

LOCATING MINORITY GROUP MEMBERS: TWO BRITISH SURVEYS OF JEWISH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS¹

Emanuel J. de Kadt

STUDIES of Jewish population groups generally need to cope with two substantial initial difficulties. The first is the *definitional* problem: who is a Jew? The second, emerging as soon as the first has been overcome, has to do with the means of *locating* the population for the purpose of the inquiry. In most countries no convenient sampling frame exists from which the Jewish population can be extracted. Electoral registers carry no data on religion or ethnic status—assuming for the moment that the definitional problem has been solved—although some countries, for example the Netherlands, have a ‘Register of Population’ in each municipality which does include data on religious status.² In England and the United States, official enquiry into a person’s religion is politically taboo; in this kind of situation no official data can help even in arriving at population estimates, let alone in providing a sampling frame.³ Ingenious methods have been devised to arrive at such estimates, but no fully satisfactory solution has been found to the problems relating to adequate coverage of the Jewish population.⁴ The most frequently employed method, that of using the membership or mailing lists of Jewish organizations, supplemented with any other known Jews, has the obvious and serious drawback of missing precisely the ‘marginal’ Jews, and the same is true of studies concentrating on neighbourhoods of a pronounced Jewish character.⁵

Occasionally a fortunate alternative presents itself: the analysis of data relating to Jews in a general population sample, feasible in the case of inquiries which identify their subjects by religion or ethnic status. American scholars have employed this method with success; some of the most interesting sociological data on Jews derive precisely from such secondary analyses.⁶ Ideally, of course, one would like to participate in the planning stage of an inquiry which is to yield specific data on the Jewish population. But even where the data have been collected by investigators concerned with problems quite different

JEWISH STUDENTS IN BRITAIN

from those which seem particularly important for the student of the Jewish sub-group, it may be rewarding to re-analyse the material. But we should note that in these cases the definitional problem looms large. An otherwise perfect sample may be useless because of the way in which subjects were identified as Jews—especially, once again, if the identifying question *ipso facto* excluded those who are un-religious or otherwise marginal Jews.⁷ Another circumstance which can spoil a promising situation is the absence in the sample of a sufficient number of Jews to make the analysis worthwhile. As in most societies Jews form merely a small minority in the population, this is perhaps the main hazard of the method.⁸

AIM AND METHOD OF THIS PAPER

This paper will concern itself with data deriving from two studies relating to the social background and social characteristics of Jewish university students in Great Britain. The first study has been previously published and was conducted by Mr. Raymond V. Baron for the Inter-University Jewish Federation of Great Britain and Ireland (IUJF), during the course of the academic year 1954-5.⁹ The population frame for this inquiry was obtained through the Secretaries of Jewish student societies: it included all members of these societies and all known Jewish students who were not members. A postal questionnaire was sent to all students thus located; after non-Jews and non-students originally included by mistake had been eliminated, the population reached numbered just over 2,000 students. The number of valid returns, on which the results of this survey are based, was 1,124—about 55 per cent of those reached. It should be noted, however, that this was less than 40 per cent of the total number of Jewish students estimated by Baron. Just over 800 of the respondents were U.K. full-time students, about one-third of the estimated number. The rest were 'associate students' (mainly part-time students and non-university students) and students from abroad. This survey will be referred to in the rest of this paper as *IUJF*.

Baron does not attempt to assess the representativeness of his respondents, and he does not explicitly consider the possibility of systematic bias.¹⁰ My misgivings about the bias of this otherwise admirable survey made me search for a way to check Baron's results against data which were less doubtful in respect of representativeness. This was found in the secondary analysis of a nation-wide survey of British university students who started their undergraduate studies in 1955. This secondary analysis, then, is the other study with which this paper is concerned.

All undergraduate applicants to U.K. universities in 1955 were asked, on behalf of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals

of the Universities of the United Kingdom, to fill in a short questionnaire dealing mainly with simple personal data, father's occupation, previous education, and career preference. The results of this survey were published in what is generally known as the Kelsall report.¹¹ The inquiry, however, did not end here. The Sociological Research Unit (SRU) of the London School of Economics and Political Science conducted a follow-up survey of a sample¹² of the U.K. entrants to first degree courses. This involved two postal questionnaires, the first sent in the Spring of 1958, when most subjects were still at university and none had graduated, the second sent in the first half of 1961, when most subjects—apart from all medical, dental, and veterinary students, and some post-graduates—had left university.¹³ It was in this latter questionnaire that three short questions were included on religion which made it possible to identify the Jewish students. The two crucial questions for this purpose were: 'Into which religious denomination (if any) were you *born* or *baptized*? Please specify, even if your membership was, or has become, purely nominal. If none, write in "none" ; and: 'Are you *now* a member of a different religious denomination? If yes, please specify.' It seems a reasonable assumption that virtually all those whom we might wish to consider Jewish, including the marginal individuals, would have identified themselves by means of these questions. In any case it can be argued that anyone who did not specify Jewish in reply to either question should, in fact, be excluded from the analysis.

Be that as it may, the secondary analysis of the SRU survey (henceforth referred to as *SRU*) is based on this self-identification of the Jewish students; they were located by inspection of the actual schedules of the entire sample. Thus we have an opportunity to compare data gathered by Baron for the Jewish students who were reached and replied early in 1955 with data referring to the cohort of Jewish students who entered university late in 1955. The data, then, do *not* refer to the same individuals: there is no overlap between the two populations. This presents certain problems, referred to below. There are, moreover, substantial areas in which the data are not comparable; some of the findings from *SRU* will therefore be analysed separately.

Before we proceed to further analysis, the basic composition of the *SRU* sample must be indicated. The total number of schedules identified as Jewish, after elimination of converts to Christianity (three cases) and addition of converts to Judaism (one case), was 115; of these 86 were men and 29 were women. But in order to arrive at meaningful computations a weighted sampling procedure had to be used (see note 12). Each actual case was therefore either counted twice (for medical students and/or students from manual backgrounds) or five times (for non-medical non-manual background students). The adjusted number of 'respondents' came to 400, of whom 290 were male and 110 female. (In the later analysis five actual cases were eliminated, because of in-

completeness in the relevant data, so that most tabulations below refer to the schedules of 82 men and 28 women, reconstituted into 280 male 'respondents' and 105 female 'respondents'.) Although this method leads to a substantial decrease in the statistical significance of small differences between sub-groups—as the cases are not all independent—and makes it impossible to use *absolute* numbers, it is the only way in which accurate *percentages* can be stated. When in the following the number of cases to which percentages refer in *SRU* is given, e.g. as $n = 385$, it should be remembered that this represents the calculated number of cases in the reconstituted population, not the actual number of cases in the available sample. 'Respondents' will be used without inverted commas in the rest of this paper to refer, for *SRU*, to this adjusted number of cases.

Checking the Estimate

Although the results of *IUJF* were based on the replies of fewer than 1,000 full-time students, Baron preceded his analysis with an estimate of the total number of Jewish university students in the U.K., arrived at with the aid of the estimates of the Secretaries of the Jewish student societies. These estimates, for Great Britain and N. Ireland, were as follows: total number of Jewish students, 3,000; total number of full-time Jewish students, 2,430. In each case the figure includes students from abroad; no estimate of their number is given. Among the replies to *IUJF* 11.3 per cent were of students from abroad; virtually all these are likely to have been full-time students. If we assume that the non-identification and non-response rates are the same for students from abroad as for U.K. students, we arrive at a corrected estimate of 2,160 full-time U.K. Jewish university students.¹⁴

We can now attempt to derive an independent, and comparable, estimate from *SRU*. It has been noted that the total number of Jewish respondents to the 1961 questionnaire was 400, of whom 290 were men and 110 women. The response rate to this 1961 *SRU* questionnaire was for men 74 per cent of the original sample of entrants, for women 82 per cent. Assuming that Jews responded neither more nor less to this questionnaire than non-Jews, we arrive at an entering Jewish student group of 390 men and 130 women, a total of 520. The over-all total of entering full-time U.K. degree students was 19,950—the Jewish proportion represents 2.6 per cent.

If we were to take this percentage of Jews among the entering students and apply it to the total number of students, thus assuming that the proportion of Jews among entrants was identical with their share in the over-all student body, we should conclude that the total number of Jewish students was, at that time, 1,950.¹⁵ But such an assumption would be false, because Jewish students were substantially over-represented in fields of study (particularly medicine) in which it takes

longer than normal to finish the course. Thus while Kelsall reported 10 per cent of male students and 9 per cent of female students (over-all 10 per cent) entering medicine, the proportions in our Jewish sample were respectively 23 per cent and 8 per cent (over-all 18 per cent). For dentistry the general figures for men and women were 3 per cent and 1 per cent (over-all 2 per cent), but among the Jewish students they were respectively 9 per cent, 5 per cent (8 per cent). Among the non-medical (etc.) students the general and Jewish proportions staying on for graduate work were similar, though the Jewish students were slightly under-represented. Thus in 1958, 21 per cent of the Jewish non-medical respondents were at university as post-graduate students, in 1959: 15 per cent, and in 1960: 11 per cent. The proportions for the over-all non-medical student body were respectively 24 per cent, 16 per cent, and 11 per cent (unpublished *SRU* data).

By using a different set of data from *SRU* we can come to a more definite estimate, which, as we shall see, corroborates the suggestions of the preceding paragraphs. Information is available from the 1961 questionnaire about the activities of the respondents from 1958 to late 1960. Hence we can calculate the total number of years spent at university for each respondent. We shall assume that a respondent still at university, e.g. late in 1960, did not interrupt his studies but had been at university without a break for six years. Although, of course, some students do leave for a period of time, returning a year or so later to resume their studies, others stay on for longer than the maximum number of years (six) which can be traced in these data. These two errors approximately cancel each other out.

The total number of respondent-years was 1,212 for male students, 431 for female students. Taking into account the response rate of 74 per cent for men and 82 per cent for women, we arrive at 1,640 man-years and 525 woman-years, a total of 2,165. This figure can be taken as an estimate of the total number of full-time U.K. Jewish university students during the approximate period 1955-1958, as it is unlikely that there was any significant fluctuation in Jewish intake during those years. It represents 2.8 per cent of the total number of full-time U.K. university students.¹⁶ The correspondence with the *IUJF* figure is remarkable. Whether or not the method used by Baron is a generally commendable procedure, it certainly yielded a result which must have been very close to the true figure for 1955.

SOCIAL BACKGROUND

Social Origin and Career Plans

The social origin of Jewish students differs in some respects markedly from that of the over-all student population. In accordance with the generally known and well-documented middle-class nature of the U.K.

JEWISH STUDENTS IN BRITAIN

Jews, the parents of Jewish students are found (to a much larger extent than is the case for the over-all student body) in non-manual occupations, particularly in the professions.¹⁷ Table 1 gives the breakdown for all full-time U.K. students entering in 1955 (source: Kelsall), and for the Jewish students in our *SRU* sample. Those whose father's occupation was uncodable have been excluded in both cases.

TABLE I
Occupation of Fathers of Students entering in 1955 (SRU)

	<i>Men</i>		<i>Women</i>	
	<i>All students</i>	<i>Jewish students</i>	<i>All students</i>	<i>Jewish students</i>
	%	%	%	%
Medicine, Dentistry	4	13	4	2
Law	1	2	2	—
Church	2	2	3	5
Teaching (all)	6	4	10	12
Other non-manua	60	66	62	74
Manual	27	14	19	8
	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>
	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/>
	<i>n</i> = 14,356	<i>n</i> = 272	<i>n</i> = 5,947	<i>n</i> = 101

The category 'other non-manual' is, of course, very vague and includes rich self-employed business men as well as low-income white-collar workers. The notable features, however, are to be found in the more specific categories. The proportion of manual workers among Jewish fathers was half of that among all fathers. The proportion of medical men among the fathers of the Jewish male students was three times as large as that among all students. The other occupations had few differences. The pattern among the women's fathers reversed that of the men in some cases. One can only speculate that this may have some connexion with the fact that traditional Jewish attitudes to learning differ in respect of men and women, but this point cannot be taken further with the data available.

We have already commented upon the large proportion of Jewish medical students. But the discrepancy between the proportion of Jews entering medicine and the over-all proportion choosing a medical career was not the only notable difference in career choice. Figures are available for the general sample of *SRU* in terms of career choices of those who were not medical, dental, or veterinary students.¹⁸ The categorizations used in Table 2 are in some respects a little ambiguous, and this table will have to be read with caution. The medical (etc.) group which has been excluded comprised some 14 per cent for the men and 10 per cent for the women in the general sample, against 33 per cent and 18 per cent for Jewish men and women respectively. These career choices were those made in 1958, when all respondents were still

at university. Those whose course of study could not be classified have also been excluded from this analysis.¹⁹

TABLE 2

Career choices for all Students and for Jewish Students in 1958 (non-medical) (SRU)

	Men		Women	
	All students	Jewish students	All students	Jewish students
	%	%	%	%
University teaching	3	3	2	—
Other teaching	21	9	60	28
Research	17	19	8	13
Civil Service	2	1	1	—
Church	4	—	0	—
Other professions	33	40	11	—
Industry/commerce	18	16	5	—
Social Service/personnel	1	6	12	13
Other/uncodable	0	5	0	45
	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
	<i>n</i> = 6,080	<i>n</i> = 165	<i>n</i> = 2,080	<i>n</i> = 53

^a Fewer than 0.5%.

For men outside the medical sciences the main difference appears to be that Jews substantially underchose non-university teaching. For women the pattern was more differentiated, but it was again the marked shift away from non-university teaching which accounted for much of the difference.²⁰ A surprising fact is the large proportion of Jewish women whose career choice either could not be classified into the given categories—'other' careers—or was uncodable. As Table 3 indicates some of these women will have ended up in other professional careers, and some will have gone into teaching. The total number of female respondents in this analysis is, however, rather small.

We can now compare the career choices of respondents given in *IUJF* with those found in *SRU*. Table 3 shows these choices. For *SRU* two sets of data are available: careers as chosen in 1958, when all respondents were in their third year at university, columns (b) and (e), and careers as chosen in 1961, columns (c) and (f), when 70 per cent of the men and 81 per cent of the women had left university.

It is clear from this table that, particularly among women, career choices varied considerably at different points in time, especially in the categories 'other teaching', 'social work', 'other', and 'undecided'. Some uncertainty remains as to whether the categories in the two surveys were sufficiently similar to make a detailed comparison of this nature valid. This is particularly true for the categories 'research' and 'professions'; when they are taken together, the differences between them in *IUJF* and *SRU* (1958) disappear. The under-representation of non-university teachers in *IUJF* was, however, substantial—also in the case of the more career-certain men. We have seen that non-university

JEWISH STUDENTS IN BRITAIN

TABLE 3

Career choices of Jewish Students

	<i>Men</i>			<i>Women</i>		
	(a) <i>IUJF</i> (1955) %	(b) <i>SRU</i> (1958) %	(c) <i>SRU</i> (1961) %	(d) <i>IUJF</i> (1955) %	(e) <i>SRU</i> (1958) %	(f) <i>SRU</i> (1961) %
Medical	22	}32	23	17	}16	8
Dental	8		9	}5		5
Vet.; other med.	5		1			
University teaching	3	2	3	5	—	5
Other teaching	2	5	6	9	29	19
Research, including technology	21	16	14	11	7	9
Professions:						
Law	14	}23	17	3	—	—
Accountancy	3					
Industry/Commerce	7	11	10	5	—	7
Civil Service	3	1	—	3	—	—
Social Service/personnel	—	4	—	13	11	2
Other	4	3	9	9	23	18
Undecided	8	4	10	21	14	24
	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)

$n = 649$ $n = 280$ $n = 280$ $n = 184$ $n = 105$ $n = 105$

teaching is, in a sense, an 'un-Jewish' career. The under-representation of this category in *IUJF* may well be due to the likely bias in its sample towards the more 'Jewish' Jews.

Distribution over Types of Universities and Lodgings

Baron had devised four categories of university, namely 'London', 'Ancient' (Oxford and Cambridge), 'Large Provincial' (Birmingham, Glasgow, Leeds, Liverpool, and Manchester), and 'Small Provincial' (the rest). The reason, as stated in an unpublished note, for the separate tabulation of the data for the third group was that at these universities there were 100 or more Jewish students (estimated), large and thriving Jewish student societies, and large Jewish communities. Comparing the distribution, in Table 4, over these four university types, we see that Oxbridge was noticeably over-represented in *IUJF*, at the expense of the other groups.

TABLE 4

Distribution of Jewish Students over Universities

	<i>IUJF</i> %	<i>SRU</i> %
Ancient	27	21
London	29	30
Large Provincial	29	32
Small Provincial	15	17
	(100)	(100)
	$n = 833$	$n = 385$

The proportions of women among the respondents were for *IUJF* and *SRU* respectively 22 per cent and 27 per cent; women were particularly under-represented in *IUJF* in the Large Provincial universities (20 per cent as against 31 per cent in *SRU*) and in the Small Provincial universities (25 per cent as against 32 per cent in *SRU*).

The data regarding the distribution of the over-all student population are not available in this particular breakdown, but we do have the figures for London and Oxbridge. These indicate that Jews were heavily over-represented in London (over-all percentage for London in 1955 was 18 per cent), and about proportionate in the Ancient universities (over-all proportion was 20 per cent) (Source: Kelsall). It is likely, but it cannot be demonstrated, that they were over-represented in the Large Provincial, and under-represented in the Small Provincial universities.

The distribution of the respondents in *IUJF* and *SRU* over the different types of lodgings was, on the whole, quite similar. From *SRU* data we have been able to distinguish (1958 questionnaire) between those who lived for two or three years in college ('college'), those who lived for two or three years at home ('home'), those who lived for two or three years in lodgings or a flat ('lodgings'), and 'others'—those who were lodged differently each year, uncodable, or living in other types of accommodation (hostels, settlements, etc.). *IUJF* provided an analysis for one particular term—that of the inquiry. Here 'home' included c. 1 per cent who lived in the houses of friends or relatives, while 'others' in this case included an unspecified, but small, number of respondents living in flats. It should be noted that in the original (unpublished) tabulation a distinction was made between Jewish lodgings and non-Jewish lodgings; about 7 per cent of the men and 5 per cent of the women in *IUJF* lived in Jewish lodgings.

TABLE 5

Accommodation of Jewish Students

	<i>Men</i>		<i>Women</i>	
	<i>IUJF</i> %	<i>SRU</i> %	<i>IUJF</i> %	<i>SRU</i> %
College	19	22	19	9
Home	49	50	51	53
Lodgings	23	20	14	20
Other	9	8	16	18
	<hr/> (100)	<hr/> (100)	<hr/> (100)	<hr/> (100)
	<i>n</i> = 649	<i>n</i> = 280	<i>n</i> = 184	<i>n</i> = 105

The only substantial discrepancy is to be found in the case of the female students: *IUJF* underrated the proportion living in lodgings and overrated the proportion living in college. This was clearly a result of

JEWISH STUDENTS IN BRITAIN

the over-representation in *IUJF* of women from the Ancient universities: while in *SRU* merely 10 per cent of all Jewish women were at Oxbridge, in the former case 20 per cent of all female respondents were studying there.

The pattern of accommodation differs for the four university groups, not only, of course, for the Jewish students. In London and the Large Provincial universities Jewish students lived preponderantly at home (the similarity from the Jewish point of view between London and these other cities which have substantial Jewish communities is borne out in this analysis). In Oxbridge they lived mainly at college, while in the Small Provincial universities the pattern was mixed. Table 6 shows this analysis by university type.

TABLE 6
Accommodation of Jewish Students, by University Type

	<i>Ancient</i>		<i>London</i>		<i>Large Prov.</i>		<i>Small Prov.</i>		<i>All</i>	
	<i>IUJF</i> %	<i>SRU</i> %	<i>IUJF</i> %	<i>SRU</i> %	<i>IUJF</i> %	<i>SRU</i> %	<i>IUJF</i> %	<i>SRU</i> %	<i>IUJF</i> %	<i>SRU</i> %
College	62	58	1	4	^a	2	8	26	18	18
Home	^a	—	78	70	72	86	38	14	50	51
Lodgings	31	33	11	14	16	9	31	34	21	20
Other	7	9	9	12	11	4	22	26	11	11
	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)

n=226 *n*=79 *n*=245 *n*=116 *n*=241 *n*=124 *n*=121 *n*=66 *n*=833 *n*=385

^a Fewer than 0.5%

Data are available for the whole student body in *SRU* relating to the students' accommodation in the year 1958.²¹ These data are, strictly speaking, not entirely comparable with those used for the Jewish students, because in the latter case the data referred to accommodation over three years. Minor discrepancies between the findings for the overall student body and for the Jewish students could well be due to this difference between Jewish data for three years and general data for one year. But there is no reason to assume that major discrepancies could also be explained in these terms. And a major discrepancy is indeed found. In Table 7 all medical (etc.) students have been eliminated, as well as the category 'other' for accommodation, which included in the case of the Jewish men largely students whose accommodation had been different each year, and in the case of the Jewish women students whose accommodation could not be coded under the given categories.

TABLE 7

Accommodation: General Student Body and Jews (SRU)^a

	Ancient		London		Rest	
	All students	Jewish students	All students	Jewish students	All students	Jewish students
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Home	1	—	27	77	24	55
Lodgings	48	37	41	16	47	28
College	51	63	32	7	29	17
	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
	<i>n</i> = 2,310	<i>n</i> = 59	<i>n</i> = 1,832	<i>n</i> = 75	<i>n</i> = 6,797	<i>n</i> = 114

^a Excluding medical, dental, veterinary students, and students in 'other' types of accommodation.

The differences in the case of the Ancient Universities were probably due to the above-mentioned discrepancy in the data. But for London and the Rest of the U.K. this could not have been the case: the homeboundness of Jewish students stands out without any doubt, although the differences would perhaps have disappeared in part if we could have controlled for parents' place of residence.

RELIGIOUS INVOLVEMENT

Jewish Society Membership

One of the important aims of *IUJF* was, understandably, to find out more about the participation of Jewish students in the activities of the university or college Jewish societies. A question invited them to state whether they were 'very active members', 'active members', 'members, but not active', or had 'little or no interest'. *IUJF* found, among its respondents, that 83 per cent were members of their Jewish society, although some 40 per cent (almost half of the total membership) were 'not active'. The largest percentage of the actual membership which was 'not active' was found in London (57 per cent), the smallest in the Small Provincial universities (28 per cent).

The proportion of members among the respondents to *IUJF* was substantially higher than the proportion among the *SRU* population of those who stated in 1958 that they were, or had been, members of their Jewish student society (cf. Table 8). This latter percentage is likely to overstate the actual proportion of members at a particular moment, because it includes all those who had *at any time* during their first three years at university joined their college Jewish society. This overrepresentation of Jewish society members in *IUJF* leads us to suspect that the survey was biased in favour of those students who were more strongly identified as Jews. I have already briefly alluded to this fact in the section on careers; further evidence will be presented in the following analysis of religious beliefs.

JEWISH STUDENTS IN BRITAIN

TABLE 8

Proportionate Membership of Jewish Student Societies

	<i>IUJF</i>	<i>SRU</i>
	%	%
Ancient	73 <small>n = 225</small>	50 <small>n = 79</small>
London	82 <small>n = 233</small>	57 <small>n = 116</small>
Large Provincial	93 <small>n = 241</small>	71 <small>n = 124</small>
Small Provincial	83 <small>n = 105</small>	55 <small>n = 66</small>
Total	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/> 83	<hr style="width: 50%; margin: 0 auto;"/> 60
	<small>n = 804</small>	<small>n = 385</small>

In the case of *SRU* we can analyse these data further, and attempt to see whether living in different types of lodgings had any bearing on Jewish society membership. Living in college apparently led to low Jewish society membership: in the Ancient universities 41 per cent of those living in college for two or more years have been members at some time during the three undergraduate years ($n = 46$), as against 64 per cent for those living outside college for two or more years ($n = 33$). The same is true for the Small Provincial universities, the other type where a considerable proportion lived in college. The numbers were small but the differences substantial: 35 per cent of those living in college ($n = 17$), but 61 per cent of the others ($n = 49$), joined at some stage. In London and the Large Provincial cities living at home went with a substantial membership proportion: 64 per cent ($n = 81$) and 70 per cent ($n = 106$) respectively. There was no clear pattern in these two university types for those living neither at home nor in college: 39 per cent ($n = 18$) in London were members, while 87 per cent ($n = 16$) in the Large Provincial cities were members. The numbers were again very small; not too much can be made of this analysis.

Judaism and its Importance

We have already seen that in the case of *SRU* the questions of Jewish relevance—apart from Jewish society membership—were framed in terms of religion. The data, on the whole, thus concern the students' attitudes to *Judaism*, not to the more general conception of *Jewishness*. We shall, however, see later that, because of certain spontaneous comments, some inferences can be drawn regarding the latter factor too. *IUJF*, directed as it was at the Jewish students as such, covered the wider area of Jewishness much more thoroughly: there were questions on Jewish education, attitudes to Zionism and inter-marriage, intentions regarding future degree of Jewishness, and anti-semitism. Here we shall have to disregard these aspects, because no

comparison with *SRU* can be made. But the questions in *IUJF* concerning Jewish religious beliefs and practices offer fertile possibilities for comparative analysis.

IUJF used the following categories of belief in the questionnaire ('Your religious belief') and in the analysis: 'Orthodox Jewish—Moderately orthodox—Reform—Liberal—Theist—Agnostic—Atheist—Indifferent', and the following categories of practices ('Your observance of Jewish practices'): 'Strictly orthodox—Orthodox, but not strictly so—Moderately orthodox/moderate—Reform—Liberal—Nationalist—Little—None'. Of the latter the first three were strictly defined in the accompanying letter; anyone answering in terms of these first three categories may be considered to have been a person in whose life religion played a definite part—thus 'Moderately orthodox/moderate' was defined as 'practising many of the major commandments of Judaism (e.g. Shabbat and Kashrut), but not on all occasions (e.g. as do many members of Orthodox synagogues)'. Reform and Liberal were, for the question on practices, defined as 'corresponding to the practices of the Association of Synagogues in Great Britain' and of 'the Liberal Synagogue' respectively—clearly a much less satisfactory definition. Here no account was taken of deviations from officially prescribed practice. One suspects that the students in *IUJF* who filled in, on practices and beliefs, 'Reform' or 'Liberal' constituted a heterogeneous group from the point of view of the role religion played in their lives.

SRU, of course, did not make such fine distinctions. It asked the respondents to assess whether the current importance of religion in their lives was 'very important—intermediate—moderately important—intermediate—of no importance'. Quite a number of respondents specified, under 'comments', that they were agnostic, merely nominally Jewish, or atheist. Some stated that religion had general importance to them, but not specifically Judaism; others held that being a Jew was important, but not in a religious sense.

Our first task was to attempt to reduce the disparate categories in each of these three tables to one common set, so that comparisons became possible. In the case of *IUJF* we have to reconcile the data on beliefs and practices; the problem here is to find combinations of belief-categories each of which is comparable in terms of religious involvement with a particular combination of categories of practice.²²

In view of the nature of the data available, it seemed most appropriate to establish three categories of involvement in or importance of religion: at least moderate importance (1), slight importance (2), and no importance (3). On the *IUJF* belief side 'orthodox' and 'moderately orthodox' clearly fit into (1), while 'atheist' and 'indifferent' should obviously be classed (3). 'Theist' is most appropriately regarded as (2). On the practices side 'orthodox to moderate' is (1), 'little' (2), and 'none' (3). 'Reform and Liberal' present a problem in either case: it is

JEWISH STUDENTS IN BRITAIN

TABLE 9

Jewish Students' Religious Belief: IUJF

	<i>Men</i> %	<i>Women</i> %	<i>Total</i> %
Orthodox/moderately orthodox ^a	12 ¹ 34 } 46	9 ¹ 32 } 41	11 ¹ 34 } 45
Reform/Liberal	13	17	14
Theist	12	13	12
Atheist	8	8	8
Agnostic	17	17	17
Indifferent	5	4	5
	(100)	(100)	(100)
	n = 641	n = 179	n = 820

^a Small figures: top line orthodox; second line moderately orthodox.

TABLE 10

Jewish Students' Religious Practice: IUJF

	<i>Men</i> %	<i>Women</i> %	<i>Total</i> %
Orthodox/Moderate ^a	6 ¹ 13 ¹ 32 } 51	4 ¹ 18 ¹ 25 } 43	6 ¹ 14 ¹ 29 } 49
Reform/Liberal	8	14	10
Little ^b	26	27	26
None	14	16	15
	(100)	(100)	(100)
	n = 645	n = 182	n = 827

^a Small figures: top line orthodox, decreasing to moderate.

^b Includes 'Nationalist', 2% in all columns.

TABLE 11

Importance of Religion: SRU

	<i>Men</i> %	<i>Women</i> %	<i>Total</i> %
Jewish: very important—moderately important ^a	7 ¹ 9 ¹ 24 } 39	20 ¹ 7 ¹ 9 } 45	14 ¹ 8 ¹ 20 } 41
Jewish: intermediate	15	13	15
General importance of religion + Agnostics: any importance	7	10	7
Jewish: of no importance	27	17	24
Agnostics: of no importance	12	13	13
Atheists	6 ^b	2	1
	(100)	(100)	(100)
	n = 276	n = 105	n = 376

^a Small figures: top line very important, decreasing to moderately important.

^b Fewer than 0.5%.

not unlikely that they were used by some respondents of high involvement, but also by others for whom religion was merely of slight importance. I have decided to split this group into two equal parts, and to allocate half to (1) and half to (2). The 'agnostics' were also, probably, a mixed group. Some of them, no doubt, worry a great deal about religion, and some may well continue to practise certain aspects of Judaism. In *SRU* one quarter of those who specified 'agnostic' or 'nominal' still considered religion to be at least of some importance to them. For lack of any better criterion I have used this information and allocated one quarter of the 'agnostics' in *IUJF* to (2) and the rest to (3).

The allocation of respondents to this threefold division is less ambiguous and *ad hoc* in the case of *SRU* than was true for the first survey. 'Jewish: very important to moderately important' were classed as (1); 'Jewish: intermediate', those for whom religion had general importance, and the 'agnostics' for whom it had some importance as (2), and the rest as (3). Having made these decisions, we can combine the last three tables into one: Table 12.

TABLE 12

Students' Religious Involvement, Combined Categories

	(a) <i>IUJF</i> Practice %	(b) <i>IUJF</i> Belief %	(c) <i>SRU</i> Religion %
At least moderate importance	54	52	41
Slight importance	31	23	22
No importance	15	26	38
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	(100)	(100)	(100)
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	<i>n</i> = 827	<i>n</i> = 820	<i>n</i> = 381

The differences between practice and belief, columns (a) and (b), for the two least involved categories, cannot be attributed to the decision made regarding the 'agnostics' distribution. If half of the agnostics had been allocated to 'slight importance'—which would not, I believe, have been justified—the percentages for 'slight importance' and 'no importance' in (b) would have been respectively 28 per cent and 22 per cent. The conclusion seems therefore in order that belief had been more affected by secularism than practice.²³ Each points probably to a different aspect of Jewish identity: beliefs to the religious aspect, practices perhaps more to a diffuse ethnic sense of Jewishness. Some support for this view can be found in the replies to another question in *IUJF*: 'Your intended future degree of Jewishness and closeness to the Jewish community: very strong, strong, fair, little, none.' Though statements of intention are notoriously poor predictors of actual future behaviour, they do provide good indicators of the present state of

mind. With a total of 40 cases of no answer eliminated, 'very strong' and 'strong' accounted for 51 per cent, 'fair' for 33 per cent, 'little' for 13 per cent and 'none' for 4 per cent ($n = 793$). This accords very closely with column (a) in Table 12; practice seems, then, to be a good indicator of Jewishness if not of Jewish religiosity.²⁴

A comparison between columns (b) and (c) raises the problem whether the categorizations are, in fact, equivalent. In other words: would the respondents to *IUJF* who classified themselves as one of the shades of Orthodox, or half of those who mentioned Reform or Liberal, have stated in response to *SRU* that religion was at least moderately important to them? And would the Theists and the other half of the Reform and Liberal respondents have marked the second 'intermediate' in reply to *SRU*? There is no way in which this question can be answered—but it can hardly be argued that the entire difference between columns (b) and (c), or even, I believe, a major part of it, should be attributed to such a lack of equivalence. It seems beyond doubt that the proportion of less religiously involved Jews reached by *IUJF* was substantially lower than their true proportion in the population.

Importance of Religion and Jewish Society Membership

In *SRU* the proportionate distribution of the importance of religion was substantially different for members and non-members of Jewish societies (see Table 13). One would expect a similar difference to occur in the case of *IUJF*; unfortunately no break-down of religious characteristics for members and non-members of Jewish student societies is available. In this context, however, it becomes important to remember that one of the main biases in the inquiry of *IUJF* related to the higher proportion of members of Jewish societies in that sample than in *SRU* (83 per cent as against 60 per cent in the latter). The two samples can be made comparable by computing the distribution of religious importance in *SRU* for a hypothetical population in which 83 per cent are members of Jewish student societies (as was the case for *IUJF*). We then arrive at a distribution of religious importance for *SRU* which has been 'standardized' for Jewish society membership with *IUJF*. The correspondence of this standardized *SRU* distribution in Table 13 with that found in Table 12 for *IUJF* beliefs is closer than that of the non-standardized distribution. But a distinct difference remains: the *IUJF* sample continues to be more religious than the *SRU* sample.

It is difficult, with the available material, to explain this fact confidently. Three suggestions seem worth considering. In the first place it is possible that further bias existed in *IUJF* towards the inclusion of more religious students. Alternatively it is possible that the difference is after all due to lack of equivalence of the categories used to compare *IUJF* and *SRU*. But a quite different line of speculation seems worth

TABLE 13

Importance of Religion by Membership of Jewish Societies (SRU)

	Members	Non-members	Total	Total 'standardized' with IUJF ^a
	%	%	%	%
At least moderate importance	49	29	41	[45]
Slight importance	23	21	22	[22]
No importance	28	50	38	[33]
	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
	<i>n</i> = 230	<i>n</i> = 151	<i>n</i> = 381	[<i>n</i> = 381]

^a For explanation, see text above.

indicating. At least some of the respondents to *IUJF* may, in fact, have replied to Baron's questions from within a different 'frame of mind' from that in which they would have responded to the *SRU* questionnaire. It is possible that the whole context of the specifically Jewish *IUJF* inquiry 'saliented' for them their Jewishness, or Jewish identity, not normally very strong, while *SRU* brought responses from people like this which were less bound to a specifically Jewish identity. A potentially fruitful research problem, which can link up with previous work on reference groups and identity, seems indicated by this analysis.²⁵

Religion, Age and the Life Cycle

It is regrettable that no analysis is available for *IUJF* of religious beliefs and practices by age or by year of birth. Religious experience tends to vary with age; more especially the suggestion has been made that for many individuals the nature and intensity of religious experience shows a marked discontinuity at the close of adolescence.²⁶ The fact that in *IUJF* almost 40 per cent were under 20, and almost 60 per cent under 21 years, while no one in *SRU* was under 23 years when the questions on religion were asked, may well have been a confounding factor of some importance.

Another factor which might have had some influence on a post-Second World War group of Jewish students is year of birth. Those who were old enough during the war to understand the news of the tragedy in Europe, and thus to have experienced it personally rather than vicariously through later accounts, might have been expected to have stronger attachments to Judaism than the younger students. The *IUJF* data, again, do not help us on this point, and the *SRU* data are not really appropriate for this analysis, as there are very few older respondents in that sample. A test of this hypothesis was nonetheless attempted. *SRU* respondents were divided into two groups: those born in 1935 and after (*n* = 338), and the older group, born in 1934 or before (*n* = 38). No consistent or statistically significant difference was found between these groups. Although 45 per cent of the older group

JEWISH STUDENTS IN BRITAIN

held religion to be at least moderately important, against 41 per cent for the younger group, 44 per cent of the older group thought it of no importance, against 36 per cent for the younger group. Slight importance was given respectively by 10 per cent and 24 per cent.

Although no comparable data exist for *IUJF*, it is of some interest to reproduce the analysis of the *SRU* data for respondents of differing marital status. The differences were small, but pointed to a noteworthy phenomenon. Of the single respondents ($n = 286$) 18 per cent stated that they had become agnostics or atheists, of the married respondents ($n = 99$) 14 per cent stated that they had become agnostics or atheists. For the married respondents without children ($n = 58$) this percentage was 16 per cent, for those with children ($n = 41$) it was 12 per cent. It seems, then, that marriage, and more particularly the founding of a family, had the effect of reducing the number of people specifically identifying themselves as agnostic or atheist.

But the distribution of single and married people over the three constructed categories of importance of religion also differed markedly (see Table 14). Further analysis revealed that the married people with children had a sharply higher 'score' on religiosity, although the marriage factor *alone* had a slight opposite effect.

TABLE 14

Importance of being a Jew and the Life Cycle (SRU)

	Single	All married	Married no children	Married with children
	%	%	%	%
At least moderate importance	39	45	32	66
Slight importance	23	18	30	5
No importance	38	34	41	29
	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)
	$n = 284$	$n = 99$	$n = 58$	$n = 41$

I should point out, however, that almost half of the 'no importance' respondents among the married without children volunteered the information that being Jewish had *social* importance for them, a fact recorded for 40 per cent of the married with children in this category. Among the single respondents who stated 'no importance' this occurred merely among one tenth. 'Rock-bottom' no importance was thus found among 34 per cent of the single, among 23 per cent of the married people without children, and among 17 per cent of the married people with children. At the other extreme being a Jew was considered very important by 10 per cent of the single, none of the married without children, and by half of the married with children.

This correlation between marital status (parenthood) and Jewishness can be interpreted in causal terms. One is inclined to infer that marriage

(parenthood) caused an increase in Jewishness or religiosity. But as there are no data for Jewishness before and after marriage and parenthood for the same individuals, some doubt as to the validity of this inference remains. Moreover, it is likely that in the case of some of those respondents for whom religion was very important this fact led to early marriage, thus reversing the suggested causal sequence. But the greater incidence of '*rock-bottom*' *no importance* among single respondents seems best explained in the former way. Thus our analysis tends to confirm the frequently reported fact that raising a family leads to the disappearance of the rebellious values found among adolescents, and a return to more traditional norms and patterns of behaviour.²⁷

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This analysis has brought to light some interesting new facts about Jewish students, such as their highly deviant accommodation pattern. It has also given fresh evidence for previously documented findings, regarding, for example, their preferred careers, their religious beliefs, and their social origins. It has found that the proportion of 'non-Jewish Jews' declines when people start founding families. It has suggested a rather intriguing problem regarding identity-activation. But all these aspects were, in a sense, incidental to the main object of this paper. This was to draw attention to the fruitfulness of secondary analysis, an alternative to surveys directed specifically at the Jewish population. The nature of this latter type of investigation is such that it almost inevitably yields results which are systematically biased, because of the non-inclusion of less fully identified members of the Jewish community. These people are Jews too—and in many respects data about them, about their social characteristics and their social attitudes are crucial for a proper understanding of the make-up of the Jewish community.

The principal advantage of secondary analysis is that it covers a sample of the entire population, in which the Jews can be located. But it can hardly supply the answer to all one's questions. Often the data which have been collected for the original purpose of the inquiry are irrelevant to one's own main interest. The next step, then, is to plan research in such a way that this location through over-all coverage becomes possible. Other sociologists are interested in different minority groups—in Catholics, for instance. It may be appropriate to conclude with the suggestion that research undertaken in co-operation with such others may be of substantial benefit to all concerned.

JEWISH STUDENTS IN BRITAIN

NOTES

¹ Financial support for this study, given by the Social Research Division of the London School of Economics, is gratefully acknowledged.

² But even in that case some problems remain. Thus in Holland the invasion of religion into many spheres of social and political life has resulted in a higher percentage declaring themselves—partly in protest—as ‘without religious denomination’ (Census 1960: 18 per cent). Many religiously alienated Jews likewise do not declare themselves Jewish. See, e.g., ‘Dutch Jewry, A Demographic Analysis, Part One’, *Jew. Jn. Sociol.*, III : 2 (1961), p. 214.

³ In Britain, Maurice Freedman has written, ‘always in theory and largely in practice Jews . . . are simply citizens without any special status such as would call for their separate enumeration’: ‘The Jewish Population of Great Britain’, *Jew. Jn. Sociol.*, IV : 1 (1962), p. 92. In the United States the issue of separation of Church and State is ideologically hypersensitive. A single question on religion, added by way of experiment to a monthly Census Bureau sample survey (see below, note 6) touched off a major controversy and left certain Jewish organizations highly indignant. This prevented the planned inclusion of a question on religion in the national census of 1960.

⁴ The only really satisfactory method would be to do a full-scale (sample) survey of the entire population, thus ensuring inclusion of the Jews. The expense of such an operation is likely to be prohibitive, unless one can join forces with investigators interested in other minorities. I am aware of one instance where such a full-scale sample survey was, in fact, carried out. Cf. Stanley K. Bigman, *The Jewish Population of Greater Washington in 1956*, Washington D.C., 1957. For an evaluation of the other methods see C. Morris Horowitz, ‘The Estimated Jewish Population of New York, 1958’, *Jew. Jn. Sociol.*, III : 2 (1961) and Louis Rosenberg, ‘The Demography of the Jewish Community in Canada’, *Jew. Jn. Sociol.*, I : 2 (1959) p. 220.

⁵ There are some interesting variations on these methods. See, e.g., the

article by Ira Rosenswawe, ‘The Utilization of Census Tract Data in the Study of the American Jewish Population’, *Jew. Soc. Stud.*, XXV : 1 (1963), which uses the high correlation of Russian-born individuals and Jews to arrive at certain demographic data. Such a method cannot, however, be utilized in areas without such recent Jewish immigration. In any case the poverty of demographic data relating to the British Jews has been widely commented upon. The most eloquent proof of this is furnished by the estimates (supplied by the Board of Deputies) of the total number of Jews in Britain, as published in the *American Jewish Yearbooks*. For the last ten years this figure has stood at 450,000; in all the other cases of major Jewish communities the estimates have been revised at least once.

⁶ In the countries where census data exist by religious or ethnic group, scholars concerned with Jewish demography have done such secondary analysis. See, e.g., Alvin Chenkin, ‘Jewish Population in the United States, 1958’, *American Jewish Yearbook*, Vol. 60, 1959, for an analysis of the (‘freak’) nationwide sample mentioned above; Louis Rosenberg, loc. cit., for Canada; Ira Rosenswawe, ‘The Jewish Population of Argentina’, *Jew. Soc. Stud.*, XXII : 4 (1960). Other types of study subject sociological survey data to a secondary analysis; an excellent example is S. Joseph Fauman, ‘Occupational Selection among Detroit Jews’, in Marshall Sklare (ed.), *The Jews, Social Patterns of an American Group*, Glencoe (Ill.), 1958. Then there have been numerous studies of voting behaviour, some analysing only the Jewish patterns—such as Lawrence H. Fuchs, *The Political Behavior of American Jews*, Glencoe (Ill.), 1956, some concentrating on the Jews after taking a general sample—e.g. Maurice G. Gussenir, ‘Jewish Vote in Chicago’, *Jew. Soc. Stud.*, XX : 4 (1958), others incidentally reporting interesting data on the Jews in the context of a wider analysis by ethnic or religious background, e.g. Edward A. Suchman and Herbert Menzel, ‘The Interplay of Demographic and Psychological Variables in the Analysis of Voting Surveys’, in P. F. Lazarsfeld

and Morris Rosenberg, *The Language of Social Research*, Glencoe (Ill.), 1955. The same principle is also successfully applied in Gerhard Lenski, *The Religious Factor*, Garden City (N.Y.), 1961, and by Andrew M. Greeley, in 'Influence of the Religious Factor on Career Plans and Occupational Values of College Graduates', *Amer. Jn. Sociol.*, LXVIII : 6 (1963).

⁷ Thus the earlier mentioned sample survey of the U.S. Census Bureau simply asked 'What is your religion?', while in other cases respondents are requested to state their 'religious preference'.

⁸ The small numbers of Jews make most of the few British studies dealing with religion of students worthless from our point of view. See, e.g., *The Survey of 900 Cambridge Undergraduates* by R. Warren Evans, reported in *Cambridge Opinion*, Vol. 16 (1959). In most cases, the Jews end up on the heap of 'other religions' in the analysis. Sometimes it is possible to combine the data of a number of surveys. This was done by Bernard Lazewitz, for his 'Some Factors Associated with Church Attendance', *Social Forces*, 39 : 4 (1961).

⁹ Raymond V. Baron, 'IUJF Survey of Jewish University Students, 1954/55', *The Jewish Academy*, Winter 5716—1955-6. I have also used the original unpublished tabulations of this survey, which were put at my disposal by Mrs. A. Klausner of the Cultural Department of the World Jewish Congress. I should like to thank Mrs. Klausner sincerely for her assistance and encouragement.

¹⁰ It is interesting to note that surveys of other student minorities are faced with the same problem of bias. Cf. Audrey G. Donnithorne, 'Catholic Undergraduates in the Universities of England and Wales', *The Dublin Review* 478, Winter 1958, and the synoptic discussion in Michael S. Fogarty, 'The Rising Tide. Growing Numbers of Catholic Students', *The Dublin Review*, 484, Summer 1960.

¹¹ Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of the Universities of the United Kingdom, *Report on an Inquiry into Applications for Admissions to Universities*, by R. K. Kelsall, London, 1957.

¹² This sample consisted of two sub-samples. Of the students from manual workers' homes and of the medical, dental, and veterinary students one in two was taken; of the non-manual and non-medical students one in five was taken.

¹³ Although some aspects of the analysis have been made available in mimeographed form, the data are still largely unpublished. I am grateful for the permission of the SRU to proceed with this secondary analysis and to use some of the unpublished data. I am greatly indebted to Mr. J. G. H. Newfield, Mrs. Christina Holbraad, and Mr. David A. Howell for their valuable help over a long period of time, and for their patience in putting up with often probably most unwelcome interruptions.

¹⁴ According to figures of the University Grants Committee (U.G.C.) the proportion of full-time non-U.K. students at British Universities in 1954-5 was 10.4 per cent. See *Annual Abstract of Statistics*, 1957, pp. 101 and 103. It is hard to decide whether the IUJF figure of 11.3 per cent was biased through differential identification or differential response of Jewish students from abroad. This is, of course, possible: these students may have been more 'visible' and more identified with the Jewish student sub-group (which possibly represented for them a familiar reference group in strange surroundings) than U.K. Jewish students. I have in any case rounded off the percentage to 11 per cent.

¹⁵ Based on U.G.C. returns of a total of 75,200 full-time U.K. students (including those reading for a diploma). See *Annual Abstract of Statistics*, 1957, loc. cit.

¹⁶ The share of the total Jewish population in the population of Great Britain is somewhat less than 1 per cent. No reliable figures are available regarding the size of the Jewish age-group of university age. A comparison of the proportion of the age-group 15-19 (who would have been of undergraduate age four years later) in a sample of the Jewish population in 1950-2, with the proportion of this age-group in the general population, shows little difference. See Hannah Neustatter, 'Demographic and other Statistical Aspects of Anglo-Jewry', in Maurice Freedman (ed.), *A Minority in Britain*, London, 1955, Table IV, p. 249, and *Annual Abstract of Statistics*, 1954, p. 9.

¹⁷ Exact figures are hard to come by, but the following papers may be consulted, also for further references: Hannah Neustatter, loc. cit., V. D. Lipman, 'Trends in Anglo-Jewish Occupations', *Jew. Jn. Sociol.*, II : 2 (1960), Ernest

JEWISH STUDENTS IN BRITAIN

Krausz, 'Occupation and Social Advancement in Anglo-Jewry', *Jew. Jn. Sociol.* IV : 1 (1962).

¹⁸ D. A. Howell, *The Student's Choice of Career*, mimeographed, 1963.

¹⁹ Note that figures quoted for the general SRU sample refer to the adjusted population in the same way as do those for the Jewish subgroup.

²⁰ Greeley, loc. cit. pp. 664-6, finds a similar disinclination towards non-university teaching among Jewish men in his re-analysis of a nation-wide American survey of college graduates. American Jewish women, however, appear more inclined than their non-Jewish counterparts to choose an educational career.

²¹ C. Holbraad, *The Accommodation of Third Year University Students and their Performance at Final Examinations*, mimeographed, 1962.

²² A difficulty is that no data for individuals exist. Thus we have to compare group distributions, and these correlations might or might not accurately represent the correlations of the two sets of data concerning the same individuals. Nevertheless I do not believe that this has led to serious distortion, as the variables involved have a great deal of *prima facie* similarity. See, on this problem, W. S. Robinson, 'Ecological Correlations and the Behavior of Individuals', *Amer. Sociol. Rev.*, 15 : 3 (1950).

²³ See the interesting discussion on the problems of practice and belief, and attitudes and behaviour in Bernard C. Rosen, 'Minority Group in Transition: A Study of Adolescent Religious Conviction and Conduct', in Sklare, op. cit., pp. 336-46.

²⁴ The definition of Jewish identity in terms of Jewishness or Judaism has been widely discussed. For the research pro-

blems involved see Bernard Lazerwitz, 'Some Factors in Jewish Identification', *Jew. Soc. Stud.*, XV : 1 (1953), Ludwig Geismar, 'A Scale for the Measurement of Ethnic Identification', *Jew. Soc. Stud.*, XVI : 1 (1954), and Marshall Sklare *et al.*, 'Forms and Expressions of Jewish Identification', *Jew. Soc. Stud.*, XVII : 3 (1955). Cf. also the series of papers of the Hebrew University Group under Simon N. Herman, referred to below.

²⁵ See specifically the first synoptic discussions by Robert K. Merton, in his *Social Theory and Social Structure*, 2nd ed., Glencoe (Ill.) 1957; and the papers of both theoretical and Jewish interest by Simon N. Herman & Erling O. Schild, 'The Stranger Group in a Cross Cultural Situation', *Sociometry*, 24 : 2 (1961), 'Ethnic Role Conflict in a Cross-Cultural Situation', *Human Relations*, 13 : 3 (1960), and Simon N. Herman, 'American Jewish Students in Israel', *Jew. Soc. Stud.*, XXIV : 1 (1962). The most interesting analysis of the concept of identity is found in Erik H. Erikson, 'The Problem of Ego Identity', *Jn. Amer. Psychoanal. Assoc.*, IV : 1 (1956). See also an excellent recent discussion in Erving Goffman's *Stigma, Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, Englewood Cliffs (N.J.), 1963.

²⁶ Erikson, loc. cit.: see also by the same author, *Childhood and Society*, New York, 1950, partic. Part IV, and *Young Man Luther*, New York 1958, a psychoanalytic historical study where the adolescent's religious crisis looms large.

²⁷ For a similar finding for Jewish subjects cf. Abraham G. Duker, 'Some Aspects of Israel's Impact on Identification and Cultural Patterns', *Jew. Soc. Stud.*, XXI : 1 (1959), p. 30, and Bernard Lazerwitz, op. cit., p. 306.