



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

California School

/"SEPARATE NOT THYSELF FROM THE COMMUNITY"

HILLEL: A STUDY OF STUDENT INVOLVEMENT /

A Thesis submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Jewish Communal Service

by

Deborah Esther Balaban

August, 1982

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE -
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

The Thesis of Deborah Esther Balaban is approved.

Bne Shalom
filed September 17, 1984
Jesse T. Magish

"SEPARATE NOT THYSELF FROM THE COMMUNITY"

HILLEL: A STUDY OF STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

To the students of the University of Texas
at Austin whose enthusiasm, involvement and
Jewish spirit made my research possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Review of the Literature	1
II. The Effect of Social Circles	20
III. Fraternities and Sororities as a Source of Competition.	26
IV. In-State vs. Out-of-State.	35
V. The Effects of Hillel Stereotypes.	40
VI. Hillel as a Match-making Service	48
VII. Jewish Burnout	51
VIII. Shaping New Identities	56
IX. Jewish Identity Issues	68
X. Conclusions and Implications for Practice.	79
Appendix 1. Sample Questionnaire.	86
Appendix 2. Hillel Activities.	104
Bibliography.	105

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
2.1 Number of activities by close friends who are Jewish	21
2.2 Number of activities by Hillel activities done with Jewish friends	22
2.3 Number of activities by other Jewish activity done with Jewish friends	23
2.4 Number of activities by religious activities done with Jewish friends	23
2.5 Number of activities by Hillel activities with non- Jewish friends	24
2.6 Number of activities by attendance at lectures with non- Jewish friends	25
3.1 Do you currently belong to a fraternity or sorority?	28
3.2 What is your status within the fraternity or sorority?	29
3.3 If Hillel and your fraternity or sorority sponsored programs at the same time, which do you think you would probably attend?	29
3.4 Number of activities by choice of Hillel or Fraternity/ Sorority program attendance.	30
3.5 The percentage of activities attended at Hillel.	31
3.6 Number of activities by number of fraternity and sorority events attended.	33
4.1 In what city did you graduate high school?	36
4.2 Number of activities by city of high school graduation	37
4.3 Number of activities by parents' decision affecting choice of UT.	39
5.1 Reasons attended a Hillel activity by degree of applicability.	41
5.2 Number of activities by reason for attending Hillel activity	42

	Page
5.3 Number of activities by reason for attending Hillel activity	43
5.4 Number of activities by reason for attending Hillel activity	43
5.5 Number of activities by reason for attending Hillel activity	44
5.6 Do any of the images given below match your image of Hillel?	45
5.7 Specific groups by degree of Hillel program directed-ness. .	46
6.1 Hillel has sometimes been referred to as a "match-making service." How do you agree that Hillel serves this function?	49
6.2 Number of activities by image of Hillel as a match-making service.	49
7.1 Number of activities by involvement in Jewish organizations or clubs	52
7.2 Number of activities by involvement in non-Jewish organizations or clubs	53
7.3 Type of organization by involvement in organization.	53
7.4 Number of activities by number of Jewish organizations involved	54
8.1 Reasons for joining a Jewish organization by degree of applicability.	58
8.2 Number of activities by reason for joining a Jewish organization	59
8.3 Number of activities by reason for joining a Jewish organization	59
8.4 Number of activities by reason for joining a Jewish organization	59
8.5 Number of activities by reason for joining a Jewish organization	60

	Page
8.6 Number of activities by degree of participation	60
8.7 Number of activities by degree of participation	61
8.8 Number of activities by degree of participation	61
8.9 Number of activities by degree of participation	62
8.10 Reasons for choosing a dormitory by degree of applicability	63
8.11 Number of activities by reason for choosing dormitory living.	63
8.12 Number of activities by reason for choosing dormitory living.	64
8.13 Number of activities by number of professors who are Jewish.	65
8.14 Campus organizations by visibility of the groups.	66
9.1 Number of activities by family's ritual observance.	70
9.2 Number of activities by self ritual observance.	71
9.3 Breakdown of respondents to question of self ritual observance.	71
9.4 How has the degree of your observance changed since leaving your parents' home?	72
9.5 Number of activities by change in degree of observance. . .	72
9.6 When you were growing up, how often did you attend religious school?	73
9.7 Were you Bar/Bat Mitzvah?	73
9.8 Were you confirmed in religious school?	73
9.9 When you were growing up, how often did your family attend services?	74
9.10 Number of activities by attendance at services.	75
9.11 Do you tend to think of yourself more as a Jew or more as an American?	75

	Page
9.12 Who do you usually go out with on dates--Jews or non-Jews?	76
9.13 If you were to marry, do you think you would marry a Jew or a non-Jew?	76
9.14 How important is Israel to you?	77
9.15 How many times have you been to Israel?	77
9.16 How important is being Jewish to you personally?	77

CHAPTER I
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

How does a Jewish student differ from other students? Are their needs so different as to merit research and specific programming?

Albert Friedlander describes the characteristics of Jewish students as follows:¹

1. distinctively different cultural ambience
2. stronger concern with ideals and causes
3. greater intensity and involvement with curriculum
4. strong relationship to family
5. identification with Jewish cultural life and Israel
6. certain sensitivity to tragic dimensions of life
7. knowledge of Jewish fate--reaction to the Holocaust

When discussing Jewish college students, a distinction arises: how a Jew identifies with the Jewish community versus the Jewish identity of a Jew and how it is incorporated into the identification process. According to Simon N. Herman, Jewish identification is the process by which the individual comes to see him/herself as part of a Jewish group²--that is to say, the extent to which an individual

¹Albert Friedlander, Never Trust a God Over 30: New Styles in Campus Ministry (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972).

²Simon N. Herman, "Criteria for Jewish Identity," World Jewry and the State of Israel (Arno Press, 1977).

identifies with the Jewish community. Jewish identity means delving deeper into the issues of what being Jewish means, and the kinds of Jews and Jewishness that develop within a majority culture. An individual can identify with the Jewish community and yet maintain enough distance to avoid developing and expanding a Jewish identity. An added part of the problem of Jewish identity formation is the American lifestyle. A tension exists between being American and being Jewish in America. American Jews, especially American Jewish college students, are seeking a way to balance this tension. Herman says, "The Jewish identity of an American Jew can only be understood in the context of his Americanism."³ It is precisely because of the tension between American values and Jewish values that Jewish college students seek to play out all the various lifestyles offered to them in college. On the college campus, students are confronted with a multiplicity of choices and options. As Irving Greenberg explains, in his article "Jewish Survival and the College Campus," when a student is faced with Jewish alternatives versus college alternatives, the student opts for the secular alternative and, also, withdraws from the Jewish community.⁴ It may not be a conscious withdrawal, but the attractiveness of a different lifestyle is appealing and can lead to exclusion of the familiar.

³Ibid., p. 181.

⁴Irving Greenberg, "Jewish Survival and the College Campus," Judaism, 17.3 (Summer 1968).

The college years are an important period of personality development and formation. It is a time when an individual is searching for self and definition of self. It is a time of trying out different roles, lifestyles and patterns of behavior. At this point in their lives, the seventeen- or eighteen-year-old college freshman can choose to become a member of any one of many diverse groups. That membership could be Jewish, non-Jewish, or even anti-Jewish. It is at this impressionable time that young Jewish students can accept or reject the feeling of Jewish "belongingness." The emotional anxiety and confusion engendered by this search for self and group identification makes learned childhood commitments and family values more vulnerable to attack. Friedlander feels the majority of Jewish students think of themselves as Jewish, but not religious. There are also the "troubled Jews,"⁵ who have some sense of belonging but don't know how to act out their feelings. The "deviant" cases become those who seek to lead a more Jewish life than their peers, and strive to exceed their parents and other similar role models with respect to Judaism.⁶ On a continuum of Jewish needs, students fall from one extreme to the other and anywhere in between.

College students are in a dilemma. They find it difficult to relate to Judaism in a positive way. Irving Greenberg looked at the

⁵ Leonard Fein, Studying Jewish Identity: Observations (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1966).

⁶ Marshall Sklare, The Study of Jewish Identity, Issues and Approaches, Simon N. Herman, ed. (The Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1971).

effect of college experience on Jewish values and loyalty. He found that college is "a disaster area for Judaism, Jewish loyalty and Jewish identity. Whatever the nature of commitment, it declines in college."⁷ Erikson says that "the sense of identity becomes more necessary whenever a wide range of possible identities is envisaged."⁸

Intertwined with Jewish needs is the concept of identity. Simon N. Herman discussed the needs of the Jewish community and felt that emphasis should be on "understanding the dynamic processes which determine the direction of Jewish life."⁹ There are many sources of identity--early home life, surrounding societal environment, experiences of life, etc.--all of which shape values and foster self-esteem, self-respect and group identification. The issue of identity is a complex one. Many sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists, all those who study human behavior, believe there to be many facets, sources and components of developing identity. Audrey Roth believes it is a process of establishing values.¹⁰ It is the development of self-esteem and self-respect based on knowledge of self, i.e., what one is, what groups one belongs to, accomplishments of those groups, etc. Andre Neher believes others can have great influence on the identity of a Jew. In his article, "The Dialectics of Jewish Identity: Beyond

⁷Greenberg, "Jewish Survival."

⁸Erik Erikson, Identity, Youth and Crisis (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1977), p. 245.

⁹Simon N. Herman, The Study of Jewish Identity, Issues and Approaches, Simon N. Herman, ed. (The Institute of Contemporary Jewry, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1971).

¹⁰Audrey S. Roth, Personal Identity: A Search for Values (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971).

Religion and Secularism," Neher states that "the Jew determines identity according to the opinion of others"¹¹ (author's italics). College students are susceptible to peer pressure. Not only are they struggling with the crises of identity, career, male/female relationships, etc., but they are worrying about making friends, concerned with how they will appear to their peers, and how to become properly socialized and accepted into the student community. Erikson says that identity is "a process located in the core of the individual and yet also in the core of his (her) communal culture."¹² As a Jew within a Jewish community, an individual discovers and develops a personal identity--but it is tied to the community. This is because of the obligation of the individual to the community. It has its roots in our history and heritage and perpetuates itself into the future. "Identity contains a complementarity of past and future both in the individual and society, it links the actuality of a living past with that of a promising future."¹³ If this is true, as Erikson states, our identity and the maintenance of today's Jews and their identity is our link to the future.

Many Jewish parents claim . . . that they gave their children everything that they did not have as children. The problem is, however, that the parents did

¹¹ Andre Neher, "The Dialectics of Jewish Identity: Beyond Religion and Secularism," Forum, 23 (Spring 1975).

¹² Erikson, p. 22.

¹³ Ibid., p. 310.

not give what they did have as children--a basically Jewish environment.¹⁴

According to Chaim Waxman, the Jewish family is of prime importance because it serves as "the central vehicle for transmission of Jewish identity."¹⁵ In support of this is the American Jewish Committee's (AJC) report, "Consultation on the Jewish Family: Its Role in Jewish Identity and Continuity." It says the family has traditionally been seen as central to Jewish continuity and the transmission of Jewish identity.¹⁶ The crucial nature of Jewish values is expressed in the family through transmission of Jewish heritage and Jewish identity formation. This does not mean the family has sole responsibility, because the community also has a role in Jewish identity formation. Unfortunately, institutions have become the substitute for the family in the transmission of Jewish values. As Lucy Davidowicz states, "Today's American Jewish parents, lacking knowledge and/or familiarity with the Jewish past, can't fulfill the traditional task (of transmitting Jewish identity), so they gave the task to communal institutions."¹⁷ The institutions of the Jewish community, from a child's

¹⁴ Dennis Prager and Joseph Telushkin, The Nine Questions People Ask About Judaism (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981).

¹⁵ Chaim F. Waxman, "Perspectives on the Family and Jewish Identification in America," American Jewish Committee, Institute of Human Relations.

¹⁶ American Jewish Committee Report, "Consultation on the Jewish Family: Its Role in Jewish Identity and Continuity," Jewish Communal Affairs Department, 1977.

¹⁷ Lucy S. Davidowicz, The Jewish Presence (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1977).

Hebrew school to a Hillel to a Federation, are expected to involve the Jew in Jewish communal activities. Institutions, however, cannot be expected to assume the role of family.

On the college campus, Hillel becomes heir to children of Jewish parents who offered their children everything, including or excluding a solid Jewish base. Students come to college with certain attitudes--about being Jewish, about obligations to family, friends and community--and these attitudes are played out in their awareness of and participation in, campus Jewish organizational life. Identity, according to the Oxford Dictionary, is the "internalized sense of participation."¹⁸ Thus, how an individual internalizes and the degree to which he/she feels a sense of identity, can be manifested in participation. That may range from ritualistic participation (lighting the candles on Shabbat), to cultural participation (speakers, social gatherings of Jews, etc.). The need to participate can also be placed on a continuum--one of satisfaction--dependent upon the degree and type of satisfaction sought. It is these types of participatory needs which Hillel seeks to meet for Jewish students. Hillel can provide a source of stability to the confused population of Jewish college students. Through well-planned programming, Jewish students can fulfill their Jewish needs and learn to act out their Jewish feelings in a positive way. Hillel has an acknowledged responsibility to college students--a responsibility placed on it by parents, students and community. Professor Abraham

¹⁸ Henry Watson Fowler, Oxford Dictionary (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925).

Lavendar says that the "future of American Jewish community may depend on the effects which the college experience has on Jewish identity."¹⁹

In another article, Lavendar presents the hypothesis that certain activities within the college community can influence an increase of identity or at least contribute to the maintenance of identity.²⁰

These "certain activities" can be extended by Hillel. In a book by Mark Jay Mirsky, he decries the atmosphere of colleges which encourage the "falling away" of Jewish students from Judaism. He says many Jewish professors and students are interested in Hillel, but they need to be courted.²¹ Therein lies the key. Hillel needs to develop a dynamism--in its leadership and its programs---to "court" the Jewish student and Jewish faculty.

When a student asks "Why should I be Jewish?" Hillel must respond in a way that offers an exciting and positive involvement in Jewish activity. Hillel can offer role models of "positive Jewish authenticity."²² But, because of the diversity of Jewish clientele on campus, new outreach methods combined with creative programming must be developed, and advertised, to draw in the unaffiliated. As Himmelfarb says, "Things need to be stirred up!" Greenberg suggests that a new

¹⁹ Abraham Lavendar, "Studies of Jewish College Students: A Review and a Replication," Jewish Social Studies, 39.1 and 2 (Winter-Spring 1977).

²⁰ Abraham Lavendar and Meyer Greenberg, "Jewish Identity on the College Campus: An Experiment in Identity Maintenance," Jewish Education, 46.1 (Spring 1968).

²¹ Mark Jay Mirsky, O You Jewish Collegian, p. 232.

²² Milton Himmelfarb, "The Jewish College Student and the Intellectual Community," Judaism, 17.1 (Winter 1968).

style of Judaism be developed. There is a need to "develop new styles of Jewishness--more open yet committed. . ." and "less organizational and more individual. . ." in order to see ". . . an end to mindless non-specific Jewish loyalty and activity. . . ." ²³

In the studies that have been written concerning the Jewish college student, there seems to be a lack of actual research about students on campus. Greenberg goes so far as to say that "there has not been enough systematic or comprehensive study of the effect of college experience on Jewish values and loyalty." ²⁴ He says of the studies which do exist, many are educated guesses. The most recent study was published in 1977. The college student and campus of the 1980's are very different from those of the 50's, 60's and 70's. If Hillel is to accommodate to the changes, we must first understand what today's Jewish college student wants.

This study focuses on college-age Jewish students: their Jewish needs, their degree of Jewish identity, the Jewish programming available to them on campus through the Jewish Student Center, and their reasons for participating, or not participating, in Hillel. The University of Texas at Austin was the campus where the study was administered. The University of Texas at Austin (UT) is typical of college campuses; it is a large state university with reputable undergraduate and graduate school programs, an equitable number of

²³ Greenberg, "Jewish Survival."

²⁴ Irving Greenberg, "The Jewish College Youth," The Jewish Family in a Changing World, Gilbert S. Rosenthal, ed. (New Jersey: Thomas Yoseloff Publisher, 1970), p. 208.

in-state and out-of-state students, a variety of campus organizations and opportunities to participate in activities outside of the campus. For these reasons, the data compiled from the research at the University of Texas typifies the experience of Jewish college students on the college campus. Traditionally, Hillel seeks to fulfill the needs of a broad range of Jewish students: religious, educational, cultural. The current Hillel programs and services are adequate and satisfactory to presently participating students. The need is to develop programs which will involve larger numbers of Jewish students on campus.

There are a number of students on campus who are not being reached by Hillel. The problem for Hillel is to first determine what it is that students of differing backgrounds and experiences desire in Jewish programming and, secondly, how to satisfy, programmatically, such a wide range of needs. This research was designed to uncover the questions Hillel must ask in order to properly assess students' needs and to develop programming which can then satisfy those needs. The crucial factor, then, is the program planning component of Hillel. The organization must ascertain the needs of Jewish students on campus, target the major needs, and eliminate programs which are not relevant. It is necessary to continue to meet the needs of students already involved and, at the same time, reach out to those who are uninvolved, with programs of interest to them, regardless of the fact that attendance at such programs may be relatively low. Outreach is essential if Hillel is to improve program variety and increase student attendance. Through an effective outreach program, Hillel can significantly affect the Jewish college student community in their

search for alternative outlets for their Jewish needs.

The research design entailed a systematic random sample drawn from Jewish students active and inactive in Hillel. A survey questionnaire was administered through the mail (see Appendix 1 for sample questionnaire). The students' names were drawn from a combination of the Hillel mailing list and a list of Distinctive Jewish Names (DJN)²⁵ taken from the University of Texas Student Directory (cross-checking with the Hillel mailing list). Fraternities and sororities were sampled as an additional source of inactive students.

Issues

At the University of Texas at Austin, Hillel has traditionally been the primary Jewish presence on campus. The author worked for three years as the Student Activities Coordinator at the Austin Hillel and worked very closely with all segments of the Jewish student community. A large percentage of time was spent developing outreach programs to the unaffiliated students and coordinating new programs for more diverse student involvement. Due to the intense level of involvement with affiliated and non-affiliated students, the author was motivated to investigate the issues of college student participation and non-participation in Hillel. Seven specific premises have been developed which will clarify the contributing factors relating to Jewish college students' involvement in the Hillel Jewish Student Center. They are herein presented as specific research hypotheses:

²⁵ DJN list provided by Dr. Bruce A. Phillips, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Los Angeles, 1982.

- A. Students with established social circles on campus will have less interest in Hillel.

Involvement on campus will be measured by the following questions: Are friends Jewish?; what kinds of activities are entered into with Jewish and/or non-Jewish friends?; do different social circles exist for different activities (i.e., Jewish, cultural, sports; friends from high school, college classes, dorms, etc.)?

- B. Fraternities and sororities compete with Hillel as a Jewish social institution.

A large percentage of Jewish students are members of a Jewish fraternity or sorority. There are six; most are exclusively Jewish. The premise focuses on why one joins a fraternity or sorority, even when a student comes to UT with an existing social circle. Does one join in order to be a part of an organization?; to identify Jewishly?; to interact socially with friends?; to interact socially with other Jews?; to find a mate? All of these social needs can be met within the fraternity or sorority setting. If this is the case, students may be less likely to seek to expand their social or Jewish needs outside of their fraternity or sorority.

- C. Students who have graduated from Texas high schools are likely to have established social circles.

It is hypothesized that students who come to UT with friends from high school, B'nai B'rith Youth Organization (BBYO), other youth groups, etc., will have an intact social group and

will, accordingly, have no need to meet their social needs through an additional organization, like Hillel.

- D. Students who have a negative image of Hillel are less likely to participate in Hillel.

The perceptions students carry with them about the Hillel organization may influence their decision to participate.

To what extent does the student image of Hillel affect participation? What are the reasons students give for not attending Hillel functions? Negative hearsay, not the "right" people, too religious, indifference to Jewish programming are several possible explanations for non-attendance in Hillel activities. The question of changing Hillel's image is a serious one and can affect student participation.

- E. Students who perceive Hillel as a Jewish matchmaking service will be less likely to seek involvement.

Do college students see Hillel as a Jewish matchmaking service? Many parents tell their children to go to Hillel to meet a "nice Jewish boy/girl." If students perceive Hillel as directing programming for the purpose of matching Jewish singles, they may be less likely to seek such services through the Hillel organization.

- F. Hillel is the victim of Jewish burnout.

Hillel is an organization dependent upon student participation. The purpose for Hillel's existence is to encourage, promote and sustain student involvement in Jewish campus life. The phenomenon of "burnout," an apathy toward involvement, can

greatly influence the amount of student participation in Hillel. Many students may come to college "burned out" from participation in high school organizations and youth groups. Do they seek to escape organizational life in college?; avoid "pigeon-holing"?; seek to blend into the anonymity of a large campus?; seek to avoid Jewish identification? Does Hillel suffer from students' apathy toward organizations in general?

G. Jewish involvement is in competition with other aspects of college life.

Jewish college students want to experiment with other identities and involvements. What types of organizations and clubs are available to students on campus? What types of people are on campus (i.e., ethnic groups, religions)? Do cults make themselves seen and heard? Campus offers opportunities for involvement in dormitories. Why do students live in a dorm?; are some dorms predominantly Jewish?; are certain dorms selected by Jewish students for specific reasons? Exposure to faculty presents another aspect of influence and involvement. Do professors influence students?; how?; how many professors are Jewish?; how does one know?

In addition to the seven hypotheses, a profile on how students feel about issues related to Jewish identity was compiled. Such questions include religious affiliation; degree of observance by family and self; religious school background; Bar/Bat Mitzvah ritual; patterns of dating (Jews or non-Jews or both); importance of being Jewish; importance of Israel. This profile on Jewish identity serves

as a source for understanding the Jewish student of the 1980's. The report reveals the influence that a Jewish background can bring to bear upon Jewish involvement and the perpetuation and continuity of Jewish life.

Sample

The sample for the research was drawn from the Jewish student community. The purpose of the research was to obtain data from Jewish students, involved and uninvolved, in Hillel activities. There are several sources of Jewish names. The Austin B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation has a mailing list with 1,813 names and addresses of undergraduate and graduate students. Names are added to the mailing list by the students themselves, by parents or by friends. The University of Texas does not require students to fill out religious preference cards. However, a few students do so, and Hillel receives the card, but the number of religious preference cards is insignificant compared with other sources of names. There are three Jewish fraternities and three Jewish sororities. Each has a roster of names, and these rosters are added to the Hillel mailing list. There are approximately 900 Jewish fraternity and sorority members, which is almost half the total number on the Hillel mailing list.

There are three subsamples. The Hillel mailing list, less the fraternity and sorority members, constitutes one sub-sample of the study. These students, typically, have demonstrated an interest in participating in Hillel programs. The fraternity and sorority members constitute a second sub-sample. These students, customarily, do not

voluntarily participate in Hillel activities, as the fraternities and sororities provide almost all activities necessary to their members' organizational and social lives. The third and last sub-sample of the total sample is called "Distinctive Jewish Names" (DJN). A list of 106 DJN was developed by the American Jewish Committee. This list of Jewish names can be used to determine the proportional representation of Jews in a community. The purpose of using the DJN list as a third sub-sample was to attempt to find the unaffiliated Jews who were not on either the Hillel mailing list or the fraternity and sorority lists. In October of every school year, a University Student Directory is printed which lists most students' names and addresses. Using the DJN list, the Student Directory was reviewed and all of the DJN found in the directory were listed separately; the number totaled 486 names. These names were cross-checked twice (once with the Hillel list and once with the fraternity/sorority list) to avoid any duplication of names. Once the lists were cross-checked, thirteen names remained that were not on the other lists. Although the sample is small, it was kept separately for comparative purposes. Of the thirteen, ten names had no addresses and were unable to be located. As will be seen later, none of the DJN respondents returned the questionnaire. They were located from a source which identifies the unaffiliated. The lack of response appears to reflect a relationship between non-affiliation and non-response.

The random selection was not taken from the total overall sample frame. Rather, each component group represented a percentage of the total, and a sample percentage was taken from each component. To

summarize, three sub-samples comprising the overall sample were:

Proportional Breakdown

Hillel List	(932)	63%
Fraternity/Sorority List	(881)	35%
DJN List	(3)	.008%

The sample was stratified to the presence in the population. The number of questionnaires was kept proportional to the number of names in mailing the questionnaires:

Hillel	$352 \times .63 = 225$
Fraternity/Sorority	$352 \times .35 = 124$
DJN	$352 \times .008 = 3$

Three hundred and fifty two copies of the questionnaire were mailed, bulk rate, with a cover letter and stamped return envelope enclosed. Each questionnaire had an identification number on the cover. A master list was kept in order to match a name/address to a number. In this way, an accurate record could be kept of who received a questionnaire and either returned or did not return it, and still protect the anonymity of the person responding to the questionnaire. The respondent did not have his/her name on the questionnaire. One and a half weeks after the first mailing of the questionnaire, a follow-up postcard was sent to those respondents who had not returned their questionnaire. A second and last postcard was sent two weeks later.

Response Rate

". . . response bias becomes a concern, with the researcher testing (and hoping for) the possibility that the respondents are

essentially a random sample of the initial sample, and thus a somewhat smaller random sample of the total population."²⁶ In computing response rates, according to Babbie, the accepted practice is to subtract all questionnaires which were returned uncompleted, could not be delivered, or were not applicable (in the case of this study, the respondent was not Jewish). The return results of the questionnaires are as follows:

Questionnaires mailed	352
Questionnaires returned uncompleted*	-14
Net sample size	338

*7 uncompleted
7 not Jewish

Hillel returned	96
Fraternity/Sorority returned	69
DJN returned	0
Total	165

Response Rate Percentage:	$165 \div 338 = 49\%$
---------------------------	-----------------------

Percentage Return By Component Group

Hillel	$(96 \div 225)$	43%
Fraternity/Sorority	$(69 \div 124)$	56%

²⁶ Earl R. Babbie, Survey Research Methods (California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973), p. 165.

The return rate is high compared with many questionnaire return rates. Statistician Allan G. Johnson says that a typical response rate of mail surveys is 10 percent.²⁷ A large part of the return rate, especially among fraternity and sorority members, can be attributed to specific outreach activity on the part of the Austin Hillel staff (this is explained in greater detail in Chapter Four).

Dependent Variable

A dependent variable was computed on the basis of the presence of specified values occurring in a list of criterion variables that already exist in the file.²⁸ Involvement was measured by the counting of the number of activities attended by the respondents (see Appendix 2 for the list of activities). The dependent variable was then divided into categories of activities attended:

0	Activities	Low	0 - 30%
1 - 5	Activities	Medium	30 - 80%
6 or more	Activities	High	80 - 100%

²⁷ Allan G. Johnson, Statistics Without Tears, p. 170.

²⁸ Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Norman H. Nie, et al. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975), p. 107.

CHAPTER II

THE EFFECT OF SOCIAL CIRCLES

Hypothesis A is Students with established social circles on campus will have less interest in Hillel. The use of social circles is a critical one which deserves careful analysis. Part of its importance lies in the degree of influence one's peer group can exert on its members. The college years come at a time of significant personality development and identity formation, and college students are readily susceptible to peer pressure. It is an important aspect of their lives to be accepted into a group, to be a part of a specific, interdependent social circle. The emphasis upon acceptance is stronger at this time than at any other because of the tensions and crises which the young adult is continually struggling to overcome and to control.

An individual can belong to more than one social circle, depending upon the type of activities in which one is interested. These social circles may overlap, or they may be mutually exclusive. At the University of Texas at Austin, as on most campuses, there exist many opportunities to become involved in a multiplicity of groups or organizations. This can include campus organizations, music clubs, intramural sports, religious organizations, fraternities, sororities, political groups, and cultural clubs. It is hypothesized that if an individual has one, or more, established social circles, he/she will have less interest in joining Hillel. The amount of time spent with

friends in other activities, Jewish and non-Jewish, can have significant impact upon attendance at Hillel activities. This is also true of individuals whose social circle centers around Hillel activities.

Due to the many social circles available in a student's campus world, the questions attempted to cover a wide range of activities: the number of their friends belonging to Hillel; the number of their close friends who were Jewish; and the types of activities engaged in with their friends (bar for a drink; visiting friends; going to movies; going out to eat; Hillel programs; other Jewish activity; sports; study; campus organizations; work; jogging; lectures; religious activities; camping; going to a party; and giving a party).

The activities engaged in with friends were analyzed and tested independently of each other in order to establish the idea of a "social circle," and the degree of influence exerted by such social circles.

The major findings support the hypothesis and are summarized here:

1. People with close Jewish friends either do not participate in any Hillel activities or are highly involved at Hillel (see Table 2.1).

TABLE 2.1

Number of activities by close friends who are Jewish

Number of Activities	How many of your closest friends are Jewish?				
	Almost All	Some	A Few	Almost None	None
Low (0)	22.5%	20.0%	48.7%	72.7%	100.0%
Medium (1-5)	59.6%	50.0%	28.0%	27.3%	0.0%
High (6+)	18.0%	30.0%	24.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 2.1 shows that the percentage of close Jewish friends one has can influence participation at Hillel either towards involvement or away from involvement. Under the category "Almost All," 22.5% do not attend any activities, but 59.6% and 18.0% do attend in Medium and High categories, respectively. This means that there are different sets of social circles among Jewish friends. Those with "Almost All" Jewish friends either participate in Hillel as part of their social activity or are involved in other activities with their Jewish friends. It also shows that attendance at Hillel is more likely to increase as the percentage of Jewish friends increases.

2. Hillel is used by those whose social group is Hillel and those without any social group at all (see Table 2.2).

TABLE 2.2

Number of Activities by Hillel activities done with Jewish friends

Number of Activities		How often do you attend Hillel with Jewish friends?			
		Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Low	(0)	0.0%	15.4%	18.5%	44.3%
Medium	(1-5)	16.7%	0.0%	58.7%	53.2%
High	(6+)	83.3%	84.6%	23.1%	2.5%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Of those who often go to Hillel with Jewish friends, 83.3% participate in 6 or more activities. Those who attend 1-5 Hillel activities but only "Rarely" with Jewish friends (58.5%),

nevertheless, are more likely to attend. Perhaps these respondents are in need of a social circle and feel they can find it at Hillel.

3. People with Jewish friends will attend Jewish activity outside of Hillel (see Table 2.3).

TABLE 2.3

Number of activities by other Jewish activity done with Jewish friends

Number of Activities	How often do you attend other Jewish activity with Jewish friends?			
	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Low (0)	25.7%	20.7%	27.3%	51.4%
Medium (1-5)	62.9%	55.2%	57.6%	21.6%
High (6+)	11.4%	24.1%	15.2%	27.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Those who engage in other Jewish activities with Jewish friends supports the thesis that those who "Often" attend other Jewish activity (25.7%) have a separate social circle in which their Jewish activity involvement is fulfilled. In conjunction with Table 2.3, see Table 2.4.

TABLE 2.4

Number of activities by religious activities done with Jewish friends

Number of Activities	How often do you attend religious activities with Jewish friends?			
	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Low (0)	28.6%	19.6%	21.4%	54.8%
Medium (1-5)	35.7%	47.1%	60.7%	42.9%
High (6+)	35.7%	33.3%	17.9%	2.4%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Of those who "Often" attend religious activities with Jewish friends, 28.6% do not attend Hillel; this group has another social circle which fulfills Jewish involvement. On the other hand, of those who "Rarely" attend religious activity, 60.7% are more likely to attend Hillel in the 1-5 activity range. This group does not have a social circle or else seeks it through activity at Hillel.

4. Non-Jewish friends have slight impact upon Hillel participation (see Table 2.5).

TABLE 2.5

Number of activities by Hillel activities with non-Jewish friends

Number of Activities	How often do you attend Hillel activities with non-Jewish friends?	
	Rarely	Never
Low (0)	10.0%	31.8%
Medium (1-5)	30.0%	50.6%
High (6+)	60.0%	17.5%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%

Those with "Almost All" non-Jewish friends had no impact on Hillel attendance, but those who do bring a non-Jewish friend to Hillel, even if "Rarely," are more likely to attend Hillel.

One activity engaged in with non-Jewish friends did have significance concerning attendance; those who went to lectures with non-Jewish friends were less likely to come to Hillel (see Table 2.6).

TABLE 2.6

Number of activities by attendance at lectures with non-Jewish friends

Number of Activities	How often do you attend lectures with non-Jewish friends?			
	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Low (0)	55.6%	17.5%	28.3%	35.8%
Medium (1-5)	33.3%	45.0%	50.0%	55.2%
High (6+)	11.1%	37.5%	21.7%	9.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The 55.6% of those who "Often" go to lectures with non-Jewish friends, and attend in the 0 activity range at Hillel, demonstrates that lectures offered elsewhere are well attended. Since that attendance is with non-Jewish friends, perhaps the lectures are on secular topics, taking place on more neutral ground where neither Jew nor non-Jew feels any kind of religious overtones.

Overall the findings support the hypothesis that social circles have an impact on participation at Hillel. Those who have social circles outside of Hillel have less interest in participating in Hillel activities. Those whose social circle is either based on Hillel activities, or who come to Hillel in search of a social circle, will be more likely to attend Hillel on a more active level.

CHAPTER III

FRATERNITIES AND SORORITIES AS A SOURCE OF COMPETITION

Hypothesis B is Fraternalities and sororities compete with Hillel as a Jewish social institution. The fraternities and sororities are a population which must be examined closely and with great care. The Jewish fraternities and sororities comprise a population of approximately 900 Jewish students, divided into three fraternities and three sororities. All are exclusively Jewish, with the exception of one fraternity which has one non-Jewish member. Traditionally, the fraternities and sororities at the University of Texas have had minimal participation at Hillel, either as individuals or as a group. Over the past three years, there has been an increase in participation for several reasons. The primary one was the creation and implementation of a fraternity/sorority outreach program at Hillel. A Hillel staff professional was given the responsibility for creating lines of communication between Hillel and the fraternities and sororities, and developing working relationships between them. The outreach effort was implemented in the following way:

1. Each fraternity and sorority was asked to appoint a representative to the Hillel Student Board, who would act as liaison between Hillel and their respective fraternity/sorority.
2. Each fraternity and sorority was asked to sponsor at least one Hillel food program a semester; either a Lox and Bagel Brunch,

a Deli Nite, or a Shabbat dinner. The sponsoring organization would be responsible for the menu, the cooking and serving of the food, and clean-up. In return, advertisements would publicize that a particular fraternity or sorority was the sponsoring organization. Participation in these sponsored food programs was good, and significantly increased fraternity and sorority activity at Hillel. Another factor in the increased participation was a change perceived by the fraternities and sororities in the type of students attending Hillel activities. Fraternities/sororities, tending to have an image of the Hillel types as "loser," were loathe to be involved because of this. Over the past three years, due to specific targeting of populations and increased creative programming, a more diverse group of individuals--including members of fraternities and sororities--began to participate at Hillel. These two factors worked in a positive manner to increase participation.

Fraternities and sororities can have a significant impact on Hillel. If properly focused and used, they can help to change the "loser" image, recruit new student groups, call for new programming, and participate willingly in a Jewish communal setting. Because of the size of their membership (900), it is important to recognize their potential as a means of educating the Jewish student community through their own participation and promotion of Hillel.

Fraternities and sororities are also recognized, generally, as not being very interested in becoming involved Jewishly. Fraternities and

sororities are complete organizational units. They feel that all of the members' needs are taken care of in the fraternity or sorority setting. The motivation to seek outside activity is limited. One rationalization for Hillel involvement is the Jewish component. While some of the fraternities and sororities are Jewish, by charter and membership, their activities are not a function of their Jewishness. Hillel can be a means for expressing their Judaism.

Of the 165 respondents who answered the questionnaire, 56.6% were members of a fraternity or sorority (see Table 3.1).

TABLE 3.1

Do you currently belong to a fraternity or sorority?

Yes	56.6%
No	43.4%

TOTAL 100.0%

Concerning their status within the fraternity or sorority, 78.0% were active members (member for second semester or more), 6.1% were pledges (first semester in the fraternity or sorority), and 13.4% were in officer positions (president, vice-president, pledge trainer, etc.). Table 3.2 reports these percentages. These figures are important to remember when reviewing the various questions and responses given concerning Hillel involvement, and fraternity and sorority involvement.

TABLE 3.2

What is your status within the fraternity or sorority?

Pledge	6.1%
Active Member	78.0%
Officer	13.4%
Social Affiliate	1.2%
Little Brother/Sister	1.2%

TOTAL 100.0%

The major findings support the hypothesis and are summarized below:

1. An overwhelming majority of fraternity and sorority members chose to attend a fraternity or sorority event over a Hillel event (see Table 3.3).

TABLE 3.3

If Hillel and your fraternity or sorority sponsored programs at the same time, which do you think you would probably attend?

Hillel Event	1.2%
Fraternity/Sorority Event	90.7%
Half of Each	1.2%
No Idea	5.8%

TOTAL 100.0%

A majority (90.7%) of the fraternity and sorority respondents chose the fraternity/sorority event to attend.

2. A majority of fraternity/sorority members also attend Hillel events in the 1-5 activity range (see Table 3.4).

TABLE 3.4

Number of activities by choice of Hillel or
Fraternity/Sorority program attendance

Number of Activities		If Hillel and your fraternity or sorority sponsored programs at the same time, which do you think you would attend?			
		Hillel	Fraternity/ Sorority	Half of Each	No Idea
Low	(0)	0.0%	19.2%	0.0%	20.0%
Medium	(1-5)	0.0%	69.2%	100.0%	60.0%
High	(6+)	100.0%	11.5%	0.0%	20.0%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

When the variables of program choice were cross-tabulated with the dependent variable, we found that a majority of fraternity and sorority members still attend Hillel activities in the 1-5 activity range. Tables 3.3 and 3.4 appear to illustrate that while fraternity and sorority members would choose to attend their fraternity/sorority event over a Hillel event, nonetheless, a majority of those would attend Hillel activities in the 1-5 range.

3. Fraternity/sorority attendance at Hillel programs is qualified by the types of programs attended.

There are issues which must be examined and explored as one views these statistics about fraternities and sororities. The issues are types of activities, attendance at activities and sponsorship of

programs. Table 3.5 describes the activities offered at Hillel and the percentage of activities attended.

TABLE 3.5

The percentage of activities attended at Hillel

	No	Yes	Total
Wine and cheese parties	80.8%	19.2%	100.0%
Bagel and Lox brunches	59.6%	40.4%	100.0%
Faculty/Graduate lunches	91.1%	8.9%	100.0%
Shabbat dinners	84.9%	15.1%	100.0%
Shabbat services	63.0%	37.0%	100.0%
High Holy Day services	45.0%	54.1%	100.0%
Lectures	66.4%	33.6%	100.0%
Purim celebration	94.5%	5.5%	100.0%
Sukkot celebration	87.7%	12.3%	100.0%
Chanukah Carnival	78.1%	21.9%	100.0%
Open House Keg Party	77.4%	22.6%	100.0%
Student Board Meetings	95.9%	4.1%	100.0%
Workshops	91.1%	8.9%	100.0%
Weekend retreat	97.3%	2.7%	100.0%
Israel programs	91.1%	8.9%	100.0%
Israel information meetings	89.0%	11.0%	100.0%
Classes	85.6%	14.4%	100.0%
Discussion with the Rabbi	91.9%	8.9%	100.0%
Social activities	78.8%	21.2%	100.0%
Israeli dancing	91.1%	8.9%	100.0%

Activities most frequently attended are High Holy Day services (54.1%) and Lox and Bagel Brunches (40.4%), followed by Shabbat services (37.0%). Many fraternity and sorority members attend High

Holy Day services for several reasons: convenience to place of residence, cost of High Holy Day tickets at local temple and synagogue, opportunity to socialize with friends in a different setting, or parents' request. Many who never attend regular Hillel programs do attend services, which is significant in two ways. It appears that the students relate to Hillel in much the same way that their parents relate to their synagogues. Participation in synagogue activities is usually limited, by the vast majority, to High Holy Day services. Students attend Hillel in the way their parents attend their synagogues, and this is verified by the statistics. To illustrate, the respondents were asked about their images of Hillel and whether certain views presented on the questionnaire matched those images. One image presented was that of Hillel as a "religious center" and the results were as follows:

87.1% believed Hillel did serve as a religious center.

12.9% believed Hillel did not serve as a religious center.

Another issue is sponsorship of programs at Hillel by fraternities and sororities. Almost every fraternity and sorority sponsored a Lox and Bagel Brunch. Their sponsorship, which resulted in good attendance because sponsorship requires member participation, constitutes one (1) activity attended. The 40.4% frequency which describes Lox and Bagel Brunch attendance figures, presented in Table 3.5, partially reflects attendance by fraternity and sorority members in the Medium category.

4. Fraternity and sorority members who attend all fraternity and sorority events are more likely to attend Hillel (see Table 3.6).

TABLE 3.6

Number of activities by number of fraternity and sorority events attended

Number of Activities	How many activities offered by your fraternity or sorority do you attend?				
	None	1-2	3-4	5+	All
Low (0)	100.0%	20.0%	14.3%	26.7%	6.3%
Medium (1-5)	0.0%	60.0%	78.6%	46.7%	87.5%
High (6+)	0.0%	20.0%	7.1%	26.7%	6.3%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 3.6 describes that those who were not active in the fraternity or sorority were less likely to be active in Hillel. It also reveals that those who attended all fraternity and sorority events were more likely to attend Hillel. Given earlier, in Table 3.2, were statistics concerning pledge status in the fraternity and sorority. Pledges, who are first semester initiates, are required to attend all fraternity or sorority functions. In addition, pledges are the fraternity and sorority members who do most of the work at the food programs sponsored by the fraternity or sorority, and who also attend the program. The statistic which defined all those fraternity and sorority members who attend all fraternity or sorority events and activities at Hillel in the Medium category is 87.5% (see Table 3.6), or sixteen respondents, which can be

attributed to the pledge status of the respondents.

In conclusion, the hypothesis is supported by the data. An overwhelming majority of fraternity and sorority members choose to attend a fraternity or sorority event over a Hillel event. Although a majority also attend Hillel events in the Medium activity category, attendance is qualified by the facts of High Holy Day service attendance, sponsorship of Lox and Bagel Brunches by fraternities and sororities, and actual work being done by pledges of the fraternities and sororities. As a social institution, the fraternities and sororities fulfill many of the needs of their members and, therefore, members do not often seek out outside activities, except as a group project (i.e., lox and bagel brunch).

CHAPTER IV

IN-STATE VS. OUT-OF-STATE

Hypothesis C is Students who have graduated from Texas high schools are likely to have established social circles. The University of Texas at Austin is the largest state university in Texas and a significant number of students who attend the University are from Texas cities. This fact bears on the subject of established social circles and its impact upon attendance at Hillel activities. Common geographic background is often a foundation for a social circle. To determine whether this was, indeed, the case, the following cities in Texas were considered:

Dallas - Fort Worth

Houston

Austin

El Paso

San Antonio

Other Texas city

Outside of Texas

The first five cities listed are the major, large cities from which students come to UT. "Other Texas city" is meant to include the many small cities in the state of Texas which are too numerous to name. Table 4.1 below depicts the percentage of respondents who graduated high school from the various cities in Texas.

TABLE 4.1

In what city did you graduate high school?

Dallas - Ft. Worth (D-FW)	23.3%
Houston (H)	22.7%
Austin (A)	4.3%
El Paso (EP)	4.9%
San Antonio (SA)	3.7%
Other Texas City (Other)	7.4%
Outside of Texas (Outside)	33.7%

TOTAL 100.0%

The research shows that 66.3% of the respondents graduated from high schools in Texas, while 33.7% came to UT from outside of Texas. This, as well as other demographic figures, supports the fact that far more residents of Texas come to the University of Texas than non-residents. The questionnaire respondents were asked if they were current Texas residents:

79.2% responded Yes to Texas resident status

20.8% responded No to Texas resident status

This takes into consideration those who did not come from Texas cities but had established residency (in Texas, one full year continuous residency establishes resident status). These figures, and the ones previously displayed in Table 4.1, verify the fact that a majority of the respondents are from Texas cities.

This hypothesis considers questions of growing up in Texas; graduation from Texas high schools; Jewish friends from high school; youth groups; B'nai B'rith Youth Organization; friends from high school who now go to the University of Texas; decision to attend UT (friends; money; location; parents). These questions look specifically at the respondents' Texas background in order to ascertain if coming from a Texas city helps to establish ready-made social circles at UT.

The major findings revealed no support for this hypothesis. While established social circles do have a significant impact on Hillel attendance, it does not seem to have much significance if the students graduated from Texas high schools. What was found to be most significant was the number of people from the category "Other Texas city" who are active in Hillel. It is this particular group of people who are most active in Hillel activities. Table 4.2 below describes these statistics.

TABLE 4.2

Number of activities by city of high school graduation

Number of Activities	In what city did you graduate high school?						
	D-FW	H	A	EP	SA	Other	Outside
Low (0)	36.8%	32.4%	42.9%	12.5%	50.0%	8.3%	27.3%
Medium (1-5)	55.3%	54.1%	28.6%	25.0%	50.0%	83.3%	41.8%
High (6+)	7.9%	13.5%	28.6%	62.5%	0.0%	8.3%	30.9%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

From "Other Texas city," 83.3% graduated from high school in those

cities and were active in the Medium category of Hillel activity. The cities closest in percentage after this were Dallas-Fort Worth and Houston with 55.3% and 54.1% respectively. From this, one may conclude that those who are from "Other Texas cities" are the most likely to become active in Hillel. We can speculate that, due to the small size of these cities, the Jewish community is small and offers fewer opportunities for Jewish involvement. These students' needs are different; they are looking to establish Jewish social circles and turn to Hillel in search of a social group. The research also pointed out that those from the category "Other Texas city" were also the lowest percentage in the Low activity category (8.3%) (see Table 4.2). Again, this reflects the search for or desire to establish social circles.

Attendance at public, private or Jewish day schools had no significant impact on attendance at Hillel nor did the number of friends in high school who now attend the University of Texas. One question, from which one may draw several conclusions, related to the reason why UT was selected as the college of choice. The choice of responses was as follows:

Friends

Boy/Girl friend

Older sibling

Location

Cost

Parents' decision

Table 4.3 below discusses "Parents' decision."

TABLE 4.3

Number of activities by parents' decision
affecting choice of UT

Number of Activities	How much did your parents' decision affect your choice of UT?			
	Very Much Applies	Somewhat Applies	Slightly Applies	Doesn't Apply at All
Low (0)	23.1%	3.8%	27.6%	37.1%
Medium (1-5)	53.8%	80.8%	51.7%	45.7%
High (6+)	23.1%	15.4%	20.7%	17.1%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The significance lies in the "Somewhat Applies" category. It reflects an 80.8% activity participation in the Medium category. It appears that parents' decision seems to pull the most weight in the decision to attend UT and in activity level at Hillel. Perhaps parents also suggest that their children go to Hillel, and this suggestion also pulls weight, to some extent, with their children.

CHAPTER V

THE EFFECTS OF HILLEL STEREOTYPES

Hypothesis D is Students who have a negative image of Hillel are less likely to participate in Hillel. The problem of stereotype and image is a problem all organizations face. It has been of major, longstanding concern to Hillels across the nation. On college campuses across the country, Hillel professionals continually battle the negative image attributed by students to Hillel, and to those students who participate in its programs. What is there about Hillel that provokes this negative response? There are really two issues to consider:

1. Does Hillel present a certain image?
2. Is the image in the "eye of the beholder"?

If Hillel is projecting a certain image, it is easier to affect change through publicity, public relations, program creativity, and Hillel staff. If it is a perception which the students have and communicate to each other and to the next generation of college students, this poses a far more difficult challenge. If we are to change the students' perceptions, we must first know what those perceptions are and then target them for change.

The area of the research for this hypothesis centered on the perceptions students have of Hillel: the negative stereotypes; why they do attend programs; why they don't attend programs; the images

they carry of Hillel; student awareness of Hillel programs. The data revealed that Hillel does have an image and that none of these had an impact on attendance. Table 5.1 below describes the reasons why students attend a Hillel program.

TABLE 5.1

Reasons attended a Hillel activity by degree of applicability

Reason Description	Why did you attend a Hillel activity?			
	Very Much Applicable	Somewhat Applicable	Not Very Applicable	Not at All Applicable
Friends Attended	34.9%	42.2%	10.1%	12.8%
Program Interested Me	42.3%	36.0%	11.7%	9.9%
I Took Part in the Program	17.9%	19.8%	26.4%	34.9%
Personal Invitation from Hillel Staff	8.4%	18.7%	18.7%	54.2%
I Enjoy a Jewish Environment	26.6%	44.0%	15.6%	13.8%
Previous Experience with Hillel	8.6%	18.1%	27.6%	44.8%
Religious Services	45.5%	18.2%	14.5%	20.9%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

The significant variables in this table were "Friends attended" (34.9%), "Program interested me" (42.3%), "Enjoy Jewish environment" (26.6%), and attendance at "Religious services" (45.5%). These four variables reflect a reason for attendance but not whether they have an effect upon attendance.

1. Program interest has no impact upon attendance at activities (see Table 5.2).

TABLE 5.2

Number of activities by reason for attending Hillel activity

Number of Activities	I attended because the program interested me			
	Very Much Applicable	Somewhat Applicable	Not Very Applicable	Not at All Applicable
Low (0)	2.1%	2.5%	23.1%	18.2%
Medium (1-5)	48.9%	75.0%	76.9%	81.8%
High (6+)	48.9%	22.5%	0.0%	0.0%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 5.2 reveals students are more likely to attend Hillel if the program interests them "Very much" (48.9%) or even "Somewhat" (22.5%) in the High activity category. But in the Medium range of activity, as the applicability of program interest decreases, attendance increases. This is exemplified in the category "Not at all applicable" with an 81.8% attendance level. Program interest is not the reason why students attend Hillel.

2. Enjoyment of Jewish environment has no impact upon attendance at Hillel activities (see Table 5.3). The significant statistics lie in the Medium attendance category. As applicability of enjoyment of a Jewish environment decreases, activity participation increases. For example, in the Medium range of participation, 31.0% responded that enjoyment of a Jewish environment was "Very

TABLE 5.3

Number of activities by reason for attending Hillel activity

Number of Activities	I attended because I enjoy Jewish environment			
	Very Much Applicable	Somewhat Applicable	Not Very Applicable	Not at All Applicable
Low (0)	10.3%	2.1%	0.0%	20.0%
Medium (1-5)	31.0%	75.0%	76.5%	80.0%
High (6+)	58.6%	22.9%	23.5%	0.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

applicable"; 80.0% responded that it was "Not at all applicable" to their attendance. This is a 50.0% difference in attendance. It appears that enjoyment of a Jewish environment is not the reason students attend Hillel activities.

3. Religious services attendance has no impact upon participation in Hillel activities (see Table 5.4).

TABLE 5.4

Number of activities by reason for attending Hillel activity

Number of Activities	I attended because of religious services			
	Very Much Applicable	Somewhat Applicable	Not Very Applicable	Not at All Applicable
Low (0)	2.0%	0.0%	6.3%	17.4%
Medium (1-5)	68.0%	55.0%	68.8%	73.9%
High (6+)	30.0%	45.0%	25.0%	8.7%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In the Medium range of activity, 68.0% responded that religious services was "Very much applicable," while 73.9% responded that it was "Not at all applicable." For those who attend Hillel, religious services is not the reason behind attendance. The statistics concerning reasons why students did not attend a Hillel program revealed no significance with the exception of the variable "Previous experience with Hillel."

4. Those students who had a previous experience with Hillel were less likely to participate in Hillel activities (see Table 5.5).

TABLE 5.5

Number of activities by reason for attending Hillel activity

Number of Activities		I attended because of a previous experience with Hillel			
		Very Much Applicable	Somewhat Applicable	Not Very Applicable	Not at All Applicable
Low	(0)	50.0%	14.3%	40.0%	63.6%
Medium	(1-5)	16.7%	57.1%	60.0%	36.4%
High	(6+)	33.3%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 5.5 reveals that those who did not have a previous experience with Hillel did not attend regardless. For those who responded "Very much applicable," 50.0% did not come to any activities and only 16.7% came to activities in the Medium range. Those who had a previous experience were less likely to come to Hillel. Underlying both these findings is a negative image that Hillel projects, or that students perceive. Those who did not

have a previous experience with Hillel did not attend programs. Is there a negative communication at work? Table 5.6 lists the images presented to the respondents and their "Yes" or "No" responses.

TABLE 5.6

Do any of the images given below match your image of Hillel?

	Yes	No	Total
Religious Center	87.1%	12.9%	100.0%
Match-making service	10.4%	89.6%	100.0%
A place your parents want you to go	25.8%	74.2%	100.0%
A place to experience Jewish identity and commitment	70.6%	29.4%	100.0%
A youth group	55.8%	44.2%	100.0%
A center for new students to get together	40.5%	59.5%	100.0%
An arm of the UJA	41.7%	58.3%	100.0%
A place that offers Israel	36.8%	63.2%	100.0%
A place that has nothing I'm interested in	8.0%	92.0%	100.0%
A place to lessen homesickness	8.6%	91.4%	100.0%
A place to go for Jewish holidays	73.0%	27.0%	100.0%
Jewish environment	79.8%	20.2%	100.0%
Other	8.0%	92.0%	100.0%

What can be derived from these statistics is the following perceptions of Hillel: Hillel is a religious center, a place to express Jewish identity and commitment, a place to go for Jewish

holidays, and a Jewish environment. While the above does not, of itself, present either a positive or negative image, the fact remains that none of them have an impact upon attendance as demonstrated in the previous tables. A very interesting statistic is reflected in the variable "A place that has nothing I'm interested in." The data shows that 92.0% do not feel that this is true; Hillel apparently offers something which interests them. The question is to determine what that "something" is because of the low significance of the variables which can have an effect upon participation. If Hillel does offer an environment in which one may express one's Jewishness and commitment, what type of programming will stimulate that kind of expression, if indeed that wish exists.

5. Students perceive Hillel programs to be designed for religious students (see Table 5.7).

TABLE 5.7

Specific groups by degree of Hillel program directed-ness

Student Group	To what degree do you feel Hillel programs are directed at a specific group?				Total
	Very Much Directed	Somewhat Directed	Not Very Directed	Not at All Directed	
Singles	.07%	26.5%	49.0%	18.5%	100.0%
Religious Students	43.4%	42.1%	11.8%	2.6%	100.0%
Zionists	31.1%	43.7%	17.2%	6.6%	100.0%
Incoming Students	22.4%	47.4%	25.0%	4.6%	100.0%
Graduate Students	7.4%	47.3%	37.8%	7.4%	100.0%
Students from Out-of-State	8.2%	35.6%	41.1%	15.1%	100.0%

Consistent with the image of Hillel as a religious center, 43.4% felt programs were "Very much" designed for religious students. For the balance of the groups listed, the general response was that programming was "Somewhat" directed at these groups. When cross-tabulated with the dependent variable, none of them had any significance for participation. The phrase "Somewhat directed" is too vague to discover what lies beneath it but, perhaps, there is a general apathy towards Hillel and its programming. The potential for participation does exist because 92.0% of the respondents reported that they are interested (Table 5.6). The problem is how to spark that interest.

Overall, it would appear that a negative image, or a narrow one, can affect the level of participation at Hillel. If Hillel is seen only as a religious center catering to religious students, a new outlook is called for by Hillel and Hillel staff. It appears that it has become necessary to invest in the creation and promotion of a new image.

CHAPTER VI

HILLEL AS A MATCH-MAKING SERVICE

Hypothesis E is Students who see Hillel as a match-making service will be less likely to be involved. On the UT college campus, due to the extremely large student body that numbers 48,000, there are a variety of opportunities to meet other students--through classes, campus organizations, social circles, fraternities, and sororities. An organization which has the explicit function of acting as a match-making service might be perceived as unattractive or unappealing. It was hypothesized that Hillel is seen as just such an organization, catering not only to the cultural and religious needs of Jewish students, but to the social needs, expressing "dating" needs, as well. This "match-making" image may be encouraged by those parents who urge their children to attend Hillel in order to meet a "nice Jewish boy/girl." While students are interested in meeting others of the opposite sex, an eighteen-year-old college freshman would rather create his/her own opportunities in environments not so obviously intended for such meetings, i.e., in classes or at friends' parties. Hillel does indeed offer social activities, but if the students perceive the Hillel environment as promoting a match-making opportunity, it is far too overt to be considered attractive to attend.

The questions which were generated from this hypothesis focused primarily around the issues of mate-finding: does Hillel, indeed,

fulfill this role; to what populations does Hillel direct its programs (see Table 5.7). Overall, the findings did not support the hypothesis, as summarized below.

1. Hillel does not serve the function of a match-making service (see Table 6.1).

TABLE 6.1

Hillel has sometimes been referred to as a "match-making service."
How do you agree that Hillel serves this function?

Very Much Agree	1.9%
Somewhat Agree	13.0%
Hardly Agree	39.0%
Don't Agree at All	16.2%
Doesn't Apply	29.9%
<hr/>	
TOTAL	100.0%

Those who agreed "Very much" to "Somewhat" were of an insignificant percentage. The majority (86.0%) felt Hillel "Hardly" or "Not at all" served the function of a match-making service.

2. The image of Hillel as a match-making service had no impact upon attendance (see Table 6.2).

TABLE 6.2

Number of activities by image of Hillel as a match-making service

Number of Activities		Do you see Hillel serving the function of a match- making service?	
		No	Yes
Low	(0)	29.5%	35.3%
Medium	(1-5)	52.1%	35.3%
High	(6+)	18.5%	29.4%
<hr/>			
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%

Although the impact of this image upon attendance is insignificant, the importance lies in the number of respondents who answered "Yes" and those who answered "No."

89.6% (146 respondents) did not believe Hillel serves the function of a match-making service.

10.4% (17 respondents) did believe Hillel serves the function of a match-making service.

These findings conclude that Hillel does not promote the image nor serve the function of a match-making service. Whether this is seen as a positive or negative can not be determined from the data. The possibility exists that, perhaps, if it did serve such a function, attendance would be affected in a positive manner. However, such information cannot be determined from this data.

CHAPTER VII

JEWISH BURNOUT

Hypothesis F is Hillel is the victim of Jewish burnout. In the previous chapters we viewed a variety of influences on participation and activity attendance at Hillel events. Those influences included social circles, fraternities and sororities, and images of Hillel as perceived by the students. An additional influence may lie in the background of the individual. The questions underlying this focus on the issue of the respondent's involvement in organizations, Jewish organizations in particular, during high school. It is hypothesized that by the time an individual is enrolled at college, and the opportunity for involvement in Hillel or some other Jewish group is presented, the student is apathetic towards organizational involvement--a phenomenon we will call "burnout." What this signifies is tiredness, a boredom with organizational life and a desire to take a vacation from "belonging." To complicate the issue, college life offers opportunities for involvement in alternative lifestyles which can be extremely appealing to a young person fresh out of high school. As a result of these variables, Hillel loses; Hillel does not have an opportunity to present itself as an option. Hillel becomes the "victim" of the student's involvement in organizations during high school and his/her subsequent burnout.

Questions were asked which concerned high school organizational involvement and attitudes carried over from the high school setting

to the college campus. Some such attitudes are: have outgrown clubs; Hillel and other organizations are too club-y/cliue-ish; tired of organizational life; no need for organizational involvement in college; a basic apathy towards organizations.

The major findings did not support the hypothesis and are discussed here.

1. Students who were more involved in organizations or clubs during high school were more likely to be involved in Hillel activities (see Table 7.1).

TABLE 7.1

Number of activities by involvement in Jewish organizations or clubs

Number of Activities	Were you involved in Jewish organizations/ clubs during high school?	
	Yes	No
Low (0)	24.8%	54.8%
Medium (1-5)	52.6%	38.7%
High (6+)	22.6%	6.5%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%

If the respondent was not involved in any Jewish club, it was more likely he/she would not attend any activity at Hillel (54.8%).

Jewish organizational involvement had an impact upon participation--attendance at Hillel programs was more likely if the individual was involved in a Jewish organization during high school. When compared with involvement in non-Jewish organizations (see Table 7.2), the findings reveal that it was not the Jewish or non-Jewish

component of the involvement; it was the degree of involvement.

TABLE 7.2

Number of activities by involvement in non-Jewish organizations or clubs

Number of Activities	Were you involved in non-Jewish organizations/ clubs during high school?	
	Yes	No
Low (0)	26.7%	34.7%
Medium (1-5)	51.1%	48.6%
High (6+)	22.2%	16.7%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%

The more involved the individual was in organizational life during high school, the more likely he/she would be involved at Hillel.

2. Students who were involved in organizations were more likely to be involved with Jewish organizations (see Table 7.3).

TABLE 7.3

Type of organization by involvement in organization

Type of Organization	Were you involved in Jewish and/or non- Jewish organizations?		Total
	Yes	No	
Jewish Organizations	81.1%	18.9%	100.0%
Non-Jewish Organizations	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%

Extent of involvement (i.e., officer status within an organization) was found to have no significance in participation at Hillel. But, an overwhelming number were officers within the Jewish organizations; 105 respondents were officers of Jewish organizations.

3. Students highly involved during high school were more likely to be involved at Hillel (see Table 7.4).

TABLE 7.4

Number of activities by number of Jewish organizations involved

Number of Activities	How many Jewish organizations were you involved with during high school?		
	1-2	3-5	5+
Low (0)	26.1%	15.4%	0.0%
Medium (1-5)	57.1%	15.4%	0.0%
High (6+)	16.8%	69.2%	100.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If a person was highly involved during high school (3-5 category), it was more likely that the person would be highly involved at Hillel (69.2%), compared with high involvement at Hillel and involvement in one or two Jewish organizations in high school (16.8%). To summarize, burnout does not seem to be a factor in attendance. Rather, the more involved a person was during high school, the more likely that involvement at Hillel would also be high.

High school involvement can influence participation in Hillel activities. The research concluded that there was more likely to be high involvement at Hillel if there was high involvement in political and cultural groups in high school. Once again, the key is "highly involved." A person who enjoys organizational life and becomes "highly

involved" during high school, especially in Jewish organizations, will be more likely to maintain that high involvement and direct his/her interest and involvement to Hillel activities. Hillel should take note of this, and turn its energies toward the Jewish organizations of high school students. More direct involvement between Hillel and Jewish high school groups and organizations could have an effect upon these students as potential Hillel participants. Hillel could benefit from joint programming with high school groups if their early exposure to Hillel is of a positive nature and occurs at a time when their decision concerning college can be influenced.

CHAPTER VIII
SHAPING NEW IDENTITIES

Hypothesis G is Jewish involvement is in competition with other aspects of college life. When an individual leaves home for college, usually at the age of eighteen, it heralds the start of steps to an independent life. Living away from parents, in a college environment, the student is now responsible for his/her own actions, in an environment of peers. The peer pressure of the dorm setting of and by itself is very influential. The choices and opportunities for involvement are diverse and tempting. At UT, there are many different aspects of college life in which to participate. As mentioned earlier, the organizations and clubs on campus are numerous--from sports clubs to music clubs to political groups. As a state university, the University of Texas attracts students from all over the state, nation and outside the United States. Thus, there are a variety of ethnicities, religions, and political interests in the University system. Organizations which espouse a cause or belief have the right to a table on campus to disseminate information about their group and cause. In the classroom, students are exposed to professors from all over the world who have their own interests and causes, and a platform from which to address a captive audience.

The questions asked attempted to uncover the students' awareness of the diversity and range of choice in college life. The questions

asked about organizations and clubs available on campus; what different types of people were on campus, in terms of ethnic, religious and political interests; what about clubs and groups? How visible were different groups and clubs; what sports activities were available; why did students live in dorms; are their professors Jewish? How does one know; do professors influence students? These questions were aimed at discovering the influence that the broad range of choices had on participation in Hillel activities.

The major findings were found to support the hypothesis that a diversity of activities is a source of competition for Jewish involvement by students. The results of the findings are summarized below.

1. Students who joined Jewish organizations were more likely to participate because of a desire to meet male and female friends and be Jewishly involved (see Table 8.1). It is possible to be involved Jewishly through participation in a Jewish organization or activity without being a member. As Table 8.1 reveals, the primary reasons for membership were "Jewish involvement" (57.0%), "To meet friends" (79.6%), "To meet Jewish men and women" (74.7%), and "To meet people of similar background" (65.3%).

TABLE 8.1

Reasons for joining a Jewish organization by degree of applicability
Why did you join a Jewish organization?

Reason for Joining	Very Much Applicable	Somewhat Applicable	Not Very Applicable	Not at All Applicable	Total
Friends joined	28.6%	38.8%	17.3%	15.3%	100.0%
Legacy	16.5%	12.4%	13.4%	57.7%	100.0%
Jewish Involvement	57.0%	35.0%	7.0%	1.0%	100.0%
To meet friends	79.6%	18.4%	2.0%	0.0%	100.0%
To meet Jewish men/women	74.7%	22.2%	2.0%	1.0%	100.0%
To meet people of similar background	65.3%	19.4%	12.2%	3.1%	100.0%
Not everyone can join	5.1%	6.1%	24.5%	63.3%	100.0%
Better opportunities for the future	18.4%	30.6%	29.6%	21.4%	100.0%
Business/professional ties for the future	12.2%	22.4%	34.7%	30.6%	100.0%
Parents wanted you to join	11.2%	31.6%	20.4%	36.7%	100.0%

2. Students who joined Jewish organizations for Jewish involvement and to meet Jews were not significantly influenced to participate in Hillel activities (see Tables 8.2 through 8.5).

TABLE 8.2

Number of activities by reason for joining a Jewish organization

Number of Activities		I wanted to be involved Jewishly			Not at All Applicable
		Very Much Applicable	Somewhat Applicable	Not Very Applicable	
Low	(0)	17.5%	17.1%	28.6%	0.0%
Medium	(1-5)	52.6%	60.0%	57.1%	100.0%
High	(6+)	29.8%	22.9%	14.3%	0.0%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 8.3

Number of activities by reason for joining a Jewish organization

Number of Activities		I wanted to meet friends			Not at All Applicable
		Very Much Applicable	Somewhat Applicable	Not Very Applicable	
Low	(0)	17.9%	22.2%	0.0%	49.2%
Medium	(1-5)	57.7%	50.0%	50.0%	41.3%
High	(6+)	24.4%	27.8%	50.0%	9.5%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 8.4

Number of activities by reason for joining a Jewish organization

Number of Activities		I wanted to meet Jewish men/women			Not at All Applicable
		Very Much Applicable	Somewhat Applicable	Not Very Applicable	
Low	(0)	16.2%	22.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Medium	(1-5)	59.5%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%
High	(6+)	24.3%	27.3%	50.0%	0.0%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 8.5

Number of activities by reason for joining a Jewish organization

Number of Activities	I wanted to meet people of a similar background			
	Very Much Applicable	Somewhat Applicable	Not Very Applicable	Not at All Applicable
Low (0)	20.3%	10.5%	25.0%	0.0%
Medium (1-5)	54.7%	57.9%	58.3%	66.7%
High (6+)	25.0%	31.6%	16.7%	33.3%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

As Tables 8.2 to 8.5 explain, the reasons for Jewish organizational participation did not influence students' participation in Hillel activities.

3. Students who are less involved in other groups are more likely to participate in Hillel (see Tables 8.6 through 8.8).
4. Students who are highly involved in other groups are less likely to participate in Hillel (see Tables 8.6 through 8.8).
5. Students who are highly involved in other groups are more likely to be highly involved in Hillel activities (see Tables 8.6 through 8.8).

Tables 8.6 through 8.8 describe three different organizations/groups and the level of activity in each.

TABLE 8.6

Number of activities by degree of participation

Number of Activities	I am involved in a national political organization				Not familiar with this organization
	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	
Low (0)	66.7%	28.6%	26.2%	30.8%	40.0%
Medium (1-5)	0.0%	28.6%	45.2%	57.1%	60.0%
High (6+)	33.3%	42.9%	28.6%	12.1%	0.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 8.7
Number of activities by degree of participation

Number of Activities		I am involved in a cultural issues group				Not familiar with this organization
		Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	
Low	(0)	62.5%	15.4%	34.0%	31.3%	50.0%
Medium	(1-5)	0.0%	38.5%	44.7%	65.6%	50.0%
High	(6+)	37.5%	46.2%	21.3%	3.1%	0.0%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 8.8
Number of activities by degree of participation

Number of Activities		I am involved in a social issues group				Not familiar with this organization
		Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	
Low	(0)	44.4%	16.0%	35.8%	33.3%	100.0%
Medium	(1-5)	0.0%	48.0%	45.3%	66.7%	0.0%
High	(6+)	55.6%	36.0%	18.9%	0.0%	0.0%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Those students who are less involved in other groups are more likely to be involved at Hillel, as the Medium category of activity of Tables 8.6 through 8.8 reveals. For the individual who is highly involved in a group outside of Hillel, participation in Hillel activities can be low or high. For those students who are highly involved in another aspect of college life, e.g., a national political organization, Hillel is not needed as an organizational activity because those needs are being met elsewhere. For those students who are highly involved in other campus activities, involvement at Hillel is also likely to be high. In Chapter 7, it was shown that students who were highly involved

in organizations during high school were more likely to be involved at Hillel. The same can hold true in college. To further illustrate the issue, Table 8.9 describes activity involvement in a religious group.

TABLE 8.9

Number of activities by degree of participation

Number of Activities		I am involved in religious group activity				Not familiar with this organization
		Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	
Low	(0)	18.2%	11.8%	24.6%	48.1%	75.0%
Medium	(1-5)	9.1%	47.1%	65.6%	42.3%	25.0%
High	(6+)	72.7%	41.2%	9.9%	9.6%	0.0%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Students who were less involved in religious group activities were more likely to participate at Hillel. For those whose religious activity involvement was high, either involvement in a religious group was being met outside of Hillel and there was not a need for Hillel participation, or Hillel was the religious group in which the respondents participated at a high level.

As stated earlier in the chapter, a dorm setting can have an influence upon the college student. Dormitory living is chosen for a variety of reasons. Table 8.10 lists the reasons stated in the questionnaire.

TABLE 8.10

Reasons for choosing a dormitory by degree of applicability

Reasons for Choosing a Dorm	Which of the following reasons apply to your decision to live in a dorm?				Total
	Very Much Applicable	Somewhat Applicable	Slightly Applicable	Not at All Applicable	
Money/cost	7.4%	18.0%	26.2%	48.4%	100.0%
Convenience	67.7%	21.3%	5.5%	5.5%	100.0%
Friends lived there	46.8%	26.2%	7.1%	19.8%	100.0%
Brother/sister lived there	15.7%	3.3%	5.8%	75.2%	100.0%
Parents made decision	3.3%	23.3%	24.2%	49.2%	100.0%
Large percent- age of Jews	56.7%	17.3%	9.4%	16.5%	100.0%

6. Students who chose dormitory living because a large percentage of Jews lived there are more likely to participate in Hillel activities (see Table 8.11).
7. Students who chose dorm living because friends lived there are more likely to participate in Hillel activities (see Table 8.12).

TABLE 8.11

Number of activities by reason for choosing dormitory living

Number of Activities	I chose a dorm because a large percentage of Jews lived there			
	Very Much Applicable	Somewhat Applicable	Slightly Applicable	Doesn't Apply At All
Low (0)	18.1%	18.2%	33.3%	66.7%
Medium (1-5)	62.5%	54.5%	66.7%	23.8%
High (6+)	19.4%	27.3%	0.0%	9.5%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE 8.12

Number of activities by reason for choosing dormitory living

Number of Activities		I chose a dorm because my friends lived there			
		Very Much Applicable	Somewhat Applicable	Slightly Applicable	Doesn't Apply at All
Low	(0)	18.6%	24.2%	33.3%	52.0%
Medium	(1-5)	67.8%	57.6%	33.3%	32.0%
High	(6+)	13.6%	18.2%	33.3%	16.0%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

For those students who chose a dorm because of the large percentage of Jews and/or because friends lived there, the impact upon Hillel participation is significant.

The question of professorial influence is one which should not be overlooked. The fact that a professor is Jewish can exert an influence on a Jewish student because a professor is a role model. If a professor demonstrates a positive posture toward Judaism and being Jewish, it can have a significant impact upon a young college student. Respondents were asked if any of their professors, currently or in the past, were Jewish. The results were:

Yes	129
No	13
Don't know	22

Next the question was asked "How many of those professors were Jewish?"

1 - 2	69
2 - 4	40

5 or more 14

Don't know 21

8. Students who have a greater number of Jewish professors were more likely to be highly involved at Hillel (see Table 8.13).

TABLE 8.13

Number of activities by number of professors who are Jewish

Number of Activities		How many of your professors are or were Jewish?			
		1-2	3-4	5+	Don't Know
Low	(0)	21.7%	30.0%	28.6%	38.1%
Medium	(1-5)	62.3%	37.5%	35.7%	57.1%
High	(6+)	15.9%	32.5%	35.7%	4.8%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

At the University of Texas, organizations which espouse a belief or cause have the right to promote their group provided it is registered on campus as a student organization. While the research did not reveal a significant impact upon attendance at Hillel activities, it did reveal the degree of awareness the students possess of the groups on campus. Table 8.14 lists some of the organizations on campus and their visibility in terms of student awareness. All of the groups had a table on campus two to three days each week. The explanation for the differences in the percentages of high visibility can probably be attributed to the groups' manner of promotion. Let us compare the Jews for Jesus (4.9%) with the Hare Krishnas (40.2%). The Hare Krishnas sing, play instruments, offer food and books free of

TABLE 8.14

Campus organizations by visibility of the groups

How often do you recall seeing each group on campus?

Campus Organization	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Never Heard of this organization	Total
Jews for Jesus	4.9%	17.7%	37.2%	37.2%	3.0%	100.0%
Hare Krishna	40.2%	39.6%	12.8%	7.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Socialists' Workers Party	3.7%	14.1%	34.4%	41.7%	6.1%	100.0%
Other radical left wing organization	6.1%	33.1%	31.3%	20.2%	8.6%	100.0%
C.A.R.P. (Moonies)	5.6%	6.2%	9.3%	16.1%	62.1%	100.0%
Evangelical group	34.1%	31.7%	15.2%	11.6%	7.3%	100.0%
Arab students organization	56.7%	22.6%	11.6%	6.7%	2.4%	100.0%
Iranian students organization	55.5%	23.8%	12.2%	5.5%	3.0%	100.0%

charge, and wear noticeably different clothing. The Jews for Jesus are more subtle in their approach, dress conservatively and usually sit behind their table offering literature.

In conclusion, the data supports the hypothesis that Jewish involvement is in competition with other aspects of college life. Due to the size of the University population, the number of potential involvements in the myriad activities of college life is enormous.

Competition exists between Hillel (Jewish involvement) and the other campus activities; all vie for the students' time and interest. It becomes a matter of priority for the student. In order to improve its position in the hierarchy of priorities, Hillel must reevaluate what it has to offer the Jewish students, in terms of serving the Jewish students' needs.

CHAPTER IX

JEWISH IDENTITY ISSUES

A profile on Jewish identity was compiled as an addition to the research on the seven hypotheses. The respondents were asked questions concerning their religious affiliation, feelings toward Judaism and Israel, the degree of personal and family observance, and personal identity issues. The findings of the data result in no definitive conclusions, but can describe Jewish identity patterns of the college student of the 1980's. It can have far-reaching implications for programming by Jewish agencies because the Jewish college student of today is tomorrow's community leader--or tomorrow's unaffiliated Jew. Close ties between Jewish organizations is crucial. A support relationship between organizations--between the Jewish student community and the general Jewish community--is imperative to insure the proper exposure of young Jewish adults to the world Jewish community outside the college environment. The exposure to Jewish life beyond college can lead the Jewish young adult to develop the characteristics of an active, committed Jewish community member. Hillel can help to develop these characteristics. It is essential for one to be overtly conscious of one's own Jewish identity--as an individual and as a member of a community. Involvement through participation and service to the community has traditionally been the basis of the Jewish ethos. There must be some kind of response and service

to the community needs. Within Judaism is the insistence on full participation in group life. Hillel said, "Separate not thyself from the community," an expression which affirms the need for whole-hearted participation in the fabric of society. In Jewish tradition, withdrawal from the community, whether actual physical removal or spiritual removal, is considered unwise and even immoral. Commitment, a major characteristic of Jewish identity, means the fulfillment of responsibilities and obligations as a Jew and as a member of the Jewish community. The community commitment is one that binds the Jews within a community together--commitment to being Jewish; living Jewishly; and learning about being Jewish. Learning to be Jewish does not mean only the practice of the rituals of religious Judaism. It means knowing who you are, where you come from--the culture, way of life, heritage, and history of being Jewish. It is knowledge that does not take place by osmosis. It is knowledge that must be transmitted, and transmitted in the home. If it does not start there, it becomes more difficult and "chancier" to "pick it up" later.

Hillel is an opportunity and a means, in the lives of young Jewish adults, to be educated, committed, involved, and caring Jews. Hillel can be a mainstay in that transitional period in a young person's life between entering college and matriculating into the adult world. Hillel offers a community structure within which one may participate in Jewish activities, develop Jewish relationships, and grow as individuals through sharing in Jewish community life.

The data on religious affiliation and degree of family and personal observance (observance is defined here as ritual observance)

reflects interesting patterns about family and the shaping of one's identity. Affiliation of the respondents, not their parents, was as follows:

Reform	63
Conservative	72
Orthodox	2
Reconstructionist	2
"Just Jewish"	16
Atheist	4
Agnostic	4

1. Students whose families were more observant were more likely to be involved at Hillel (see Table 9.1)

TABLE 9.1

Number of activities by family's ritual observance

Number of Activities		How ritually observant do you consider your family to be?			
		Very Observant	Somewhat Observant	Non-Observant	Not at All Observant
Low	(0)	12.5%	30.6%	36.4%	25.0%
Medium	(1-5)	68.8%	52.3%	39.4%	0.0%
High	(6+)	18.8%	17.1%	24.2%	75.0%
TOTAL		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

It is interesting to note that of those who were active in the High category of participation, it was those whose family was basically non-observant who had a higher activity attendance.

2. Students who identified themselves as "Somewhat observant" were more likely to participate in Hillel (see Table 9.2).

TABLE 9.2
Number of activities by self ritual observance

Number of Activities	How ritually observant do you consider yourself to be now?			
	Very Observant	Somewhat Observant	Non- Observant	Not at All Observant
Low (0)	20.0%	22.9%	41.5%	60.0%
Medium (1-5)	30.0%	56.3%	45.3%	20.0%
High (6+)	50.0%	20.8%	13.2%	20.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In the High category, those who said they were "Very observant" were more likely to come to Hillel. What must be taken into consideration is the number of respondents in each category, as the highest numbers are found in the "Somewhat" and "Non-observant" categories (see Table 9.3).

TABLE 9.3
Breakdown of respondents to question of self ritual observance

Very Observant	10
Somewhat Observant	96
Non-Observant	53
Not at All Observant	5
TOTAL	164

It was of interest to determine whether the respondents had experienced any change in their observance and if that had any effect on their attendance (see Table 9.4).

TABLE 9.4

How has the degree of your observance changed since
leaving your parents' home?

Degree of Observance	Number of Respondents
More Observant	32
Same Level of Observance	73
Less Observant	57
TOTAL	162

3. Students whose religious observance increased found their needs met through participation at Hillel (see Table 9.5).

TABLE 9.5

Number of activities by change in degree of observance

Number of Activities	How has the degree of your observance changed?		
	More Observant	Same Level of Observance	Less Observant
Low (0)	25.0%	28.8%	33.3%
Medium (1-5)	34.4%	54.8%	54.4%
High (6+)	40.6%	16.5%	12.3%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In the Medium category, those whose observance remained the same and those who had become less observant were very close in percentage, 54.8% and 54.4%, respectively. What is interesting to note is the High activity category; those who increased their level of observance were far more likely to participate at Hillel (40.6%).

Statistics which focus on the background of the respondents while they were growing up reflect the minimum and maximum range of religious

background (see Tables 9.6 through 9.9).

TABLE 9.6

When you were growing up, how often did you attend religious school?

Once a week	39.9%
2 times a week	18.4%
3 times a week or more	36.2%
Not at all	4.9%

TOTAL	100.0%
-------	--------

TABLE 9.7

Were you a Bar/Bat Mitzvah?

Yes	63.2%
No	36.8%

TOTAL	100.0%
-------	--------

TABLE 9.8

Were you confirmed in religious school?

Yes	75.2%
No	24.8%

TOTAL	100.0%
-------	--------

TABLE 9.9

When you were growing up, how often did your family
attend services?

Once a week	19.0%
Once a month	27.0%
2-3 times a month	19.0%
2-3 times a year	31.3%
Once a year or less	3.7%

TOTAL 100.0%

The majority attended services "2-3 times a year" (31.3%). This pattern of family influence on observance is reflected in the following question: Since attending college, how often did you attend services?

Once a week	1.8%
Once a month	11.0%
2-3 times a month	3.7%
2-3 times a year	68.3%
Once a year or less	15.2%

4. For those who attended services 2-3 times a year while growing up, the pattern of attendance at services 2-3 times a year carried through to college (68.3%). This is supported by the data in Table 9.10. If we look at the column "2-3 times a year," we again see the pattern of service attendance from childhood to young adulthood reflected in Hillel participation (60.7%).

TABLE 9.10

Number of activities by attendance at services

Number of Activities	Since college, how often do you attend services?				
	Once a Week	Once a Month	2-3 Times a Month	2-3 Times a Year	1 Time a Yr. or Less
Low (0)	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	27.7%	56.0%
Medium (1-5)	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	60.7%	36.0%
High (6+)	66.7%	66.7%	50.0%	11.6%	8.0%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Personal identity questions asked for the respondents' response in terms of feelings, rather than experiences (see Table 9.11).

TABLE 9.11

Do you tend to think of yourself more as a Jew,
or more as an American?

More as a Jew	31.5%
More as an American	13.9%
Equally Jewish and American	50.3%
Other	4.2%
TOTAL	100.0%

"Other" refers to those individuals who wrote in on the questionnaire that one could not equate the American nationality with the Jewish religion. These respondents felt that being Jewish was not a nationality, and therefore classified themselves in the "Other" category.

The following questions reflect the personal Jewish identity of the college student. As stated earlier, while significant conclusions cannot be drawn, a pattern can be discerned from the material as to how students feel about their Jewishness which has implications for future programming by Jewish organizations (see Tables 9.12 through 9.16).

TABLE 9.12

Who do you usually go out with on dates--Jews or non-Jews?

Jews only	22.8%
Mostly Jews	30.9%
About half and half	17.9%
Mostly non-Jews	17.3%
Only non-Jews	3.1%
Not currently dating	8.0%
<hr/>	
TOTAL	100.0%

TABLE 9.13

If you were to marry, do you think you would marry a Jew or non-Jew?

Definitely a Jew	55.9%
Probably a Jew	26.7%
Makes no difference	14.3%
Probably a non-Jew	2.5%
Definitely a non-Jew	0.6%
<hr/>	
TOTAL	100.0%

TABLE 9.14

How important is Israel to you?

Very important	55.2%
Important	27.0%
Somewhat important	14.1%
Not too important	3.7%
Not at all important	0.0%

TOTAL	100.0%
-------	--------

TABLE 9.15

How many times have you been to Israel?

Never	62.4%
Once	27.3%
2-3 times	8.5%
4 or more times	1.8%

TOTAL	100.0%
-------	--------

TABLE 9.16

How important is being Jewish to you personally?

Very important	61.3%
Important	27.6%
Somewhat important	6.7%
Not too important	4.3%
Not at all important	0.0%

TOTAL	100.0%
-------	--------

Hillel seeks to develop Jewish students who will come out of their college experience as committed Jews who will take an active role in

Jewish life. The issues discussed above can play a major role in this transitional "training" period. What must be sought is a stronger relationship between the general Jewish community and the student community. The results of such an interaction can strengthen the larger Jewish community. Through the analysis and understanding of the patterns of Jewish identity and behavior, programming can be shaped to meet the needs of young Jewish adults. The Jews we seek to serve in today's world grew up Jewish in America. As Leonard Fein states, "Today's Jews are the comfortable Jews--they've never known the meaning (precisely) and attraction of being part of the Jewish people."¹ Jewish professionals had better take a long, hard look at the young people in the Jewish community of today, review the services presently offered by Jewish agencies and, perhaps, redirect their efforts to program more effectively to meet Jewish needs as they exist today. The research done in this study of Jewish identity on the college campus can supply some necessary data and direction for building programs based on current needs.

¹ Leonard Fein, "Dilemmas of Jewish Identity on the College Campus," Judaism, 17.1 (Winter 1968).

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

"My entire way of life is determined by my Jewishness. It influences my way of thinking and conduct. I am a Jew all the time and cannot even imagine myself being anything else." (religious student)

"What is important is to feel oneself Jewish, to consider oneself part and parcel of the people and to observe at least some of the Jewish customs which symbolize the special character of the Jewish people."

(Traditionalist)

"I think very rarely about Jewish affairs, mainly only when something happens to the Jews abroad and also at the time of the holy days." (non-religious student)¹

These three quotations sum up, succinctly, three different types of Jews to be found on the college campus. The extremists on either end do exist, but it is with the more centrally defined students that this thesis is concerned. What has been shown, through the hypotheses and the resulting support or non-support by the data, is which of the

¹Simon N. Herman, "Criteria for Jewish Identity," World Jewry and the State of Israel (Arno Press, 1977).

three types may be found to be in the majority on the college campus. The University of Texas at Austin is representative of a state university which has a sizable Jewish student population. The conclusions drawn from the research on college students and their participation or non-participation in Hillel activities at UT can be expanded to other communities and college campuses. The conclusions drawn from this research are of importance to Hillel Foundations and other Jewish agencies, all of which will, at some point in the future, be planning programs and targeting this population in the hopes of evolving a knowledgeable, active and committed community member.

The foundation of this thesis is based on the seven hypotheses outlined at the outset. Each hypothesis was either supported or not supported by the collected data and the statistical tests performed on that data. Each hypothesis, and the conclusions reached, is summarized below.

Hypothesis A

Students with established social circles on campus will have less interest in Hillel.

The data concluded that social circles do have an impact on Hillel attendance. It was found that the number of close Jewish friends one has can have an impact on participation at Hillel, either towards involvement or towards non-involvement. Those students who have "Almost all" Jewish friends either do not participate in any Hillel activities or are highly involved in Hillel. This reveals different social circles at work, since those who do not come to Hillel have another outlet for

activity with their Jewish friends. Others have a social circle which participates within the Hillel environment as their outlet for Jewish involvement. It was also found that those with no friends active in Hillel do not participate in Hillel; thus, their social circle outside of Hillel meets their needs.

Those students who have social circles outside of Hillel show less interest in participating in Hillel activities. Those who come to Hillel more regularly are those students whose social circles are to be found at Hillel, or who come to Hillel seeking to establish social circles. Overall, the hypothesis is supported by the data.

Hypothesis B

Fraternities and sororities compete with Hillel as a Jewish social institution.

A large percentage of the respondents had friends in fraternities and sororities. The impact of fraternities and sororities upon Hillel attendance reveals significant support of the hypothesis. The majority of fraternity and sorority members choose to attend an event sponsored by their fraternity or sorority rather than a Hillel event. The data showed that fraternity and sorority members, in the main, also attend Hillel in a Medium activity range (1-5). This is qualified by two facts:

1. High Holy Day service attendance is an event attended by many fraternity and sorority members.
2. All fraternities and sororities sponsor Lox and Bagel Brunches at Hillel and attend the event.

The fraternity/sorority system, as Jewish social institutions, fulfills many of the needs of its members so that they do not often seek outside activities. Overall, attendance at Hillel is usually on a group basis at the above events.

Hypothesis C

Students who have graduated from Texas high schools are likely to have established social circles.

The overall findings do not support this hypothesis. It was found that established social circles do have an impact upon attendance (Hypothesis A), but it is of little significance if the students graduated from Texas high schools. It was found that even students from Dallas and Houston, who are in the majority, establish their social circles once they get to college and the Texas high school social circles either no longer exist or have no impact upon Hillel attendance. The exceptions are the students from the "Other Texas city" category (small cities in Texas). These students are in need of a social circle due, perhaps, to the small size of their home Jewish community and are more likely to seek involvement at Hillel.

Hypothesis D

Students who have a negative image of Hillel are less likely to participate in Hillel.

The data revealed that Hillel does have an image--that of religious center, a place to experience Jewish identity, a place for new students to meet, and a place to go for Jewish holidays. The research revealed that none of these had an impact on attendance.

These images of Hillel are not seen as attractive enough to impact attendance, according to the data. It does not appear that program interest, a Jewish environment, or previous experience with Hillel programs account for attendance or lack of it. Ninety-two percent of the respondents claimed they were interested in Hillel. But the data does not suggest what it is that interests them. Overall, the present images of Hillel suggest a negative effect on attendance. The potential for participation exists, but the current images appear to support the hypothesis that students who perceive negative images of Hillel are less likely to participate in Hillel.

Hypothesis E

Students who perceive Hillel as a Jewish match-making service will be less likely to seek involvement.

Of all the hypotheses, this one had the least support. Hillel does not promote an image of a match-making service nor is it seen as serving the function of one. The positive or negative aspect of this perception cannot be determined from the data. It is possible that if Hillel were to serve such a function, it could enhance Hillel's image and have a positive impact upon attendance. To attempt to promote this image, however, would be risky. Again, whether this is seen as a positive or negative image cannot be drawn from the data.

Hypothesis F

Hillel is the victim of Jewish burnout.

The key to this hypothesis is involvement. The findings revealed that burnout does not seem to be a factor in attendance at Hillel.

The more highly involved an individual was in high school organizations, Jewish and/or non-Jewish, the more likely it is that involvement at Hillel will also be high. Far more students were involved in Jewish organizations than in non-Jewish organizations. But the important issue is involvement--high involvement leads to continued high involvement. The data disproved the hypothesis that those who were involved during high school would become apathetic or tired of organizations and not participate in Hillel activities.

Hypothesis G

Jewish involvement is in competition with other aspects of college life.

Due to the large size of the University of Texas at Austin, there is a great diversity of activities on campus that compete with Hillel for a student's time, let alone his/her interest. The data was found to be in support of the hypothesis that many different interests impinge upon a student's life, and compete for a student's time.

The greatest impact on attendance is made by involvement in other groups. For example, if a student is involved in a national political organization, in a cultural group, or in a social group, Hillel is not needed. On the other hand, the less involved a student is in such groups/organizations, the more likely his/her involvement at Hillel.

The importance of professorial influence upon students was pointed up in this data. Many of the respondents had more than two Jewish professors and those students were more likely to come to Hillel. While the influence is not direct, it can be said that the

attitude a professor projects towards "Jewishness" can influence, positively or negatively, students' attitudes toward being Jewish and subsequent participation at Hillel.

The Jewish college student of the 1980's seems to support the statement of the non-religious student, quoted in the beginning of the chapter. The Jewish college student seems to have his/her roots firmly planted in the American middle-class lifestyle, which has a profound effect on his/her Jewish identity and behavior, and on the intellectual response to being Jewish. As Lucy Davidowicz states, "If Jews . . . have put their unmistakable Jewish stamp on the community at large, they have also placed an American middle-class stamp on their own traditional religious beliefs and observances."² There is an unmistakable American middle-class approach to Judaism which is revealed in the attitudes and behaviors of the college student. Somewhere, underneath the middle-class values and influences, lies the interest and desire to embrace Judaism as enthusiastically as they have the "American Way of Life."³ The problem and the challenge are to discover what it will take to spark that interest.

²Lucy S. Davidowicz, The Jewish Presence (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1977), p. 72.

³Ibid., p. 91.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE



JEWISH STUDENT POPULATION STUDY

AT

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

INSTRUCTIONS

THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO THESE QUESTIONS. WE ARE MERELY SEEKING TO UNDERSTAND YOUR FEELINGS AND THOUGHTS ABOUT A VARIETY OF ISSUES.

THE NUMBERS YOU SEE NEXT TO THE ANSWER CATEGORIES AND IN THE RIGHT HAND COLUMNS SHOULD BE IGNORED. THEY ARE INCLUDED ONLY TO ASSIST IN THE CODING OF YOUR ANSWERS FOR THE COMPUTER.

QUESTIONNAIRE ID# — — —

© DEBORAH BALABAN
FEBRUARY, 1982

SECTION A

IN A UNIVERSITY SETTING, STUDENTS GET TO KNOW PEOPLE FROM MANY DIFFERENT BACKGROUNDS. IN THIS FIRST SECTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT YOUR FRIENDS AT UT.

1/4

— — — 1

A-1) Thinking of your closest friends on campus, or the people you see most often socially, how many would you say are Jewish?

Almost all.....()1

5/

Some.....()2

About half.....()3

A few.....()4

Almost none.....()5

None.....()6

A-2) Next we would like to ask you about where you first met your friends on campus. Below you will find a list of common places where people meet their friends. Please indicate how many of your Jewish friends on campus you know from each of the places listed below.

	1 Many	2 Some	3 A Few	4 None	
A. From high school	()	()	()	()	6/
B. From some other college	()	()	()	()	7/
C. From dorms	()	()	()	()	8/
D. Through classes	()	()	()	()	9/
E. Through other friends	()	()	()	()	10/
F. Through campus activities	()	()	()	()	11/
G. B'nai B'rith Youth Organization or other youth groups	()	()	()	()	12/
H. Fraternity/Sorority	()	()	()	()	13/
I. Other	()	()	()	()	14/

A-3) Next we would like to ask you about your non-Jewish friends on campus. Please indicate how many of your non-Jewish friends on campus you know from each of the places listed below.

	1 Many	2 Some	3 A Few	4 None	
A. From high school	()	()	()	()	15/___
B. From some other college	()	()	()	()	16/___
C. From dorms	()	()	()	()	17/___
D. Through classes	()	()	()	()	18/___
E. Through other friends	()	()	()	()	19/___
F. Through campus activities	()	()	()	()	20/___
G. Inter-faith group	()	()	()	()	21/___
H. Fraternity/ Sorority	()	()	()	()	22/___
I. Other	()	()	()	()	23/___

A-4) Thinking of your closest friends at UT, about how many of these friends did you know in the high school from which you graduated?

Almost all.....	() 1	24/___
Some.....	() 2	
About half.....	() 3	
A few.....	() 4	
Almost none.....	() 5	
None.....	() 6	

A-5) How many of your closest friends from high school now attend UT?

All or almost all.....()1

25/___

Some.....()2

About half.....()3

A few.....()4

Almost none.....()5

None.....()6

A-6) How many of your friends at UT would you say belong to or are active in Hillel?

All or almost all.....()1

26/___

Some.....()2

About half.....()3

A few.....()4

Almost none.....()5

None.....()6

A-7) How many of your friends would you say belong to a fraternity or sorority?

All or almost all.....()1

27/___

Some.....()2

About half.....()3

A few.....()4

Almost none.....()5

None.....()6

A-8) As part of this study, we are interested in the types of activities people like to take part in with their friends. For each of the activities below, please indicate how often you usually do each of the following with your Jewish friends on campus.

	1 Often	2 Sometimes	3 Rarely	4 Never	
A. Bar for a drink	()	()	()	()	28/___
B. Visiting friends at apt. or dorm	()	()	()	()	29/___
C. Going to movies	()	()	()	()	30/___
D. Going out to eat	()	()	()	()	31/___
E. Hillel	()	()	()	()	32/___
F. Other Jewish activity	()	()	()	()	33/___
G. Sports	()	()	()	()	34/___
H. Study	()	()	()	()	35/___
I. Campus orgs.	()	()	()	()	36/___
J. Work	()	()	()	()	37/___
K. Jogging, etc.	()	()	()	()	38/___
L. Lectures	()	()	()	()	39/___
M. Religious activities	()	()	()	()	40/___
N. Camping	()	()	()	()	41/___
O. Go to a party	()	()	()	()	42/___
P. Give a party	()	()	()	()	43/___

A-9) For each of the activities below, please indicate how often you do each of the following with your non-Jewish friends on campus.

	1 Often	2 Sometimes	3 Rarely	4 Never	
A. Bar for a drink	()	()	()	()	44/___
B. Visiting friends at apt. or dorm	()	()	()	()	45/___
C. Going to movies	()	()	()	()	46/___
D. Going out to eat	()	()	()	()	47/___
E. Hillel	()	()	()	()	48/___
F. Sports	()	()	()	()	49/___
G. Study	()	()	()	()	50/___
H. Campus orgs.	()	()	()	()	51
I. Work	()	()	()	()	!
J. Jogging, etc.	()	()	()	()	52
K. Lectures	()	()	()	()	54/___
L. Religious activities	()	()	()	()	55/___
M. Camping	()	()	()	()	56/___
N. Go to a party	()	()	()	()	57/___
O. Give a party	()	()	()	()	58/___

SECTION B

THE NEXT SECTION CONCERNS ISSUES IN THE CLASSROOM AND ON CAMPUS AND HOW THIS AFFECTS YOU.

B-1) Have you ever experiences an anti-Semitic incident in class?

Yes.....()1

59/___

No.....()2

B-2) How did you feel about the anti-Semitic incident?
(Check all that apply)

Embarrassed.....()1

60/___

Angry.....()1

61/___

Hurt.....()1

62/___

Unconcerned.....()1

63/___

Confrontative.....()1

64/___

Defensive.....()1

65/___

Sad.....()1

66/___

Other.....()1

67/___

B-3) If a professor, in class, revealed an anti-Semitic or anti-Israel feeling, how would you react?

A. Disagree with privately.....()1

68/___

B. Argue publicly with professor.....()2

C. Refer problem to Hillel rabbi.....()3

D. Refer to Dean of academic department.....()4

E. Other.....()5

B-4) Are or were any of your professors Jewish?

Yes.....()1

69/___

No.....()2

Don't know.....()3

If yes,

B-5) How many are or were Jewish?

1 - 2.....()1

70/___

3 - 4.....()2

5 or more.....()3

Don't know.....()4

B-6) If your professor(s) are or were Jewish, how did you know he/she was Jewish? (Check all that apply)

A. Name.....()1

71/___

B. Jewish identity revealed directly
and openly.....()1

72/___

C. Yiddish expressions in language.....()1

73/___

D. Reference to something Jewish.....()1

74/___

E. Appearance.....()1

75/___

F. Just seemed Jewish.....()1

76/___

G. Other.....()1

77/___

Please specify,

AMONG THE VARIOUS GROUPS ON CAMPUS, THERE MAY BE SOME WHICH ACTIVELY RECRUIT NEW MEMBERS OR ADVOCATE A PARTICULAR POINT OF VIEW.

B-7) As part of this study, we would like to know whether these groups are seen as a threat to Jews on campus. For each of the following, please indicate whether you feel this group poses:

	1 A major threat to Jews	2 Some threat to Jews	3 Small threat to Jews	4 Slight threat to Jews	5 No threat to Jews	6 Not familiar with this org.	
A. Jews for Jesus	()	()	()	()	()	()	5/___
B. Hare Krishne	()	()	()	()	()	()	6/___
C. Socialist Workers Party	()	()	()	()	()	()	7/___
D. Other radical left-wing organization	()	()	()	()	()	()	8/___
E. C.A.R.P.	()	()	()	()	()	()	9/___
F. Evangelical group	()	()	()	()	()	()	10/___
G. Arab students organization	()	()	()	()	()	()	11/___
H. Pro-Khomeini Iranian students org.	()	()	()	()	()	()	12/___

B-8) There are many different groups on campus. We are interested in which ones are most visible. For each of the following, please indicate about how often you can recall seeing each group on campus.

	1 Often	2 Sometimes	3 Rarely	4 Never	5 Never heard or this org.	
A. Jews for Jesus	()	()	()	()	()	13/___
B. Hare Krishne	()	()	()	()	()	14/___
C. Socialist Workers Party	()	()	()	()	()	15/___
D. Other radical left-wing org.	()	()	()	()	()	16/___
E. C.A.R.P.	()	()	()	()	()	17/___
F. Evangelical organization	()	()	()	()	()	18/___
G. Arab student organizations	()	()	()	()	()	19/___
H. Iranian student organization	()	()	()	()	()	20/___

SECTION C

THERE ARE MANY DIFFERENT ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS TAKING PLACE AT THE UT CAMPUS. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHICH ONES INTEREST YOU.

C-1) How often do you usually go to the activities or programs of the following groups or organizations?

	1 Often	2 Sometimes	3 Rarely	4 Never	5 Not familiar with this org.	
A. National political org.	()	()	()	()	()	21/___
B. Cultural group	()	()	()	()	()	22/___
C. Social issues	()	()	()	()	()	23/___
D. Special interests	()	()	()	()	()	24/___
E. School political group	()	()	()	()	()	25/___
F. Religious group	()	()	()	()	()	26/___
G. School newspaper	()	()	()	()	()	27/___

C-2) During the last year, did you attend any of the following events as a spectator?

	1 Frequently	2 Sometimes	3 Rarely	4 Never	
A. Intramural sports	()	()	()	()	28/___
B. Intercollegiate sports	()	()	()	()	29/___

C-3) Have you ever been a participant in any of the following intramural sports at UT?

	1 Yes	2 No	
A. Football	()	()	30/___
B. Basketball	()	()	31/___
C. Baseball	()	()	32/___
D. Soccer	()	()	33/___
E. Volleyball	()	()	34/___
F. Swimming	()	()	35/___
G. La Crosse	()	()	36/___
H. Other	()	()	37/___

SECTION D

AS PART OF THE STUDY, WE ARE INTERESTED IN YOUR RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND AND YOUR PERSONAL OPINIONS AND THOUGHTS CONCERNING YOUR IDENTITY AND OTHER ELEMENTS OF JUDAISM.

D-1) Please indicate whether you are Reform, Conservative, Orthodox, Reconstructionist, or something else. We don't mean what you (or your family) belong to, but what you consider yourself.

Reform.....	()1	38/___
Conservative.....	()2	
Orthodox.....	()3	
Reconstructionist.....	()4	
"Just Jewish".....	()5	
Athiest.....	()6	
Agnostic.....	()7	

D-2) How Jewishly observant do you consider your family to be?
(Observance is defined here as ritual observance)

Very observant.....()1

39/___

Somewhat observant.....()2

Basically non-observant.....()3

Not at all observant.....()4

D-3) How Jewishly observant do you consider yourself to be now?

Very observant.....()1

40/___

Somewhat observant.....()2

Basically non-observant.....()3

Not at all observant.....()4

D-4) How has the degree of your observance changed since leaving
your parents' home? Have you become

More observant.....()1

41/___

Same level of observance.....()2

Less observant.....()3

D-5) When you were growing up, how often did you attend religious
school?

Once a week.....()1

42/___

2 times a week.....()2

3 times a week or more.....()3

Not at all.....()4

D-6) Were you a Bar/Bat Mitzvah?

Yes.....()1

43/___

No.....()2

D-7) Were you confirmed in religious school?

Yes.....()1

44/___

No.....()2

D-8) When you were growing up, how often did your family attend services?

Once a week.....()1

45/___

Once a month.....()2

2 - 3 times a month.....()3

2 - 3 times a year.....()4

Once a year or less.....()5

D-9) Since attending college, how often do you attend services?

Once a week.....()1

46/___

Once a month.....()2

2 - 3 times a month.....()3

2 - 3 times a year.....()4

Once a year or less.....()5

D-10) Do you tend to think of yourself more as a Jew, or more as an American?

More as a Jew.....()1

47/___

More as an American.....()2

Equally Jewish and American.....()3

Other.....()4

D-11) We are interested in patterns of dating. Who do you usually go out with on dates - Jews or non-Jews?

- Jews only.....()1
 Mostly Jews.....()2
 About half and half.....()3
 Mostly non-Jews.....()4
 Only non-Jews.....()5
 Not currently dating.....()6

48/___

D-12) If you were to marry, do you think you would marry a Jew or a non-Jew?

- Definitely a Jew.....()1
 Probably a Jew.....()2
 Makes no difference.....()3
 Probably a non-Jew.....()4
 Definitely a non-Jew.....()5

49/___

D-13) How important is being Jewish to you personally?

- Very important.....()1
 Important.....()2
 Somewhat important.....()3
 Not too important.....()4
 Not at all important.....()5

50/___

D-14) How important is Israel to you?

- Very important.....()1
 Important.....()2
 Somewhat important.....()3
 Not too important.....()4
 Not at all important.....()5

51/___

D-15) How many times have you been to Israel?

Never.....()1

52/___

Once.....()2

2 - 3 times.....()3

4 or more times.....()4

D-16) What is the longest period of time you spent there?

53/___

D-17) About how many years of Jewish education have you had altogether, prior to attending college?

None.....()1

54/___

1 - 4 years.....()2

5 - 10 years.....()3

11 or more.....()4

D-18) Have you ever attended a Jewish studies course at the college level?

Yes.....()1

55/___

No.....()2

SECTION E

AS PART OF THIS STUDY, WE ARE INTERESTED IN THE REASONS PEOPLE JOIN DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONS.

E-1) Are you a member or do you belong to any Jewish organizations or groups? (either on or off-campus)

Yes.....()1

56/___

No.....()2

If no, stop here and go to question E-3.

If yes, continue...

E-2) Below are a number of reasons people often give as to why they join an organization. Please indicate the reasons you joined a Jewish organization, i.e. fraternity, sorority, Hillel, etc.

	1 Very much applicable to me	2 Somewhat Applicable	3 Not very Applicable	4 Not at all applicable	
A. Friends joined	()	()	()	()	57/___
B. "Legacy"	()	()	()	()	58/___
C. Jewish involvement	()	()	()	()	59/___
D. To meet friends	()	()	()	()	60/___
E. To meet Jewish men/women	()	()	()	()	61/___
F. To meet people of similar background to mine	()	()	()	()	62/___
G. Not everyone can join	()	()	()	()	63/___
H. Better opportunities for the future	()	()	()	()	64/___
I. Business/professional ties for the future	()	()	()	()	65/___
J. Parents wanted you to join	()	()	()	()	66/___

E-3) Are you a member or do you belong to a non-Jewish and/or campus organization(s)?

Yes.....()1

No.....()2

67/___

If no, stop here and go to question E-5.

If yes, please specify which one(s) you are most active in:

E-4) Below are a number of reasons people often give as to why they join an organization. Please indicate the reasons you joined a non-Jewish and/or campus organization(s).

	1 Very much applicable to me	2 Somewhat Applicable	3 Not very Applicable	4 Not at all Applicable	
A. Friends joined	()	()	()	()	68/___
B. Campus involvement	()	()	()	()	69/___
C. To meet friends	()	()	()	()	70/___
D. Experience for the future	()	()	()	()	71/___
E. Business/professional ties for the future	()	()	()	()	72/___
F. Parents wanted you to join	()	()	()	()	73/___
G. Not everyone can join	()	()	()	()	74/___

BEGIN
DECK 3

1/4

3

HERE WE ARE INTERESTED IN HILLEL AND FRATERNITY/SORORITY PROGRAMMING.
IF NEITHER APPLY TO YOU, PLEASE MOVE ON TO QUESTION E-8.

E-5) Hillel, the Jewish Student Center, offers a variety of programming. Below are listed the various activities sponsored by Hillel. Please indicate those activities you may have attended since coming to UT.

- | | |
|---|--------|
| A. Wine and cheese parties.....()1 | 5/___ |
| B. Bagel and Lox brunches.....()1 | 6/___ |
| C. Faculty/Graduate lunches.....()1 | 7/___ |
| D. Shabbat dinners.....()1 | 8/___ |
| E. Shabbat services.....()1 | 9/___ |
| F. High Holy Day services.....()1 | 10/___ |
| G. Lectures.....()1 | 11/___ |
| H. Purim celebration.....()1 | 12/___ |
| I. Sukkot celebration.....()1 | 13/___ |
| J. Chanukah Carnival.....()1 | 14/___ |
| K. Open House Keg Party.....()1 | 15/___ |
| L. Student Board Meetings.....()1 | 16/___ |
| M. Workshops.....()1 | 17/___ |
| N. Weekend retreat.....()1 | 18/___ |
| O. Israel programs.....()1 | 19/___ |
| P. Israel information meeting(s).....()1 | 20/___ |
| Q. Classes.....()1 | 21/___ |
| R. Discussion with the Rabbi.....()1 | 22/___ |
| S. Social activities.....()1 | 23/___ |
| T. Israeli dancing.....()1 | 24/___ |

E-6) Below are listed some reasons people give for attending Hillel activities. If you have attended an activity at Hillel, please indicate the reasons why you attended.

	1 Very much applies to me	2 Somewhat applies to me	3 Not very applicable to me	4 Not at all applicable to me	
A. Friends attended	()	()	()	()	25/___
B. Program interested me	()	()	()	()	26/___
C. I took part in the program	()	()	()	()	27/___
D. Personal invitation from Hillel staff	()	()	()	()	28/___
E. Enjoy Jewish environment	()	()	()	()	29/___
F. Previous experience with Hillel	()	()	()	()	30/___
G. Religious services	()	()	()	()	31/___

E-7) If you have not attended a Hillel program, please indicate the reasons why you haven't attended.

	1 Very much applicable to me	2 Somewhat applicable to me	3 Not very applicable to me	4 Not at all applicable to me	
A. Friends don't attend	()	()	()	()	32/___
B. Not my type of people	()	()	()	()	33/___
C. Programs don't interest me	()	()	()	()	34/___
D. I'm not religious	()	()	()	()	35/___
E. Rabbi/Director turns me off	()	()	()	()	36/___
F. Don't like environment	()	()	()	()	37/___
G. Previous experience with Hillel	()	()	()	()	38/___
H. Friends' experiences or opinions	()	()	()	()	39/___
I. Time conflict with other event	()	()	()	()	40/___

- E-8) Thinking of your closest Jewish friends on campus or those you see most often socially, how many would you say have attended a Hillel-sponsored event?

Almost all.....()1
 Some.....()2
 About half.....()3
 A few.....()4
 Almost none.....()5
 None.....()6

41/___

- E-9) Looking at Hillel activities, do you feel the programs are directed at a specific group? Please indicate below the group(s) at which you feel programs are directed.

	1 Very much directed	2 Somewhat directed	3 Not very directed	4 Not at all directed	
A. Singles	()	()	()	()	42/___
B. Religious students	()	()	()	()	43/___
C. Zionists	()	()	()	()	44/___
D. Incoming new students	()	()	()	()	45/___
E. Graduate students	()	()	()	()	46/___
F. Students from out-of-state	()	()	()	()	47/___

- E-10) Hillel has sometimes been referred to as a "match-making service". How do you agree that Hillel serves this function?

Very much agree.....()1
 Somewhat agree.....()2
 Hardly agree.....()3
 Don't agree at all.....()4
 Doesn't apply.....()5

48/___

E-11) People have many different images of Hillel. Do any of the images given below match your image of Hillel?
(Check all that apply)

- | | |
|--|--------|
| A. Religious center.....()1 | 49/___ |
| B. Match-making service.....()1 | 50/___ |
| C. A place your parents want you to go.....()1 | 51/___ |
| D. A place to experience Jewish identity and commitment.....()1 | 52/___ |
| E. A youth group.....()1 | 53/___ |
| F. A center for new students to get together.....()1 | 54/___ |
| G. An arm of the UJA.....()1 | 55/___ |
| H. A place that offers Israel.....() | 56/___ |
| I. A place that has nothing I'm interested in.....()1 | 57/___ |
| J. A place to lessen homesickness.....()1 | 58/___ |
| K. A place to go for Jewish holidays.....()1 | 59/___ |
| L. Jewish environment.....()1 | 60/___ |
| M. Other.....()1 | 61/___ |

Fraternity and sorority members, please continue.

All others go to question E-14.

E-12) If Hillel and your fraternity or sorority sponsored programs at the same time, which do you think you'd probably attend?

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|
| Hillel event.....()1 | 62/___ |
| Fraternity/sorority event.....()2 | |
| Half of each.....()3 | |
| No idea.....()4 | |

E-13) If the activities sponsored by Hillel and your fraternity or sorority were of different types, would your attendance depend on the activity type? Please indicate below which event you would probably attend.

	1 Hillel	2 Fraternity/ Sorority	3 No idea	
A. Social program	()	()	()	63/___
B. Educational program	()	()	()	64/___
C. Cultural program	()	()	()	65/___

E-14) If you were to attend a Jewish activity at Hillel, with whom would you be most likely to go?

- A. A friend from Hillel.....()1 66/___
- B. A friend from fraternity/sorority.....()2
- C. A boy/girlfriend.....()3
- D. Makes no difference.....()4

E-15) If you were to attend a non-Jewish activity on campus, with whom would you be most likely to go?

- A. Fraternity/sorority friend.....()1 67/___
- B. Campus organization friend.....()2
- C. Hillel.....()3
- D. Boy/girlfriend.....()4
- E. Makes no difference.....()5

E-16) The Austin Jewish community outside the campus has different organizations. Please indicate below any of the organizations in which you have joined or participated.

- A. Agudas Achim synagogue.....()1 68/___
- B. Temple Beth Israel.....()1 69/___
- C. Austin Jewish singles group.....()1 70/___
- D. Jewish Community Council of Austin.....()1 71/___

SECTION F

IN THE NEXT SECTION, WE ARE INTERESTED IN COLLEGE LIFE - SPECIFICALLY DORMS AND FRATERNITIES AND SORORITIES. IF NEITHER APPLIES TO YOU PRESENTLY OR AT A TIME IN THE PAST, PLEASE SKIP TO SECTION G.

F-1) Do you currently live in either a university or private dorm?

	1	2	
	Yes	No	
University dorm	()	()	72/___
Private dorm	()	()	73/___

F-2) If yes, which dorm do you live in?

A. Dobie Center.....	()1	74/___
B. Castilian.....	()2	
C. Madison.....	()3	
D. Jester Center.....	()4	
E. Other University dorm.....	()5	

F-3) Have you ever lived in a University or private dorm at UT?

	1	2	
	Yes	No	
University dorm	()	()	75/___
Private dorm	()	()	76/___

If yes,

F-4) Which dorm did you live in?

A. Dobie Center.....	()1	77/___
B. Castilian.....	()2	
C. Madison.....	()3	
D. Jester Center.....	()4	
E. Other University dorm.....	()5	

F-5) People choose to live in a dormitory for a variety of reasons. Which of the following apply to you?

	1 Very much applies	2 Somewhat applies	3 Slightly applies	4 Doesn't apply at all	
A. Money/cost	()	()	()	()	5/___
B. Convenience	()	()	()	()	6/___
C. Friends lived there	()	()	()	()	7/___
D. Brother/sister lived there	()	()	()	()	8/___
E. Parents made decision	()	()	()	()	9/___
F. Large percentage of Jews	()	()	()	()	10/___

F-6) People choose their college based on many considerations. For each of the factors below, please indicate why you chose UT.

	1 Very much applies	2 Somewhat applies	3 Slightly applies	4 Doesn't apply at all	
A. Friends came here	()	()	()	()	11/___
B. Boy/girlfriend	()	()	()	()	12/___
C. Older sibling here	()	()	()	()	13/___
D. Location	()	()	()	()	14/___
E. Cost	()	()	()	()	15/___
F. Parents' decision	()	()	()	()	16/___
G. Friends already here	()	()	()	()	17/___

F-7) Do you currently belong to a fraternity or sorority?

Yes.....()1

No.....()2

18/___

If yes,

F-8) What is your status within the fraternity or sorority?

- A. Pledge.....()1
B. Active member.....()2
C. Officer.....()3
D. Social Affiliate.....()4
E. Little brother/little sister.....()5

19/___

F-9) Fraternities and sororities often have mixers/parties with other sororities/fraternities. With which other fraternities/sororities do you have mixers/parties?

	1 Jewish	2 Non-Jewish
All	()	()
Half and half	()	()
None	()	()

20/___

21/___

22/___

F-10) Which mixers/parties do you prefer to attend?

- A. Jewish.....()1
B. Non-Jewish.....()2
C. Equal for both.....()3
D. No preference.....()4

23/___

F-11) On the average, how many activities are offered per month by your fraternity/sorority?

- 1 - 2.....()1
3 - 4.....()2
5 or more.....()3

24/___

F-12) Of these activities offered, how many of the activities would you say you attend?

- None.....()1
 1 - 2.....()2
 3 - 4.....()3
 5 or more.....()4
 All.....()5

25/___

SECTION G

AS PART OF OUR STUDY, WE ARE INTERESTED IN SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT YOU. PARTICULARLY, WE'RE INTERESTED IN HIGH SCHOOL YEARS AND THE KINDS OF ACTIVITIES IN WHICH YOU WERE INTERESTED.

G-1) In what city did you graduate high school?

- A. Dallas-Ft. Worth.....()1
 B. Austin.....()2
 C. Houston.....()3
 D. El Paso.....()4
 E. San Antonio.....()5
 F. Other Texas city.....()6
 G. Outside of Texas.....()7

26/___

G-2) If graduated from a Texas high school, what high school did you attend?

27-28/___

THE NEXT SERIES OF QUESTIONS CONCERN GROWING UP IN TEXAS. IF THE INFORMATION DOES NOT APPLY TO YOU, PLEASE CONTINUE TO G-6.

G-3) How long have you lived in Texas?

Born in Texas.....()1

29/___

Longer than 10 years.....()2

Between 5 and 10 years.....()3

Less than 5 years.....()4

G-4) What kind of schools did you attend prior to going to college?
(Check all that apply)

A. Public school.....()1

30/___

B. Private school.....()2

31/___

C. Jewish day school.....()3

32/___

G-5) If you attended a combination of public and private schools,
what was your last enrollment prior to graduation from high
school?

A. Public education.....()1

33/___

B. Private education.....()2

C. Jewish day school.....()3

G-6) In high school, did you belong to any Jewish clubs, organiza-
tions, youth groups, outside of school activities?

Yes.....()1

34/___

No.....()2

If yes,

G-7) How many different ones did you belong to?

1 - 2.....()1

35/___

3 - 5.....()2

More than 5.....()3

G-8) Were you an officer of any of these organizations?

Yes.....()1

36/___

No.....()2

G-9) In high school, did you belong to any non-Jewish clubs or organizations outside of high school?

Yes.....()1

37/___

No.....()2

If yes,

G-10) How many different ones did you belong to?

1 - 2.....()1

38/___

3 - 5.....()2

More than 5.....()3

G-11) Were you an officer of any of these organizations?

Yes.....()1

39/___

No.....()2

G-12) During high school, in what types of organizations/committees were you involved? (Check all that apply)

A. Political.....()1

40/___

B. Social.....()2

41/___

C. Cultural.....()3

42/___

D. Special interests.....()4

43/___

E. School paper.....()5

44/___

F. Sports.....()6

45/___

G. Other.....()7

46/___

G-13) How often did you attend meetings for the organization(s)?

	1 Never	2 Rarely	3 Sometimes	4 Often	
A. Political	()	()	()	()	47/___
B. Social	()	()	()	()	48/___
C. Cultural	()	()	()	()	49/___
D. Special interests	()	()	()	()	50/___
E. School paper	()	()	()	()	51/___
F. Sports	()	()	()	()	52/___

G-14) How many of your friends in high school would you say were Jewish?

- Almost all.....()1 53/___
- Some.....()2
- About half.....()3
- A few.....()4
- Almost none.....()5
- None.....()6

DEMOGRAPHIC ITEMS

AGE _____

54-55/____

YEAR IN COLLEGE

FRESHMAN _____ 1

56/____

SOPHOMORE _____ 2

JUNIOR _____ 3

SENIOR _____ 4

GRADUATE _____ 5

MARITAL STATUS

SINGLE _____ 1

57/____

MARRIED _____ 2

DIVORCED _____ 3

WIDOWED _____ 4

SEPARATED _____ 5

LIVING
TOGETHER _____ 6

HILLEL ACTIVITY CARD HOLDER

YES _____ 1

58/____

NO _____ 2

PLACE OF RESIDENCE

DORM _____ 1

59/____

APARTMENT _____ 2

HOUSE (FRATERNITY/SORORITY) _____ 3

HOME/DUPLEX _____ 4

CONDOMINIUM _____ 5

PRIMARY METHOD OF TRANSPORTATION TO SCHOOL

OWN CAR _____ 1

60/___

BUS _____ 2

WALK _____ 3

FRIENDS'
CAR _____ 4

CURRENT TEXAS RESIDENT

YES _____ 1

61/___

NO _____ 2

CURRENT STUDENT STATUS

FULL-TIME _____ 1

62/___

PART-TIME _____ 2

MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY

PARENTS

AMERICAN-BORN _____ 1

63/___

FOREIGN-BORN _____ 2

64/___

APPENDIX 2

Hillel, the Jewish Student Center, offers a variety of programming.

Below are listed the various activities sponsored by Hillel. Please indicate those activities you may have attended since coming to UT.

- A. Wine and cheese parties
- B. Bagel and Lox brunches
- C. Faculty/graduate lunches
- D. Shabbat dinners
- E. Shabbat services
- F. High Holy Day services
- G. Lectures
- H. Purim celebration
- I. Sukkot celebration
- J. Chanukah Carnival
- K. Open House Keg Party
- L. Student Board Meetings
- M. Workshops
- N. Weekend retreat
- O. Israel programs
- P. Israel information meeting(s)
- Q. Classes
- R. Discussion with the Rabbi
- S. Social activities
- T. Israeli dancing

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Angus, Jacob B. Jewish Identity in an Age of Ideologies. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1978.
- Avni-Segre, Dan V. A Crisis of Identity: Israel and Zionism. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.
- Bailey, Kenneth D. Methods of Social Research. New York: The Free Press, 1978.
- "Consultation on the Jewish Family: Its Role in Jewish Identity and Continuity." Jewish Communal Affairs Department, American Jewish Committee, 1977.
- Davidowicz, Lucy S. The Jewish Presence. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1977.
- Erikson, Erik. Identity, Youth and Crisis. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1968.
- Fein, Leonard. "Dilemmas of Jewish Identity on the College Campus." Judaism 17.1 (Winter 1968), 10-21.
- _____. Studying Jewish Identity: Observations. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1966.
- Feldstein, Donald. "Campus Jews and Jewish Institutions." Midstream 16.4 (1970), 58-64.
- Fowler, Henry Watson. Oxford Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.
- Friedlander, Albert. "Never Trust a God over 30: New Styles in Campus Ministry." New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.
- Greenberg, Irving. "Jewish Survival and the College Campus." Judaism 17.3 (Summer 1968).
- _____. "The Jewish College Youth." The Jewish Family in a Changing World. Ed. Gilbert S. Rosenthal. New Jersey: Thomas Yoseloff Publisher, 1970.

- _____. "Escape from Freedom: Jewish Identity in America." American Jewish Quarterly 55.1 (September 1965), 5-21.
- Group Life in America: A Task Force Report. American Jewish Committee, Institute of Human Relations, New York, 1972.
- Herman, Simon N. "Criteria for Jewish Identity." World Jewry and the State of Israel. Arno Press, 1977.
- _____. The Study of Jewish Identity, Issues and Approaches. Ed. Simon N. Herman. The Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1971.
- Himmelfarb, Milton. The Jews of Modernity. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.
- _____. "The Jewish College Student and the Intellectual Community." Judaism 17.1 (Winter 1968), 3-9.
- "Jewish Identity and the Jewish College Student." Annual Conference of Hillel Directors, 1959.
- Jospe, Alfred. "Judaism on the Campus: Essays on Jewish Education in the University Community." B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1963.
- Klein, Judith Weinstein. Jewish Identity and Self-Esteem. American Jewish Committee, Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity, 1980.
- Lavendar, Abraham D. "Disadvantages of Minority Group Membership: The Perspective of a 'Non-Deprived' Minority Group." Ethnicity 2 (1975) 99-119. Academic Press, Inc.
- _____, and Meyer Greenberg. "Jewish Identity on the College Campus: An Experiment in Identity Maintenance." Jewish Education 46.1 (Spring 1968).
- _____. "Studies of Jewish College Students: A Review and a Replication." Jewish Social Studies 39. 1 and 2 (Winter-Spring 1971), 37-52.
- Liebman, Charles. "Jewish Survivalism and Its Impact on Jewish Life in America." Presented to American Jewish Committee, Jewish Community Affairs Committee, 1978.
- _____. "The Present State of Jewish Identity in Israel and the United States." Forum 27.2 (1977), 22-34.
- _____. The Ambivalent American Jew. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1973.

Mirsky, Mark Jay. O You Jewish Collegian.

Neher, Andre. "The Dialectics of Jewish Identity: Beyond Religion and Secularism." Forum 23 (Spring 1975), 102-111.

"New Frontiers for Jewish Life on the Campus." International Conference of Hillel Directors, 1967. Washington, D.C.: B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, Inc., 1969.

Novack, William. "The Greening of American Jewry." Judaism 20 (1971) 213-217.

Prager, Dennis, and Joseph Telushkin. The Nine Questions People Ask about Judaism. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981.

Rosenman, Yehuda. "Looking Ahead: Issues and Priorities." Presented to JCA Commission, 1978.

Roth, Audrey S. Personal Identity: A Search for Values. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971.

Schwartz, Howard. "Jewish College Youth Speak Their Minds." Publications, Service of the American Jewish Commission, 1969.

Segalman, Ralph. "Jewish Identity Scales: A Report." Jewish Social Studies 29 (1967), 92-111.

Sklare, Marshall, ed. The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group. Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.

_____. The Study of Jewish Identity, Issues and Approaches. Ed. Simon N. Herman. The Institute of Contemporary Jewry, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1971.

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Ed. Norman H. Nie et al. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Waxman, Chaim I. "Perspectives on the Family and Jewish Identification in America." American Jewish Committee, Institute of Human Relations.

_____, and William Helmreich. "American Jewish College Youth Changing Identity." Forum 27.2 (1977), 25-43.