CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

SECOND GENERATION HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR EGO IDENTITIES

by

Joyce Nicholls-Goudsmid

B.A. (Hons.), Simon Fraser University, 1984

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

Psychology

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

January 1987

ISBN 0-315-36384-3

APPROVAL

Name: Joyce Nicholls-Goudsmid

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of thesis: Second Generation Holocaust Survivors and the Development of Their Ego Identities

Examining Committee:

Chairman: Dr. M.L. Bowman

Dr. J.E. Marcia
Senior Supervisor

Dr. R.G. Ley

Dr. R. Krell
External Examiner
Associate Professor
Department of Psychiatry
University of British Columbia

Date Approved: 30 January, 1987

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

Second Generation Holocaust Survivors and the Development of Their Ego Identities

Author: _____
(signature)

Joyce Nicholls-Goudsmid
(name)

Feb 10/87
(date)

ABSTRACT

The present study was designed to investigate the relationship between ego identity and information received about parental Holocaust experience in a sample of adult second generation survivors. Identity was assessed using an Identity Status Interview (ISI) derived from Erik Erikson's theory of ego identity formation; transmission of information was assessed by means of a Transmission of Information Interview (TII) developed for the present study. Statistical tests of cross tabulations of the resulting categorical data did not reach significance. However, the sample includes a large number of Diffusions who received Holocaust information from their parents in a vague or partial manner. Material from the TII is cited and common features, as well as the range of responses, found therein are discussed. These include but are not limited to the expressed lack of detailed information about parental Holocaust experience, ambivalence about seeking out this information in adulthood, and ambivalence toward parents as survivors/victims. The sense of "life as a mission", often noted in children of survivors, was not observed to the extent that was expected. The results are discussed in terms of Erikson's identity theory and object-relations theory. Implications for the third generation of survivors and for future research are noted.

What

should I do now?

Learn Hebrew?

Learn Yiddish?

Learn the Kabbala?

Learn the dreidel game?

Chop off my hair?

Pick oranges in Haifa?

Picket anti-semitic rock operas?

Force my nice

goyish husband

to convert?

In a world of survivors

is any gesture

adequate?

From *Diaspora 4*

Enid Dame

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. James Marcia for his continued support and encouragement of my research interests, and Dr. Robert Ley for being a member of my thesis committee. A special thanks to Dr. Robert Krell for his help and guidance in the initial stages of this project.

I am grateful to Wilf for his love and patience and for the quality of life with which he provides me; to Jan Scalzo for her friendship, and for her assistance in executing this study; and to Edward Clarke who, in addition to being a friend, became a timely source of moral support and information.

Most important, I wish to express my thanks and gratitude to the people who agreed to be interviewed for this project. They gave hours of their time, answered difficult and personal questions,.....and often provided coffee as well. Obviously, without their interest and generosity of spirit this thesis would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

FOREWORD

The Holocaust is a topic that often poses a dilemma when it is chosen as an area of scientific investigation. On the one hand, scientific investigation requires, among other things, the use of unambiguous language. On the other hand, to attempt to talk or write about the Holocaust in objective terms might be viewed as a betrayal of those who suffered, and suffer still, from its impact. Does one refer to the Six Million as having died or having been murdered? Does one write holocaust or Holocaust? Furthermore, the ways in which one chooses to define certain terms immediately reflects one's perspective on various aspects of the Holocaust. In the end, the choices made must be dictated by the writer's conscience and his or her awareness of the constraints imposed by the arena in which the investigation takes place.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Holocaust signifies an era in the history of humankind during which the Nazis systematically destroyed six million Jews as well as untold hundreds of thousands of gypsies, dissidents, and members of other minority groups. Of the approximately nine million Jews who lived in the countries of Europe that fell under German rule during the war, about three million survived - 500,000 in Western Europe and 2.5 million in Eastern Europe (Bauer, 1982). Only 200,000 Jews survived concentration camps; others hid in homes of sympathetic non-Jewish friends and strangers, fled to non-occupied countries, lived as non-Jews with false identification, went underground to work with the Resistance, and lived in the wild (see, for example, Glatstein, Knox, & Margoshes, 1968; Laska, 1983 for survivors' accounts of their experiences).

For these survivors, the task of establishing post-war lives was monumental. Their pre-war homes and businesses were lost to them through confiscation or destruction; their friends and immediate families were dead or untraceable; their former neighbours eyed them with fear and suspicion; and they no longer felt safe in Europe. Some immigrated to countries where they had relatives who had left Europe prior to 1938 or had managed to escape at the start of the war. Many immigrated to countries where they knew no one. Others joined the Exodus to what is now Israel; prior to 1948, this Exodus often included a detour to internment camps in Cyprus (Bauer, 1982). For almost all of the survivors it was an entirely new life - not only new languages, jobs, cultural mores, and social contacts, but also (often) new families; it was rare for previously married or engaged individuals to be reunited with partners and children.

In an attempt to re-create lost family units, many survivors were anxious to (re)marry and (re)start having children. The desire to have children arose out of another need as well -

to show victory over the Nazis by demonstrating that an entire race of people could not and would not be eradicated. But these marriages and new families posed additional problems for survivors.

First, many marriages were made in haste, "sometimes to the first plausible person survivors encountered after their liberation" (Newman, 1979). This often tended to result in the joining of two shattered individuals each seeking to vest in the other the roles of lost parents, partner, and siblings, all in one. In any case, "the marriages of the period 1945-1949, whether or not to other survivors, assured that at least one partner would carry the tragedy into new homes" (Krell, 1979).

Second, despite the desire to have children, the decision to actually have them was fraught with difficulty. The world was a dangerous place for Jewish children - 1.5 million of them had died through the efforts of the Nazis. Furthermore, many women, especially those who had survived concentration camps, experienced amenorrhea, infertility, miscarriages, and feared bearing deformed, handicapped babies (Bergmann & Jucovy, 1982).

Third, many survivors were just out of childhood when they became separated from their parents. Their ultimate experience of parents or adult caretakers was that these individuals were powerless and unable to protect them. Therefore, survivors had unresolved conflicts with respect to their parents and had doubts about their own ability to parent (Aleksandrowicz, 1973; Newman, 1979; Robinson & Winnik, 1981).

Fourth, there was the survivors' dilemma of whether or not to tell their children about their Holocaust experiences. On the one hand, parents want to protect their children from unpleasantness and danger; on the other, they want to prepare them for whatever dangers that might befall them. Furthermore, survivors were learning that the world could not fathom their experiences and was not prepared to hear of them; some wondered whether for their own well-being they, too, should join in the "conspiracy of silence" (Bergmann & Jucovy,

1982). Therefore, the problem of 'to tell or not to tell'; and if to tell, when, how, and how much? (After Krell, 1979)

CHAPTER II

DEFINITIONS OF SURVIVORSHIP

Holocaust Survivors: The First Generation

The task of defining the term "survivor" in the context of the Holocaust is not a straightforward one. There is ~~an~~ apparent tradition in the literature that "Holocaust survivor" is synonymous with "Nazi concentration camp survivor", although such an assumption is often not made explicit at the outset. Thus, research addressing Holocaust survivors typically has included only Jewish survivors of concentration camps, although more recently such research has included also other survivors of the Holocaust of similar European and religious background, i.e., Jews who survived as described earlier.

It is not difficult to understand the motivation behind equating the terms concentration camp survivor and Holocaust survivor. First, the roots of such definition may be found in the term Holocaust itself. Of Greek origin, the word holocaust means "burnt offering" or "complete destruction by fire", as well as "a great destruction" (Klein, 1966, p. 737). Given the Nazi method of choice for the final disposition of bodies in the extermination and concentration camps, i.e., burning pits and the crematoria, those who survived the camps had, indeed, survived destruction by fire. [1]

A second reason for the lack of distinction between the two terms may have its roots in the matter of reparation for surviving victims of the Nazis. In 1956 the Federal Republic of West Germany enacted laws which would provide for

> financial compensation to those who lost their property or whose health was undermined by Nazi persecution. According to these Restitution Laws, a causal connection between the traumatic experience and the impaired state of health has to be proved. (Engel, 1962, p. 191)

The survivors who could prove most convincingly such a connection, given their most obvious

loss of health and property, were the concentration camp survivors. Therefore, these individuals came to the attention of physicians, neurologists, and psychiatrists first. Thus concentration camp survivors became the first visible, and for many years the only, survivors to be addressed in the literature.

Third, and perhaps most compelling, is the view that concentration camp survivors came closest to death without actually dying. Any one of the hundreds of personal accounts of these survivors will attest to the starvation, disease, physical and psychological assaults, and pervasive degradation that characterized existence in the camps. To survive under such circumstances, it may be argued, constitutes something unique, and so these individuals alone are the "true" survivors of the Holocaust. Wilson and Fromm (1982) maintain this position and state that while a definition of Holocaust survivors encompassing those who survived in many ways, e.g., hiding in woods or moving from town to town, is satisfactory for "organizational purposes...for psychological purposes, it is not" (p. 290).

Such a narrow focus highlights a basic issue inherent in the definition of who is a survivor. As noted by Prince (1985), to make distinctions between survivors

> who lived in hiding under starvation conditions and those who were partisans and lost their entire families but were not directly brutalized, or those who were in death camps as compared to those in slave labour camps, one is dealing at levels of experience in which fine discriminations become sacrilegious. (pp. 11-12)

This is not to suggest that all surviving victims of Nazi persecution are assumed to have suffered equally and to bear some well-defined homogeneous set of long-term effects. They did not and do not. But as Prince continues, "the statistically 'significant' outcome of each of these conditions was not survivorhood but death" (ibid.). The Nazis intended the extinction of the Jewish people (see Hitler, 1939, quoted in Kren & Rappoport, 1980, p. 72; Himmler, 1943, in Ammon, 1984, p. 406), and the so-called "Final Solution" did succeed in "legally" eradicating six million of them, thereby destroying the fabric of the Jewish communities of Europe. To quote Elie Weisel, "Not all victims were Jews, but all Jews were victims." In this

context, **all** Jews who were in Europe (except Britain and Sweden) for any length of time between 1935[2] and 1945 and survived should be considered Holocaust survivors and are defined as such in what follows.

Children of Survivors: The Second Generation

As noted by a number of investigators of the children of Holocaust survivors (e.g., Kestenberg, 1972), it is easier to define what constitutes a second generation survivor than a "first generation" survivor. The second generation comprises the survivors' children who were born after the Holocaust. It is noted that children born during that time but who were "removed from the centers of persecution before they suffered from it directly, and were later reunited with one or both surviving parents" (Linzer, 1984, p. 79) sometimes also are defined as children of survivors, rather than child survivors (e.g., Krell, 1985). However, given that it is not clear exactly what is meant by "centers of persecution", Linzer's definition is not utilized here.

One additional aspect of definition must addressed; that is the use of the term "second generation survivor" rather than "child of survivor". Although both terms may be found in the literature and are often used interchangably, implying that the choice of term is irrelevant, herein "second generation survivor" is used advisedly for two reasons. First, had the Final Solution succeeded, the children of survivors would not have been born and in that sense they, too, are survivors. Second, there is ample evidence in the literature (reviewed below) to demonstrate that the children of survivors have had, in some respects, "different" childhoods; they were inheriting, in differing ways and to varying degrees, the legacy of the persecution of their parents. In this sense, also, they may be considered survivors.

CHAPTER III

TRANSGENERATIONAL EFFECTS: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The transgenerational effects of the Holocaust went virtually unnoticed until the early 1960s when the children of survivors were in or approaching adolescence. Among the first to address the problems of the second generation was Vivian Rakoff, then a practising psychiatrist and assistant research director at Jewish General Hospital in Montreal. He noted that

> within the last year or two, it has been my experience - similar to that of other psychiatrists - that I am seeing more adolescents than one would expect whose parents are survivors of the holocaust....It could be argued that the population I encounter is unique; perhaps because I work in Montreal, which is one of the immigrant cities of the post-war world, I encounter more rootless refugees than in other cities. But the parents, the actual victims in these cases, are not conspicuously broken people. (1966, p. 18)

In investigating the families of these children, Rakoff suggested that, for survivors, "a life that is not simply a 'given', but an almost unexpected gift, may seem to be not a life to be lived, but a mission" (ibid., p. 21). Thus, their children

> shared in the burden of excessive significance and expectation. In their turn they were not allowed to lead their own individual lives. It is almost as if their parents in an attempt to justify their survival, demanded qualities of their children which were the accumulation of their expectations of all the dead who were murdered. (ibid.)

Sigal and Rakoff (1971) and Trossman (1968), also in Montreal, found a number of features that typify the parent-child interaction in survivor families, relevant to the clinical material presented by their patients. These features include:

1. Overprotection by the parents who mistakenly hope to enable their child to cope better by constantly warning him or her of possible - albeit unlikely - disappointments and disasters.
2. The inculcating of guilt in the child, after hearing the memories of his or her parents, because the child's life is so much better.
3. Paranoid suspicion toward the gentile world to such a degree that the child is forced to choose between mistrust of all others or the accusation of disloyalty by the parents.

4. The expectation that the child provide fulfillment in the parents' empty lives and vindicate all the suffering they endured. (After Phillips, 1978)

The foregoing was observed also by Aleksandrowicz (1973), Danieli (1981), Roden and Roden (1982), Russell (1980), and Phillips (1978). The latter has discussed the psychological effects of the features described above, as follows. The extreme degree of overprotection and expectation that the child will provide meaning to the parents' lives creates a problem for that child. While attempting to follow its natural tendencies toward personal growth, achievement and success, it is thwarted by parents who do not trust the world in which the child must function and who cannot accept the need of the child to become an individual. At the same time, the child is unable to express its growing unhappiness and anger because the parents have already suffered so much (see also Parker, 1983; Prince, 1985). Therefore, the child feels guilty for having such negative feelings toward the parents who have given so much.

Fogelman and Savran (1980), who have led short-term support groups for children of survivors, caution - as do others (Phillips, 1978; Rabinowitz, 1977; Rakoff, 1978) - that many such children are well-adjusted despite their feelings and concerns regarding their parents' past. In addition, they note that it is difficult to separate the effects of being the child of an immigrant from being the child of an immigrant survivor. Nevertheless, on the basis of their observations from nine groups of five to ten participants each, between 1976 and 1978, these writers summarize the feelings and concerns of, or "psychological effects" upon, the second generation as follows;

1. a need to identify with parents' suffering in order to understand them better and feel more intimate with them;
2. difficulty in communicating with parents about the atrocities they suffered for fear of causing themselves and their parents pain, or of discovering to what lengths their parents had to go in order to survive;

3. conflict between the need to express themselves openly and the attempt to protect their parents from further suffering by remaining silent about their own pain and anger;
4. struggle with the fantasy of compensating their parents for the loss of family, friends, and entire communities;
5. problems in coping with their own rage, shame, mistrust, guilt, fears, or scarred [sic] feelings because of ~~what~~ happened to their parents;
6. inability to mourn people they never knew; and
7. a search for a personal way to express their thoughts and feelings about the Holocaust and develop a meaningful continuity with their family's past. (Fogelman & Savran, 1980, p. 99)

These are, of course, anecdotal accounts by a self-selected group of second generation survivors. However, they are not at odds with the clinical observations by Rakoff and others, cited earlier.

None of the participants in the support groups appeared to be experiencing any psychopathology, and this point illustrates one of the difficulties in interpreting the literature addressing second generation survivors. Much of the literature has been concerned with the psychopathology manifested by second generation concentration camp survivors. The reports include either clinical case studies of survivors' children in analysis (e.g., Auerhahn & Prelinger, 1983; Barocas & Barocas, 1973, 1979; Jucovy, 1983; Kestenberg, 1972) or studies comparing the second generation with offspring of Jewish parents not having been directly involved in the Holocaust but with both groups composed of members of a clinical population (e.g., Aleksandrowicz, 1973; Sigal, Silver, Rakoff, & Ellin, 1973). This holds particularly for earlier investigations of survivors and their children.

Recent exceptions to this are Davidson (1980), who stressed the study of adaptive patterns in a non-clinical survivor population, Russell (1980), who strongly advocated research addressing "how some survivor families avoided transmitting the trauma [of the Holocaust]

transgenerationally or adapted to it and dealt with it healthily" (p. 198), and Fogelman and Savran mentioned above. None of these investigators have denied that there are psychosocial effects, perhaps unique to the second generation, associated with being the child of a Holocaust survivor; however, they have asserted that these effects very often are not psychopathological.

There is, in fact, a small but growing body of literature that indicates virtually no transgenerational effects of the Holocaust. In one of the largest studies with second generation survivors, Sigal and Weinfeld (1985) found "scant evidence...for an excess of problems in separation/individuation in a randomly selected sample of young adult children of survivors" (p. 2), and no differences between children of survivors and control subjects in problems in controlling aggression. However, these investigators noted differences between children of survivors and controls in information-seeking behaviour and socio-political attitudes and allowed that "conflict, anxiety, or defense may determine the direction taken by cognitive inquiry or political orientation" (p. 19). Rustin (1971) found no evidence that the effects of parents' Holocaust experiences lead to psychopathology in the second generation, although there were some personality differences between children of survivors and matched controls, e.g., the former demonstrated a greater degree of Jewish identification.

Leon, Butcher, Kleinman, Goldberg, & Almagor (1981) found "no significant differences between survivor and control group children on any of the psychological variables or in their attitudes and behaviours toward their parents" (p. 503). However, psychological adjustment was determined with the MMPI and the Children's version of the Current Life Functioning Form, which would appear to limit the results to only a lack of gross psychopathology or psychological maladjustment. Zlotogorski (1983) found no differences between children of concentration camp survivors and controls (both non-clinical) in "offspring's sense of well-being and level of ego development (Loevinger)" (p. 352). However, "high-functioning second-generation subjects...viewed their families as significantly more structured or rigid as

compared with perceptions of high-functioning comparison subjects" (ibid.).

Finally, Weiss, O'Connell, and Siiter (1986) compared 25 children of survivors with an equal number of children of non-Jewish European immigrants and an additional 25 children of non-Jewish American-born parents on a number of variables. These investigators noted that, rather than a "children of survivor syndrome", they found an "immigration effect" characterized by a high degree of guilt, a high degree of religiosity, and a low degree of alienation.

The above-mentioned studies provide an important balance to research with clinical samples of second generation survivors which implies an extremely poor prognosis for this and succeeding generations of Holocaust survivors (Rosenthal & Rosenthal, 1980; Rubenstein, 1981; J.J. Sigal, personal communication, 1986). Nonetheless, even the aforementioned studies are not at odds with the bulk of the literature which supports the notion that although

> children of survivors are as varied in personalities, political views, and religious observances as the Jewish community as a whole...out of their shared feelings arise pressures, conflicts, and ambivalence that make it possible to speak of them as a group. (Roden & Roden, 1982, p. 68)

Some investigators have suggested that the way in which parental experiences are recounted, if at all, is one of the most important aspects of the first generation-second generation interaction. Blumenthal (1981) proposed that an area of study more relevant than the relationship between the amount of information provided and children's psychopathology would be the varying patterns of parental communication about the Holocaust. Prince (1985), in looking at these patterns, noted the "tremendous variation" in the ways that parents communicated their Holocaust experiences. At one extreme are parents who talked about the Holocaust extensively and had done so from the child's birth (or so it seems to the child). At the other extreme are parents who never talked about their experiences or, if they did, said very little and never elaborated - giving a strong non-verbal indication that "these things are not for discussion."

Between the extremes Prince found a variety of nuances and subtleties: transmission that was fragmentary and evolved over time, with events not being placed in context; the same few events being related repeatedly, with no sense of the whole story; indirect transmission through "accidental" exposure to photographs or conversations, or through hearing parents scream during nightmares. In addition there are affective differences in the way that parental experiences were related. Some parents communicated "about the past in such a way to let the child know that the trauma had been mastered and the mourning process completed" (p. 16). Others were still in mourning, still embittered and guilt-ridden, still preoccupied with their suffering.

Trachtenberg and Davis (1978) stated that "children whose parents shared openly and appropriately their wartime experiences seemed to have less difficulty dealing with the parent-child relationships" (p. 299). Davidson (1980) found a relationship between second generation effects and both excessive communication of Holocaust experiences and a lack or avoidance of communication or denial of the experiences. Krell (e.g., 1979) has implied that indirect, covert transmission of parental Holocaust experience may be more damaging to the second generation than is open, direct, non-threatening communication. Axelrod, Schnipper, and Rau (1980), Slipp (1979), and Russell (1980) all found that the one major difference between functional children of survivors and hospitalized patients (also children of survivors) seemed to be that their families were involved in survivor organizations and that the children, while growing up, were exposed to fairly open discussion of parents' concentration camp experiences in "non-threatening" ways (Russell, 1980). Furthermore

> the degree to which family discussions of the Holocaust and parents' pre-Holocaust lives have been banned and considered taboo may contribute to the severity of the survivor child's psychopathology by inhibiting the development of a secure identity. (Axelrod et al., 1980, p. 12)

It is also possible that the development of an individual identity may be affected without any resulting psychopathology.

CHAPTER IV

IDENTITY

From an Eriksonian perspective, one's identity is neither something conferred upon the individual by society, nor does it appear as a phenomenon of nature like some secondary sex characteristic. Rather, identity is acquired in the context of ongoing psychological development in a social milieu. Erikson's epigenetic model of psychosocial development details eight stages spanning one's life from birth to death. Note that this is a **psychosocial** model; although based upon Freud's notion of psychosexual development, Erikson's theory shifts the focus from id to ego. Therefore, external reality, in the form of societal (including parental) expectations, plays a major role in Erikson's model. It retains the assumption of a fixed, universal sequence of maturation, but incorporates the demands of the sociocultural milieu in which one matures.

Each stage in Erikson's model is conceptualized as comprising a psychosocial task, the successful resolution of which has positive implications for each subsequent stage. However, each task recurs at each successive stage of development so that, depending upon one's life experiences, a positive resolution at one stage may be reaffirmed or reversed in later stages and a negative resolution may be exacerbated or ameliorated in a similar manner.

The fifth stage of this model is concerned with the psychosocial task of adolescence, establishing a personal or ego identity. In this model, identity is "a psychological structure...formed out of an individual's unique synthesis of previous identifications [i.e.]...the individual's own unique combination of identification elements in his or her past history" (Marcia, 1979, p. 2). But how these identification elements are synthesized (or not) is influenced by the outcomes of tasks of the previous four stages.

Stage one extends from birth to 12-18 months, and corresponds roughly to the oral stage in psychoanalytic theory. The psychosocial issue at this stage is one of the infant developing a healthy balance between a sense of trust and a sense of mistrust. That is, an infant

> whose needs are met when they arise, whose discomforts are quickly removed, who is cuddled, fondled, played with and talked to, develops a sense of the world as a safe place to be and of people as helpful and dependable. (Elkind, 1973, p. 272)

This constitutes a basic sense of trust. A fearful, suspicious attitude toward the world, fostered by inadequate, inconsistent and rejecting care, constitutes an overall sense of mistrust.

Stage two, occurring during the second and third years of life, is concerned with the development of a sense of autonomy versus a sense of shame and doubt. The child starts to test its new motor skills and mental abilities at this time, and the parents' responses to these new activities have a crucial impact.

> If parents recognize the young child's need to do what he is capable of doing at his own pace and in his own time, then he develops a sense that he is able to control his muscles, his impulses, himself and, not insignificantly, his environment - the sense of autonomy. (ibid.)

On the other hand, when caretakers are unwilling to let the child do for itself (to the extent that it is capable) and the child's unsuccessful attempts to control the environment are met with harsh criticism, the child develops a sense of shame with respect to others and a sense of doubt about its own abilities. Successful outcome of this stage is more autonomy than shame and doubt, although, as noted earlier, these issues are rarely resolved "once and for all".

Stage three involves achieving a balance between initiative and guilt. This is effected by the extent to which parents respond positively to self-initiated physical and intellectual abilities. Answering questions, encouraging curiosity, and providing the opportunity for physical activity all foster initiative. Prohibiting or deriding play and enquiry foster "a sense of guilt over self-initiated activities in general that will persist through later life stages" (ibid., p. 273).

Stage four corresponds to latency in psychoanalytic theory and to the concrete operational stage in Piaget's theory of cognitive development. This means that the child is starting to make identifications outside the home as well as to develop relatively more sophisticated ways of reasoning. During this stage, children become concerned with academic achievement as well as with making things and "practising" adult activities, e.g., building and baking. Praise and encouragement for these activities at home and/or at school foster a sense of industry in the child, a sense of being capable of worthwhile things. Belittling or ignoring the child's achievements, or focussing on failures, foster a sense of inferiority.

The fifth, adolescent, stage is one of integration. The child's newly developed skills in this regard allow him or her to bring together, essentially unconsciously, all previous identifications as determined by the outcomes of the four previous stages. Thus

> if the young person reaches adolescence with...a vital sense of trust, autonomy, initiative and industry, then his chances of arriving at a meaningful sense of ego identity are much enhanced. The reverse, of course, holds true for the young person who enters adolescence with considerable mistrust, shame, doubt, guilt and inferiority. (Elkind, 1973, pp. 275-276)

For Erikson, the dichotomous representation of the psychosocial task at adolescence was ego identity versus role confusion. Subsequently, this was expanded by Marcia (1966), who developed a semi-structured interview and rating manual to evaluate the individual's position on two dimensions, "crisis" and "commitment", with respect to certain identity elements. "Crisis", now more accurately referred to as "exploration" (Marcia, 1979, p. 4), refers to having undergone a period of decision-making, with serious questioning of values and consideration of alternatives. "Commitment" refers to "adherence to a path, sticking to a particular direction and taking action consistent with that direction" (ibid., p. 5).

Given the foregoing two dimensions, there are four possible identity outcomes or statuses. These are characterized as follows:

Individuals who are **Identity Achieved** have been through a period of exploration (as defined

above) and have emerged with relatively firm commitments in various areas of their lives.

Moratoriums are presently in a period of exploration and, furthermore, are actively seeking to make commitments in various identity areas. In fact, they may already have made some vague commitments.

Foreclosures have never been through a period of exploration but are committed to certain attitudes and values - usually ones adhered to by parents and/or other authority figures.

Diffusions may or may not have been through a period of exploration but, in any case, have not made commitments in many areas of their identity. Furthermore, Diffusions tend not to be overly concerned about this.

Since Marcia's early work some 20 years ago, approximately 150 studies in identity status have been undertaken, many of them confirming the construct and concurrent validities of Marcia's identity status typology (see Bourne, 1978, and Marcia, 1976, for reviews of this research). Most of these studies have involved only adolescents in college/university, with very few of them addressing identity status in non-college youth and adults. Nonetheless, with respect to the latter it has been found that while, as noted earlier, identity formation is not a "once and forever" thing, Identity Achievement, Foreclosure, and Diffusion tend to be fairly stable over time, with the latter two being most stable (Adams & Fitch, 1983; Marcia, 1976; Waterman, Geary, & Waterman, 1974; Waterman & Goldman, 1976; Waterman & Waterman, 1971; 1975). This appears to obtain particularly in the adult years which, in general, "do not constitute a period of extensive redirection of identity choices" (Waterman, 1982, p. 349).

An exception to this was found with women who either were full-time homemakers ("traditional") or had resumed careers after an interruption for child-bearing ("neo-traditional"); O'Connell (1976) observed that, after marriage, these women's "sense of identity seems to have undergone a moratorium [i.e., a hiatus] which is not terminated until the school children stage of the life cycle" (cited in Waterman, 1982, p. 348). O'Connell concluded that traditional and neo-traditional women's establishment of a strong sense of identity is less

straightforward than is that of non-traditional women (i.e., women who are continuously committed to their careers).

One other aspect of identity research bears mention, that is the issue of sex differences. A number of studies with adolescents have found sex differences but, again, little research has been done with adults. The exception is a study by Tesch & Whitbourne (1982) which found no identity differences between male and female adults in vocational choice, religious beliefs, political ideology, or attitudes toward premarital sex. However, with respect to sex role attitudes, females were more likely to be in Moratorium whereas males were overrepresented in the Foreclosure category.

Identity and the Second Generation

Many investigators have noted the difficulties of the second generation in establishing a personal, separate identity and this is hardly surprising. First, second generation survivors came to the attention of the mental health profession when the children were in the stage of life during which identity formation is the the major task, i.e., adolescence.

Second, Eriksonian theory notes that because

> the search for identity involves production of a meaningful self-concept in which the past, present, and future are linked together....the task is more difficult in a historical period in which the past has lost its anchorage of family and community tradition...[and] the future is uncertain. (Muuss, 1975, p. 63)

The destruction of "the continuity of Jewish history" (Dawidowicz, 1981, p. 14), the consequent migration of survivors to other countries, and the communication of their fear of what the future could hold for their children, must certainly be seen to have implications for the identities of second generation survivors.

Implicit in much of the literature is the notion that the way in which these effects are consistently manifested is in the establishment of an individual identity. Roden and Roden

(1982) observed that "the difficulties [of the second generation] become compounded in adolescence by the usual identity crisis typical of the stage" (p. 70). Trossman (1968) observed that, in families where one parent is emotionally absent because of preoccupation with the Holocaust, the late adolescent is confronted with "a whole spectrum of difficulties...in the sphere of identity formation" (p. 122), especially where the "absent" parent is of the same sex. This observation has received corroboration from the identity status research in which it has been found that Identity Diffusion in adolescent offspring is associated with emotional absence of and/or rejection by the same-sex parent (Marcia, in preparation).

Furthermore, from an Eriksonian epigenetic perspective, these difficulties may persist long after adolescence is over. One might then argue that for many adult second generation survivors, a personal identity has not yet been successfully established. However, as noted by Russell (1980), there appears to be a "marked identification-individuation differential in children in survivor families" (p. 194). He suggests that the differential is due to different child-rearing practices, and one aspect of these practices is the way in which parental Holocaust experience has been communicated to the second generation.

For example, Fishbane (1979) found that open but not excessive communication of parental experience was positively related to the encouragement of "the separation of the young adult from the parents" (p. 449). This, in turn, was seen to have positive implications for offspring's autonomy and, thus, the establishment of his or her own separate identity. Savran & Fogelman (1979) commented even more to the point that "children of survivors...need to know more [about their parents' Holocaust experiences] in order to have a complete identity" (p. 151).

To date, however, there are few studies that have examined specifically the relationship between communication of parental experience and ego (i.e., personal) identity. Hammerman

(1980) used a Survivor Offspring Questionnaire (constructed for her study) to assess young adult offspring's historical perspective, historical knowledge, and conscious expressed interest with respect to the Holocaust, and Simmons' (1970) Identity Achievement Scale to measure identity. She found a positive relationship between Ego Identity and objective and subjective historical information, a focus on both pre-war and post-war information, and initiation of discussion by the child. However, these results obtained for the male subjects only. Hammerman concluded that the "content and process dimensions of knowledge may be more important than knowledge itself" (p. 1941). That is, getting the information is more important than the information itself.

More recently, Lichtman (1984) investigated the relationship between parental communication of Holocaust experiences and "the psychological well-being of their adult children" (p. 914). Thus the degree of depression, hypochondriasis, and paranoia (per MMPI scales), anxiety, and guilt, as well as empathy and ego strength were assessed in a non-clinical sample of second generation survivors (defined as for the present study). In addition, a questionnaire about parental communication about the Holocaust, constructed by Lichtman, produced six factors or communication categories:

1. Mother's frequent and willing discussion of her wartime experiences and the transmission of factual information.
2. Guilt-inducing communication by either parent.
3. Father's frequent and willing discussion of his wartime experiences and the transmission of factual information.
4. Awareness of the Holocaust at a young age and its nonverbal presence in the home as conveyed by either parent.
5. Indirect communication about the Holocaust, as conveyed by both parents.
6. Affective communication about the Holocaust, as conveyed by both parents. (After Lichtman, 1983)

Overall, Lichtman found a significant relationship between exposure to indirect (COM 5), gloomy, non-verbal (COM 4), guilt-inducing (COM 2) communication by mothers of their Holocaust experiences and offspring's anxiety, paranoia, hypochondriasis, and low ego strength. Fathers' communication was related inversely to depression and hypochondriasis. (However, no information is given on the degree of elevation on the MMPI scales, therefore the degree to which offspring's psychological well-being was lacking is not known).

Lichtman concluded that these results obtained because when mothers speak about their experiences, their children (particularly those of the same sex) perceive their mothers as victims and identify with them as such. This explanation is consistent with an object-relations approach to sex differences in parental identification (see Chodorow, 1978, for a detailed discussion). Fathers, on the other hand, "are more likely to present to their children the identity of a fighter" (p. 921).

CHAPTER V

THE PRESENT STUDY

As noted by Waterman (1982), "it is an attractive hypothesis that parental behaviour contributes to identity formation, and the pattern of research results obtained provides readily interpretable links between family functioning and the various identity statuses" (p. 352). However, as Waterman noted further, causal links between family variables and identity development cannot be inferred because of the methodological and conceptual limitations of such research. That is, most of the studies in this area use "verbal report measures obtained from adolescent or youth respondents [or their parents and] these measures are subject to errors of memory, defensive distortion, and conscious impression management" (ibid.).

Even if all the reports were assumed to be accurate, for example through corroborative reports, "it would still not be possible to reach a conclusion concerning any causal contribution of family variables" (ibid.). The "style" or manner in which a parent communicates with his or her child may constitute a response to, rather than an influence upon, a particular behaviour or attitude of that child. For example, "it is far easier to provide a supportive, child-centred environment when children identify strongly with the parents and follow family traditions without questioning" (ibid.). Thus, Foreclosed offspring beget parenting associated with such Foreclosure and not vice versa.

In a similar vein, how one characterizes having been parented may be a function of one's identity status, so that Foreclosures remember their parents as having been "close, loving, and child-centred with encouragement to conform to family values" (Marcia, in preparation) whether or not this is actually how the parents behaved.

The foregoing illustrates the need for longitudinal, prospective (predictive) studies in which to examine the so-called antecedents of identity formation. However, there is also a

place for research such as the present, retrospective study. Examining how individuals within the various identity statuses view their psychosocial development (although they might not describe "growing up" in those terms!) allows the generation of hypotheses that may be operationalized in predictive studies.

Furthermore, whereas Waterman's caveats regarding causal links between family variables and identity formation in offspring are well-taken, they should not be allowed to minimize the legitimacy of attempts to study and interpret such links. Family variables or, more exactly, parenting styles have been found to influence, as well as interact with, the psychological development of offspring (eg., Baumrind, 1968). There is no theoretical basis upon which to assume that this may not also be the case with identity formation, as defined in the context of the present study.

The present study is exploratory in nature and addresses the relationship between parental transmission of Holocaust experience and identity formation in second generation survivors. Specifically, this study examines the various processes by which parental experience has been communicated to the second generation and the implications these processes have for the various ways in which offspring may resolve the issues pertaining to identity.

This study goes beyond Hammerman's (1980) and Lichtman's (1983; 1984) by utilizing Marcia's (1966) taxonomy of patterns of identity formation, i.e., Identity Achieved, Moratorium, Foreclosure, and Diffuse, rather than merely determining the degree to which an identity has been established. Furthermore, it focusses on the process of transmission rather than the content of parental experiences, per se.

Hypotheses

Based on the work of Axelrod et al. (1980), Lichtman (1984), Prince (1985), and Russell (1980), four broad categories of parental communication of Holocaust experiences are proposed for use in the present study: covert, vague references to Holocaust experiences with resistance to questioning or elaboration; full explicit disclosure that is "threatening"; piecemeal, explicit, "non-threatening" disclosure in response to questioning by children; and full explicit disclosure that is "non-threatening". "Threatening" refers to parental preoccupation with the Holocaust marked by unresolved grief, bitterness, shame, guilt, anger, and the communicated expectation that the child will make reparation for parental suffering. "Non-threatening" refers to a relative lack of parental preoccupation with the Holocaust and an attempt to resolve the personal issues and conflicts arising from it, including an ability to see the child's life in the context of his or her own psychosocial needs.

Furthermore, it is proposed that covert, vague disclosure with resistance (Group 1) and threatening full explicit disclosure (Group 2) will be associated with less adaptive patterns of identity formation than will explicit but piecemeal disclosure upon questioning (Group 3) and non-threatening full explicit disclosure (Group 4). Therefore, specific hypotheses are as follows:

1. More Group 1 individuals will be in the Diffusion status than in any other identity status.
2. More Group 2 individuals will be in the Foreclosure status than in any other identity status.
3. More Group 3 individuals will be in the Moratorium status than in any other identity status.
4. More Group 4 individuals will be in the Identity Achieved status than in any other identity status.

In addition to reporting the results of statistical tests conducted on these hypotheses, the

results section will present material selected from the transmission interviews. Any conclusions to be drawn from this material will be reported in the discussion section of this thesis.

Rationale for specific hypotheses

There are a number of converging paths from which these hypotheses derive. One is based upon the implications for the second generation that may be found in Erikson's psychosocial stages preceding adolescence. The tasks of these stages are to develop a basic sense of trust, a sense of autonomy, a sense of initiative, and a sense of industry. Growing up in a milieu where parents themselves have lost their basic sense of trust in the world; where preoccupation with recent suffering and loss interferes with emotional, if not also physical, availability; where a fear of additional loss results in overprotection and discouragement of autonomy; where curiosity about family history either is discouraged or signals the release of a deluge of affect-laden information; where physical activity, perhaps including appropriately aggressive play, is met with sharp rebuke or an inability to set limits; where one's early attempts to master the environment and achieve academically are seen as inadequate, and failures are deemed unacceptable; where continuity with the past has been destroyed and the future means guarding against a repeat of the recent past - these have profound implications for the ways in which the phase-specific crises of psychosocial development are resolved.

In terms of Erikson's model, the implications are negative and impact specifically on identity development. That is, "lack of trust in childhood recurs as identity confusion in adolescence"; a sense of "shame, self-doubt, dependency, self-consciousness, and meek compliance resulting from too many restrictions, unfair punishment, and the parent's frustration in marriage, work, and citizenship" compromises the ability to achieve autonomy and, thus, to achieve an identity. "If parents resist and restrain the newly developing initiative too much by

making the child feel guilty" for physical exploration and endless questioning, the child as adolescent is inhibited by fear and guilt from exploring various role options; and if a child fails to acquire a feeling of success and recognition, i.e., a sense of industry, he or she "will be plagued by feelings of inadequacy and inferiority...that contribute to ego diffusion in [adolescence]" (after Muuss, 1975, pp. 59-63).

Both overwhelming the child with the Holocaust and protecting him or her from it may be seen to reflect parental preoccupation with the Holocaust and, thereby, a lack of recognition of the child's psychosocial needs. Therefore it is proposed that threatening parental communication about the Holocaust and resistance to disclosure of personal family history, both, will be associated with less successful identity formation, i.e., the Foreclosure and Diffusion statuses. It is recognized, of course, that later life experiences may have some ameliorative effect on identity formation but, from a psychodynamic point of view, unless these unresolved early childhood issues are addressed outright they continue to inform and affect, to a large extent, adult functioning. On the other hand, it is proposed that providing information in the "normal" context of family history-giving or in response to age- and context-appropriate questions from children will be associated with more successful identity formation, i.e., the Achievement and Moratorium statuses.

The rationale with respect to specific modes of transmission being associated with specific identity statuses is as follows. Foreclosures tend to report that their upbringing was "child-centered with encouragement to conform to family values" (Marcia, in preparation, p. 29). Survivors who see their children as "vehicles" for reparation will make early demands for adherence to family values and will provide little opportunity and no support for the exploration of other values. Diffusions perceive their parents as distant and rejecting (ibid.). Survivors who will not talk to their children about their Holocaust experiences will have difficulty talking about family history at all. That is, discussion of the past necessarily involves the Holocaust and the losses resulting from it. Therefore, children of these survivors will see

their parents as distant and, to some extent, rejecting. Furthermore, Diffusions have little sense of where they are going with their lives; second generation survivors with little sense of their past will have difficulty creating a sense of their future.

The distinctions between the two more adaptive identity statuses, in terms of modes of transmission, are less clear-cut. The literature (e.g., Marcia, ibid.) suggests that Moratoriums "are ambivalent about their parents...attempting to please while struggling for autonomy" (p. 29). If a child is placed in the position of always having to ask for Holocaust information, conflict will arise between wanting to have a sense of one's history and knowing that the giving of this information causes pain to the parents. Or, the fact that the information is not given in a threatening manner but not given entirely willingly either may lead to conflict arising from simultaneous gratification and frustration by the parents. The sense is that the child is not prohibited from exploration, but his or her path to separation and individuation is not made entirely easy by the parents. Theoretically, however, one could not be a Moratorium forever, and such an individual would be expected to "take a break" and be a Diffusion for a while, or to move on to become Achieved.

Achieved individuals are those who "have families from whom they can differentiate successfully and maintain a rapprochement" and who have "a balanced and realistic appraisal of similarities and differences" (ibid.) between themselves and their parents. To effect this, the individual needs to have resolved the "basic issues of nurturance and security" necessary for "mature identity resolution" (Orlofsky & Frank, 1986, p. 585). One would expect that this would take place in an environment where the child's, rather than the parents', needs are being met and security, or trust in the world, is possible. This would include the child being provided with a sense of his or her history without being traumatized by it.

CHAPTER VI

METHOD

Subjects

Included in the study were 16 females and 5 males (mean age = 36.2 years) who are Jewish and have at least one parent who was Jewish and living in Europe for some time between 1935 and 1945. An additional seven potential subjects were contacted; however, one did not meet the criteria, two did not return calls, and four did not have the necessary time available prior to the projected completion of data gathering.

Subjects were recruited in a number of ways. Almost half (9) were individuals who volunteered to participate after a presentation by the principal investigator to a Second Generation organization. An additional four subjects responded to a request for subjects in a local Jewish newspaper. Six subjects were referred by individuals who had already been interviewed, and two subjects were referred by a mutual acquaintance.

Instruments

Identity Status Interview (ISI) - Appendix A

The ISI protocol used in this study comprised an expanded version (Waterman, 1980) of the semi-structured ego identity interview originally developed by Marcia (1966). The expanded version is for use with adults and includes five content areas: family/career priority, vocational choice, religious ideology, political ideology, and sex role attitudes. Each area was rated with respect to one of four identity statuses on the basis of two main criteria, exploration and commitment, using Waterman, Besold, Crook, and Manzini's (1980) scoring manual. Finally an overall rating of one of the four statuses, considered to reflect the individual's characteristic

style of identity functioning, was given.

Transmission of Information Interview (TII) - Appendix B

This interview was constructed for use in the present study. The questions that constitute the interview were generated by the principal investigator who had earlier circulated a briefer interview protocol to her two research supervisors and a published author in the area of first and second generation Holocaust survivors. In response to suggestions from these individuals and upon further reflection, the present semi-structured interview protocol was constructed. The interview includes questions such as "When did you first find out about your parents' Holocaust experiences?"; "What would happen if you asked your parents about those experiences?"; "How might you be different from children whose parents are not Holocaust survivors?"; and "How will/have you approach/ed this aspect of your family's history with your child/ren?"

The protocol was essentially standard for all subjects but a degree of flexibility was allowed. For example, some questions were answered in the context of responding to other questions and therefore were not asked specifically later. Furthermore, certain questions were sometimes elucidated or rephrased if a subject had difficulty responding to the original wording of the question. Overall, it was intended that subjects feel as comfortable as possible so that candor in disclosure of personal family history would be maximized.

Procedure

Because of the various ways in which subjects were recruited, there were a number of ways in which actual participation was arranged by the principal investigator. Subjects who had volunteered from the Second Generation organization were contacted, reminded of their offer, and asked if they still wished to participate. If so, a mutually convenient time and venue

were arranged. Subjects referred by others were contacted and told who the caller was, how she came into possession of their names and telephone numbers, and the general nature and purpose of the study, including the extent of the required time commitment. They were asked if they wished to participate; again, if so, a mutually convenient time and place were arranged. Appointments were made in much the same way with subjects who responded to the publicized request for subjects. This request included a general statement of purpose of the study, criteria for inclusion, and the principal investigator's telephone numbers.

Most interviews were conducted in the subjects' homes. The research assistant usually arrived first, introduced herself and administered the informed consent package (Appendix C). Each subject signed and returned one copy and kept the other for his or her records. The ISI then commenced. The principal investigator arrived after approximately one and one-quarter hours (the estimated time of completion of the ISI) and, after a brief break and introductions, the TII was administered. At the end of this interview the subject was debriefed.

The ISI was always administered by the research assistant and the TII always by the principal investigator. This was done because the research assistant was necessary for establishing inter-rater reliability and, therefore, it was preferable that she be blind to the hypotheses. To ensure this as much as possible, it was decided that she be trained in only one of the interviews. The ISI was chosen because it was thought to be relatively more structured and easier to learn than the TII.

In addition the ISI was always administered first, the TII second, except in two cases. In each of those instances the investigators arrived at the same time to interview a married couple; therefore in each case one spouse was administered the TII first and the ISI second. The usual sequence of ISI - TII was utilized, again, to maximize candor in disclosure. That is, it was anticipated that, relative to the areas addressed by the ISI, the Holocaust might be more difficult to talk about with a virtual stranger. Therefore, administering the ISI first was

intended to allow the subject to become comfortable with being interviewed and, thereby, to establish rapport in the first interview which would carry over to the second interview.

Debriefing

Debriefing comprised a reiteration of the originally stated intent of the study, but with more detail provided regarding the various ways in which parental Holocaust experiences might be transmitted. Furthermore it was explained that a number of characteristic ways of making decisions about important life choices were hypothesized to be associated with the ways in which children found out about their parents' Holocaust experiences, more so than with the nature of those experiences. Examples were given of foreclosed, diffuse, moratorium, and achieved styles, but those actual category names were not used. All subjects were thanked for their time and interest and were asked if they knew of anyone else who might be interested in taking part in the study. Finally, they were assured that they would receive a written summary of the results of the study upon its completion.

Reliability of Identity Status and Transmission Category Ratings

Each interviewer tape-recorded and rated her own interviews. Each tape was then rated independently by the other interviewer. In the case of a disagreement, a final rating was reached through mutual reanalysis of the interview, although this was still considered a disagreement. For the ISI an inter-rater agreement of 95% was obtained (Kappa = .91); for the TII inter-rater agreement was 86% (Kappa = .77).

CHAPTER VII

RESULTS

Sample characteristics

Subjects were sixteen (76%) adult females and five (24%) adult males ranging in age from 26 - 41 years ($\bar{x}$ = 36.2; s.d. = 3.75). All but two subjects (10%) were of families in which both parents were survivors. Only one parent (3%) was described as having lived "underground" working with the Resistance; six (16%) were able to escape continental Europe before the start of the war; eight (21%) were survivors of concentration camps, as well as having survived very difficult situations in hiding, in ghettos, and/or slave labour camps. The remaining 23 (60%) parents survived similar living situations in an occupied country or in Russia. This gives a total of only 38 parents (35 still living) for 21 subjects because two subjects each had one non-survivor parent and two subjects were siblings thereby sharing the same two parents. Seven survivor parents (18%) had been married previously to spouses who were killed by the Nazis, and had lost, altogether, seven children under similar circumstances. In addition, one child died during the course of a successful attempt by one subject's parents to escape from the Nazis.

Nine subjects (43%) were born in the U.S. or Canada; the families of the remaining twelve had immigrated to North America by the time the subject was seven years old. All of the subjects had attended university or college although five of them (23%) did not complete their programmes. For six subjects (29%) the the highest degree obtained was at a Bachelor's level; for four (19%) it was a Master's degree; and, six (29%) had completed the highest degree obtainable in their field, e.g., Ph.D, LL.B, M.D. A large proportion of subjects (33%) held degrees in and/or worked in some aspect of the mental health profession, and almost 20% had careers in education. Other careers included law, medicine, public health (excluding

mental health), business, and media or public relations work.

Fourteen subjects (66%) were married, eleven for the first time. Twelve subjects were married to other Jews, six to other second generation survivors (four of them comprised two married couples). Of the seven unmarried subjects, all female, four had never married and three were divorced. Twelve of the subjects (57%) had children, between one and three each, for a total of nineteen children and a mode of two per family. In addition, three subjects were pregnant at the time of the interviews, two of them having no other children.

Recruitment of Subjects

It was anticipated that the recruitment of a statistically optimal number of subjects would be a problem, although the extent of the problem was unexpected. That is, initial response to a request for subjects was good; it was expected that the response rate would drop but that a "reasonable" number of potential subjects would hear or read of the project and be interested in taking part. This did not happen. Despite an appeal to the general membership of the second generation organization via their newsletter, no members other than those who had volunteered initially volunteered to participate in the study.

Letters to the editor in two small community newspapers yielded only one interested individual who did not fulfill the criteria for participation. A broader, more general, appeal to the public was considered but the idea was rejected because of the perceived sensitive nature of the study's topic and orientation. As it was, a letter requesting participants, printed in a local Jewish newspaper, elicited a telephoned response that was strongly anti-Semitic. Therefore, referral by "word of mouth" became the method of choice for obtaining subjects. However, it is a recruitment method that requires more time than was available for the present study. Nonetheless, as small as the sample is, its almost equal division between members of the second generation organization and non-members is an advantage for purposes of statistical analysis.

Statistical analyses

Although a number of specific hypotheses were generated *a priori* as noted earlier, the present study was essentially an exploratory one. Therefore, the following is a report not only of the results of tests on specific hypotheses, but also of results of a number of analyses conducted *a posteriori*, to elucidate additional potentially interesting areas for future research. It is acknowledged that this may increase the probability that some analyses will have reached significance by chance.

The four identity statuses and four modes of transmission generated a sixteen-cell contingency table (see Table 1). For the purposes of analysis, however, the identity status and transmission of information categories were collapsed from four into two each on a number of dimensions. The four identity statuses were divided into two groups on four dimensions, commitment (Achieved and Foreclosed) versus no commitment (Moratorium and Diffuse); exploration (Achieved, Moratorium, and Diffuse) versus no exploration (Foreclosed); high identity (Achieved and Moratorium) versus low identity (Foreclosed and Diffuse); and, "some" identity (Achieved, Moratorium, and Foreclosed) versus "no" identity (Diffuse).

The four modes of transmission of information were divided ~~into two~~ groups on three dimensions of disclosure; negative (Groups 1 and 2) versus positive (Groups 3 and 4); full (Groups 2 and 4) versus partial (Groups 1 and 3); and vague (Group 1) versus non-vague (Groups 2, 3, and 4). This generated twelve different analyses that utilized cross tabulations of categorical data (12 - 2 x 2 contingency tables), none of which yielded statistically significant results. However, significantly more subjects were found in the Diffuse identity status than in any other status, and in all other statuses combined ($\chi^2(3, N = 21) = 11.6$; $p < .005$ and $\chi^2(1, N = 21) = 13.1$; $p < .005$, respectively). Furthermore, significantly more subjects were found in Group 1 than in any other transmission group, and in all other groups combined ($\chi^2(3, N = 21) = 14.2$; $p < .005$ and $\chi^2(1, N = 21) = 11.6$; $p < .005$, respectively).

Table 1

Identity Statuses by Transmission Modes

ISI TII

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total
Diffuse	7	1	4	0	12
Foreclosed	3	1	0	1	5
Moratorium	0	0	1	0	1
Achieved	2	0	1	0	3
Total	12	2	6	1	21

A number of the *post hoc* cross tabulations also reached statistical significance, especially with respect to differences between subjects recruited from the second generation organization and subjects recruited from the community at large. Subjects from the organization tended to be females ($\chi^2(1, N = 21) = 4.92$; $p = .03$) who had received information regarding parental Holocaust experience in negative ways ($\chi^2(1, N = 16) = 6.11$; $p = .01$). For all subjects, the relationship between receiving parental information in a negative or a vague manner and being recruited from the organization approached significance ($\chi^2(1, N = 21) = 3.5$; $p = .06$ and $\chi^2(1, N = 21) = 2.74$; $p = .10$, respectively).

Subjects who had received information regarding parental Holocaust experience in a vague manner tended to be significantly older than subjects who had received that information in a non-vague manner (mean age = 39 and mean age = 33, respectively) ($\chi^2(1, N = 21) = 4.07$; $p = .04$). This relationship approached significance when mode of transmission was assessed on the dimension of partial versus full disclosure ($\chi^2(1, N = 21) = 3.18$; $p = .07$).

Transmission of Information Interview

What is particularly striking about the individuals in this study, as a group, is the paucity of information conveyed to them about their parents' Holocaust experience. Second generation survivors seem to feel this lack of information keenly and many expressed a desire to fill the monumental gaps in their understanding of their families' histories.

Even within the lack of information there are many variations. Some subjects reported never having been told anything specific; others remember having been told but have forgotten certain details, e.g., names of camps, dates of incarcerations, contexts of events in parents' lives. Furthermore, they acknowledged that they have been told and forgotten the same information on previous occasions. For many, further clarification of those details is seen as unlikely because they were given in spontaneous outbursts by parents in the past but have

never been acknowledged as a topic for discussion. On the other hand, two subjects offered to telephone parents in the presence of the interviewer in order to clear up confusion about details.

The process of discovery

Some second generation survivors were in early adulthood before they had any real notion of what their parents, and grandparents, had been through. One woman, now in her early thirties, remembers early incidents such as taking a form to school to be signed (for purposes of compensation by the German government), or overhearing conversations about the Holocaust. But, she said, "I didn't want to hear about it so I didn't listen. I didn't think about [the death of] my grandparents until my trip to Israel [about eight years ago] and it was the first time I cried in fifteen years." It was then that she started asking her parents about their survival of the Holocaust and they were able to talk about it to a limited extent. A number of subjects have requested and been granted, in the past few years, taped personal histories of their parents' Holocaust experiences. Some of these histories are reported to be incomplete due to the upset of the parents in recounting their experiences. Other subjects mentioned their desire to do these tapings with their parents "one of these days, before it's too late." However, they have extreme reservations about making the actual request because they are afraid of causing pain to their parents by asking them to recall intentionally their traumatic pasts.

For some children the process of discovery has been a long and painful one, hearing different versions of the same story at different ages, or hearing a new aspect of the story every time that it is told. Now, in adulthood, they are still not sure of what the true version is and they may never know because the only ones able to tell are unwilling or, because of ill health, unable to do so. As one subject related

> Finding out [about my mother's Holocaust experiences] has been really difficult and lots of what I have found out has been [bits] that I've had to piece together

and even hearing my mother's actual stories [now]...there are a lot of inconsistencies." One subject has known from an early age that he was born in a refugee camp, but did not discover until his late teens that this camp had also been one of the well-known concentration camps. After having had this fact revealed to him by family friends, the young man asked his parents why they had not told him this. They replied that they did not want him to feel burdened by the fact that he had been born "in **that** place." In the case of one subject, certain aspects of his parents' Holocaust histories were first, unwittingly, revealed in a joint counselling session with his father. Additional details were never provided because, he said, "He was uncomfortable, I was uncomfortable, so I didn't ask." This subject commented that even now he feels that he was "duped" into accepting so little information, and is embarrassed that he never thought to query his parents. Another subject who still has little information about that part of her parents' lives said, "We were brought up in such a strange way, that [the Holocaust] wasn't real".

A number of subjects disclosed that a lot of the information they have about that part of their parents' lives came through their own spouses, who appear to have less difficulty asking questions of their survivor in-laws. Furthermore, the second generation spouses expressed surprise that their parents would be that forthcoming with individuals who were not of the second generation or even, in two cases, not Jewish. In a number of other cases, information about parental Holocaust experiences came from survivor in-laws who knew the subject's parents during that time, or came to know them since.

Despite the shared lack of information cited above, most subjects professed always to have known that their parents were Holocaust survivors. One subject said that she knew "three months pre-birth", but most simply acknowledged that it was something that they grew up with. For example, "I always knew. My mother did not have a [concentration camp] number, but I always knew." Another said, "It's something I just always knew [although] not the details until much later. [But] my sense of the Holocaust was always there." Still another

reported, "It's always been part of my life...that my parents had lost their family [sic],...their youth, their childhood...[that] everything that was familiar to them was obliterated." And one subject summed it up with an interesting analogy, as follows:

> It wasn't so much telling us...it was a matter of grown-ups talking...I don't know when my mother specifically told me. I think it was sort of like sex; she never did [tell me] and one day I asked her...but it was always expected that you would know...it was just part of life.

These subjects grew up in close-knit enclaves, within metropolitan centres, of survivors and their children and overheard conversations between their parents and other survivors; they saw the numbers on the arms of their parents' friends. Their friends and many of their school-mates were the children of their parents' friends. In that environment, said one subject, "I thought that everybody had been through the Holocaust." Another related that not until she left home did she learn that other people, i.e., non-survivors and non-Jews, lived differently from the way in which she had been raised.

A small number of subjects did not grow up in this cultural milieu and did not experience the same kind of identification, although they had a notion of their parents' survivorship. One subject, whose parents were the only members of both their families to escape the Nazis by fleeing Europe, reported having felt that "nobody was like my parents and nobody was like me. I felt different and ashamed; [being the child of Jews and survivors] was sort of a curse to have to live with." Another subject, now married to a non-Jew, said that when she was young her family did not mix with Jews, so she never felt Jewish. She was aware only that her parents were immigrants and that "this wasn't their first marriage."

For the few subjects who received explicit information in childhood regarding their parents' experiences, there was a wide range of contexts in which this information was conveyed. Some subjects remembered having a parent sit them down one day and start talking for the first time about a murdered spouse and/or child. Others had information conveyed to them when stimuli such as "German connotation products", people's names, or

Alsatian dogs triggered conversations about personal Holocaust experiences. The trauma and upset associated with the recollection of those events made some children feel that these were not the kind of things one asked questions about; for many of those children, who are now adults, those feelings never went away.

Some subjects reported having felt able to ask questions but having chosen not to, because they didn't want "lectures" and were afraid that once the telling started it would never stop. A very few of the subjects felt able to ask questions and did, with the focus of the questions changing from the very personal, in early childhood, to more general questions about the Holocaust in adolescence and young adulthood. Others professed to have been disinterested in asking questions, as the following statement poignantly illustrates:

> If I had ever been interested, I could have got my father to talk about it but I was totally disinterested, **totally**, and didn't want to know about it and actually didn't want to believe it. I mean, I just never wanted to think about it on any level; and it was such a thorough 'never wanting to think about it' that I have no memories of not wanting [to know]...like it wasn't even a struggle. Like obviously the struggle took place when I was very, very young. And all I can remember is being totally disinterested.

There were differences, of course, between parents, so that one was more forthcoming with information or amenable to discussion than the other. For example, "my father would start to say things and my mother would stop him." One subject, whose father was in the Resistance, reported that her father talked relatively openly and easily about his Holocaust experiences, and was fairly responsive to questions. Her mother, who at various times was in one of the Polish ghettos, a concentration camp, and in hiding, would become visibly upset and cry a great a deal when conversation turned to the Holocaust, and spoke about it with much difficulty. Another subject reported that her father talked very little about his experiences; when he did "it was always with a lesson, like 'don't get complacent'." Her mother, on the other hand, talked more easily about her experiences and with "a sense of accomplishment...[for] overcoming the odds." Another subject related that her father has always become too upset to talk about the Holocaust, but she found out about some of his

Holocaust activities from a published personal account he had written. Her mother, she said, "sat me down and told me [her account] a few years ago." A few subjects received all the information they have about one parent from the other parent, although occasionally one parent had not been told, either, of the other parent's experiences.

Even if a child knew that his or her parents were Holocaust survivors, the meaning or impact of that was often not understood for years. Sometimes the empathic understanding of one's parents' experiences, whether one knew the details or not, came at age 8 or 9, sometimes in the early or late teens, sometimes not until adulthood. One subject described her moment of understanding as follows:

> I was sitting in a restaurant with my child and my husband...and the following thoughts went through my mind, which I had [had] many times [before] - my child was a year old at that point - and I thought, "Oh, I'll have to tell my mother that [my child] did such and such" or some sort of thing that I would share with with her about how great [my child] is [Speaker's voice breaks] and then - I'm going to get emotional - [Speaker cries while continuing]...and then the thought went through my mind which had never gone through my mind [before], that my mother had three children...and **obviously** the same kinds of thoughts went through her mind of "I have to tell my mother..." and her mother was dead, and that thought never had went through my mind [before]. I don't know how, how you can be [my age]...and never realize that. And I just started to cry in the restaurant, I just went hysterical [i.e., crying as I am now]. And, not only was her mother dead but her mother had been tortured...All of these things, the reality of the Holocaust, the fact that it had really happened, [the awareness] suddenly happened, it just suddenly took place. I just suddenly felt [the Holocaust] for the first time.

Life as a mission

Twenty years ago, Vivian Rakoff observed that the life of the child of a survivor seems to be "not a life to be lived, but a mission." Not surprisingly this was observed also in the present study although not to the extent that was expected. In the case of one subject, this sense of mission was articulated as follows:

> Everything that's happened, it puts tremendous pressure on a child. It's almost as if you have to live because of these people that have died. There's a tremendous responsibility to live and not just to live but to live well, and to live very fully, and to live very successfully, and to live very happily and creatively and to do something...to move mountains;...it's even more so with survivors' kids [than with

> children of non-survivor Jews and immigrants]. There was an insistence on excellence, excelling to the point that you win a Nobel Prize [or] find a cure for cancer; you don't just bungle along. You are the future and you have to make up for the fact that so much was lost.

This speaker's father lost his first wife and their young daughter to the Nazis. Before the birth of this second child by his second wife, he "was almost obsessed with the fact that it would be a daughter." It was, and she was named for the first child. For the young woman quoted above, everything she does must have meaning in a larger context. A similar sentiment was expressed by a subject who said,

> Those people, the six million [who died], are always sort of with me. I don't do things for them but I think they didn't die in vain because I'm...doing my best and I'm continuing their spirit or something...Everything [I do] is meaning-oriented...If I'd been born on the same date in the horoscope [but not to survivors] I'm sure I'd still be intense...because that's the way I'm supposed to be but I'd be intense in a completely different way [and] not **as** intense.

Another subject conveyed a sense of "mission" in the context of her own birth and the imminent birth of her child. Her mother is a child-survivor who attempted and failed to save her own younger sister from the Nazis. The subject described having always had a sense of herself, as a female first-born, as a replacement for her mother's murdered little sister. She believes that her mother had this sense also and that this is why her mother "went out of her way" to tell her, rather than her younger siblings, of her Holocaust experiences. She is now looking forward to the birth of her own child who "has to be a girl" because the death of her mother's sister "has to be finished." She also construes this as reparation to her mother because, in having a younger sister herself, she said, "I have something my mother lost."

Certainly other subjects expressed strong feelings with respect to the Holocaust and their parents' experience of it. The second generation's responses to what the first generation went through range from shame, as cited earlier, to tremendous admiration; from a "second generation" bitterness and rage to sadness and regret for the lost lives of the living. Said one subject, whose father survived five or six years in the labour camps,

> You grow up with an infinite, infinite amount of respect for someone who has gone through that. Knowing that you know someone who's gone through those kinds of experiences gives you a lot of inner strength just in your own life, [so] that you know you can survive no matter how terrible a situation is, that you have the inner ability to do it [i.e., survive].

Said another

> [My siblings and I] are as optimistic a group as you will find. We feel that, if nothing, else, my parents showed us that it's possible to survive anything, no matter how horrible or difficult;...and not only is it possible to survive, it's possible to go on, so that is something that they've really imparted to us.

Another conveyed a sense of awe about "how brave" her parents were and about "the miracles that kept them alive."

Some children of survivors spoke somewhat more bitterly as in the case of the young woman who said, "I feel like a survivor. It's not my choice. I'd rather my parents not have gone through the experience and not be the child of survivors." Said another, "It's still painful for me; for example, [to think] 'my mother was a slave'....The stories are so sad, I want to cry." Another sentiment often expressed was reflected in the comment that "it really gives you a long-term feel for anger, a lot of that [as well as] a significant feeling of loss." Some subjects also talked about their own feelings of guilt, as conveyed by one woman who, while talking about her mother, said "[I felt] guilty that she had to go through [the Holocaust]. She never said [anything] to make me feel guilty. I just did."

For some individuals, the Holocaust is as alive for them now as it was (and perhaps still is) for their parents. One subject, who started the interview with the statement that he was "not influenced by the Holocaust more than the average Jew", ended with the following words:

> I don't want to think about the Holocaust actually. I don't want to think about the effects it had on [pause] people. But then once I'm faced with it, I don't want to avoid it. I feel compelled to think about it. It's not just a piece of history; it's a horrible flaming event in my mind. But most of my working day I don't even want to think about it much. I want to put it in a compartment and just sort of bounce off it as necessary.

Said another, "You live with the horror of it;...you realize that there's a world out there that

doesn't care."

There is an ambivalence among second generation survivors, with respect to how they view their parents and their parents' experiences. This is rarely expressed but often implied. One subject responded early in the TII as follows:

> I was never ashamed that my parents were survivors of the Holocaust. I recognized early that there was a tragedy associated with my parents and that it made them be less free, more fearful, more clingy, more controlling, less adventuresome, more desiring of security than other people, and that this sadness left them less than playful. In fact my mother said that a few years ago, just exactly like that. But I knew that. I think it takes some maturity...to realize that all of your history makes for a richness, all of who you are.

Later in the interview this individual talked about her awareness in childhood of having unmet needs; in her words, "I needed more powerful people to make me feel more secure." But she did not perceive her parents as more powerful and, she stated, "I resented that." Her present awareness of herself in relation to important others suggests that she resents it still.

Current parental disclosure about the Holocaust

As noted earlier, for some parents discussion of the Holocaust is just as difficult now as it was when their children were growing up and the experience was much more recent. Said one subject,

> They're very interested in pursuing a happy life now; and they're very concerned about taking good care of themselves and having a good time, and that's obviously a result of the bad time they had [during the Holocaust]...Yet they're still hurt and angry and bitter and scared...I don't think they've lost the pain. [When they talk about it now] they're just as emotional as they used to be...Yeah, my mother much more than my father.

Said another,

> My mother can [still] get very emotional about these things; my father less so...Except when he talks about the loss of his [first] son. If [my mother] starts getting emotional,...she'll find some crumpled piece of Kleenex, blow her nose and go on, and just finish the story. It's never been any different.

Another second generation survivor related that her father still can't talk about the Holocaust; he just starts to cry. She continued,

> My dad's not a talker; that's his personality; that's the kind of person he is. But he's also very emotional, so to bring up anything about his family...I don't even know how many brothers and sister he had. [I think] he got his emotionality from the Holocaust.

One subject, who has recently been trying to get information from her parents about their experiences, disclosed that she used "emotional blackmail" to get her mother to talk. That is, she impressed upon her mother the importance of that information to her own son's (the grandson's) Jewish identity; she received a one hour tape of her mother's experiences. But, she said, "At this point, it's almost like [the Holocaust] is almost forgotten,...that her life is so separate from that [now]." Her father, however, has been unable to talk for more than fifteen minutes on the subject.

> [For my father], it is much more painful. I don't think he's dealt with it much over the years. He feels guilty [for being] the only survivor [in his family]. My father is much more alone in the world.

Pre-Holocaust vs Holocaust information

Most of the parents of the second generation survivors in this study apparently were much more forthcoming about their lives before the Nazi occupation than during it. Some related stories of their earlier lives in well-to-do close families, of having "a good life", of "having fun", of leading "rich, interesting lives." They were "carefree", with "lots of family [and] friends"; "They enjoyed life." Other parents related that their pre-Holocaust lives were "hard", sometimes involving an unhappy childhood and/or early parental death.

But for some parents, talking about those earlier times was just as difficult. Memories of those times include memories of people who had been murdered by the Nazis and, therefore, remembering causes sadness. "My mother talked about before the war [but] she would cry when she would think about the loss." In addition, being unable or unwilling to talk about the Holocaust sometimes led to being unable to talk about anything. One subject, whose survivor parent gave meagre and varying accounts of his activities during the Holocaust, said rather bitterly, "It kind of stifles [any] conversation when you're trying to keep a lie

going for twenty-one years."

For a few of the survivors it was as though their lives began and ended with the Holocaust. One subject said he knows more about his parents during the Holocaust because of their "focus on how this great mass of lives disappeared all at once." Another subject described that time for his parents as "the paramount experience of their lives and of most of [their] friends."

To remember and not to forget

All the subjects agreed that it is important for succeeding generations to know about the Holocaust. One second generation survivor who is involved in the Holocaust education of her own children as well as the children of others stressed that

> The second generation has a responsibility to educate. We have no choice; we can't "take it or leave it." We need to pass on the history so that people that [sic] perished won't be forgotten and their lives weren't lost in vain. Also, people need to understand the beginnings of how those things happened.

Another subject conveyed her concern that the history of the Holocaust be kept alive; otherwise "It's...an outrage against God that these things can happen and a generation or two later it can be forgotten."

The answer to the question of how and when to tell their own children about that aspect of their family's history was not as clear. A number of subjects send, or intend to send, their children to Hebrew school which includes Holocaust education in its curriculum. In response to the question of how to deal with this topic in their homes, most subjects have waited, or will wait, for their children to bring it up, or until they reach "the age of reason", i.e., latency. They feel that when their children are ready to know they will ask, unless they do not ask in which case, at some point, they will have to be told. One subject, whose child is still an infant, added that

> My struggle [will] be how to possibly impress upon her how important [the Holocaust] is, not in terms of her own personal history but, in terms of History and human beings and how important it is that we learn a lesson from that.

This second generation survivor and others expressed concern also about providing children with information that they themselves do not have and that will pass away with the first generation. It is unfortunate that, at least for the present sample, there appears to be little communication about the Holocaust between survivors and their grandchildren. The most likely explanation for this is that most of them live great distances from one another and visit together infrequently.

Self-perceived transgenerational effects of the Holocaust

All but one of the individuals interviewed indicated that they have been affected by their parents' Holocaust experiences. Some discussed those effects in terms of the ways in which they were parented; others talked about them in terms of the impact of the Holocaust on them, personally. For example, subjects talked about how the Holocaust had made their parents secretive and afraid, and this was conveyed to their children with statements such as "You've got to make the world safe for yourself" and "Don't get complacent. It can happen again." One subject recalled her mother "shushing" her

> because the walls have ears. It's different when you grow up in a house that says the walls have ears, [with] a parent who really believes that, who's afraid of the system....People who have shared that experience, share [my] cynicism.

Many children commented on their parents' paranoia, particularly about non-Jews and/or non-survivors, but also about the world and its events in general. Given his parents' experiences, said one subject, "I tend to find relevance where others say it's just a piece of news." Said another, "[I am] more cautious, more nervous about anti-Semitism. It's the influence of my father['s survivorship]." Another stated flatly, "Parents alter the way you see the world." Others commented that they "live with a certain amount of guilt" for what their parents went through, and they have a hard time being "selfish", i.e., doing things for their own benefit rather than for someone else's.

Many subjects described the impact upon them of the fact that the Holocaust is part of their family's and the Jewish history. The following quote summarizes the feelings of a number of subjects.

> I feel more identified with tragedy. I get the feeling that if both my parents had been in Canada during the war, I wouldn't be as intense or identify as strongly with the Holocaust.....I always bear it in mind...Because I am a Jew, it could happen again...to me and my family and our cushy little life-style and I am more cognizant of it because it was a personal experience in the family.

Another subject said that the fact that the Holocaust happened means that "we are not in that much control of our lives" that we can always make choices. Many ascribe their heightened sensitivity to human rights violations, the fact that they "accept losses as a matter of course", their desire to be "more closely involved with Jewish life", and their sense of self-sufficiency and ability to "handle anything that comes up" to the fact that their families were victims of the Holocaust. One subject, speaking about the impact of the Holocaust on her life said, "I am very demanding of myself and others, quite aggressive,...[and] concerned with the quality of life. I am always concerned with 'what am I doing with my life?'" Subjects also expressed an almost fierce sense of the importance of family.

Many subjects admitted to anti-German feelings, although some allowed that they treat individual people of German origin or descent on an individual basis. Said one, "Sons and daughters are not responsible for [the behaviour of] preceding generations", although this same person admitted that he does not want to do business with Germans. Others also expressed a negative attitude toward Poland and non-Jewish Poles.

One individual asserted quite strongly that he had not been affected particularly by the fact that his parents were survivors. He admitted to questioning this even as he was being interviewed, but stood by his initial perceptions. His sense of himself is more as the child of immigrants and Jews, rather than survivors, per se. Yet, he occasionally considers how he would feel if he lost one of his children in the way his father did during the Holocaust. He commented that the rage this elicits in him leads him to think that "it is easier not to think

about it."

Children of survivors as children of immigrants

All the second generation survivors interviewed for this this study were also children of immigrants, most often directly to Canada from Europe. For some of these children the immigrant experience is recalled as a personal and vivid one; for others who were born in the new country, or were extremely young when they arrived there, the memories are more "parent-mediated." As might be expected, the immigrant experience was a difficult one for these families. This is expected to be the case for anyone who must learn a new language, embrace new cultural mores, and establish a new social network. One subject recalled that her mother, who survived a ghetto, a brief stay in a concentration camp, and a labour camp, said that "being an immigrant was harder than being in the Holocaust." Another subject remembered her grandparents saying that the immigrant experience was worse than the war. "They talk about it with a lot more emotion, a lot more anger" than they do the Holocaust.

A common experience for these immigrant families was to have survived the Holocaust, applied to emigrate to Canada or the United States, and waited for many months in refugee camps until their number in the quota system came up. They arrived in their new country with virtually nothing and settled in urban centres to where other survivors or family had preceded them. They created, or found employment in, small businesses and lived above them in cramped quarters. The parents talked only with other survivors, in foreign languages, about the lives they had left behind. Their children were more interested in assimilating the new culture. The older children, i.e., those who were old enough to function in the community, acted as liaisons between their European parents and the foreign culture.

If these may be viewed as the typical features of the immigrant experience, the process was more complicated for the survivors and their families. The children noted their parents' heightened sense of potential persecution and paranoia with respect to non-Jews. The

survivors found also that many non-survivor Jews were unable to understand what had happened under the Nazis and were no more accepting than were the non-Jews. In addition, the young children of survivors recognized that their parents were burdened with a tremendous sense of sadness and loss, a burden that the parents of their non-survivor immigrant school-mates did not seem to bear.

Psychological Difficulties

The present study did not attempt to ascertain the degree to which any of the individuals interviewed were experiencing any form of psychopathology. In the clinical opinions of the two interviewers, no gross psychology was demonstrated. However, if it did not come up in the context of responses to other questions, subjects were asked if they or any member(s) of their families had utilized the services of the mental health profession.

Some subjects responded that they, one of their parents, or other members of their families had either received counselling or been in therapy. Parents of three subjects had received psychiatric diagnoses. Some subjects merely commented that one or another member of their family should have sought therapy but did not. Most often the need for psychological intervention, whether received or not, for members of one's family was ascribed to sequelae of the Holocaust. However, for the few subjects who had sought counselling or therapy, the Holocaust was rarely implicated in their reasons for going.

With respect to parental psychological difficulties, the major problems described by their children were fear of loss, and guilt. Two subjects each related that a parent had threatened or attempted suicide when the child was leaving home. Many of the parents were described as individuals who are "really nervous about people going away", who grieved the "loss" of their children to other parts of the country. As one subject described it, their parents' attitude is "How could someone **choose** to leave" family and friends?

Almost all of the subjects talked about the effects on their parents of the guilt of having survived while others perished. Said one, "my father never recovered [from the] guilt, anger, bitterness, and frustration that he couldn't save his family." A number of subjects talked about the guilt their parents still experience over having convinced other family members to stay behind while they themselves fled, fully convinced that they and not their families were in the most danger. Others reported that their parents feel guilty for having been present when others were taken away by the Nazis and having made no attempts at rescue.

CHAPTER VIII

DISCUSSION

Any discussion of the results of this study must, of course, be tempered by the fact that the sample's size and the sampling methods used may have resulted in a sample non-representative of the population of non-clinical second generation survivors. However, on some dimensions, the characteristics of the present sample do not appear to diverge a great deal from those found in other studies of a similar nature. For example, a non-statistical examination suggests that in terms of age, proportion of married subjects, proportion of subjects with children, level of education, and socio-economic status (SES), the present second generation sample is comparable to one used by Russell, Plotkin, and Heapy (1985). Sigal and Weinfeld (1985), who proposed that their sample was the least biased one used to date and, thus, most representative of the second generation, found a similar level of education and SES. However, their sample was somewhat younger and included a greater proportion of single people.

The large proportion of the present second generation sample working within the mental health profession was found also by Russell et al. (1985) and has been noted by Levine (1982) and Prince (1985). This finding may be due to the possibility that mental health professionals are more likely to agree to participate in studies by other mental health professionals. On the other hand it is worth noting that subjects in the present study were found in all four identity statuses and that various modes of transmission were evidenced. This suggests that, despite the self-selection of subjects which normally restricts the range of data, a reasonable sample of the second generation was obtained.

The finding that over one-half (57%) of the subjects were rated as Diffusions was not entirely unexpected. As the earlier literature review indicates, a large number of second generation survivors have vague, incomplete information about their parents' Holocaust

experience, and this was found also in the present study. Furthermore, it was hypothesized that more individuals who received covert, vague disclosure with resistance (Group 1) would be found in the Diffusion status than in any other status. This was found in the present study in terms of absolute numbers, although the hypothesized relationship did not hold in terms of relative frequency. The implications of this finding will be discussed later.

The finding that there were so few individuals who had received "threatening full explicit disclosure" (Group 2) was somewhat surprising as this mode of transmission is noted often, particularly in the psychoanalytic literature. Given the nature of that body of literature, it may be that a prevalence of other modes of transmission is to be expected in a non-clinical sample. It is also possible that if this study had been conducted elsewhere, more Group 2 individuals would have been found. That is, the data for most of the research with second generation survivors come from individuals in Eastern Canada and the U.S.; both of these areas appear to have larger and more cohesive communities of Jews in general and survivors in particular. It might also then follow that more Foreclosures would be found in these other communities because, as noted by Waterman (1982), individuals who grow up in homogeneous communities, with little exposure to alternative life-styles, may be more likely to form and maintain Foreclosure commitments.

That differences were found between subjects recruited from the Second Generation organization and those recruited from the community at large was not surprising but interesting nonetheless. The fact that more females came from the organization may reflect only that females comprised most of the subjects. However, individuals who have only the vaguest information regarding their parents' Holocaust experience or who received the information in a threatening manner may feel more of a desire to be part of an organized group of people with similar experiences than would people for whom this is a more integrated, less contentious aspect of their lives. Such a group seems to serve not only as a supportive context in which to explore and come to terms with the personal meaning to be

ascribed to the Holocaust, but also as an organization in which to demonstrate one's commitment to keeping the Holocaust within public remembrance. This may be related to the findings of Tauber (1981) who noted that children of survivors who were involved with a group of other children of survivors were more strongly identified as such, in addition to having a stronger Jewish identity, but also felt more alienated. Furthermore, Goldburg (1983) found that children of survivors were more alienated than children of non-survivor, non-immigrant Jews.

Subjects not involved with the organization, some of whom were aware of its existence and some of whom were so made aware, suggested (somewhat defensively) that they did not "need" such involvement. They spoke of the Holocaust as a tragic event in the lives of their parents that had happened and, to some extent, had affected them, and life went on from there. They tended to view the coming together of second generation survivors in a group as analogous to group therapy, and they considered that inappropriate for themselves. Since subjects from the community were often referred to the study by one another, a more socially oriented network may fulfill any desire for affiliation with other second generation survivors. If they choose to demonstrate their commitment to remembrance of the Holocaust this may be done in the context of Jewish observances and not specifically as first or second generation survivors. Nonetheless it was noted that non-group individuals who also had received little information regarding the Holocaust were still quite curious as to how their experience of second generation survivorship compared with that of others. Tauber's study did not seek to examine any relationship between transmission of Holocaust information and reference group involvement. However, it may be that mode of transmission is related to the identification and alienation noted by Tauber and that this is expressed through involvement with a reference group.

The finding regarding a relationship between age of subject and mode of transmission appears to parallel the trend in the Holocaust literature regarding transgenerational effects.

That is, as the number of years since the Holocaust has increased, the literature has reported less psychopathology and has discussed the intergenerational effects, if any, more in terms of identity issues. One explanation for this trend is that research with the second generation has increasingly become the concern of social scientists who are themselves members of the second generation. Therefore, the interest is in looking at how well and not how poorly the second generation is doing. It is unfortunate that there have been no follow-up reports of the children of survivors upon whom the early studies of Rakoff and Sigal and Trossman are based. It would seem important to know how well or how poorly these individuals are doing in adulthood, and what made the difference.

In any case it is possible that the more time that has passed since their experiences, the more able many parents are to talk about them to their children, and the better the prognosis for the second generation. This could account for the significant difference in age between subjects who received vague and/or partial and non-vague and/or full information, and for the decreased reporting of psychopathology. It may be that the task of resettlement in a foreign culture together with the extreme recency of the Holocaust contributed to the relative inability of parents to share information with children born at that time. For example, many writers (e.g., Bergmann & Jucovy, 1982) have discussed the "psychic numbing" of survivors as an immediate result of the Holocaust. Once the initial stages of resettlement were completed, and some temporal and emotional distance could be gained from the Holocaust, some parents may have been better equipped to share their experiences with later-born children.

This may not have been entirely positive, as in the case of two siblings interviewed for the present study. Both appeared to have a lot of information about their parents' Holocaust experiences, but the contexts in which this information was given appeared to be somewhat different. The older sibling recalled that his parents' pre-Holocaust lives were discussed more, whereas the younger said that he knows more about his parents' lives during the Holocaust. Disclosure to the younger sibling seems to have been more affect-laden, although this could

be a reflection of the subject's, and not the parents', relational style. Both siblings grew up in a community of first and second generation survivors, but the elder participated in his parents' immigrant experience whereas the younger was born some years later. Ultimately, the mode of transmission for the younger sibling was rated as "full threatening", whereas for the older sibling it was "full non-threatening."

Instruments

Although it is said that it is a poor worker who blames her tools, some difficulties were noted with the instruments used in the present study. The most obvious difficulty was with the measure constructed for the present study, the Transmission of Information interview. While the interview itself appears to have face validity, and reliability has been established for the rating criteria, it may have been more useful to use a more objective measure already validated elsewhere. The fact that such a measure exists (Lichtman, 1984) did not become apparent until well after the present study had been conceived and proposed. Lichtman's questionnaire produced six factors or categories of parental communication which are quite similar to, but better defined than, the transmission categories proposed for the present study. Using the questionnaire could have facilitated the data collection and analysis for the present study, and may have provided additional validition for a useful measure for future research.

Difficulties were noted also with the Identity Status interview protocol. First, although it comprises questions to be asked of adults, it does not recognize sufficiently the vast array of contemporary adult experience that may include phenomena such as divorce and remarriage. For example, the protocol contains no questions regarding divorce or its importance in one's life. But divorce and/or the breaking up of a first marriage is bound to have an impact on one's attitudes and future life-choices and, therefore, should be addressed directly in the interview. The questions regarding marriage tend to apply more to a first, "younger" marriage, with an emphasis on parental attitudes and how marriage changed one's plans. These issues

tend to be less relevant in second, "older" marriages when individuals are likely to be somewhat more established in other areas such as careers. In fact, subjects perceived many of the questions as irrelevant to their later marriages. A general comment on the interview section on marriage is that there are no questions regarding the choice of a particular partner, and parents' response to such a partner. This was an important aspect for some of the subjects in the present study, e.g., with respect to marrying a non-Jew.

Another important phenomenon not addressed by the interview is that of individuals who are not married but who "live together". It would seem important to the intent of the interview to ask about this, e.g., Why are they not married? Was a choice made? How was this choice made? Is the situation likely to change in the future? Why/Why not? In addition, the organization of the "Family Roles" section implies that people who are married have or will have children, and that people who have not married do not yet have children. These assumptions may apply often, but not always.

Furthermore, the questions regarding sex roles appear not to recognize that, in the wake of feminism, use of the words "masculine" and "feminine" is no longer appropriate in the context of the intent of the interview. Many of the subjects in the present study had difficulty responding to this section because of the connotations of those two adjectives. It may be that asking what it means to be male or female would be more useful. Also, the prevailing egalitarian attitudes toward sex roles, at least in this culture, make it likely that expressing such attitudes or even acting on them to some degree can be a function of social desirability with respect to one's cohorts and/or the interviewer. The questions regarding sex roles do not assess this. Therefore, attitudes toward sex roles might be assessed along the same lines as political ideology, with similar questions regarding exploration of and commitment to feminist attitudes. Many individuals hold these attitudes but do not see them in the context of political ideology. Therefore, they do not mention them when discussing politics.

Second, although the protocol allows for alternative terminology for use with non-Christian subjects in the section on religion, it appears not to allow for the fact that a large number of Jews are "ethnic Jews", as one subject put it. These are individuals for whom being Jewish is a cultural matter and not a religious one.

In the present study many subjects seemed foreclosed on ethnic Judaism, but they could not be rated as Foreclosed. That is, these subjects did not appear to demonstrate uniquely Jewish values in family/career priority, vocational choice, political ideology, or sex role attitudes. They do not have "Jewish" jobs and Zionism was not mentioned as an issue of concern. Most have never considered affiliating with any religion other than Judaism, but many are not particularly religious. They do not keep kosher households or the Sabbath, and they do not attend synagogue or have prayers on a regular basis. They do observe some of the rituals of the "important" Jewish religious festivals, i.e., Pesach and Hanukkah, and admit that they do this for reasons of cultural identity, or out of a sense of duty, not for religious reasons. Some send their children to Hebrew school, mostly because the standard of education found there is perceived to be higher than at other schools.

The sense that is conveyed is one of a lack of exploration beyond many traditional rituals, which would seem characteristic of Foreclosure, without the kind of commitment that defines Foreclosure. Rather, commitment is a function of personal circumstances, e.g., one's time of life, whether or not one has children, visits with parents, etc., although most subjects could not be rated as having foreclosed on their parents' values either. Consequently, despite a Foreclosed "feel" to these individuals, the criteria of the identity statuses seemed to demand a rating of Diffuse. For example, many subjects said that they were open to other career possibilities (other than their present careers) but were not actively exploring such possibilities; some had had a number of careers already. Others were in the process of thinking about changing careers but it was not an issue of concern at the time. The kinds of responses given to questions in the ISI were often, "It will emerge in time"; "I'm not settled

on where I am [with respect to some issue] by a long shot...but it's not a big concern at the moment"; "I don't need to decide. It will resolve itself in the coming year"; "I can see everyone [else's] argument too clearly [with respect to ideology]"; "I don't think about it. Let others judge"; "I sit on the fence"; or, simply, "I don't know what my attitudes are."

Kroger (1985) noted a similar situation in her study of identity status with New Zealand university students. She concluded that "this raised some issues regarding complexities of commitment versus noncommitment and appropriate criterion areas for assessment when the identity statuses framework is removed from its culture of origin" (pp. 144-145). Survivors and their children do not constitute a different culture, or even a sub-culture, but they do comprise a group of individuals with a heritage that is traumatic and different from that of the prevailing culture. For them, different or additional criterion areas for assessing ego identity may be appropriate.

A question that arises is whether or not the children of survivor Jews are "more Jewish" than children of "non-survivor" Jews. Some would suggest that they are (J.E. Marcia, personal communication, 1986; Rustin, 1971). It has been noted that children of Jewish immigrant survivors and children of non-Jewish European immigrants both are characterized by a high degree of religiosity when compared with non-Jewish American-born children (Weiss et al., 1986). Comparison with a group of children of Jewish immigrants not from Europe, as well as a matched group of second generation survivors still living in Europe, would ascertain whether this is, as Weiss et al. concluded, part of an "immigrant effect" or not. The results could indicate that the effect may have more to do with persecution or with the circumstances under which immigration took place. For members of the second generation it may be that a strong feeling of affiliation with the traditions of Judaism, whether acted upon or not, may serve as a way for them to identify with their parents and parental suffering without actually foreclosing on their parents. It may also serve the same purpose with respect to those who perished simply because they were Jewish. That is, it is important for the second generation

to be Jewish and to raise their children as Jews so that millions will not have died in vain. However, there is a large degree of flexibility in the extent to which one may commit oneself and one's family to Judaism as a culture and/or a religion, and still be considered Jewish.

Identity in Second Generation Survivors

As reported earlier, there were more individuals found in Group 1 than in any other group and there were more Diffusions than any other identity status. Furthermore, as represented in Table 1, all but one of the Diffusions received vague or piecemeal information. This suggests that with a larger sample, the hypothesized *trends* might have reached statistical significance, although all of the specific hypotheses may not have.

The issue appears to be one of establishing an ego identity and this seems to be a problem for many of the second generation survivors interviewed for the present study. In recent years (i.e., the 1980s) identity research has noted an increase in the proportion of Diffusions found among college/university students (Marcia, in preparation). In the sixties and seventies college students were more likely to be in Moratorium. Marcia has suggested that this trend toward Diffusion in adolescence may be related to the "highly competitive, laissez-faire, anti-social program ideology in North America" (p. 25) in which "packaging becomes more important than contents" (ibid.). Furthermore, there are indications that Diffusion in college is likely to be carried into adulthood (Waterman, 1982). However, most of the individuals interviewed for the present study are long out of college and therefore are unlikely to be part of the above-mentioned trend. Whether or not the trend extends also to adults in the general population would be an important area for future research within the identity status framework.

The reasons for the difficulty that second generation survivors have with ego identity may become clearer when one considers their subjective experience of being the children of survivors. First, one must return to a quote from Muuss (1975), cited earlier, that stresses the

importance of integrating the past, the present, and the future in the search for an identity. In order for successful identity establishment to occur, the past must be anchored in family and community tradition and there must be some degree of certainty about the future. The most devastating consequence of the Holocaust was the loss of family and community tradition. In most cases, the only past that survivors have been able to give to their children is the Holocaust. The task of integrating this event into their lives has been all but impossible for many survivors; it appears to be no less difficult for their children.

Furthermore, the children of survivors have been brought up with the warning that

> This world is not this world...that after Auschwitz, the ordinary rhythms and appearances of life, however innocuous or pleasant, [are] far from the truth of human existence. Underneath those rhythms and appearances [lie] darkness and menace. (Lifton, 1986, p. 3)

Second generation survivors function on two levels; on one they live their lives as do most people, making plans and engaging in activities that assume that life tomorrow will not be unlike life today. On another level they live knowing that they cannot assume such continuity. This is not a case of assuming that it is possible that one could get hit by a bus tomorrow while crossing the street. This is a case of living with the knowledge that tomorrow someone may paint a swastika on the front of one's house, or that someone in a uniform may come to the house and take away a spouse or one's children, or that one's clients or customers may start availing themselves of the services of others, who happen not to be Jewish.

These are lessons that have been taught, consciously or not, by survivors to their children. As young children they may not have believed that this would be possible - not here; not now - but they could not deny their parents' grief, bitterness, and guilt over the losses they had experienced. Who could argue, with certainty, that such a thing could not happen here, especially if one were told, "They thought the same thing in Germany." Who would even dare to argue? Even forty years later, both survivors and their children are sensitized to anti-Semitic attitudes, and find them in the apparent tolerance of some groups

and nations to accused Nazi war criminals, hate literature, and violence directed against Jews or Jewish institutions. These are perceived as very personal threats to one's security. In the face of such insecurity, it is exceedingly difficult to establish a secure and positive ego identity. As children of survivors the second generation has a more recent history of active persecution than do other Jews longer-established outside Europe; the experience of having to "pick up and move" is a more immediate one. However, as children of immigrants the second generation is more presently involved in adapting to the culture to which their parents have brought them. Adopting a diffuse identity could be a coping stategy in attempting to "find a niche" between these two conflicting demands.

It is also possible to look at the phenomenon of the diffuse identity in second generation survivors from the perspective of object-relations theory (see, e.g., Greenberg & Mitchell, 1983). The children of survivors have had a difficult task in coming to terms with who their parents are. They must have internalized their parents as whole objects initially, otherwise they would not have been able to develop cognitively or psychologically. Soon, in addition to the "normal" splitting that is assumed to occur in early ego development, another, grosser, split may have taken place with respect to the parental objects. (This does not refer to the splitting associated with the polarization of good and bad objects that, when exaggerated, is seen to be characteristic of borderline personality disorders.) The parents were idealized on the one hand because they are primary love-objects, experienced as all-knowing, all-powerful. On the other hand, they were denigrated because the children came to experience them as weak, passive victims of an event perpetrated upon them. They were perceived as having been damaged, physically and emotionally, sometimes psychologically. Instead of fulfilling their children's needs, parents often turned to their children with their own neediness. The integration of these split-objects would have been an extremely difficult task for the infant psyche.

One way of coping with this would be, in effect, to alienate oneself from one's parents because to identify with them entirely would be too difficult; and to identify with only the weak or the strong object would be too threatening. This alienation or distancing may be seen in the subjects' own reports of not remembering or believing or thinking about what they knew or suspected about their parents' Holocaust lives. And it is alienation from the parents that has been implicated in the Identity Diffusion in offspring.

The children obviously incorporated some aspects of their parents; because of those partial identifications, necessary commitments such as marriage, children, and career choices are possible. But one suspects that the "normal" process of developing an ego identity, i.e., letting go of some aspects of the parents while incorporating identifications from other sources, did not take place because the integrated identity appears not to be present. The reason that this state of affairs obtains even now is that second generation survivors are still ambivalent about their parents. There is still the split between heroes who survived incredible odds, and broken spirits who continue to mourn their losses; between wanting to approach them to fulfill a need, and not wanting to approach them for fear of the consequences. Having heroes as parents can be just as alienating in adulthood, as illustrated by the number of subjects who responded with some variation of the statement, "I marvel that they survived and I'm not sure that, under similar circumstances, I would be able to do so." The children of survivors have introjected a concept of adulthood that includes being a survivor in the way their parents are. They try to imagine themselves experiencing what their parents experienced but cannot imagine how they themselves could survive. In this sense they can never be the people (adults, parents) that their parents are; the realization of this on whatever level of understanding could well lead to alienation.

There is another way in which to conceptualize the results of the present study in terms of identity. Perhaps what looks like Diffusion with Foreclosed elements is actually Foreclosure with Diffuse elements. The work of Mary Ainsworth (e.g., 1969), John Bowlby

(e.g., 1958), and Margaret Mahler (e.g., 1963), among others, has established that the more anxious or ambivalent a child's attachment is, the more difficult it is for that child to individuate. In ego identity terms this is hypothesized to result in Foreclosure (Marcia, in press). Therefore, it may be that the children's ambivalence toward their survivor parents has resulted in an underlying Foreclosed identity. However, there is an overlay of Diffusion which reflects continued but not very energetic attempts to be different from parents and more like the prevailing culture, which has less traditional, more laissez-faire values.

There is a third possibility. That is, the diffusion seen in the individuals in this study may be similar to the present-day tendency toward diffusion as noted earlier. It may be that the economic climate and the political swing to a less social-programme-oriented ideology, in addition to a threat of nuclear annihilation, all conspire to make a firm identity a very difficult thing to maintain for anyone. Perhaps the subjects in this study have, at different times in their lives, been in other identity statuses - Foreclosures in childhood, Diffusions in early adolescence, Moratoriums in college, and Achievements in adulthood, or some variation thereof - just as anyone else in the population at large. This argument is attenuated by the self-reports of many of the subjects in the identity interviews. It is true that at different points in their lives, some subjects may have been in moratorium, i.e., actively exploring alternatives and making tentative commitments. But in many more cases situations just seemed to present themselves, to be accepted or rejected until something else came along. Commitments were made because "the time was right", or "it seemed like a good idea at the time." This suggests that many of the present Diffusions have always been Diffusions, and are not Achievements or Moratoriums being seen during a brief hiatus.

The focus of the foregoing has been the difficulty experienced by many second generation survivors in establishing integrated ego identities. However, as was seen in Table 1, subjects were found across all four identity statuses. In particular, three subjects were rated as Identity Achieved with two of them having received parental Holocaust information in a vague

manner. In these cases "vague" entails virtually no information in childhood with somewhat more detail provided indirectly in later life. These two subjects each were raised in a family in which parental psychopathology was diagnosed. Both of them described fairly traumatic early lives. Both left home in late adolescence to establish primary relationships and careers elsewhere. One has received the services of a mental health professional. Both of these individuals conveyed a sense of having worked very hard to establish separate, autonomous identities. There are still some areas of concern for them in which they would like to make some changes, but they have and are able to articulate a fairly clear sense of who they are. This suggests that being a second generation survivor may direct but need not define the process of developing an ego identity.

It was noted earlier that all but one of the subjects rated as Diffuse received parental Holocaust information in a vague or piecemeal manner. It may be that the distinction between these two modes of transmission is not a useful one and that the important thing is that parents provide the information as fully as possible of their own accord when their children are young. In itself, this may be of little value to the second generation as children of survivors. But it may be of great value to the second generation as parents of the third generation.

Recent study of the intergenerational effects of the Holocaust has found a greater degree of psychopathology among the children of the second generation than among their cohorts in the general population (J.J. Sigal, personal communication, 1986). This appears to be history repeating itself, in which case the Holocaust may have implications also for the ego identity of the third generation. One way in which this may be ameliorated is to inform the third generation of as much of their families' pasts as possible, especially that of their grandparents. There is a problem in this, of course. Who will provide the information? Many second generation survivors do not have that information and, therefore, cannot pass it on. Grandparents, the survivors themselves, are often unavailable or still unwilling to talk to young

children about such things.

Some survivors are not unwilling to talk, as film documentaries, Holocaust education projects, and (video-)recorded first-hand accounts indicate. These survivors want to ensure that the past is not forgotten, in the hopes that the Holocaust will never happen again. Their accounts also serve the function of providing a family history to some of the members of the third generation, one that extends beyond the birth of their parents or the arrival of their grandparents in a new country. It is not enough for children to know the history of their culture; they also need to have a sense of personal continuity with the past, i.e., the actual people they come from.

It is up to the second generation to confront their Holocaust heritage and, as much as possible, to convince their survivor parents of the importance of providing the information necessary to do so. The responses of many of the subjects in the present study suggest that their hesitance or refusal to ask questions even now is a way of coping with their own anxiety and fears rather than, or in addition to, the anxiety and fears of their parents. In the context of unresolved issues with parents, having to do with fantasies of their survival and the reality of unmet needs, parental upset is experienced as threatening to one's own psychological equilibrium. It is frightening to try to come to an empathic understanding of what one's parents' Holocaust experiences were. It entails having to recognize the extent to which one's parents were victimized and degraded, and the degree to which chance played a role in their survival. It reasserts the realization that, but for that role of chance, one also would not exist. Children of survivors have spent much of their lives defending against that recognition. As they say, "It's easier not to think about it." But one suspects that it is each succeeding generation's "thinking about it" and working it through that will result in the Holocaust relinquishing its hold on its living victims.

Summary and Conclusions

In terms of exploratory research, the present study has yielded some useful and interesting information regarding second generation survivors. First, it augments the growing body of research literature that addresses second generation survivors from a non-clinical perspective. (It is perhaps ironic that the confirmation of the "non-clinicalness" of the present sample is made on the basis of the impressions of the two interviewers who are graduate students in clinical psychology.) The focus away from psychopathology is an important aspect of the research, if not to science then certainly to second generation survivors.

Second, the results of the study indicate that while, under certain circumstances, being the child of Holocaust survivors can result in deficits in ego identity, these effects are modifiable by other variables including the individual him- or herself. The delineation of what additional variables mediate the impact of the Holocaust on future generations of survivors is beyond the scope of the present study. However, additional research with the survivors or children of survivors of the Holocaust and other traumata, using the ISI, could be of benefit in this regard. The results suggest also that where one grows up as a second generation survivor may also have bearing on how the intergenerational effects are played out.

Third, the results of the present study support the conclusions of Krell (1979), Prince (1985), and Roden and Roden (1982), among others, who stress that, in many respects, the second generation comprises a group of individuals who represent a large range of human variability. Second generation survivors may be characterized as a group in the same way that "males" or "females" may be thus characterized, sharing common aspects but always composed of individuals.

There is an important point to be addressed here; that is, the question of what a Diffuse identity means in the "real" world of the present sample. The individuals who

participated in the present study are, by any standards, normal, successful individuals. They have professional careers, live in well-appointed homes, are culturally sophisticated, and have active, pleasant social lives. Many are actively involved in community affairs, either as Jews, or children of survivors, or parents, or ordinary citizens, or any combination thereof. In that sense they are quite dissimilar from the Diffusions found in adolescent populations, i.e., individuals who "Don't know and don't care." But these adult Diffusions do present as always being in transition without the urgency associated with individuals in Moratorium; they seem to experience a continued or intermittent sense of dissatisfaction in certain areas of their lives. If, as suggested earlier, the recency of the impact of survivorship and immigration may be implicated in this phenomenon, it may well ameliorate with succeeding generations.

With respect to the identity research, it would appear to be important that, in keeping with Erik Erikson's epigenetic approach to personality development, more study be done with adults. One of the biggest gaps in the identity research is a baseline for the distribution of identity statuses in the general adult population. There is no point in comparing "this group" with "that group" in terms of identity if there is no way of telling whether either group differs significantly from the population at large. Furthermore, the ISI protocol should be re-worked in order to ensure that it samples accurately the range of contemporary adult experience. It would be useful also to assess whether different identity statuses prevail at different times in contemporary culture, varying with different economic and political climates, or with attention to global concerns.

Finally, identity research should continue to assess ego identity in various sub-cultures and ethnic groups within the dominant culture, in addition to non-North American and non-Western cultures. This would not only provide data useful in cross-cultural identity studies, but it would also elucidate the immigrant experience under various circumstances of immigration. Immigration under traumatic circumstances, e.g., as refugees, has received little attention in the psychological literature yet is a reality for an increasing number of individuals.

Research in this area could well be of benefit to those who assist new immigrants and their children in resettlement.

NOTES

1. Some writers claim that the word Holocaust "has a euphemistic ring and covers the general concept, thus diminishing the Jews as victims of Nazi tyranny" (Bergmann & Jucovy, 1982, p. 3). Yet, Dawidowicz (1976) asserts that "Holocaust" is merely the English word for "Shoa" and that the etymological roots of the Hebrew word

> suggest a more specific Jewish interpretation....The implication is that once more the Jewish people are sacrificial victims, and that the Holocaust is another link in the chain of suffering and martyrdom. (Bergmann & Jucovy, ibid.)

These are the exact grounds upon which others object to the use of "Holocaust" because, they ask, "[the] sacrifice [is] to whom and for what?" (Lifton, 1980, p. 113).

2. This is not the date usually associated with the start of the Holocaust. The dates commonly used are either 1933, when the Nazis came to power, or 1939, the year Germany invaded Poland. For present purposes the first date is considered too early because although the Nazis started their campaign against the Jews almost immediately upon coming to power, its impact upon entire Europe was not felt right away. On the other hand, 1939 is considered too late because it implies that World War II and the Holocaust are synonymous, and they are not. Anti-Semitic uprisings in Poland became epidemic in the mid-1930s and Jews were being sent to concentration camps shortly thereafter. Therefore, a compromise date of 1935 is chosen; it is the year in which the Nuremberg Laws were enacted.

REFERENCES

Adams, G.R., & Fitch, S.A. (1983). Psychological environments of university departments: Effects on college students' identity status and ego stage development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44,* 1266-1275.

Ainsworth, M.D.S. (1969). Object relations, dependency, and attachment: A theoretical review of the infant-mother relationship. *Child Development, 40,* 969-1025.

Aleksandrowicz, D.D. (1973). Children of concentration camp survivors. In E.J. Anthony & C. Koupernik (Eds.). *The child in his family: The impact of death and disease, Vol. II.* New York: Wiley, 385-392.

Ammon, G. (1984). The dynamics of Holocaust. *Dynamische Psychiatrie, 17,* 404-415.

Auerhahn, N.C., & Prelinger, E. (1983). Repetition in the concentration survivor and her child. *International Review of Psychoanalysis, 10,* 31-46.

Axelrod, S., Schnipper, O.L., & Rau, J.H. (1980). Hospitalized offspring of Holocaust survivors: Problems and dynamics. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 44,* 1-14.

Barocas, H.A., & Barocas, C.B. (1973). Manifestations of concentration camp effects on the second generation. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 130,* 820-821.

Barocas, H.A., & Barocas, C.B. (1979). Wounds of the fathers: The next generation of Holocaust victims. *International Review of Psychoanalysis, 6,* 331-340.

Bauer, Y. (1982). *A history of the Holocaust.* New York: Franklin Watts.

Baumrind, D. (1968). Authoritarian vs authoritative control. *Adolescence, 3,* 255-272.

Bergmann, M.S., & Jucovy, M.E. (Eds.). (1982). *Generations of the Holocaust.* New York: Basic Books.

Blumenthal, N.N. (1981). Factors contributing to varying levels of adjustment among children of Holocaust survivors. (Doctoral dissertation, Adelphi University, 1981). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 42,* 1596B.

Bourne, E. (1978). The state of research on ego identity: A review and appraisal. Part II.

Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 7, 371-392.

Bowlby, J. (1958). The nature of the child's tie to his mother. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 39,* 350-373.

Chodorow, N. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Danieli, Y. (1981). Differing adaptational styles in families of survivors of the Nazi Holocaust. *Children Today, 10,* 6-10, 34-35.

Davidson, S. (1980). The clinical effects of massive psychic trauma in families of Holocaust survivors. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy,* 6, 11-21.

Dawidowicz, L.S. (1981). *The Holocaust and the historians.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Elkind, D. (1973). Erik Erikson's eight ages of man. In J. Rubenstein (Ed.), *Annual editions: Readings in psychology, '73-'74.* Guilford, Conn.: Dushkin Publishing Group.

Engel, W.H. (1962). Reflections on the psychiatric consequences of persecution. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 16,* 191-203.

Fishbane, M.DeK. (1979). Children of survivors of the Nazi Holocaust: A psychological inquiry. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1979). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 40,* 449B.

Fogelman, E., & Savran, B. (1980). Brief group therapy with offspring of Holocaust survivors. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 50,* 97-108.

Glatstein, J., Knox, I., & Margoshes, S. (Eds.). (1968). *Anthology of Holocaust literature.* Phila.: Jewish Publishing Society of America.

Goldburg, J.B. (1983). The transmittal of the trauma of the Holocaust to survivor children and American Jewish children. (Doctoral dissertation, Drake University, 1983). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 44,* 953B.

Greenberg, J.R., & Mitchell, S.A. (1983). *Objects relations in psychoanalytic theory.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Hammerman, S.I. (1980). Historical awareness and identity development in young adult offspring of Holocaust survivors. (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1979). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 41*, 1941B.

Jucovy, M.E. (1983). The effects of the Holocaust on the second generation: Psychoanalytic studies. *American Journal of Social Psychiatry, 3*, 15-20.

Kestenberg, J.S (1972). Psycho-analytic contributions to the problem of children of survivors from Nazi persecution. *Israel Annals of Psychiatry & Related Disciplines, 10*, 311-325.

Klein, E. (1966). *A comprehensive etymological dictionary of the English language, I*, A-K. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing.

Krell, R. (1979). Holocaust families: The survivors and their children. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 20*, 560-568.

Krell, R. (1985). Therapeutic value of documenting child survivors. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 24*, 397-400.

Kren, G., & Rappoport, L. (1980). *The Holocaust and the crisis of human behaviour*. New York: Holmes & Meier.

Kroger, J. (1985). Separation-individuation and ego identity status in New Zealand university students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 14*, 133-147.

Laska, V. (Ed.). (1983). *Women in the resistance and in the Holocaust: The voices of eyewitnesses*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press.

Leon, G.R., Butcher, J.N., Kleinman, M., Goldberg, A., & Almagor, M. (1981). Survivors of the Holocaust and their children: Current status and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41*, 503-516.

Levine, H.B. (1982). Towards a psychoanalytic understanding of children of survivors of the Holocaust. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 51*, 70-92.

Lichtman, H. (1983). Children of survivors of the Nazi Holocaust: A personality study. (Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1983). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 44*, 3532B.

Lichtman, H. (1984). Parental communication of Holocaust experiences and personality characteristics among second generation survivors. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 40*, 914-924.

Lifton, R.J. (1980). The concept of the survivor. In J.E. Dimsdale (Ed.), *Survivors, victims, and perpetrators: Essays on the Nazi Holocaust* (pp. 113-126). Washington: Hemisphere Publishing.

Lifton, R.J. (1986). *The Nazi doctors: Medical killing and the psychology of genocide*. New York: Basic Books.

Linzer, N. (Ed.). (1984). The faith and pathology of Holocaust survivor families. In N. Linzer (Ed.), *The Jewish family: Authority and tradition in modern perspective* (pp. 177-193). New York: Human Sciences Press.

Mahler, M. (1963). Thoughts about development and individuation. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 18*, 307-324.

Marcia, J.E. (1966). Development and validation of ego identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3*, 551-558.

Marcia, J.E. (1976). Identity six years after: A follow-up study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 5*, 145-160.

Marcia, J.E. (1979). Identity status in late adolescence: Description and some clinical implications. Address given at Symposium on Identity Development at Rijksuniversitat, Groningen, The Netherlands.

Marcia, J.E. (In preparation). In J. Marcia, A. Waterman, & B. Matteson. (Eds.), *Ego identity and intimacy: A handbook for psychosocial research*. Hillsdale, N.Y.: L. Erlbaum.

Marcia, J.E. (In press). Ego identity as an integrative concept for ego psychoanalytic, cognitive/moral developmental, and object relations theory. In D. Lapsley & C. Powers (Eds.), *Self, ego, and identity: Integrative approaches*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Muuss, R.E. (1975). *Theories of adolescence* (3rd ed.). New York: Random House.

Newman, L. (1979). Emotional disturbance in children of Holocaust survivors. *Social Casework:*

The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, 60, 43-50.

O'Connell, A.N. (1976). The relationship between lifestyle and identity synthesis and resynthesis in traditional, neo-traditional, and non-traditional women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44,* 675-688.

Orlofsky, J., and Frank, M. (1986). Personality structure as viewed through early memories and identity status in college men and women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 580-586.

Parker, F.K. (1983). Dominant attitudes of adult children of Holocaust survivors toward their parents. (Doctoral dissertation, Saybrook Institute, 1983). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 44,* 2230B.

Phillips, R.E. (1978). Impact of Nazi Holocaust on children of survivors. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 32,* 370-378.

Prince, R.M. (1985). Second generation effects of historical trauma. *Psychoanalytic Review, 72,* 9-29.

Rabinowitz, D. (1977). *New lives: Survivors of the Holocaust living in America.* New York: Knopf.

Rakoff, V. (1966). The long term effects of the concentration camp experience. *Viewpoints, 1,* 17-22.

Rakoff, V. (1978, January 20). Second encounter group, Holocaust seminar [Address at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto.] *Canadian Jewish News,* p. 12.

Robinson, S., & Winnik, H.Z. (1981). Second generation of the Holocaust: Holocaust survivors' communication of experience to their children and its effects. *Israel Journal of Psychiatry & Related Sciences, 18,* 99-107.

Roden, R.G., & Roden, M.M. (1982). Children of Holocaust survivors. *Adolescent Psychiatry, 10,* 66-72.

Rosenthal, P.A., & Rosenthal, S. (1980). Holocaust effect in the third generation: Child of another time. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 34,* 572-580.

Rubenstein, I. (1981). Multi-generational occurrence of survivor syndrome symptoms in the families of Holocaust survivors. (Doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, 1981). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 42,* 4209B.

Russell, A. (1980). Late effects - influence on the children of the concentration camp survivor. In J.E. Dimsdale (Ed.), *Survivors, victims, and perpetrators: Essays on the Nazi Holocaust* (pp. 175-207). Washington: Hemisphere Publishing.

Russell, A., Plotkin, D., & Heapy, N. (1985). Adaptive abilities in nonclinical second-generation Holocaust survivors and controls: A comparison. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 34,* 564-579.

Rustin, S. (1971). Guilt, hostility, and Jewish identification among a self-selected sample of adolescent children of Jewish concentration camp survivors. (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1971). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 32,* 1859B.

Savran, B., & Fogelman, E. (1979). Psychological issues in the lives of children of survivors. In L. Steinitz & D. Szonyi (Eds.), *Living after the Holocaust.* New York: Bloch.

Sigal, J.J., & Rakoff, V. (1971). Concentration camp survival: A pilot study of the effects on the second generation. *Journal of the Canadian Psychiatric Association, 16,* 393-397.

Sigal, J.J., Silver, D., Rakoff, V., & Ellin, B. (1973). Some second-generation effects of survival of the Nazi persecution. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 43,* 320-327.

Sigal, J.J., & Weinfeld, M. (1985). Mutual involvement and alienation in families of Holocaust survivors. Unpublished manuscript, McGill University.

Simmons, D. (1970). Development of an objective measure of identity achievement status. *Journal of Projective Techniques in Personality Assessment, 34,* 241-244.

Slipp, S. (1979). The children of survivors of Nazi concentration camps: A pilot study of the intergenerational transmission of psychic trauma. In L. Wolberg & M. Aronson (Eds.), *Group therapy: An overview 1979* (pp. 197-204). New York: I.U.P.

Tauber, I.D. (1981). Second-generation effects of the Nazi Holocaust: A psychosocial study of a nonclinical sample in North America. (Doctoral dissertation, California School of

Professional Psychology, 1980). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 41,* 4692B.

Tesch, S.A., & Whitbourne, S.K. (1982). Intimacy and identity status in young adults. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43,* 1041-1051.

Trachtenberg, M., & Davis, M. (1978). Breaking silence: Serving children of Holocaust survivors. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 54,* 294-302.

Trossman, B. (1968). Adolescent children of concentration camp survivors. *Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 13,* 121-123.

Waterman, A. (1980). Ego identity status among married, adult women. Paper presented at Eastern Psychological Association.

Waterman, A. (1982). Identity development from adolescence to adulthood: An extension of theory and a review of research. *Developmental Psychology, 18,* 341-358.

Waterman, A.S., Besold, B., Crook, W.P., & Manzini, S. (1980). *Ego identity status scoring manual for adults.* Unpublished manuscript, Trenton State College.

Waterman, A.S., Geary, P.S., & Waterman, C.K. (1974). A longitudinal study of changes in ego identity status from the freshman to the senior year at college. *Developmental Psychology, 10,* 387-392.

Waterman, A.S., & Goldman, J.A., (1976). A longitudinal study of ego development at a liberal arts college. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 5,* 361-369.

Waterman, A.S., & Waterman, C.K. (1971). A longitudinal study of changes in ego identity statuses during the freshman year at college. *Developmental Psychology, 5,* 167-173.

Waterman, C.K., & Waterman, A.S. (1975). Fathers and sons: A study of ego identity across two generations. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4,* 331-338.

Weiss, E., O'Connell, A.N., & Siiter, R. (1986). Comparisons of second-generation Holocaust survivors, immigrants, and non-immigrants on measures of mental health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50,* 828-831.

Wilson, A., & Fromm, E. (1982). Aftermath of the concentration camp: The second generation. *American Academy of Psychoanalysis, 10,* 289-313.

Zlotogorski, Z. (1983). Offspring of concentration camp survivors: The relationship of perceptions of family cohesion and adaptability to levels of ego functioning. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 24*, 345-354.

APPENDIX A - IDENTITY STATUS INTERVIEW

General Opening
Are you married?
(If yes) How long have you been married?
Do you have any children, and if so, how many?
(If yes) And what are their ages?
(If appropriate) How many still live at home?
(If appropriate) What are the older ones doing now?

What area are you living in now? How long have you lived there?
Where are you from originally?
(If appropriate) And where is your (husband)(wife) from?

How did you come to move into that neighbourhood?
And how do you feel about living there?
Have you become involved in any local community activities?
(If yes) Can you describe what you do with the group(s)?

Can you tell me something about your educational background?
(If appropriate) And what is your (husband's)(wife's) educational background?
What type of work is (he)(she) doing now?

What was your father's educational background?
And what (is)(was) his occupation?
How about your mother, what education did she have?
And has your mother been employed outside the home?

Do you have any brothers or sisters?
(If yes) Are they older or younger than you?

Would you briefly fill me in on what you have been doing since high school in terms of education, work, and marriage?
(If not given chronologically) Can you tell me when you were doing each of the things you mentioned?

Family Roles
(For respondents who are married)

How did you come to meet your (husband)(wife)?
How long did you know (him)(her) before you married?

How did your decision to marry change the plans that you previously had at that time?

Did you find the decision to marry a difficult one to make, or was it what you always wanted to do?
(If appropriate) What influenced your decision at the time?

How did your parents feel about your marrying when you did?

Looking back on it, are you glad that you married when you did?
(If not) Why? What would you have done differently?

(If appropriate) Was the timing of your first child planned or was it unexpected?
(If appropriate) Why did you feel starting a family at that time was desirable?

How did you feel when you learned you were going to be a (father)(mother)?

Looking back on it, are you glad that you started a family when you did?
(If not) Why? What would you have done differently?

(For respondents who have not married)

Have you thought about the possibility of marriage for you?

(If appropriate) At what point in your life would you like to marry?
Why do you consider that a favourable time?
(If preferring not to marry) Why would you like to remain single?
How do your parents feel about you not marrying up until now?

Have you thought about having children at some point?
(If appropriate) At what time in marriage do you feel it would be best for you to have children?
Why is that a favourable time?
(If preferring not to have children) Why would you prefer not to have children?

(For all respondents)

What do you see as the advantages of being a (husband and father)(wife and mother)?

What do you see as the disadvantages or limitations?

How would you compare your ideas about a family with those of your (father)(mother)?

Have you ever gone through an important change in your thinking about family roles?
(If yes) Please describe the changes.

What started you thinking about these questions?
How did you go about working out your ideas?
Who may have influenced your decisions?
At this point do you believe your ideas are fairly well worked out or are you still working on them?
(If still working on them) What are you doing at this point to work out your thinking?

Do you think there is any conflict between being a (husband and father)(wife and mother) and pursuing a career?
(If yes) How will it interfere?
How do you think you (have)(will) resolve(d) that conflict?
How much concern (do)(did) you have over this question?

How does your (wife)(husband) feel about your attitudes about being a (husband and father)(wife and mother)?

Do you see your ideas about being a (husband and father) (wife and mother) changing or do you think they will remain pretty stable?

Remaining Home
How (do)(did) you feel about maintaining the responsibility for running a household?

What do you find most satisfying about it?
What do you find least satisfying about it?

(If appropriate) How do you think your being at home has affected your children?

How does your (husband)(wife) feel about your working within the home?
Does (he)(she) have any objections or does (he)(she) encourage the idea?
How has that affected you?

How do your own parents feel about your working within the home?
How has that affected you?

Have (had) you ever considered resuming your education or starting to work outside the home, rather than remaining at home?
(If yes) Tell me how you worked out your thinking on that question.
(If appropriate) Was (is) it a difficult decision to make?
(If appropriate) What helped you make your decision?
(If appropriate) What (is) was your (husband's)(wife's) attitude on this question?
(If appropriate) How are you going about trying to resolve your uncertainty?
(If appropriate) How important is this question for you now?

Overall, how satisfied would you say you are at this point in your life with your work in running a household?

Do you see your feelings and ideas about this remaining stable or do you think they may very well change in the future?
(If appropriate) In what direction would you anticipate a change?
(If appropriate) What do you think may bring about a change?
(If appropriate) How do you think you will handle it if such a change does occur?

Education (Past)
Where did you attend college?

What was your major field?
How did you come to choose that field?
(If not already answered) When did you first become interested in _____?
What did you find attractive about _____?
Did you have any plans about what you would like to do with _____after you graduated?
(If not evident from work experience) Have you been able to follow up on those plans since graduating?

When you were in college, or before, had you ever considered any other fields?
When did you first become interested in _____?

What did you find attractive about _____?
(If several alternative fields, ask about each in turn.)
And were there any other fields that you considered?

How seriously were you considering each of the fields you mentioned?
Did you ever feel that you were actively deciding between _____ and _____?
Was this a difficult decision to make?
What influenced your choice here?

(If attended college before marriage) Most parents have plans for their (sons)(daughters), things they'd like to see them go into, things they'd like to see them do. Did your folks have any plans like that for you?

Do you think they may have had a preference for one field over another, even though they would never have tried to pressure you about it?

(If attended college during or after marriage) (Wives)(Husbands) usually have some feeling about their spouse's education and plans.
What was your (wife's)(husband's) feeling about your studies?

Do you think (he)(she) may have had a preference for one plan or another, even if (she)(he) never would have tried to pressure you about it?

Education (Present)
Where are you attending school now?

What are you planning to major in?
(If not sure of major) Are there any fields you are considering?

Do you have any ideas about what you'd like to do after graduation?

How did you come to decide on _____? (Ask concerning future plans, if known, otherwise concerning major field. If no definite field mentioned, then omit.)

When did you first become interested in _____?
What do you find attractive about _____?
(If several alternative fields mentioned, ask about each in turn.)
Are there any other fields you considered?

How seriously were(are) you considering each of the fields you mentioned?

(For students who have specified a decision)
Did you ever feel that you were actively deciding between _____ and _____?
Was this a difficult decision to make?
What influenced your choice?

(For students who have not specified a decision)
Do you feel that choosing a career is something that you're trying to work out now, or do you feel that this is something where you can let time take its course and see what happens?
Do you have any idea when you would like to have this decision made by?
How are you going about getting the information you'd like to have in order to make a decision?
Do you feel that this is an important decision for you to make now or are you more concerned with other things right now?

How willing would you be to change your plans from _____(the strongest one or two fields mentioned) if something better came along? (If asked "What do you mean by better?" respond: Whatever might be better in your terms.)

(If a possibility for change is indicated)
What might you change to?
What might cause such a change?
How likely do you think such a change would be?
(Repeat for all the possibilities mentioned.)

(Wives)(Husbands) usually have some feelings about their (husband's)(wife's) education

and plans. What are your (wife's)(husband's) feelings about your studies?
Do you think (she)(he) may have a preference for one plan or another, even if (she)(he) never would try to pressure you about it?

Do you think your attending school helps or hinders your marriage?
In what ways?
Do you find it difficult to attend school and manage the responsibility of a (husband)(wife)?
(If yes) Where do you find the most problems arising?

How do you think your attending school has affected your children?

Did you ever have any uncertainty about whether you should have started school again or should continue?
(If appropriate) Was it a difficult decision to make?
(If appropriate) What helped you to resolve your uncertainty?
(If appropriate) How are you going about trying to resolve your uncertainty?
(If appropriate) How important is this question for you now?

Working (Past)
Where did you work?
How long did you work there?
Did you work there full-time or part-time?
(If part-time) How many days or hours a week did you work?

Did you enjoy working where you did?
What did you find attractive about it?

How did you come to choose _____ as a line of work?

Did you ever work at any other kinds of jobs?
When was that?
Did you enjoy that type of work?
What was attractive about it?
(If several types of work were mentioned, ask about each in turn.)

(If working before marriage) How did your parents feel about your decision to take the job you did at the time?

What led you to decide to stop working?
Was it a difficult decision for you to make?
(If appropriate) How did your (wife)(husband) feel about your decision to end your employment?

Working (Present)
Where do you work?
How long have you worked there?
Do you work full-time or part-time?
(If part-time) How many days or hours a week do you work?

(If appropriate) Do you prefer full-time or part-time work?

Do you enjoy working where you do?
What do you find attractive about it?

How did you come to choose _____ as a line of work?

Have you worked at any other kinds of jobs?
When was that?
Did you enjoy that type of work?
What was attractive about it?
(If several types of work are mentioned, ask about each in turn.)

If you had a choice, is there any other kind of work you'd prefer doing?
(If yes) Why do you think you would like that field?
Do you have any plans to try it in the future?
Are you taking any steps in that direction?

(If working before marriage) How did your parents feel about your decision to take the job you did at the time?

(If appropriate) Do you think your working helps or hinders your marriage?
In what ways?
Do you find it difficult to work and manage the responsibilities of a (husband)(wife)?
(If yes) Where do you find the most problems arising?

How does your (wife)(husband) feel about your having the job you do?
Does (she)(he) have any objections or does (she)(he) encourage the idea?

How do you think your working at the job you have has affected your children?

Did you ever have any uncertainty about whether you should be working or be working at the job you have?
(If appropriate) Was it a difficult decision to make?
(If appropriate) What helped you resolve your uncertainty?
(If appropriate) How are you going about trying to resolve your uncertainty?
(If appropriate) How important is this question for you now?

Future Plans

At this point, are you considering making any major changes in your life, concerning work, education, or family?
(If yes) What type of change are you considering?
What do you hope to be able to gain from making such a change?

How does your (wife)(husband) feel about the possibility of such a change?

As you look ahead, five to ten years, do you think you will be making any major changes in your life, concerning work, education or family?
(If yes) What type of change do you think you may make?
What do you hope to be able to gain from making such a change?
How likely do you think it is that you will be able to make such a change?

Religion

Do you have any religious preference?
Do your parents have any religious preference? If so, in what religion were each of your parents raised?
Have they both continued in the _____ religion?
(Separate by M and F if different religions.)

How important is religion in your parent's home?
(If important) Can you give me some examples?

Does your (wife)(husband) have a religious preference?

Are you currently active in church or church groups? (Adapt for Jews)
(If not active) How about in the past, were you ever active in church groups?
(If not already answered) How frequently do you usually attend church services?
What is your reason for attending services?
How important would you say religion is in your life?

You have already answered this next question in part, but I want to ask it directly. I'd like to find out where you stand on questions on the existence of God and the importance of organized religion.
(If Catholic, add: and the authority of the Pope.)

How do your parents feel about your religious beliefs?

Are there any important differences between your beliefs and those of your parents?

Are there any important differences between your religious beliefs and those of your (wife)(husband)?

Was there ever a time when you came to question, to doubt, or perhaps to change your religious beliefs?
What types of things did you question or change?
What started your thinking about those questions?
How serious were these questions for you?
Do you feel that you've resolved these questions for yourself or are you still working on them?

(If resolved) What helped you to answer these questions?
(If unresolved) How are you going about trying to answer these questions?

At this point, how well worked out do you think your ideas in the area of religion are?

Do you think your ideas in this area are likely to remain stable or do you believe that

they may very well change in the future?

(If they may change) In what direction do you think your beliefs might change?
What might bring about such a change?
How likely is it that such a change might occur?

(If evidence of continued thought to religious questions) How important is it to you to work out your ideas in the area of religion?
Are you actively trying to work out your beliefs now or are you more concerned with other things right now?

How would you like to see your own children raised with respect to religion? Why?

Politics

Do you have any political preferences? (If asked "What do you mean by political preference?" respond: either party preference or a position on the liberal-conservative dimension.)
Do you consider yourself a Democrat or Republican?
Do you consider yourself as generally liberal, moderate, or conservative?

Does your father have any political preferences? (D or R; L, M, or C?)
Does your mother have any political preferences? (D or R; L, M, or C?)
How important is politics in your parent's home?
(If important) Can you give me some examples?

Does your (wife)(husband) have any political preferences? (D or R; L, M, or C?)

Are there any political or social issues that you feel pretty strongly about?
(If asked "Such as?" respond: Whatever might be important issues for you? If asked again suggest such issues as the economy, the energy problem, etc.)

What would you like to see done about _____?

Are there other issues which you have views about?

What would you like to see done (in each of the areas mentioned)?

How did you come to develop the beliefs that you are expressing?
What do you feel have been the most important influences on you concerning these questions?

Have you ever taken any political action, like joining groups, participating in demonstrations, participating in election campaigns, writing letters to government or other political leaders?

What led you to become involved in these activities? (When possible mention the various activities.)

(If no issues or activities were discussed)
Do you feel that you are actively trying to arrive at a set of political beliefs or do you feel that the area of politics isn't very important to you at the present time?
(If now actively trying)
Can you tell me something about the types of things you are thinking about?
How are you going about getting the information you need to make a decision? How important is it for you to work out these ideas?

Are there any important differences between your views and those of your parents?

Are you aware of any important differences between your views and those of your (wife)(husband)?

Was there ever a time when you found your political ideas undergoing change - where you believed one thing and then, several months or years later, found you had very different ideas on the same issue?
What led you to make that type of change?

At this point do you believe that your political beliefs are likely to be stable over time or do you feel that they may very well change?

(If they may change)
In what directions do you think your beliefs might change?
What might bring about such a change?
How likely is it that such a change might occur?

(If possible change due to changes in world situation)
Do you feel that the changes would occur just on specific issues, or might there be a change in your general political philosophy?
How likely is it that such a general change might occur?

How would you like to see your own children raised with respect to politics? Why?

Sex Roles

Changing the topic again, I'd like to find out something about how you see the (masculine)(feminine) role.

There are a variety of behaviours and traits that different people associate with being (masculine)(feminine); what characteristics do you usually associate with (masculinity)(femininity)?

How do you see (men)(women) expressing a (masculine)(feminine) role today?

Is that the way you would like to be (masculine)(feminine) or would you like to express (masculinity)(femininity) in a different way?

What advantages and disadvantages do you see as associated with the (masculine)(feminine) role in society?

How did you come to learn what it means to be (masculine)(feminine)?
Do you feel that is something that came rather naturally for you or were there times when you were uncertain as to how you should act? Can you give me some examples?

How was your behaviour in this area influenced by your parents?
How about the effects your brothers and sisters may have had?
Are there any important differences between the ways in which you and your (father)(mother) express (masculinity)(femininity)?
How about differences between you and your (brothers)(sisters) regarding (masculinity)(femininity)?

How do your views of (masculinity)(femininity) compare with those of your (wife)(husband)?

Are there any areas of behaviour which you are still questioning as a (male)(female)?
(If yes) What is the nature of your uncertainty?
Why do you think this is an issue for you?
How are you going about trying to work out your ideas about what you should do?

Do you see your ideas about (masculinity)(femininity) remaining stable or do you see them as changing in the future?

How would you like to see a (son)(daughter) of your own raised with respect to (masculinity)(femininity)?
Why?

In raising children, do you believe there are any important differences in how you should treat boys and girls?

Do you believe you (will)(are, raising your own children in ways very different from the way you and your (wife)(husband) were raised?
(If appropriate) In what ways?

Other Concerns

Those were the topics I thought might be of some concern or importance to you. I've probably missed some important areas, though.

What is most important to you at this time in your life?

What do you find yourself thinking about or worrying about the most?

(As appropriate, follow-up on any other areas of concern not previously covered.)

Closing

As you reflect on your life at this point, what would you say are your greatest satisfactions?

What would you say are the areas of the greatest dissatisfaction?

On balance, how satisfied or dissatisfied would you say you are with where you are at the present time?

What are your most important personal objectives in the next five years?

What are you doing now that will help you toward that goal?

That's all the questions I have; do you have any questions for me?

Thank you for your help.

APPENDIX B - TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION INTERVIEW

1. How do you feel about talking to me about being a second generation survivor?
2. How do you feel about being referred to as a second generation survivor, as opposed to the child of survivors? Do you have a preference?
3. When did you first find out about your parents' Holocaust experiences? How old were you? What were the circumstances of your being told? Who told?
4. What do you know of your parents' experiences during that time? What did they tell you? How did you feel about what you heard? How do you feel now about what you heard?
5. What about other family members or parents' friends - did you hear about your parents' experiences from them?
6. What would happen if you asked your parents about their Holocaust experiences? How did they react? How about now?
7. Did your parents talk to you about their pre-Holocaust lives? What do you know of that?
8. Do you think that being a second generation survivor has affected your life? In what ways? How are you different from children whose parents are not survivors? What if you were the child of immigrants who were not survivors, how might you be different?
9. What do you know of your parents' immigrant experience?
10. Are you named for anyone?
11. How will/have you approach/ed this aspect of your family's history with your child/ren? At what age? At what level? i.e., personally or globally.
12. Is it important to pass this information on to the children? Why/Why not?
13. Has anyone in your family ever been a recipient of services of the mental health profession?
14. Is there anything else that you consider important about being a second generation

survivor that I haven't asked you about?

15. Do you have any final comments that you'd like to make?

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

BURNABY, BRITISH COLUMBIA V5A 1S6
Telephone: (604) 291-3354

INFORMED CONSENT BY SUBJECTS TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

NOTE: The University and those conducting this project subscribe to the ethical conduct of research and to the protection at all times of the interests, comfort, and safety of subjects. This form and the information it contains are given to you for your own protection and full understanding of the procedures, risks and benefits involved. Your signature on this form will signify that you have received the document described below regarding this project, that you received adequate opportunity to consider the information in the document, and that you voluntarily agree to participate in the project.

Having been asked by Joyce Nicholls-Goudsmid of the Psychology Department of Simon Fraser University to participate in a research project, I have read the procedures specified in the document entitled:

Parental Holocaust Experience and Second Generation Survivors

I understand the procedures to be used in this project and the personal risks to me in taking part.

I understand that I may withdraw my participation in this project at any time.

I also understand that I may register any complaint I might have about the project with the chief researcher named above, or with her supervisor, Dr. James E. Marcia, or with the Chairman of the Psychology Department, Simon Fraser University, Dr. R. Blackman.

I may obtain a copy of the results of this study, upon its completion, by contacting Joyce Nicholls-Goudsmid, Department of Psychology, Simon Fraser University.

I agree to participate by being interviewed as described in the document referred to above, during the period

_____/_____/ 1986 to _____/_____/ 1986 at _____.
(day) (month) (day) (month)

DATE_____ NAME_____

ADDRESS_____

SIGNATURE_____

SIGNATURE OF WITNESS_____

When you have read the document referred to above, please initial the back of it.

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

BURNABY, BRITISH COLUMBIA V5A 1S6
Telephone: (604) 291-3354

INFORMATION SHEET FOR SUBJECTS

Title of Project: Parental Holocaust Experience and Second Generation Survivors

This study will examine the various means by which children became aware of or were told about their parents' Holocaust experiences, and the manner in which this information was incorporated into the children's own attitudes and values.

Your voluntary participation in this project entails signing a consent form, thus signifying your agreement to being interviewed about your values and attitudes regarding occupational choices, ideology, and sex roles, and how you learned or became aware of your parents' Holocaust experiences. The interviews will take approximately two (2) hours and you may withdraw your consent to participate at any point during that time. The interviews will be tape-recorded, for experimental purposes. Therefore, some of these tapes will be heard by one other person (the co-researcher) besides the interviewer.

The tapes will not be identifiable by name or other personally identifying information; rather, each tape will carry a code number with the code key known only to the two researchers. The key and the tapes will be stored in a locking filing cabinet in a private office at Simon Fraser University. At the end of the project the tapes will be erased; if this is not the case, you will be asked for voluntary informed consent to that effect. These procedures are to ensure that all information remains anonymous and confidential.

After your interview, I will be available to discuss this project in more detail with you. I would also welcome any comments that you may have with respect to any aspect of your participation in it.

Thank you for your interest in this project.

Joyce Nicholls-Goudsmid
M.A. Student, Psychology
Simon Fraser University