

RELIGIOUS OR ETHNIC SELF-IDENTIFICATION OVER THE TELEPHONE: A PILOT STUDY OF MANCHESTER JEWRY

Marlena Schmool

Introduction

THE research reported here developed while planning a survey of the Jewish population of Greater Manchester. The aim of that survey is to examine the social, demographic, economic, and Jewish identity of Jews (whether or not they are affiliated to the Jewish community) who live in the area which was under the jurisdiction of the Greater Manchester local authority between April 1974 and March 1986. It is to be a large-scale direct sample survey undertaken by the Community Research Unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews in co-operation with the Greater Manchester Jewish Representative Council.

Manchester Jewry is dispersed throughout the conurbation. Its members live in a variety of locations (suburban, inner city) and of types of housing. These factors combined to suggest the use of telephone interviews for a preliminary stage of the survey. Furthermore, experience abroad shows that telephone interviews can provide valid data and that the method should not be rejected out of hand in Britain.

Although this pilot exercise grew out of projected research concerned with the Jewish population of the Greater Manchester area, the findings of the study were expected to have wider application. At the same time as the Manchester Jewish Population Survey was being planned, a co-ordinated round of social surveys of Jewish communities throughout the world was proposed by the World Zionist Organization and the Institute of Contemporary Jewry of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. If telephone interviewing were to prove practicable in Greater Manchester, it could be considered for Jewish community research throughout Great Britain.

The conventional wisdom in the Jewish community of Great Britain has been that, for historical and psychological reasons, British Jews would be unwilling to identify themselves as Jews over the telephone.

Experience from American studies carried out in such different communities as Rhode Island, St Louis, and Denver indicates that Jews in America do not show this reluctance.¹ In this respect, American Jews are most likely following general American cultural patterns. Thus, in a culture where telephone coverage is more widespread² and its usage is more strongly related to social rather than to business matters,³ Jewish historical memory may become less important and psychological barriers against answering questions about Jewishness from unsolicited callers less pronounced.

Telephone Ownership in the Jewish Community

A telephone study could not be contemplated if the group to be examined was expected to have low levels of telephone ownership. However, Anglo-Jewry is largely a middle-class community⁴ and prima facie Manchester Jewry might be expected to show high levels of telephone ownership, certainly higher than the national average. Indirect evidence in support of this hypothesis comes from a study of *Jewish Chronicle* readers in 1984.⁵ Analysis of their ownership of durable goods (among which telephones were included) shows that in 1984, 42 per cent of *Jewish Chronicle* households had dishwashers and 45 per cent had video-cassette players. The comparable 1986 General Household Survey figures of the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys for all households in Great Britain were seven per cent and 38 per cent respectively. It would therefore seem reasonable to expect telephone ownership among Jews to be at least at the 83 per cent national average reported in the 1986 General Household Survey.⁶

One exception to this general high level of ownership could be the elderly. Initial enquiries to the Manchester Jewish Social Services (MJSS) suggested that adult children of the elderly usually ensure that their parents have telephones, but other disadvantaged or low socio-economic-status groups might not own, or have access to, telephones. A subsequent analysis carried out in October 1988 by MJSS on behalf of the Community Research Unit found that of the 140 cases then being dealt with by the MJSS, 64.3 per cent of all clients had a telephone. Nationally, 63 per cent of all households with a gross weekly income of £60 or less in 1986 had telephones.⁷ However, the Director of MJSS considered that the 64.3 per cent underestimated ownership levels, since not all telephone numbers were on file; but unfortunately the remaining names were not checked against the telephone directory to see if this was so. The MJSS records further showed that 76.9 per cent of the 78 elderly and 48.3 per cent of the other 62 clients had telephones. It is therefore in the other category (such as single-parent households) that the greatest non-coverage occurs.⁸

A further factor to be taken into account in a large-scale study would be the proportions of ex-directory numbers and other numbers not

A PILOT STUDY OF MANCHESTER JEWRY

listed by an individual's surname. In Britain in 1985, at least 12 per cent of numbers were not listed;⁹ therefore, the problem must be faced. This pilot study, which was concerned with testing responses to an ethnic/religious question, did not directly deal with that issue. However, some problems about the telephone-number coverage of synagogue lists emerged in the course of the research. These are examined below, as are levels of non-household and business numbers.

Aims and Methods

The aims of the study were, first, to test whether British Jews (as exemplified by Manchester Jewry) will admit to their Jewishness over the telephone and, second to see if the response is affected by whether or not the interviewer's bona fides is vouched for by a recognized Jewish institution. Simultaneously, the attitude of non-Jews to the question has to be considered. If directory-lists, random-digit dialling, or Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) are eventually to be used in Jewish community surveys, it is important to know that non-Jews will answer a screening question directed at pinpointing households with Jewish members.

With these objectives, two random samples of 150 households were selected. The first was from ten Manchester synagogue membership lists in hand at the time of the study and the second from the North Manchester area British Telecom directory, where numbers sampled were those with addresses in the M7 or M25 postal districts (areas where Manchester Jews were known to reside) and the entry was not immediately identifiable as a business telephone number.

The interview period was from the end of October 1988 to the middle of January 1989 (excluding the Christmas vacation from mid-December to immediately after the New Year 1989). By mid-December 1988, 143 interviews were carried out by 20 students from the Applied Social Work Department at Manchester Polytechnic, as part of their Research Methods course. They had no previous interviewing experience and were trained by the Research Director of the Community Research Unit. The remaining 157 interviews were carried out by Unit staff in London and Manchester in the first half of January 1989. Interview quotas and questionnaire rotation for the students were controlled by Mr David Boulton of Manchester Polytechnic.¹⁰ Since the questions were of a simple nature and could be answered by any adult, interviewers were not instructed to interview any specified member of the household but were told to make sure that the interviewee was 17 years of age or over. Interviews by the Unit research staff were supervised by the Research Director. While experienced interviewers would have completed the interviewing more quickly, the concomitant cost would have precluded the test being carried out. Moreover, the questionnaires were very simple to administer, taking at

MARLENA SCHMOOL

most only two or three minutes, well within the capability of the students. (Copies of the two questionnaire forms used by the interviewers are given in the Appendix, at the end of this paper.)

The two questionnaires were distributed between the two samples at random, and if repeat calls were necessary, they were made at times which differed from the time of the original call. Most initial calls were made between 4.30 p.m. and 7.30 p.m. There was no interviewing on Friday afternoon after 3.00 p.m. or throughout Saturdays, so as not to offend Jews on the Sabbath. Some telephoning was conducted on Sunday to households expected to be Jewish.

The two samples were subdivided. Half of each set of respondents were told that the interviewer was a student carrying out research as part of his/her course at the Manchester Polytechnic while the other half were told that the student interviewer was conducting a small study under the auspices, and with the backing, of the Greater Manchester Jewish Representative Council. The study was designed in this way to examine two separate issues: first, whether the method of introduction affected response; and second, whether the response rate differed between the Jewish and the general samples.

Although the interviewing was cold-calling (that is, without previous arrangement), this did not mean that, at least insofar as the Jewish sample was concerned, prospective interviewees need be totally ignorant about the survey. In an effort to develop communal awareness and to increase support for the proposed project, there had been widespread discussion and publicity in the local Jewish press over a period of some two years. In addition, immediately before telephone interviewing began and at regular intervals while it was in progress, the Manchester Jewish press carried reports about this particular small survey. Interviewees could thus have known that they might be telephoned. The publicity stressed that interviewers would not know the identity of those whom they were contacting since they had been given only a telephone number — not a name or address. It was also made clear that the findings would be used solely for statistical purposes and would be treated in the strictest confidence.

A press release covering the same points was also sent to the *Bury Times*, the *Salford Times* and the *Manchester Evening News* — local newspapers read in the North Manchester area where the Jewish community is centred. During the first interviewing period, student interviewers told the Research Director that they themselves had read about the survey. It also became clear that some non-Jewish respondents knew about the study following unsolicited coverage in local free newspapers.

In studies of the type proposed, when interviewees cannot be individually warned of a forthcoming telephone call, this essential information must be provided through the press and, where

A PILOT STUDY OF MANCHESTER JEWRY

appropriate, augmented by other local advertising methods, such as notices in local shops, so that a basic level of awareness about the project can be developed.¹¹ The efficacy and penetration of this media coverage were assessed by asking self-identifying Jews whether they had read about the study in the two local Jewish newspapers (which together have an average weekly circulation of about 8,500) or whether they knew of it from any other source.

Synagogue Membership Lists

One of the major problems faced in planning the Manchester survey is the development of a population register of Jews from which to draw the sample. It is inappropriate here to discuss definitional problems of Jewishness but previous research indicates that the synagogue-affiliated section of British Jewry should be the initial core of the sample frame.¹²

Early in the planning of the survey, in mid-1986, 33 synagogues listed in the Greater Manchester Jewish Representative Council Year Book were asked to provide a copy of their membership lists to the Community Research Unit. The process of collecting these lists was very protracted, with many follow-up contacts being made. At the time of sampling for the telephone pilot study in October 1988, only 12 lists had been obtained. The main reasons given for not providing them may be summed up by such comments as 'Our members are worried about who could see or have access to the lists', and historically-induced caution — although there were also a few reservations about receiving junk-mail and other misuse of data-sets. Ten of these 12 lists were already entered in the Unit's computer when the pilot study was initiated. The original 150 synagogue-list random sample was drawn by computer from these ten lists which covered about 60 per cent of the known synagogue membership in the Greater Manchester area. The time-lag between receiving them and sampling from them could account for much of the change to non-Jewish households referred to below.

Some of the synagogue lists of addresses also gave telephone numbers; the remaining numbers were traced either in the telephone directory or from directory enquiries. Of the original 150 sample addresses, 34 were rejected: 25 were ex-directory numbers, five were for addresses outside the Greater Manchester area, and three were households either without a telephone or with a number listed under a name different from that available to us. The 34th address was for a synagogue member known, from reports in the local Jewish press, to have left Manchester. The 34 names were replaced by a random sample from those available synagogue lists from which names and addresses had not yet been entered on the computer.

In the course of telephoning, we found that 11 of the 150 numbers (seven per cent) in the final synagogue list were no longer for Jewish

MARLENA SCHMOOL

households. It is not possible to say how many numbers changed from one Jewish owner to another: in the interests of anonymity, no attempt was made to find the name of the present householder. A further seven numbers (five per cent) taken from the synagogue lists were non-households — for instance, a doctor's surgery or business premises.

Findings

Table 1 sets out the response to the telephone calls according to the source of the number contacted and to which questionnaire was used. Of the total 300 numbers selected, 23 (ten directory and 13 synagogue-lists) had to be discarded as 'out-of-scope'. Within this group, eight of the telephone directory sample and six of the synagogue-lists sample were discontinued lines, while two of the telephone directory sample and seven of the synagogue-lists numbers were non-household. At a further 21 numbers (ten directory and 11 synagogue-lists) no contact was made after three telephone calls. The 'no contact' category of the synagogue-lists numbers included three numbers which were answered by telephone-answering machines on each of three contact attempts. Interviews were then completed with 77 per cent of the remaining 130 telephone directory numbers, and 70 per cent of the 126 synagogue-lists numbers.

TABLE 1. *Response according to source of telephone number and questionnaire used*

	<i>Source</i>				<i>Questionnaire</i>			
	<i>Directory</i>		<i>Syn. lists</i>		<i>Student</i>		<i>Jewish</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Attempted Calls	150	100	150	100	150	100	150	100
Contact	130	86.6	126	84.0	135	90.0	121	80.7
<i>Interviews</i>								
Jewish Household	10	6.7	77	51.3	45	30.0	42	28.0
Non-Jewish Household	90	60.0	11	7.3	52	34.7	49	32.7
Refusal	30	20.0	38	25.3	38	25.3	30	20.0

If we then turn to the response to the different questionnaires, we find that, of the 135 contacted with the 'student' introduction, 72 per cent gave interviews compared with 75 per cent of the 121 contacted with the 'Jewish' introduction.

As regards the character of refusal, only four of the 68 refusal cases were immediate 'hung up' response. The remaining 64 refusals were 34 cases characterized as 'household refusal', where the adult answering the telephone refused to be interviewed (giving answers such as 'I'm

A PILOT STUDY OF MANCHESTER JEWRY

not interested', 'I'm in the middle of cooking', 'Don't ring, please' and 'I'm too busy now but don't call back'), and 30 classified as 'respondent refusal' where the telephone was answered by someone under the age of 17 who passed the call to an adult, who then refused to come to the telephone.

In total, 25 per cent of the original sample from synagogue lists refused to participate in the study, as opposed to 20 per cent of the telephone directory sample. When the refusal according to type of questionnaire is examined, the 'student' introduction is seen to have produced 13 (nine per cent) household refusals whereas the 'Jewish' introduction prompted this immediate refusal in 21 cases (14 per cent). However, the *combined* household and respondent refusal rate reverses this pattern, being 24 per cent for the 'student' questionnaire while the combined figure for these two responses to the 'Jewish' questionnaire was 18.7 per cent.

The anticipated loss of Jewish households from the synagogue-lists sample has already been discussed. It was expected that a compensatory number of Jewish households would occur in randomly-sampling the M7 and M25 postcode telephone numbers, since previous research has shown that more than five per cent of the population of these areas of Manchester is Jewish.¹³ This expectation was realized, with the telephone-directory sample yielding 11 interviews with Jewish households.

When the outcome of contacts is collapsed into simply refusal and interview completed, four groups in all can be defined according to the source of telephone number and questionnaire used. Each group had 75 targeted contacts. Of these, in the student questionnaire/directory group, 52 interviews were completed while in the student questionnaire/synagogue lists 45 were completed; 48 in the Jewish questionnaire/directory group and 43 in the Jewish questionnaire/synagogue-lists group were completed. It is thus clear that response rates were not significantly affected by either sample source or type of questionnaire used. (Chi-square for the effect on response of questionnaire used is 0.039 and of source of number is 1.671. Neither of these is significant with one degree of freedom at the five per cent level.) Furthermore, the pattern of responses according to type of questionnaire and to source of telephone number does not differ greatly from the original allocation pattern.

As stated above, in order to allay suspicion among Jewish respondents, there was regular publicity about the Telephone Study in the local Jewish and general Manchester press. The publicity was of a general nature, explaining that a number of households chosen at random would be telephoned. It was further specified that this was a technical exercise in preparation for the planned survey of Greater Manchester Jewry. This reassurance was repeated in the course of the

fieldwork period. These press reports were only the latest stage in a regular flow of information about the survey over a two-year period. It was therefore assumed that, if the local Jewish press reports were effective, respondents would know of the survey. However, the results from the 87 Jewish households interviewed suggest that the information had not penetrated the communal psyche to any great extent. Only 17 per cent remembered learning about the survey from reading the Jewish press, while a further three per cent had heard about it from another source. Strikingly, 77 per cent of Jewish respondents said that they had no knowledge about the project.

Since the aim of the study was simply to assess whether Jews would self-identify and, simultaneously, whether non-Jews would answer the screening question rather than just put the telephone down, the questionnaire used was deliberately very short and in no way tested whether Jews would answer a more detailed one. To counterbalance this and to indicate *stated* willingness of Jews to answer a fuller questionnaire over the phone, Jewish respondents were asked 'If asked, would you be ready to answer questions about yourself and your family over the phone?'. Thirty-five of the 87 Jewish respondents (40 per cent) said that they would be prepared to answer, while 31 (35 per cent) said that they would refuse; 16 (18 per cent) were undecided and the remaining five (6 per cent) gave no reply. However, there were few totally unqualified answers. Thus, a respondent might be willing to answer further questions 'with identification', 'but not on Saturdays' or 'by appointment'. On the other hand, someone initially unwilling might be prepared to answer fuller questions in 'maybe some other way' or 'depending on the personalness', suggesting that in (undefined) given circumstances they would answer. The occasional 'definitely yes' reported back by interviewers was obviously very encouraging.

Discussion

The main reason for conducting this pilot study was to test whether the bald question 'Is anyone in the household Jewish?' would be answered by Jews and non-Jews over the telephone. Our results show that a question framed to elicit this information will probably be answered. Irrespectively of the source of the telephone-number or of the introductory preamble to the questionnaire, some 60 per cent of the samples replied to this question. The completion rates of 59 per cent and 67 per cent which we obtained compare favourably with the results reported by Collins *et al.* The studies they analysed had response rates in telephone studies of between 46 and 65 per cent, with 60 per cent being considered an encouraging level.¹⁴ The higher completion rate for contacted numbers in the telephone-book sample may reflect the ease with which an interviewer could maintain contact long enough to ask the religious or ethnic screening-question. Once it became clear to

A PILOT STUDY OF MANCHESTER JEWRY

non-Jews that this was near the end of the interview, it was readily answered. The difference in completion rates, however, is not statistically significant.

It is important that respondents in households without Jews are equally prepared to answer this question because these households would have to be eliminated from any study using this technique for screening for Jewish identity. It became evident in the course of interviewing that the question was indeed acceptable to non-Jewish households, often being greeted with amusement.¹⁵ In this light, the 27 and 33 per cent combined 'non-contact/refusal' rates for the telephone-directory and the synagogue-lists samples respectively became worrying. If this type of question is used in later studies with similar results, the self-selection bias would be two-fold: (un)willingness to self-identify as a Jew would be added to a general (un)willingness to participate in a survey.¹⁶ The nature and scale of this pilot work did not allow the reasons for non-response to be categorized or quantified. The 17 per cent household refusal to the Jewish questionnaire where contact was made, as opposed to the ten per cent refusal to the student questionnaire, might indicate self-(de)selection bias. However, as owing to possible change of ownership we did not know exactly which homes (even on the synagogue list) were Jewish, we can do no more than offer this as a possibility. But since response rates are not significantly affected by the type of questionnaire, it could equally be that refusal *overall* was related more to the fact of being called to the telephone than to the subject-matter of the research.

The conventional wisdom about the reluctance of members of the British Jewish community to self-identify over the telephone must therefore be called into question. A high proportion of synagogue-affiliated Jews in Manchester were willing to admit their Jewishness over the telephone, at least to the extent that they generally were prepared to be involved in a short telephone interview. Some questions, however, remain unresolved — a major one being whether respondents would agree to longer interviews.¹⁷ Furthermore, this pilot highlighted problems already anticipated about obtaining lists from synagogues and from other community organizations which would be the core of the sample frame in planning a community survey.

As regards communal lists, the bias in telephone ownership away from the elderly and low-economic-status households (as suggested by the MJSS data) was expected in the light of data from general sources. However, the erosion over time owing to the change-over to non-Jewish households (at least seven per cent) and loss from the sample because members gave a business number to the synagogue (five per cent) were not so predictable — nor was the extent of ex-directory numbers or of numbers listed under other names and not given to synagogues.

MARLENA SCHMOOL

The possible use of electoral registers, telephone directories, and similar general lists to supplement and expand the core of affiliated members of the community is affected by the proportion of Jews in the wider society and their dispersion within it. Overall, with an estimated Jewish population of 326,000 in Great Britain (according to Community Research Unit data), about six persons in every thousand are Jewish, with the major concentrations in Greater London and Greater Manchester. As noted above, the M7 and M25 postal districts were chosen for this telephone exercise because they are known to be areas of concentrated Jewish population. It was expected that more than five per cent of the households would be Jewish, and in fact this was the case for seven per cent of that sample. Were the Manchester study to be based solely on unstratified random sampling of the total population, and assuming unrealistically that all Jewish households had telephones and that there were no refusals, approximately 87 calls would be needed to pinpoint one Jewish household.¹⁸

Stratification would reduce this ratio but clearly cost would become an overriding factor. However, costs must be balanced against the anticipated real gains in representativeness. Preparatory work for the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey in the USA indicated that, whereas 2.5 per cent of the American population are Jewish, more than three per cent of households screened have a Jewish member.¹⁹ It would seem from the Manchester pilot study that, with a properly-worded screening question, telephone interviewing in Britain might similarly widen the coverage of communal studies. To the best of my knowledge, there is no published social research on British Jewry based on data acquired from a telephone survey.

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to Professor Martin Collins of the City University for his comments on an earlier version of this paper.

NOTES

¹ See Calvin Goldscheider and Sidney Goldstein, *The Jewish Community of Rhode Island: A Social and Demographic Study, 1987*, Jewish Federation of Rhode Island, Providence, R. I., 1988; Bruce A. Phillips and Eleanor P. Judd, *Denver Jewish Population Study 1981*, Allied Jewish Federation, Denver, 1982; Bruce A. Phillips and Eve Weinberg, *The Milwaukee Jewish Population* (unpublished report), 1984; and Gary A. Tobin, *A Demographic and Attitudinal Study of the Jewish Community of St. Louis*, Jewish Federation of St Louis, 1982.

² See Dennis Trewin and Geoff Lee, 'International Comparisons of Telephone Coverage' in Robert M. Groves *et al.*, eds., *Telephone Survey Methodology*, New York, 1988, p. 17.

³ Martin Collins, Wendy Sykes, Paul Wilson, and Norah Blackshaw, 'Nonresponse: the UK Experience', in *op. cit.* in Note 2 above, p. 214.

A PILOT STUDY OF MANCHESTER JEWRY

⁴ Stanley Waterman and Barry Kosmin, *British Jewry in the Eighties: A Statistical and Geographical Study*, Board of Deputies of British Jews, London, 1986, p. 47; Stanley Waterman, *Jews in an Outer London Borough, Barnet*, Queen Mary College, London, 1989, pp. 34–38.

⁵ I am grateful to the *Jewish Chronicle* for providing these unpublished data and for authorizing publication.

⁶ See T. Griffin, ed., *Social Trends 19*, HMSO (Her Majesty's Stationery Office), London 1989, p. 104.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ I am grateful to Mr Michael Anderson, Director of Manchester Jewish Social Services, for compiling this information from his agency records.

⁹ See Martin Collins and Wendy Sykes, 'The Problems of Non-coverage and Unlisted Numbers in Telephone Surveys in Britain', in *The Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Series A (General), vol. 150, Part 3, 1987, p. 244.

¹⁰ I am grateful to Mr David Boulton and to the students and staff of the Applied Social Work Department of Manchester Polytechnic for their participation in, and help with, the fieldwork.

¹¹ See Deborah J. De Lange and Barry A. Kosmin, *Community Resources for a Community Survey*, Board of Deputies of British Jews, London, 1979, pp. 16–19; and Goldscheider and Goldstein, op. cit. in Note 1 above, p. 8.

¹² See S.J. Prais and Marlena Schmool, 'The Size and Structure of the Anglo-Jewish Population 1960–1965', in *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, vol. 10, no. 1, June 1968, p. 19; and Barry A. Kosmin and Caren Levy, *Synagogue Membership in the United Kingdom, 1983*, Board of Deputies of British Jews, London, 1983.

¹³ Waterman and Kosmin, op. cit. in Note 4 above, p. 27.

¹⁴ Collins *et al.*, op. cit. in Note 3 above, pp. 215–16.

¹⁵ It also provided an interesting anomaly. One synagogue-list number was that of a lady who had been born Jewish, had converted to Christianity, and when contacted was just going to church.

¹⁶ Although the same biases may occur in door-to-door interviewing, it is possible to identify most Jewish houses by the mezuzah affixed to the doorpost. See Barry A. Kosmin and Caren Levy, *Jewish Identity in an Anglo-Jewish Community*, Board of Deputies of British Jews, London, 1983, p. 12; and Wendy Sykes and Martin Collins, 'Effects of Mode of Interview: Experiments in the UK' in *Telephone Survey Methodology*, op. cit. in Note 2 above, p. 305.

¹⁷ See Collins *et al.*, op. cit. in Note 3 above, p. 229.

¹⁸ Using Random Digit Dialling, 17,722 households were contacted in Milwaukee to find 475 with a Jewish member: see Phillips and Weinberg, op. cit. in Note 1 above, p. A-2; in Denver 41,000 calls were made for 802 completed interviews: see Phillips and Judd, op. cit. in Note 1 above, p. vii. That is, there was one Jewish household per 37 calls in Milwaukee and one per 51 calls in Denver.

¹⁹ This information was provided by Dr Barry A. Kosmin, Director of the North American Jewish Data Bank.

MARLENA SCHMOOL

APPENDIX

Code Number:

Phone Number:

Respondent: M F

Hello, is that number? (VERIFY TELEPHONE NO.)

My name is I am a social science student at Manchester Polytechnic and I would be grateful if you would answer one or two questions for a small project which people on my course are carrying out. This will only take one or two minutes.

Could I please speak to someone aged 17 or over?

IF ANOTHER PERSON COMES TO ANSWER, INTRODUCE YOURSELF AGAIN

The first few questions are just about habits and pastimes.

1. Could you tell me whether anybody in the household drives a car?
YES NO
IF YES How many drive?
2. Now what about smoking, does anyone in the household smoke?
YES NO
IF YES: Could you tell me how many people smoke?
3. Does any one support a football team?
YES NO
IF YES: Which?
4. Could you tell me if more than one household uses this phone number?
YES NO
IF YES: How many households use it?

We are also interested in minority groups. And we are doing part of our study for the Manchester Jewish Community.

5. Could I ask if anyone in the household is Jewish?
YES NO
IF NO, CLOSE INTERVIEW. That's all I need to know, thank you.
Thank you very much for your help.
6. How many people are Jewish?
7. What is the precise occupation of the head of your household?
.....
8. Have you read about this project in the *Jewish Telegraph* or *Gazette*?
YES NO
IF NO: Did you hear about it in any other way, e.g. from a friend?
YES NO

A PILOT STUDY OF MANCHESTER JEWRY

9. If asked, would you be ready to answer questions about yourself and your family over the phone?

YES NO DON'T KNOW

Thank you very much for sparing the time to answer these questions. I hope you enjoyed the interview.

Code Number:

Phone Number:

Respondent: M F

Hello, is that number? (VERIFY TELEPHONE NO.)

My name is I am a social science student at Manchester Polytechnic and I would be grateful if you would answer one or two questions. My class is helping Manchester Jewish Representative Council on some background technical-work for a proposed survey of the Manchester Jewish Community. You may have read about this in the local press.

Could I please speak to someone aged 17 or over?

IF ANOTHER PERSON COMES TO ANSWER, INTRODUCE YOURSELF AGAIN

1. First, could you tell me if you are all one household at this phone number?
YES NO

IF NO: How many households use this number?

2. How many people are there altogether in your household including yourself?

3. How many of these people are Jewish?

IF NONE, CLOSE INTERVIEW. That's all I need to know, thank you. Thank you very much for your help.

4. How long have you personally lived at this address years

5. What is the precise occupation of the head of your household?
.....

6. Are there other Jewish families living in your street?
YES NO DON'T KNOW

7. Have you read about this project in the Jewish Telegraph or Gazette?
YES NO

IF NO: Did you hear about it in any other way, e.g. from a friend?
YES NO

8. If asked, would you be ready to answer questions about yourself and your family over the phone?

YES NO DON'T KNOW

Thank you very much for sparing the time to answer these questions. I hope you enjoyed the interview.