A REPORT ON THE FINDINGS OF A STUDY OF JEWISH YOUNG ADULTS AND THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER *

by Harry Specht, Ph.D.

Berkeley, California

THE PROBLEM

N the past 15 years, the proportion of center members in the 18- to 24-year-old age group has dropped markedly. While the numbers in this age group in the general population have decreased about 5 percent between 1950 and 1960, the numbers of Jewish young adults participating in center programs have declined by more than 50 percent in the same period.²

* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Los Angeles, June 1, 1964. This report summarizes a study sponsored jointly by the National Jewish Welfare Board and the Florence Heller School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare of Brandeis University. Funds in support of the research were provided by members of the Board of Directors of NJWB and other friends of its late executive vice-president, Samuel D. Gershovitz. Dr. Milton Gordon of the University of Massachusetts assisted in the research and contributed many of its theoretical perspectives. The study was a doctoral dissertation, Brandeis Univ., 1963, and is reported more fully in Highlights from a Study of Jewish Young Adults by Harry Specht, NJWB, New York, 1964.

1 In 1947 there were approximately 105,000 members in this age category representing 23 percent of center membership. In 1958 there were approximately 34,000 members in this age group representing 5.7 percent of center membership. (JWB Year Book 1958-59, Vol. IX, NJWB, New York, 1960, p. 8.)

² Donald Bogue, The Population of the United States, Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1959, pp. 113, 766, 769.

While center program for some other age groups has become more extensive, notably for juniors and older adults, center programs appear to be unsuccessful in meeting the needs of young adults. At the same time, young adults do seem to seek activity on a group basis, as evidenced by the large numbers of individuals in this age range who participate in other forms of leisure-time activity.

The center's methods of serving people and its membership policies do not appear to attract Jewish young adults for group activity, and further, do not seem to be effective in developing Jewish young adult leadership.

A major objective of the study was to gain some understanding of the means by which centers can best meet the needs of Jewish young adults today, and to identify the needs of Jewish young adults who participate in center programs, as well as those who do not. The increasing numbers of young adults in the general population in the present decade—and their further increase in the next few decades—add to the urgent necessity of broadening our knowledge of the social needs of this age group.

Along with the quantitative decline in young adult membership, there is some evidence of change in the personal characteristics of young adults who use centers. The view expressed by many professional center workers is that, increasingly, a large proportion of young adult members are "socially inept," or "inadequate," or "disturbed." 8

The study, therefore, sought to evaluate this loss of young adult center membership, and to point up those aspects of programming which can help meet the social needs of this group. In addition, it was felt that a study of young adults, with suggestions as to the kinds of programs which might meet their needs, would be of use to all youth-serving agencies.

METHODOLOGY

Several research methods were used in the study of the problem. First, in order to place the study in a larger framework, an analysis was made of the "available population," that is, the population of unmarried Jewish young adults (18- to 30-years-of-age) in the United States. Particular attention was paid to the characteristics of the subpopulation who are available to attend center programs since they are not married, not attending college, and not serving in the Armed Forces. For this purpose, population data and data from other research studies were used.

Second, three communities were selected in which there are Jewish community centers and sufficient Jewish population so that operating programs for Jewish young adults could be examined and interviews could be held with center board members, staff members and other community leaders. One center is in a low-income area of Brooklyn, New York; one is in a middle-income area of a suburb of Boston, Massachusetts; and one is in a city in the mid-west with a medium-sized Jewish community which is largely middle-income.

Third, interviews were obtained with 282 unmarried Jewish young adults in the 18- to 30-year-age range. Schedules were developed to secure information about how such factors as age, sex, education, occupation, group memberships and attitudes toward Jewishness are related to center membership. The three study agencies provided 132 of the respondents and the remaining 150 respondents were selected by other means to include a sample of non-members of centers.

Fourth, over 100 groups and organizations in the three study communities, in which unmarried young adults are known to participate, were selected for observation and study. The various clubs, special interest groups, mass activities and other formalized and informal groups in which the young adults were involved at the time of the study were traced out to develop the outlines of the "social network" for Jewish young adults.

FINDINGS

The findings of the study cover six major areas: young adult population, courtship, young adult groups, other young adult leisure-time activities, factors affecting young adult program in the JCC, and factors associated with center membership.

In summary, the typical Jewish young adult is well-integrated in American society; his ties to Jewishness and to other

⁸ For example, see the following:

William Rosenthal and Harry A. Schatz, Young Adults and the Jewish Community Center, National Jewish Welfare Board, New York, August, 1956; National Jewish Welfare Board, "Meeting Young Adult Needs Through the Center," Workshop Report of Biennial Meeting JWB, New York, April 9, 1954, (Mimeo.); "Minutes of Tri-City Staff Meeting on Single Adults," (Middle Atlantic Section, Washington, D.C., June 6, 1961); Richard La Pan, "Needs of Young Adults Today," (June 7, 1961), (Mimeographed); Charles Parmet, "Where Are Our Young Adults?," Journal of Jewish Communal Service, Vol. XXXII, No. 2. (Winter, 1955).

Jews are mainly on the level of social activity. Group activities like large dances and parties which provide opportunities to meet members of the opposite sex are the chief basis for most group formation. Center professionals and other community leaders are prone to consider this unsatisfactory motivation on which to base center program. The result is that Jewish young adults find that center programs do not meet their needs.

We have identified four kinds of groups in which young adults participate: small social groups; small special-interest groups, large special-interest associations; and "circulation-enabling" associations. Because of historical developments, professional approaches, and institutional considerations, center workers tend to discourage mass courtship and circulation-enabling activities and to focus on small social and small special-interest group programs. This runs counter to the needs and desires of young adults, and center program is therefore largely unsuccessful with this age level.

The concept of center membership does not take into consideration the needs of the "occasional" member, although large numbers of young adults only participate on an "occasional" basis. Stress on small group activities and criteria for center membership also keep many potential young adult leaders from participation.

Our data reveals a great difference between young adults who have gone to college and those who have not; there is also a great difference between those who take part in center programs and those who do not.

The Young Adult Population 4

The literature on the Jewish community of the United States reports that the

typical Jewish young adult is nativeborn. He no longer lives in a ghetto and now has almost as much freedom of choice with respect to education, employment and housing as other Americans of his socio-economic level. There is little conflict between being "Jewish" and being "American" in his mind: as Will Herberg points out, the American Jew "is in the position where he can establish his Jewishness not apart from, nor in spite of, his Americanness, but precisely through and by virtue of it. Judaism has achieved its status in the American Way of Life as one of the three 'religions of democracy.' "5

Jewish young adults have little investment in formal Jewish religious and educational institutions. This no doubt arises from the child-centeredness of Jewish community life today and the social basis of that community life. The young adult is no longer the child around whom so much Jewish religious and educational activity revolves; neither is he yet one of the parents who plan and sponsor these activities for the children. The greatest interest of the young adult lies in the social institutions, and it should come as no surprise to find that the majority of Jewish young adults emphasize the social aspect of their Jewish associations and group By this we mean that Jewish groups, rituals and ceremonies are of interest only as a means of maintaining primary relationships with other Jews rather than as a guide and a reinforcement to a Jewish religious way of life.

Although the major interests of Jewish young adults in regard to Jewishness appear to center on the development and

⁴ A more detailed discussion of the Jewish young adult population can be found in Harry

Specht, "Jewish Young Adults: Characteristics of the Population and Implications for the JCC," presented at the NJWB Bienniel Convention; Boston, Mass., April 18, 1964.

⁵ Will Herberg, Protestant-Catholic-Jew: An Essay in Religious Sociology (Doubleday and Co., Garden City, New York, 1956), p. 213.

maintenance of social ties with other Jews, this does not represent the full meaning which Jewishness has for them. The majority do anticipate that they will have other kinds of ties to the Jewish community when they are married and are parents. More important than this, even in light of their present minimal connection with Jewishishness, there appears to be a felt need among Jewish young people to associate with one another. This need for association with other Jews apparently exists apart from, or in addition to, the needs created by the fact that Jews are still excluded from some institutions of the general American community. While some agencies (e.g. Jewish vocational services and Jewish community centers) arose in part because Jews were denied opportunities in the general community. the desire for communal association among Jews appears to persist even after this denial ceases to be a reality.

Contrary to the beliefs of many center workers, Jewish young adults appear to be generally comfortable about their Jewishness. It is their singular interest in *social* ties to other Jews which is often misinterpreted as a negative response to their Jewishness.

It is interesting that in our interviews with young adults the Jewish component of the center appears to have a much greater significance to them than one might have expected. though there is very little explicit content in the centers' programs young adults which could be considered distinctively Jewish, and with few exceptions the young adults desired no change in this regard, the young adults who use the center clearly view the agency as fulfilling important needs for them as Jews. Respondents described the center as a "Jewish" agency which provides them with an opportunity to "socialize with Jews" and opportunities to enjoy "Jewish culture and religion." These words appear in their descriptions of the centers' functions and purposes with an unmistakably high frequency. Repeatedly, they defined the function of the center as that of "bringing Jews together," and "having Jewish boys meet Jewish girls."

In our analysis of available population we found that the most readily accessible population for centers is the group of young, lower-educated young adults. The interests, values and attitudes of this group conflict with and repel the larger available (but not as accessible) population of medium age (21- to 27-year-olds) which is better educated and more cosmopolitan. amples of the differences between these age levels (and education levels) can be found in the sizes, purposes and goals of the groups they attend, in their attitudes toward their Jewishness, and in their attitudes toward different ways of meeting dates and the kind of dates they want to meet.

The medium-age group, the subgroup which is least "connected" to local institutions (such as the center or the synagogue) is also the most affluent subgroup. It is best able to make use of a variety of resources under private, commercial or communal sponsorship. We attribute their mobility and their lack of "connectedness" with local communal institutions to a number of factors-involvement with educational institutions, service in the armed forces, involvement with the professions, and the family-centered quality of life in the suburbs which offers little to the unmarried young adult in the way of social opportunities.

This medium-age group is also the most numerous of the available young adult subgroups. The members of this group are, in a sense, a large consumer market for which the centers and a host of other "producers" of services for young adults are in competition. These

other producers of services include private promoters of Lonely Hearts Clubs and massive social dances, as well as social agencies such as fund-raising organizations and synagogues. Social welfare services such as centers have not traditionally viewed themselves as having to "compete" for clients. Therefore, the center plays a cooperative role with these other producers, offering to coordinate services and avoiding overt competition. At the same time, most of the other producers are hard at work grabbing their share of the market.

In our analysis of demographic data we find no evidence that there has been a Jewish population explosion in the United States.⁶ But even if there has been a Jewish population explosion, we would still expect that in the next decade the number of Jewish young adults who use the centers will be less than it is today because of social factors like earlier marriage, a greater proportion of the population marrying, education, military service, and the generally high degree of mobility of this population.

However, the factor which has had the greatest impact on the participation patterns of the Jewish young adult population has been their educational attainment. Estimates of 62 percent of Jewish young people between 18- and 21-years-of-age attending college are probably conservative, and there is some evidence that the proportion may be 75 percent or more. The geographic

mobility of young adults in general is high, but it is even higher among Jewish young adults because of their high educational level and the occupational patterns of a highly-educated population

Courtship

The courtship activities of young adults are one of the most interesting and significant aspects of the study. Interest in opportunities for courtship is a factor which influences the structure and program of all young adult social groups and organizations. The term "courtship opportunities" refers to activities, such as dances and cocktail parties, which are specifically designed to enable males and females to meet.

The general response of center professionals and many other community leaders to courtship activities for young adults was found to be overwhelmingly negative-attitudes ranged from derisive and disapproving to antagonistic. Mass dances and other kinds of activities which attract young adults in large numbers are viewed with disdain and considered inappropriate for center pro-Center personnel devote gramming. most of their efforts to developing small group activities which offer both "culturally worthwhile" experiences, and "meaningful" personal relationships.

This negative response to courtship activities creates a gulf between center and young adult, discouraging young adult participation in center programs. Although a large percentage of unmarried Jewish young adults might seek

⁶ Although Eric Rosenthal, in his thorough analysis of Jewish fertility in the United States, hypothesizes that there may be an increase expected in the Jewish fertility ratio at some time in the future, the best available evidence we have to date is that Jews seem to be "scarcely reproducing themselves." Eric Rosenthal, "Jewish Fertility in the United States," American Jewish Year Book, 1961; American Jewish Committee, New York, 1961, p. 26. Also, Donald Bogue, op. cit., pp. 696-97.)

⁷ From an unpublished report of The Survey

of Career Choices of Jewish Youth, by S. Norman Feingold, Sol Swerdlof, and Howard Rosen, B'nai Brith Vocational Services. In a survey of 6,700 Jewish high school youth who are members of B'nai B'rith, Habonim, and JCCs, it was found that approximately 90 percent were planning to attend college. Of the remaining group, 6 percent were undecided and only 4 percent stated that they would not attend college.

courtship opportunities at centers, they are discouraged by the attitudes of center personnel toward courtship activities. Their desire to participate in courtship activities (and their lack of interest in center-condoned programs) is defined as "self-centeredness" and "immaturity" by many center workers.

Closely related to courtship is the need of most young adults to "circulate"—to find social mechanisms which will enable them to meet new people easily and quickly, both dates and friends. This need is particularly intense for a highly-educated population because of their high degree of mobility (in both the geographic and social-psychological sense). In this regard also, Jewish young adults find the response of the center to this need negative and unrewarding.

A special problem for the center is the older unmarried young adult, the individual over 28 years of age. Though this is a small part of the total national population, it is composed of an extremely large proportion of people who will never marry. This never-marrying population is generally unwelcome in social agencies which are not prepared to meet their special requirements, and many desperately need to find ways by which to participate meaningfully in the social and cultural life of their community.

Young Adult Groups

The group associations of young adults are of particular interest to youth-serving agencies, since most services to young adults are provided through group experiences. From our data we are able to describe the salient features of the following different kinds of groups, as well as some of the differences among the young adults who participate in them:

1. Small social groups, e.g., neigh-

- borhood clubs, informal college groups, and cellar clubs;
- Small special-interest groups,
 e.g., dramatics groups, hobby
 groups;
- 3. Large special-interest associations, e.g., political groups and professional associations;
- 4. Circulation-enabling associations.

Membership in small social groups is directly associated with age and is usually limited to 18- to 21-year-olds. The geographic scope of such groups is generally limited and is usually bounded by a neighborhood, a college, or by agency membership.

This type of group seems to originate and survive on the initiative of the members; it is usually formed on the basis of friendship choices and once formed, remains fairly stable. When some members drop out—to attend college, to serve in the armed forces, to take jobs in other communities, or to marry—the group begins to disintegrate. New members may be recruited, but this is unusual in small social groups of young adults. It appears that small social groups are, in part, extensions of adolescent peer group relationships.

Many small social groups seem to disintegrate as some of their members become interested in "circulation-enabling" activities which often conflict with the basic functions of the small social group. In addition, other factors direct the young adult away from small social groups to other types of group associations as he grows older. These include: 1) fewer people are available in the older age groups to form small social groups; 2) the small social group is not well suited to meeting the courtship and occupational needs of young adults; 3) relationships are less stable in the older age levels; 4) older young adults are better able to pay the costs of participation in other types of activities; and 5) most important of all, young adults over 21 seek participation in groups involving large numbers of people.

Small special interest groups involving younger people, particularly those in which students participate, appear to serve an educational training function. Many young adults in the 21- to 27-yearage range tend not to participate in small special interest groups, being involved in "circulation-enabling" and large special-interest associations as a solution to their courtship and occupational needs. On the other hand, unmarried young adults, 28 years old and over, have greater need for special interest groups because they have less need, or less desire, for courtship opportunities and thus have fewer opportunities to form friendships. They also have more stable occupational connections. Small special interest groups allow participants to maintain relationships which cut across age, sex and marital status lines.

The circulation-enabling association is the young adult group par excellence. These are large co-ed groups of unmarried young adults which offer opportunities for courtship on a mass basis. They generally involve people over 21 and under 35. The term "circulation-enabling" refers to the fact that large numbers of young adults pass in and out of these associations with regularity and ease. Although there is usually a small core of officers and leaders, it is difficult to determine exactly who constitutes the membership of such associations, and the participants themselves are often not sure of who is and who is not a member. Flexibility in the membership structure meets a social need of the young adult and is essential for the survival of such associations. The "occasional" quality of membership in this type of group is one of its outstanding features.

Many professionals who have worked with young adults will recognize that the circulation-enabling association describes many of the young adult groups which meet in Jewish community centers, as well as in other settings. It should be noted that in considering all of the reported group memberships of the respondents, circulation-enabling associations proved to be a fairly widespread phenomenon.

Because of limited space we will not elaborate on how the circulation-enabling association meets the differential needs of young adults, but it should be noted that these associations vary in their characteristics and programs, and the variations are related to the age and social class characteristics of the members.

Other Leisure-Time Activities

The other leisure-time activities which were studied are mass courtship promotions, kinship groups, country clubs and vacation resorts. We will comment here only on the first of these activities.

A "mass courtship promotion" is, simply stated, an income-producing activity for a private businessman. The arrangements are simple. The promoter secures a hall, a band and the services of several assistants and advertises the availability of these facilities to paying customers through the newspapers. The paying customers come at the specified time, make use of the facilities to meet other paying customers. They leave at the specified time, more or less satisfied with the service, but with no further commitment or obligation to the promoter.

Centrally-located in metropolitan areas, mass courtship promotions attract a wide age range of unmarried young adults. The widespread existence of such promotions was of some surprise to the researchers because professionals in centers were unaware of the large

numbers of young adults involved. Usually, professionals dismissed such programs as unimportant and valueless, a judgment which is not supported by our research.

As in the case of circulation-enabling associations, there is a clear-cut and readily identifiable ethnic character to specific mass courtship promotions, and a surprising homogeneity in the age and socio-economic status of the customers. Generally, the promotions attract a public over 21 years of age. In actual practice the promoter may be a communal agency, or a communal agency which permits a private promoter to use its name and facilities in exchange for a part of the profits.

Policy decisions regarding questions of recruitment, program content, publicity and the handling of individuals have to be made, whether the programs are operated by professionals or by However, promoters make promoters. their decisions on a monetary basis While many young adults use promotions, it seems unfortunate that so many of these important decisions are left to the promoters. An observer cannot help but feel that many young adults are, after all, very young, that courtship is an important activity for the young, and that some young adults are very lonely and in need of help and guidance in the conduct of courtship affairs. Some of the promoters are unscrupulous and promotions can be harmful to some participants. If there are no substantial programs of this kind operated by communal agencies there is no competing orientation to serve as a standard for mass courtship activities.

Factors Affecting Young Adult Program in the Jewish Community Center

The position of the membership on the scale of generations seems to be the major underlying factor which determines the character of the program

which the center develops for young We define immigrants as firstgeneration Americans; their children and grandchildren constitute the second and third generations. We are referring to social generations, and not to chronological generations. Thus, gardless of the actual chronological generational position of a Jewish young adult in the mid-western city, he is, socially, part of a third- and fourth-generation community. Generational position is directly related to social class, at least in the three communities in our study. That is, the membership group with the higher generational position was of the higher social class.

Historically, in the first stage of its development, the center used educational methods to aid first- and second-generation Jews to adjust to American life.⁸ In a later stage the center turned to social group work methods to aid third-generation Jews to "return" to and become reintegrated in the Jewish community. Because relationships among Jews have become institutionalized and taken for granted, the methods which were useful in meeting the needs of earlier generations seem to be less indicated now.

It seems to be generally true that there is a relationship between generational position and the "function" of the center and the methods used by the center.9

SOSCAR I. Janowsky, The JWB Survey, National Jewish Welfare Board, New York, 1948, p. 81

⁹ It is necessary to make a distinction between the concept of "function" and the concept of "goal or purpose." In this discussion the term function refers to "consequences" or "outcomes" of behavior regardless of the intended or planned aims and goals of that behavior. Goals and purposes are viewed as the intended and planned for meaning of behavior. Thus, the aims and goals of JCCs could be quite different from the functions of JCCs. For example, the goal of a JCC program could

Center workers who rely on use of the earlier methods (education and group work) appear to have a "member to worker" orientation to young adults. With this orientation, the young adult's relationship to the worker and the agency is of primary importance; with this orientation workers tend to view the behavior of young adults in negative This is clearly evident in some of the literature on center work with young adults in which stress is laid on the importance of the "relationship" between the members and the worker. A "diagnostic individual intake" in which this relationship is given maximum attention is seen as the very quintessence of good practice with young adults.

Center workers who do not rely heavily on the earlier methods have a "member to community" orientation to young adults. With this orientation the primary concern of the worker is with the relationship of young adults to a wide range of institutions in the Jewish and general communities such as educational institutions and professional With this orientation there is groups. recognition that the member's relationship to the worker and the agency may be of minimal importance. With this orientation workers tend to view the behavior of young adults in more positive terms.

The center's unsuccessful approach to

be to develop a positive Jewish identification among members while the function (or consequence) of the program could be Americanization or acculturation of immigrants.

It should be noted that all of the methods to which we refer may have had other consequences in addition to those which we describe. For example, group work methods have been used to assist in individual social adjustment and in developing social action. However, our concern is to clarify what appear to us to be the major consequences resulting from the use of particular methods, regardless of any other stated or unstated outcomes.

young adults is due to several factors. There is an unselective use of social group work method (which is, in turn, equated with "small social groups") to serve young adults. The emphasis which local agencies place on membership enrollment appears to be related to the organizational needs of the center as well as the professional needs of center workers. These factors, along with others, tend to select particular young adults out of the available population for participation in center programs, discouraging the participation of the larger available population of young adults.

The concept of agency membership which is used by the centers involved in the study does not seem to take account of an important proportion of young adults who are currently participating in our programs. That is, agencies do not regard "occasional" participation as significant although this is a way in which many young adults prefer to take part in groups and organizations. For example, 57 percent of the members whom the study agencies classified as "inactive" did in fact participate in programs "occasionally." A large percentage of non-members were also found to be "occasional" participants. another way, 55 percent of all of the "occasional" participants found in the study (and we consider this to be a significant form of participation) were not on the agencies' membership lists.

The processes used for the selection of representative young adult leaders are influenced by many of the same factors which agencies use to measure participation. Two of the prerequisites which centers have for such leaders are; affiliation with a local agency and membership in a small social group. Young adult respondents who appeared to be good potential community leaders would not be drawn into center programs or into planning groups because they would not meet these requirements.

Factors Associated with Center Membership

Among the factors related to determining which young adults participate in center programs are: education, geographic mobility, occupational status, and dating patterns. The most important factor seems to be education.

There are many differences in the social characteristics of "actives" (young adults who participate in center programs) and "non-participants." Actives are less mature, more dependent, less socially adequate than non-participants. However, these differences either dwindle or disappear when the educational status of respondents is held constant. That is, when lower-educated actives are compared to lower-educated non-participants, the differences are minimal or do not exist at all.

There are, no doubt, psychological, intellectual and social differences which set some Jewish young adults apart from others and keep them from obtaining college education. These differences are intensified by the differences which college education itself makes. Because it creates and enhances social. financial and intellectual differences among young people, it produces a vast gulf between those who have it and those who do not. The selective influence of college leaves a residual pool of Jewish young adults who, in the context of the values and attitudes of the Jewish community, are left behind, are less socially able, and have lower social status in that community. The young adults who use the Jewish community center are indeed different from those who do not. more than anything else, they are the less educated Jewish young adults, and many of the social characteristics which they exhibit are related to their lower educational status.

Thus, the data suggest that there are social class differences between actives and non-participants. Personality dif-

ferences aside then, centers, in their desire to serve all Jewish young adults, must direct their efforts toward developing methods for serving different social classes of young adults rather than assuming that all young adults have similar social and intellectual needs which can be met by the same program, and attributing behavior differences to the psychosexual needs of the individuals.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We have made the following recommendations to the Jewish Welfare Board based on these findings:

- 1) Programs for Jewish young adults should offer courtship opportunities on a mass basis. In large cities, such a program would have to take into account the many competing organizations and groups which offer such opportunities.
- 2) Programs for Jewish young adults should encourage group activities of the "circulation-enabling" type to offer young adults the opportunity to move in and out of a wide range of social relationships with ease and regularity. Large mass activities, with the stress on courtship opportunities, should be the foundation of such programs. Work with small groups should be selective, as with handicapped young adults, leadership special groups, interest groups, or classes.
- 3) Programs for Jewish young adults should be organized on a city-wide basis in large cities, and on a regional basis where there are smaller Jewish communities. Formal membership in the local center has little meaning to most Jewish young adults and appears to be unnecessary in the development of a program aimed at the broad community of Jewish young adults, and indeed, may discourage participation if made a requirement.
- 4) In work with representative young adult leaders, centers should select some of the highly-educated, profes-

sional, socially-conscious young people who may not necessarily be involved in identifiable and stable small social groups, and who may not be enrolled at a local center.

5) Recognition of social class differences, which are best reflected in the educational achievements of young adults, calls for differential program which will serve the needs of different types of young adults. For example, manifest helping purposes of circulation-enabling associations (particularly fund-raising for charitable causes) may be one form of program which will be particularly appealing to higher-educated young adults.

Enabling the lower-educated young adult to bridge the social gap between himself and the large majority of Jewish young adults who are higher-educated may call for programs which introduce him to content which students handle at the college level, and which introduce him to the social life of the college. This is particularly important to younger, lower-educated males.

There are other important findings of this study which we have not discussed in this brief report. In the full report, attention is given to the effects of different kinds of programs, the different methods of working with Jewish young adults, and the characteristics of different groups of young adults. All of these subjects are treated in terms of differences between communities and are presented in the context of the historical development of the Jewish community center.