

yet members and who may perhaps never be able to qualify if its membership requirements are raised or even maintained. Not only does this represent a potential loss of large numbers and large revenues but it also represents, potentially at least, the possibility of another organization of social workers which may even outstrip in membership the present Association of Social Workers. There is no doubt that this is a problem and perhaps also a serious one. But there are those who would question the wisdom of a professional association becoming so much concerned about numbers and income as to forget its main purpose. They would seriously question the value of a professional association of social workers whose standards would be so low as to admit everyone who would want to join. For it would no longer be a professional organization, but one that would seek members to enable it to seek new members, etc. *ad infinitum*.

There are those in both associations, who believe that the two associations should work independently and not influence each other on the matter of their respective standards. Many of us do not share this point of view. We firmly believe that whether we recognize it or not these two associations do and must continue to influence each other. They are the only two bodies officially and directly concerned with raising the standards of social work as a whole. Schools of social work must eventually become the main source of future members of the Association of Social Workers. The latter organization, because of its size and influence can profoundly affect the standards of the Association of Schools by its requirements for membership. If it should lower these requirements there will be less pressure upon schools outside the Association to raise their standards in order to meet the requirements of the Association of Schools. Evidence of this is available on all sides. In self-defense the schools of social work and their alumni will be forced to create another Association of Social Workers which will have standards of admission that will be in accord with decent professional requirements. This would result in a conflict between the two associations which should by all means be avoided. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that the two associations begin to think together on what is after all a common problem. There is no medium at the present time for such common thinking. It is high time that such a medium were created.

Above everything else the Association of Schools must begin thinking in terms of securing the services of a full-time secretary. The time required for the examination of applicant schools, the coordination of the existing committees, the examination of schools that will want to give the Provisional Certificate, and possibly also the examination of member schools on the basis of the modified By-Laws, will be beyond its present resources. No organization depending on

voluntary services can perform these tasks satisfactorily. Nor can they be performed by committees without serious losses. Unless the Association has adequate means for judging the work of schools that apply for admission, as well as to judge their progress before granting them full membership, in accordance with the latest By-Law, and unless it has the means for examining the work of member schools, it will be impossible to raise the standards to where they should be.

There is also great need for continuing studies of the extent and types of experimentation going on in the member schools. A clearing house of such information could be of great value, not only to the schools conducting or contemplating the experiments but also to the others who should be informed on what is going on. The Association of Schools is the logical agency for making this information available to its members. The Association should also stimulate experiments on the basis of the needs which would come to its attention through the contacts which it would maintain with its member schools. There is no other agency in the social work field for this purpose. It logically belongs in the Association, and it must equip itself to perform this service.

An additional service that the Association could render to its member schools, directly or indirectly, would be for it to secure a substantial fund for the purpose of subsidizing and developing the work of existing schools. It is not conceivable that the Foundations interested in education for social work could be induced to set aside and pool certain funds to be administered by a central agency which would have current and up-to-date information on the work and needs of the different schools. Details of administration so as to protect the fund, its administrators, and the member schools, could be easily worked out. It would, however, be unworkable unless a full time staff were available to the Association.

The progress which the Association of Schools has made in the last few years is but a mere beginning. Because of the recognition which social work has received in the last few years, because of the constantly advancing standards before the depression, because of the developing public fields in social work, and because of the greater professional consciousness which has come to social workers as well as to the schools of social work, new and increased demands will be made upon the schools in the future. They will have to equip themselves as they are not now equipped for giving a high type of professional education. The Association of Schools is the only agency that can guide and stimulate the schools in the development of their standards. Its greatest opportunities, therefore, for a high type of professional and educational service lie in the future.

Some Problems in the Collection and Interpretation of Jewish Population Data*

By H. L. LURIE

Bureau of Jewish Social Research, New York

IT is generally recognized that accurate population data are essential elements in the analysis of vital statistics, in quantitative measurements of social problems and are basic for social planning. The United States Census Bureau collects and prepares data based upon actual enumerations which may be applied to an understanding of social conditions and social problems for the population as a whole. In addition to counts of living persons, tables on age and sex distribution, family status, country of origin of the foreign born, occupation and employment status, and other essential facts about population are prepared at regular intervals.

Population data and vital statistics prepared by governmental agencies are available for studying problems of the white, Negro, Indians and other groups. Considerable material on the native born and foreign born groups on basis of country of origin can be derived from the general population data. However, the census of population does not attempt to obtain specific data on the Jewish group as such, either on the basis of religious affiliation or other classification. In this respect the United States population data differ from practices of some of the European countries and of Canada which collect population figures by religion and by race. The only official enumeration on a national basis consists of tabulations made from the records of immigrants compiled by the Labor Department of immigrants who enter and depart. The Census of Religious Bodies is an estimate compiled from other data and is not based upon direct enumeration. It offers material on religious institutions but not upon individuals or groups as such. So far as the census is concerned, Jews are not a distinct racial or ethnic stock. They are included in the total white group undistinguished from other native whites and included among the foreign born according to country of origin.

The nearest approach to enumeration of resident Jews made by the U. S. Census Bureau is the information on Yiddish mother tongue of the foreign born groups obtained in the decennial census. In the 1910 census and 1920 census a count was taken both of the foreign born population and of the native born children of foreign or mixed parentage on the basis of the mother tongue of the immigrant. In 1930

tabulation was limited to the foreign born only and data on the native born children of foreign born or mixed parentage for this item have not been reported. The 1930 census gives 1,222,658 foreign born whites reporting Yiddish as their mother tongue. This is probably somewhere between one third and one-fourth of the total group in the United States who may be classified as Jews.

The accuracy of the item on Yiddish mother tongue may be seriously questioned. The 1910 census reported 1,051,767 and the 1920 census, 1,091,820 Yiddish foreign born. The increase in the ten year period of 40,053 appears to be much smaller than the additions normally to be expected from the Jewish immigration less the death of Yiddish immigrants. It has been suggested by those who have attempted to estimate Jewish population that a part of the error may have been due to the fact that a large number of Russian Jews were reported in the 1920 census as Russian rather than Yiddish mother tongue. This factor in the probable inaccuracy of the mother tongue statistics is cited for the purpose of indicating the difficulties likely to be encountered in census enumeration of the Jewish group.

Lacking official statistics and opposing their collection, Jews as individual students and through local and national agencies have promptly proceeded to supply the deficiency by various guesses and estimates ranging from entirely impromptu attempts to laborious collection of schedules. A record of such estimates go back as far as 1790. In recent times the most important contributions to our information on Jewish population in the United States have been made by Dr. Joseph Jacobs from the years 1905 to 1912, and by Dr. Harry S. Linfield whose most intensive study of Jewish population was made for the year 1927.

While there are inaccuracies in all population studies, even where the method of actual enumeration is carefully used, it is obvious that derived estimates in all probability supply much less accurate information. Jewish population estimates according to one or more of the methods to be described have their values. They are frequently but not invariably nearer to an approximation of the actual than guesses of population made without such efforts. In addition to their fallibility as a total count of Jewish population, they lack the detailed information concerning age and sex distribution and other important items obtained in the regu-

*Paper read before the Conference on the Economic Status of the Jews in the United States, May 12, 1934.

lar counts of population and necessary as corrective factors in considering a particular set of data concerning the Jews. May I cite one example. A part of the Jewish population data in the United States which may be considered as obtained by the least unsatisfactory method of estimating is based by computing the total population from the number of school children absent on important Jewish holidays. If we attempt to use this figure in any state or community to determine the ratio of Jewish inmates of penal institutions to the total Jewish group, we are confronted with the difficulty that we do not have available the population counts for Jewish males of the same age groups. This is upon occasion supplied by some local study which is then assumed to fit all geographical and political subdivisions. We know, of course, that the age distribution varies in localities and in native white and Negro groups, and as between foreign born and native born population, and that a comparison of incidence of delinquency needs to be related to be accurate to specific figures on age and sex distribution. Frequently, however, comparisons are made and judgments given on Jewish delinquency which fail to take these factors into account or which employ vague or uncertain data. It is easy to lose sight of the fact that population data based upon estimates are at their best crude approximations and cannot and should not be used as the basis for scientific study of social problems.

Since practically all of the Jewish population data available are derived through estimates, it is important to review the methods which have been employed and to analyze their adequacy for social study and scientific research. Most of the earlier estimates previous to 1905 were little more than sheer guesses. More or less intensive effort was expended in collecting various local estimates. In the very small communities they occasionally represented actual counts of persons known to the estimator. In other instances memberships in Jewish synagogues or other Jewish organizations were used as the point of departure as a guess concerning the total number of Jews in a given locality. The method used by Dr. Joseph Jacobs was an improvement over these random methods. Using what appeared to be a more or less satisfactory estimate made in the year 1877, the number of Jewish immigrants recorded by the Labor Department beginning with the year 1881 were added and computations made for the natural increase, the differential between an estimated birth and death rate for the population. The estimate obtained in this way was then compared with other estimates on the basis of the nativity of the foreign born given in the United States Census, the Jewish component in this group being considered to represent the same ratio of Jews to non-Jews in the foreign born group as in the immigration lists. The statistics on Yiddish mother tongue were also used as a basis for an estimate. By making various

assumptions and corrections Dr. Jacobs obtained substantially similar estimates as a result of the various methods employed.

Another method which had been employed locally was to obtain an estimate based upon Jewish deaths. By ascertaining the number of Jewish burials the total Jewish population is variously computed. A number of studies have indicated that the Jewish death rate was probably smaller than the crude death rate as a whole due, perhaps in part, to differences in age distribution and to various social and biological factors. Estimates of population based upon Jewish deaths, therefore, have usually involved a coefficient based upon the assumption of a lower Jewish death rate. In the New York City Jewish Communal Survey which obtained Jewish population data for 1925, a careful study was made of actual census schedules in a number of well populated Jewish districts as the basis for obtaining the death rate coefficient related to specific age groups. Since the use of Jewish deaths for estimating population requires a procedure of this type which amounts, in effect, to an actual census or scrutiny of an available enumeration of at least a sizeable fraction of the Jewish population, the method has not been generally employed. If census schedules are used for obtaining a sample enumeration, there are large difficulties in identifying Jews in the census tract.

Actual local enumerations of Jews being unavailable and the method of computing from death rates requiring considerable energy and expense, attempts have been made to find some other index to Jewish population. Dr. Alexander Dushkin developed a method for the statistical study of the Jewish population in New York City in 1917 which has been found useful by Jewish educational agencies. It has been called the "Yom Kippur" method and is based upon computing the total Jewish population from the number of unusual absences of school children on an important Jewish holiday. Where departments of school attendance keep accurate records of school enrollment and registration, the differential between the attendance on the Day of Atonement or Rosh Hashonah and the attendance on a normal or average school day is taken as representing the number of Jewish school children. With this information in hand the total Jewish population is estimated on the basis that Jewish children constitute the same percentage of the Jewish population that school children as a whole or children between the ages of five and fourteen constitute of the total population. However, no one knows whether this assumption is or is not valid at a particular time and for a specific locality. By this method, which approaches an actual fact concerning at least a large number of Jewish school children, it is assumed that an approximate estimate of Jewish population for a city or even for a large Jewish neighborhood may be obtained. By analyzing the data for districts known to have large num-

bers of Jews, as compared with neighborhoods largely or entirely non-Jewish, a corrective factor may be obtained.

The population study made by Dr. Harry Linfield in 1927 combined various methods. In the small communities efforts were made to have local correspondents enumerate all persons of Jewish faith. Estimates were then made for those communities which did not respond or the small communities and rural areas not canvassed. This was obtained through estimating the percentage of Jewish population in localities of given general population from the ratios obtaining in corresponding areas. In urban places with a general population of 25,000 and over, estimates of the number of Jews were received from organizations and individuals and the data examined in the light of other available information concerning the number of Jews in the respective cities. In the case of eight cities assumed to have 50,000 or more Jewish population, estimates were made by using the method of school absences. The total Jewish population of the United States obtained through these methods was then compared with estimates made from immigration data and from statistics of mother tongue. Using various assumptions it was believed that a degree of correspondence between the various methods of estimating was obtained.

In making large computations from partial data the degree of error is likely to decrease with an increasing size of the unit. The Jewish population estimates which we have available for the United States as a whole are probably more nearly accurate than information available for any given state or city, and it is probable that information for large cities is less inaccurate than that for areas of smaller Jewish population. Nevertheless we must not lose sight of the fact that even our total population estimates for the United States are at best guesses made from fractional data. Supposed counts in small localities where presumably the enumerator knows or has access to the total Jewish group are likely to be highly inaccurate. Estimates made from membership lists are similarly open to question. Estimates made from Jewish burials depend upon an unknown coefficient, the Jewish death rate, and are, therefore, subject to considerable error. For example, an estimate of Jewish population in the City of Baltimore was made by the Bureau of Jewish Social Research for the year 1925 using burial records. These records were obtained from the local bureau of vital statistics and were checked to exclude non-resident deaths. Since the crude death rate for the population as a whole was not considered applicable to the general population, the deaths were tabulated by age groups and an estimate made for the population in each age group using the age group death rates obtained by Jews in New York City by a more intensive method of study. There is a considerable probability of error in each of the age group computations; for example, the death rate for females, age ten to fourteen, is placed at one per 1,000. There were four deaths in that age and sex group in Balti-

more in 1925 and, therefore, it is estimated that there were 4,000 Jewish females in that age group. A difference of a single death in this group would change the estimate by 1,000 persons. A variation of a single death in each one of the eleven age groups for each sex would have affected the estimate by 10.6 percent. Baltimore on this basis was estimated to have a population of 60,610. There would be a larger probability of error in cities with a smaller Jewish population if this method were to be used.

The Yom Kippur method is similarly beset with errors and difficulties. Aside from the problem of approximating the absences from school on Yom Kippur or Rosh Hashonah to the Jewish school children enrolled by correcting the absences on that date by normal absences, there is a further problem of estimating total Jewish population from the assumed figure of Jewish school children. The estimate is on the basis that Jewish school children have the same ratio to the total Jewish population that school children as a whole have to the total general population. There is a high degree of probability that the facts will not bear out this theory. Because of varying age distributions due to varying migration periods and differentials in birth and death rates, a ratio probably obtains in every community which differs from that of the general population. In the eight cities in which this method was used in the 1927 population estimates, the coefficient used for estimating Jewish population from school attendance based on the ratio to be found in the general population varied from 4.79 in Detroit to 8.45 in St. Louis. The coefficient for New York City was 5.73 and the average for the eight cities was 5.83. Is there any reason for assuming that the ratio of school children to the total Jewish population in St. Louis is nearly 50 percent greater than it is in New York or Newark? There were 5,853 abnormal absences in St. Louis on Yom Kippur in the year 1925. Using the coefficient for the general St. Louis population an estimate of 49,457 Jews is obtained. If, however, the coefficient of 5.83, which is the average for the eight cities, were used the estimate of Jewish population in St. Louis would be only 34,123. Another example may further illustrate this point. An estimate probably from membership lists and similar information was made for Cleveland, Ohio, of the Jewish population of 100,000 for the year 1917. The estimate in 1925 based on school absences and using the coefficient of 5.83, the average for six other cities is given as 83,129. If the St. Louis coefficient had been employed the estimate would have been 120,489. The Philadelphia coefficient would give an estimate of 97,389. It would appear that where such large variations in estimates as between 83,129 and 120,489, are possible the method cannot be considered valid and is not much of an improvement over more casual methods of guessing population.

Population estimates for Chicago which have used the school absence method may be cited as another case in point.

In 1923 the Jewish Welfare Board estimated a population of 288,131. In 1927, Dr. Linfield, using the statistics of mother tongue furnished by the U. S. Census for the year 1920 and adding to this 75 per cent of the enumerated Russian mother tongue in Chicago, obtained an estimate of 345,651, based on the assumption that the combined mother tongue group constituted 60 percent of the total Jewish population. This is an arbitrary estimate since 60 percent is used for mid-western cities and 75 percent is assumed as the fraction for cities on the eastern seaboard. Recognizing that 345,000 is probably too large an estimate and assuming a greater incidence of foreign born in the Chicago Jewish population, the estimate was reduced to 325,000 for the year 1927. In 1931 another estimate of Jewish population was made by the Chicago Jewish Charities by the method of school absences. It was found that the number of absences on Rosh Hashonah exceeded the absences on Yom Kippur so that it was found desirable to take the Rosh Hashonah absences rather than the Yom Kippur absences as indicative of the number of Jewish children in the public schools. The basis upon which this conclusion was reached is not given and it seems to go counter to the general belief that there is a stricter taboo on school attendance on Yom Kippur than on other Jewish holidays. The total population registered in the schools was found to be 17.7 percent of the total population as reported by the U. S. census. If this percentage is used, the Jewish estimate of population would be approximately 370,000. The ratio of 14.5 per cent which represents, according to the 1930 U. S. Census, the proportion that children of the ages of five to fourteen constitute, in the total Chicago population, gives an estimate of 302,164 which was accepted as the final estimate.

That the various methods of estimating population lead to conflicting variations in results, may be indicated by another example. Dr. Alexander Dushkin estimated a population of 5,000 for the Borough of Richmond in New York City in 1917, based on school absence information. The New York City Census Committee, which obtains estimates on the basis of sampling the religious composition of selected neighborhoods in New York City, made an estimate of 17,168 Jews in the same borough in the year 1920. An estimate based on the Yom Kippur method obtained by the New York Bureau of Jewish Education gives an estimate of 2,601 Jews in the Borough of Richmond for the year 1927.

The conclusion to be drawn from a study of Jewish population estimates is that they may be considered to have limited value for purposes of general information, that they are subject to gross errors when applied to subdivisions or neighborhoods of a city, and that they should not be employed as a basis for statistical studies of Jewish social and economic problems.

At best they may possess some crude values for such procedures as determining quotas for fund raising purposes or for other harmless pursuits. The school absence

method as employed by the Jewish Education Association has value for the purpose of that Association which is primarily to determine the number of Jewish school children in a given area. Aside from this purpose the data should be used with great caution for studying the social problems of Jewish children and probably should not be employed at all for deriving estimates of adult Jewish population.

In the light of this conclusion what should be done about Jewish population statistics? The cost of making enumerations of Jews by voluntary agencies is prohibitive since enumerations of Jewish population would involve a house to house canvassing of practically the total area for which a population count is desired. Local communities may find it of interest to make various estimates from time to time but it may be questioned whether it is practical or desirable to set up a well organized Jewish population study for the country as a whole. To do this task thoroughly on the basis of known methods of computation would involve considerable expense since such studies should be undertaken, if at all, upon a continuous basis which would permit of making careful comparisons from year to year of the results obtained and discovering at least in part the incidence of errors and the peculiarities of estimates made. Some organized effort, however, might be devoted to compiling in a central source the various local population estimates which for various reasons are being made, and analyzing and comparing the results obtained over a period of years.

If we are to have an approach to accurate population data, it is obvious that the sole feasible basis for obtaining such information usable for a study of social problems and for statistical comparisons is to be obtained only through an official enumeration undertaken by the United States Census. Religious affiliation has been excluded from census schedules because of opposition to this question on the part of various religious groups. In fact, this opposition has occasionally been considered as an achievement in protecting Jewish and other sectarian rights. The United States Census of Religious Bodies attempts to obtain a count of religious membership. This count, however, which is variable for the different religious sects and for the Jewish group, and is based largely upon adult male membership rather than upon religious affiliation or attendance at religious institutions, has been of little value in presenting official information on numbers of Jews. For example, the 1916 report lists 357,135 for the membership of Jewish religious institutions; in 1926 the number of Jews in the Census of Religious Bodies is given as 4,081,242, the total estimate of Jewish population obtained by other methods being substituted for the count of religious memberships previously obtained.

The method of computing local Jewish population estimates from the published data on Yiddish mother tongue presents its own type of difficulty. The assumption has been made that there is an approximately constant ratio between

this item and the total Jewish population differing somewhat as between the Eastern seaboard with a greater proportion of immigrants and the Middle West with a larger native born population. Taking the 1930 data on Yiddish foreign born and the 1927 estimates of Jewish population we get the following variations: for the seaboard cities of Baltimore, Boston, Jersey City, Newark, New York, Philadelphia and Providence, the Yiddish foreign born were from 24.0% (Jersey City) to 38.8% (Boston) of the estimated Jewish populations; for the Middle West cities of Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Detroit, Indianapolis, Milwaukee and Pittsburgh, the percentage varied from 11.6% (Indianapolis) to 34.4% (Detroit); in the far West cities of Denver, Kansas City, Omaha and St. Louis, percentages varied from 17.2% to 22.3% and in the Pacific cities—Los Angeles 30.3%, Oakland 12.4%, San Francisco 10.2%, and Seattle 15.1%.

It, therefore, is evident that there is either no approximately identical ratio of Yiddish foreign born to total Jewish population in a given area or region in this country or our Jewish population estimates of population are faulty, or more likely both factors are involved.

The reasons for opposition to the inclusion of an item on religious affiliation in the federal census of population are not clear. The explanation has been given that because of the separation of church and state and that the government is not concerned with matters of religion. If this is valid, there would appear to be no logic in the official Census of Religious Bodies which the government has definitely undertaken for many years. The question of religious affiliation cannot be considered too personal a matter for census inquiry since other very personal matters, such as economic and family conditions, are regularly obtained. There is actually little objection to the census questions on the part of the public since it is generally recognized that reports are published in the form of statistical tables, thus completely preserving the anonymity of the individual and that the original census schedules are confidential documents.

What, then, are the underlying reasons for a lack of willingness on the part of Jewish groups and individuals to request the inclusion of the religious item in the census in order that definite statistical data on Jewish population may be obtained? The facts of the number of Jews, the geographical distribution, age classification, and family status, are not matters arousing controversial opinion. The same national Jewish agencies whose leaders have been foremost in opposing government statistics have been most assiduous in supplying privately this type of information and making it available for general distribution. The reason for the lack of religious affiliation in the census data is perhaps bound up with the fear that such information may furnish the basis for invidious comparisons and prejudiced interpretations.

If we were to make requests to the U. S. Census Bureau for the inclusion of some item in the census blank whereby Jews could be identified, we should need to decide whether the distinguishing item should be religious affiliation or race grouping. Either item would involve considerable difficulty. Religious affiliation can be more accurately defined and is, therefore, more satisfactory as a basis of enumeration. An argument could be made out that the Jewish group is not confined to those who profess a Jewish faith, that there are likely to be large numbers who will not identify themselves as Jews religiously, and that the enumeration would be incomplete for this reason. A classification by race would, however, present even greater difficulties. The Canada census definition of race is scarcely valid on scientific grounds and is largely related to national origins except for Hebrews, Negroes, Indians, Chinese, and a few other groups. In this country, for a comprehensive classification on race, we would be forced to divide the population into Americans as including all those white immigrants who have lost track of their European origin or who have a very mixed European origin. At present the U. S. Census already classifies individuals into races, Negroes, Indians, Asiatics, etc., but lumps all white together as either native born or foreign born. The foreign born groups are divided on the basis of country of origin which is approximately that of the Canadian "racial" classification for these groups. In order, therefore, to segregate Jews in the census, it would be necessary to add a special racial classification, Jews or Hebrews, which would hardly be desirable or in accordance with scientific knowledge. Whatever the Jews may be as a human group they are distinctly not a race. It would mean that the native white population would largely be divided into American and Jews. This is a distinction which many Jews would not desire to have made since native Jews are as entitled to the American racial classification as the rest of the native white population.

The Jewish religious affiliation, as in the case of Yiddish mother tongue, will not give us a total enumeration of all those who have some Jewish background, interest or affiliation. It will not include all individuals who have had at least one Jewish grandmother but it will provide us with a solid body of facts from which rates of geographical distribution, citizenship, age and sex distribution, size of family, occupational data and other useful information essential for general studies of the social problems of Jews may be obtained. There is no guarantee, however, that the inclusion of the item of religious affiliation will necessarily produce tables on these factors since the Census Bureau may not engage in the cost involved in preparing these special tables and might limit itself to presenting crude population data as to the number of Jews and their distribution in the United States. There is an analogy with the present item on mother

tongue. In spite of the fact that considerable detailed tables could be prepared for individuals included under this item for age and sex distribution, occupational data, family data, etc., such tabulations to my knowledge, have not been made by the U. S. Census Bureau and their preparation would require voluntary funds to defray the cost of such tabulation.

If in the United States we do not succeed in having a census enumeration of Jews, it is far better to restrain our research ambitions to make statistical comparisons of Jews with non-Jews on the basis of meager, inadequate and incomplete data which have thus far been produced by private research bureaus and individuals. The existing comparisons on death rates, delinquency, dependency, mental diseases, occupations and other items, need to be heavily discounted. In my opinion it is preferable to have no Jewish statistics or other quantitative measurements in this country than to

labor earnestly, but mistakenly, on studies of dubious scientific value which result from employing our present inadequate Jewish population data.

Although it would not be desirable or practical to engage in a thoroughgoing and nation-wide collection of Jewish population data under voluntary auspices, there is need for a central service on Jewish population data. Such a service might engage in the continuing process of collecting local estimates, advising with local groups on methods of population study, reviewing, analyzing and interpreting the data which are produced and acting at all times as a brake upon the inexact and incorrect use of the available information. A service of this nature might be made available at a reasonable cost and could be incorporated in a central research service on Jewish problems.

Selected Bibliography

JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA, 1906; Vol. XII; United States Statistics, page 370 (J. Jacobs).

THE JEWS IN THE UNITED STATES, A Study of Their Number and Distribution, Harry S. Linfield; 1927; 107 pages; published by American Jewish Committee.

JEWISH POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, Memoir of the Bureau of Jewish Statistics of the American Jewish Committee, Joseph Jacobs; American Jewish Year Book 1914-1915 (5675), pages 339-378.

THE JEWISH POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, Samson D. Oppenheim; American Jewish Year Book, 1918-1919 (5679), pages 2-74.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY; No. 19, 1910; The U. S. Census Bureau's Estimate of Jewish Population of 1790; page 178.

THE JEWISH POPULATION OF CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, Charles S. Bernheimer; The Jewish Social Service Quarterly, December 1925, Vol. II, No. 2, pages 111-115.

PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF 11TH CENSUS, 1890; (Vital Statistics of the Jews in the United States, J. S. Billings); United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Bulletin No. 19.

RELIGIOUS BODIES, Separate Denominations, 1926; United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Vol. II, Jewish Congregations, pages 645-668.

MOTHER TONGUE OF THE FOREIGN BORN WHITE POPULATION, Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930; United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

A STATISTICAL STUDY OF THE JEWISH POPULATION OF NEW YORK CITY, Alexander M. Dushkin; The Jewish Communal Register, 1917-1918, pages 75-89; published by Kehillah (Jewish Community) of New York City.

THE JEWISH POPULATION OF MARYLAND, Geo. E. Barnett; American Jewish Year Book, 1902-1903 (5663), pages 46-62.

JEWISH POPULATION OF CHICAGO, 1931; mimeographed pamphlet, 21 pages, published by Jewish Charities of Chicago.

THE TREND OF JEWISH POPULATION IN BOSTON, A Study to Determine the Location of a Jewish Communal Building, Ben Rosen; printed pamphlet, 27 pages; 1921; Monograph of Federated Jewish Charities of Boston.

POPULATION SECTIONS OF SURVEYS OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES, by Bureau of Jewish Social Research.

POPULATION STUDIES AND ESTIMATES, of the Jewish Welfare Board.

THE NEED FOR JEWISH POPULATION STATISTICS, Uriah Zevi Engelmann; The Menorah Journal, November 1927; Vol. XIII, No. 5, pages 464-479.

A SOCIETY FOR JEWISH STATISTICS, Uriah Zevi Engelmann; The Menorah Journal, April 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 4, pages 385-387.

JEWISH MIGRATIONS IN THE LAST TWENTY-FIVE YEARS, Jacob Leschinsky; 1927, Berlin; 87 pages (in Yiddish).

STUDIES IN ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS, Jacob Leschinsky; published by Yiddish Scientific Institute, Berlin, 1928, Vol. I (in Yiddish).

JOURNAL OF JEWISH DEMOGRAPHY, STATISTICS AND ECONOMICS, Jacob Leschinsky, Professor B. Brutkus, Dr. Jacob Segall; 1924 (in Yiddish).

A CENTURY'S CHANGES IN JEWISH NUMBERS AND OCCUPATIONS, Jacob Leschinsky; The Menorah Journal, July-September 1932, Vol. XX, No. 2, pages 174-179.

THE DECLINE OF JEWISH POPULATION DENSITY IN EUROPE, Uriah Zevi Engelmann; Social Forces, December 1933, pages 244-247.

Salaries in Jewish Family Case Work Agencies in March, 1934

By RALPH G. HURLIN

Director, Department of Statistics, Russell Sage Foundation

DURING the past ten years, the Department of Statistics of the Russell Sage Foundation has made a series of studies at intervals of about two years for the purpose of tracing salary changes in family case work agencies. One of these studies is now under way. Data were requested at the beginning of April concerning salaries paid during March of this year. As in previous studies, effort has been made to include this year all Jewish family welfare agencies listed as such by the Bureau of Jewish Social Research and all member agencies of the Family Welfare Association of

America. In addition, in the current study data have been obtained from selected Catholic and public family agencies, which while not numerous enough to be necessarily representative will give some basis for comparison of salaries in these two increasingly important divisions of the family case work field.

We are able to report in general much more prompt response to the request for data this year than in the past. Of the Jewish agencies, all of the larger ones supplied information within a few weeks of our request and the sched-

TABLE 1—MEDIAN, QUARTILE AND EXTREME SALARIES FOR THE MORE COMMON NON-CLERICAL POSITIONS IN 44 JEWISH FAMILY CASE WORK AGENCIES, IN MARCH, 1934, BY SIZE OF ORGANIZATION

Position and size of organization	Number of organizations represented	Number of workers included	ANNUAL SALARIES			
			Lowest	Lower quartile	Median	Upper quartile
<i>Executives</i>						
Under 4 workers	14	14	\$ 960	\$1,320	\$1,710	\$2,160
4 or 5 workers	5	5	1,800	2,544	3,564
6 to 9 workers	3	3	2,790
10 to 19 workers	4	4	1,800	2,484	4,200
20 to 49 workers	4	4	3,120	3,924	5,400
50 or more workers	3	3	7,500
<i>Assistant executives in charge of family case work</i>						
50 or more workers	2	2	3,888
<i>Case work supervisors</i>						
6 to 9 workers	1	1	1,440
10 to 19 workers	4	4	1,200	2,400	2,700
20 to 49 workers	5	5	1,884	2,544	2,820
50 or more workers	3	3	2,640	2,976	3,000
<i>District secretaries</i>						
20 to 49 workers	4	11	1,452	1,611	1,776	1,974
50 or more workers	3	18	2,100	2,280	2,592	3,000
<i>Case workers</i>						
Under 4 workers	8	10	900	1,032	1,080	1,320
4 or 5 workers	5	8	852	1,182	1,500
6 to 9 workers	4	7	900	1,200	1,800
10 to 19 workers	8	36	864	1,107	1,356	1,494
20 to 49 workers	6	60	960	1,200	1,446	1,572
50 or more workers	3	119	1,440	1,680	1,800	1,905
<i>Case workers in training</i>						
4 or 5 workers	1	1	900
20 to 49 workers	3	18	840	900	996	1,164
						1,368