are giving and are really doing things for the right

reasons- they want to help people. Whether they think they are

going to get into heaven, they are good people…When you think

about Christianity, I try to think about the people that are good and

doing good, and not the crazy zealots that are haters. I think the

good loving Christians would frown upon those people…I think

about the people, a lot of my best friends being Christian, they are

good people they want to help you if you are in a bad position.

They want what's best for you and your family… Christians are

good people that want to help you and do what's best for you.

Six participants comprised the typical category that reported neutral or ambivalent thoughts/feelings about Christianity. Greg said, "You know I really don't have any particular feelings that I recognize now..." Four participants qualified the difference between Christians and Christianity. Annie stated:

Some of my best friends are Christian. I do have friends that are

Christian that I see their spirituality in a very positive way for

them, and I am happy for them. I don't want to place on a religion

one viewpoint. I think there is a wide range of people within that

group who might feel different ways. I personally don't subscribe

to the same beliefs that they do, but I don't think I have a lot of

feelings about that. I think I'd feel upset if somebody said, "Well

you are Jewish, so you must be XYZ," and pigeon hole me.

Thoughts about Christian Privilege

In this domain one general, two typical and four variant categories are found. The general category was (A) Negative Impact of Christian Privilege. The typical categories were (B) Benefits of Christian Privilege and (C) Effects of Christian Privilege are Mediated by Geographical Region. The variant categories were (D) Cannot Identify Benefits of Christian Privilege, (E) No Thoughts Previous to Participation, (F) Denies or Minimizes Christian Privilege, (G) Limited Experiences with Christian Privilege, (H) Does not Agree with Construct of Christian Privilege.

Participants were prompted to reflect on their perceptions of Christian privilege and its manifestations in America. Generally, they identified a negative impact of

Christian privilege. Christine stated that, "I don't talk openly about my

religion…Sometimes I have to remind myself that, yeah, I grew up in a very Jewish area,

but most people in the world, or most people in the country, will never meet a Jew."

Similarly, Donna said, "Just like any majority- it is easier to be white, just like I

said…[they] don't have to worry about it." Harriet said the following:

> I guess it's around holiday time. Even that Halloween has been
>
> kind of a secular holiday is an old Saint's Day. My kids were
>
> allowed to trick or treat, but (??)my granddaughter - my daughter
>
> doesn't have my granddaughter trick or treat. She dresses up for the
>
> holiday Purim, which probably falls out in March, but she's re-
>
> thinking it because the neighborhood she's living in is heavily
>
> Christian and it's hard to explain to her, my granddaughter, when,
>
> how is she going to understand when it's not being celebrated as a
>
> religious holiday. So part of that – the fact that it's a national
>
> holiday: Christmas. You don't work, you don't go to work and we
>
> go to the movies. That's what we do. Sometimes we do get together
>
> because my kids aren't working, no one's working, and say,
>
> "Alright everyone come over and I'll make a meal," but it's not our
>
> holiday – we know that. So you definitely feel it at the time…I
>
> mean tax payer dollars going to putting up wreaths and lights and
>
> decorations all over - the street lights and Santa Claus riding
>
> around on the fire engines in our towns. I think it's around

Thanksgiving they start doing that. So that certainly drives home

the fact that it's a Christian country, even though, technically, it's

not.

Typically, participants were able to identify benefits of Christian privilege for Christians. Lacy said, "Christians don't have their schedules dictated by their religion, so they're not trying to navigate trying to be out of work or out of school around their holidays or their important moments." Similarly, Becky suggested, "Maybe their ability to form community with other Christians," when asked to reflect on the possible benefits of Christian privilege. Participants also typically discussed the role that geographical region plays in the perception and prevalence of Christian privilege. Donna said, "I think if you are in the south or the midwest, where Christianity is the majority, there are definite privileges there for the Christians. I think it depends on your region, where you live." Likewise, Jill said, "I'm just not sure in …the major metropolitan cities…surrounding areas, and California. Maybe in the midwest it would be more prevalent."

Four participants could not identify benefits of Christian privilege. Unprompted, three participants reported that they had not given the construct of Christian privilege thought prior to participation. While three participants denied or minimized Christian privilege. Jill shared her views:

I don't really perceive that they're privileged. I think that privilege

goes to color in this country, not towards religion. I just don't see

any privileges that they've been entitled to that I've been deprived

of. That's just never been my experience and so I don't know what

privilege you may be referring to. Just because they're music is

played on their - I don't find that a privilege, I don't find that

offensive. I don't find it a privilege or a detriment.

Variantly, two participants reported having limited experiences with Christian

privilege. Becky said, "Thinking about it, I really have not experienced it that much."

Regarding the final variant category, two participants disagreed with the construct

of Christian privilege. Greg said:

When I was a kid in high school, I saw the Christian kids as being

very privileged. I saw later on in business, at times, people who

were different than I were privileged, but I am not sure it was

because they were Christian. I think it was more that there were so

many of whomever they were, as opposed to what I was. I'm not

sure I see it as a religious issue. I see it only as, more as an issue

of numbers. Whichever group, whichever anything is dominant by

virtue of numbers, they will tend to have special opportunities and

special situations occur for them. Because people generally look

after those that are closest to their experience. I think that

everybody is trying desperately to be privileged. But, I think that

by and large in the US, it is not that you are a Christian or Jew or

anything.

Expectations for Helping Professionals

Three typical and two variant categories present in this domain. The typical categories were (A) Recognize Diversity within the Population, (B) Gain Basic Knowledge of the History/Traditions, and (C) Understand Jewish Clients Deal with Privilege and Oppression, which was comprised of one variant and one typical subcategory (a) Anti-Semitism Impacts Jewish Clients and (b) Christian Privilege Impacts Jewish clients, respectively. The variant categories were (D) Have a Multicultural Personality and (E) Understand the Importance of Community and Family.

Typically, participants illuminated that Judaism is a broad group, with much diversity. Becky described Judaism as "more than just a religion," while Eric felt that responding to the prompt regarding advice for mental health professionals would undermine Jewish clients stating, "Part of me says 'nothing, you should know nothing about Jewish people,' just know that don't assume that anything about somebody because they are Jewish."

Eight participants identified gaining basic knowledge of the history and traditions of Judaism as important information for working with Jewish clientele. Christine cautioned, "Know something about Judaism because I think for some people there's an assumption that a lot things that are Christian beliefs are also Jewish beliefs, so maybe knowing a little bit about history or a little bit of things, in general." Kate offered unique insight:

> I initially had a Jewish therapist and I have to say it was very
>
> helpful to have a dialogue, or to not have to explain things, but I

think it is also very interesting that the therapist I have been with

for most of my significant formative years is not Jewish. There's a

lot of explaining and there is a lot of – there's tremendous lack of

understanding in certain concepts, especially in religious Judaism.

For example, the concept of Jewish law being binding, meaning

it's not a preference that, for example, I don't wear pants, it's not

just a preference - I feel obligated to observe certain rules, of

modesty. If you give me a pair of pants to wear, it is not a

preference, it is that I do not want to wear them. I think that's one

of the challenges, especially for observant Jews who are working

with non-Jewish mental health professionals. There are a lot of

main concepts that I think my therapist has done a lot of learning

on, from our conversations. He's actually quite incredible in the

therapeutic relationship - to feel misunderstood in such a

tremendous way, but also to be able to bridge that, I think can also

be very healing."

Participants typically believed that mental health professionals should understand

Jewish clients are impacted by both privilege and oppression. The data in this domain

covered two specific subcategories, the impact of anti-Semitism and the impact of

Christian privilege. Fred referred to the internalization of anti-Semitism and impact of

external anti-Semitism as "burdens" that are "negative aspects to Judaism that I should

know about or feel as we talk… a lot of it might be personal insight or personal feelings

about Judaism that are derived from either anger or upsetment or different thoughts about life." While Lacy spoke about mental health professionals' role in a Christian dominated culture:

> Support them in gaining strength and being able to kind of make
>
> sure that their needs and their priorities are honored and to speak
>
> up for what they need and what they want and what they believe
>
> in, so that they can uphold their culture or their religion - that part
>
> of their life, without feeling like they are being discriminated
>
> against or not heard or understood, but that they can be heard or
>
> understood.

Five participants indicated the importance of community and family in the lives of Jewish clientele. Harriet said:

> Judaism isn't about a personal God, it's about an insight and to
>
> some people it's not about do you believe in God – it's a
>
> community religion. It's a religion that requires in order for prayer
>
> to happen, you need a minimum of ten people in order to have
>
> what we call a minion. … The reason is that you're not praying
>
> alone. That you're with other people, that you have that support of
>
> the community.

Jill echoed the aforementioned ideology succinctly stating "Family is paramount."

Three participants discussed the traits of a *multicultural personality* (Ponterotto, 2010). Each spoke about keeping an open, exploratory mind when approaching Jewish

issues. Annie underpinned the importance of "basic cultural competency" and "approaching clients in an open way." Harriet said, "create a safe space."

American Jewish Identity Scale

Discussed previously in Chapter 3, participants also completed the *American Jewish Identity Scale* (AJIS). This 33-item self-report scale assesses cultural and religious identification of respondents (Friedlander, et al., 2010). As noted, the instrument was used to triangulate the qualitative data. Possible scores could range from (extremely low identification) – 4 (extremely high identification) (Friedlander, et al., 2010). Scores on this administration ranged from 1.39 – 3.52 (mean = 2.37), suggesting a range of identification from low to high with cultural and religious Jewish identity. Individually, participants response sets were reflective of the interview data provided.

Chapter V

DISCUSSION

We began this study to explore the way a specific marginalized religious group (Non-Orthodox Jews) understands and experiences (A) Judaism and (B) Christianity's status in the United States as a privileged social group. Multicultural issues have become less distal in recent years, resulting in a charge by American Psychological Association's governance to gain understanding of religion, prejudice, and oppression, in 2007. To dismantle the oppressive forces that are in place, we must first understand what needs to change. Jews were arguably most suitable to share their experiences, as they are at the same time white and a religious minority in the United States.

The interview process was enlightening and inspiring. I had the opportunity to hear from Jewish men and women, who struggle and cope oppression a daily basis. The insight that was present with several participants was palpable. All participants were forthright and demonstrated a willingness to share their experiences, even if not always clearly articulated. Specifically, throughout these interviews, it was clear that some of the participants were less able to identify privilege, while others were clearly passionate on

the subject. Through the narratives that were shared I have a more clear understanding of

the Jewish experience. Hearing the narratives helped me to better understand the impact

of greater culture on the Jewish experience on an individual and personal level. The

following is an overview of findings, followed by summary and conclusion, limitations,

and finally implications for research and practice.

Overview of Findings

    Personal Interpretation of Jewish Identity. This study affirms the previously

noted research, which has found that Jewish identity is dynamic and complex (Altman et

al., 2010; Blumenfeld & Klein, 2009; Boyarin & Boyarin, 1993; Friedman et al., 2005;

Gans, 1956; Langman, 1999; Naumburg, 2007; Rosen, 2006; Schoenfeld, 1956;

Schlosser, 2006). This truth may be reflected by the variability in responses to prompts

regarding Jewish identity. The absence of a general category in this realm may be as

interpretive as the data that were obtained. There was no overarching generally endorsed

theme the respondents used to describe Judaism. The differentiation in identity themes

underscores other inquiries that have found the importance of debate, discussion, and

education, which has added to the variability in the American Jewish identity (Langman,

1999, Levitt and Balkin, 2003, Schlosser, 2006). Participants noted the fluidity and

personal nature of their individual Judaism. Typically, respondents noted their personal

connection with Judaism. Reasoning for personal Judaism was often cited, but highly

differentiated. Some participants identified to the researcher that obtaining a general

response profile might be difficult.

    As discussed by Schlosser (2006), and reaffirmed by this inquiry, the Jewish

identity seems to have both religious and cultural components. The distinction was reflected in responses to the AJIS. Participants that scored lower on the AJIS actually had higher scaled scores when religious items were removed, reflecting identification with the cultural identity. Respondents with higher endorsed religiosity also reflected higher cultural identification. Respondents typically underscored the importance of the cultural components of the ethnicity, but also discussed the religiosity. The cultural component was discussed at once nebulously as a "cultural thing," in terms of traditions that maintain a connection to ancestors and history. Participants spoke about a feeling of kinship and connectedness that is felt around other Jews, while others described changes in religious observance throughout life, while their ethnic identity has remained stable. The findings that suggest a stable ethnic identity and a dynamic religious identity reaffirm prior research with similar findings (Atkinson, 1983; Fischer and Moradi, 2001; Friedman et al., 2005; Phinney, 1996). Relatedly, some of the participants also spoke about Judaism as a way of life, identifying it as a worldview and structure for understanding and deciding on tasks of daily living to making large life altering decisions.

As stated previously, development and life events have a large impact on identification with Jewry (Friedman et al., 2005). It should be noted that there were two distinct themes were uncovered within responses to prompts regarding Jewish identity experiences. Participants spoke about specific childhood experiences that had profound impacts on their current Jewishness and the transformative nature of travel to Israel.

Regarding minority identity, this study found some evidence that was contrary to

past inquiries. Previous research has indicated that minority status can disrupt maintenance of Jewish identity and take a psychological toll on the population (Altman et al., 2010; Friedlander et al., 2010; Langman, 1999). While participants in this inquiry indicated, indeed, marginalization has led to some psychological discomfort, they note it has yielded an increased sense of understanding of a personal Jewishness. It may be that marginalization is an important part of the Jewish experience that creates, at once, psychic pain and increased connection to the history, traditions, and culture of Judaism.

Every participant identified a negative impact of Christian privilege on their Jewishness. There was variability within the understanding of this negative impact, but many people spoke of interpersonal relationship difficulty and feeling like an outsider in the greater culture. Several noted that their childhood had been marred by microaggressions and anti-Semitism, in which they were expected to speak for their religion and questioned as to "why" their beliefs were in place.

It should be noted that all participants identified a negative impact of Christian culture, while three stated they were unsure of the impact, and four noted that Christian culture has no impact. This is an interesting finding that may highlight the phenomenon that Bem and Bem (1970) termed "the nonconscious ideology" (??). In their postulate, they referred to the oppressive-privileged, who live life without examination (Bem & Bem, 1970; Schlosser, 2003). Schlosser likened this ideology to a fish in water. The fish, with no experience of air, has no idea that it is surrounded by water, as it has only been wet. The theory could easily be used to understand the data through the eyes of the marginalized Jew. In the U.S., like the fish, Jews only know the oppression and

marginalization that comes with Judaism, because that is their only experience. Not only are they unaware of the oppressive forces that are in place to maintain the status quo, but they may not see the impact it has on their functioning.

Relatedly, the strengths that are inherent within this people, are highlighted by the participants who were able to identify moderators, or buffers, that limited the impact of Christian culture. These moderators include strong Jewish models with the family, and a community that was open to and affirming of Judaism.

The Impact of Anti-Semitism and Christian Privilege. With regards to thoughts and feelings about Christianity, participants generally reported negative thoughts or feelings about the institution. Their responses were distinctly divided into three subcategories, in which they identified negative thoughts and feelings about the political rhetoric, doctrine of proselytizing, and history of oppression. Again, in this portion we found contradictory results, in that 8 of 12 participants also identified positive feelings or ambivalence regarding the culture. Some of the positive feelings identified were related to the variant category that was uncovered, in which four participants qualified the difference between Christians and Christianity (i.e., participants noted distrust/dislike for Christianity, but recognized positive feelings for individual Christians). These findings may be related to the act described in previous research in which oppressors "fragment" personal, or individual beliefs, from that of the mainstream (Clark et al., 2002; McIntost, 1998; Schlosser et al., 2009; Simoni and Waters, 2001).

Participants typically described experiences in which they felt concealing their Judaism was necessary. Relatedly, four participants described instances in which they

were expected to participate in Christian activities. Taken together, these seemingly separate themes may indicate the unspoken rules in culture that perpetuate the state of affairs. Mael (1991) and Schlosser (2003) both described the phenomenon of "passing" in previous theoretical papers These findings bring real world examples to the discussion to describe these ideas.

When describing reasons for concealing Jewishness, only one participant described an overt anti-Semitic attack, which was verbal. Ian described a late night, in which he was cursed and accosted by an unknown other on a subway ride, while wearing a Star of David necklace, a visible symbol of Judaism. No other participant spoke about a symbol of their ethnicity that they wore. He went on to describe the impact of the assault leading to behavioral changes, including the removal or obstruction of his symbol when he felt unsafe, effectively "passing" as a non-Jew and concealing his identity. This interesting phenomenon may be related to the invisibility of the Jewish identity. That is, his visible symbol was creating an inability to "pass." At the very least, this illustrative example, and others described in this theme, adds robustness to the knowledge base that describes the awareness of discrimination impacting the thoughts and beliefs held by Jews (Altman, et al., 2010; Friedman et al., 2005; Langman, 1999; Schlosser, 2006).

The Perception of Christian Privilege. Participants generally discussed the negative impact of Christian privilege. Christian privilege leaves Jews feeling like outsiders in greater American culture (Alper and Olsen, 2012). Participants described heightened awareness of Christian events, at times, realizing they are alone, surrounded by Christian company. Several participants spoke about feeling like "guests" within

Christian culture. The impact of the outsider observations was discussed from the participants' vantage point and that of the oppressor. Participants reported that segregation is a cost to both marginalized religious groups and Christians. One participant further analyzed this idea, and spoke about segregation leading to an increased division of resources, in which no group benefits. The data affirm previously postulated costs, such as limited access, disrupted employment opportunities, segregation, and decreased ability to function within the calendar (Schlosser, 2003).

In contrast, ten participants were able to identify benefits of Christian privilege. These benefits were almost exclusively reported from the perspective of Christians, with one exception. Ian reported Christianity has provided a "structure" for the American political and economic system, in which the United States has "thrived." All other participants spoke about privileges for Christians manifesting through communal aspects (e.g., family, access within their community, community events) or calendar events (e.g., holidays, work schedules that meet Christian needs). Participants reflected on the impact of privilege, which has led several to seek out Jewish communities, and limit travel to areas perceived as "safe," "liberal," or "diverse."

Of note, participants typically discussed that Christian privilege is mediated by geography within the United States. However, many of those same participants were able to identify examples of feeling like an outsider or experiencing microaggressions within the workplace in large metropolitan areas, with substantial Jewish populations. The northeast and New York City were the only two geographic areas identified in which Christian privileges are perceived as limited or non-existent. The midwest and south

were identified as locales that are unsafe or unexplored, due to stereotypes held regarding

Christianity and acceptance for Jews. Two of the participants noted limited experience

with Christian privilege, and further analysis of the raw data uncovers they identified

little contact with greater Christian culture, due to geography. Again, this finding affirms

Schlosser's (2003) theorized costs of Christian privilege. However, it also draws

attention to additional information regarding the limitations to marginalized religious

groups' mobility. The lack of mobility is related to both limits in opportunities for

community and perceived anti-Semitism, rather than only the former, as previously

postulated.

Helping Professionals. With regards to identifying strengths and coping,

participants employed multiple strategies for dealing with marginalization. Most notably,

participants described concealing their Jewishness when appraisal necessitated it for

either maintaining relationships or safety. These participants described past or theoretical

instances in which they have or would,conceal their Judaism. For at least two

participants, the interview item that elicited these responses brought on feelings of shame

for previous actions.

Again, highlighting adaptability of this population, participants variantly identified

experiences in which they "reframed" perceived microaggressions. One participant

chose to reflect a peer's proselytization as a positive saying, "I appreciate your caring for

me," while another used humor to reframe the difficulty.   Five of the participants

described traveling in social circles that were either Jew-affirming or composed of like-

minded Jewish individuals.

Five participants noted the importance of education as a coping mechanism for marginalization. This finding was easily divisible into two distinct subcategories. Some of the participants chose to seek education for themselves in which they either used marginalization as an opportunity to teach an oppressor, or act as a liaison to get to information, while others chose to seek education to better understand oppression and its psychosocial impact. Four participants noted that repression was a coping strategy, that was used either at times or often, when presented with Christian privilege and marginalization.

Participants were asked to reflect on their needs from mental health professionals. Responses to the two prompts in this domain were analyzed and divided into four distinct categories. First, and most salient, was that 75% of participants recognized the importance of psychotherapists' understanding of diversity within the Jewish population. That is, participants thought it important for therapists to see that there is great variability in identification and practice among Jews. Participants that were non-practicing made clear the importance of Jewish cultural identification in the lives of ethnic Jews. Participants spoke of experiences with both secular and Jewish therapists, including previous treatments in which their individuality as a Jew was not recognized and they, like in greater culture, did not feel understood. Within this theme, several participants suggested therapists "Google it" or "just ask" when wondering about an aspect of individual Jewry. At least two participants recognized the importance of discussing individual Jewry within the therapeutic relationship, and that although one may not identify religiously, the ethnic components are likely to be highly important aspects of

contemporary Judaism.

Eight participants chose to underscore the importance of a foundational understanding of Judaism for helping professionals. Participants described that the understanding should include the different denominations, and the disparity between non-Orthodox and Orthodox Judaism. Participants also outlined the importance of having a clear understanding of the rituals of the faith surrounding major life events and holidays, which may often come up in presenting problems or throughout treatment. Relatedly, five participants underscored the importance of family and community within American Jewry, and the importance of that phenomenon in cross-cultural counseling experiences. These findings illustrate some of the areas described in Affirmative Psychotherapy for the American Jew (Schlosser, 2006).

Of particular interest was the theme in which clients discussed the importance of privilege and oppression. This advice for helping professionals was diverse and complementary, falling into two distinct subcategories. Psychotherapists should know about the history of oppression and anti-Semitism, including how that may impact today's Jew. Participants described that Christian privilege is an important consideration that many struggle with. Participants described this as an integral part of the Jewish identity, which causes intrapsychic pain, and leaves individuals wondering about their place in American culture. One participant described a family member's experience of denial to graduate school due to his Judaism, which has also impacted the participant's view of his Jewish identity. Within this theme, participants describe the importance of the therapist's role in helping Jewish clients navigate discrimination and upholding their

cultural traditions.

Finally, participants variantly discussed the importance of counselors maintaining a multicultural personality. Participants described keeping an open mind and having open discussions with clients in non-judgmental and empathic ways. One participant noted the importance of a "safe space" for Jewish discussions, through acknowledging differences and welcoming dialogue. Another participant noted the importance of the therapist "turning off religious feelings," and went on to describe developing insight, awareness, and understanding biases and counter-transferences with regards to religious beliefs.

Summary and Conclusions

This study brought to light the impact of Christian culture and Christian privilege on a subset of non-Orthodox American Jews. As members of the ethnicity, these men and women have a perspective that is poised to aid the inter-faith dialogue and lead to change within the United States. Their narratives and choice to participant may have implications for psychotherapeutic practice, research, and the political atmosphere. The results expand on previous inquiries that document the behaviors and core components of the Jewish identity, while providing a detailed understanding of the impact of Christian privilege and culture in American Jewry. This study also provides evidence of the importance of the Jewish identity in decision-making and worldview development, while illustrating the perception and experience of Christian privilege, and the coping strategies participants employ to maintain their Jewish identity, while operating in the greater Christian culture.

Limitations

The study is limited by the methodology and instruments employed (e.g., this qualitative research has limited sample size, limited generalizability, and employed telephones to conduct interviews) (Dewey, Schlosser, and Kinney, 2011; Ponterotto 2005). Further, the findings are specifically applicable to a subset of Judaism, the non-Orthodox Jew. As such, extrapolating the findings to other minority religious groups or other subsets of Judaism should be done with extreme caution. One should also use caution generalizing to all non-orthodox Jews, due to the limited sample size.

Consideration should be made for participants' possible biases. All participants

self selected on a first response basis, yielding a population that may not be representative of the greater population who chose not to participate. Participant non-identification could have been impacted by many factors unknown to the investigators, although, caution was taken to limit extraneous stressors (call for participants was not made near High Holy Days, due to possible compounding of stressors related to the holidays). Also, non-participants may not have been aware of the call because of the chaining technique that was employed.

As previously discussed in chapter three, participants were provided a copy of the protocol and Schlosser's *Christian Privilege: Breaking the Sacred Taboo* (2003) before the interviews, to increase the depth and richness of data collected. Later discussed in the team's bias discussions, this practice primes the participant and risks biasing the participant's response set (Personal Communication, A. Stratner, 2011). Conversely, there is a possibility that the results reflect the expectations and biases of the investigators. It should be noted that the team was aware of and had continuous discussion and cross checks with an independent auditor on the subject of biases throughout the yearlong analysis process. As noted by Knox and Burkard (2009) this is usually part of the CQR process and there is no empirical evidence to support that this practice has an impact on the data. The results should be cross-referenced with the themes identified in the bias meeting outlined in chapter three.

Implications for Research and Practice.

  Research. As noted in chapter one, religiosity and marginalized religious groups have not been included in many multicultural inquiries and discussions. A gap in the literature was found in understanding the experience of marginalized religious groups. The findings of this study add to the literature that is beginning to develop a more sophisticated understanding of the multifaceted nature of the Jewish Identity (Altman et al., 2010).

  Future research may use the information within to develop scales to add to the understanding of Christian privilege, either (a) the perception of, or (b) the impact on functioning. Part of that process may be replicating this study with a more homogeneous population (e.g., geographically, by denomination, by age cohort). Future research into the impact of anti-Semitism and Christian privilege on Jewish identity would greatly add to the multicultural literature. The findings may also act as a template for developing psychoeducational preventative interventions for targeted populations.

  Training. Training programs still have large deficits in instruction of trainees in interventions regarding religious and spiritual concerns (Richards and Allen, 2005). The deficits in training translate into professionals having difficulty integrating religious and spiritual issues into practice, and researchers that do not see value in studying religion and spirituality and their implications for application and research (Schlosser, 2005), the importance of which have been underscored by findings of this study. Training programs should begin to explore implementing training modules to add to already existing multicultural coursework.

Practice. Practitioners can use the information to develop a more rich

understanding of the impact of privilege and oppression on non-Orthodox Jews, and the

diversity of the American Jewish experience. It is important to hear the warnings of

many of the participants, reminding psychotherapists to ask questions, remain

unassuming, and remain open-minded to discussions. The data also uncovered that

participants in the study are impacted by both anti-Semitism and Christian privilege,

throughout their lives. The results of this study underscore the value of practitioners'

awareness of the discrimination in the lives of Jewish clients (Altman, et al., 2010;

Schlosser, 2006). The awareness of anti-Semitism, safety concerns, and fear of

discrimination are a present part of contemporary Judaism, which should be considered

when working with Jewish clients. The data indicates that therapists should work to

develop a more global view of religion in the lives of clientele. These data are contrary

to the belief that many mental health professionals hold that religion is a discrete

experience. This study underscores evidence that the intersection of religion and

spirituality is important in the quality of life for our clients (Schlosser, 2005).

References

Aberson, C. L., Healy, M., & Romero, V. (2000). Ingroup bias and self-esteem: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4,* 154-173.

Adams, M., & Bracey, J. H. (Eds.). (1999). *Strangers and neighbors: Relations between Blacks and Jews in the United States.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Aday, L. (1996). Designing and conducting health surveys (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Alba, R. (2006). On the sociological significance of the American Jewish experience: Boundary blurring, assimilation, and pluralism. *Sociology of Religion, 67(4).* 347-358.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Allport, G. W. (1966). The religious context of prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *5,* 447-457.

Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5,* 432-443.

Altemeyer, B. (2003). Why do religious fundamentalists tend to be prejudiced? *The international Journal for the Psychology of religion*, *13(1),* 17-28.

Altemeyer, B. & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest and prejudice. *The International Journal of the Psychology of Religion, 2,* 113-133.

Altman, A. N., Inman, A. G., Fine, S. G., Ritter, H. A., & Howard, E. E. (2010).

Explorations of Jewish ethnic identity. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 88,* 163-173.

Anti-Defamation League. (2009). Retrieved from
http://www.adl.org/ADL_Opinions/Civil_Rights/PhilJewishExp_12242009.htm
on February 15, 2011.

Anti-Defamation League. 2005a. *Attitudes Towards Jews in 12 European Countries.*
New York: First International Resources

Anti-Defamation League. 2005b. *American Attitudes towards Jews: An Anti-Defamation League Survey* . New York: First International Resources.

APA. (2007, August 16) Resolution on Religious, Religion-Based and/or Religion-Derived Prejudice. Retrieved October 30, 2008, from www.apa.org

Aquilino, W.S. (1994). Interview mode effects in surveys of drug and alcohol use: A field experiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 58,* 210–240.

Atkinson, D. R. (1983). Ethnic similarity in counseling psychology: A review of research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11,* 79–92.

Atzmon, G., Hao, L., Pe'er, I., Velez, C., Pearlman, A., Palamara, P., Morrow, B., Friedman, E., Oddoux, C., Burns, E., Ostrer, H. (2010). Abraham's Children in the Genome Era: Major Jewish Diaspora Populations Comprise Distinct Genetic Clusters with Shared Middle Eastern Ancestry. *The American Journal of Human Genetics, 86,* 850-859.

Biale, D., Galchinsky, M., & Heschel, S. (1998). *Insider/Outsider: American Jews and Multiculturalism.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Beaman, L. G. (2003). The myth of pluralism, diversity, and vigor: The constitutional privilege of Protestantism in the United States and Canada. *Journal for the Scientific Study of religion,* 42 (3), 311-325.

Bem, S. L., & Bem, D. J. (1970). Case study of a nonconscious ideology. Training the woman to know her place. In D. J. Bem (Ed.). *Beliefs, attitudes, and human affairs* (89-99). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Bergin, A. E., & Jensen, J. P. (1990). Religiosity of psychotherapists: A national survey. *Psychotherapy, 27,* 3-7.

Berman, P. (Ed.). (1995). *Blacks and Jews: Alliances and arguments.* New York: Delta Trade.

Bilgrave, D. P. & Deluty, R. H., (1998). Religious Beliefs and Theraputic Orientations of Clinical and Counseling Psychologists. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion.* June, 329-349.

Blustein, D. L. Davis, O., Murphy, K. A., Kenny, M. E., Jernigan, M., Perez-Gualdron, L., Castaneda, T., Koepke, M., Land, M, & Urbano, A. (2010). Exploring urban students' constructions about school, work, race, and ethnicity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 57 (2), 248-254.

Blumenfeld, W. J., Klein, J.R. (2009). Working with Jewish undergraduates. *New Directions for Student Services*, 125 (Spring).

Blumenfeld, W. J., (2006). Christian Privilege and the Promotion of "Secular" and Not-So "Secular": Mainline Christianity in Public Schooling and in the Larger Society. *Equity and Excellence in Education.* 39, 195-210.

Blumenfeld, W.J. (2006). Outside/inside/between sides: An investigation of Ashkenazi
Jewish perceptions of their 'Race.' Multicultural Perspectives: *Journal of the
National Association for Multicultural Education,* (8) 3, 11-18.

Boyarin, D. and Boyarin, J. (1993). Diaspora: Generation and the ground of Jewish
identity. *Critical Inquiry,* 19 (Summer).

Brodkin, K. (2000). *How the Jews Became White Folks and What that Says about Race
in America.* Livingston, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Chapple, A. (1999). The use of telephone interviewing for qualitative research. *Nurse
Researcher 6,* 85–93.

Clark, C., Vargas, B. M. Schlosser, L. Z., & Alimo, C. (2002). It's not just "secret Santa"
in December: Addressing educational and workplace climate issues linked to
Christian Privilege. *Multicultural Education.* (10), 2: 52-58.

Cohen, J.E. (2010). Perceptions of anti-Semitism along American Jews, 200-05, A
Survey Analysis. *Political Psychology.* (31)1.

Corey, G. (2005). *Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy.* (7). Belmont,
CA: Thompson Books/Cole.

Corey, G., Corey, M. S., & Callanan, P. (2007). Values and the helping relationship.
Issues and ethics in the helping professions (7th ed. pp. 89-90). Belmont, CA:
Thomson Brooks/Cole.

Croteau, J. M., Talbot, D. M., Lance, T. S., Evans, N. J. (2002). A qualitative study of
the interplay between privilege and oppression. *Journal of Multicultural
Counseling and Development, 30,* 239-258.

Cummings, K.D., Haworth, J.G., and O'Neil, K. (2001). A "perfect standard?"
Exploring perceptions of student life and culture at Wheaton College. *Religion and Education,* (28)2, 33-64.

Daughtry, H.D. (1997). *No monopoly on suffering: Blacks and Jews in Crown Heights (and elsewhere).* Trenton, NJ: African World Press.

D,Costa, G. (1990). One covenant or many covenants? Toward a theology of Christian-Jewish relations. *Journal of Ecumenical Studies, 27* (3), 441-452.

Dean, J. K., Chang, C. Y. (2007). Addressing privilege and oppression in counselor training and practice: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 85* (3), 317-324.

DellaPergola, S. ,Rebhun, U., & Tolts, M. (2005). Contemporary Jewish Diaspora global context: Human development correlates of population trends. *Israel Studies*, 10 (1), 61-95.

Dewey, J. Jane, Schlosser, Lewis Z., Kinney, Robert S. (2011). Faithful Allies- The Experience of LGB Affirming Christian Clergy. Dissertation Abstracts International.

Duncan, J. R. (2003). Privilege, invisibility, and religion: A critique of the privilege that Christianity has enjoyed in the United States. *Alabama Law Review, 54* (2) 617-636.

Dyson, J., Cobb, M., & Forman, D. (1997), The Meaning of spirituality: A literature review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 26, 1183-1188.

Eck, D. L. (2001). A new religious America: How a "Christian country:" has bow

become the world's most religiously diverse nation. New York: HarperCollins.

Eckardt, A, & Eckardt, R. (1970). Review of encounter with Israel: A challenge to
conscience. *Journal of the America Academy of Religion,* 526-528.

Ellman, Y. (1987). Intermarriage in the United States: A comparative study of Jews and
other ethnic and religious groups. *Jewish Social Studies,* (49)1, 1-26.

Fairchild, E. F. (2009). New Directions for Student Services. Christian privilege, history,
and trends in U.S. Religion. 125., Spring, 2009.

Fairchild, E.E. And Blumenfeld, W.J., (2007). Traversing boundaries: dialogue on
Christian privilege, religious oppression, and religious pluralism among believers
and non believers. *College Student Affairs Journal,* (26-Spring)2, 177.

Fairchild, E.E. (2009). Christian privilege, history, and trends in U.S. Religion. *New
Directions for Student Services,* (125)Spring.

Fein, L. (1988). *Where are We? The Inner Life of American Jews.* New York, NY:
HarperCollins.

Feldman, J. (2007). Constructing a shared Bible land: Jewish Israeli guiding
performances for Protestant pilgrims. *American Ethnologist, 34* (2), 351-374.

Fiebert, M. S., Horgan, L., and Peralta, E. (1999). Assessing African-American and
Jewish intergroup perceptions and attitudes. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 88,*
253-258.

Fischer, A. R., & Moradi., B. (2001). Racial and ethnic identity: Recent developments
and needed directions. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M.
Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 341–370). Thousand

Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fouad, N. A., Brown, M. T. (2009). *Handbook of Counseling Psychology.* In lent,

    Robert W. (ed.) Role of race and social class in development: Implications for

    counseling psychologists (3), 379-404. Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons

    Inc.

Friedlander, M. L., Friedman, M. L., Miller, M. J., Ellis, M. V. Friedlander, L. K.

    Mikhaylov, V. G. (2010). Introducing a brief measure of cultural and religious

    identification in American Jewish identity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57*

    (3), 345-360.

Friedman, M. L., Friedlander, M. L., & Blustein, D. L. (2005). Toward an

    understanding of Jewish identity: a phenomenological study. *Journal of*

    Counseling Psychology, 52 (1), 77-83.

Frye, M. (2003). Oppression. In Kimmel, M. S., Ferber, A. L. (ed.) *Privilege*. (pp. 13-

    50). Boulder: Westview.

Fukuyama, M. A., Sevig, T. D. (1999). *Integrating Spirituality into Multicultural*

    Counseling. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gallup Poll (2005, December 2). Another Look at Evangelicals in America today.

    retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/20242/another-look-evangelicals-

    america-today.aspx March 4, 2011.

Gans, H. J., (1956). American Jewry: Part: I. American Jewry: Present and Future.

    (21) (pp. 422-430).

Garcia, B. (2009). Social Work with Immigrants and Refugees. In Chang-Muy, F. &

Congress, E. P. (ed.), *Theory and social work practice with immigrant*

populations (pp. 79-102).

Geismar, L. (1954). A scale for the measurement of ethnic identification. *Jewish Social*

Studies, (6), 33-60.

Goldberg, J. J. (1996). *Jewish power: Inside the American Jewish estab- lishment.*

Cambridge, MA: Addison Wesley.

Groves, R. (1990). Theories and methods of telephone surveys. *Annual Review of*

Sociology, 16, 221– 240.

Heilman, S.C. (1982). The sociology of American Jewry: The last ten years. *Annual*

Review of Sociology: 1982, (8), 135-160.

Helms, J.E. & Cook, D.A. (1999). *Using Race and Culture in Counseling and*

Psychotherapy: Theory and Process. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hill, Clara E., Thompson, Barbara J., Hess, Shirley A., Knox, Sarah, Nutt Williams,

Elizabeth, Ladany, Nicholas (2005). *Journal of Counseling Psychology.*

Consensual qualitative research: an update. 52.2, 196-205.

Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Nutt Williams, E. (1997).   A guide to conducting

consensual qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 25* (4), 517-572.

Hoge, D. R., Carroll, J. W. (1975). Social Forces. Christian beliefs, nonreligious factors,

and Anti-Semitism. (53) 4.

Huddy, L. (2003). Group identity and political cohesion. In D. O. Sears, L. Huddy, & R.

Jervis (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of political psychology* (pp. 511–558). New York:

Oxford University Press.

Hyers, L. L. & Hyers, C. (2008). Everyday discrimination experienced by conservative Christians at the secular university. *Analysis of Social Issues and Public Policy, 8* (1), 113-137.

Isacco, A. & Garfield, C. F. (2010). Child healthcare decision-making: Examining "conjointness" in paternal identities among residential and non-residential fathers. *Fathering, 8* (1), 109-130.

Jacobs, J. B., & Henry, J. S., (1996). The social construction of a hate crime epidemic. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology,* 86.

The Jewish Daily Forward (2010) Jewish Legitimacy. Retrieved from http://www.forward.com/articles/129454/ on April 22, 2011.

Judaken, J. (2008). So what's new? Rethinking the 'new anti-Semitism' in a global age. *Patters of prejudice*, (42) 4-5.

Kaufman, J. (1995). *Broken alliance: The turbulent times between Blacks and Jews in America (2nd ed.).* New York: Simon and Scheuster.

Kavanaugh, K., & Ayres, L. (1998). ''Not as bad as it could have been'': Assessing and mitigating harm during research interviews on sensitive topics. *Research in Nursing & Health, 21,* 91–97.

Kille, D. A. (2004). "The Bible made me do it:" Text, interpretation and violence. In J. H. Ellens (ed.), The Destructive Power of Religion, 1, 55-73. Westport, CT: Praeger

Kille, D. A. (2005). Unconsciously poisoning the roots: Psychological dynamics of the Bible in Jewish/Christian conflict. *Pastoral Psychology, 53* (4), 291-300.

Kimmel, M. S. (2003). Toward a pedagogy of the oppressor. In Kimmel, M. S., Ferber, A. L. (ed.) *Privilege*. (pp. 1-12). Boulder: Westview.

Kinney, R., Schlosser, L. Z., Lytle, & M., Dewey, J. J., (2011, August). *Christian perspectives on Christian privilege: A consensual qualitative study*. Poster presented at the Annual Convention of the APA – Division 17 (Counseling Psychology), Washington, D.C.

Klaff, V. (2006). Defining American Jewry from religious and ethnic perspectives: The transition to greater heterogeneity. *Sociology of Religion.* 67 (4), 415.

Klug, B. (2003). the collective Jew: Israel and the new anti-Semitism, Patterns of prejudice 37 (2).

Knox, S., Catlin, L., Casper, M., & Schlosser, L. Z. (2005). Addressing religion and spirituality in psychotherapy: Clients' perspectives. *Psychotherapy research, 15,* 287-303.

Knox, S., Burkard, A. (2009, July). Qualitative Research Interviews. Psychotherapy Research 19 (4-5).

Kosman, B. A., & Lachman, S. P. (1993). One nation under G-d. New York: Harmony.

Kress, J. S., & Elias, M.J. (2000). *Ecological theory,, self-complexity, and Jewish identity: Implications for research and practice.* Retrieved from http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~melias/JRNweb.pdf on March 2, 2011.

Langman, P. F. (1995). Including Jews in multiculturalism. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development,* 23, 222–236.

Langman, P. F. (1999). *Jewish Issues in Multiculturalism: A Handbook for*

Educators and Clinicians. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson Inc.

Langman, P. F. (2000). Assessment issues with Jewish clients. In R. H. Dana (Ed.),
Handbook of Cross- Cultural and Multicultural Personality Assessment (pp. 647–
668). Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates.

Levitt, D. H., & Balkin, R. S. (2003). Religious diversity from a Jewish perspective.
Counseling and Values, 48, 57–66.

MacDonald-Dennis, C. (2006). Understanding anti-Semitism and its impact: A new
framework for conceptualizing Jewish student identity. *Equity and Excellence in
Education, 39,* 267-278.

Mael, Fred A. (1991). Career constraints of observant Jews. *The Career Development
Quarterly, 39* (4), 08894019, 19910601.

Marcus, K.L., (2007). The resurgence of anti-Semitism on American college campuses.
Current Psychology, 26, 206-212.

Mayer, E. (1979). *Modern Jewish orthodoxy in post-modern America: a case study of
the Jewish community in Boro Park.* Xerox University Microfilm.

McCoy, S. K., & Major, B. (2003). Group identification moderates emotional responses
to perceived prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 1005–
1017.

McGrath, J.C. (2006). Post-traumatic growth and the origins of early Christianity.
Mental Health, Religion, and Culture. 9 (3), 291-306.

McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack.* Retrieved from
http://www.library.wisc.edu/edvrc/docs/public/pdfs/LIReadings/InvisibleKnapsac

k.pdf   on February 7, 2011.

Ming Liu, W, Hernandez, J., Shepard, S., Haag, S. (2009). A qualitative examination of

masculinity, homelessness, and social class among men in a transitional shelter.

Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 10 (2), 131-148.

Moyn, S. (2009). Anti-Semitism, philosemitism and the rise of holocaust memory.

Patterns of prejudice, 43 (1).

Myer, I. H. & Wilson, P. A. (2009). Sampling lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations.

Journal of Counseling Psychology, 56 (1) 23-31.

National Jewish Population Survey. (2010). The Jewish Population, Retrieved from

http://www.jewishdatabank.org/Reports/Jewish_Population_in_the_United_States

_2010.pdf on January 31, 2011.

Naumburg, C. G. (2007-July). Judaism: A hidden Diversity. *Smith College Studies in*

Social Work, 77 (2-3), 79-99.

Novick, P. (2000). *The Holocaust and Collective Memory: The American Experience.*

London, GBR: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Novick, G. (2008). Is there a bias against telephone interviews in qualitative research?

Research in nursing & health, 31, 391-398.

Operario, D., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). Ethnic identity moderates perceptions of prejudice:

Judgments of personal versus group discrimination and subtle versus blatant bias.

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27, 550–561.

Paloutzain, R. F., Park, C. L. (2005). *Handbook of the psychology of religion and*

coping: Theory, research, and practice. New York: Guilford Press.

Paragment, K. I., Trevino, K., Mahoney, A., Silberman, I. (2007). They killed our lord: The perception of Jews as desecrators of Christianity as a predictor of anti-Semitism. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion*, 46 (2): 143-158.

Park-Taylor, J., Ng, V., Ventura, A. B., Kang, A. E., Morris, C. R., Gilbert, T., Ponterotto, Joseph G. (2010). Multicultural Personality: An Evolving Theory of Optimal Functioning in Culturally Heterogeneous Societies. *The Counseling Psychologist, 38 (5): 714-758.*

Srivastava, D., Androsiglio, R. A. (2008). What it means to be and feel like a "true" American: Perceptions and experiences of second- generation Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 14* (2), 128-137.

The Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life (2011). U.S. religion landscape survey. Retrieved January 31, 2010 from http://religions.pewforum.org/reports .

Phinney, J. S. (1996). When we talk about American ethnic groups, what do we mean? *American Psychologist, 51,* 918–927.

Pon, G. (2007). Becoming lost and found: Peace, Christianity, and anti-oppression. *Critical Social Work,* 8 (1).

Ponterotto, J.G. (2002). Qualitative research methods: The fifth force in psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, (30), 394-406.

Raiya, H.A., Pargament, K.I., Mahoney, A., Trevino, K. (2008). When Muslims are perceived as a religious threat: Examining the connection between desecration, religious coping, and Anti-Muslim attitudes. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology,* (30) 311-325.

Richards, P.S., & Allen, E. B. (2005). Ethical and process issues and guidelines. *A spiritual strategy for counseling and psychotherapy* (pp. 183-217). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Rosen, D.C. (2006). The identity of American Jews: A psychological exploration. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67 (6-B) 3501.

Rosenthal, E. (1978). Intermarriage among Jewry: A function of acculturation community organization and family structure. In Martin, B. (ed.), *Movements and Issues in American Judaism,* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Rosmarin, D. H., Pirutinsky, S., Pargament, K. I., & Krumrei, E. (2009). Are Religious Beliefs Relevant to Mental Health Among Jews? *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 1 (3), 180-190.

Rowatt, W. C., LaBouff, J., Johnson, M., Froese, & P., Tsang, J. A. (2009). Associations among religiousness, social attitudes, and prejudice in a national random sample of American adults. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, 1* (1), 14-24.

Safirstein, A. B. (2002). Exploring aspects of Jewish American group membership beyond religiosity. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63,* (3-B) 1611.

Scheepers, P.M., Gijsberts, M., Hello, E. (2002). Religiosity and prejudice against ethnic minorities in Europe: Cross national tests on a controversial relationship. *Review of Religious Research 43,* 242-265.

Schlosser, L. Z. (2003). Christian privilege: breaking the sacred taboo. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 31,* 44-51.

Schlosser, L. Z. (2006). Affirmative Psychotherapy for American Jews. *Psychotherapy:*

Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 43, 424-435.

Schlosser, L. Z., Ali, S. R., Ackerman, S. R., Dewey, J. J. (2009). Religion, ethnicity, culture, way of life: Jews Muslims, and Multicultural Counseling. *Counseling and Values*, 54, 48-64.

Schlosser, L. Z., Foley, P. F., Stein, E. P., Holmwood, J.R., (2009). *Handbook of Multicultural Counseling.* In Ponterotto, J. G., Suzuki, L. A., Casas, J. M., Alexander, C. M. (ed.) Why does counseling psychology exclude religion? A content and methodological critique. (3), 453-466. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schlosser, L. Z., Foley, P. F. (2008). Ethical issues in multicultural student—faculty mentoring relationships in higher education. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning, 16* (1), 63-75.

Schlosser, L. Z. MacDonald-Dennis, C. (2006). Antisemitism. In Y. Jackson (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of multicultural psychology* (44-45). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schlosser, L. Z., Sedlacek, W. E. (2003). Christian privilege and respect for religious diversity: Religious holidays on campus. *About Campus: Enriching the Student Learning Experience, 7* (6), 31-32.

Schlosser, L. Z., Talleyrand, R. M., Lyons, H. Z., Baker, L. M. (2007). Racism, anti-Semitism, and the schism between Blacks and Jews in the United States: A pilot intergroup encounter program. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *35,* April.

Schoenfeld, E. (1999). Jewish Americans: A religio-ethnic community. In Dworkin, A.G, Dworkin, R.J. (ed.) T*he Minority Report: An Introduction to Racial, Ethnic,*

and Gender Relations-3rd edition, (364-394). New York, NY: Harcourt Brace

College Publishers.

Seifert, T. (2007). Understanding Christian privilege: Managing the tensions of spiritual

plurality. *About Campus,* May-June.

Sellers, R. M. & Shelton, J. N. (2003). The role of racial identity in perceived racial

discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 1079–1092.

Shamir, M., & Sagiv-Schifter, T. (2006). Conflict, identity, and tolerance: Israel in the Al-

Aqsa Intifada. *Political Psychology, 27*, 569–595.

Simon, R.J., Schaler, J.A. (2007). anti-Semitism the world over in the twenty-first

century. *Current Psychotherapy, 26,* 152-182.

Sim, W., Hill, C. E., Chowdhury, S., Huang, T., Zaman, N., Talavera, P. (2010).

Problems and action ideas discussed by first- and second- generation female east

Asian students during dream sessions. *Dreaming, 20* (1), 42-59.

Simoni, J. M., and Walters, K. L. (2001). Heterosexual identity and heterosexism:

Recognizing privilege to reduce prejudice. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *41,* 157-

172.

Singer, D., & Grossman, L. (Eds.) (2005). American Jewish Yearbook 2005. New

York: American Jewish committee.

Smith, E. J. (1991). Ethnic identity development: Toward the development of a theory

within the context of majority/minority status. *Journal of Counseling and

Development*, *70,* 181-188.

Smith, E.M. (2005). Telephone interviewing in health- care research: A summary of the

evidence. *Nurse Researcher, 12,* 32–41.

Smith, H. (2009). *The World's Religions.* New York, NY: Harperone.

Steinberg, S. (1965). The anatomy of Jewish identification: A historical and theoretical view. *Review of Religious Research, 7* (1), 1-8.

Sue, D. W. (2003). *Overcoming our racism: The journey to liberation.* San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons.

Sturges, J.E., & Hanrahan, K.J. (2004). Comparing telephone and face-to-face qualitative interviewing: A research note. *Qualitative Research, 4,* 107–118.

Sweet, L. (2002). Telephone interviewing: Is it compatible with interpretive phenomenological research? *Contemporary Nurse, 12,* 58–63.

Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., & Ferguson, M. J. (2001). Everyday sexism: Evidence for its incidence, nature, and psychosocial impact from three daily diary studies: *Journal of Social issues, 57,* 31-54.

Telushkin, J. (2001). *Jewish Literacy, Revised ed.* New York: NY: HarperCollins.

Waldman, S. (2008). F*ounding Faith: Providence, Politics, and the Birth of Religious Freedom in America.* New York, NY: Random House.

Watt, S. K. (2007). Difficult dialogues, privilege and social justice: Uses of the privileged identity exploration (PIE) model in student affairs practice." *College Student Affairs Journal, 26* (2), 114-126.

Watt, S. K. (2009). Difficult dialogues at the intersection of religious privilege. *New Directions for Student Services, 125,* (Spring).

Winston, A. S. (1998). "The defects of his race": E. G. Boring and anti-Semitism in

American psychology, 1923-1953. *History of Psychology, 1* (1), 27-51.

Wistrich, R.S. (1991). *anti-Semitism: The Longest Hatred.* New York, NY: Schocken

Books.

Appendix A

E-mail Recruitment Letter

Dear Friend,

I am writing to tell you about a study being conducted this summer, which investigates the place of Christian culture in the United States from the perspective of Jewish individuals. As a member of an interfaith family, (i.e., Jewish and Non-Jewish) I have become interested in the intersections of Christian and Jewish culture in the larger United States context. This is the second project I am completing in this realm under the tutelage of Dr. Lewis Schlosser, who has studied Jewish issues and Christian privilege throughout his career. *Jewish perspectives on Christian Privilege: A Qualitative Study* may uncover information that will help ease the way the religions of the United States relate to each other. I hope you will consider taking part.

If you wish to participate, you will fill out two brief questionnaires, read a short article, and then answer questions in an interview. Each interview will be conducted in one telephone session.

If you wish to participate, or have questions about the study, please contact me at robert.kinney@student.shu.edu or (620) 719-6977. In addition, I would appreciate if you would forward this e-mail message to any other Jewish adults that may also be interested in participating, even if you are not.

Thank you for your consideration, assistance, and time.

Robert Kinney, M.A.
Counseling Psychology Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Professional Psychology & Family Therapy
Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Ave.
South Orange, NJ 07079

This study has been approved by Seton Hall University's Institutional Review Board.

Appendix B

Formal Letter of Solicitation

Dear Participant,

I am a Counseling Psychology Doctoral Candidate in the Department of Professional Psychology and Family Therapy in the College of Education and Human Services at Seton Hall University.

For my final research project, I am conducting a qualitative study exploring the experience (thoughts, feelings, perceptions, etc.) of Jewish Americans. Eligibility for this study includes self-identification as a Jew from a non- Orthodox sect of Judaism (e.g., Conservative, Liberal Reform, Secular, etc.), as well as being 18 years of age or older, raised predominantly in the United States, and United States citizenship.

Participation in the study will involve reading a short article (*Christian Privilege: Breaking the Sacred Taboo*), a telephone interview that should last approximately 45-60 minutes and completing two short surveys (i.e., demographic questionnaire and the American Jewish Identity Scale). These forms will take less than five minutes to complete. The interview will be digitally recorded. Although the interview will be recorded, your name will not be used by the interviewer throughout. After the interview is complete the recording will be transcribed, and all identifying information will not be recorded. The digital recording will be moved to a secure location, only accessible to the primary researcher. The transcripts will be stored on a USB memory stick and kept in a lockable secure site to which only the primary researcher will have access.

Participation in this study is voluntary. You have the right to refrain from answering portions of the interview and withdrawing from the study at any time, even after the interview. Withdrawal from the study will have no negative consequences. Participation is not expected to cause any harm beyond that of normal day-to-day experience.

This study will add to the body of knowledge on the subject of Christian Privilege. Moreover, the knowledge gained from this study could inform interventions to dismantle oppression and privilege and aiding in the religious discourse in the United States. It is my belief that understanding the experience of Jews will help Christianity and individuals understand the impact of Christian Privilege on individuals.

If you agree to participate, a packet including this letter, and an informed consent document will be mailed to you along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Your consent to participate is identified by your signature on the informed consent document, which can be returned in the self-addressed, stamped envelope supplied in the packet.

Sincerely,

Robert Kinney, M.A.
Seton Hall University, PPFT Counseling Psychology
(620) 719-6977
robert.kinney@student.shu.edu

Lewis Z. Schlosser, Ph.D. ABPP
Seton Hall University, PPFT Counseling Psychology
(973) 275-2503
Lewis.schlosser@shu.edu

Appendix C

Demographic Information
Demographics

Several demographic questions follow. Please answer the following questions as honestly and completely as possible.

Age:

_____

Gender:
_____Male   _____Female

Ethnicity:

_____

Highest education completed:

_____High School   _____Some College   _____Bachelor's

_____Master's   _____Professional Degree (JD, MD, etc.)

_____Doctoral Degree (PhD, EdD, etc.)

Occupation: _____

Are you employed at or are you a student at a Jewish organization:

_____Yes   _____No

Marital Status: _____

Number of Children: _____

Current Religious Denomination/Affiliation: _____

What religious affiliation were you raised in: _____

Were you raised in the United States:
                              _____Yes   _____No

Appendix D

Interview Questions

1. What does your Judaism Mean to you?

2. How has Christian culture impacted your life?

a. How has living in a Christian culture altered the way you live your life as a Jew?

3. Tell me about sometimes when you have felt like an outsider as a Jew.

      a. In Christian company

      b. how do you cope?

4. Tell me about sometimes you felt you had to mask or keep secret your Jewish identity.

5. What feelings does Christianity bring up for you?

      a. How do you manage these feelings?

      b. How do these feelings impact your relationships with non-Jews?

6. What are your thoughts on Christian privilege?

      b. What are the costs of Christian privilege?

      c. What are the benefits of Christian privilege?

7. Has Judaism has ever adversely impacted your life (e.g., work, personal, socially, financially)?

8. What should a non-Jewish mental health professional know about working with Jewish people?

      a. how can mental health professionals best support Jews as live within a Christian dominated culture?

Appendix E

Informed Consent
On Department Letterhead

Researchers' Affiliation
Robert Kinney and Alex Stratener are students in the Counseling Psychology program at Seton Hall University, Professional Psychology & Family Therapy Department. Lewis Z. Schlosser, Ph.D. ABPP is a faculty member in the Counseling Psychology Program at Seton Hall University and Julie Ancis, Ph.D. Is a faculty member in Counseling Psychology at Georgia State University.

Purpose and Duration of Research
The purpose of the research is to explore how Jewish individuals view their place as Jews and understand the privileged status of Christians in a Christian dominated society. Specifically, it seeks to explore how Jews understand Christianity's status in the United States as a privileged social group (compared to non-Christian groups, like Jews and Muslims). Hopefully, the results will foster a better understanding of all religions and the interaction between them in a society that has multiple subcultures within it. In addition, the results may shed new light on Christian culture and uncover some of the costs of Christian privilege. The interview will be 45-60 minutes in duration.

Procedures
There will be a demographic questionnaire, a survey, and an interview containing questions with an article for review. Both the article and questions are on the topic of Christian Privilege. The interviews will be conducted over the telephone. The office where the research will be conducted is private and there will be no other people in the room during the interviews. The interview will be recorded then transcribed by a research team member.

Instruments
Before the interview, participants will fill out a survey called the American Jewish Identity Scale. Sample items are "I read Jewish newspapers." (participant respond with 1, 2, 3, or 4 to indicate level of agreement) and "I am proud to be Jewish." The interview consists of questions such as "What should a non-Jewish mental health professional know about working with Jewish people? " and "What does your Judaism mean to you?" Demographic information will also be collected (age, sex, etc.).

Voluntary Participation
Participation in this study is voluntary; as such, participants can discontinue at any point in the study, with no penalty.

Confidentiality
Confidentiality will be preserved by the researchers. If, during the course of interview identifying information is entered into the recording, it will be removed during transcription. All research materials will be secured on a USB memory stick. All

identifying materials will be secured by the researcher in a locked file cabinet. The data will only be accessible by the primary researcher.

Anonymity
Because of the design of the study, anonymity cannot be preserved. Interpersonal contact is a requirement for participation.

Record Retention
After the interviews are transcribed, digital recordings will be destroyed. The data, which has no identifying information, will be stored for three years, as required by Seton Hall University.

Anticipated Risks
There are no known risks to participants.

Anticipated Benefits
There are no known benefits to participants.

Contact Information
If there are concerns about the rights of participants please contact the IRB at (973) 313-6314. If there are questions or concerns about the present research please contact:

<div align="center">

Robert Kinney, M.A.   Lewis Z. Schlosser, Ph.D. ABPP
Seton Hall University   Seton Hall University
(620) 719-6977   (973) 275-2503
robert.kinney@student.shu.edu Lewis.schlosser@shu.edu

</div>

Recording
The interviews will be recorded and then transcribed. The transcripts will be identified through code numbers to protect the identity of the participants. After transcription, the digital recordings will be destroyed.

_____
   Print   Sign   Date

My signature indicates I have read and understand the above items and give my permission for the interview to be taped.

Participants will be given a copy of the signed and dated Informed Consent Form.

Appendix F

American Jewish Identity Scales (AJIS)

1	2	3	4
Not at all true of me	Somewhat true of me	Fairly true of me	Very true of me

Please respond to the following items about your Jewish identity on a 1 to 4 scale, where

1 = not at all true of me and 4 = very true of me.

_____ I observe the Sabbath.

_____ I enjoy Jewish literature.

_____ I deliberately seek out Jewish professionals (health care providers, realtors, etc.) or

businesses.

_____ I read Jewish newspapers.

_____ I am embarrassed, ashamed, or angry when a Jew does something criminal.

_____ I study Jewish religious texts (e.g., Torah, Talmud, Gemora).

_____ I try to follow all Jewish commandments in my daily life.

_____ I am proud to be Jewish.

_____ I believe in the coming of the Messiah.

_____ Being ethnically Jewish is more important to me than my nationality.

_____ I show my Jewish identity to others by the way I dress.

_____ It is important for me to date or marry a Jew.

_____ I make contributions to Jewish causes.

_____ I regularly keep my head covered for religious reasons.

_____ A member of my household lights candles on the Sabbath.

_____ I have a mezuzah in my home.

_____ I know today's date on the Hebrew calendar.

_____ I listen to Jewish secular music.

_____ I feel connected to Judaism through my personal ancestors.

_____ I celebrate all Jewish holidays.

_____ My sense of being Jewish is constant no matter where I am.

_____ "Tikkun olam" ("healing the world") is a Jewish value that is important to me.

_____ I follow the dietary rules of Passover.

_____ I read Hebrew.

_____ I keep Kosher.

_____ I dress in accordance with Jewish religious commandments.

_____ I feel a strong connection to Israel.

_____ I am active in a Jewish community center or organization.

_____ I regularly go to a Mikvah.

_____ I fast on Yom Kippur.

_____ I attend Jewish religious services at a temple, synagogue, or shtiebl.

_____ When in mourning, I observe all Jewish religious rituals.

_____ I ritually wash my hands before eating bread.