

**National Jewish
Population Study**

**Jewish
Community
Services
Facts for Planning**

One of a series of reports on the study findings



**Council of Jewish Federations
and Welfare Funds
315 Park Ave. South, New York, N. Y. 10010**

This is one of a series of reports on the findings of the National Jewish Population Study sponsored by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. This is the first comprehensive national study made of the Jewish population of the United States.

The NJPS, under the direction of Dr. Fred Massarik of the University of California of Los Angeles and a distinguished group of colleagues, was based on a sample scientifically chosen so as to be representative of the total U.S. Jewish population. This sample included communities of all sizes and in all parts of the country, with random samplings to include Jews not on any organizational lists as well as those who were.

While the NJPS data are of interest and value to many individuals concerned with Jewish life, the Federations which financed the study have as their purpose the use of the findings in local, regional and national planning. The initial set of reports will, therefore, be elements relating most closely to these concerns.

Each community will also now have facts which set a national perspective for its own local situation. In addition, the projections for the future made possible by the national study should enable Federations to anticipate in their planning the demands brought about by changing population patterns.

June 1975

Price: \$1.00

ATTITUDES TOWARDS JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES

by
FRED MASSARIK

The attitudes of Jews toward Jewish sponsored services in their communities are of direct concern to Jewish Federations and their agencies. The National Jewish Population Study posed a number of questions concerning these services to a cross-section of the adult Jewish population. The questions dealt with the Jewish Community Center, Jewish Child Care Service, Jewish Family Service, Jewish Community Relations, Home for the Aged, Hospital and Vocational Service.

Information was sought for each type of service only from those respondents who indicated an awareness of the existence of that service. Thus, questions about Jewish hospitals would be limited to persons in the cities which have these institutions.

PREFERENCE FOR JEWISH SPONSORSHIP OF LOCAL SERVICES

A majority of the persons expressed a preference for Jewish sponsorship for all fields of service. For five of the seven fields, this preference ranged between 74 per cent and 80 per cent of all respondents. For the aged field, this increased to 85 per cent while for hospitals it dropped to 56 per cent.

	<u>Prefer Jewish Sponsorship</u>	<u>Prefer General Sponsorship or Indifferent</u>
Aged	84.8	15.3
Community Relations	79.7	20.4
Community Center	78.4	21.5
Child Care Service	73.6	26.6
Family Service	75.2	24.9
Vocational Service	73.8	26.2
Hospital	55.8	44.1

N.B. - Details in this and other tables may not always add to 100.0 per cent because of rounding.

The patterns were roughly similar for those who strongly preferred and those who somewhat preferred Jewish sponsorship. Here, the Homes for the Aged with Jewish sponsorship were strongly preferred by seven out of ten respondents; the Community Relations field was strongly preferred by six out of ten respondents; while, with the exception of the Hospitals, the remaining services ranged between 51 per cent and 54 per cent with a strong preference for Jewish sponsorship. The Hospitals brought up the lowest point with 40 per cent of all respondents showing a strong preference for Jewish sponsorship.

Table 1 PREFERENCE AS BETWEEN JEWISH OR GENERAL SPONSORSHIP OF SERVICES,
BY FIELD OF SERVICE
(respondents expressing any opinion = 100 per cent)*

Field of Service	Jewish Sponsorship		Undecided	General Sponsorship		Total	(No Opinion)
	Strongly Preferred	Somewhat Preferred		Strongly Preferred	Somewhat Preferred		
Aged	71.5	13.3	10.0	2.7	2.6	100.0	(30.3)
Community Relations	61.0	18.7	10.8	5.6	4.0	100.0	(33.2)
Community Center	54.2	24.2	11.1	5.9	4.5	100.0	(30.3)
Child Care	52.7	20.9	14.3	4.4	7.9	100.0	(36.4)
Family Service	52.4	22.8	12.9	4.2	7.8	100.0	(34.3)
Vocational Service	50.6	23.2	16.0	4.5	5.7	100.0	(31.6)
Hospital	39.7	16.1	22.8	11.5	9.8	100.0	(28.1)

* Limited to respondents reporting awareness of service in their community.

THOSE "STRONGLY PREFERRING" JEWISH SPONSORSHIP BY AGE

The extent to which age is a factor with regard to the attitude towards Jewish sponsorship of services is examined in Table 2. The age analysis would reflect difference in nativity and generational factors, as well as those differences which may be related to the person's place in the life cycle.

If we ignore for the moment the relatively small group of respondents under age 25, we find that there is a positive correlation between a strong preference for Jewish sponsorship of service and the age group of the respondents. In each case, the "strong preference" for Jewish sponsorship is lower in the 25 to 44-year-old group than in the 45 to 64-year-old group, and the latter group is less than in the 65-year-old and up category. In only two service categories do we find a "strong preference" for Jewish sponsorship in a "majority of respondents in the 25 to 44-year old group. The others fall below this mark with the lowest point being reached by the Hospitals, where 24 per cent of the respondents in this age group indicated a "strong preference" for Jewish sponsorship.

The age group under 25 is an anomaly in that for most services, the "strong preference" for Jewish sponsorship obtains a greater proportion of respondents in this age group than in the next age group, 25-44. The one exception is the Home for the Aged and this may reflect the fact that, for this age group, the Home for the Aged represents a rather abstract service at this time. This age group in the sample includes persons from the age of 21 through 24 and, thus, covers a much narrower age span than any of the other three age groups.

Table 2 PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS "STRONGLY PREFERRING" JEWISH SPONSORSHIP OF SERVICES, BY FIELD OF SERVICE AND BY AGE (for each age group respondents with any opinion = 100 per cent)*

Field of Service	Age Group				Total All Ages
	Under 25	25-44	45-64	65 & Up	
Aged	54.2	64.0	73.9	80.8	71.5
Community Relations	69.3	58.7	59.9	72.1	61.0
Community Center	67.9	43.0	57.2	67.2	54.2
Child Care	39.5	41.7	57.0	70.9	52.7
Family Service	44.9	41.0	57.9	68.8	52.4
Vocational Service	37.5	36.1	60.8	64.9	50.6
Hospital	37.5	23.9	40.7	59.2	39.7

* Limited to respondents reporting awareness of service in their community.

PREFERENCES ON COMMUNITY SPENDING FOR LOCAL SERVICES

People were asked whether the Jewish community would wish to spend more, the same, or less money for specified local services. Since a large number of the respondents could not be expected to know either the present level of community dollar support or the budget level of the agencies or institutions themselves, it is not surprising that the number reporting no opinion was more than half of all the respondents. Of those that did express an opinion, however, the Homes for the Aged again had the most positive response. Almost 81 per cent of these respondents indicated that more money should be spent by the community for the Home. Hospitals were reported by a smaller proportion of respondents as requiring more community funds. Four per cent of the respondents expressed the opinion that no community funds should be given to this institution. The Community Center received the same proportion as the Hospitals in terms of preferring more funds, although a somewhat larger proportion indicated that the Center should receive the same amount as it is now receiving.

Table 3 PREFERENCE AS BETWEEN COMMUNITY SPENDING
 MORE OR LESS ON SERVICES
 (respondents expressing any opinion = 100 per cent)*

Field of Service	Community Should Spend:					Total	(No Opinion)
	Much More	A Little More	Same as Now	Less Than Now	Not at All		
Aged	59.1	21.6	18.4	0.3	0.5	100.0	(50.1)
Community Relations	41.1	27.5	22.6	8.2	0.6	100.0	(55.7)
Community Center	37.1	25.2	32.4	4.4	0.8	100.0	(54.4)
Child Care	49.8	21.7	19.1	8.8	0.6	100.0	(62.8)
Family Service	44.2	27.7	21.5	5.9	0.6	100.0	(62.3)
Vocational Service	44.2	23.6	28.7	2.5	0.9	100.0	(63.4)
Hospital	38.0	24.3	26.6	7.0	4.1	100.0	(47.2)

* Limited to respondents reporting awareness of service in their community.

PREFERENCE FOR "MUCH MORE" COMMUNITY SPENDING FOR LOCAL SERVICES, BY AGE

In most cases there was a positive correlation between increasing age and a preference for having the community provide much more funding for the given services. For those under 25, the pattern is at variance with the trend observed for the majority of the groups shown. Indeed, in four out of seven fields of service, a higher proportion of those under 25 years of age preferred the community to spend 'much more' on these services than did even the oldest age group. The major differences were for the Homes for the Aged and Hospitals, however, where the under 25 age group reported smaller proportions asking for 'much more' in community spending.

Table 4 PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS PREFERRING "MUCH MORE" COMMUNITY SPENDING ON SERVICES, BY FIELD OF SERVICE AND BY AGE (respondents expressing any opinion = 100 per cent)*

Field of Service	Age Group				Total All Ages
	Under 25	25-44	45-65	65 & Up	
Aged	49.1	50.2	60.5	64.6	59.1
Community Relations	35.7	39.6	42.2	47.7	41.1
Community Center	60.0	29.6	38.5	38.5	37.1
Child Care	61.6	48.1	49.6	48.1	49.8
Family Service	61.1	40.3	43.6	48.7	44.2
Vocational Service	52.9	33.7	51.7	45.2	44.2
Hospital	39.2	39.3	34.7	50.6	38.0

* Limited to respondents reporting awareness of service in their community.

PREFERENCE FOR "MUCH MORE" COMMUNITY SPENDING FOR LOCAL SERVICES,
BY SEX

A greater proportion of women favored a larger increase in community support than did men. Only with regard to the Jewish Community Center was this reversed, with 45 per cent of the men indicating that they wanted 'much more' community spending for this service compared with 31 per cent of the women. There are undoubtedly various factors involved in this apparent sex difference in outlook, one of which may relate to the men being more likely to make the decision on payment.

Table 5 PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS PREFERRING "MUCH MORE"
COMMUNITY SPENDING ON SERVICES, BY FIELD OF SERVICE AND BY SEX
(for each sex, respondents with any agencies = 100 per cent)*

<u>Field of Service</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
Aged	55.4	60.2
Community Relations	39.9	45.0
Community Center	44.5	30.5
Child Care	40.4	58.0
Family Service	34.7	52.9
Vocational Service	42.9	47.8
Hospital	35.5	43.6

* Limited to respondents reporting awareness of service in their community.

PREFERENCE FOR "MUCH MORE" COMMUNITY SPENDING FOR LOCAL SERVICES, BY
HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Attitudes were analyzed for those in households reporting \$20,000 or more in household income, and those reporting less than \$20,000. For most services, the differences in the proportion of respondents who want the community to spend 'much more' is not significant, differing in most cases by no more than 2 or 3 percentage points.

However, in two fields there were significant differences. With regard to Aged services, the households reporting \$20,000 or more in family income showed 48 per cent of the persons wishing the community to spend "much more", compared with 63 per cent for those with income of under \$20,000. This pattern was reversed with regard to the Jewish Community Center, with 45 per cent of the persons in the higher income households wanting "much more" spent, compared with 35 per cent for the households with income under \$20,000. The preference for much more community support of Jewish Homes for the Aged expressed by persons in households in less than \$20,000 compared with those households having higher incomes may be due, in part, to the fact that there are more aged, as previous reports have shown, in the lower income group.

Table 6 PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS PREFERRING "MUCH MORE" COMMUNITY SPENDING ON SERVICES, BY FIELD OF SERVICE AND BY FAMILY INCOME (for each income group, respondents with any opinion = 100 per cent)*

<u>Field of Service</u>	<u>Family Income</u>	
	<u>\$20,000 or more</u>	<u>Under \$20,000</u>
Aged	48.1	62.6
Community Relations	39.9	38.9
Community Center	44.8	34.7
Child Care	45.9	46.0
Family Service	42.4	40.0
Vocational Service	40.5	45.1
Hospital	37.6	36.9

* Limited to respondents reporting awareness of service in their communities.

THOSE WHO "STRONGLY PREFER" JEWISH SPONSORSHIP OF LOCAL SERVICES BY PER CENT OF CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS GOING TO JEWISH CAUSES

In Table 7 we see that there is a consistent correlation between those who report that they give 80 per cent of their contributions to Jewish charities and those who report that they "strongly prefer" Jewish sponsorship of local services. With the exception of Jewish Family Services and Jewish Child Care Service, the proportion of those who gave 80 per cent of their contributions to Jewish charities and "strongly preferred" Jewish sponsorship of local services were 20 to 30 per cent higher than the proportions in those households where less than 80 per cent of total contributions was given to Jewish charities.

Table 7 PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS "STRONGLY PREFERRING"
 JEWISH SPONSORSHIP OF SERVICES, BY FIELD OF SERVICE
 AND PROPORTION OF CHARITABLE GIVING GOING TO JEWISH AGENCIES
 (for each income category, respondents reporting any opinion = 100 per cent)*

Field of Service	For Those Who Report Giving: 80 per cent or more of their total contributions to Jewish agencies, the proportion "strongly preferring" Jewish sponsorship	Under 80 per cent of their total contributions to Jewish agencies, the proportion "strongly preferring" Jewish sponsorship
Aged	79.2	66.5
Community Relations	72.9	52.5
Community Center	60.5	50.3
Child Care	50.6	47.7
Family Service	53.3	46.3
Vocational Service	59.3	41.2
Hospital	44.6	33.8

* Limited to respondents reporting awareness of service in their communities.

THOSE WHO "STRONGLY PREFER" JEWISH SPONSORSHIP OF LOCAL SERVICES BY HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Analysis of the persons who "strongly preferred" Jewish sponsorship of local services divided into those in households of \$20,000 or more income, and those with less, revealed a consistent pattern with those having less than \$20,000 household "strongly preferring" Jewish sponsorship by larger proportions than those respondents with household incomes of \$20,000 or more. The differences here, however, are small and, in the case of some fields, minimal. Nevertheless, for Jewish Child Care Service, Jewish

Vocational Service and Jewish Hospitals, the lower income respondents show a very clear-cut "strong preference" for Jewish sponsorship compared with those in households with higher incomes.

Table 8 PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS "STRONGLY PREFERRING" JEWISH SPONSORSHIP OF SERVICES, BY FIELD OF SERVICE AND BY FAMILY INCOME (respondents expressing any opinion = 100 per cent)*

Field of Service	For Those Who Report Family Incomes Of:	
	\$20,000 or more, the proportion "strongly preferring" Jewish sponsorship	Under \$20,000, the proportion "strongly preferring" Jewish sponsorship
Aged	72.6	76.0
Community Relations	64.9	70.0
Community Center	54.6	56.3
Child Care	46.1	56.4
Family Service	50.8	53.7
Vocational Service	44.6	58.0
Hospital	35.1	45.5

* Limited to respondents reporting awareness of service in their communities.

THOSE WHO "STRONGLY PREFER" JEWISH SPONSORSHIP OF LOCAL SERVICES BY "IMPORTANCE" OF BEING JEWISH

The pattern is very clear-cut when the relationship is analyzed for those who stated that being Jewish was "very important", compared to those who answered "somewhat important", or "unimportant" correlated with the preference for Jewish sponsorship of local services. For those

who believe being Jewish is very important, the proportion that strongly preferred Jewish sponsorship of local services ranged from a low of 47 per cent with regard to Jewish hospitals to a high of 82 per cent with regard to Homes for the Aged. The range for other persons was from 28 per cent to 54 per cent. While the rank order of fields of services in terms of a strong preference for Jewish sponsorship was largely the same for both groups, there was one noticeable difference. Those who indicated that being Jewish was "very important" to them, placed the Jewish Vocational Service in the third position, while those who did not feel that being Jewish was "very important" ranked this service lower than Jewish Hospitals.

Table 9 PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS "STRONGLY PREFERRING" JEWISH SPONSORSHIP OF SERVICES, BY FIELD OF SERVICE AND BY IMPORTANCE OF BEING JEWISH (for each category, respondents reporting any opinion = 100 per cent)*

<u>Field of Service</u>	<u>For Those To Whom Being Jewish Is:</u>	
	<u>Very important, the proportion "strongly preferring" Jewish sponsorship</u>	<u>Somewhat important, or unimportant, the proportion "strongly preferring" Jewish sponsorship</u>
Aged	81.7	54.2
Community Relations	72.9	45.8
Community Center	65.9	33.4
Child Care	66.9	31.0
Family Service	64.7	31.4
Vocational Service	69.0	24.4
Hospital	46.6	28.1

* Limited to respondents reporting awareness of service in their communities.

PROPORTION OF ELIGIBLE RESPONDENTS WITH 'NO OPINION'

Table 10 indicates the proportion of eligible respondents who opted for "no opinion" and who are, therefore, not included in the various Tables above. With regard to the question of whether Jewish or general sponsorship of local services was preferred, the range of "no opinion" went from 28 per cent dealing with Hospitals, to 36 per cent dealing with Jewish Child Care Services.

With regard to the question as to whether the Jewish community should spend more, the same, or less money for specified services, the number with no stated opinion was much higher, ranging from 47 per cent with regard to Hospitals to 63 per cent with regard to Jewish Vocational Services.

Table 10 PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WITH
NO STATED OPINION ON COMMUNITY SPENDING
ON SERVICES OR THEIR SPONSORSHIP
(for each category all respondents reporting awareness
of service in their communities = 100 per cent)

<u>Field of Service</u>	<u>Proportion of Respondents With No Stated Opinion As To Whether:</u>	
	<u>Community Should Spend More or Less For Service</u>	<u>Jewish or General Sponsorship or Service is Preferable</u>
Aged	50.1	30.3
Community Relations	55.7	33.2
Community Center	54.4	30.3
Child Care	62.8	36.4
Family Service	62.3	34.3
Vocational Service	63.4	31.6
Hospital	47.2	28.1

Other published reports from the
National Jewish Population Study are:

INTERMARRIAGE
DEMOGRAPHIC HIGHLIGHTS
THE JEWISH AGING
MOBILITY
NATIONAL AND REGIONAL POPULATION COUNTS
JEWISH IDENTIFY
METHODOLOGY