

https://dspace.org/

The Jewish day school matriculate

Kark, Gertrude

2015-04-23
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/17522

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

In the second chi-square analysis, the class of University Exemption Certificate was examined (with the High School Leaving Certificate candidates eliminated from the calculation). Again, no significant difference was found. $X^2 = 4.73$, d.f. 3 $P > 0.05$ N/S.

In his concluding analysis, Land (1966 p. 107) gives his comparative findings of his KDHS and Control Group pupils. He finds that although both schools did very well in the examinations, the results of the two schools differ at the 1% level, showing the KDHS results as being significantly above those of the other school. Yet the analysis of the material collected from both groups did not provide any explanation for the difference. "Both groups were highly motivated and there were no factors influencing either group to the extent that the one would achieve results that were significantly better than the other group". His conclusion is that the KDHS matriculate "reacted far more strongly under the influence of the motivating forces and has thus achieved better results..." From all this, he summarises "The motivating forces appear to be very largely socio-political and are determined by the past history of the Jew and also by the political and social forces acting on him today".

The present investigator cannot accept Land's conclusions. It is felt that a possible explanation for the excellent KDHS results may be drawn from personal communications and discussions. It was learned that, during the years under investigation, a determined effort was being made by the KDHS authorities to achieve outstanding matriculation results. To this end, scholars who appeared to find it difficult to maintain the school's standards and cope with a seven-subject matriculation examination including Hebrew, were either encouraged by the school authorities to transfer to other schools, or did so of their own volition. It would seem, then, that the drive of the school authorities and of the parents, might well provide the explanation.

iii. Military Training.

The information relating to military training is included at this stage because it affected the year of entry to post-school educational or training establishments for numbers of male members of both the KDHS and Control Groups.

According to information supplied by the Witwatersrand Command of the South African Defence Forces (1970), the ballot system was used for the call-up for compulsory military training of male youths at the age of 17 years during the period 1957 to 1963. Girls are not called upon to undergo military training.

Table 6 (iv) provides an analysis of the male matriculates, showing the numbers who underwent military training.

TABLE 6 (iv). MILITARY TRAINING OF MALE MATRICULATES

GROUP	YES		NO		TOTALS	
KDHS	20	29%	50	71%	70	100%
CONTROL	15	23%	49	77%	64	100%

x^2 = 0.230, d.f. 1 P > 0.05 N/S. After Yates' Correction.

The 'Yes' category includes those who received military training, including training received in Israel. It is noted here that young male immigrants to Israel from South Africa are required to undergo military training there. However, the Government of Israel gives at least partial recognition to the period of training which such immigrants received in South Africa before emigrating.

The chi-square analysis of Table 6 (iv) X^2 = 0.230, d.f., 1 P > 0.05 N/S, shows that there were no significant differences between the two Groups.

It was also found that there were no differences of significance in the comparison of participation by the members of the two Groups of matriculates in the various branches of the South African Defence Forces.

iv. Post- School Training Establishment.

It was to be expected that in a group where so many pupils obtained University Exemption Certificates, large numbers would continue their education. The expectation was, however, exceeded in that of the 226 matriculates involved in this study, only 2 did not continue with any type of educational training, and 1 other failed to respond to this question. The investigator learned that the 1 matriculate did, in fact, embark on a lengthy and intensive type of in-service training in his father's business. In fact, therefore, only 2 of the 226 matriculates had no post- school training whatsoever.

It is now important to compare the types of post-school education or training the KDHS and Control Group matriculates chose in order to fit themselves for their adult lives within the general and Jewish communities. Such a comparison should test the first part of the hypothesis on which this study is based. This part of the hypothesis postulated that the standard of general education provided by KDHS would be higher than that provided by the Control Group schools. Table 6 (v) reproduced on page 47 and entitled "Post-School Training Establishment" gives the complete analysis.

From Table 6 (v) it can be seen that, of the very small number of matriculates who did not go to university, 8 KDHS and 18 Control Group studied at technical institutes. Four KDHS females and 1 male and 1 Control Group female attended the Hebrew Teachers' Seminary to become Hebrew teachers; 4 KDHS and 1 Control Group females enrolled at the Johannesburg College of Education to train as primary school teachers, and 1 female in each Group undertook training to become nursery school teachers.

TABLE 6 (v). POST-SCHOOL TRAINING ESTABLISHMENT.

GROUP	UNIVERSITY		TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTION			TECHNICAL TRAINING ***	NONE	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
	SOUTH AFRICA *	OVERSEAS	C.O.E. ****	NURSERY SCHOOL	H.T.S. **				
KDHS m	61 87%	5 7%	0	0	1 1.5%	2 3%	0	1 1.5%	70 100%
KDHS f	21 52.5%	4 10%	5 12.5%	1 2.5%	3 7.5%	6 15%	0	0	40 100%
Control m	52 81%	1 2%	0	0	0	10 15%	1 2%	0	64 100%
Control f	40 77%	0	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	8 15%	1 2%	0	52 100%

* South African University - includes academic degree plus Transvaal Teachers' Higher Diploma (T.T.H.D.)

** H.T.S. - Hebrew Teachers' Seminary Diploma, including 1 KDHS male and 1 Control female who continued with a post-diploma one-year course in Jerusalem.

**** College of Education including only those without academic status (see *)

*** Technical Training - includes Pharmacy, Optometry, Shorthand-typing, Book-keeping, Apprenticeship in Engineering, Institute of Actuaries (AIA), Textile Engineering, Computer Careers, C.I.S., O.K. Bazaars Business Management, Insurance Institute, Night School at Zionist Organisation of America House (ZOA) to become a guide in Israel.

Analysis of university and non-university enrolment shows a chi-square value, after Yates Correction had been applied, of 0.398, d.f. 1 P > 0.05 N/S. In other words, there is no difference of significance between the KDHS and Control Groups in this regard.

Turning now to a comparison of the extent of academic achievements of those who enrolled at a university, the matriculates' replies have been placed in three groups, namely, those who did not complete any academic course; those who achieved a first degree, and those who achieved higher (that is, a status higher than that of a first degree) or professional status. Included in the figures in this latter category are those matriculates who, at the time of completing the questionnaire, were in their final year of study or awaiting their final examination results. Their results were subsequently verified. Table 6(vi) entitled "Extent of Academic Achievements" sets out the analysis of the replies in the terms described.

TABLE 6 (vi). EXTENT OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENTS.

GROUP	NONE	FIRST DEGREE	HIGHER/PROFESSIONAL STATUS	TOTAL ENROLMENT
KDHS	15 16%	8 9%	68 75%	91 100%
CONTROL	15 16%	13 14%	67 70%	95 100%

X^2 = 1.082, d.f. 2, P > 0.05 N/S.

It is to be noted that 16% of those who enrolled at a university from both the KDHS and Control Groups, did not complete a degree course. It is also worthy of note that percentages as high as 70 in the case of the Control Group and 75 in the KDHS Group, continued their academic studies after obtaining a first degree.

(v) Matriculates' Occupations (1968).

Having shown that the great majority of matriculates continued their education at a university, it was to be expected that most of them, with the exception of those who were occupied as housewives and mothers, would be found to be engaged in professional work. Their responses to the relevant question were classified in terms of the Standard Classification of Occupations published by the International Labour Office in Geneva, in 1958, as shown in Table 6 (vii) (a).

TABLE 6 (vii) (a). MATRICULATES' OCCUPATIONS (1968).

OCCUPATIONAL GROUP		KDHS (110)		CONTROL GROUP (116)	
Professional Workers:					
Accountant/Auditor		7		6	
Research Worker		1		4	
Engineer		5		0	
Medical Practitioner		11		10	
Dental Surgeon		1		1	
Pharmacist/Optometrist		0		2	
Veterinary Surgeon		2		1	
Actuary		1		1	
Teacher/Lecturer		9		9	
Barrister/Lawyer		2		6	
Journalist		2		1	
Librarian		1		1	
Social Worker		2		0	
Physiotherapist		0		2	
Psychotherapist		0		1	
Media Planner		0		1	
	Sub-Total		44		46
Administrative, Technical and Related Workers:					
Director of Companies		10		6	
Manager		0		12	
	Sub-Total		10		18
Clerical Workers:					
Clerks		2		2	
Typists		2		0	
	Sub-Total		4		2
Sales Workers:		2		2	
Farmers, etc.:		1		0	
Service, etc. Workers:		1		0	
	Sub-Total		4		2
	TOTALS:		62		68
Housewives		21		37	
Students		24		9	
Unemployed		2		2	
N/R		1		0	
	TOTALS:		110		116

From Table 6 (vii) (a) a composite picture of the Occupational Groups is given in Table 6 (vii) (b). For this purpose the respondents were divided into 2 major groups of 'Professional' and 'Other' workers. The housewives, students, unemployed and 'No Response' groups were excluded from the analysis to which Yates Correction was applied.

TABLE 6 (vii) (b). MATRICULATES' OCCUPATIONS (1968).

GROUP	PROFESSIONAL	OTHER	TOTALS
KDHS	44 71%	18 29%	62 100%
Control	46 68%	22 32%	68 100%

X^2 = 0.047, d.f. 1 N/S.

Twentyone KDHS and 37 Control Group females were occupied in running their homes at the time of completion of the questionnaire and were not occupied in the work for which they had had post-school training. It is interesting to note, nevertheless, what post-school training these women had undertaken in order to prepare themselves for occupations other than that of housewife. Table 6 (viii)(a) reproduced on page 52 shows the distribution of their qualifications.

In Table 6 (viii) (b) the distribution shown in Table 6(viii)(a) is analysed under the headings 'Academic/Professional', 'Other' and 'None', and shows a chi-square of 0.106, d.f.2 P$\nearrow$ 0.05 N/S.

TABLE 6 (viii) (b). QUALIFICATIONS OF MATRICULATE HOUSEWIVES

GROUP	ACADEMIC/ PROFESSIONAL	OTHER	NONE	TOTAL
KDHS	13 62%	6 29%	2 9%	21 100%
Control	22 59%	12 32%	3 9%	37 100%

X^2 = 0.106 d.f.2 P$\nearrow$ 0.05 N/S.

TABLE 6 (viii)(a). QUALIFICATIONS OF MATRICULATE 'HOUSEWIVES

QUALIFICATION	KDHS (21)	CONTROL (37)
Bachelor of Arts	3	5
Bachelor of Commerce	1	0
Teacher	9	6
Secretary/Typist/Clerk	5	8
Orthodontic Nurse	1	
Medical Practitioner	0	2
Bachelor of Arts (Hons)	0	4
Master of Arts	0	2
Bachelor of Arts, L.T.C.L.	0	1
Pharmacist	0	2
Physiotherapist	0	2
Comptometer Planner	0	1
Diplomas (Law, French, Librarianship)	0	4
No qualifications	2	3

In conversation with a cross-section of the female matriculates of both Groups, the impression was gained that many were already planning, if not actually studying, for higher qualifications or different degrees. Several expressed the intention of returning to employment as soon as their families were complete and old enough for them to do so.

(vi) Conclusions.

In the early part of this chapter, there was discussion of Land's (1968) findings, the greatest attention being paid to his finding that the matriculation results of his KDHS and Northview Groups showed a significant difference. By contrast, the present

study has shown that no significant difference was to be found in regard to the matriculation results of the KDHS and Control Groups. Nor were subsequent differences relating to military training; university or other enrolment; extent of academic achievements or occupations, found to be of significant difference.

In other words, analysis of the responses to these matters by the 110 KDHS matriculates of the years 1956 to 1962 inclusive and of the 116 matriculates of the Control Group showed no differences of significance. Consequently, the section of the first part of the hypothesis enunciated on page 36, which refers to the high standards of general education of the KDHS matriculates, must be abandoned.

The second section of the first part of the hypothesis relates to Jewish education and Jewish values. Attention turns now, in chapter 7, to these matters.

- - - - -

CHAPTER 7. JEWISH EDUCATION.

The replies of the matriculates to the questions relating to their Jewish studies will be examined in this chapter. The historical and traditional backgrounds of Jewish studies are essential elements in such an examination; in fact, analysis of current studies is comprehensible only in relation to the past.

Evidence of the importance which has always been attached to Jewish education can be found throughout the literature from the earliest times. Josephus, who lived from the year 37 to the year 100 C.E., stressed the tremendous importance of the education of the children: "Our principal care of all is this, to educate our children well, and we think it to be the most necessary business of our whole life, to observe the laws that have been given us, and to keep those rules of piety that have been delivered down to us". (From "Flavius Josephus Complete Works" trans. William Whiston 1964, p. 610 Book I v.12). Another early example features in a tractate (volume) of the Talmud (200 C.E.); "Jewish Education occupies an unique position in Jewish life. The study of Torah ..." (which includes the Pentateuch, Prophets, Sacred Writings, Talmud, Rabbinic commentaries and other religious writings)..."is a cardinal principle of the Jewish faith", (peah a).

Emphasis on the need for education has continued through successive generations. Education stands second only to defence in Israel's priorities today, and, as stated previously, it is a major preoccupation of Diaspora Jewish communities in this second half of the twentieth century. Currently, the suggestion is often made that Jewish parents strive for the best possible general education of their children in order to provide them with physical and economic security. This may well be so, but without doubt the importance of education, both Jewish and secular as a good in itself, has long been highly valued by the Jewish people.

i. Barmitzvah/Batmitzvah Ceremonies.

The Barmitzvah ceremony (see Appendix V p.152, Appendix VII p.156) constitutes a crucial phase in the life of the Jewish boy. Bar Mitzvah ("Son of the Commandment") is defined by Roth (1959) as the "ceremony marking the initiation of a boy at the age of 13 into the Jewish religious community and into observance of the precepts of the Torah". Roth is of the opinion that the ceremony may have been in practice much earlier than the first specific reference to it in the 13th century. The keynote of the ceremony is the reading of the relevant portion of the Law in the synagogue by the celebrant on the Sabbath nearest to his thirteenth birth date. This follows his father's reading of a blessing in which he thanks God for freeing him from legal responsibility for his child's actions. The first laying, or wearing of the Tephillin (i.e. Phylacteries) is a part of the ceremony. According to Roth (1959) the Tephillin are "two black leather boxes fastened to leather straps, containing four portions of the Pentateuch written on parchment. (Exod. 13: 1-16; Deut. 6:4-9; 11; 13-21). They are bound ("laid") on the arm and the head (Deut. 6:8)". The regular "laying" of the Tephillin becomes a religious obligation for all males after their Barmitzvah. The practice is carried out with morning prayers except those on the Sabbath and Holy Festival days.

Reform Judaism conducts a similar Barmitzvah ceremony for boys. It also introduced the concept of the Batmitzvah ceremony for girls at about the age of twelve years. This differs radically from that of the Barmitzvah, the keynote being the preparation of the girls for the setting up and maintaining of 'proper' Jewish homes. (See Appendix VI p.154 and Appendix VII p.156). The Batmitzvah rapidly became a highly successful social event, and, in recent years, was accepted into the ceremonial of some orthodox congregations. In fact, both Barmitzvah and Batmitzvah ceremonies have such a strong social overlay that they do not necessarily give an indication of the extent of religious observance, if any, on the part of the celebrant or the family. Social pressures of themselves appear to be strong enough to ensure that almost all Jewish boys and ever-increasing numbers of girls, participate in the ceremonies.

The syllabuses of the Barmitzvah and Batmitzvah ceremonies of the United Hebrew Institutions of Johannesburg and of the United Progressive Hebrew Schools of Johannesburg, will be found in the Appendices referred to above. The length of training for the ceremonies is not prescribed and varies considerably. One hour classes twice weekly for about one year, seem to be regarded by most congregations as necessary to provide the minimum required knowledge and training.

It may be of interest to compare the concept and the preparation for and programme of these ceremonies with those of other religious denominations. Appendix VIII (p.157) contains the information relating to the Dutch Reformed Church; Appendix IX (p.158) relating to the Presbyterian Church and Appendix X (p.159) relating to the Roman Catholic Church. The fundamental concept which all the above denominations have in common is that the acceptance or initiation of the young person brings full membership and rights of the relevant religious bodies, and preparation for conducting their own homes and lives in the spirit and the manner prescribed by their religions. The Jewish congregations introduce their children to full membership at an earlier age than the Christian groups and their ceremonies are more formal than the others, with the young people actually participating in the services.

There are obviously, differences in the abilities of the individuals who train boys and girls for these ceremonies, and in the motivations of the pupils themselves. The home attitudes and the expectations of parents who enrol their children for training also vary. Nevertheless, it can be argued that the Barmitzvah and Batmitzvah ceremonies provide Jewish children with a common experience which is designed to help them fit into the Jewish culture which has persisted for thousands of years despite the vicissitudes of Jewish history, anti-semitism, nazism and assimilation. Jewish culture is not something that is inherited. It has to be learned, and the participation of the child on the verge of adolescence in the religeo-social ceremony, is his introduction to it and to the modification of his attitudes. It marks a major change in his acculturation as a full member of the Jewish community.

For the purposes of the present study, it has been assumed that all the male matriculates received instruction for the Barmitzvah ceremony. It is very unlikely, however, that all the girls undertook the Barmitzvah ceremony.

It was considered to be important to discover whether the matriculates took advantage of the opportunities of this minimal introduction, to study Jewish education and culture any further. This called for consideration of their post-Batmitzvah or Barmitzvah Jewish studies. One of the basic purposes of the KDHS is to stimulate and foster continuous Jewish studies. The school's matriculates in this investigation had had 5 years of instruction in addition to such tuition as they may have had before entering the high school. The Control Group, on the other hand, had to acquire their instruction out of school hours by means of private tuition or part-time classes. The essential analysis of post-Batmitzvah or Barmitzvah Jewish studies must, therefore, be done in two sections. Consideration must be given to the instruction given at KDHS and secondly, to the more informal voluntary courses which were available for the Control Group matriculates.

ii. The School Years.

The official Jewish studies syllabus of the KDHS (Appendix XI p.161) was taught from Standard 6 up to matriculation level, giving the pupils 5 years of tuition in the relevant subjects, apart from any instruction they may have had in their primary school days. Jewish studies was a compulsory matriculation subject, and very few scholars were exempted from it. In fact, between 1955 and 1960, children who had had no previous instruction in the Hebrew language or the subjects included in 'Jewish Studies' were not admitted to the school in Standard VI. During 1961 and 1962, such children were able to gain admission if it was thought that they would be able to qualify to take Hebrew as a matriculation subject.

The content of Jewish studies for the Control Group matriculates who either had private tuition or were enrolled in part-time classes conducted under the aegis of the Board, is not as readily available. In fact, their programme depended almost entirely upon their individual teachers. Local Jewish educationists were consulted as to the best way of dealing with the problem of assessing the material taught and the standards achieved. On the advice of these educationists, Jewish history, Religious Thought, The Bible, Jewish Literature, Zionism and Hebrew Language were listed as the six divisions comprising Jewish studies for the purposes of this investigation.

The question now arises whether the members of the Control Group did continue their Jewish education after completing their Batmitzvah or Barmitzvah training. Table 7 (i) shows the numbers and proportions who did so.

TABLE 7 (i). JEWISH STUDIES WHILE AT SCHOOL POST BARMITZVAH / BATMITZVAH

CONTROL GROUP

SEX	YES	NO	TOTALS
Male	24 38%	40 62%	64 100%
Female	22 42%	30 58%	52 100%

$\chi^2 = 0.228$, d.f. 1, $P > 0.05$ N/S

There is no significant difference between the numbers of males and females. The important observations are that the majority of males (62%) and females (58%) did not continue Jewish studies, and that a slightly higher percentage of females than males continued these studies. This is unexpected and may be explained in terms of the probability that the girls intended to study Hebrew as a qualifying subject for a university degree of Bachelor of Arts, or that they were planning to enrol at the Hebrew Teachers' Seminary to train as Hebrew teachers.

Information was available on the length of time the Control Group continued their Jewish studies while still at school and this is given in Table 7 (ii).

TABLE 7 (ii). NUMBER OF YEARS OF POST-BAR/BATMITZVAH JEWISH STUDIES WHILE STILL AT SCHOOL (CONTROL GROUP)

SEX	LESS THAN 2 YEARS	2-3 YEARS	4-5 YEARS	TOTALS
Male	5 21%	12 50%	7 29%	24 100%
Female	4 17%	2 13%	16 70%	22 100%

It is noted that 50% of the males studied for a further 2 to 3 years and 29% for 4 to 5 years. By contrast, 13% of the females continued for 2 to 3 years, whereas 70% did so for 4 to 5 years. This suggests that the greater interest of the females as revealed in Table 7 (i) was parallelled by the longer time they were prepared to spend on these studies by comparison with the males.

The matriculates were also asked to indicate the kind of studies that they followed. As the numbers involved were fairly small, the responses were combined into three categories, as shown in Table 7 (iii). It can be seen that the majority combined further work in Hebrew language with other aspects of Jewish culture and religion. Those who did no language work at all, were very few in number.

TABLE 7 (iii). HEBREW LANGUAGE AND OTHER JEWISH SUBJECTS. CONTROL GROUP.

SEX	HEBREW LANGUAGE ONLY	LANGUAGE AND OTHER ASPECTS	JEWISH STUDIES EXCLUDING HEBREW	TOTALS
Male	9 37%	13 54%	2 9%	24 100%
Female	5 22%	17 74%	0	22 100%

It is observed that more than 50% of the males and almost 75% of the females included all the subjects listed in Jewish studies in the courses. Thirty-seven percent of the males and 22% females concentrated on language study, whereas no more than 9% of the males and 4% of the females excluded the Hebrew language from their courses.

Those matriculates who did not continue with Jewish studies after completing the Barmitzvah or Batmitzvah ceremony, were asked to give their reasons for stopping. Twentyfive males and 11 females declared that they were not interested, while 6 members of each Group gave no reason. Nine of each sex indicated that such studies were not available to them, while 5 males and 3 females said they had no time because of conflicting interests. Two males and 4 females

suggested that they had not been stimulated at home to wish to continue with their studies. From several conversations, the investigator gained the impression that some scholars would have continued had they been able to do so on their school premises. It must be borne in mind that those Control Group matriculates who continued their Jewish education after Batmitzvah or Barmitzvah, were confronted with difficulties which did not apply to the KDHS pupils whose Jewish studies were a part of their daily school programme. These difficulties affected not only their out-of-school activities, but were manifested, it would appear, in lower standards of attainment.

iii. Post-School Jewish Education.

The next matter for consideration is a comparison of the extent to which the KDHS and Control Groups continued their Jewish education after matriculation. This comparison is shown in Table 7 (iv).

TABLE 7 (iv). POST-SCHOOL JEWISH EDUCATION.

GROUP	NO	YES	TOTALS
KDHS	47 43%	63 57%	110 100%
Control	67 57%	49 43%	116 100%

X^2 = 2.186, d.f. 1, P > 0.05 N/S. after Yates Correction.

The important finding here is the lack of significant difference between the KDHS and Control Groups. Fifty-seven percent of the Control Group as against 43% KDHS had no formal post-school Jewish education. It is of particular importance to note the high percentage of KDHS matriculates who dropped all Jewish studies after completing the matriculation examination. This raises the question of how successful the KDHS was, in fact, in achieving its objective of laying the foundations for the continuation of Jewish studies and practices. It would seem that, although the KDHS matriculates

continued such studies throughout their school years, no more than 57% were sufficiently interested or stimulated to include them in their post-school programme of education. The conclusion must, then, be reached that the success achieved by KDHS in this matter, was limited to the facts that all its pupils continued to the matriculation level, and that 57% continued further.

A comparative analysis of the relationship between post-Barmitzvah/Batmitzvah and post-school Jewish education was done in order to ascertain whether there was any difference of significance between the KDHS and Control Groups' continuity of this aspect of their education. The findings are shown in Table 7 (v).

TABLE 7 (v). POST-BAT/BARMITZVAH AND POST-SCHOOL JEWISH EDUCATION.

CATEGORY	KDHS		CONTROL GROUP	
Post-Bat/Barmitzvah and post-school	63	57%	32	28%
Post-Bat/Barmitzvah and no post-school	47	43%	14	12%

X^2 = 2.608, d.f. 1. P > 0.05 N/S. after Yates Correction.

Table 7 (v) includes 110 or 100% KDHS matriculates but only 46 or 40% of the Control Group. The reason for this is that not all members of the Control Group had post-Bat/Barmitzvah Jewish education. In fact, 17 members of the Group or 15% had a break in their Jewish studies after Bat/Barmitzvah, and then carried on again after matriculating. Fourteen or 12% continued their Jewish studies whilst they were still at school and then terminated them. The balance of 39 or 45% had no Jewish education at all after their Bat/Barmitzvah training.

Referring back to Table 7 (v), attention is drawn to the fact that, whereas this Table refers to participation in Jewish studies programmes, there is no reference to the content or quality of such programmes. Nevertheless, the total picture shows that 43% of the Control Group did concern themselves with the study of

Jewish subjects after matriculating, by comparison with 57% of the KDHS matriculates.

The number of years of post-school Jewish education is shown in Table 7 (vi). The periods 1 to 3 years and 4 to 5 years were combined in order to permit of chi-square analysis.

TABLE 7 (vi). NUMBER OF YEARS OF POST-SCHOOL JEWISH EDUCATION.

GROUP	NONE	1 - 3 YEARS	4 - 5 YEARS	TOTALS
KDHS m	35 50%	22 31%	13 19%	70 100%
KDHS f	12 30%	17 43%	11 27%	40 100%
Control m	35 55%	18 28%	11 17%	64 100%
Control f	27 52%	15 29%	10 19%	52 100%

$X^2 = 6.823$, d.f. 6., $P > 0.05$ N/S.

It is found that there is no significant difference between the returns of the KDHS and Control Groups in connection with the number of years spent on post-school Jewish studies. Again, it is the absence of any significant difference that is significant.

Had the KDHS exercised an important influence on its pupils, it would have been reasonable to expect that a much higher proportion of its matriculates than those of the Control Group would have continued their Jewish education after matriculating. As this was not the case, other possible influences on those matriculates who continued, both KDHS and Control Group members, require consideration. A major influence may well have been parental example or influence. However, sufficient material to permit of assessment of parental influence was not available. The other major influence was probably the development and progress of the State of Israel. This progress led to an enhanced self-respect and status of almost every South African Jew and created among a considerable number of them, a desire for more Jewish knowledge, including the study of Hebrew. The close personal and

family relationships that were established with Israel, and the rapid development of study and holiday facilities in Israel, all contributed to strengthening the desire for a greater awareness of things Jewish.

Israel's progress and academic advancement have, in fact, exercised an influence on scholarship in South Africa. Personal interviews with matriculates demonstrated that the published findings in archaeological research, investigations into the early history of the Middle East, the social anthropology of the different immigrant groups, sociological studies and studies relating to integration of people from different socio-economic and cultural levels, and other like studies, have stimulated comparable studies in South Africa. Interest in a wide range of subjects related to the past and present life of the peoples of Israel has encouraged study tours, under academic leadership, to that country.

There is a further aspect of post-school studies which does reflect positively on the value of the KDHS influence. Children attending the King David School brought home something of the spirit and character of the school, and this exercised an influence on some parents. This fact was established from personal contacts with parents who had been stimulated by their children to take up Jewish studies. These, then, are among the important influences stimulating post-school and continuing studies of Jewish life, thought and language.

The venues of post-school Jewish education were considered with a view to ascertaining the nature and quality of such education. The findings are shown in Table 7 (vii).

TABLE 7 (vii). VENUE OF POST-SCHOOL JEWISH EDUCATION.

GROUP	FORMAL		INFORMAL				TOTALS	
	HEBREW SEMINARY	UNIVERSITY	COURSE/ DISCUSSION GROUP	SELF-STUDY	OTHER			
KDHS m	1 3%	4 11%	6 17%	16 46%	8 23%		35	100%
KDHS f	4 14%	6 21%	7 25%	6 21%	5 19%		28	100%
Control m	0 0%	0 0%	3 11%	21 72%	5 17%		29	100%
Control f	1 4%	6 24%	2 8%	9 36%	7 28%		25	100%

It is reasonable to assume that the instruction provided in formal institutions such as seminaries and universities, would be more serious than in the odd courses or discussion groups or by studying on one's own. It is noted in Table 7 (vii) that the majority of KDHS and Control Group matriculates pursued their post-school Jewish education through informal channels, whereas much smaller numbers enrolled for such studies in the more formal institutions. This finding leads to considerable doubt as to the total value of the post-school Jewish education of both the Control and the KDHS Groups.

It will be recalled that one of the important reasons which stimulated the establishment of the South African Board of Jewish Education and the Day School Movement, was the need to make provision for the training of teachers of Jewish subjects. Table 7 (vii) reveals that very few matriculates attended the Teachers' Training course at the Hebrew Seminary. This appears to indicate that KDHS was not very successful in promoting Hebrew teaching as a career. Those matriculates who studied Hebrew at university did so as part of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts.

iv. Reasons For No Post-School Jewish Studies.

In Table 7 (iv) it was shown that 43% KDHS and 57% Control Group matriculates did not continue Jewish studies after leaving school. It should be interesting to find the reasons why they did not do so. Table 7 (viii) gives the analysis of the replies to this question.

TABLE 7 (viii). REASONS FOR NO POST-SCHOOL JEWISH STUDIES

GROUP	NO TIME		NO INTEREST/MOTIVATION		TOTALS	
KDHS m	15	40.5%	22	59.5%	37	100%
KDHS f	7	47%	8	53%	15	100%
Control m	8	21%	30	79%	38	100%
Control f	5	33%	10	67%	15	100%

$X^2 = 4.65$, d.f. 3. $P > 0.05$ N/S.

It can be seen that there was no significant difference between the two Groups in their reasons for not continuing Jewish studies post-school. It can also be seen that for all four Groups the lack of interest or motivation was a frequent response.

The important finding here is that for all Groups lack of interest or motivation is high. The reasons given by the KDHS Group for not having the time for Jewish studies were expressed mainly in terms of the fact that they were still busy with their other studies. A few gave as their reason, either that they were fully occupied in business, or that marriage and parenthood left them no time. The reactions of some of the KDHS matriculates, none of whom declared lack of opportunity as their reason for not continuing their studies, are possibly indicative of the frame of mind at the time. Two claimed that their involvement in their Youth Movement occupied their time; one declared that his home life made full provision for his Jewish educational needs; another claimed that he knew "enough to satisfy my personal needs". One stated that "having heard nothing else throughout my youth" he did not want any more, whilst the other blamed bad teaching at the school which had led to his loss of interest and ultimate "complete disillusionment".

(v) Hebrew Language.

Study of the Hebrew language is a most important part of Jewish studies and is included in every consideration of it. In fact, it is felt in some quarters that 'Hebrew' is the only subject of importance in the Jewish studies programme. It is considered in isolation at this stage because language classes, which do not

include specific study of other aspects of Jewish education, are readily available and are supported by large numbers of adults in Johannesburg. Attendance at such classes does, indirectly, bring to the participants some information on Jewish matters apart from language study.

Hans' (1963) view that "It appears that language is more important in the building up of national character than any other factor" would receive strong support from policy makers in both the Republic of South Africa and the State of Israel. The extent to which the Hebrew language was studied by the KDHS and Control Groups when they were scholars has been discussed earlier. Answers are now sought to such questions as: Is there any difference of significance between the Groups' post-school study of Hebrew? On the individuals' own assessments did their knowledge of the language in 1968 show any significant differences? The distribution of matriculates who attended Hebrew language classes after leaving school is shown in Table 7 (ix).

TABLE 7 (ix). POST-SCHOOL HEBREW CLASS ATTENDANCE.

GROUP	YES		NO		TOTALS	
KDHS m	18	26%	52	74%	70	100%
KDHS f	22	55%	18	45%	40	100%
Control m	7	11%	57	89%	64	100%
Control f	21	40%	31	60%	52	100%

$X^2 = 12.838$ d.f.3. $P < 0.001$ ***

The important conclusion to note is that there is a highly significant difference between the KDHS and Control Groups insofar as post-school study of the Hebrew language is concerned. This is so despite the fact that the percentage of KDHS matriculates who continued their study of the language after leaving school was low. It might have been expected that, having studied the language to matriculation level, they would have wished to maintain and improve

their knowledge of it. It might also have been anticipated that the atmosphere at KDHS would imbue its pupils with a love of the language, in addition to an appreciation of it as a vital link with Israel, and as the only means of understanding and appreciating Jewish liturgy and religious practices. The importance of a knowledge of Hebrew has been propounded for generations by Jewish philosophers, educationists, teachers and leaders, and has been admirably summed up by Janovsky (1967). "I believe ..... that a language is the expression of a people's genius. Hebrew is the key to the spiritual and cultural heritage of the Jews.... It provides rootage in the Jewish past and serves as a powerful link to the people of Israel and the Jews throughout the world".

It was impossible to give the matriculates any form of test of the level of their knowledge of Hebrew when the questionnaire was distributed in 1968. In the absence of any objective test, they were asked to rate their knowledge as 'fluent', 'fair', 'minimal' or 'None'. The analysis of the replies is given in Table 7 (x).

TABLE 7 (x). KNOWLEDGE OF HEBREW 1968

GROUP	FLUENT	FAIR	MINIMAL	NONE	TOTALS
KDHS	37 34%	23 21%	34 31%	15 14%	109 100%
Control	11 10%	7 6%	22 19%	74 65%	114 100%

$X^2 = 45.275$, d.f. 3. $P < 0.001$ ***

This Table provides some interesting observations. Further breakdown of the column marked 'None' showed that 15% KDHS males and 28% females claimed to have no knowledge of the language at the time of answering the questionnaire. To have become so ignorant in so short a time, suggests that for these individuals there never was any substantial knowledge of the Hebrew language. The lack of any knowledge was high in the Control Group - 70% males and 56% females. This marked difference is also seen in

the comparative percentages between the KDHS and Control Groups' levels of 'fluency' and 'fair' knowledge of the language. Personal assessment of their knowledge of the language in 1968, then, showed a high degree of significance in the difference between the two Groups.

vi. Conclusions.

Summing up this survey on Jewish Studies after Batmitzvah/ Barmitzvah, it is recalled that, while all the KDHS scholars continued to matriculation standard, only 38% of the males and 42% of the females of the Control Group, carried on at all. Of those who did, 50% of the males continued for only 2 to 3 years, and 7% of the females did so for as long as 4 or 5 years.

Lack of interest or parental stimulation appeared to be the main causes of the higher number of drop-outs. The difficulties associated with attendance at out-of-school classes were also partly responsible for lower standards of attainment.

Very small numbers of both KDHS and Control Groups pursued formal Jewish studies after matriculating, and there is no significant difference between the Groups in the length of time that such studies were continued. Most of those who did continue to study in South Africa either took 'Hebrew' as a subject for a Bachelor of Arts degree, or undertook training at the Hebrew Teachers' Seminary.

Consideration of the time spent on Jewish education and the sources of such education after matriculation, has shown no significant differences between the KDHS and Control Groups. This leads to doubt as to the extent of validity of the first part of the hypothesis of this study, which includes the postulate that KDHS would provide its matriculates with a Jewish education which they would want to pursue in their future lives. On the other hand, comparison of the study and knowledge of the Hebrew language, shows a highly significant difference, leading to the conclusion that KDHS did exercise a strong influence in this particular aspect of Jewish education. It has also been shown in this chapter that KDHS stimulated the interest and involvement in Jewish education of some parents. On the other hand, few matriculates were stimulated to train at the Hebrew Teachers' Seminary.

- - - - - -

CHAPTER 8 JEWISH VALUES

The extent of the matriculates' Jewish education and of their interest in pursuing the study of such subjects as Jewish history, the Bible, religious thought, Jewish literature, Zionism and the Hebrew language were examined in Chapter 7. The purpose now in investigating their interpretations of the concept 'Jewish Values' is to discover whether their training for introduction into the adult Jewish community through the Batmitzvah ceremony for girls and Barmitvah for boys, and their subsequent Jewish studies, had given to them purposive meaning of 'Jewish values' which would affect the conduct of their adult lives. How do they interpret their Jewishness in their day-to-day living; in the type of schooling they want for their children; in their participation in communal affairs, Jewish, non-sectarian and on all levels including that of South African national activities? How does their interpretation of their Jewishness affect their attitudes towards the State of Israel?

Whereas Jewish studies must provide the knowledge and understanding of the cardinal Jewish values, there have been many conflicting opinions on what is, in fact, meant by Jewish values. Gamoran (1924) writing of the problem of Jewish education in America, where the child must be prepared for participation in American Jewish life and, through it, for its contribution to American life, expresses himself "the problem is one of transmitting the important values of the Jewish social heritage and at the same time of effecting an adequate adjustment to the conditions of American life. Spiritual renewal without self-effacement - adequate adjustment without loss of individuality - these should be the watchwords of our educational policy".

The South African Board of Jewish Education has been faced consistently with this very problem. Therefore, it was considered worthwhile to elicit reactions from the matriculates which might help in its solution. In question 8 (Appendix I p.126) the matriculates were asked "Please assume that your non-Jewish neighbour, with whom you are on friendly terms, asks what you mean by 'Jewish values'. How would you answer?" Approximately a dozen lines were provided for a slightly extended reply. In view of the multiple answers which were given, it was decided to do a Content Analysis of the replies which were grouped into eleven categories. The categories are

listed in Table 8 (i) page 73 and are described now in the Ranking Order of the KDHS replies.

The first category was labelled 'Religious/Traditional Observances' and it included knowledge of the Hebrew language. The second category 'Tolerance' included concepts such as the equality of mankind, mercy, justice and fairness. The importance of the family and family relationships constituted the third category. Values such as honesty, sincerity, integrity, self-discipline, high moral standards and humility were grouped under the label of 'Personal Standards'. The category labelled 'Charity' included philanthropy, compassion and offering help to those in need of it. 'Affinity with the Jewish Group' was the designation given to the category which included pride and belief in Judaism and the importance of Biblical and Jewish history. Twenty-seven matriculates made comments which were confused , or contradictory, or irrelevant. For example, some showed confusion between 'Jewish values', religion and characteristics. They contrasted what they called 'the narrow observance of rigid, mechanical, traditional practices' with moral, ethical and spiritual values. "Parents are ambitious for their children" was one of the values given in this group listed under the title 'Reply Meaningless'. The eighth category 'Love of Learning' included the importance of education, of cultural pursuits and of intellectual achievements, and also, a respect for knowledge. The ninth category included the 24 matriculates who claimed that there are 'no specific Jewish values' and the tenth category entitled 'Identity with Israel' is self-explanatory, as is the final one entitled 'Miscellaneous', which included a variety of responses such as loyalty to the State; respect for the older generation; a sense of humour; a high regard for human life. Forty matriculates (19 KDHS and 21 Control Group) did not respond to the question, and a few included in their replies items which only appeared once and have not been included in Table 8 (i).

A few matriculates offered more extensive comments. Most of those who did, held the opinion that 'Jewish values' have been altered by historical events and the passing of time. One used as his example "Jewish passivity" which he stated had been regarded as a 'value' but is no longer so considered. Another, whose thinking appeared to be on similar lines, referred to the pride of Jewry in the "Haganah" (the

Underground Defence Force of Jewish Palestine under British Mandatory Regime). He contrasted this pride with the historically commended "passive" behaviour of persecuted Jews throughout history until modern times. Others sought explanations for differences between present-day and historical connotations of the term. They listed such explanations as 'lack of anti-semitism'; 'intellectual enlightenment' and the 'closer contact' which occurs nowadays between Jews and non-Jews, particularly at university level.

The categories G. 'Reply Meaningless'. I. 'No Specific Jewish Values' and L. 'No Response', provide a total of 48 KDHS and 43 Control Group matriculates, that is, 91 of the 226 matriculates who are under discussion in this study. This constitutes some 40% of the total number and leads to conjecture as to whether this figure is a reflection of the uncertainty that exists among Jewry in regard to the meaning of 'Jewish values'.

The categories entitled 'Religious/Traditional Observances'; 'Tolerance' and 'Importance of Family' are given high Rank Order by both KDHS and Control Groups. Category E. 'Charity' stands approximately mid-way in both Groups while I. 'No Specific Jewish Values' is ranked low in both Groups. It is surprising to note that category J. 'Identity with Israel' stands low in both Groups, but particularly so in the KDHS Group. One possible explanation for this is that 'Identity with Israel' would not have been considered a 'Jewish value' prior to the last 20 years or so, and it may be that the matriculates, remembering what they had heard in their homes in their childhood days, did not give thought to this item when answering the question. Category H. 'Love of Learning' also stands particularly low in the KDHS Group and no explanation has been found for this. It is not only among the Jewish people that 'Love of Learning' is spoken of as a Jewish characteristic, but in the general community this value is generally acknowledged.

Some reference should be made at this stage to the values listed in Table 8 (i) in the context of consideration as to whether they may legitimately be considered to be specifically Jewish. While there may be difference of opinion in regard to category H. 'Love of Learning', there can be little doubt that categories B. 'Tolerance'. C. 'Importance of Family', D. 'Personal Standards',

and E. 'Charity' cannot be considered to be exclusively Jewish values. These four categories account for 86 of a total of 179 KDHS comments and 93 of a total of 234 Control Group comments. In other words, 48% of the KDHS and 40% of the Control Group comments referred to categories which could not, with justification, be considered to be exclusively 'Jewish values'. It would seem then, that with the exception of the first category, namely, 'Religious/Traditional Observances' which was ranked first by both Groups, the majority chose values which are not specifically Jewish.

In order to complete the evaluation of the data provided in Table 8 (i), a Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was calculated. The Correlation Coefficient Value was found to be 0.71 showing that there is some relationship between the Rank orders given by the KDHS and Control Groups. When the significance of the Correlation Coefficient was calculated, the standard error was 2.85 and the probability value was therefore less than 1%. The Correlation Coefficient, therefore, differed significantly from zero. It would seem from the above calculation that there is some evidence of a degree of difference between the KDHS and Control Groups in their ranking of Jewish values and this is probably accounted for by the greater extent of the Jewish education of the KDHS matriculates. On the other hand, the extent of agreement, and particularly on those categories which did not reveal exclusively Jewish concepts, suggests that both Groups had some difficulty in isolating a series of characteristics which would indicate to their neighbours those specific group concepts identified as Jewish.

Only one of the series of questions posed at the beginning of this chapter has, as yet, been considered. In the following chapter, the attitudes of the matriculates to Zionism and Israel will be assessed.

TABLE 8 (i). JEWISH VALUES.

VALUES	KING DAVID HIGH SCHOOL				CONTROL GROUP			
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	RANKING	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	RANKING
A. Religious/ Traditional Observances	16	13	29	1	20	28	48	1
B. Tolerance	18	8	26	2	14	10	24	4
C. Importance of Family	12	10	22	3	22	15	37	2
D. Personal Standards	9	11	20	4	9	6	14	7.5
E. Charity	8	10	18	5	14	4	18	6
F. Affinity with one's Group (Jewish). N.B. Not based on orthodoxy	11	6	17	6	15	20	35	3
G. Reply Meaningless	12	4	16	7	7	4	11	9.5
H. Love of Learning	11	3	14	8	11	10	21	5
I. No specific Jewish Values	10	3	13	9	7	4	11	9.5
J. Identity with Israel	7	3	10	10	8	6	14	7.5
K. Miscellaneous	7	3	10	11	6	5	11	11
L. No response	12	7	19		15	6	21	

CHAPTER 9. ATTITUDES TOWARDS ZIONISM AND IDENTIFICATION WITH ISRAEL.

The impact on South African Jewry of the declaration of the establishment of the State of Israel in May 1948 has been referred to previously. Proper understanding of this, and appreciation of its effects on the lives of the Jewish people of South Africa, calls for a minimum of background information about the development of the Zionist Movement which, within approximately 50 years of its establishment, brought about the proclamation of the State.

'Zionism' was the term coined by N. Birnbaum in 1893 for the Movement which had as its objective the Jewish return to Palestine, the land of Israel. But it expressed Jewish aspirations as old as the Babylonian Exile (597 and 586 B.C.E.). The aspirations were purely religious until the 19th century and formed a part of traditional liturgy. In the later part of the 19th century, more practical ideas were propagated by the Hibbat Zion (Love of Zion), an organisation which came into being in Russia in 1882 and which emphasised practical colonisation of, and working for, a living in Palestine. During the last two decades of the 19th century, a number of separate bodies was evolved by the Hibbat Zion. In 1897 they crystallised into a World Zionist Organisation at the first Zionist Congress which was held in Basle under the leadership of Theodor Herzl. The programme of the World Zionist Organisation which was adopted at this Congress came to be known as the Basle Programme. It stated that "Zionism aims to establish a publicly-assured, legally-secured home for the Jewish people in Palestine."

The South African Jewish community has been acknowledged as one of the Zionist strongholds since the establishment of the Organisation, but it could not be said that all South African Jews were personally involved, or even interested in it, prior to the Second World War. However, the wholesale slaughter of European Jewry by the Nazis, followed by the establishment of the State of Israel, stimulated the personal involvement in Zionist affairs of almost every South African Jew.

In this study, the attitudes towards Zionism in relation to membership of organised Zionist bodies for different age groups within the South African Jewish community were considered. In terms of the second part of the hypothesis of this study, such consideration should determine whether, in fact, the KDHS matriculates were, through Zionist affiliation and association with Israel, establishing a closer identification than were the members of the Control Group.

i. Zionist Youth Movements.

During the school years of the matriculates, there were in South Africa six official Zionist Youth Movements, namely, Betar, Bnei Akiva, Bnei Zion, Habonim, Hashomer Hatzair and Young Israel. All these Movements, which catered for children from about six years of age through adolescence, were fashioned to some extent on the Girl Guide and Boy Scout Movements, but each had a different ideological basis. Appendix XII (p.162) gives the official programme of Habonim, which has always been the largest Zionist Youth Movement in South Africa. In more recent years, Bnei Zion, Hashomer Hatzair and Young Israel have been incorporated in other Movements or have stopped functioning entirely. The Bnei Akiva Movement is strictly religious in outlook, and its goal is the achievement of orthodox practices in the lives of its members and of the State of Israel. The Betar Movement is the young arm of a right-wing militant political party in Israel. The principles on which this Movement is based are set out in Appendix XIII (p.163).

It was not considered necessary to analyse membership of each of the Youth Movements. Whilst in some cases, choice of affiliation was directed by parents' ideological beliefs, it appears to have been more usual that children joined that Movement which was well organised in the area where they lived. It was also a common practice for children to change from one Movement to another, depending on the group to which their friends belonged. What is considered important to this study, is whether or not the scholar was an active member of a group, and whether membership lasted for some years or whether it was of passing and ephemeral interest. Table 9 (i) presents the available material.

TABLE 9 (i). MEMBERSHIP OF ZIONIST YOUTH MOVEMENT

GROUP	NO	YES		TOTAL
		ONE YEAR OR LONGER	LESS THAN ONE YEAR	
KDHS m	22 31%	28 40%	20 29%	70 100%
KDHS f	18 45%	12 30%	10 25%	40 100%
Control m	27 42%	9 14%	28 44%	64 100%
Control f	21 40%	7 14%	24 46%	52 100%

X^2 = 19.147. d.f. 6 P < 0.01 **

The figures in Table 9 (i) show that there was a high degree of significance in the difference between the participation of the KDHS and Control Groups in the Youth Movements. The percentages of those who did not join were high, but that of the KDHS males was considerably lower than the other 3 groups. In other words, a much higher percentage of KDHS males were members. It is also noted that of those matriculates who had been Youth Movement members, a much higher proportion came from KDHS, and they remained members for a longer period of time than the Control Group. Finally, it is noted that the difference in significance between the KDHS and Control Groups was a high one.

Following on this finding, it appeared necessary to ascertain why so many matriculates had not been members of Youth Movements. These Movements did not function on school campuses, and it appears that pressures at school did discourage some KDHS pupils from joining. For example, 24% KDHS males and 39% females declared that they had not joined any Zionist Youth Movement because, being pupils at KDHS, no purpose would be served by doing so. The implication was that KDHS provided the same programme of education and activities as any Zionist Youth Movement.

The Zionist Youth Movements did not have sufficient numbers of youth leaders to enable them to conduct groups in all the residential suburbs of Johannesburg. The more powerful Movements, that is, those with large membership had, of course, greater numbers of groups. In some suburbs, there were, therefore, groups belonging

to more than one Movement, whereas in others membership was much less. Some scholars, for a variety of reasons, were not willing to participate in the activities of any of the groups which were located in their home areas and preferred to remain unattached. The number of matriculates who stated that they had not joined Youth Movements because there were 'no groups in the area' where they lived, is very small.

The percentages of matriculates who gave 'lack of interest' as their reason for non-participation are very high. It would have been interesting to have been able to discover whether this reaction was due to the matriculates themselves, or, to the programmes offered by the Youth Movements, during that particular period.

TABLE 9 (ii) REASONS FOR NON-MEMBERSHIP OF ZIONIST YOUTH MOVEMENT

GROUP	BECAUSE PUPIL AT K.D.H.S.	NO GROUP IN AREA	NOT INTERESTED	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
KDHS m	5 27%	3 14%	11 50%	3 14%	22 100%
KDHS f	7 39%	1 6%	9 50%	1 5%	18 100%
Control m	0	0	25 93%	2 7%	27 100%
Control f	0	2 9.5%	17 81%	2 9.5%	21 100%

ii. Post-School Student Zionist/Jewish Organisations.

It is recalled that most of the KDHS and Control Group matriculates attended tertiary education. Most tertiary educational institutions encourage the conduct of a wide range of societies on the campus. Turning now from the school-going age group, which had the practical difficulties referred to above in joining suitable Zionist groups, it should be interesting to consider whether, the next age group, finding itself in a situation favouring Zionist involvement, would show any increased difference of significance between the KDHS and Control Groups. However, comparison of the analysis of Table 9 (i) and Table 9 (ii) shows that, whereas the former showed a high degree of significant difference, the latter shows no difference of significance.

TABLE 9 (iii) MEMBERSHIP OF STUDENTS' JEWISH AND/OR ZIONIST ASSOCIATION

GROUP	YES	NO	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
KDHS m	32 46%	36 51%	2 3%	70 100%
KDHS f	20 50%	18 45%	2 5%	40 100%
Control m	18 28%	46 72%	0	64 100%
Control f	23 44%	28 54%	1 2%	52 100%

X^2 = 7.729, d.f.3 P > 0.05 N/S.

Membership does not necessarily indicate the extent of involvement in the affairs of the relevant organisations. It appeared, however, from discussions that most members paid annual subscriptions. From time to time they attended gatherings on the campus or in private homes, when they were visited by important overseas visitors, especially those coming from Israel. The attendances at social gatherings were also reasonable, but study group activity appears to have been confined to comparatively small numbers.

In terms of the hypothesis which postulated that the KDHS would stimulate the establishment and maintenance of closer links with Zionism and Israel than would the Control Group, the finding which has just been described suggests that the effects of KDHS on Zionist affiliation was not long-lasting.

On the other hand, mention must be made of the fact that numbers of KDHS matriculates, including some among the group now being studied, claimed that their involvement in positions of leadership within the Zionist Youth movements left them no time for active participation in the relevant student organisation.

iii. Adult Zionist Affiliation.

At this stage, attention is drawn to the fact that once the matriculate has graduated from the student category, the range of his or her activities is liable to become more limited because of entry into employment, the beginning of home-making and other adult

responsibilities. Nevertheless, attention was directed to the young adults and their attitudes towards the Zionist Movement, as reflected in their participation in Zionist affairs.

Table 9 (iv) entitled 'Attitude Towards Zionism' gives an analysis of the figures of those who declared themselves to be Zionists; those who went further and stated that they were actively involved in Zionist work; those who declared themselves to be non-Zionists; those who had other comments to offer; and those who gave as their reply that they 'live in Israel'. There is within the World Zionist leadership conflict as to the definition of a 'Zionist', and so there is a difference of opinion among members of the Jewish communities on this subject. Briefly, there are those who maintain that a 'Zionist' is one who goes to make his home and live in Israel, and that all other Jews who are interested in Israel are 'friends of Israel' and not 'Zionists'. Others maintain that one may live in Israel and not be a 'Zionist'. Similarly, there are some who hold the view that the very fact of living in Israel entitles one to be called a 'Zionist'. For the purposes of this investigation, it has been considered best to avoid differences of opinion by having a distinct category of those who 'live in Israel', as recorded in Column 3 of Table 9 (iv).

TABLE 9 (iv) ATTITUDE TOWARDS ZIONISM

GROUP	ZIONIST	ZIONIST WORKER	LIVE IN ISRAEL	NON-ZIONIST	OTHER COMMENTS	TOTALS
KDHS m	28 40%	6 9%	8 11%	24 34%	4 6%	70 100%
KDHS f	21 52%	1 2%	5 15%	11 27%	2 4%	40 100%
Control m	18 28%	1 1.5%	1 1.5%	40 63%	4 6%	64 100%
Control f	25 48%	0 0	0 0	23 44%	4 8%	52 100%

The numbers who declared themselves to be 'Zionist workers' are very low. The range of their 'Zionist work' was a wide one, including being a Hebrew teacher at a Jewish Day School; holding a

position of leadership within the Zionist Youth Movements; participating in performing arts programmes for fund-raising, and other work. For the purposes of the present study, however, the range of 'Zionist work' is not of importance. It is the support of the concept of Zionism, that is, the attitudinal approach, that is of primary interest.

The numbers of matriculates who declared themselves to be 'non-Zionists' were far higher in the Control than in the KDHS Group. Nevertheless, a fairly high percentage of non-Zionists was found among the KDHS Group.

In Table 9 (v) the replies have been put into the two broad groupings 'Zionist' and 'Non-Zionist' for the purpose of a chi-square analysis. In this grouping, those who were living in Israel were regarded as Zionist supporters.

TABLE 9 (v) ZIONIST AND NON-ZIONIST GROUPINGS

GROUP	ZIONIST	NON-ZIONIST	TOTALS
KDHS m	42 64%	24 36%	66 100%
KDHS f	27 71%	11 29%	38 100%
Control m	20 33%	40 67%	60 100%
Control f	25 52%	23 48%	48 100%

$X^2 = 17.271$. d.f.3 $P < 0.001$ ***

The chi-square finding leads to the conclusion that the KDHS matriculates were significantly more likely to support Zionist activities than were those of the Control Group. This is, in fact, in contrast with Table 9 (iii) in that it supports Table 9 (i). This may be attributed to the influence of KDHS but, on the other hand, home influences may have had some degree of effect.

iv. Identification with Israel.

In Chapter 4 reference was made to the conflicts of opinion as to the extent, if any, to which the KDHS should encourage identification with Israel. Explanation was also given of the changes in

ideology and policy from the time the Day School was first mooted until its establishment and also over the years following its establishment. There have also been differences of opinion as to whether the school did, in fact, exercise any marked influence in regard to identification with Israel during the years which are being studied. No previous academic study and no detailed records have been kept, so that opinions expressed have probably been largely conjecture, or the result of limited factual knowledge. In this study, information was sought which might reveal differences of significance between the attitudes of the KDHS and Control Groups towards Israel. Such information included the numbers and nature of visits made to Israel by the matriculates while they were still at school; how many of them wished to settle in Israel and how many had already made their homes there. Their attitudes towards Israel and the extent of their wish for identification with that country were also considered.

a. Visits to Israel.

One straightforward and objective approach towards the problem of assessing the matriculates' identification with Israel was to discover how many of them had visited the country. Table 9 (vi) shows the numbers of matriculates' visits to Israel. (The Table excludes the 13 KDHS and 3 Control Group matriculates who were living in Israel in 1968).

TABLE 9 (vi) NUMBERS OF MATRICULATES' VISITS TO ISRAEL

GROUP	NO VISITS		ONE VISIT		MORE THAN ONE VISIT		TOTALS	
KDHS m	30	48%	13	21%	20	31%	63	100%
KDHS f	9	29%	12	35%	13	36%	34	100%
Control m	32	51%	22	35%	9	14%	63	100%
Control f	17	34%	25	50%	8	16%	50	100%

$X^2 = 19.709$, d.f. 6, $P < 0.001$ ***

Analysis of Table 9 (vi) shows that there is a strongly significant difference between the likelihood of the KDHS and Control Group members visiting Israel, and between the frequency of such visits. It is also noted that 48% KDHS and 51% Control males and 29% KDHS compared with 34% Control Group females had never been to Israel. There was also a slightly bigger chance that the KDHS Group would be more likely to visit Israel. It is shown that two-thirds as many males as females had never visited Israel, and this difference is brought out again in the figures representing only one visit. Surprisingly, the percentages of the Control Group in this column were much higher than the KDHS Group.

In the third column referring to 'More Than One Visit', the KDHS male and female percentages are more than twice as high as those of the Control members of both sexes. In this column, there is also a great difference between the percentage of males as compared with females in each of the Groups.

There are several possible reasons for these findings. Firstly, it must be remembered that a high percentage of the males had to do one year of military training. Secondly, most of the males had committed themselves to professional studies. Such studies, both because of the financial implications and the time factor, may have accounted for the fact that single visits were fewer in number than in the case of females. Another possible factor is that more females than males studied at the Hebrew Teachers' Seminary, where it was a recommended part of the course that a final year be spent at a Teachers' Training College in Jerusalem.

Two possible reasons can be ascribed to the difference in the 'More Than One Visit' column. Firstly, there is the possible influence exercised by KDHS. A second possible reason arises from the cause of the original selection of the KDHS by the parents. In this connection, it is of interest to note the replies given by parents as to the reasons for their choice of school (pp. 185, 186).

b. Nature of Visits.

Since the establishment of the State of Israel, various Zionist bodies including the Youth Movements, student organisations, university

authorities, social welfare organisations and educational bodies have organised courses in Israel in order to encourage visits of various age groups, and special interests. For example, the Youth Movements conduct annual study courses for potential youth leaders during the South African summer vacation. Similarly, university student organisations arrange holiday tours which include provision for students to meet and work with Israeli students in their same field of study. Tours specially arranged for the keen student, or the amateur archaeologist, may be conducted in Israel, or in Israel and Greece, and so on.

An analysis of the nature of visits by the KDHS and Control Groups is given in Table 9 (vii).

TABLE 9 (vii) NATURE OF VISITS TO ISRAEL

GROUP	PRIVATE VISITS	STUDY OR SERVICE VISITS	TOTALS
KDHS	43 74%	15 26%	58 100%
Control	51 81%	12 19%	63 100%

X^2 = 0.461 d.f. 1 P > 0.05 N/S after Yates Correction.

Table 9 (vii) shows that whilst there is no significant difference between the nature of the visits of the two Groups, a higher percentage of the KDHS matriculates went on study or service visits. On the other hand, the vast majority of both Groups who visited the country, did so privately.

c. Desire to Live in Israel.

The replies to the question 'Would you care to make your home in Israel?' are analysed in Table 9 (viii) where the replies were divided into the categories 'Yes', 'No', 'Qualified Reply' and 'No Response'.

TABLE 9 (viii) DESIRE TO LIVE IN ISRAEL

GROUP	YES		NO		QUALIFIED REPLY		NO RESPONSE		TOTALS	
KDHS	29	27%	12*	11%	56	51%	13	11%	110	100%
Control	13	11%	13*+	11%	66	57%	24	21%	116	100%

$X^2 = 7{,}355$, d.f. 2. $0.01 < P < 0.05$ *

There is a significant difference between the two Groups at the 1% level.

*Attention is drawn to the fact that the number 12 KDHS in the column entitled "No" includes 4 who stated that this was because of local family commitments. The same explanation was given by 3 of the 13 Control Group members. +In addition, 2 members of the Control Group stated as their reason "Don't like Israelis".

A variety of reasons was offered for the uncertainty shown in the column 'Qualified Reply'. The largest number who specified personal anxieties, were concerned about the disparity of living standards between South Africa and Israel. This number included 19 KDHS and 24 Control Group matriculates. Eighteen KDHS and 10 Control Group, almost all of whom were qualified professional workers, expressed concern about being able to get suitable work in Israel. Assurance of their personal safety was a cause of concern of 4 KDHS and 9 Control Group. Eight KDHS and 11 Control Group declared that they would go to live in Israel if they had no other alternative, whereas 5 KDHS and 8 Control Group replied to the effect that they had not visited the country and wished to do so before reaching a decision about going to live there.

d. Reactions to Israel.

Question 17 (Appendix I p.132) listed 10 statements in order to test the reactions of the matriculates to the State of Israel. Some of these statements were positively, and others were negatively

linked to Israel. The matriculates were asked to use in their replies the 5-category response, 'Strongly agree', 'Agree', 'Uncertain', 'Disagree' and 'Strongly disagree'. Chi-square analysis was done on the responses to each statement (with three exceptions), after they had been grouped into three categories in which 'Strongly Agree' and 'Agree' were combined, as were 'Disagree' and 'Strongly Disagree'.

The responses were then divided into three groups. The first group consisted of those which produced an overwhelming consensus of opinion between KDHS and the Control Group. It was not possible to do a chi-square analysis of the three statements in this group which are shown in Table 9 (ix).

TABLE 9 (ix) STATEMENTS NOT ANALYSED BY CHI-SQUARE

STATEMENT	COMMENTS
b. The status of the Jew has been enhanced by the establishment of the State of Israel.	A positive answer was given by 97% KDHS males, 97% KDHS females 89% Control males and 88% Control females.
g. I would not choose to live in Israel under any circumstances.	93% KDHS females, 87% KDHS males, 83% Control males and 79% Control females opposed this statement.
h. The establishment of the State of Israel has made life more difficult for Jews in the Diaspora.	90% KDHS males, 98% KDHS females 86% Control males and 85% Control females disagreed with this statement. Only a few expressed qualified agreement with it and all of them gave as their explanations the plight of Jews in Arab and USSR countries.

The second group of statements shown in Table 9 (x) entitled "Statements Showing No Significant Differences" comprised those with a wider spread of response and so a chi-square analysis was done on each of them. However, no significant differences between the two Groups emerged, as far as the six statements were concerned.

TABLE 9 (x) STATEMENTS SHOWING NO SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

STATEMENT	CHI-SQUARE
(a) Israel is the spiritual home of all Jewry.	4.36, d.f. 2, P > 0.05 N/S
(d) I am willing to undertake voluntary work for the benefit of Israel because I believe that the continuity of the Jewish people depends upon the progress of Israel.	5.814, d.f. 2, P > 0.05 N/S N.B. Approaching 5% level
(e) Expressions of solidarity with Israel in no way reduce a person's loyalty to his country of origin.	1.429, d.f. 2 P > 0.05 N/S
(f) Israel must manage her affairs without expecting support, either financial or manpower, from Diaspora Jewry.	0.263, d.f. 2, P > 0.05 N/S
(i) I would consider moving to Israel if I could be assured of the same living standard as I have in this country.	2.891 d.f. 2, P > 0.05 N/S
(j) You can be a good Jew without associating yourself with Israel in any way.	2.560, d.f. 2, P > 0.05 N/S

Of the ten statements, only one, statement (c), "I would unconditionally like to make my home in Israel", showed a highly significant difference between the KDHS and Control Groups. It can be seen

from Table 9 (xi) that, although there was not a great deal of difference between those matriculates who were uncertain about their desire to live in Israel, the KDHS Group was much more likely to give a clear positive response than was the Control Group.

TABLE 9 (xi) UNCONDITIONAL DESIRE TO LIVE IN ISRAEL

GROUP	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	UNCERTAIN	TOTALS
KDHS	41	37	32	110
Control	16	62	38	116

$X^2 = 17.639$, d.f. 2 $P < 0.001$ ***

It has been shown that there were very great similarities between the KDHS and Control Groups when their responses to the ten statements on their identification with Israel were analysed individually. Only one statement revealed a significant difference between the two Groups with the KDHS matriculates showing a greater identification with Israel (statement (c)). One other statement (statement (d)) on voluntary work for Israel produced a chi-square value which was approaching the 5% level of significance. This form of analysis, however, did not take into account the consistency of each matriculate's responses to the ten statements. It was decided, therefore, to analyse this part of the material in a different way. An arbitrary numerical value was assigned to each of the five categories of responses. That which indicated the strongest identification with Israel was given 5 points. That which indicated the weakest, or a negative relationship with Israel, was allotted 1 point. For seven of the statements the allocation was 5 points for a 'strongly agree' and 1 point for a 'strongly disagree' response. In three of the statements, however, numbers (g). (h) and (j) the 'strongly disagree' had clearly to be allocated the highest number of points. Then, each matriculate's total score was calculated. It will therefore be appreciated that a score approximating towards 50 indicates a very strong identification with Israel. Table 9 (xii) shows the frequency distribution for 109

KDHS and 114 Control Group.

TABLE 9 (xii) FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

VALUES	KDHS	CONTROL
46-50	4	0
41-45	23	12
36-40	43	35
31-35	32	44
26-30	6	17
21-25	1	4
16-20	0	1
11-15	0	1
6-10	0	0
0-5	0	0
n =	109	114
Mean	3.73	3.43
s.d.	.409	.514

Critical ratio = 4.66, $P < 0.01$ **

It can be seen from the Table that there was only a difference of 0.3 between the two Groups, and that the standard deviations were fairly similar. Despite this small difference, the distribution of scores was analysed by means of a critical ratio. The value was as high as 4.66 which gave a probability of such a difference occurring by chance as less than 1 in 100.

Although the analysis showed a significant difference in favour of KDHS matriculates, the difference was still a very small one. It would probably therefore be safer to accept that there was only a small difference between the two Groups in their identification with Israel.

At different stages in this chapter, the matriculates' responses, two similar questions were analysed, an important instance being analysis of the reactions to the question 'Are you a Zionist?', and the statement 'I would like to make my home in Israel'. Table 9 (xiii) shows that there was the probability that only 1 in 1,000 in the KDHS and 1 in 100 in the Control Group could have occurred by chance. In other words, there is a linked relationship between being a Zionist and wanting to live in Israel; that is, there is a considerable measure of internal consistency for both Groups when their responses to 'Are you a Zionist?' and 'I would like to make my home in Israel' are cross-tabulated.

TABLE 9 (xiii) ARE YOU A ZIONIST? I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE MY HOME IN ISRAEL.

	ARE YOU A ZIONIST? KDHS		CONTROL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE MY HOME IN ISRAEL.				
YES	35	5	12	5
NO	1	9	6	22
CONDITIONAL	35	21	27	36
	n = 106		n = 103	

X^2 = 23.057, d.f. 2, P $<$ 0.001*** X^2 = 10.601, d.f.2, P $<$ 0.01**

Analysis of the 106 of a total of 110 KDHS matriculates is given in Table 9 (xiii). One expressed uncertainty about his reactions to both questions; 2 did not respond to either question and the fourth replied that he was not a Zionist, but made no response to the question whether he would like to make his home in Israel. On the Control Group side of Table 9 (xiii), 8 of the total of 116 members have been excluded from the analysis. Three of these expressed uncertainty as to whether they were Zionists, but would like to make their home in Israel under certain

conditions; 2 who did not respond to the question 'Are you a Zionist?' would nevertheless like to make their homes in Israel under certain conditions; 1 declared that he was not a Zionist and he did not indicate his reaction to the statement 'I would like to make my home in Israel'. The remaining 2 matriculates did not indicate whether they were Zionists. One ignored the second question as well, whereas the other expressed the desire to settle in Israel.

v) Conclusions.

The second part of the hypothesis postulated that the spirit generated at KDHS would stimulate its matriculates to commit themselves to both Jewish communal affairs and to Israel to a greater extent than would the members of the Control Group. It is timely to consider at this stage the underlying intention of this part of the hypothesis. Whereas, for convenience sake, there has been some degree of differentiation between 'Zionism' and 'Identification with Israel' in this study, such differentiation can, at the present time, only be regarded as hypothetical. By and large there is today general agreement among the Jewish people that Jewish affairs, be they communal, national or international, and association with the Zionist Movement and with Israel, are all part and parcel of being Jews. In fact, then, each item studied in this chapter is a part of one picture and the conclusions relating to each query relate to the picture as a whole.

It has been found that during their school days, the KDHS matriculates participated in Zionist Youth Movement activities to a greater extent than did those of the Control Group. There were no differences of significance between the Groups during their student days insofar as involvement in Jewish and Zionist affairs was concerned. But in young adulthood, there was found to be a high degree of difference of significance between the Zionist affiliation of the two Groups, and this also applied to the matters of visits to Israel; the desire to emigrate to Israel and make their homes there; and, in general, to Zionist affiliation. In these cases, the KDHS matriculates revealed stronger identification

with Israel. When the two Groups were compared on a series of value judgments on Israel, however, very few significant differences emerged. It needs to be remembered, however, that one of the significant differences concerned the responses of the 2 Groups to the idea of living in Israel. When the matriculates' responses were quantified and a critical ratio applied to these results, a significant difference emerged. It is argued, however, that the difference between the means of the two Groups was so small that this result should be interpreted with caution.

It would seem, therefore, that the second part of the hypothesis has been shown to have some degree of validity. In the following chapter, another aspect of identification with Jewish values, that is, in membership of voluntary service organisations, will be explored.

- - - - -

CHAPTER 10. INVOLVEMENT IN VOLUNTARY SERVICE

The third part of the hypothesis on which this study was based postulated that the KDHS matriculates would become more involved in South African activities than would the Control Group. The term 'South African activities' was intended to be understood in the widest possible positive terms. It was therefore important to ascertain the extent to which KDHS had succeeded in stimulating social consciousness and in encouraging voluntary service in various fields of social and communal endeavours. This chapter will look at two kinds of activities, namely, Jewish sectarian and non-sectarian. The age range of the matriculates who were investigated, was from the early twenties to thirty-one. Also, it will be recalled that 24 of the 110 KDHS and 9 of the 116 Control Group were still students when the questionnaires were completed in 1968/69 (see Table 6 (vii) a. p. 50). It was clear, therefore, that in many cases these young people would not have established for themselves a life style which would leave them time or money to devote to a wide range of voluntary service activities. It was, nevertheless, considered that useful pointers to developing trends might be discerned.

Voluntary service to religious, humanitarian, philanthropic, social welfare and communal organisations are traditionally regarded by Jewry as mitzvot (blessings) to be sought and coveted. Good citizenship, including participation in civic, national and political affairs also commands the respect and admiration of the Jewish community. The answers to the questions as to how, and to what extent, the matriculates had begun to involve themselves in communal and national affairs, might provide the pointers to the developing trends.

i. Involvement in Jewish Organisations.

Membership of Jewish organisations is exclusively Jewish, but the activities of some are not necessarily confined to Jewish people. Some Jewish organisations have a religious purpose; others concentrate on welfare work. A third category is concerned with

cultural activities and a fourth is committed to Israel-orientated affairs. The religious organisations are linked with religious observances and the rites of death but they, as the welfare and charitable bodies, undertake welfare work. These organisations do not confine their help to Jewish people. For example, those which concentrate on visiting the sick in the various hospitals and nursing homes, take gifts and spend much time with patients, regardless of their religious denominations. Others give their time to aiding under-privileged and African children with food, clothing and schooling. Mothers are taught various crafts and domestic skills with which they may be able to supplement their incomes. The aged and the lonely are given companionship and entertainment.

Table 10 (i) shows the participation of matriculates in adult Jewish organisations. It is to be noted that very small numbers of matriculates did not reply to relevant questions and their numbers are not included in the X^2 Table.

TABLE 10 (i) MEMBERSHIP/PARTICIPATION IN ADULT JEWISH ORGANISATIONS

GROUP	YES	NO	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
KDHS m	39 56%	27 38%	4 6%	70 100%
KDHS f	30 75%	9 22.5%	1 2.5%	40 100%
Control m	29 45%	33 50%	2 5%	64 100%
Control f	26 50%	25 49.5%	1 0.5%	52 100%

$X^2 = 9.835$, d.f.3 $0.01 < P < 0.05$ *.

The finding shows a significant difference at the 5% level, with the KDHS males and females participating to a greater extent than did their opposite numbers in the Control Group. In both Groups female participation was higher than male which is not surprising and fits into the pattern of other adult voluntary services in the community.

The Jewish organisations mentioned by matriculates were grouped into categories of social services, religious, cultural and Israel-orientated. Table 10 (ii) reproduced on the following page, details the distribution of membership of Jewish organisations.

It was remarkable to find that 50% or more of the responses showed that the matriculates were members of, and possibly participants in the work of, adult Jewish organisations. Perhaps this is accounted for by the fact that positive responses to membership of religious bodies referred to the synagogue and/or the "Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society", bodies to which most Jews consider it essential to subscribe. It is noted that some matriculates were members of more than one society.

TABLE 10 (ii) MEMBERSHIP OF ADULT JEWISH ORGANISATIONS

GROUP	SOCIAL SERVICE	RELIGIOUS	CULTURAL	ISRAEL ORIENT-ATED	SOCIAL SERVICE PLUS RELIGIOUS	CULTURAL PLUS RELIGIOUS	ISRAEL ORIENT-ATED PLUS RELIGIOUS	OTHER	SOCIAL SERVICE PLUS RELIGIOUS PLUS ISRAEL ORIENT-ATED	CULTURAL PLUS SOCIAL SERVICE PLUS ISRAEL ORIENT-ATED	NONE	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
KDHS m	1	12	7	3	3	1	5	5	1	1	27	4	70
KDHS f	4	1	0	8	2	0	1	7	7	0	9	1	40
Control m	7	8	0	6	2	0	3	1	2	0	33	2	64
Control f	3	2	0	3	5	0	3	1	9	0	25	1	52

ii. Involvement in Non-Sectarian Organisations.

Question 15 sought information about involvement in civic, national, political and social welfare organisations, whose membership was not specifically Jewish. It called for replies relating to past and present (as at 1968) service. The reactions to this question were disappointing. In fact, the striking feature of Table 10 (iii) is the high percentage of 'No Response' in all Groups, reaching over 50% in the KDHS and over 40% in the Control Groups. This is of additional interest because a number of replies contained criticism of the questionnaire on the grounds that the investigator had not been interested in matters other than Jewish or Zionist. The complaint was that no consideration had been given to loyal participation in matters of South African interest. It is possible, however, that this reaction was caused by some of the respondents' awareness of their small involvement in this category of voluntary service. It is also possible that there was reluctance to reveal participation in the activities of political organisations.

The positive responses included involvement of university students who had undertaken various types of voluntary work associated with the nature of their academic studies. These numbers are shown in brackets in the column entitled "YES". It was premature to try to ascertain the extent to which such service would continue in post-graduate life.

TABLE 10 (iii) VOLUNTARY SERVICE TO NON-SECTARIAN ORGANISATIONS

GROUP	YES	NO	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
KDHS m	14(6) 20%	19 27%	37 53%	70 100%
KDHS f	10(3) 25%	9 22%	21 53%	40 100%
Control m	22(3) 34%	15 24%	27 42%	64 100%
Control f	14(4) 27%	14 27%	24 46%	52 100%

$X^2 = 2.054$, d.f. 3, $P > 0.05$ N/S.

Table 10 (iii) shows that there is no significant difference between the KDHS and Control Groups.

iii. Conclusions.

It has previously been suggested that nothing more than pointers or trends might be found in regard to the integration of the matriculates into adult society. This section, covering as it does the involvement of matriculates in voluntary service bears out the feeling that little of value on this specific aspect of integration into adult society can be found at this stage.

In addition to the already commented upon fact that the No Response rate was so high, there could also be gained the idea that the KDHS and the Control Group were interested in Jewish, but not in general voluntary work. But this conclusion would be based on false premises in view of the fact that both the KDHS and Control Groups omitted, in almost every case, reference to national or local activities.

- - - - - -

CHAPTER 11. MATRICULATES' REACTIONS TO SCHOOL CURRICULA

The evaluation of the King David School High School and the Control Schools by young Jewish people who had matriculated during the years 1956 to 1962 inclusive, should add to the picture which has presented during the analysis of the material collected for this study.

i. KDHS Matriculates' Evaluations of Their Curriculum.

It was anticipated that, whereas the KDHS Group would base their evaluations of their school primarily on their own personal experiences, the Control Group would rely on hearsay, on opinions expressed by their parents and, to some extent, on press and other news media and their effects on the Jewish community. For this reason, the first part of this chapter is concerned mainly with the responses given by KDHS matriculates. It relates to their experiences at school with the five aspects of education specified in question 21 (Appendix I p134). The five aspects were Religious Instruction, Ideological Teaching, Cultural Subjects, General Education and Social Amenities. Then a brief account is given of the approach towards the teaching of religious practices and Jewish values in the school. This is followed by a survey of the extent to which religious observances were being maintained in adult life and this will be compared with the extent of religious observances on the part of Control Group matriculates.

Table 11 (i) entitled 'KDHS Matriculates' Reactions to Aspects of Education' provides an analysis of the matriculates who felt that more intensive provision was made by KDHS than by other schools for the listed aspects of education, and the numbers who approved and disapproved of this more intensive provision. Following on Table 11 (i), the detailed comments on the various aspects will be recorded.

TABLE 11 (i) KDHS MATRICULATES' REACTIONS TO ASPECTS OF EDUCATION

	MORE INTENSIVE PROVISION THAN OTHER SCHOOLS					
	YES	APPROVE	DISAPPROVE	NO COMMENT	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
Religious Instruction	91 83%	55	21	15	19 17%	110 100%
Ideological Teaching	34 31%	17	9	8	76 69%	110 100%
Cultural Subjects	38 35%	31	3	4	72 65%	110 100%
General Education	71 65%	59	1	11	39 35%	110 100%
Social Emenities	33 30%	27	1	5	77 70%	110 100%

At this stage, it is proposed to analyse Table 11 (i) so far as religious instruction is concerned. It is of interest to note from the Table that of the 21 matriculates who disapproved of the more intensive provision made at KDHS for religious instruction, 8 expressed disapproval of any sort of religious instruction; 6 complained that too much instruction was given; 6 were critical of the teaching methods; 1 made the constructive suggestion that he would like to see a more philosophical basis provided in the course. It is clear from the Table that there was an emphatic and general opinion that 'Religious Instruction' was certainly more intensive than in the other schools. It is also noteworthy that although half the matriculates approved of the extent of religious instruction offered at school, a number wrote freely on the subject at the end of the questionnaire. Fourteen such comments were highly critical, 10 referring particularly to the 'poor quality' of Religious Instruction teaching. One matriculate interpreted 'inadequate' in the sense of insufficiency. Nine complained of 'bigotry', 'irrationalism' or 'narrowness' in the presentation. One suggested the need for a course in 'comparative religion' and another asked that the subject be treated in a 'modern, relevant way'. Verbal comments of more or less the same numbers expressed displeasure at being compelled to submit to the disproportionately large volume of 'Religious Instruction'.

Explanation of what the school authorities wanted to achieve insofar as religious observances and ideology are concerned, will be followed by comparison of the KDHS responses regarding their religious practices with those of the Control Group who would have had none of this special training during their schooling. Their major influences would have been their own homes and their own experiences when attending synagogue in their childhood.

It must be pointed out that two commonly held and contradictory points of view were expressed within the local Jewish community from the time of the founding of the KDHS at least until the time of the present investigation. On the one hand, there was strong criticism that the school exercised pressures for practices and observances which some parents did not themselves follow, and did not require their children to follow. On the other hand, various orthodox sections decried the religious instruction given at the school which they considered fell far short of the minimum requirements. It might be mentioned here that it appears to be a common belief of non-Jewish interested bodies - academic, scholastic and religious, that reference to the KDHS is synonymous with reference to a Jewish orthodox school. That this is incorrect is borne out by a comment of the Principal of the school, who informed the investigator (1970) that the school 'provides a broadly national traditional Jewish education. It must cater for all needs and it therefore steers a middle course". This comment has been heard on many occasions from individuals and from representatives of the S.A. Board of Jewish Education. It has also been said by the school authorities and by teachers and parents of the scholars, that the KDHS scholars "have been taught the tools or skills of religious practices even if they do not use them".

It should also be remembered that several Jewish religious sects are to be found, together with a wide range of beliefs as to what does, and what does not, constitute religious observances. Consultation with several leading local religious authorities yielded uniform advice, which was followed. The matriculates were asked in the questionnaire to signify the extent of their present religious observances by marking "Yes", "Some" or "None". Table 11 (ii) shows the analysis of the replies received.

TABLE 11 (ii) OBSERVANCE OF RELIGIOUS PRACTICES

GROUP	NONE	YES	SOME	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
KDHS m	14 20%	14 20%	42 60%	0	70 100%
KDHS f	8 21%	9 23%	22 55%	1 1%	40 100%
Control m	19 30%	9 14%	35 55%	1 10%	64 100%
Control f	12 23%	13 25%	27 52%	0	52 100%

$X^2 = 4.045$, d.f.6 $P > 0.05$ N/S

The chi-square test showed that there was no significant difference in the extent of the KDHS and Control Groups' observance or non-observance of religious practices. A similar lack of significance was found when the males and females in each of the KDHS and Control Groups were combined ($X^2 = 3.451$, d.f. 2 $P > 0.05$ N/S.)

The question pertaining to religious practices invited additional elaboration. The information obtained from this source, which was used by most who responded to the questionnaire, demonstrated some confusion, uncertainty or ignorance of matriculates of the meaning of religious observances and practices. Of one Group, 52% stated that they had observed 'Some' religious practices: these ranged from maintaining 'a kosher home' with varying degrees of kashrut such as "I don't eat pig", or "I buy kosher meat", or "We don't eat pork in our home, but may elsewhere". In the same Group of those who quoted "synagogue attendance" as one of their practices, the attendance varied from daily to once a week; to occasional visits; and to High Holy Days.

It is apparent that the findings relating to religious observances must be treated with reservation.

What is of importance in regard to the analysis shown in Table 11 (ii) is that there was no significant difference between the KDHS and the Control Groups. The KDHS Group not only attended a full-day Jewish school which provided a curriculum of Jewish studies, including instruction in the religious "tools" or usages, already referred to. It also provided what is termed a "Jewish atmosphere". This "atmosphere" included daily participation in the offering of the correct prayers at the correct times of day and in the correct manner; traditional functions to celebrate the High Holy days and national festivals, and so on. The present findings led to the conclusion that the KDHS did not necessarily stimulate a pattern of religious observances in the post-school lives of the matriculates. This, however, is not evidence of failure on the part of KDHS if, in fact, it is not an avowed objective of the school to provide indoctrination of religious observances.

The constant fear of Jewish leaders and parents that young people were increasingly marrying out of the Jewish faith, led the investigator to enquire into the religion of the matriculates' spouses, which might provide an indication of the degree of inter-marriage of both Groups of

matriculates. However, it is shown in Table 11 (iii) entitled 'Religion of Spouse' that very few of those who were married in 1968/69, that is, 6 out of 136 matriculates, had married out of the faith. This figure must be treated with reserve because the investigator's personal and lengthy association with many of the families involved in this study, provided her with evidence of the unreliability of some responses on this subject. There may have been reluctance on the part of some informants to admit social relationships which are frowned upon by the Jewish community.

TABLE 11 (iii) RELIGION OF SPOUSE

	MARRIED		NOT MARRIED	TOTAL
	JEWISH SPOUSE	NON-JEWISH SPOUSE		
KDHS m	31	1	38	70
KDHS f	32	1	7	40
Control m	33	3	28	64
Control f	40	1	11	52

In view of the unreliability of the figures in the column entitled 'Non-Jewish Spouse' chi-square analysis was not undertaken.

Real understanding and appreciation of the Jewish religion demands a good knowledge of the Hebrew language. Although it was not listed in the aspects of education shown in Table 11 (i), a number of matriculates voluntarily commented on the subject in the unstructured information which they offered at the end of the questionnaire. Such comments were made by 7 KDHS matriculates, 6 of whom expressed dissatisfaction with the quality of teaching, the other expressing satisfaction. One matriculate included in his expression of dissatisfaction his preference for locally-trained, by contrast with 'cheder' teachers. This last comment was expressed in a number of ways by most of the KDHS matriculates with whom verbal contact was established. It should be borne in mind that the only secondary school in Johannesburg, apart from the KDHS, which gives intensive instruction in the Hebrew language, is the Yeshiva College. The first group of scholars from Yeshiva

College wrote the matriculation examination at the end of 1962.

From the unstructured comments on KDHS, it was noted that 'Ideological Teaching' (see second line of Table 11 (i)) was considered by most matriculates to refer to Jewish matters. Nevertheless, as many as 70% did not respond at all. Also, there was a small range of comments. No less than 26% KDHS matriculates disapproved of the 'Ideological Teaching' provided by the school. Three expressed their disapproval of any sort of ideological teaching. Another 9 disapproved of the inadequate content of the teaching, 5 of them specifying that the call to the challenge of Zionism was weak, and a sixth, that there was 'non-encouragement of aliyah'. One matriculate felt that too much 'Ideological Teaching' was given, and another that none was given at all. One complained of the constant repetition throughout his years at the school. On the other hand, 11 matriculates expressed satisfaction, stating that they did so in the sense that the instruction they were given provided them with an 'awareness' or an 'identification' with their Jewishness.

Regarding the aspect of education listed as 'Cultural Subjects' in Table 11 (i), it can be seen that only 35% of the matriculates considered that more intensive provision was made by KDHS than other schools. Of the 38 matriculates who constituted this group, 31 approved of this more intensive provision, 3 disapproved and 4 had no comments to make at all. Of the 3 who disapproved, 2 complained of inadequacy whilst the third expressed the opinion that the Government schools offered better facilities. On the matter of 'Cultural Subjects' as with 'Ideological Teaching' and, as will be seen shortly, with 'Social Amenities' there was a conspicuously high number of matriculates who did not record any view. The number in each case was in excess of 65% of the total. This may indicate some lack of appreciation of the meaning or the descriptive titles which were used in the questionnaire. On the other hand, it is possible that the high figures for 'No Response' merely indicated that there was no well-defined opinion on them.

The aspect of 'General Education' brought a response from 71 matriculates to the effect that more intensive provision was made for it at KDHS than at other schools. Of the 71, 59 matriculates approved of the standard of general education, one disapproved, 11 made no

comments and 39 did not respond at all. The 1 matriculate who expressed disapproval complained of the constant repetition of work. In their final summing up of their opinions of KDHS, 2 other matriculates referred to the aspect of 'General Education' with high praise.

The fifth aspect of education analysed in Table 11 (i), 'Social Amenities' was apparently understood by most KDHS matriculates to refer to sporting activities. This aspect brought the highest 'No Response' return, namely, 70%.

In question 22 addressed to the KDHS matriculates (Appendix Ip.134) and the same question to the Control Group (Appendix III p.139) the technique of putting statements into positive and negative forms, and asking the matriculates to indicate those with which they were in agreement, was used. Three items, namely, (a), (d) and (e) related only to the KDHS Group. The other 4 are discussed in section (ii) of this chapter. The KDHS replies to (a), (d) and (e) are analysed in Table 11 (iv), Table 11 (v) and Table (vi).

TABLE 11 (iv) "WHEN I WAS A SCHOLAR AT KDHS I BELIEVED/DID NOT BELIEVE THAT THERE WAS "SOMETHING SPECIAL ABOUT BEING A PUPIL THERE".

BELIEVED	DID NOT BELIEVE	UNCERTAIN	TOTALS
72 66%	36 32%	2 2%	110 100%

TABLE 11 (v) "I HAD/DID NOT HAVE JEWISH FRIENDS ATTENDING OTHER SCHOOLS"

YES	NO	TOTALS
96 87%	14 13%	110 100%

TABLE 11 (vi) "AFTER LEAVING SCHOOL I FELT THAT I WAS BETTER/AS WELL/ NOT AS WELL EQUIPPED TO ASSOCIATE WITH NON-JEWISH AGE-MATES AS MY JEWISH ACQUAINTANCES WHO HAD NOT ATTENDED KDHS.

BETTER EQUIPPED	AS WELL EQUIPPED	NOT AS WELL EQUIPPED	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
18 16%	70 64%	18 16%	4 4%	110 100%

From the analyses which have been presented, it may be observed that the majority of the KDHS matriculates felt that there was good in their school. The majority was satisfied with most levels of education provided by the school as was shown in the reactions to the five aspects of education, and the three statements in Tables 11 (iv), (v) and (vi). The analyses also showed that social relationships were not confined to children attending KDHS, and that the KDHS scholars did not feel that they were isolated.

ii. KDHS And Control Groups' Reactions to Their Schools.

The first section of this chapter dealt with responses to two questions. The first of these was directed only to KDHS matriculates, with the exception of a comparison of the KDHS and Control Groups' present extent of religious observances. Question 22 (see Appendix I p.134) consisted of 7 statements, 3 of which, (a), (d) and (e) pertained only to the KDHS Group and were not included in the Control Group's questionnaire (see Appendix II p.139). The other 4 statements in this question were dealt with in the same way as (a), (d) and (e) and were pertinent to both KDHS and Control Groups. These are analysed and commented upon now in Tables 11 (vii), (viii), (ix) and (x).

TABLE 11 (vii) I WAS ALWAYS/SOMETIMES/NEVER CONSCIOUS OF A SPECIAL OBLIGATION TOWARDS THE JEWISH COMMUNITY

GROUP	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	NEVER	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
KDHS	15	53	40	2	110
Control	39	54	13	10	116

After the No Response figure had been eliminated,
$X^2 = 24.412$, d.f. 2, $P < 0.01$ **

It is recorded that there was one minor difference in the phrasing of the statement to the KDHS and Control Group matriculates. The KDHS statement had the words 'because I was attending KDHS' added.

It should be explained at this point that it has always been a policy of KDHS to provide bursaries and subsidies for children whose parents cannot meet all the costs of sending them to the school. In the early years, the fees were very low, but even then parents were helped to meet them and the costs of transportation and books, and, sometimes school uniforms, and so on. Although fees have been heavily increased over the years, various forms of assistance are still provided for those in need of help. In these circumstances, therefore, the significant difference between the reactions analysed in Table 11 (vii) seems to be important. The figures show that it is the Control Group, rather than KDHS which is much more likely to be conscious of obligations towards the Jewish community which provides a high proportion of the monies, through voluntary contributions, for such provisions and other aspects of the maintenance of KDHS. There were, of course, a number of special cases, reference to one of which warrants special reference. The circumstances of this matriculate were such that schooling could only have continued up to the minimum permissible school-leaving age, that is, 16 years, had KDHS not provided the maximum of assistance up to matriculation when a first-class with several distinctions was achieved. The excellent results led to the award of bursaries and scholarships which enabled the matriculate to obtain a Ph.D. academic standard. This matriculate expressed, most vigorously, indebtedness to, and life-long appreciation of, the assistance received from the S.A. Board of Jewish Education.

Table 11 (viii) "I associated/did not associate with non-Jewish scholars" gives the analysis of the second of the 4 statements referred to above.

TABLE 11 (viii) I ASSOCIATED/DID NOT ASSOCIATE WITH NON-JEWISH SCHOLARS

GROUP	ASSOCIATED	DID NOT ASSOCIATE	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
KDHS	68	42	0	110
Control	95	20	1	116

After elimination of the No Response return and after Yates' Correction, $X^2 = 11.732$, d.f. 1 $P < 0.01$ **

It is noted that the statement in the Control Group questionnaire emphasised social associations.

It was to be expected that there would be a greater chance of the Control Group matriculates associating with non-Jewish scholars. It can be seen from the Table that approximately 2 in 5 KDHS matriculates had had no association with non-Jewish pupils. It can also be seen, however, that for the majority of the KDHS matriculates, attendance at the Jewish Day School did not isolate them from the rest of the community.

It can also be seen that 1 in 5 matriculates from the Control Group had made friendship patterns with a single religious group (Jewish) and had not, in fact, associated socially with non-Jewish scholars. Himmelfarb (1960) has this to say on the subject of social relationships. "Every piece of research I have seen confirms that there is no difference in inter-attitudes between Day School and other Jewish children when age, social class, parents' education and the like are the same".

Table 11 (ix) entitled "After leaving school I was/was not conscious of any obligation to do my best 'for the sake of my school' " gives the analysis of the third statement which, like the fourth, shows no significant difference between the KDHS and Control Groups.

TABLE 11 (ix) AFTER LEAVING SCHOOL I WAS/WAS NOT CONSCIOUS OF ANY OBLIGATION TO DO MY BEST 'FOR THE SAKE OF MY SCHOOL'

GROUP	YES	NO	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
KDHS	27	79	4	110
Control	28	85	3	116

After eliminating the No Response return and after Yates' Correction $X^2 = 0.020$, d.f. 1 $P > 0.05$ N/S.

This shows that there was no significant difference in the activities of the KDHS and Control Groups insofar as loyalty to their school was concerned. The same conclusion was reached, as shown in Table 11 (x) when the extent of post-school association with the relevant schools was concerned.

TABLE 11 (x) "TODAY I MAINTAIN/DO NOT MAINTAIN TIES WITH MY SCHOOL

GROUP	YES	NO	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
KDHS	26	82	2	110
Control	14	100	2	116

After elimination of No Response returns and after Yates' Correction $X^2 = 4.453$, d.f. 1 $P > 0.05$ N/S.

Summarising the findings of section ii of this chapter, it may be said that the King David High School was less successful than the Control Schools in imbuing in its scholars a sense of obligation towards the Jewish community. It was also found to be more likely to confine friendship patterns within the religious, that is, the Jewish group. Furthermore, it is clear that the Jewish Day School was no more successful than the Control Schools in creating lasting loyalties on the part of its matriculates.

iii. Education of Matriculates' Children.

To extend the analysis of the reactions of the matriculates to their own scholastic experiences, a different series of questions was posed: Would the KDHS matriculates want their children to attend their school? Would those of the Control Group want their children to attend Government undenominational schools as they had done, or would they prefer to send them to KDHS? What reasons would be given for the preferences?

Before giving the analysis of the reactions to the type of question, it is as well to consider the numbers of married matriculates at the time of the completion of the questionnaire and the sizes of their families. This analysis is given in Table 11 (xi). The Table therefore provides a picture of the marital status of the matriculates and the numbers of children in their families as at 1968/1969.

TABLE 11 (xi) NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF MARRIED MATRICULATES

GROUP	N/A NOT MARRIED	MARRIED	TOTAL	NUMBER OF COUPLES WITH NO CHILDREN	ONE CHILD	2 OR MORE CHILDREN
KDHS m	39	31	70	18	8	6
KDHS f	5	35	40	12	12	9
Control m	27	37	64	19	12	5
Control f	11	41	52	6	11	20

The direct question was asked: 'Would you send your children to KDHS'. Table 11 (xii) shows the distribution of the replies to this question.

TABLE 11 (xii) WOULD YOU SEND YOUR CHILDREN TO KDHS

GROUP	YES	NO	UNDECIDED	NO RESPONSE	TOTALS
KDHS m	44 63%	6 9%	18 26%	2 2%	70 100%
KDHS f	18 45%	3 7.5%	17 40%	2 5%	40 100%
Control m	14 22%	32 50%	17 27%	1 1%	64 100%
Control f	14 27%	20 38%	18 35%	0	52 100%

$X^2 = 49.423$, d.f. 6, $P < .001$ ***

Table 11 (xii) shows a high degree of significance in the difference between the reactions of the KDHS and Control Groups with the KDHS Group being much more likely to send their children to their old school. The numbers of 'Undecided' in both Groups show little difference between the males of both Groups and the females of both Groups, but in both Groups the females were higher.

This finding, which is of considerable interest, stimulated further analysis of the reactions of both Groups of matriculates to the suggestion of sending their own children to the KDHS for their education. The analysis was made from the replies received to question 21 which offered 13 reasons, 8 of them, numbered (a) to (h), being in favour, and 5 of them, (i) to (m), being against.

In Table 11 (xiii) on page 112 the columns marked 'Order' show the importance attached to the various statements by the matriculates. Item (d), referring to the inclusion of Hebrew language and Jewish studies in the school's curriculum, brought the greatest response. Considerable importance was also attached to items (a) and (b) which concerned the educational standard at the school. This is not surprising, because from the very beginning of the school, attention was concentrated on achieving the best possible examination results. Consequently, every effort was made to attract teachers of the highest status and experience. The numbers of scholars in each class were also small, and every attempt was made to keep them so in those years.

Table 11 (xiv) on page 112, shows the distribution of responses made by the matriculates enumerated in Table 11 (xii) under the heading 'No', that is, those who would definitely not send their children to KDHS.

It is noteworthy that the totals of the 'No' group are much lower than those of the 'Yes' group. The differences between the KDHS and Control Groups are considerable. It is clear that the large majority of the Control Group who did not favour KDHS, objected to what is called here 'a form of separatism'. This reaction is frequently expressed when the merits of Jewish Day Schools are discussed. Almost as important are those who do not favour the KDHS because of anxiety that attendance at a Jewish school would make the integration of the individual into the adult general community more difficult that it normally is. This, too, is a matter of constant debate and discussion. The late Rabbi Kopul Rosen, Founder and Principal of the Carmel College Jewish Boys' High School in England, held the strong conviction that the Jewish youth who had been educated in a totally Jewish atmosphere and surroundings, would be better equipped than any others to face integration into an undenominational adult society. According to Rosen, he would have the inner reserves of strength to face possible anti-semitism and other discomforts, to which those educated in Government schools would react most unhappily.

TABLE 11 (xiii) DISTRIBUTION OF AFFIRMATIVE ANSWERS

REASONS	KDHS m			KDHS f			CONTROL m			CONTROL f		
	NO.	%	ORDER	NO.	%	ORDER	NO.	%	ORDER	NO.	%	ORDER
(a) the high standards of teaching	36	51	2	12	30	2	7	11	2	12	23	1
(b) the comparatively small classes	19	27	4	9	22.5	3	5	8	4	8	15	4
(c) the range of extra-curricular cultural facilities provided by the school	22	31	3	5	12.5	5	4	6	5	10	19	2
(d) the inclusion of Hebrew language and Studies in the curriculum	41	60	1	15	37.5	1	12	19	1	10	19	2
(e) the religious influence	19	27	4	8	20	4	6	9	3	6	12	5
(f) the fact that it is a Private School	5	7	6	4	10	6	1	2	6	1	2	6
(g) the need to protect my children from the possible prejudices to which children attending other schools might be subjected	5	7	6	1	2.5	8	0	0		0		
(h) the social benefits	4	6	8	2	5	7	0	0	7	1	2	6

TABLE 11 (xiv) DISTRIBUTION OF NEGATIVE ANSWERS

REASONS	KDHS m			KDHS f			CONTROL m			CONTROL f		
	NO.	%	ORDER	NO.	%	ORDER	NO.	%	ORDER	NO.	%	ORDER
(i) the Jewish High School is a form of separatism with which I do not agree	2	3	1	2	5	2	32	50	1	19	36	1
(j) attendance at a Jewish school makes the integration of the pupil into the general community difficult	1	1	2	1	2.5	4	28	44	2	13	25	2
(k) too much pressure is brought to bear on the children to try to achieve results beyond the capacities of some of them	0	0	4	1	2.5	4	6	9	4	7	13	5
(l) parents are too heavily taxed, over and above the actual school fees	1	1	2	2	5	2	6	9	4	12	23	3
(m) the children are greatly influenced by others coming from wealthy homes, so that they become too demanding	0		4	3	7.5	1	10	16	3	9	17	4

In Table 11 (xiii), it has been shown that the considerably larger numbers of individuals' answers in favour of the educational possibilities at KDHS came from matriculates of the school, and in Table 11 (xiv), where reasons for not sending children to KDHS were listed, large numbers of the Control Group matriculates responded.

It seemed important, however, to see whether the order of affirmative and negative responses given by the Control and KDHS Groups was similar. It was therefore decided to do a Rank Order Correlation Coefficient, and for this purpose the males and females in the KDHS and Control Groups were combined. The results of this combining are shown in Tables 11 (xv) and (xvi) on the following page.

TABLE 11 (xv) DISTRIBUTION OF AFFIRMATIVE ANSWERS

REASONS	KDHS		CONTROL	
	NUMBER	RANK ORDER	NUMBER	RANK ORDER
(a) the high standards of teaching	48	2	9	5
(b) the comparatively small classes	28	3	13	3
(c) the range of extra-curricular cultural facilities provided by the school	27	4.5	14	2
(d) the inclusion of Hebrew language and Jewish Studies in the curriculum	56	1	22	1
(e) the religious influence	27	4.5	12	4
(f) the fact that it is a Private School	9	6	2	6
(g) the need to protect my children from the possible prejudices to which children attending other schools might be subjected	6	7	0	8
(h) the social benefits	5	8	1	7

Rank Order Correlation Coefficient = .792

TABLE 11 (xvi) DISTRIBUTION OF NEGATIVE ANSWERS

REASONS	KDHS		CONTROL	
	NUMBER	RANK ORDER	NUMBER	RANK ORDER
(i) the Jewish High School is a form of separatism with which I do not agree	4	1	51	1
(j) attendance at a Jewish school makes the integration of the pupil into the general community difficult	2	4	41	2
(k) too much pressure is brought to bear on the children to try to achieve results beyond the capacities of some of them	1	5	13	5
(l) parents are too heavily taxed, over and above the actual school fees	3	2.5	18	4
(m) the children are greatly influenced by others coming from wealthy homes, so that they become too demanding	3	2.5	19	3

Rank Order Correlation Coefficient = .675

Author Kark G
Name of thesis The Jewish Day School Matriculate 1972

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.