

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
California School

in cooperation with

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
School of Social Work

FACTORS AFFECTING DECISION-MAKING BY PROFESSIONAL
AGENCY PERSONNEL REGARDING APPROVAL OF ADOPTIVE
APPLICANTS WHO WERE HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS

A Thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements
for the double degrees

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

and

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

by

JUDITH M. HARRIS in collaboration with JUDY L. DOTY

June 1974

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
California School

in cooperation with

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
School of Social Work

FACTORS AFFECTING DECISION-MAKING BY PROFESSIONAL
AGENCY PERSONNEL REGARDING APPROVAL OF ADOPTIVE
APPLICANTS WHO WERE HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS

Thesis approved by

Rose F. Kaplan

Samson H. Levy

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to acknowledge the support, encouragement, and help extended by the agency personnel of Vista Del Mar.

We would also like to thank Dr. Samson Levy of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion for sponsorship of this research project.

We would especially like to thank Dr. Samuel Taylor of the University of Southern California, School of Social Work and Dr. Rosa Kaplan of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, School of Jewish Communal Service, for their devoted efforts and their thoughtful consideration in helping us complete this research project.

Last, but not least, we wish to thank John Doty for his patience, thoughtfulness and his inspiration throughout the year as we worked on this research project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION AND STUDY PROBLEM.	1
The Study Problem	1
Significance.	2
Background.	4
Literature.	6
Focus.	18
Operational Definitions	23
II. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY.	24
Data Collection	24
Sample	26
Analysis of Data	33
Limitations in Generalizing From Sample Selected	34
III. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	36
Board Minutes	36
Case Records.	37
Findings of Interview Schedule.	41
IV. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS.	51
Summary of Findings	51
Discussion and Conclusions.	56
Recommendations for Further Study	60

APPENDICES	52
Appendix A: Criteria For Adoptive Parents	62
Appendix BI:	64
Appendix BII:	65
Appendix BIII:	74
Appendix C.	84
Table I: Items of adoption criteria (CWLA and VDM) not present in case records	84
Table II: Number of items of adoption criteria (CWLA and VDM) deviated from and the number of times each was found.	85
Table III: Items of adoption criteria (CWLA and VDM) thought to be important to Professional Personnel	86
Table IV: Comparison between number of times criteria were found deviated from in the case re- cords and the number of social workers who considered criteria crucial in evaluating couples for adoption.	87
FOOTNOTES	88
BIBLIOGRAPHY	91

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND STUDY PROBLEM

The Study Problem

Journal articles, the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA), and agencies have established criteria, based on the best available knowledge, to increase the likelihood that placement of adoptive children will be successful for both the children and the parents. It is already known that many adoptions take place out of the agency system through such means as lawyers and "black markets." Public sentiment on behalf of prospective adoptive parents exerts pressure upon adoption agencies and their staffs to make favorable decisions whenever possible since, the "childless couple" seeking a child has a strong emotional appeal to the public. However, the social worker and the adoption agency also have the awesome responsibility of keeping in mind what is in the child's best interest also, as established by research studies and embodied in CWLA and agency policies.

The cases of adoptive applicants who were survivors of the Nazi Holocaust represented an especially challenging

situation. It is likely that an adoption social worker and an agency may have felt an even greater emotional tug or sense of pressure to make the family of Holocaust survivors more complete by approving adoptions whenever possible. Yet, the "risks" involved in placing a child with a couple who were subjected to the extraordinary trauma of the Nazi experience may also have been great.

This research project examined this issue by conducting a retrospective study of the influences and pressures felt by the agency and personnel at Vista Del Mar, a Jewish agency serving children and families located in Los Angeles, California. Vista Del Mar was involved in making adoptive placements with couples who survived the Nazi Holocaust, and has an excellent reputation for all its programs for children, including its adoptive services program. Therefore it was an ideal setting for the conduct of this study.

Significance

Obviously professional graduate social workers are also human beings subject to various personal, organizational and societal pressures in addition to the influences of their professional judgment and knowledge. Social work agencies are also under the influence of these kinds of pressures. Social work agencies and their personnel

exist within an arena of community and professional expectations, as do other professions such as law and medicine.

Most of the time there is a consensus among "expectors" or role senders, regarding expectations. However, what happens when there is not a consensus or when there is a two-way tug? How do professionals and agencies resolve divergent expectations? The resultant dilemma has been referred to as role conflict. In role conflict situations, decisions may be less than optimal unless there is: a) recognition that there's a conflict of expectations; and, b) the establishment of special procedures to help guide special decision-making processes.

The researchers interviewed professional personnel who were social workers in the adoption program at Vista Del Mar during the period in which Holocaust survivors sought to adopt children, to see whether role conflict occurred between agency-professional and community expectations, and how staff and the agency dealt with the situation. It is recognized that role conflict can occur in relation to other crises as well, such as in efforts to serve flood victims and refugees, etcetera. Through this study it is hoped that insights will be gained and factors will be identified that illuminate understanding as to how role conflict is managed in such challenging situations as occur in the adoption decision-making arena.

This study may be of special significance to the field of Jewish Communal Studies. It is possible that there are factors which affect decision-making in Jewish agencies that relate to Jews who have suffered persecution. These Jews may be the subjects of guilt and pity and may, therefore, receive special treatment from the Jewish community in circumstances involving decision-making.

Background

Since World War II there has been a great amount of international sympathy and a desire to make restitution to people who suffered the Nazi Holocaust. Social service agencies throughout the world mobilized their forces to help these people. In the United States, as elsewhere, Jewish agencies felt particularly responsible for rendering services to victims of the Nazis'.

There were a number of married couples, one or both of whom were Holocaust survivors, who wanted to adopt children after they had immigrated to the United States. Due to the Nazi atrocities many of these people had lost children, spouses, parents, siblings or other loved ones, and/or were unable to bear their own children. In Los Angeles, California, Vista Del Mar was the agency to which most of these people were referred. Vista Del Mar, a voluntary non-profit Jewish multi-service agency is now primarily a

residential treatment center for emotionally disturbed children. During the period of time in which these Holocaust survivors requested adoption, Vista Del Mar was the major center of adoption for the Jewish community. The researchers suspected that it was a difficult task for this agency to screen Holocaust survivors who were prospective adoptive parents due to the conflicting pressures staff were subject to. While the agency was concerned with adhering to their adoption standards, it was also under societal pressures to respond as flexibly and humanely as possible to the needs of these people (restitution).

Recently, some of these adoptive parents have contacted the agency concerning problems with their home life and adopted children. There have also been some cases, in which the agency found it necessary to refuse second adoptive children to these couples due to difficulties in caring for their first adoptive child. Vista Del Mar is currently questioning whether or not they might originally have been less rigorous in applying certain criteria in placing adoptive children with these couples. Furthermore, the agency wondered what, if any, influences led the workers and the agency to modify some of their usual standards in the cases of these couples.

Thus, this study is concerned with the pressures Vista Del Mar and its personnel had to deal with when screening

the Holocaust survivors as prospective parents, and the personnel's recollections of the way they may have been influenced by various considerations. Due to the lack of time and money, the researchers were unable to contact the Holocaust survivors who were accepted (or rejected) as adoptive parents. However, the researchers did review case records of those approved as adoptive parents. The agency personnel who were involved in adoption studies of the Holocaust survivors were also interviewed.

Literature

Holocaust - International Sympathy

A review of the literature shows that volumes of material have been produced regarding the Nazi Holocaust. Since the authors of these materials hail from many different countries, it is evident that sympathy and response to the human suffering and destruction instigated by the Nazi regime has been widespread. The subject has been dealt with in various fields, some of which include history philosophy, religion, psychology, literature and the arts. Herbert Feis stated that "the suffering of Jews touched even distant and comfortable hearts, over-riding prejudice."¹

Some of the most concrete evidence of international

sympathy for Holocaust victims appears in the number of monuments created to perpetuate the memory of the offense the Nazis committed against mankind. Adolf Reith states that "the motive for the creation of memorials to victims...was everywhere the same: to honor and remember the dreadful fate of the innocent...who were systematically wiped out because of their race...and of their political and religious convictions."² According to Reith, after World War II every European country was struggling with the question of how the excess of human suffering could be compressed into memorials.³ Countries that had been enslaved by the Nazis such as Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia considered it a foremost duty to remember concentration camp victims and to care for those graves which still existed. Barracks, crematoriums and execution rooms were preserved at the sites of various camps including Auschwitz, Buchenwald, and Dachau.⁴ National and international art and architectural competitions were established for the creation of memorials to Holocaust victims. The award-winning works received much publicity as seen in a pictorial pamphlet printed by the Committee for the Memorial to the Unknown Jewish Martyr.⁵ This pamphlet shows ceremonies in Paris attended by world-reknown figures, honoring artists selected by the committee.

International sympathy is also evidenced in documents. Printed in a publication entitled Book of Documents, 1917-

1947 are excerpts from papers written by various world leaders which express outrage and compassion for the plight of Nazi victims.⁶

Their Brother's Keeper by Phillip Friedman and The Holocaust Kingdom by Alexander Donat discuss the risks taken by Christians in Nazi occupied countries, who shielded and sheltered Jews to keep them from the hands of the Nazis.⁷ The sympathy felt by Christian people throughout Europe towards their fellow man, led them to perform courageous and humanitarian acts.

Holocaust - International Response

The prevalence of international sympathy motivated international response in terms of programs and policies instituted to rehabilitate and to make restitution to Holocaust survivors. It is known that countries from which concentration camp inmates had been transported had been largely indifferent toward Nazi manipulations and the suffering of these people during the Hitler years.⁸ Before armistice was declared the American Jewish conference was calling for ".....compensation and reparation for losses suffered by Jews in Germany and Nazi occupied territories," and "liberalization of existing immigration laws." The United Nations had issued a statement regarding Nazi atrocities committed against Jews giving reaffirmation "to in-

sure that those responsible for the crimes (would)...not escape retribution."¹⁰ Due to their own guilt and international influence, the Nazi occupied countries established restoration programs once World War II was over.¹¹ Agreements were made to set up government agencies to provide food, clothing, shelter and jobs for survivors. However, since most of these people had no families or friends to return to, since they distrusted the governments and citizens of their homelands, and since they suspected that anti-semitism was still prevalent in the previously Nazi occupied countries, they were resistant to living in them again. According to Feis, most of these people wanted to go to Western European countries, the United States or Israel, then called Palestine.¹² It would have been necessary for these countries to revise their immigration policies in order to accommodate all those who wished to leave their own countries, but the Western European nations and the United States refused to do so largely for economic and political reasons.¹³

Many articles such as those by Zachariah Schuster,¹⁴ and Sidney Hertzberg,¹⁵ discuss the issue of resettlement of the displaced persons who were released from the concentration camps, and advocated the relaxation of immigration policies regarding Palestine. Since the Western European countries and the United States found it necessary to limit immigration, they at first endorsed open immigration

for Palestine, and later the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish state.¹⁶ Thus, as the literature shows, one of the most crucial responses to the plight of Holocaust victims, not only in terms of continuation of the Jewish people, was the institution of the Jewish state as an entity in itself.

Lloyd Gartner and Max Vorspan, state that the Jewish communities of the world felt that they owed the Holocaust survivors assistance in resettling and reestablishing themselves.¹⁷ Restorative programs were instituted by world wide Jewish agencies as well as by governmental agencies of countries previously occupied by the Nazis. Gartner and Vorspan discuss the undertakings of Jewish agencies in California which worked in coordination with Jewish agencies throughout the United States, financed by the United Jewish Welfare Fund.¹⁸ The Jewish agencies had to guarantee immigration commissions in various states, by written affidavits, that responsibility would be taken for refugees brought to those states. Jewish families already residing in these states, who were usually connected with refugees as family or friends, pledged that they would take financial responsibility for the newcomers. In the event that these pledges were broken, the Jewish agencies guaranteed that they would assume responsibility. The issue of guaranteed responsibility was particularly crucial in California since the strict immigration laws placed deportation well

within the realm of possibility. It is noted that the California Emigre Service Committee afforded lenient terms in working with Jewish agencies, and that none of the Holocaust refugees were deported. The Jewish agencies also assumed the responsibility of finding housing and jobs for refugees. Gartner and Vorspan remark that this was a difficult task because of complaints of the general community that immigrants were given preference over Americans in these areas.¹⁹ Thus, from Gartner's and Vorspan's writings it is seen that in the United States Jewish communities and communities at large endeavored to operate special programs and policies of assistance to these refugees.

Prescriptive policies and programs were not the only ways in which the world responded to the plight of Holocaust survivors. Once the immediate material necessities were taken of, concern arose over helping these people to readjust to their new environments psychologically. A survey of the Psychological Abstracts shows that investigations into the psychological effects of the Holocausts upon survivors began to be conducted around 1945. Since that time a body of literature from international sources has continued to emerge. Articles such as those by DeWind, Hafner and Herniz, Nathan, Etinger and Winnik, Niederland, Shuval, Simenauer, and Winnik, deal with the effects of the trauma of Nazi concentration camp experiences upon the survivors, and propose to show evidence of consistently ob-

served symptoms termed "survivors' syndrome."²⁰

Ackley, and Barocas and Barocas have studied the effects of the Holocaust experience upon child-rearing. Such research has become increasingly important, not only in terms of helping Holocaust survivors adjust to their environments, but to help their children adjust.²¹

The literature shows that international sympathy which encompassed feelings of responsibility, guilt, and desire to make restitution stimulated responsive actions from communities to assist Holocaust survivors.

Adoption Guidelines

In the 1960's adoption was increasing as a means of creating families.²² Due to the increased number of children needing homes and parents during the 1960's, social agencies undertook more responsibilities for arranging adoptions of children. Much of the concern which emerged at this time was related to refining the level of professional adoptive practices. The role which the adoption agency social worker was taking on was the difficult one of the decision maker in placing children with families. It was necessary for the worker to search for a family which could provide certain standards of care for it's children and one that possessed the ability to cope with the potential stresses of the adoptive role.

Though in the literature of the 1960's there was no agreement upon what constituted a "good" or "bad" adoptive parent, a body of literature emerged which described desirable characteristics which should be present in adoptive applicants.²³ The C.W.L.A. came up with a list of the generally acceptable qualifications for adoptive applicants. (See Appendix A)

The adoption manual of Vista Del Mar, dated 1966, was also reviewed as a part of this study. Criteria were assessed along with C.W.L.A. standards. They both stipulated approximately similar requirements with exception that Vista Del Mar was more stringent in regards to religion, requiring that an adoptive home have a Jewish atmosphere, since Vista Del Mar is a Jewish agency.

Some of the literature from the middle 1960's showed that earlier standards for adoptive applicants had been modified due to the large number of children needing placement, and the more limited number of parents available.²⁴ A study done by Hyton, indicated the two-thirds of seventy-five agencies examined had made changes in their adoption policies aimed at easing requirements for adoptive parents, so that they could place more children in need of families.²⁵

Role Conflict

To assess whether or not pressures were exerted on the agency personnel it is necessary to discuss what occurs to people when they are caught in a role conflict as "the simultaneous occurrence of two or more role sendings, such that compliance with one would make difficult compliance with the other."²⁶ It appears from the literature that there are several different types of role conflict. Katz and Kahn, reason that there are conflicts that exist as conflicts in the object environment of the focal person.²⁷ These conflicts give rise to psychological conflicts of some kind and degree within the focal person. Other types of conflict are generated directly by a combination of externally sent role expectations which the focal person requires of himself. Personal role conflict occurs when role requirements violate the needs, values and capacities of the focal person.

In a 1964 study by Kahn, he found that one-half of his sample of male wage earners were laboring under conditions of noticeable conflict. Forty-eight per cent were subjects to conflict from two sets of people who wanted different things from them.²⁸ The literature shows that the personality of the decision maker carries some influence in the choice that is made from among the divergent expectations.²⁹ His own orientation or predelections are

involved in the assignment of priorities to the relevant variables. The person may, for example, assign the greatest weight to the "rightness" of the act or the "cooperation" of his behavior. However, there is little research on the resolution of role conflict, as it seems to vary from person to person according to the situation in which he finds himself in with regard to the conflict.

Cognitive Dissonance

The concept of cognitive dissonance may be useful in the understanding of decision-making and role conflict resolution. Individuals strive towards consistency within themselves. However, sometimes an individual's attempts to achieve consistency fails and under such conditions there is psychological discomfort. This is known as cognitive dissonance.³⁰ According to Festinger conflict arises because of the simultaneous pressures of two mutually incompatible influences.³¹ This may occur when new and incompatible events happen or new information becomes known to a person, creating at least momentary dissonance.

Sometimes an event may occur which is so compelling in its nature, that it produces almost identical reactions or behavior in everyone for whom it has relevance. Where an opinion must be formed or a decision taken, some dissonance is almost unavoidably created between the cogni-

tion of the actions taken and those opinions or knowledge which tend to point toward a different course of action.

As soon as dissonance appears, the need arises to reduce or eliminate it. When a person is faced with a decision between two alternatives, his behavior is largely directed toward making an objective and impartial evaluation of the merits of the alternatives.³² This takes place by collecting information about the alternatives, evaluating this information in relation to the self and establishing a preference between the alternatives. To reduce or eliminate dissonance a person can change his cognition about his behavior by changing his actions or feelings. He can also change his knowledge about the subject to agree with his decision. If dissonance can not be reduced it persists and may cause problems. Lewin stated that the stronger the conflict before the decision, the greater the tendency to carry through on the decision once it is made.³³

Social Pressure In Groups

Small groups occupy a strategic position as determiners of the behavior and attitudes of their members. Such things as customs and institutionalized patterns of social interaction among people operate to produce a large measure of conformity in people. The sources of the pressure to conform and the means of application of such pre-

ssure are clearly important. Three sources of such pressure are:

- 1) pressures from within the self, for a person who has accepted many values and ideologies during the process of his socialization,
- 2) pressures exerted on a person by means of institutions, laws and taboos,
- 3) pressures to conform from smaller groups within society to which the individual belongs.

The social group is at once a major source of cognitive dissonance for the individual and a major vehicle for eliminating and reducing dissonance which may exist in him or her. One of the most effective ways of eliminating dissonance is to discard one set of cognitive elements in favor of another, something which can sometimes only be accomplished if one can find others who agree with the cognitions one wishes to retain and maintain.³⁴

SUMMARY

In summary, the literature has shown that widespread sympathy was felt towards Holocaust survivors. In response governmental and private agencies established programs and policies to help these people readjust to society. During the 1960's when some Holocaust survivors were applying for adoption, the professional personnel at Vista Del Mar, may have been caught between a number of pressures: 1) pro-

viding homes for the increasing number of adoptive children; 2) adhering to professional standards in approving adoptive parents for these children; 3) restoring Holocaust survivors to "normal" status by allowing them to adopt children even though weaknesses or problems may have been present in these survivors.

Focus

This study explored the extent to which there may have been role conflict within Vista Del Mar and its professional personnel in regard to the screening of adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors. It is recognized that sympathy towards Holocaust survivors has been widespread. Governmental and private agencies, particularly Jewish agencies, felt a responsibility to make restitution to these people.

Professional personnel who were involved in making decisions as to whether or not Holocaust survivors would be approved as adoptive parents may have been subject to a variety of influences. These influences could have ranged from the personnel's personal inclinations, to professional standards for adoptive placement, to community sentiment to compensate Holocaust survivors.

From an inspection of agency adoption files fifteen case records of adoptive parents who were Holocaust sur-

vivors were identified. According to a review of these fifteen records, approval of the adoption applications occurred between 1961 and 1967. Using a list of C.W.L.A. and Vista Del Mar adoption criteria, the researchers examined the case records to determine whether or not these criteria were relaxed, as recorded by the adoption social workers.

In addition, the researchers interviewed eight professional agency personnel who were involved in screening the adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors. Professional personnel included those who held administrative positions and those who were social workers during the time that the Holocaust survivors were being studied (1961-1967). The researchers also reviewed the agency board minutes from the years 1960 through 1967 to determine if any policy changes regarding acceptance or rejection of Holocaust survivors were instituted.

The interview questions which the researchers asked agency personnel dealt with influences or factors which may have affected their decision-making regarding approval of the Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents. The researchers recognized that since this is a retrospective study the data was affected by selective recall and/or ability of the personnel to reconstruct past events.

The focus of this study was to determine whether or

not the decision-making of Vista Del Mar's professional personnel was affected by conflicting pressures, in regard to approval of Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents. Through interviews with professional personnel and through examination of the agency case records and board minutes, the researchers sought to explore and determine answers to the following questions:

I. Pertaining to professional personnel:

A. Professionals' awareness of 'special pressures' at the time of adoption application.

1. a) Did board members exert "special pressures" either pro or con, regarding acceptance of Holocaust survivors as adoptive applicants? If so, what were they?
- b) Did the administration through memoranda, meetings, and other communications discuss "special issues" regarding the applications for adoption by Holocaust survivors? If so, what were they?
2. Was personnel aware of other agencies' policies regarding the accommodation of Holocaust survivors? Did staff of other agencies exert "special pressures" on Vista Del Mar personnel to accept Holocaust survivors as adoptive

applicants? If so, what were they?

3. Did friends appeal to personnel to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive applicants? If so, what were these appeals?
 4. Did the Jewish community exert "special pressures" upon Vista Del Mar to accept Holocaust survivors as adoptive applicants? If so, what were they?
 5. Did the community at large exert "special pressures" upon Vista Del Mar to accept Holocaust survivors as adoptive applicants? If so, what were they?
 6. Did personnel feel pressures within themselves, regarding the Holocaust experience, to accept Holocaust survivors as adoptive applicants? If so, what were they?
 7. Were personnel aware of any "special pressures" from the applicants, themselves?
 8. How did agency personnel resolve the "special pressures" to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive applicants?
- B. Professional personnel's awareness of "special pressures" present when working with Holocaust survivors. (Same questions as above, 1 through 8, this time)
- C. Which criteria were important to professional per-

sonnel in the screening of the individual cases?
Were any considered more important than others?
If so, why?

- D. Was there disagreement among personnel regarding approval of certain Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents?
- E. Did personnel feel a personal responsibility for the outcome of the adoption? More than the usual?
- F. How do the personnel feel the adoptions turned out?
- G. If they had to do it over again, would personnel make the same decisions? If not, what would they change? Do they have a different perspective now than they did previously?

II. Pertaining to case records:

Was there evidence that the adoption criteria of C.W. L.A. and Vista Del Mar were present in the case records or was there evidence that exceptions were made? (See Appendix A for list of C.W.L.A. and Vista Del Mar criteria)

III. Pertaining to Agency Board minutes:

Was there any evidence of policy changes regarding accepting or rejecting Holocaust survivors as adoptive applicants?

Operational Definitions

- 1) Professional Personnel: The employees of Vista Del Mar, administrative staff and social workers, who were involved at any stage of the decision-making process regarding Holocaust survivors as adoptive parent applicants.
- 2) Holocaust Survivors: One or both members of a couple who either experienced life in a concentration camp, were themselves or had family subject to Nazi atrocities, or had to flee home and family in order to protect themselves from capture by Nazis.
- 3) "Special Pressure": Implied or explicit expectations sent to focal persons either to adhere to agency standards or to be more accommodating to Holocaust applicants; or societal pressures to make restitution to Holocaust victims.
- 4) Role Conflict: "The simultaneous occurrence of two or more role sendings such that compliance with one would make difficult compliance with the other."³⁵
- 5) "Special Issues": Areas in which adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors did not meet crucial specifications for acceptance as adoptive parents. Attention brought to these areas may have led to making flexible considerations or taking risks in accepting Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Data Collection

The data consisted of information gathered from Vista Del Mar board minutes, from case records of adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors, and from interviews with professional personnel who worked on those identified cases.

The researchers reviewed agency board minutes, excluding executive minutes due to agency policy concerning confidentiality, from the years 1960 through 1967. They attempted to determine whether or not any policy changes had been instituted regarding adoption application by Holocaust survivors.

Using Questionnaire A (See Appendix A), data regarding the eighteen items listed as the generally acceptable criteria of C.W.L.A. and Vista Del Mar was obtained by the researchers from a review of the fifteen case records of adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors. The researchers attempted to determine if any of the eighteen items were consistently deviated from, and also the total

number of items that were modified. The researchers were looking at the total number of deviations from standards observed only in the particular cases under examination. They were not attempting to obtain a frequency distribution comprised of deviations from standards regarding cases of Holocaust survivors as compared to deviations from standards regarding all other adoption cases. (This would have required a review of all adoption cases in the agency's files which would have been too time-consuming for completion by the researchers within their time limitations) Since a comparative study was not possible, the researchers realize that any notable deviations from the agency's established adoption criteria which they observed can be viewed as initial but only highly tentative modifications of the agency's usual routine.

In addition, using an interview schedule, data (See Appendix B II) was gathered from the eight professional personnel who worked with the adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors. This interview schedule collected data to show:

- 1) what factors professional personnel looked for in screening adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors,
- 2) whether "special pressures" resulting in role conflict, were exerted upon personnel regarding acceptance of Holocaust survivors to adoptive

parents,

- 3) how professional personnel resolved role conflicts.

The researchers, administered open-ended questions to the eight professional personnel who were involved with the adoptive parents. Although the researchers obtained the approval of the Vista Del Mar to carry out this study, they contacted the personnel involved prior to the time of interviewing to explain the nature of the study and to set up appointments to interview them.

Pretest

Due to the small, specific nature of both sampling groups the researchers felt a pretest was relatively unnecessary. The only provision made for pretesting was the administration of the interview schedule to two social workers chosen at random who were not involved with the cases under examination.

Sample

The study consisted of three phases which included review of Vista Del Mar board minutes from the years 1960 through 1967, examination of fifteen case records of adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors, and interviews of eight professional personnel who screened these

Holocaust survivors for approval as adoptive parents.

The Board Minutes: Descriptive Information

The agency provided the researchers with the board minutes from the years 1960 through 1967. The executive minutes were removed due to agency policy which stipulated strict confidentiality in regard to these minutes. In review of the minutes the researchers looked for policy changes regarding adoption and more specifically, policy changes pertaining to adoption by Holocaust survivors. The researchers have taken into consideration that they were restricted by several limitations in examining the minutes:

- 1) The board minutes reflected the understandable personnel biases of the recorder, and therefore there was some degree of selectivity as to what was included in them.
- 2) The board minutes only presented the researchers with evidence of formal communications within the agency. There were no records of informal communications to be reviewed.
- 3) Due to the inaccessibility of the executive minutes, it is conceivable that the researchers were not able to obtain some information regarding policies on adoption and adoption by Holocaust survivors.

The Adoptive Parents: Descriptive Information

The researchers reviewed the adoption files of Vista Del Mar from the years 1950 through 1968, and were able to locate fifteen case records of adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors. It is possible that more exist but these were the only case records located after an exhaustive screening of over six hundred records.

The researchers previously described the way in which they compiled a list of adoption criteria comprised of C. W.L.A. and Vista Del Mar standards which they used in examining the case records (See Chapter I, Literature under Adoption Guidelines). This list was categorized into eighteen individual items (See Appendix A). Since the case records were not written in a format which corresponded directly to the eighteen items, it was necessary for the researchers to adapt the information given in the records to fit their list of criteria.

The researchers wish to make note of several limitations in regards to review of the case records. It is recognized that the fifteen case records were not compiled for research purposes, but rather for use as internal references for agency administration and personnel. Due to this fact they are written neither in a systematic or uniform manner. The social workers who evaluated the adoptive couples recorded information in their own individual

styles. Furthermore they selectively included the material which they felt was pertinent, resulting in the reflection of their personal biases within the records for which they were responsible. Further restrictions concerning review of case records include: the possibility that more case records of adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors exist in the agency's files which were not located by the researchers; and the possibility that there exists further information regarding the fifteen case records examined about which the researchers remain uninformed.

Of the fifteen case records reviewed it appeared that both members of each adoptive couple were Jewish. One or both members of each couple lived in a country which was taken over by the Nazis to or during World War II. One or both members of each couple either experienced life in a concentration camp, were themselves or had family who were subject to Nazi atrocities, or had to flee home and family in order to protect himself or herself from capture by Nazis. It is to be noted that all of the fifteen adoptive placements occurred between 1961 and 1967.

The Professional Personnel: Descriptive Information

From a review of the fifteen case records, eight different professional personnel who were involved with adoption work with Holocaust survivors were identified and sub-

sequently interviewed by the researchers. (See Appendix B II, Interview Schedule B).

The researchers realize that a number of limitations existed concerning the interviewing of professional personnel. It is possible that the researchers were unable to identify all of the professional personnel involved in adoption work with Holocaust survivors. This could be due to several reasons: 1) perhaps all of the cases of adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors present in the agency files were not located for review; 2) the names or initials of other personnel involved may not have been present in the records examined; 3) the researchers may have overlooked the names or initials of personnel included in the records although they attempted to examine records thoroughly and carefully.

Since this was a retrospective study it was necessary for the interviewees to respond to questions based on recall. It is possible that their recollections may have been distorted, since they may have remembered events as being more positive or negative than they were in actuality.

The way in which the interviews were conducted may have affected the responses of some of the interviewees. Due to time limitations it was necessary for the researchers to separately interview four agency personnel each. Al-

though the researchers attempted to devise a uniform method for administering the interview schedule, there may have been differences in the ways the interviews were carried out. Furthermore, although the researchers attempted to administer questions in an objective manner, it is possible that they may have unconsciously communicated messages which affected the responses of the interviewees. Since it was impossible for the researchers to conduct all eight interviews at the same time, there may have been informal discussions among agency personnel regarding the interviews which may have affected the responses, even though the interviewees were requested to refrain from discussion until after all of the interviews had been conducted.

The responses of the interviewees may have been affected by certain influences to which they could have been subject. Due to the fact that some of the questions in the interview schedule may have caused interviewees to take a defensive stance in answering, they may have responded in such a way as to protect themselves and/or the agency. In addition, the fact that one of the researchers was involved in field work at Vista Del Mar may have influenced the responses of the interviewees.

Of the eight professional personnel identified, five were still at Vista Del Mar while three had left the agency within the past three years. They have or had been at

Vista Del Mar an average of sixteen years.

The professional personnel have been social workers for an average of twenty-seven years, with an average of fourteen and one-half years working in adoption, in addition to experience in other fields.

Of the five professional personnel remaining at Vista Del Mar at the time of this study, two are directors or assistant directors of the agency's departments, two are social workers and one is a unit supervisor. During the 1960's when adoptions involving Holocaust survivors were taking place, four were social workers, two were directors of case work, one was a social work supervisor, and one was director of the agency.

All eight are Jewish, and of these eight, four had either immediate family members or other relatives who experienced the Holocaust. Two of these four had close relatives involved.

Administration and Board Members

The researchers wish to distinguish between social workers and administrators in discussing "professional personnel." Administrators include those professionals who were employed in policy-making and policy-implementing within the agency. As mentioned, some of those profes-

sionals currently employed by Vista Del Mar, who worked in the capacity of social workers in screening adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors, were promoted to administrative positions either during or after the period of time from 1961 through 1967. The person who served as the director of the agency between 1961 and 1967 is no longer living. However, the researchers did locate and interview the director who served from 1967 through 1972.

Analysis of Data

Data acquired through review of Vista Del Mar board minutes was described.

Data obtained from the fifteen case records of Holocaust survivors regarding C.W.L.A. and Vista Del Mar adoption criteria (Appendix A) was coded to determine whether each of the eighteen items were present or absent, by using respectively the words "yes" and "no". This data is described in Appendix C. Furthermore, it was compared in two ways: 1) Data within the table was compared (See Appendix C, Table I): a) to find the total number of items which reveal deviations from usual criteria (See Appendix C, Table II), and b) to find which items were deviated from most often; 2) The above data was compared with data gathered from questions regarding professional personnel's perceptions of the criteria which were important in screen-

ing the adoptive applicants (See Appendix C, Table III).

The data collected from the interview schedule designed for agency personnel was tabulated, described and analyzed to determine what factors affected their decision-making processes while screening Holocaust survivors who were adoptive applicants (See Appendix B III). The data discussed above, which was compared with data collected from case records, was put into tables to determine which criteria professional personnel, through recall, consistently considered important in the screening process (See Appendix C, Table IV). Furthermore, from the data collected the researchers hoped to determine what pressures, if any, were exerted upon the professional personnel to accept Holocaust survivors as adoptive applicants and how they dealt with these pressures.

Limitations in Generalizing From Sample Selected

It is recognized that the data gathered from this study cannot be considered conclusive evidence upon which generalizations can be drawn, due to the fact that this is a retrospective study dependent upon professional personnel's selective recall and ability to reconstruct past memories. Furthermore, since this study concerns a limited sample who may have had unique experiences obtained specifically from one agency, it would be difficult to genera-

lize to other situations.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The findings of this study were derived through an examination of board minutes of Vista Del Mar, a review of fifteen case records of Holocaust survivors who were adoptive parents, and the administration of an interview schedule to eight agency personnel who were involved in adoption work with the adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors. This study was conducted to ascertain if there were factors which affected decision-making by professional regarding approval of adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors.

Board Minutes

The researchers examined board minutes of Vista Del Mar dating from 1960 through 1967. It was not possible for the researchers to review executive minutes due to agency policy concerning confidentiality. Through examination of these minutes the researchers found no reference to any policy changes regarding adoptive applicants who were Holocaust Survivors. However, the researchers did find policy

changes pertaining to adoption in general. In 1961, the age for eligibility of potential adoptive parents was raised from forty to forty-five for men and from thirty-five to forty for women. In addition, the requirements for citizenship were modified from United State citizenship to legal proof of entry into the United States with plans to remain. Also, the number of adoptive children that could be placed in an adoptive home was changed from two to three. In 1962, a change in policy was made to include Orange County as well as Los Angeles County within those areas served by Vista Del Mar. In 1964, the age limit for adoptive parents was removed completely. In 1965 a policy was instituted which eliminated restrictions regarding the number of children, either natural or adoptive, in the home at the time application was made for adoption. Previously there had been a unit of three children in the home in order for a couple to be considered eligible for adoption. In 1965, the adoption fee was increased from five hundred and fifty dollars per child to six hundred and fifty dollars per child. It was noted that the agency would reduce the fee under special circumstances. However, the mixtures did not spell out what "special" meant.

Case Records

Of fifteen case records of adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors, each having been examined for presence

or absence of the eighteen adoption criteria (See Appendix A) there were a possible total number of two hundred and seventy deviations. From review of these case records the researchers found a total number of only nineteen deviations (See Appendix C, Table I and Table II). This appears to the researchers to be an inconsequential number of total deviations from criteria, since it is likely that the same total number of deviations might be found in a similar review of adoption cases in general. Those deviations which were found related to nine of the eighteen items of general adoption criteria (See Appendix C, Table I and Table II). Several of these items seem to be worthy of further mention, especially in view of the responses of the social workers interviewed concerning their standards of important criteria upon which to evaluate adoptive couples (See Appendix C, Table II).

Concerning "Marital History", several of the case records recorded either previous divorces or problems within the marriages. However, within these records notes were made to the effect that it appeared as though the weaknesses and strengths of the marital partners seemed to counterbalance those of one another.

Concerning "Attitudes Towards Children", it was mentioned in the case records that the attitudes of some of the couples were inflexible in that they would only accept

adoptive children who met their specified qualifications, or that there were uncertainties on the part of the professional personnel regarding the couples' abilities to set limits for children.

In regard to "Attitudes Towards Adoptions," some of the case records noted the couples' resistance to accepting adoption in that they preferred to be secretive and wanted to consider the adoptive child a natural child.

Concerning "Health", which it can be assumed includes both mental and physical health, one of the case records mentioned that one marital partner had attempted suicide prior to the time of the adoption application. This appears as evidence of an occurrence of mental instability which might possibly be injurious to the well being of a child.

There are several factors worthy of mention which cannot be considered actual deviations from the listed general adoption criteria. From the fifteen cases studied, the couples appeared to be older than most couples applying for adoption. The ages for men ranged from 32-49 years of age, with the mean age being thirty seven and one-half years of age. For women, the ages ranged from 29-45 years of age, with the mean being thirty-five years of age. Several professional personnel interviewed by the researchers, stated that they felt that the applicants who were Holocaust sur-

vivors were too old, and thus, they tried to help the couples decide against adoption. However, the professional personnel were unable to reject an applicant on the basis of age alone, since the policy concerning age limits had been extended in order to meet the need of the rising numbers of adoptive children who needed homes.

The length of marriage for these couples, which ranged from four to sixteen years, was found to be well within the range specified in the criteria. However, several of the professional personnel interviewed, seemed to feel that a couple who had been childless for many years might encounter difficulties in accepting adoption. It is noteworthy that thirteen of the fifteen couples who were Holocaust survivors had been childless prior to adoption application, and had been married for an average of ten years.

The standards applying to "Family Background (Broken Homes)" appear to have been disregarded consistently since fourteen out of fifteen case records mentioned disintegration of family life due to circumstances of the Nazi Holocaust. However, this item cannot be considered as a deviation since it is assumed that the meaning of "Broken Homes" in the general adoption criteria refers to disruption of family life due to internal discord rather than uncontrollable external circumstances such as those of the Nazi Holocaust.

Findings of Interview Schedule

The eight agency personnel interviewed were selected after a thorough and careful review of the fifteen case records of adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors.

Awareness of Influences Upon Decision-Making in Evaluating Adoptive Couples in General

Professional personnel interviewed generally tended to respond that they were aware of influences upon their decision-making in evaluating adoptive couples in general. The influences were felt either directly by the interviewees or indirectly through their supervisors. All of the interviewees felt that they had taken risks in accepting and rejecting couples as adoptive parents. Most of the interviewees were aware of influences from board members, agency personnel and community members, usually through informal discussion (See Appendix B III, Question B6). Sometimes board members or community members would exert influences by offering money or material goods that would benefit the agency.

Interviewees were also aware of influences exerted by adoptive applicants themselves. According to all interviewees, most adoptive applicants tried to emphasize their strengths and de-emphasize their weaknesses. Some adoptive applicants attempted to influence the interviewees by

offering material goods or money to them or to the agency.

Characteristics of Holocaust Survivors Remembered By
Agency Personnel

The interviewees were responsive when asked to recall generally what they remembered about adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors. In a number of instances, they were able to cite examples of specific cases. In addition, they were able to recall specific characteristics about Holocaust survivors. The most frequently mentioned responses were: Holocaust survivors wanted to perpetuate their Jewishness by raising a child; the applicants they had suffered a great deal in terms of loss and deprivation to which the interviewees did not want to add by refusing the couples adoptive children; the Holocaust experience caused the interviewees to have the desire to make restitution to the Holocaust survivors for the suffering they had endured by accepting them as adoptive parents.

Half of the interviewees remembered taking special risks in accepting Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents in that they felt the survivors had been "developmentally altered" and "emotionally handicapped" by their traumatic experiences (See Appendix B III, Question CIA). All of the interviewees recollected that they used quite flexible considerations concerning acceptance of Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents, in that they were older than most

adoptive parents; that they held extreme traditional European views and had not adapted themselves to contemporary American culture; that they were rigid and inflexible.

Awareness of Influences Upon Decision-Making in Evaluating Adoptive Couples Who Were Holocaust Survivors

Professional personnel generally tended to respond that they were not aware of formal policies, agency discussions or influences which might have affected their decision making regarding adoptions by Holocaust survivors. The trend appeared to be that most interviewees did not feel formal pressures from the agency, itself, from its board members or its personnel. However, one interviewee's responses tended to disagree consistently with those of the other interviewees concerning formal pressures. This interviewee recalled that the administration attempted to influence decisions regarding adoption by Holocaust survivors through written memos and/or directives, through conferences and through other communications, while all others had no recollection of such communications. Several interviewees noted that they felt informal pressures, from board members or other influential persons within the Jewish community, usually through social contact.

Five of the interviewees stated that they were not aware of special appeals made to them by the Holocaust sur-

vivors, themselves. However, three interviewees stated that they were aware of special appeals made by Holocaust survivors such as: they wanted special attention since they had experienced the Holocaust; they wanted to perpetuate Jewishness since so many Jews, including their families, had been killed in the Holocaust; they were enormously persistent about wanting adoptive children, more so than the usual adoptive applicants. All but one of the interviewees felt pressures within themselves to accept applicants who were Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents. Most of the interviewees stated that they felt conflict between acting on a professionally objective basis and acting on opinions colored by emotions in the decision-making process regarding acceptance of Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents. Examples of their emotional feelings regarding the Holocaust survivors include among others guilt, pity, empathy, a desire to make restitution for previous deprivation and loss (See Appendix BIII, Question C9).

In response to the question of how special pressures to accept or reject Holocaust survivors were resolved, all but one of the interviewees said that they looked for the strengths in these couples. The one dissenter in this instances said that no special pressures were felt.

It is noteworthy that while most interviewees tended to respond freely and specifically to open-ended questions concerning their recall of applicants who were Holocaust survivors (See previous discussion in Chapter III, FINDINGS, under "Characteristics of Holocaust Survivors Remembered by Agency Personnel"), they subsequently answered that they did not feel special pressures to accept these applicants as adoptive parents (See previous discussion in this section of Chapter III, FINDINGS). However, they did tend to respond that they resolved special pressures regarding Holocaust survivors, and were able to tell how they did so (See previous discussion in this section of Chapter III, FINDINGS).

The Professional Personnel's Evaluations of Their Own Decisions Regarding Acceptance of Holocaust Survivors as Adoptive Parents

Most agency personnel recalled turning down some applicants who were Holocaust survivors for adoptive placement. Six of the interviewees said that Holocaust survivors were accepted upon the basis that any other adoptive applicant would be accepted, that is according to the general adoption criteria. The interviewees stated that Holocaust survivors were rejected upon the basis that any other adoptive couple would be rejected. Two of the interviewees felt that Holocaust survivors were accepted due to the fact that they had weighed these couples' strengths

much more heavily than their weaknesses. All eight interviewees rejected Holocaust survivors due to the fact that they were "obviously emotionally disturbed or their development had been altered" (See Appendix B III, Question D 2-a-2). In spite of accepting the Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents, seven of the interviewees had reservations and felt that they had taken risks concerning the acceptance of these couples for adoption. In fact, they felt more uncertainty than usual for the outcome of these adoptions.

It is interesting to note that in retrospect half said they would make the same decisions and half said they would not, if they had to make the decisions over again. The most common response of those personnel who said that they would make the same decisions over again was that newly acquired knowledge about the couples would not have affected their decisions. However, one of the interviewees who responded positively said that one of the bases upon which Holocaust survivors were accepted previously was guilt, and would currently have been guilt. The trend among those personnel who said that they would not now accept Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents was that newly acquired knowledge concerning the outcomes of these adoptions and psychological research on "survivors syndrome" would not permit them to accept these couples.

It is noteworthy that the findings concerning the interviewees' recall of special risks and flexible considerations (See Appendix B III, Question C1) seem to be consistent with the findings that the interviewees felt they had taken risks, had more reservations in accepting these couples as adoptive parents, and felt more responsible than usual for the outcome of these adoptions (See Appendix B III, respectively Questions D 3, 4, and 6). Furthermore, the findings that most of the interviewees felt pressures with themselves (See Appendix B III, Question C 9) would also seem to be consistent with the findings that the interviewees felt more uncertainties about the outcomes of these adoptions (See Appendix B III, Question D 6).

Discussion Among Professional Personnel Which May Have Resulted in Policy Changes Regarding Adoption by Holocaust Survivors

All interviewees responded that there were discussions among professional personnel concerning specific applicants who were Holocaust survivors. There was concurrence that these discussions took place in adoption conferences where all applicants in general were dealt with on an individual basis. Several of the interviewees did tend to recall that more concern was expressed about Holocaust survivors as a group than about other adoptive applicants in general. It is interesting to note that some of the findings reveal a consensus among the interviewees that no formal discussions

concerning applicants who were Holocaust survivors were participated in (See Appendix B III, Question C 2b), whereas other findings show that the interviewees felt that formal discussions were held concerning applicants who were Holocaust survivors (See Appendix B III, Question E). However, most of the interviewees tended to agree that such formal discussions were held as a part of the routine case-review process.

All interviewees responded that no general policy changes were made in regard to applicants who were Holocaust survivors as a group. However, there was agreement that some policies were relaxed for some cases of applicants who were Holocaust survivors on an individual basis in order that they could meet the requirements for acceptance as adoptive parents. This appears to be consistent with the findings regarding review of board minutes in which no policy changes concerning adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors were revealed (See Chapter III, FINDINGS, section on Board Minutes).

Role Conflict

Six of the interviewees stated that if they had the opportunity to make their decisions over again they would have made the same decisions. This was due to the fact that that they did not consider the Holocaust experience to be a

factor which would differentiate them from other couples. One of the interviewees who appeared to take a contrary position throughout the interview stated that the same decisions would not have been made in the event that these applicants had not been Holocaust survivors. The reason given to support this response was that the interviewee now recognized the Holocaust experience as a potential cause for poor parenting by an adoptive couple which could, in turn, be detrimental to the healthy development of a child. These findings appear to be inconsistent with other responses in which half of the interviewees said that in retrospect they would have made the same decisions, and half said that in retrospect they would not have (See Appendix B III, Questions D 7).

The findings in this area also appear to be inconsistent with the responses elicited concerning interviewees' feeling that they had taken risks, had reservations and felt more uncertainties in regard to accepting applicants who were Holocaust survivors (See Appendix B III, respectively Questions D 3, 4 and 6).

All of the interviewees responded that they had experienced role conflict in general in their professional practice. All but one interviewee said that they had not experienced role conflict specifically related to evaluating adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors. The interviewee who answered that role conflict had been ex-

perienced in the instance of evaluating adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors, said that this role conflict was resolved by allowing "emotions" to influence professional judgment. The emotional influences led to the decision to accept Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents. These findings seem to be inconsistent with the responses concerning pressures that the interviewees felt within themselves to accept Holocaust survivors, and inconsistent with the responses concerning how they resolved them (See Appendix B III, respectively questions C9 and C11). In these responses the interviewees tended to agree that they had resolved special pressures concerning adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors by weighing their strengths more heavily than their weaknesses.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The stated purpose of this study was to explore factors affecting decision-making by professional agency personnel regarding approval of adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors. The focus of this study was to examine the extent to which there may have been role conflict within Vista Del Mar and its professional personnel in regard to the screening of adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors.

Summary of Findings

The findings of this study were derived through an examination of board minutes of Vista Del Mar: a review of fifteen case records of Holocaust survivors who were adoptive parents; and the administration of an interview schedule to eight agency personnel who were involved in adoption work with the adoptive parents, who were Holocaust survivors.

Board Minutes

Through review of the Vista Del Mar board minutes the researchers found no policy changes specifically relating to adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors. Several policy changes concerning adoption in general were found.

Case Records

The researchers found an inconsequential number of deviations from items of agency and professional adoption criteria through a review of the case records of adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors. However, the researchers found several deviations from items of criteria which the interviewees seemed to feel were crucial in evaluating adoptive applicants. Those items deviated from among the case records of adoptive parents were "Marital History," "Attitudes Towards Children," "Attitudes Towards Adoption," and "Health." Although no other actual deviations from the criteria were discovered, material pertaining to some of the criteria appeared questionable: 1) under "Age"; couples who were Holocaust survivors consistently appeared older than most couples applying for adoption at the time. 2) under "Length of Marriage;" a number of Holocaust survivors had been married and childless for many years. 3) under "Broken Homes;" fourteen of the fif-

teen Holocaust survivors came from broken homes but this was due to external circumstances rather than internal family discord.

Interview Schedule

Most interviewees stated that they were not aware of formal influences, such as from policies, board or administration, upon their decision-making either concerning adoptive applicants in general or concerning adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors. Some were aware of informal influences upon decision-making on adoptions in general, while a few were aware of informal influences in regard to Holocaust survivors. These informal influences were usually derived through social contact with board members, administration and/or prominent community members. All of the interviewees were aware of influences exerted upon them by appeals of adoptive applicants. Also it was noted that some of the Holocaust survivors were especially persistent and were willing to use their special status as a factor for persuading personnel to reach a favorable decision.

When asked, the interviewees generally tended to recall clearly their experiences in working with adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors. Half of the respondents remembered taking special risks in making

placements, and all recollected that they were quite flexible in accepting these couples as adoptive parents.

Seven of eight professional personnel interviewed recognized that they had felt pressure within themselves, i.e. emotional feelings, to accept Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents. Those seven were also able to recall how they resolved "special pressures" in general; they emphasized the applicants' strengths and de-emphasized their weaknesses.

Seven of the interviewees felt that they had taken risks in accepting some of the Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents. Seven of the interviewees said that they had reservations about case situations of those Holocaust survivors accepted as adoptive parents. Six of the interviewees responded that nevertheless they felt more uncertainties, other than the usual, for the outcomes of these adoptions. Half said that in retrospect they would not have made the same decisions to accept the Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents, and half said they would. Of the four interviewees who responded positively, one contended that the Holocaust survivors would still be accepted again due to the prevalent feelings of guilt, and sympathy concerning the Holocaust.

All of the interviewees concurred that there was discussion at adoption conferences among professional person-

nel concerning applicants who were Holocaust survivors. They said that these conferences were held as part of the routine case review process. A few interviewees felt that there was more concern for the Holocaust survivors as a group than for other adoptive applicants in general.

Most of the interviewees responded that they would have made the placements anyway had the couples not been Holocaust survivors. They did not feel that the Holocaust experience was a factor which warranted special consideration. However, one of the interviewees stated that the same decisions would not be made at present because the effects of the parents' Holocaust experience are now recognized as being potentially detrimental to the healthy development of a child.

All of the interviewees stated that they had experienced role conflict within their professional practices. Of those for whom it was necessary to resolve the role conflict most said that they acted upon professional judgment, while a few said that they allowed their emotions to overcome their professionalism. Only one interviewee responded that role conflict had been experienced in regard to evaluating adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors. In this instance decision-making was influenced by emotions leading to acceptance of Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents.

Discussion and Conclusions

The researchers had anticipated findings that the professional personnel who approved Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents felt that competing influences were exerted upon them and therefore experienced role conflict during the evaluation processes. According to most of the professional personnel interviewed influences were felt only within themselves, and they did not experience role conflict in regard to evaluating adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors. However, a few of the professional personnel said that they felt informal influences besides pressure within themselves, but did not experience role conflict in regard to adoption work with Holocaust survivors.

Only one of the professional personnel reported feeling some formal pressures as well as informal and personal pressures which led to role conflict in evaluating adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors. Therefore, one of the assumptions upon which this study was based, that role conflict was experienced by professional personnel who evaluated adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors, was not borne out in the findings. However, since all of the professional personnel interviewed felt some pressures, either formal, informal, or personal, the expectations of the researchers were neither completely affirmed or nega-

ted. Since the assumption upon which this study was based appeared to be neither completely affirmed nor negated further discussion is necessary.

The researchers wish to point out two phenomena which occurred throughout the interviews. First, it is noteworthy that seldom were professional personnels' recollections in total agreement. For example, while the general trend was for a greater number to respond that they had not felt influences, other than within themselves, there were some professional personnel who clearly stated that they did feel the pressure of outside influences.

Of particular interest is the manner in which the professional personnel responded to the interview schedule as the questions progressed from the general to the more specific. The researchers presume that as the questions of the interview schedule progressed from gathering general information to gathering specific information, the respondents may have become increasingly threatened and protective of their professional positions. The findings seem to support this presumption. For example, it can be noted that in the beginning stages of the interview, the professional personnel were able to recall considerable amounts of information concerning their work with adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors. They remembered specific characteristics of the Holocaust survivors as

well as that they had taken special risks and had made flexible considerations in accepting these couples as adoptive parents. They all agreed that they felt pressures within themselves regarding the acceptance of Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents. While in general they said that they felt pressures to approve these couples such as guilt, pity and the desire to make restitution for the losses suffered, after they had approved them, they recalled feeling that they had taken risks; has reservations and felt more uncertainties than usual regarding the outcomes of these adoptions. Moreover, half said that in retrospect they would not have made the same decisions due to newly acquired knowledge concerning the Holocaust experience.

However, the answers of the professional personnel in the latter part of the interview schedule were not consistent with their earlier responses. Particularly those who previously had said that they felt influences, either formal, informal or personal, responded that the acceptance of Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents was initiated on the basis of professional judgment, no differently than the acceptance of any other adoptive applicants. Furthermore, in the latter part of the interview schedule, several of the professional personnel who previously stated that (in retrospect) they would not have made the same decisions said that they would have made the same decisions since the

Holocaust experience did not differentiate these applicants from other adoptive applicants.

Finally all but one of the professional personnel who had previously reported feeling influences and pressures said that they did not experience role conflict in regard to evaluating adoptive couples who were Holocaust survivors.

The researchers speculate that the theory of cognitive dissonance may explain why the professional personnel were inconsistent in some of their responses. "Cognitive dissonance is when conflict arises because of the simultaneous pressures of two mutually incompatible influences.³⁷ The incompatible influences present in the professional personnel interviewed may have been the conflicting desires to simultaneously: 1) serve the professionalism of the agency and themselves; 2) also share their doubts and reservations with the researchers. It appears that most of the professional personnel chose to favor the professionalism of the agency and themselves when the questions relating to this issue turned more specific. In this way it would seem that they would have been able to reconcile the dissonance in order to avoid conflict from the agency personnel and/or conflict within themselves.

Recommendations for Further Study

It is recognized that certain limitations of this study prevent the researchers from providing conclusive evidence upon which generalizations can be drawn. It must be noted that the findings of this study were based upon: 1) perceptions of recorders of board minutes, 2) perceptions of professionals who wrote case records, and 3) selective recall of professional personnel. In addition, this study concerned a limited sample of Jewish professionals obtained from Vista Del Mar, a Jewish agency in Los Angeles, California. It appears likely that these professionals may have had unique experiences in evaluating adoptive applicants who were Holocaust survivors in that they all had personal emotional investment in the Holocaust experience. However, the researchers recognize that situations of personal emotional investment of professional personnel in the circumstances of their clients have occurred and will occur within the realm of professional practice.

Besides the influences of emotional feelings towards clients upon decision-making, this study has shown that in this specific situation the community, the agency, its board members, administration and personnel, exerted influences upon professionals which could have affected their decision-making. It is possible that the presence of

these influences could affect the decision-making not only of other Jewish Communal professionals, but of other social work professionals, in general, in similar circumstances. The researchers recommend that further studies be executed concerning different situations involving decision-making in other agencies. From these studies it is hoped that generalizations could be made in order to identify factors which affect decision-making. It is further hoped that from these generalizations ways of increasing the awareness of Jewish Communal and other social work professionals, regarding factors which affect decision-making could be derived.

The researchers conclude from the findings of this study that there is a definite need for Jewish Communal professionals and, more generally, social work professionals to be cognizant of those factors which do affect their decision-making. Besides the influences of society at large, professional and agency guidelines, peer pressures and internal personal pressures, there may be other factors which have not been recognized.

APPENDIX A

CRITERIA FOR ADOPTIVE PARENTS

"CWL A Standards"

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Generally Acceptable Criteria for Adoptive Applicants (CWL A, 1965)</u>	<u>Criteria Specific to Vista Del Mar (Manuel 1, 1966)</u>
1) Age	Age of parents should be within the range of the ages of the natural parents of the child. It is usually between the ages of 25-40 depending on the age of the adoptive child.	Same.
2) Citizenship	Usually of the USA.	Proof of legal entry into the USA, and plan to remain in the USA.
3) Length of marriage.	Couple must be married at least 2-4 years.	Must be married at least 2 years.
4) Residence	Specific to each agency.	Must reside in either LA or Orange counties.
5) Other children in family.	Whether couple has none, 1, 2, made little difference but if more than 3 were usually rejected.	Applicants are accepted from childless, as well as from couples with 1, 2, or more children either natural or adopted.
6) Religion	This usually depends on how each agency views mixed religions but is usually a higher rejection if is mixed.	Family must consider themselves Jewish. Couples of mixed religion are accepted if home is Jewish atmosphere.

<u>Categories</u>	<u>Generally Acceptable Criteria for Adoptive Applicants (CWLA, 1965)</u>	<u>Criteria Specific to Vista Del Mar (Manuel 1, 1966)</u>
7) Economic status	To be able to adequately support a family.	Adequate financial provisions to maintain an acceptable standard of living. Wife shouldn't have to work to supplement family income.
8) Health	In general good health.	Medical form must be filed and acceptable.
9) Infertility	Reason and proof. Couples adaptation to it. Attitudes towards it and to each other.	Reason and proof. Others same as general.
10) Marital history	Is important that stability be found in the home.	Proof of marriage and/or divorce. Others same.
11) Broken homes	Find out background on the parents.	Same.
12) Siblings	Find out the placement of the parents in the home.	----
13) Occupation	----	----
14) Education	----	----
15) Birthplace	----	----
16) Housing	Should be adequate for family.	----
17) Attitudes towards children	Should both want them and enjoy them.	Experiences with them and joy for them.
18) Attitudes towards adoption	Willing to adopt, ready and attitudes towards natural parents and telling child of adoption.	Same.

APPENDIX B I

10500 National Boulevard
Los Angeles, California
90034

February 20, 1974

Dear

Currently we are candidates to receive the Master of Social Work Degree from the University of Southern California in June of 1974. We are conducting a study for our Master's thesis under the sanction of Vista Del Mar, which concerns personnel who were working at this agency with Holocaust survivors who were adoptive applicants during the 1960's.

The names of those social workers involved with the cases of adoptive parents who were Holocaust survivors appeared in the adoption files which we reviewed. We would greatly appreciate your cooperation in allowing us to interview you.

All names and information obtained from the interviews will be kept strictly confidential. We will be contacting you by telephone in the near future to set a time for an interview.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Judy Doty

Judith M. Harris

APPENDIX B IIA. PERSONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

1. How long have you been employed as a social worker?
2. Are you presently employed at Vista Del Mar, or at another agency?
3. If not at Vista Del Mar, when did you leave?
4. How many years have you or had you been with Vista?
5. How many years of experience have you had:
 - a. In the field of adoption?
 - b. Other (specify)?
6. If now at Vista, what is your present position?
7. What was your position in the 1960's when you were doing adoption work at Vista?
8. Are you Jewish?
9. Did you have any immediate family members or other relatives who experienced the Holocaust? If yes, please discuss (who)?

B. INFLUENCES IN ADOPTION IN GENERAL:

1. What do you consider to be the most important factors in evaluating an adoptive couple?
2. Have you ever taken what you knowingly felt were calculated risks in adoption? If so, were there any factors most influential in your decision?
3. Have you ever felt any personal conflicts or uncertainties regarding your recommendations to either accept or reject an adoptive applicant? If so, please describe.
4. Have your recommendations in the past either for or against adoption been reversed by Vista or another agency? If so, please describe.

5. Did adoptive applicants in general make appeals to you to try to influence affirmative decisions from you? If so, please describe.
6. Concerning decision-making in adoption work, have you felt any other people tried to influence your recommendations?
 - a. Board members or agency personnel at Vista?
 - b. Personnel from other agencies?
 - c. Community members through formal or informal communications?
 - d. Your own family and friends?

C. PROFESSIONALS' AWARENESS OF INFLUENCES AT THE TIME OF ADOPTION APPLICATION BY HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS:

1. Since the special interest of this study is adoptions by Holocaust survivors, is there anything in particular you remember about them?
 - a. Special risks?
 - b. Flexible considerations?

2. Did you feel any influences from agency board members to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.
 - a. Influences felt as a result of policy discussions?
 - b. Influences felt as a result of conferences?
 - c. Influences felt as a result of sending personnel to meetings?
 - d. Influences felt as a result of written directives or memos?
3. Do you remember any ways in which the administration attempted to influence decisions regarding adoption by Holocaust survivors? If so, please describe.
 - a. Through written memos or directives?
 - b. Through conferences?
 - c. Through other communications?

4. Were you aware of any other agencies' policies regarding acceptance of Holocaust survivors for adoption? If so, please describe.
5. Did personnel of other agencies exert any pressure on you to accept Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.
6. Did any of your personal friends appeal to you to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.
7. Did any person or group of the Jewish Community exert any pressures on you to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.
 - a. Formal?
 - b. Informal?
8. Did any person or group of the community at large meaning other agencies, groups, or individuals outside the Jewish community, exert any pressures on you to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.
 - a. Formal?
 - b. Informal?

9. Did you feel pressures within yourself to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.
10. Other than the usual appeals from the applicants, were you aware of any special or unique pressures from the Holocaust applicants themselves to be accepted for adoption? If so, please describe.
11. How did you personally resolve the special pressures to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents?

D. FACTORS AFFECTING PROFESSIONAL PERSONNELS' DECISIONS
IN EVALUATING CASES FOR ADOPTION:

1. Did you ever turn down applicants who were Holocaust survivors for adoptive placement? If so, please describe.
2. In considering Holocaust applicants for adoption:
 - a. What factors about them were most important in your decisions.

1. To accept them?

2. To reject them?

b. Why were these factors important?

3. If you had any reservations what factors in the case situation caused you to make your decision to accept these couples?

4. Were you aware of taking any risks regarding accepting these couples for adoption? If so, please describe.

5. Did you interview and evaluate any other applicants for adoption who were immigrants besides Holocaust survivors?

a. Were any of these applicants turned down for adoptive placement?

b. If so, what factors influenced your decision to do so.

6. Did you feel any uncertainty for the outcome of these adoptions?

More than usual?

7. If you had it to do over again would you have made the same decisions? Please describe what your decision would have been and why:

E. DISCUSSION AMONG PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL:

1. Was there any discussion among the professionals at the agency regarding specific Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.
2. To your knowledge, through communications at the agency between personnel, administration and Board members, were any policy changes instituted regarding the acceptance of Holocaust survivors? If so, please describe.

F. DECISION-MAKING QUESTIONS (ROLE OF CONFLICT)

1. In retrospect, do you feel that you would have made these placements if the family had not been Holocaust survivors? Please describe.

Social workers are often asked to make difficult decisions about complex matters. In addition to the special appeals of the situation at hand, there are often community or agency pressures to lean in one direction or another in the decision-making process. Some authors refer to this as role conflict. For example, personnel may be inclined to make one decision while their professional judgment pushes them in another direction, while the agency and community may be moving still in another direction.

2. Have you ever been aware of this kind of pressure in your professional practice?
3. Could you tell me how you personally deal with this matter?

APPENDIX B IIIA. PERSONAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. How long have you been employed as a social worker?
2. Are you presently employed at Vista Del Mar, or at another agency?
3. If not at Vista Del Mar when did you leave?
4. How many years have you or had you been with Vista?
5. How many years of experience have you had:
 - a. In the field of adoption?
 - b. Other (specify)?
6. If now at Vista, what is your present position?
7. What was your position in the 1960's when you were doing adoption work at Vista?
8. Are you Jewish?
9. Did you have any immediate family members or other relatives who experienced the Holocaust? If yes, please discuss (who)?

(See Sample in Professional Personnel)

B. INFLUENCES IN ADOPTION IN GENERAL:

1. What do you consider to be the most important factors in evaluating an adoptive couple?

See Appendix C, Table III

2. Have you ever taken what you knowingly felt were calculated risks in adoption? If so, were there any factors most influential in your decision?

8 - Yes

Influential factors:

3 - Positive qualities outweighed negative ones

2 - No answer

1 - Administrative Pressures

1 - Guilt

1 - Number of babies greater than number of families available for placement.

3. Have you ever felt any personal conflicts or uncertainties regarding your recommendations to either accept or reject an adoptive applicants? If so, please describe.

7 - Yes

1 - No

4. Have your recommendations in the past either for or against adoption been reversed by Vista or another agency? If so, please describe.

5 - Yes

2 - No

1 - Cannot recall

5. Did adoptive applicants in general make appeals to you to try to influence affirmative decisions from you? If so, please describe.

8 - Yes

Emphasized strengths, de-emphasized weakness, offered money or material goods to personnel or agency; used influence of respected community members and Board members.

6. Concerning decision-making in adoption work, have you felt any other people tried to influence your recommendations?

- a. Board Members or agency personnel at Vista?

7 - Yes

1 - No

- b. Personnel from other agencies?

1 - Yes

6 - No

1 - No answer

- c. Community members through formal or informal communications?

8 - Yes (through informal communications)

- d. Your own family and friends?

1 - Yes

8 - No

C. PROFESSIONALS' AWARENESS OF INFLUENCES AT THE TIME OF ADOPTION APPLICATION BY HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS:

1. Since the special interest of this study is adoptions by Holocaust survivors, is there anything in particular you remember about them?

3 - Did not want to add to the couples suffering, deprivation or loss, wanted to make restitution.

- 2 - The tragedies endured by the Holocaust survivors
- 2 - The couples wanted to perpetuate their Jewishness by raising a child
- 1 - Nothing

a. Special risks?

- 4 - Development of Holocaust survivors was altered
- 2 - Couples were emotionally handicapped
- 1 - Extreme traditional European views
- 1 - Nothing

b. Flexible considerations?

- 3 - Extreme traditional European views
- 3 - Inflexible, rigid, demanding
- 2 - Older than most adoptive couples

2. Did you feel any influences from agency board members to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.

a. Influences felt as a result of policy discussions.

8 - No

b. Influences felt as a result of conferences?

8 - No

c. Influences felt as a result of sending personnel to meetings.

2 - Yes (case conferences)
6 - No

d. Influences felt as a result of written directives or memos?

1 - Yes (informal)
7 - No

3. Do you remember any ways in which the administration attempted to influence decisions regarding adoption by Holocaust survivors? If so, please describe.
- a. Through written memos or directives?
- 1 - Yes
7 - No
- b. Through conferences?
- 1 - Yes
7 - No
- c. Through other communications?
- 1 - Yes
7 - No
4. Were you aware of any other agencies' policies regarding acceptance of Holocaust survivors for adoption? If so, please describe.
- 1 - Yes
7 - No
5. Did personnel of other agencies exert any pressure on you to accept Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.
- 1 - Yes (couples had personnel of other agencies plead their cases if they knew them.)
7 - No
6. Did any of your personal friends appeal to you to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.
- 1 - Not sure
7 - No
7. Did any person or group of the Jewish Community exert any pressures on you to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.
- a. Formal? 8 - No
- b. Informal? 2 - Yes (Lawyers, doctors, rabbis)
6 - No

8. Did any person or group of the community at large, meaning other agencies, groups, or individuals outside the Jewish community, exert any pressures on you to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.

a. Formal? 1 - Maybe

b. Informal? 7 - No

9. Did you feel pressures within yourself to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.

7 - Yes - (Wanted to act as professionals but felt many emotions and feelings towards Holocaust survivors: guilt, pity, empathy, desire to make restitution. Felt unqualified to evaluate them because they had not experienced the Holocaust. Felt they were a special class. Did not dwell on their weaknesses but looked for strenghts.

1 - No

10. Other than the usual appeals from the applicants, were you aware of any special or unique pressures from the Holocaust applicants themselves to be accepted for adoption? If so, please describe.

3 - Yes (Wanted special attention since they had experienced the Holocaust. Said they wanted to perpetuate Jewishness. Enormously persistent.

5 - No

11. How did you personally resolve the special pressures to accept or reject Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents?

7 - Resolved it by looking for the strengths more than the weaknesses.

1 - Felt no pressures

D. FACTORS AFFECTING PROFESSIONAL PERSONNELS' DECISIONS
IN EVALUATING CASES FOR ADOPTION:

1. Did you ever turn down applicants who were Holocaust survivors for adoptive placement? If so, please describe.
 - 5 - Yes
 - 3 - Do not remember
2. In considering Holocaust applicants for adoption:
 - a. What factors about them were most important in your decisions
 1. To accept them?
 - 2 - accepted based on weight given to strengths with less regard for weaknesses.
 - 6 - accepted on same basis as other adoptive parents
 2. To reject them?
 - 4 - obviously emotionally handicapped
 - 4 - rejected on same basis as other adoptive applicants
 - b. Why were these factors important?
 - 5 - So child could have as normal a life as possible
 - 2 - No answer
 - 1 - Wanted to make sure that the burdens the parents had suffered were not placed on the kids.
3. If you had any reservations what factors in the case situation caused you to make your decision to accept these couples?
 - 7 - Yes (accepted based upon strengths)
 - 1 - No
4. Were you aware of taking any risks regarding accepting these couples for adoption? If so, please describe.
 - 4 - same risks as with other adoptions in general
 - 7 - Yes
 - 2 - risked the ability of Holocaust sur-

vivors to adjust to contemporary American culture.

- 1 - Risked not being able to evaluate their life experiences
1 - No

5. Did you interview and evaluate any other applicants for adoption who were immigrants besides Holocaust survivors?

- 6 - Yes
2 - No

- a. Were any of these situations turned down for adoptive placement?

6 - do not remember

- b. If so, what factors influenced your decision to do so?

6 - do not remember

6. Did you feel any uncertainty for the outcome of these adoptions?

- 6 - Yes
2 - No

More than usual?

- 6 - Yes
2 - No

7. If you had it to do over again would you have made the same decisions? Please describe what your decision would have been and why?

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 4 - Yes | 3 - Knowledge now would not make any difference |
| | 1 - felt guilty then and feels guilty now |
| 4 - No | 2 - New knowledge would be cause for change of decision. |
| | 1 - Now realizes that Holocaust survivors were too traditional, rigid and inflexible |
| | 1 - Now realizes that Holocaust survivors are emotionally handicapped. |

E. DISCUSSION AMONG PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL:

1. Was there any discussion among the professionals at the agency regarding specific Holocaust survivors as adoptive parents? If so, please describe.

8 - Yes (In adoptive conferences reasons:

6 - same amount of concern for Holocaust survivors as with any other adoptive applicants.

2 - more concern than usual for Holocaust survivors as a group

2. To your knowledge, through communications at the agency between personnel, administration and Board members, were any policy changes instituted regarding the acceptance of Holocaust survivors? If so, please describe.

8 - No

F. DECISION-MAKING QUESTIONS (ROLE CONFLICT)

1. In retrospect, do you feel that you would have made these placements if the family had not been Holocaust survivors? Please describe.

6 - Yes (Holocaust experience not considered a factor)

1 - No (Now would be able to separate the Holocaust experience and would be able to determine qualities regarding it which would be detrimental to a child's development.

1 - Do not know.

Social workers are often asked to make difficult decisions about complex matters. In addition to the special appeals of the situation at hand, there are often community or agency pressures to lean in one direction or another in the decision-making process. Some authors refer to this as role conflict. For example, personnel may be inclined to make one decision while their professional judgment pushes them in another direction, while the agency and community may be moving still in another direction.

2. Have you ever been aware of this kind of pressure in your professional practice?

8 - Yes (In general)

7 - No (Re: Holocaust Survivors)

1 - Yes (Re: Holocaust Survivors)

3. Could you tell me how you personally dealt with this matter?

In general:

4 - Dealt with role conflict through use of professional judgment.

2 - Dealt with role conflict by allowing emotions to overcome professional judgment.

2 - Did not have to resolve

In regards to Holocaust survivors:

The one who experienced role conflict resolved it by allowing emotions to influence professional judgment.

APPENDIX C

TABLE I

Items of adoption criteria (CWLA and VDM) not present in case records.

Case records	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	Items of criteria
1		X				X				X							X	X	
2																		X	
3																			
4																		X	
5		X								X						X	X		
6																			
7																		X	
8																			
9										X									
10								X											
11										X									
12						X	X												
13																X			
14																			
15																		X	

X = Not present in case records.

NOTE: Numbers through 18 represent items of CWLA and VDM adoption criteria. See Appendix A.

TABLE II

Number of items of adoption criteria (CWLA and VDM) deviated from and the number of times each was found.

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Times Found Deviated</u>
Attitudes toward Children	4
Housing	4
Attitudes toward Adoption	3
Marital History	2
Health	2
Infertility	1
Economic Status	1
Religion	1
Proof of Citizenship	1

NOTE: See Appendix A for CWLA and VDM adoption criteria.

TABLE III

Items of adoption criteria (CWLA and VDM) thought to be important to Professional Personnel.

Professional personnel	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	Items of criteria
1																	X	X	
2										X							X	X	
3										X							X	X	
4							X										X	X	
5	X									X							X		
6										X	X						X	X	
7	X					X		X	X								X	X	
8	X							X	X										

X = Important in professionals' evaluation of applicants.

NOTE: Numbers through 18 represent items of CWLA and VDM criteria.
See Appendix A.

TABLE IV

Comparison between number of times criteria were found deviated from in the case records and the number of social workers who considered criteria crucial in evaluating couple for adoption.

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Number of Times Deviated From Found In Case Records</u>	<u>Number of Social Workers Who Considered Item Crucial In Evaluation</u>
1) Age		
2) Citizenship	1	
3) Length Marriage		3
4) Residence		
5) Other Children		
6) Religion	1	
7) Economic Status	1	1
8) Health	2	
9) Infertility	1	3
10) Marital History	2	6
11) Background		1
12) Siblings		
13) Occupation		
14) Education		
15) Birthplace		
16) Housing	4	
17) Attitudes Towards Children	4	8
18) Attitudes Towards Adoption	3	7

FOOTNOTES

1. "Report of the U.S. Army on the Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

2. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

3. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

4. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

5. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

6. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

7. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

8. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

9. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

10. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

11. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

12. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

13. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

14. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

15. "The Korean War," U.S. Army, 1953, p. 1.

FOOTNOTES

1. Herbert Feis, The Birth of Israel (New York: WW Norton and Company, Inc., 1967), p. 20.
2. Adolf Reith, Monuments of the Victims of Tyranny (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969), p. 16
3. Ibid., p. 8.
4. Ibid., p. 8.
5. Memorial to the Unknown Jewish Martyr. (Paris: Committee for the Memorial to the Unknown Jewish Martyr, 1957).
6. Book of Documents, 1917-1947 (No place given; Jewish Agency for Palestine, no date given).
7. Phillip Friedman, Their Brother's Keeper (New York: Crown Publisher, Inc., 1957), Alexander Donat, information corresponding to that given for Friedman.
8. Judah, Pilch, ed., The Jewish Catastrophe in Europe (New York: American Association for Jewish Education, 1960), p. 4.
9. A Survey of Facts and Opinions on Problems of Post-War Jewry in Europe and Palestine (No place given: American Jewish Conferences, 1943), p. 39
10. Ibid., p. 40.
11. Joseph Dunner, Ph.D. The Republic of Israel, (New York: Whittlesey House, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950), p. 63.
12. Feis, op. cit., p. 19.
13. Ibid., p. 19.
14. Zachariah Schuster, "Must the Jews Quit Europe?" Commentary, I (December, 1945), p. 9-16.
15. Sidney Hertzberg, "Future of Europe's Jews," Commentary, I (December, 1945), 35-42.

16. Joseph Dunner, Ph.D., The Republic of Israel (New York: Whittlesey House, McGraw - Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950), p. 63; Herbert Feis, information corresponding to that given for Dunner.
17. Lloyd Gartner and Max Vorspan, A History of the Jews of Los Angeles (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1970), p. 229.
18. Ibid., p. 229.
19. Ibid., p. 230.
20. E. DeWind, "The Confrontation with Death," International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 49 (1944), 302-306; J. Hafner and Herniz, information corresponding to that given for DeWind; T. Nathan, L. Etinger and E. Winnik, information corresponding to that given for DeWind; W. Niederland, information corresponding to that given for DeWind; J. Shuwal, information corresponding to that given for DeWind; E. Simenauer; information corresponding to that given for DeWind; E. Winnick, information corresponding to that given for DeWind.
21. George Ackley, "Attitudes in Child Rearing Practices, Before and After Concentration Camps," Dissertation Abstracts, 19 (1958), 163-170; Carol Barocas and Harvey Barocas, information corresponding to that given for Ackley.
22. David Bernard, Placement of Adoptive Children (New York: MacMillan and Sons, Inc., 1963), p. 70.
23. F. Brieland, Experimental Study of Caseworkers' Perceptions of Adoptive Applicants (New York: University Press, 1965), Child Welfare League of America, information corresponding to that given for Brieland.
24. J. Triseliatio, Evaluation of Adoption Policy and Practice (New York: University Press, 1965), Myron Chevlin, information corresponding to that given for Triseliatio.
25. J. Triseliatio, Evaluation of Adoption Policy and Practice (New York: University Press, 1965), p. 379.
26. Robert Kahn and Daniel Katz, Social Psychology of Organization (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967), p. 32.

27. Ibid., p. 86.
28. Ibid., p. 108.
29. Ibid., pp. 112, 125, 192.
30. Leon Festinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1957), p. 10.
31. Ibid., p. 12.
32. Leon Festinger, Conflict Decision and Dissonance (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1964), p. 152.
33. Ibid., p. 25.
34. Leon Festinger, Stanley Schachter and Kurt Back, Social Pressures in Informal Groups (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1950), p. 67.
35. Robert Kahn and Daniel Katz, op. cit., p. 32.
36. See Footnote 20.
37. Festinger, Op. cit., 1957, p. 10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackley, George. "Attitudes in Child Rearing Practices, Before and After Concentration Camps". Dissertation Abstracts. 19, 1958, 163-170.

A Survey of Facts and Opinions on Problems of Post-War Jewry in Europe and Palestine. American Jewish Conference, 1943.

Barocas, Carol B. and Barocas, Harvey A. "The Wounds of the Fathers". The American Journal of Psychiatry. July, 1973.

Becker, H.J. and Polikow L. "Mind of Mass Murderer; The Nazi Executioners-Those Who Stood By". Commentary 12, November 1951, 451-459.

Bernard, David. Placement of Adoptive Children. New York: MacMillan and Sons, Inc., 1963.

Book of Documents, 1917-1947 (No place given) Jewish Agency for Palestine, (no date given).

Bradley, Trudy. An Exploration of Caseworkers' Perceptions of Adoptive Applicants. New York: Child Welfare League of America Inc., 1966.

Brieland F. Experimental Study of the Selection of Adoptive Parents at Intake. New York: University Press, 1965.

Caplain, Theodore. Principles of Organization. San Francisco: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., 1964.

Chevlin, Myron. "Adoption Outlook." Child Welfare, 46, 1967, 75-82.

Child Welfare League of America. Guidelines for Adoption Service. New York: Child Welfare League of America Inc., 1971.

Cost, M. "What can We do with Germany?" New Statesman-Nation, 28, 1944, 263-265.

De Wind, E. "The Confrontation with Death," International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 49, 302-306.

- Donat, Alexander, The Holocaust Kingdom. New York: Holt, Rinehard, Winston, 1965.
- Dunner, Joseph, Ph.D. The Republic of Israel. New York: Whittlesey House, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950.
- Etinger, Leo. "Preliminary Notes on a Study of Concentration Camp Survivors in Norway." Israel Annals of Psychiatry and Related Disciplines, 1, 1963, 59-57.
- Etinger, Leo. "The Syndrome of Concentration Camps." Ceskoslavenska Psychiatric. 66, 1970, 257-266.
- Family Service Association of America. Casework Papers on Selection of Adoptive Parents. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1960.
- Feis, Herbert, The Birth of Israel. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1967.
- Festinger, Leon, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1957).
- _____, Conflict Decision and Dissonance. (Palo Alto, Stanford University Press, 1964.
- _____. Schachter Stanley, Back, Kurt, Social Pressures in Informal Groups. Palo Alto Stanford University Press, 1950.
- Friedlander, Albert H. Out of the Whirlwind. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1968.
- Friedman, Paul. "Some Aspects of Concentration Camps Psychology." American Journal of Psychiatry, 105, 1948-49, 601-605.
- Friedman, Phillip. Their Brothers Keeper. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1957.
- Gartner, Lloyd P. and Vorspan, Max. A History of the Jews of Los Angeles. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1970.
- Gordon, Henrietta. Adoption Practices, Procedures and Problems. Philadelphia: Brace-Harcourt Inc., 1967.
- Hafner, J. and Herniz R. "Psychological Disturbances following Prolonged Pressure." Social Psychiatry. 3, 1968, 79-88.

- Herberg, W. "Postwar Revival of the Synagogue," Commentary IX, April 1950, 315-325.
- Hertzberg, Sidney. "Future of Europe's Jews," Commentary 1, December 1945, 35-42.
- Hilberg, Raul. Documents of Destruction, Germany-Jewry, 1933-1945. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971.
- Hoppe, R. and Klaue, D. "Re-Semantization of Affects in Survivors of Persecution," International Journal of Psychiatry. 49, 1968, 324-326.
- Humphrey, M. and Ouenstend, C., "Adoption: Child Adjustment Factors in Emotional Disturbances in Acting out Behavior." British Journal of Psychiatry. 109, 1963, 599-608.
- Hurvitz, N. "Sources of Motivation and Achievement of American Jews," Jewish Social Studies, 23, October 1961, 217-234.
- In Everlasting Remembrance: A Guide to Memorials and Monuments Honoring the Six Million. New York: American Jewish Congress (no date given).
- Jaffee, Ruth, "Dissociative Items in Concentration Camp Survivors." International Journal of Psychoanalysis. 49, 1968, 310-312.
- Kahn, Robert and Katz, Daniel. Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1967.
- Katz, Josef. One Who Came Back. New York: Herzl Press, 1973.
- Kraus, Otto and Kulka, Erich. The Death Factory. New York: Pergamon Press, 1966.
- Krystal, Henry. Massive Psychic Trauma. New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1968.
- Kuper, Jack. Child of the Holocaust. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1968.
- Lorenzer, Alfred. "Some Observations on Latency Symptoms in Patients Suffering Persecution." International Journal of Psychoanalysis. 49, 1968, 316-318.

- Lowrie, Donald. The Hunted Children. New York: W. W. Norton Company, Inc., 1963.
- Manheim, R. and Poliakov L. "Eichmann: Administrator of Extermination Definite Solution of the Jewish Problem." Commentary VII, May 1949, 439-446.
- March, Tony, Darkness Over Europe. New York: Rand McNally and Company, 1969.
- Manheim R. and Poliakov L. "Human Mortality and the Nazi Terror," Commentary, X, August 1950, 111-116.
- Mechanicus, Philip. Year of Fear. New York: Hawthorne Books Inc., 1964.
- Memorial to the Unknown Jewish Martyr. Paris: Committee for the Memorial to the Unknown Jewish Martyr, 1957.
- Nathan, T.; Etinger, L.; and Winnik, E.; "The Psychiatric Pathology of Survivors of the Nazi Holocaust." Israel Annals of Psychiatry and Related Disciplines. 1, 1963, 113-119.
- Niederland, William. "Clinical Observations on Survivors Syndrome." International Journal of Psychoanalysis. 8, 1968, 11-14.
- Nyiszli, Miklas, Dr. Auschvitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account. New York: Frederick Fell, Inc., 1960.
- Pilch, Judah, ed. The Jewish Catastrophe in Europe. New York: American Association for Jewish Education, 1960.
- "Psychiatric Disturbances of Holocaust Survivors." Israel Annals of Psychiatry and Related Disciplines. 5, 1967, 91-100.
- Reith, Adolf. Monuments of the Victims of Tyranny. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
- Schuster, Zachariah. "Must the Jews Quit Europe?" Commentary, 1, December 1945, 9-16.
- Shull, Fremont; Delbecq, Ardie; Cummings, L.S. Organizational Decision Making. San Francisco: McGraw Hill, 1970.
- Shuval, Judith. "Some Concentration Camps: Persistent Effects of Trauma Five Years after Concentration Camps." Social Problems, 5, 1957-58, 230-243.

- Simenauer, E. "Late Phychic Sequella from Concentration Camp Experiences." International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 49, 1968, 306-309.
- Simon, Herbert, Administrative Behavior. New York: Free Press, 1968.
- Smythe, N. H. and Pine, J. J. "Jews in America Since World War II." Pylon. 16, March 1955, 65-70.
- Sosnowski, Kiryl. The Tragedy of Children Under Nazi Rule. Warszawa: Zachodnia, Agencja Prasowa, 1962.
- Straker, M. "The Survivors Syndrome: Theoritical and Therapeutic Dilemmas." Lvae Medical. 42, 1971, 37-41.
- "Successful Adoptive Parents." Social Work. 1960, pp. 4-21.
- Triseliatio, J. Evaluation of Adoption Policy and Practice. New York: University Press, 1965.
- Wiesel, Eliezer. After the Storn: A Symposium on the Holocaust. New York: Joint Commission on Jewish Education of the UAHC and CCAR, 1967.
- Wiesel, Eliezer. From Holocaust to ReBirth, New York: Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, 1970.
- Winnik, E. "Further Comments Concerning Psychopathology of Concentrations Camp Victims." Israel Annals of Psychiatry and Related Disciplines. 1, 1963, 1-16.