

The United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg

Community Study

Ira M. Sheskin, Ph.D.

Associate Professor
Department of Geography
and Faculty Member
Judaic Studies Program
University of Miami



The United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg

December, 1994

Additional Information on Jews in Harrisburg
History. Michael B. Coleman, <i>The Jews of Harrisburg</i> .
NJPS. The Council of Jewish Federations 1990 National Jewish Population Survey provides a national ``yardstick'' with which to compare results. Copies of the report are available from CJF (730 Broadway, NY, NY 10003) for \$10.
<i>Community Review</i> published bi-weekly by the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg.
Harrisburg Jewish Community Center Commemorative Journal 1983.

The United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg
100 Vaughn Street
Harrisburg, PA 17110
Telephone: (717) 236-9555
Fax: (717) 236-8104

Acknowledgments

This project was a team effort of the Greater Harrisburg Jewish community. The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance of the members of the Demographic Study Committee of the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg, under the able leadership of David Helfman. The Committee assisted in the design of the questionnaire and the survey procedures. All congregational rabbis and agency executives were also given an opportunity to contribute to the design of the questionnaire.

Jordan Harburger, Executive Director of the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg, with whom I also had the pleasure of working with in Orlando, deserves special thanks for his dedication to the project. He has a good grasp of the procedures necessary to implement the results of this study.

A special thanks is due to the Norman and Phyllis Lipsett Supporting Foundation and those who responded to their challenge grant to fund the study.

Of all the Demographic Study Committee chairs with whom I have had the pleasure to interact, David Helfman stands out as the one who made the greatest contribution to the project. He asked probing questions when reviewing this report, which contributed in a significant way to its thoroughness and precision.

Our interviewing team also deserves special mention. Although they were remunerated for their efforts, they often went well beyond the call of duty, recognizing the importance of this project to the Jewish community to which most of them belong.

I would also like to thank my staff, Lillian and Joseph Sheskin, Ronald and Todd Albert and Karen Tina Sheskin, all of whom assisted with many aspects of the project.

As we go to press, the implications of the findings are being studied by various UJC groups and others within the Jewish community. Modifications will certainly be made by UJC, Jewish agencies, organizations, and synagogues to assure the quality of Jewish life and Jewish continuity in Greater Harrisburg.

Abbreviated Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Survey Methodology	4
Chapter 3: Jewish Population Size	21
Chapter 4: Geographic Profile	29
Chapter 5: Demographic Profile	63
Chapter 6: Religious Profile	117
Chapter 7: Synagogues and Jewish Organizations	181
Chapter 8: Jewish Education	217
Chapter 9: Services for the Jewish Community	233
Chapter 10: Social Service Needs	267
Chapter 11: Israel	275
Chapter 12: Anti-Semitism	285
Chapter 13: The Community Review	295
Chapter 14: Philanthropic Profile	307
Appendix A: The Survey Instrument	

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Introduction	1
Other Benefits of a Demographic Study	2
Definition of the Study Area	2
Definitions	2
``Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and Just Jewish''	2
NJPS and Quad Cities	3
Intermarriage	3
Generation	3
Elderly vs. Non-Elderly	3
Median	3
Chapter 2: Survey Methodology	4
The Survey Mechanism	4
Survey Instrument Design	5
Sampling	5
Random Digit Dialing Sample	5
DJN Sample	5
Weighting of the Sample	8
Definition of an Eligible Household	8
Definition of an Eligible Respondent	8
Training Session	9
Publicity	9
Field Work	9
Ethics	9
Comparisons with Other Communities	10
Relationships Between Variables	10
Reading the Tables	11
Small Sample Sizes	11
General Comments on Sample Size	12
Detailed Explanation of Standard Error	12
Estimating the Size of the Jewish Population	18
Reliability of the Survey	19
Some Suggestions for Future Research	20
Chapter 3: Jewish Population Size	21
Chapter Highlights	21
Current Size of the Jewish Population	22
Changes in the Population in Jewish Households, 1985-1992	23
Future Size of the Population in Jewish Households	24
Comparison with Other Metropolitan Areas	25

Chapter 4: Geographic Profile 29

Chapter Highlights	30
Location of the Jewish Population	32
Home Ownership	34
Place of Birth	38
Generational Status	42
Months in Residence	44
Length of Residence	45
Length of Residence at Current Address	49
State or Country of Origin	52
Moving Plans	54
Expected Destination for Movers	58
Adult Children in Harrisburg	60

Chapter 5: Demographic Profile 63

Chapter Highlights	64
Age/Sex Distribution	66
Household Size	76
Household Structure	82
Latch Key Households	89
Marital Status	90
Level of Secular Education	96
Employment Status	102
Housing Value	106
Household Income	110
Voter Registration	114

Chapter 6: Religious Profile 117

Chapter Highlights	118
Current Jewish Identification	120
Current Religious Practices	130
Light Chanukah Candles	132
Attend a Passover Seder	136
Have a Mezuzah on the Front Door	141
Keep Kosher	145
Light Sabbath Candles	150
Refrain From Use of Electricity on the Sabbath	155
Have a Christmas Tree in the Home	158
Synagogue Attendance	162
Intermarriage	172
The Children of Intermarriage	178

Chapter 7: Synagogues and Jewish Organizations 181

Chapter Highlights	182
Synagogue Membership	184
Results of Synagogue Survey	190
Profile of Synagogue Members	194
Importance of Synagogue Cost as a Reason for Joining and Not Joining a Synagogue	196
Jewish Organizational Membership	198
Jewish Community Center Membership	203
Major Reason for Not Joining the JCC	206
Activities a JCC Could Offer	209
Jewish Community Center Participation	211
Association with the Jewish Community	213
Overall Involvement in Jewish Activity	214

Chapter 8: Jewish Education 217

Chapter Highlights	218
Formal Jewish Education of Adults	219
Type of Formal Jewish Education of Adults	222
Children in Preschool	224
Type of Education of Children	226
Formal Jewish Education of Children	227
The Yeshiva Academy	230
Quality of Hebrew School Education	232

Chapter 9: Service for the Jewish Community 233

Chapter Highlights	233
Familiarity with Jewish Agencies	235
Familiarity with the Jewish Home	238
Familiarity with the Yeshiva Academy	241
Familiarity with the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg	244
Familiarity with the Jewish Family Service	247
Familiarity with the B'nai B'rith Housing	250
Familiarity with the Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies	253
Quality of Services Provided by Jewish Agencies	256
Preference for Jewish-Sponsored Services for Family Problems	260
College Attended by Those Under Age 30	264

Chapter 10: Social Service Needs 267

Chapter Highlights	267
Disabilities	268
Need for Selected Social Services	271

Chapter 11: Israel 275

Chapter Highlights	275
Percentage of Households in which Someone Has Been to Israel	276
Emotional Attachment to Israel	281

Chapter 12: Anti-Semitism	285
Chapter Highlights	285
Personal Experience with Anti-Semitism in the Past Year in Greater Harrisburg	285
Perception of Anti-Semitism in Greater Harrisburg	290
Chapter 13: The Community Review	295
Chapter Highlights	295
Market Penetration of the <i>Community Review</i>	296
Profile of Readers of the <i>Community Review</i>	300
Perception of the Quality of the <i>Community Review</i>	301
Preference for Editorial Content	304
Chapter 14: Philanthropic Profile	307
Chapter Highlights	308
Overall Levels of Donation to Jewish and Non-Jewish Charities and to the UJC	309
Overall Levels of Giving	310
Jewish Charities	310
United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg	312
Non-Jewish Charities	318
Contributions to Jewish Charities and Non-Jewish Charities Compared	320
Contributions to Jewish Charities	322
Contributors and Non-Contributors to the UJC	326
Contributions to the UJC	330
Contributions to Non-Jewish Charities	334
Preference for Israel/Local Allocation	338
Provision for Jewish Charities in Wills	342

Appendix A: The Survey Instrument

List of Tables

Chapter 2: Survey Methodology

Table 2-1: Results of the Random Digit Dialing	6
Table 2-2: Distinctive Jewish Names	7
Table 2-3: Approximate Standard Errors of Projected Percentages	14
Table 2-4: Sampling Errors of Differences Between Percentages	15
Table 2-5: Comparison of Survey Results with Reality	20

Chapter 3: Jewish Population Size

Table 3-1: Current Size of the Jewish Population	22
Table 3-2: Geographic Distribution Among Regions Based Upon City Directories 1985-1992	23
Table 3-3: Absolute Changes in the Geographic Distribution of the Jewish Population 1985-1994	24
Table 3-4: Jewish Population Figures for Pennsylvania	25
Table 3-5: Jewish Communities of 5,000-10,000	26

Chapter 4: Geographic Profile

Table 4-1: Population by Zip Codes	33
Table 4-2: Percentage Owning Home Comparison with Other Communities	35
Table 4-3: Home Ownership	36
Table 4-4: Place of Birth of Persons in Jewish Households	39
Table 4-5: Place of Birth Comparison with Other Communities	40
Table 4-6: Generational Status by Age of Respondent	43
Table 4-7: Generational Status by Area	43
Table 4-8: Generational Status Comparison with Other Communities	44
Table 4-9: Length of Residence by Geographic Area	45
Table 4-10: Length of Residence by Geographic Area	45
Table 4-11: Length of Residence Comparison with Other Communities	46
Table 4-12: Household Structure by Length of Residence	48
Table 4-13: Length of Residence at Current Address by Geographic Area	49
Table 4-14: Length of Residence at Current Address Comparison with Other Communities	50
Table 4-15: Place of Previous Residence of Respondents	53
Table 4-16: Moving Plans Comparison with Other Communities	55
Table 4-17: Moving Plans Comparison with Other Communities	55
Table 4-18: Moving Plans by Geographic Area	56
Table 4-19: Moving Plans by Age of Respondent	56
Table 4-20: Moving Plans by Marital Status	57
Table 4-21: Moving Plans by Household Structure	57
Table 4-22: Expected Destinations of Movers	58
Table 4-23: Expected Destination for Movers Comparison with Other Communities	59
Table 4-24: Percent of Households With Adult child in Greater Harrisburg	61

Chapter 5: Demographic Profile

Table 5-1: Age\Sex Distribution	67
Table 5-2: Age 19 and Under Comparison with Other Communities	69
Table 5-3: Age 60 and Over Comparison with Other Communities	70
Table 5-4: Percentage Female Comparison with Other Communities	71
Table 5-5: Age by Geographic Area	73
Table 5-6: Age by Geographic Area	75
Table 5-7: Household Size by Area	77
Table 5-8: Average Household Size Comparison with Other Communities	78
Table 5-9: Number of Persons Per Household Comparison with Other Communities	79
Table 5-10: Household Structure	83
Table 5-11: Household Structure Comparison with Other Communities	84
Table 5-12: Household Structure by Geographic Area	87
Table 5-13: Household Structure by Geographic Area	88

Table 5-14: Latch Key Households Comparison with other Communities	89
Table 5-15: Current Marital Status by Geographic Area	91
Table 5-16: Current Marital Status Comparison with Other Communities	92
Table 5-17: Current Marital Status by Age, Males	94
Table 5-18: Current Marital Status by Age, Females	95
Table 5-19: Level of Secular Education by Sex	97
Table 5-20: Level of Secular Education Comparison with Other Communities	98
Table 5-21: Level of Secular Education by Age, Males	100
Table 5-22: Level of Secular Education by Age, Females	101
Table 5-23: Level of Secular Education by Area	101
Table 5-24: Employment Status by Sex	102
Table 5-25: Employment Status Comparison with Other Communities	103
Table 5-26: Employment Status by Geographic Area	104
Table 5-27: Employment Status by Age, Males	105
Table 5-28: Employment Status by Age, Females	105
Table 5-29: Housing Value Comparison with Other Communities	107
Table 5-30: Housing Value by Geographic Area	107
Table 5-31: Housing Value by Age of Respondent	108
Table 5-32: Housing Value by Jewish Identification	109
Table 5-33: Housing Value by Home Ownership and Synagogue Membership	109
Table 5-34: 1993 Household Income by Geographic Area	110
Table 5-35: Household Income Comparison with Other Communities	111
Table 5-36: 1993 Household Income by Age of Respondent	112
Table 5-37: 1993 Household Income by Household Structure	113
Table 5-38: Voter Registration Comparison with Other Communities	114
Table 5-39: Voter Registration	115

Chapter 6: Religious Profile

Table 6-1: Jewish Identification by Geographic Area	121
Table 6-2: Jewish Identification by Geographic Area	121
Table 6-3: Jewish Identification Comparison with Other Communities	122
Table 6-4: Jewish Identification by Age	124
Table 6-5: Jewish Identification by Age of the Respondent	125
Table 6-6: Jewish Identification by Household Structure	125
Table 6-7: Jewish Identification by Length of Residence	127
Table 6-8: Jewish Identification by Generation	127
Table 6-9: Jewish Identification by Synagogue Membership and Intermarriage	128
Table 6-10: Summary Findings on Religious Practices	131
Table 6-11: Light Chanukah Candles Comparison with Other Communities	133
Table 6-12: Light Chanukah Candles	134
Table 6-13: Attend a Passover Seder Comparison with Other Communities	137
Table 6-14: Attend a Passover Seder	139
Table 6-15: Have a Mezuzah on Front Door Comparison with Other Communities	142
Table 6-16: Have a Mezuzah on Front Door	143
Table 6-17: Keep Kosher in Home Comparison with Other Communities	146
Table 6-18: Keep Kosher in Home and In and Out of Home Comparison with Other Communities	147
Table 6-19: Observance of the Kosher Laws	148
Table 6-20: Light Sabbath Candles Comparison with Other Communities	151
Table 6-21: Light Sabbath Candles	153
Table 6-22: Refrain from Use of Electricity on the Sabbath	156
Table 6-23: Have a Christmas Tree in Home Comparison with Other Communities	159
Table 6-24: Have a Christmas Tree in Your Home	160
Table 6-25: Attendance at Services by Sex and Synagogue Membership	163
Table 6-26: Attendance at Services Comparison with Other Communities	164
Table 6-27: Attendance at Services by Age	166
Table 6-28: Attendance at Services by Generation	167

Table 6-29: Attendance at Services by Household Structure	168
Table 6-30: Attendance at Services by Geographic Area	169
Table 6-31: Attendance at Services by Jewish Identification	170
Table 6-32: Attendance at Services by Visits to Israel	171
Table 6-33: Intermarriage by Age	173
Table 6-34: Intermarriage Comparison with Other Communities	174
Table 6-35: Intermarriage	176
Table 6-36: The Children of Intermarriage	178
Table 6-37: The Percentage of Children Who are Jewish Comparison with Other Communities	179

Chapter 7: Synagogues and Jewish Organizations

Table 7-1: Membership In a Synagogue	187
Table 7-2: Synagogue Membership Comparison with Other Communities	189
Table 7-3: Lifetime Synagogue Membership Comparison with Other Communities	190
Table 7-4: Synagogue Type Comparison with Other Communities	191
Table 7-5: Results of Survey of Synagogues	193
Table 7-6: Importance of Cost in Your Decision to Join or Not Join a Synagogue	196
Table 7-7: Importance of Cost as a Reason for Joining or Not Joining a Synagogue	197
Table 7-8: Current Memberships	200
Table 7-9: Organizational Membership Comparison with Other Communities	202
Table 7-10: JCC Membership Comparison with Other Communities	204
Table 7-11: Overlapping Memberships Comparisons with Other Communities	205
Table 7-12: Major Reason for Not Joining the JCC	207
Table 7-13: Major Reason for Not Joining the JCC Comparison with Other Communities	207
Table 7-14: Activities the JCC Could Offer That Would Make You Consider Joining	210
Table 7-15: JCC Participation Comparison with Other Communities	211
Table 7-16: Associated with the Jewish Community	214
Table 7-17: Memberships, Philanthropy and Ritual Practice	215

Chapter 8: Jewish Education

Table 8-1: Percent of Adults with a Formal Jewish Education by Age and Sex	219
Table 8-2: Percent of Adults with a Formal Jewish Education by Geographic Area	220
Table 8-3: Percent of Adults with a Formal Jewish Education Comparison with Other Communities	221
Table 8-4: Type of Jewish Education of Adults who Had a Jewish Education	223
Table 8-5: Preschool Education	225
Table 8-6: Percent of Children in Preschool who are in Jewish Preschool Comparison with Other Communities	225
Table 8-7: Type of School for Jewish Children	226
Table 8-8: Formal Jewish Education of Jewish Children	228
Table 8-9: Formal Jewish Education of Jewish Children Ages 6-17 Comparison with Other Communities	229
Table 8-10: Children Currently Enrolled in Jewish Education Comparison with Other Communities	229
Table 8-11: Market Segments for Yeshiva Academy	230
Table 8-12: Reasons for Not Sending Child to Yeshiva Academy	231

Chapter 9: Services for the Jewish Community

Table 9-1: Familiarity with Jewish Agencies	235
Table 9-2: Familiarity with Federation (UJC) Comparison with Other Communities	236
Table 9-3: Familiarity with the Local Jewish Nursing Home Comparison with Other Communities	237
Table 9-4: Familiarity with the Jewish Family Service Comparison with Other Communities	237
Table 9-5: Familiarity with the Jewish Home.	239
Table 9-6: Familiarity with the Yeshiva Academy	242
Table 9-7: Familiarity with the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg	245
Table 9-8: Familiarity with the Jewish Family Service	248

Table 9-9: Familiarity with B'nai B'rith Housing	251
Table 9-10: Familiarity with Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies	254
Table 9-11: Quality of Service Provided by Jewish Agencies	256
Table 9-12: Quality of Service Provided by the Local Jewish Nursing Home Comparison with Other Communities	257
Table 9-13: Quality of Service Provided by Jewish Family Service Comparison with Other Communities	258
Table 9-14: Quality of Service Provided by the Federation Comparison with Other Communities	259
Table 9-15: Preference for Jewish-Sponsored Counseling Services Comparison with Other Communities	261
Table 9-16: Preference for Jewish-Sponsored Counseling Services	262
Table 9-17: Colleges Attended By Those Under Age 30	265

Chapter 10: Social Service Needs

Table 10-1: Disabilities	269
Table 10-2: Percentage of Households Containing a Disabled Person Comparison with Other Communities	270
Table 10-3: Need for Selected Social Services in the Past Year	272
Table 10-4: Need for Selected Social Services	273
Table 10-5: Need for Counseling Comparison with Other Communities	274
Table 10-6: Need for Singles Programs Comparison with Other Communities	274

Chapter 11: Visits to Israel

Table 11-1: Someone in Household Has Been to Israel	278
Table 11-2: Someone in Household Been to Israel Comparison with Other Cities	280
Table 11-3: Emotional Attachment to Israel	282
Table 11-4: Emotional Attachment to Israel Comparison with Other Communities	284

Chapter 12: Anti-Semitism

Table 12-1: Personally Experienced Anti-Semitism in the Past Year in Greater Harrisburg	287
Table 12-2: Personal Experience with Anti-Semitism in the Past Year Comparison with Other Communities	289
Table 12-3: Perception of Anti-Semitism in Greater Harrisburg	291
Table 12-4: Perception of Anti-Semitism Existing in Community Comparison with Other Communities	293

Chapter 13: The Community Review

Table 13-1: Percentage Reading or Receiving the <i>Community Review</i>	297
Table 13-2: Percentage Reading the Local Jewish Newspaper	299
Table 13-3: Perception of the Quality of the <i>Community Review</i>	302
Table 13-3: Perception of the Quality of the Local Jewish Newspaper Comparison with Other Communities	304
Table 13-5: Preference for Editorial Content of the <i>Community Review</i>	305

Chapter 14: Philanthropic Giving

Table 14-1: Levels of Donation to Jewish and Non-Jewish Charities, and to The United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg	311
Table 14-2: Percentage Contributing to Jewish and Non-Jewish Charities Comparison with Other Communities	313
Table 14-3: Dollar Amounts Contributed to Jewish Charities Comparison with Other Communities	314
Table 14-4: Contributions to the Jewish Federation Comparison with Other Communities	316
Table 14-5: Contributions to Non-Jewish Charities Comparison with other Communities	319
Table 14-6: Overlapping Jewish and Non-Jewish Giving Patterns	321
Table 14-7: Contributions to Jewish Charities	323
Table 14-8: Contributors and Non-Contributors to The United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg . . .	327
Table 14-9: Donation Market Segments Comparison with Other Communities	330
Table 14-10: Contributions to The United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg	331
Table 14-11: Contributions to NON-Jewish Charities	335
Table 14-12: Preference for UJC Allocations	339
Table 14-13: Preferences for Federation Allocations Comparison with Other Communities	341
Table 14-14: Have a Will with Provisions for Jewish Charity	343

Chapter 1

Introduction

This is the first report arising from the demographic study of the Jewish population of Greater Harrisburg. The study commenced in April, 1994 and was completed in December, 1994. The need for such a study had been recognized for some time. Thus, Dr. Ira M. Sheskin of the University of Miami was engaged to undertake the effort, under the direction of the Executive Director of The United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg, Jordan Harburger. David Helfman chaired the Demographic Study Committee. This chapter outlines the purposes of the study.

The significant changes in the Greater Harrisburg Jewish community present major challenges. Planning based upon sound information is vital. Research and planning have become essential components of the activities of the organized Jewish community in the United States. More than 50 community and marketing studies have been completed in American Jewish communities since 1980, and a National Jewish Population Survey was conducted by the Council of Jewish Federations in 1971 and 1990. Complex decisions must be made by UJC concerning: 1) the location of facilities; 2) the implementation of new programs and the curtailment of others; and 3) new methods for increasing fund-raising and affiliation.

In many ways, the term “demographic study” is a misnomer, for community studies such as this one are actually designed to collect information on more than just demographic factors. This study has collected data about a broad range of demographic and geographic characteristics, religious involvement, service delivery, and campaign information. The relationship between the first three areas (demographic, geographic, and religious) and service delivery and campaign information are of particular importance. More specifically, this study was designed to collect information on the following factors:

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| 1) Geographic Profile | 7) Anti-Semitism |
| 2) Demographic Profile | 8) Philanthropic Activity |
| 3) Religious Profile | 9) Israel |
| 4) Synagogues and Jewish Organizations | 10) the <i>Community Review</i> |
| 5) Formal Jewish Education | (the local Jewish newspaper) |
| 6) Needs of the Jewish Community | |

Other Benefits of a Demographic Study

In addition to the information collected by this study, a number of other benefits of the research process may be noted:

- 1) Many people in the community were contacted by UJC for the first time, for the purpose of soliciting information and their opinions about themselves and the Jewish community. The vast majority of respondents were pleased to receive a call, and, on the whole, a good public relations job was accomplished.
- 2) Many respondents, simply via the act of answering the questions, were provided an opportunity to examine their own Jewish identities and their relationship to the Jewish community.
- 3) About 30 community persons were involved in the interviewing. These persons learned much about the Jewish community, and many will probably increase their involvement in the future.
- 4) The circulation of the study report throughout the community will lead to a greater awareness of the programs and services available within the Jewish community and should help to unify efforts of, and clarify directions for, various Jewish organizations.

Definition of the Study Area

The study area includes all areas of Greater Harrisburg included in the local telephone directory and is divided into two regions. East Shore includes all applicable areas to the east of the Susquehanna River. West Shore includes all applicable areas west of the river.

Definitions

The definitions used in this reported are those used in the National Jewish Population Survey.

Orthodox, Conservative, Reconstructionist, Reform, and Just Jewish

With the exception of the section on the types of synagogues, when results are reported for Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, or Just Jewish groups, reference is being made to a person's self-identification, not type of synagogue membership. Note that Reconstructionist does not appear in many tables because of the small sample size for this group.

NJPS and Quad Cities

In a number of tables comparing the results of this study with other cities, reference is made to the National Jewish Population Studies (NJPS), conducted in 1971 and 1990. As implied by the title, these were national studies of Jews in the United States. These studies were conducted by the Council of Jewish Federations.

Quad Cities refers to the Davenport, Iowa and Rock Island, Illinois areas.

Types of Marriage

In-Marriages are of two types:

- **In-marriage:** An in-marriage is when both spouses were born Jewish and both currently consider themselves Jewish.
- **Conversionary marriage:** A conversionary marriage is an in-marriage when one spouse was not born Jewish, but currently considers him/herself Jewish (irrespective of formal conversion) and the other spouse was born Jewish and is currently Jewish.

Intermarriage: An intermarriage is when one spouse was born Jewish and is currently Jewish and the other spouse was not born Jewish and does not currently consider him/herself Jewish.

Generation

Generational data are available for the respondent only.

- **First generation:** The respondent is categorized as first generation if he/she was born outside the United States.
- **Second generation:** The respondent is categorized as second generation if he/she was born in the United States, but his/her mother was born outside the United States.
- **Third generation or higher:** The respondent was born in the United States and his/her mother was also born in the United States.

Elderly vs. Non-Elderly

Except as otherwise specified in this report, elderly refers to persons age 65 and over, non-elderly, to persons under age 65.

Median

The median is a measure of the “central tendency” of a distribution. For example, if the median age is 40, this implies that half of the population is older than 40 and half is younger.

Chapter 2

Survey Methodology

The study was conducted via telephone, utilizing the appropriate sample design, questionnaire development process, and analytical techniques. This section summarizes the methodology used in each phase of the study.

The Survey Mechanism

The first step was to select an appropriate survey mechanism. The choices included a mail survey, the distribution of questionnaires at synagogues and other Jewish institutions, a home interview survey, and a random digit dialing telephone survey, supplemented when necessary by telephone directory methods. Consistent with most other Jewish demographic studies conducted in the United States in recent years, the random digit dialing telephone survey was selected. This methodology has the advantages of a high response rate, the guarantee of anonymity to the respondent, and eliminates the necessity of compiling a list of Jewish households from which to sample.

The random digit dialing telephone survey proceeded as follows. For each of about 30 three-digit telephone exchange codes (652, 238, 236 etc.) in the study area, four-digit random numbers were generated to produce 7-digit telephone numbers. These numbers were purchased from Survey Sampling, Inc. in Fairfield, Connecticut. When an interviewer dialed these numbers, there was no guarantee that a residential household, let alone a Jewish household, was reached. In fact, 17,400 different numbers were dialed to produce the 188 successful random digit dialed interviews. This is a yield rate of 1.1% (188/17,400). The remainder of the numbers dialed were either disconnected, not in service, changed to an unlisted number, changed to a new number, businesses, no answer after at least four attempts, fax machines, or non-Jewish households.

Because there was no guarantee that a Jewish household had been reached, the first question asked after a brief introduction was: "Was anyone in your household born or raised as a Jew?" If the answer was "yes," the interview continued. If the answer was "no," a second question was used: "Are there any Jewish persons or persons who consider themselves Jewish living in this household?" If the answer was still "no," the interviewee was thanked and the interview terminated.

A very important aspect of this procedure is that it results in a fair share of interviews from households who choose not to have their telephone number in the telephone directory. New residents, people in certain professions, and single persons living alone are least likely to have their numbers published.

Less than 5% of Americans have no telephone. In this area, only 2.1% of households do not have telephones. This percentage is probably lower and negligible for the Jewish population. Obviously, Jews without telephones could not be included in the study. In addition, no persons in institutions, such as nursing homes, were able to be interviewed, unless the institution provided separate telephone numbers for each resident.

Survey Instrument Design

The survey instrument was designed through a cooperative effort by The United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg Demographic Study Committee and staff and Professor Ira Sheskin of the University of Miami. In addition, congregational rabbis and local agency executives were provided an opportunity for input to the questionnaire.

Sampling

The sample is a combination of a RDD sample (random digit dialing, discussed above) and a DJN sample (see below) of Jewish households from the telephone directory. In total, 457 interviews were conducted; 188 were developed through the RDD sample, and 269, through the DJN sample.

RDD Sample

The results of the RDD survey calling are shown in **Table 2-1** for the first 17,400 random digit dialed numbers. In total, 188 RDD interviews were completed and 4 potential respondents refused. 97% of persons known to be Jewish who were contacted cooperated with the survey.

Note that 59% of the calls went to non-Jewish residences; 9% of persons were never home, another 14% of the numbers turned out to be disconnected and 9% of the calls reached business or government numbers. In all, telephones were dialed more than 36,000 times to complete 188 interviews.

Only the following exchange codes were called: 232, 233, 234, 236, 238, 243, 249, 258, 533, 540, 541, 545, 561, 564, 566, 599, 652, 657, 691, 697, 731, 732, 737, 761, 763, 766, 774, 938, and 939. These exchanges include 95% of the households on the UJC mailing list. 46% of the numbers dialed were in Cumberland County, 50% were in Dauphin County, and 4% were in York, County.

DJN Sample

After the completion of the RDD survey, an additional 269 surveys were completed from households with a distinctive Jewish name (DJN) in the current Greater Harrisburg telephone directory. This greatly facilitated the project: one RDD survey was completed every 2 hours; almost two DJN surveys were completed each hour. The names used for DJN sampling are shown in **Table 2-2**.

The sample size is adequate so that we can be 95% certain that the error margin for the overall county-wide results is no greater than $\pm 4.6\%$. The sample size is also adequate so that we can be 99% certain that the error margin for the results as a whole is no greater than $\pm 6.0\%$.

Table 2-1 Results of the Random Digit Dialing		
Result	Number	Percentage
Non-Jewish Respondents		
Non-Jewish Respondents	10,344	59.4%
Jewish Respondents		
Completed Survey	188	1.1
Terminated Survey	0	0.0
Failed Attempt to Call Back a Jewish Respondent, Jewish Respondent Refused Interview	5	0.03
Other Results		
Refusal from Respondent, but do not know if respondent is Jewish	418	2.4
Disconnected Number	2,426	13.9
Business or Government Number	1,644	9.4
Answering Machine, No Answer or Busy Phone on at least 3 attempts	1,601	9.2
Changed to unlisted number or number has been changed	35	0.2
Fax Machine	740	4.3
Total	17,400	100.0%

Table 2-2
Distinctive Jewish Names
Source: United Jewish Appeal Demographic Kit

Abraham	Goldberg	Nathanson	Zeitlin
Abrahams	Goldfarb	Perlman	Zuckerman
Abrahamson	Goldman	Pincus	
Abramovitz	Goldstein	Rabinowitz	
Abrams	Gottlieb	Rappaport	
Abramson	Greenbaum	Rosen	
Adelman	Greenberg	Rosenbaum	
Aronson	Greenwald	Rosenberg	
Bercovitz	Grossman	Rosenblatt	
Berkowitz	Halperin	Rosenbloom	
Berman	Halpern	Rosenblum	
Bernstein	Halprin	Rosenstein	
Birnbaum	Horowitz	Rosenthal	
Blumberg	Horwitz	Rothman	
Blumenthal	Hurwitz	Rothschild	
Bornstein	Hyman	Rothstein	
Brodsky	Isenberg	Ruben	
Brody	Kahn	Rubenstein	
Cahn	Kaplan	Rubin	
Caplan	Katz	Samuels	
Cohen	Katzman	Schulman	
Cohn	Kohn	Segal	
Eisenberg	Lefkowitz	Shapiro	
Eisner	Lerner	Shulman	
Epstein	Levi	Siegel	
Feinberg	Levin	Silverman	
Feingold	Levine	Silverstein	
Feinstein	Levinson	Strauss	
Feldman	Levitt	Sugarman	
Finkelstein	Margolin	Weinberg	
Freedman	Margolis	Weiner	
Friedman	Markowitz	Weinstein	
Ginsberg	Moskowitz	Weintraub	
Gold	Nathan	Wexler	

Weighting of the Sample

As mentioned above, two sampling methods were utilized—random digit dialing (RDD) and Distinctive Jewish Names (DJNs). The RDD subsample was compared to the DJN subsample on a number of key variables (age, length of residence, household size, geographic area, marital status, home ownership, Jewish denomination, synagogue membership, JCC membership, trips to Israel, contributions to the UJC, income, etc.). It was found (using chi-square tests) that these two subsamples did differ significantly on age and synagogue membership. Thus, appropriate weighting factors were developed to correct this problem to the maximum extent. For further information, see Ira M. Sheskin, *Survey Research for Geographers* (Washington, DC: Association of American Geographers) Ch. 3.

Definition of an Eligible Household

For the purposes of this study, an eligible household was one that contained at least one person who was either currently Jewish or had been born or raised Jewish. No institutionalized persons were interviewed. Persons in retirement communities, such as adult congregate living facilities (ACLFs), were interviewed.

Definition of an Eligible Respondent

No procedure was used to select a person randomly within each Jewish household. Rather, an attempt was made to interview a Jewish person within each household who was 18 years of age or over. The only known bias resulting from this procedure was that 65% of respondents were female, whereas 53% of the adult population is female.

Any respondent age 18 or over who identified him/herself as Jewish was interviewed. This type of self-definition is standard in Jewish community studies. In households containing non-Jewish members, the Jewish member was interviewed, if at all possible, because of the significant number of questions applicable only to Jews. When interviewing a non-Jew, several questions were asked with the non-Jew in a proxy fashion. For example, a non-Jew was asked if his/her spouse considered him/herself Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, Reconstructionist, or Just Jewish.

Unlike the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey, however, by design, we did not interview people who had a Jewish parent, but were not raised Jewish and are not currently Jewish.

Training Session

Paid workers from the Jewish community were used for the interviewing process. These workers were found via advertisements in the *Community Review* (the local Jewish newspaper) and by word of mouth. A four-hour training session was held at the JCC on June 5, 1994. A training manual was provided to each worker. About 30 persons attended the training session. Ultimately, about 26 workers did the vast majority of the interviewing. Workers were paid \$6/hour.

Publicity

Stories about the survey appeared in the *Community Review* and in the *Patriot and Evening News*. A flyer was sent to everyone on the UJC's mailing list. Bulletin advertisements and announcements were sent to all synagogues and Jewish organizations. Posters about the survey were distributed throughout the community. The purpose of this publicity was to prepare potential respondents for the possibility that they might receive a telephone call, hopefully making them more receptive.

Field Work

The survey commenced on June 6, 1994, and continued until June 14, 1994. To facilitate contacting respondents, each candidate telephone number was redialed as necessary. Each number was dialed at least four times: twice on two different evenings, once on a weekend, and once on a weekday. Interviewing was conducted between 9:30 a.m. and 9:30 p.m. No interviewing was done on Friday evening or Saturday.

The interviews averaged about 15 minutes and the response rate was 97% on the RDD portion of the survey (among households with an identified Jew). The company, Survey Sampling of Fairfield, Connecticut, which is responsible for providing samples for thousands of surveys per year, indicates that survey researchers are often achieving response rates below 50%. Thus, the 97% overall response rate is much higher than most recent surveys. The higher response rate may be attributable, in part, to the effort made to convince refusals to eventually participate. Initial refusals were called back at least two more times. In many cases, Professor Sheskin explained the purpose of the survey to reluctant respondents, and he was able to convince many reluctant respondents to participate.

Ethics

Because respondents were contacted in the privacy of their homes and personal questions were asked, each interviewer was required to sign an "Ethics Statement," modified from the "Code of Professional Ethics and Practices" of the American Association of Public Opinion Research.

Comparisons with Other Communities

Whenever possible, comparisons are made to other Jewish communities. These comparisons are limited to communities where community surveys have been conducted since 1979, and by whether questions were relatively similar to those asked in Greater Harrisburg.

The comparisons in the tables to the National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) are to those households in the survey which are Core Jewish households as defined in that study. Core Jewish households contain at least one person who is Jewish by religion, a secular Jew, or a Jew by Choice.

Note that, in the cases of Miami, Chicago, and New York, results may appear twice. Each community has now done two studies, one in the early 1980s and one in the 1990s.

Relationships Between Variables

First, an important distinction must be made between ``correlation'' and ``cause and effect.'' Simply because one finds a correlation—a ``relationship''—between two variables **does not necessarily imply** that one causes the other. To cite an extreme example to illustrate this point, scientists have found a statistical relationship between sunspot activity and the size of the rabbit population in England. That is, during years in which there are more sunspots, there are also more rabbits in England! While the relationship exists, one cannot prove that sunspots cause rabbits. (Or that rabbits cause sunspots!)

The lesson for this report is that just because one finds a relationship between, for example, charitable giving to non-Jewish causes and synagogue membership, it does not necessarily imply a cause and effect relationship. That is, because synagogue members are more likely to give charitable donations does not ``prove'' that belonging to a synagogue ``causes'' one to give charitable donations. It could be that those who are already more philanthropic are more likely to join a synagogue. Or it could be that higher income respondents are both more likely to be philanthropic and to join a synagogue and that the relationship shown between synagogue membership and philanthropy is actually a relationship of both of these factors with income.

Second, in many ways, surveys ``create'' rather than collect data. That is, persons are asked to think about some issues that they have probably not thought about before in quite the same way (terms such as ``definitely'' and ``strongly prefer''). Groups of people react to questions in varying ways. Thus, if one finds a significant difference between the responses of the elderly and the young, it may be due to real differences in attitudes between the two groups resulting from the different environments in which the two groups have matured or due to the greater experience of the elderly. On the other hand, the difference could very well be attributable to the varying manner in which persons of different ages respond to questions or to being interviewed.

Reading the Tables

Percentage distributions for each question on the questionnaire are shown, along with selected crosstabulations by age, geographic area, sex, generation, household structure, marital status, income, synagogue membership, religious identification, and other variables.

In some tables, ``don't knows'' and missing values are included in the computations, and in some cases they are not included. This depends on whether the ``don't know'' is a statement of value or merely an inability to remember.

Throughout the tables, two additional pieces of information are presented: the **projected** number of Jewish households (or individuals) and the **sample size**, or actual number of interviews obtained for a particular group.

Throughout this report, where percentages do not always add to 100%, it is because of rounding error, multiple answers, or ``no response'' from respondents. When reading the tables, percentages add **down** when the percent signs appear across the top of the columns. The tables add **across** when the percent signs appear in the first column. Because only a small number of tables add across, the headings of these tables indicate such.

A word of explanation is necessary about the relationship between the sample size column and the projected number of households (or individuals) column. The sample size column is based upon the actual number of surveys completed with particular types of people. The projected numbers are based upon the *weighted* percentages of different groups. For example, the tables indicate a sample size of **39** non-elderly single households and project **336** such households. The tables also indicate a sample size of **71** elderly couple households and project **307** such households. This is not an error. Rather, when the weighting factors were programmed, younger households were given higher weights and older households were given lower weights for the reasons explained on page 8.

Small Sample Sizes

Because of limited sample size, it is not always possible to have detailed analyses for every combination of variables that one might desire. Furthermore, the incidence of certain sub-populations (e.g., particular service users) in the total population is so small that the total number of cases in a survey such as this is not large enough to do detailed analyses.

While standard tests of significance have been used to evaluate the entire data set, a discussion of these tests in conjunction with each table or interpretation is not included in this report. While of use to social scientists in determining causality, inclusion of these significance tests in the report is not very informative for most readers.

The following rules were generally followed in deciding when to report on particular variables. A minimum cell size of 30 within a crosstabulation was necessary before any inferences would be drawn. This is a relatively small number of cases compared to many other kinds of scientific or social scientific studies. However, it should be clearly stated that the sampling error on such small numbers is quite large. The data are used in an interpretive way to draw general impressions and inferences, and should not be used as literal representations of the population. Differences of 5% to 10% or even more between two variables when the cell size is so small should not be taken as exact representations. It should merely point to directional differences.

In a number of instances, the sample size for a particular group is followed by an asterisk. This is done to call the reader's attention to the small sample size.

General Comments on Sample Size

Since this study of the Greater Harrisburg Jewish community is based on a sample of the total Jewish population, rather than on a study of the total Jewish population, the resulting figures are subject to sampling variability. This causes estimates based on a sample to vary by chance. Standard error is the estimate of random variation of a sample statistic around its true population parameter, which would be obtained if data were collected from every member of the whole population. Sampling variability does not bias our estimates, but defines a range of confidence within which to interpret the sample results.

A sample size of 384 is needed so that one can be 95% certain that no reported percentage varies by more than $\pm 5\%$, termed the "standard error." That is, with 384 interviews, if 50% of respondents were to say that, for example, they have visited Israel, one could be 95% certain that if one asked every Jewish household in the area, the percentage of affirmative responses would lie between 45% and 55%. With 457 interviews, the error margin is $\pm 4.6\%$.

This error margin is the maximum sampling error that can occur. It is applicable to percentages that are near 50%. As a percentage in this report approaches the extremes of 0% or 100%, the error margin decreases. For example, with a sample size of 384, if 90% of respondents said "yes" to a question, the error margin would be a standard error of $\pm 2.9\%$, rather than the $\pm 5\%$ mentioned above.

Detailed Explanation of Standard Error

Tables 2-3 and 2-4 are generalized tables of standard errors for samples of various sizes and for various proportions, provided that they are selected as simple random samples from an infinite population. **In this case, the errors are less than shown in the tables, since the 457 households represent a 14% sample of all Jewish households.**

Table 2-3 indicates that given a percentage answering a question in a certain way and the total number of cases on which the percentage is based, chances are that 95 times out of 100, the real population percentage (if the study interviewed the whole Jewish population) lies in the range defined by adding and subtracting the number indicated in the table to the percentage obtained from the sample.

Consider the following as an example of the use of **Table 2-3**. Suppose that 26% of a particular group (non-elderly singles) indicated that they have made a trip to Israel. Further suppose that the survey included 32 interviews with non-elderly singles. In **Table 2-3**, the row labeled ``25% or 75%'' would be consulted because 26% is closest to 25%. The column labeled as having a sample size of 25 would be consulted because 32 is closest to 25. The number at the intersection of the ``25% or 75%'' row and the sample size of ``25'' column is 17%. The conclusion is that we can be 95% certain that if we interviewed all Jewish non-elderly singles, the percentage who have been to Israel would lie between 9% and 43% ($26\% \pm 17\%$).

Table 2-4 allows us to compare measures relating to different groups of the population. Some of the differences observed between groups in their responses to a question may be due to sampling error, and should not be regarded as statistically significant. The table indicates the approximate size of the difference between percentages of responses of two groups to a particular question. Each section of the table refers to different percentage levels.

As can be observed from **Table 2-4**, the smaller the actual number of cases in each group, the larger the difference in the percentages between the groups must be to achieve significance. Therefore, comparisons involving small groups should be done with caution. In addition, the closer the percentages are to 50%, the further apart the percentages must be to achieve statistical significance.

Consider the following as an example of the use of **Table 2-4**. Imagine that 45% of those under age 65 (Group 1) and 55% of those age 65 and over (Group 2) observe a particular ritual. Further assume that 400 interviews were conducted with Group 1 and 300 with Group 2. Consulting the final section of the table labeled ``For Percentages Around .50,'' for a Group 1 sample size of 400 and a Group 2 sample size of 300, the two percentages must be 7.4% apart for one to conclude that the two percentages are ``statistically significantly different.'' In this example, the two percentages (55% and 45%) are 10% apart. Thus, we can conclude (with 95% certainty) that if we interviewed all Jewish households in Greater Harrisburg, that we would find that a higher percentage of persons over age 65 observe this ritual.

When using **Tables 2-2 and 2-3**, attention must be given to the fact that the ``sample sizes'' in the tables refer to actual number of respondents and not to the projected number of Jewish households or individuals.

Table 2-3
Approximate Standard Errors of Projected Percentages
(95% Confidence Level)

Estimated Percentage	Sample Size											
	25	50	75	100	150	200	250	300	400	500	750	900
2% or 98%	5.6	4.0	3.2	2.8	2.3	2.0	2.8	1.6	1.4	1.2	1.0	0.9
5% or 95%	8.6	6.2	5.0	4.4	3.5	3.1	2.7	2.5	2.2	1.9	1.6	1.4
10% or 90%	12.0	8.5	6.9	6.0	4.9	4.2	3.8	3.5	3.0	2.7	2.2	1.9
20% or 80%	16.0	11.3	9.2	8.0	6.5	5.6	5.1	4.6	4.0	3.6	2.9	2.5
25% or 75%	17.3	12.2	10.0	8.7	7.1	6.1	5.5	5.0	4.3	3.9	3.2	2.7
30% or 70%	18.3	13.0	10.6	9.2	7.5	6.5	5.8	5.3	4.6	4.1	3.3	2.9
40% or 60%	19.6	13.9	11.3	9.8	8.0	6.9	6.2	5.2	4.9	4.4	3.6	3.1
50%	20.0	14.1	11.5	10.0	8.2	7.1	6.3	5.8	5.0	4.5	3.6	3.2

Source: Adapted from: Moehrer, Herman J. and McTavish, Donald G.
Descriptive Inferential Statistics, 3rd edition. Boston: Allyn Bacon, 1988.
 (This is the source for **Table 2-3** and **2-4**).

Table 2-4
Sampling Errors of Differences Between Percentages

[illegible]

For Percentages Around .10 or .90

[illegible]

Table 2-4 (continued)
Sampling Errors of Differences Between Percentages

For Percentages Around .20 or .80

[illegible]

For Percentages Around .30 or .70

[illegible]

Table 2-4 (continued)
Sampling Errors of Differences Between Percentages

For Percentages Around .40 or .60

[illegible]

For Percentages Around .50

[illegible]

Estimating the Size of the Jewish Population

This study has employed a modified version of a standard methodology that has been used by many Jewish community studies for estimating the size of an area's Jewish population. This methodology may be outlined as follows:

- 1) Information was obtained from the US Census and local planning departments indicating that about 179,363 households lived in Greater Harrisburg in June 1994. According to US census data for Greater Harrisburg, 175,569 of these households have telephones. Thus, only 2.1 % of households have no telephone.
- 2) During the course of the random digit dialing telephone survey, for the first 10,000 random digit dialed numbers, 2.005054% (119/5,935) of the households reached contained one or more Jewish persons. Based upon previous research in other communities and discussions with other persons in the field, a 5 % correction factor was added to account for Jewish households who deny that they are Jewish in surveys such as this one. This means that 2.1061499% of the households in the area contain a Jew. Further adjustments are made to this figure below.
- 3) An examination was made of the 90 households that refused, after repeated calling, to indicate whether the household was Jewish. These telephone numbers were found in a reverse telephone directory and, on the basis of surname and given name, a judgment was rendered as to whether the household was Jewish. A similar procedure was employed for the 339 telephone numbers for which repeated dialings yielded no contact with the household. These numbers were also looked up on the UJC mailing list. These adjustments change the percentage Jewish to 2.2627278 %
- 4) An adjustment was made because not all of the telephone exchange codes in the area were called. Rather, we called 30 exchange codes that contained 95 % of the UJC's mailing list. (Had we called all exchange codes for the random digit dialing portion of the survey, about 9 of the 188 RDD surveys would have come from these exchange codes; thus, a negligible amount of accuracy may have been lost in this procedure.) The exchange codes we called contained about 77 % of the telephone lines in the area. Figuring that 5 % of the Jewish population would have been found in the 23 % of the numbers not dialed implies that 1.8252145 % of households contain a Jew.
- 5) The above indicates that there are 3,200 Jewish households in Greater Harrisburg (1.8252145 % times 175,569 total households).
- 6) The results of the survey indicate that the household size is 2.6759. Multiplying this figure times the number of Jewish households (3,200) yields an estimate of 8,563 persons in Jewish households. 160 Jews in institutions are added to this total. (See Chapter 3.)

Reliability of the Survey

While the overall statistical margin of error ($\pm 4.6\%$) has been discussed above, this section looks at a few of the results of the study that can be compared with reality (**Table 2-5**). Overall, this survey predicts reality quite well. Quite often, surveys such as this produce results at wide variance with reality. In many communities, Jewish demographic studies produce statistics on the percentage of households belonging to a synagogue that are twice the actual rate.

This survey *does not* overestimate synagogue membership, JCC membership, nor the number of gifts to The United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg. Most surveys do overestimate these values for several reasons. First, persons active in the Jewish community are more likely to respond to a survey such as this. Second, some respondents tend to overstate their own behavior to impress the interviewer. Finally, when asked if they made a donation to a Jewish Federation (UJC), people respond in the affirmative because they gave to the Jewish National Fund or other such agency.

But overall, this survey does a good job of predicting reality (**Table 2-5**). For this survey, 49.3% of respondents are synagogue members, versus 51.5% based upon a survey of the synagogues. This difference may be due to some households who belong to more than one synagogue.

The survey indicates 976 JCC members, whereas the JCCs reports 946. The survey suggests 1,949 readers of the *Community Review*. The paper claims a circulation of 2,120. The survey predicts that 1,459 households gave to UJC in the past year, the actual number is 1,519, a 2% difference.

In addition, the attainment of a 97% response rate on the RDD portion of the survey for those who indicated that they are Jewish is quite positive as well.

The major conclusion is that we can have a high degree of confidence in the reliability of the results of this survey.

Table 2-5 Comparison of Survey Results with Reality		
Factor	Survey Says	Actual Number
Number of Synagogue Members	(49.3%) 1,577	(51.5%) 1,647
JCC Membership	(30.5%) 976	(29.6%) 946
Readership of the <i>Community Review</i>	(60.9%) 1,949	(66.3%) 2,120
Gifts To UJC	(45.6%) 1,459	(47.5%) 1,519

Some Suggestions for Future Research

Despite the considerable length of this report, it leaves many questions unanswered. Three avenues of future research may be suggested.

Further Analysis of the Current Data Set. The current report examines many different crosstabulations with a series of variables, including geographical locations, age, gender, synagogue membership, and income level. Additional types of analysis could easily be performed using the same data, involving additional crosstabulations with these as well as other variables.

New Specific-Purpose Surveys. Some of the questions raised by this survey may not be answerable from the given data. A separate survey of students currently enrolled in Jewish education may prove fruitful. A survey of current JCC members might also prove useful.

Major Follow-up Survey. This survey should be repeated in the year 2004, about ten years hence. The major purpose of repeating the survey at regular intervals is to monitor the manner in which demographics, attitudes, beliefs, and practices change over time. In addition, telephone directory methods should be used at two-year intervals to update the size and location of the Jewish population.

Chapter 3

Size of the Jewish Population

Chapter Table of Contents

Chapter Highlights	21
Current Size of the Jewish Population	22
Changes in the Population in Jewish Households, 1985-1992	23
Future Size of the Population in Jewish Households	24
Comparison with Other Metropolitan Areas	25

Chapter Highlights

- This study finds that approximately 8,600 persons live in about 3,200 Jewish households in Greater Harrisburg. In total, about 7,160 Jewish persons live in Greater Harrisburg.
- About 2,300 Jewish households (72%) live in the East Shore and about 900 (28%) in the West Shore, for a total of 3,200. The percentage split between the West Shore and the East Shore has not changed since 1985.
- From 1985-1994, the Jewish population decreased from 10,300 to 8,600. This decrease may be overstated for reasons discussed in this chapter.
- Harrisburg has long been and continues to be the third largest Jewish community in the state, trailing Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

Current Size of the Jewish Population

This study finds that approximately 8,600 persons live in about 3,200 Jewish households in Greater Harrisburg (**Table 3-1**). (A Jewish household is defined as a household containing one or more Jews.) In addition, about 160 Jewish persons live in institutions such as the Jewish Home and do not have their own telephone numbers.

About 18.4% of the persons in Jewish households are not Jewish. Thus, the number of Jews living in households in Greater Harrisburg is about 7,000. Including the institutionalized population, the total is 7,160.

Table 3-1 Current Size of the Jewish Population				
Region	# of Households	Household Size	# of Persons in Jewish Households	# of Jews
East Shore	2,300	2.6572	6,112	5,164
West Shore	900	2.7234	2,451	1,821
Total	3,200	2.6759	8,563	6,987
Jewish persons in institutions				160

Changes in the Population in Jewish Households, 1985-1994

The available data for this section of the report causes us to treat some of the conclusions with caution. The public library in Harrisburg does not keep old telephone directories. While the current telephone directory covers both East Shore and West Shore, there are two City Directories: Harrisburg and West Shore. The latest available Harrisburg City Directory was dated 1994 and the latest available West Shore City Directory was dated 1992. Comparison of the latest telephone directory with the latest city directory suggests that the telephone directories contain about 22.5% more households.

Table 3-2 shows the DJN (distinctive Jewish name) count (for 105 DJNs) and the percentage of Jewish households in each of the two regions. The data indicate that a significant decline occurred in the Jewish population from 1985-1992 by about 18.1%. This decline is consistent with a decline in JCC membership from 1,400 to about 950 during this period.

The city directories indicate as well that the percentage of the Jewish population living on the East Shore remained about the same during this period. The percentage on the West Shore found via the survey was 28% and the 1994 telephone directory DJN counts indicate that about 30% live on the West Shore. The lower percentage on West Shore in the City Directories may be due to a smaller geographic area covered by the City Directory. Because of the general congruence between the telephone survey and the telephone directory DJN counts, and because the counts in the city directories seem to indicate little change in the percentage living on West Shore, the analysis in **Table 3-3** assumes that about 28% live on the West Shore in both 1985 and 1994.

Table 3-2 Geographic Distribution Among Regions Based Upon City Directories 1985 - 1994		
Region	1985 DJN Count	1992/4 DJN Count
West Shore	120 (21 %)	107 (23 %)
East Shore	444 (79 %)	355 (77 %)
Total	564	462

Table 3-3 shows the changes in the geographic distribution of Jewish households and persons in Jewish households from 1985-1994. **Table 3-2** suggests that a 18% decline occurred in the Jewish population from 1985-1992.

Thus, the number of Jewish households appears to have declined from 3,840 to 3,200 during this 9 year period and the number of persons in Jewish households declined from 10,274 to 8,563. This assumes that household size has remained the same over the past nine years.

It should be noted that this estimate of population decline (1,711 or 16.7%) may be an overestimate of the actual decline. First, if a greater number of households are, in 1994, choosing to have unlisted telephone numbers than was the case in 1985, this would partially explain the decline in DJN households in the telephone directory. Second, to the extent that intermarriage has increased since 1985, there also will be fewer DJNs in the telephone directory (if a Jewish female marries a non-Jewish male). While these two factors may somewhat ameliorate the decline, this researcher is confident that the decline, while it is probably lower than the 16.7%, is significant.

Table 3-3 Absolute Changes in the Geographic Distribution of the Jewish Population 1985-1994				
	1985		1994	
Area	Households	Persons	Households	Persons
East Shore	2,765	7,347	2,300	6,112
West Shore	1,075	2,927	900	2,451
Total	3,840	10,274	3,200	8,563

Future Size of the Population in Jewish Households

The future is unpredictable. If a major economic downturn occurs, the size of the Jewish population of this area may be affected negatively. The fact that Harrisburg is the state capital should soften economic changes.

Over the past nine years, the Jewish population has declined significantly. With 18% of the current households in residence for less than five years, Jews are clearly still moving into Harrisburg. Yet, comparing the percentage of households who have moved in in the past five years with the percentage who indicate plans to leave in the next three years suggests that some growth may be seen in the next few years.

Comparison with Other Metropolitan Areas

Table 3-4 indicates that Greater Harrisburg continues to be the third largest Jewish community in the Commonwealth, but is well behind Philadelphia (250,000) and Pittsburgh (45,000). In total, 330,000 Jews now live in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Table 3-4 Jewish Population Figures for Pennsylvania 1994 American Jewish Year Book			
Community	# Jews	Community	# Jews
Allentown	6,000	Pittsburgh	45,000
Altoona	100	Pottstown	650
Bethlehem	800	Pottsville	250
Butler	250	Reading	2,800
Chambersburg	125	Scranton	3,100
Easton Area	1,200	Sharon	260
Erie	800	State College	550
Harrisburg	7,160	Stroudsburg	400
Hazleton Area	300	Sunbury	400
Johnstown	415	Uniontown	250
Lancaster	2,100	Upper Beaver County	200
Lebanon	350	Wayne County	500
New Castle	200	Wilkes-Barre	3,200
Oil City	100	Williamsport	350
Philadelphia	250,000	York	1,500
Pike County	300	Total for Pennsylvania	330,000

Also for comparison, **Table 3-5** shows the size of the Jewish population compared with other communities of 5,000 - 10,000.

Table 3-5 Jewish Communities of 5,000 - 10,000 1994 American Jewish Year Book		
Community	State	Jewish Population
Orange County	NY	10,000
San Antonio	TX	10,000
Indianapolis	IN	10,000
Palm Springs	CA	9,850
Stamford/New Canaan	CT	9,600
Ocean County	NJ	9,500
Norwalk	CT	9,500
Wilmington	DE	9,500
St Paul	MN	9,200
Sonoma County	CA	9,000
Ventura County	CA	9,000
Syracuse	NY	9,000
Louisville	KT	8,700
Memphis	TN	8,500
Lehigh Valley	PA	8,500
Brockton	MA	8,000
Passaic-Clifton	NJ	8,000
Richmond	VA	8,000
Sullivan County	NY	7,425
Jacksonville	FL	7,300
Harrisburg	PA	7,160
Pomona Valley	CA	6,750
Omaha	NE	6,500
Honolulu	HA	6,400
Trenton	NJ	6,000

Table 3-5 Jewish Communities of 5,000 - 10,000 1994 <i>American Jewish Year Book</i>		
Community	State	Jewish Population
Dayton	OH	6,000
Raleigh-Wake County	NC	5,750
Jersey City	NJ	5,700
Nashville	TN	5,600
Portland (southern Maine)	ME	5,500
Toledo	OH	5,500
Akron	OH	5,500
Birmingham	AL	5,200
Schenectady	NY	5,200
Albuquerque	NM	5,000
Charlotte	NC	5,000
Ann Arbor	MI	5,000
Fort Myers/Lee County	FL	5,000
Fort Worth	TX	5,000
Austin	TX	5,000

Chapter 4

Geographic Profile

Chapter Table of Contents

Chapter Highlights	30
Location of the Jewish Population	32
Home Ownership	34
Place of Birth	38
Generational Status	42
Months in Residence	44
Length of Residence	45
Length of Residence at Current Address	49
State or Country of Origin	52
Moving Plans	54
Expected Destination for Movers	58
Adult Children in Harrisburg	60

Chapter Highlights

- Approximately 33% of Jewish households live in the 17110 zip code, 15% in 17112, 8% in 17055, and 8% in 17011. The distribution of Jews among the zip code areas suggests that there is significant geographic concentration to the Jewish population in Greater Harrisburg.
- About 73% of Jewish households own their own home, compared with 67% for Jews nationwide. Home ownership is lower for those under age 35 (62%) and age 75 and over (41%). Those who are divorced (55%) are less likely to own their own home than the other marital status types.
- About 5% of persons in Jewish households are foreign born, 39% were born in Harrisburg, 12% in New York, and 10% in Philadelphia. In total, 60% were born in Pennsylvania, 80% were born in the Northeast, 5% in the Midwest, 7% in the South, and 3% in the West. The percentage locally born is at about the center of American Jewish communities.
- About 7% of respondents are first generation (foreign born), 19% are second generation (born in the United States of foreign-born parents), and 74% are third generation or higher (born in the United States of United States-born parents). The percentage third generation or higher is the highest of any comparison community and compares to 62% for Jews nationwide and to 75% for all Pennsylvania Jews.
- About 8% of households (250 households) spend more than 2 months of the year outside Harrisburg. About 100 households go to Florida for two months or more.

Chapter Highlights

- About 21% of households are new residents: they have moved to Greater Harrisburg during the past five years, 11% have lived here 5-9 years, 19% for 10-19 years, and 50% for more than 20 years. 65% of new residents are settling in East Shore and 35% in West Shore. The 50% in residence for 20 or more years is high compared to other Jewish communities.
- About 41% of residents in Greater Harrisburg moved into their current residence in the past 5 years. This is relatively high compared with other Jewish communities.
- 14% moved to Greater Harrisburg from Philadelphia, 10% from New York, 5% from Pittsburgh, 9% from other parts of Pennsylvania, and 4%-5% from each of New Jersey and Maryland.
- 9% indicated that they will definitely move in the next three years; another 11% indicated they will probably do so. Persons under age 35 are much more likely to indicate plans to move than are older persons. About 19% of households with children indicate they will probably or definitely move within the next three years. These figures include moves within the metropolitan area.
- 10% indicate likelihood of moving out of the metropolitan area. This percentage is toward the middle of the comparison American Jewish communities. The percentage changing residence within the metropolitan area is the lowest of any American Jewish community.
- About 5% indicate that they will definitely move out of Greater Harrisburg within the next three years. This figure rises to 14% of those under age 35.
- 43% of households age 40 and over have adult children in the local area. (There are no comparative data to other communities for this question.)

Location of the Jewish Population

This section examines the location of the Jewish population by zip code. **Table 4-1** shows the distribution of households and population by zip code. Approximately 33% of Jewish households (1,059 households) reside in zip 17110, 15% (493 households) in 17112, 8% in 17055, 8% in 17011, 7% in 17109, and 6% in 17013. Thus, almost half of the Greater Harrisburg Jewish households live in one of two zip code areas. 77% live in one of six zip codes. It is clear from this table that the Jewish population of Greater Harrisburg is geographically clustered. This should act to facilitate the location of community facilities and community programming.

These results are confirmed by a map of households with a distinctive Jewish name transferred to UJC under separate cover.

Because the zip codes differ in terms of household size, the final two columns of the table provide estimates of the number of persons in Jewish households in each zip code. The differences are not great between the percentage of Jewish households in each zip code area and the percentage of persons in Jewish households in each zip code area.

Note that less than 5 interviews were completed in Hershey.

Table 4-1 Population by Zip Codes (Sample size = 457, Projected Number of Households = 3,200)						
Zip	Region	Number of Households	% of Households	Household Size	Number of Persons	% of Persons
17110	East	1,059	33.1%	2.7453	2,907	33.9%
17112	East	493	15.4	2.8573	1,409	16.5
17055	West	266	8.3	3.0109	801	9.4
17011	West	262	8.2	2.5123	658	7.7
17109	East	214	6.7	2.2532	482	5.6
17013	West	176	5.5	2.6788	471	5.5
17111	East	128	4.0	2.8810	369	4.3
17102	East	128	4.0	1.6761	215	2.5
17070	West	74	2.3	2.6459	196	2.3
17036	East	70	2.2	3.2840	230	2.7
Other Zips		330	10.3	2.5000	825	9.6
Total		3,200	100.0%	2.6759	8,563	100.0%

Home Ownership

Table 4-2 shows that 73% of households own their own home, with only 27% being renters.

The ownership rate (73%), while higher than for the American Jewish community (67%), is well below the rate for the Pennsylvania Jewish community (84%). It is also well below most Florida communities, except Miami (75%). It is about equal to Detroit (73%), New Orleans (72%), and Washington (70%). It is higher than Baltimore (65%). Ownership is also significantly higher than is true for Dauphin County as a whole (64%). It is about equal to Cumberland County (72%) and compares with 64% in the 1990 US Census.

Table 4-2
Percentage Owning Home
Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	% Own	Community	Year	% Own
West Palm Beach	1987	89%	St Louis	1982	72%
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	83%	New Orleans	1988	72%
South Broward	1990	82%	Washington DC	1983	70%
Louisville	1991	82%	Worcester	1987	69%
Palm Springs	1985	82%	Orlando	1993	69%
Hartford	1982	80%	St Paul	1993	68%
San Antonio	1991	79%	San Francisco	1988	67%
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	78%	Baltimore	1985	65%
Rochester	1988	78%	Philadelphia	1983	63%
Rhode Island	1987	77%	Miami	1982	62%
Kansas City	1985	75%	Toronto	1991	62%
Dallas	1985	75%	Boston	1985	47%
Miami	1994	75%	NJPS (US)	1990	67%
Atlantic City	1985	74%	NJPS (PA)	1990	84%
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	74%	United States Census	1990	64%
Harrisburg	1994	73%	Dauphin County	1990	64%
Detroit	1991	73%	Cumberland County	1990	72%

No significant difference is seen between East Shore (72%) and West Shore (75%) (Table 4-3). Home ownership rates are highest at 90% for those age 50-64. They are lowest for those under age 35 (62%) and age 75 and over (41%). Home ownership is lowest for non-elderly singles (33%) and elderly singles (31%), and is highest for households with children (83%) and non-elderly couples (87%).

Home ownership is related to income, with only 27% who earn under \$25,000 per year owning, versus 62% of those earning \$25,000-\$50,000, 86% of those earning \$50,000 - \$100,000, and 97% of those earning over \$100,000.

Finally, divorced (55%) and widowed (40%) respondents are much less likely to own their own home than is the case for married (76%) and single (85%) respondents .

Table 4-3 Home Ownership			
Variable	% Owning	Sample Size	Projected # of Households
All Households	72.7%	457	3,200
Geographic Area			
East Shore	72.0%	345	2,300
West Shore	74.6%	112	900
Age of Respondent			
Under 35	61.6%	90	781
35 - 49	80.1%	143	1,168
50 - 64	89.8%	75	592
65 - 74	70.6%	72	352
75 and over	40.7%	77	304

Table 4-3 Home Ownership			
Variable	% Owning	Sample Size	Projected # of Households
Household Structure			
Households with Kids	83.2%	154	1,258
Non-Elderly Couple	86.5%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	32.8%	39	336
Elderly Couple	77.1%	71	307
Elderly Single	31.2%	66	307
Household Income			
Under \$25,000	26.8%	72	637
\$25 - \$50,000	62.0%	83	819
\$50 - \$100,000	86.3%	106	1,142
\$100,000 and over	97.2%	57	602
Marital Status of Respondent			
Married	75.9%	340	2,406
Widowed	39.6%	52	256
Divorced	54.9%	23*	189
Single, Never Married	84.8%	42	349

Place of Birth

Overall, 96% were born in the United States (**Table 4-4**), with 39% born in Greater Harrisburg, 12% were born in New York State, 10% in Philadelphia, and 6% in other areas of Pennsylvania, and 5% in Pittsburgh. In total, about 60% were born in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and another 20% from other places in the Northeast, 7% from the South, 5% from the Midwest, and 3% from the West.

Only 5% were born outside the United States, mostly (2%) in Eastern European countries.

Table 4-5 shows place of birth in comparison to other Jewish communities. Greater Harrisburg, with 39% locally born, is at about the center of the comparison communities. It is much higher than the Florida communities and compares to 22% in Richmond, 36% in Washington, 50% in Baltimore, 51% in Essex-Morris, NJ, 63% in Pittsburgh, and 65% in Philadelphia. The percentage locally born is important because such persons often have stronger ties to the local Jewish community, feeling that the metropolitan area is their home. While 39% is relatively high, note that it is lower than the three major metropolitan areas around Harrisburg: Baltimore (50%), Philadelphia (65%), and Pittsburgh (63%).

The percentage of foreign born (5%) is among the lowest of any American Jewish community and compares to 8% in Baltimore and Washington and 11% in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia.

62% of Americans were born in their current state of residence, according to the 1990 US Census, versus 60% for Jews in Harrisburg. 5% of Jews in Greater Harrisburg are foreign born, versus 3% of Pennsylvanians in general.

Note that in the past ten years, Harrisburg has absorbed 300 Jews from the former Soviet Union.

Table 4-4 Place of Birth of Persons in Jewish Households Shows individually all places accounting for 1% or more of Places of Birth (Sample Size = 1,166, Projected # of Individuals = 8,563)	
Location	% Born
Harrisburg	39.0%
New York	12.1
Philadelphia	10.3
Other Pennsylvania	5.8
Pittsburgh	5.2
New Jersey	3.7
Maryland and DC	3.5
Ohio	1.8
Massachusetts	1.6
Illinois	1.4
California	1.0
Pennsylvania	60.3%
Other Northeast	20.1%
South Total	7.4%
Midwest Total	5.1%
West Total	2.5%
Total US	95.5%
Eastern Europe Total	2.2%
Asia-Africa (includes .3% born in Israel)	1.3%
Western Europe Total	.8%
Middle and South America	.2%
Total Foreign	4.5%

Table 4-5 Place of Birth Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Locally Born	U.S. Born, (not Local)	Total U.S. Born	Foreign Born
West Palm Beach	1987	2%	90	92	8
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	5%	83	88	11
South Broward	1990	7%*	75	82	18
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	14%	80	94	6
Orlando	1993	14%	79	93	7
Los Angeles	1979	16%	60	56	24
Columbus	1990	17%	77	94	6
Miami	1994	22%	59	80	20
Hartford	1982	22%	65	87	13
Richmond	1983	22%	72	94	6
Denver	1981	22%	67	89	11
San Francisco	1988	24%	62	86	14
Dallas	1989	29%	63	92	8
Washington DC	1983	36%	56	92	8
Harrisburg	1994	39%	56	95	5
Toronto	1991	39%	20	59	41
St Paul	1992	39%	48	88	13
Boston	1985	47%	46	93	7
Minneapolis	1981	47%	40	87	13
St Louis	1982	50%	34	84	16
Baltimore	1985	50%	42	92	8
Rhode Island	1988	50%	41	91	9
New Orleans	1988	50%	42	92	8
Essex-Morris NJ	1986	51%	41	92	7

Table 4-5 Place of Birth Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Locally Born	U.S. Born, (not Local)	Total U.S. Born	Foreign Born
Louisville	1991	53%	38	90	10
Kansas City	1985	59%	29	90	10
Cleveland	1987	59%	28	87	13
Chicago	1990	61%	29	90	9
Pittsburgh	1984	63%	26	89	11
Philadelphia	1984	65%	24	89	11
Chicago	1981	66%	21	87	13
Worcester	1987	76%	24	99	1
Rochester	1988	87%	12	99	1
Atlantic City	1985	Not Available		90%	10
Milwaukee	1983	Not Available		89%	11
New York	1990	Not Available		83%	17
New York	1981	Not Available		83%	17
* Does not include 5% who were born in Dade County.					

Generational Status

First generation is defined as someone who was not born in the United States. Second generation persons were born in United States, but had at least one foreign-born parent. Third generation or higher indicates that the respondent and both parents were born in the United States. Overall, 7% of respondents are first generation; 19%, second generation; and 74%, third generation or higher (Table 4-8).

Table 4-6 shows this variable crosstabulated with age. As expected, as age increases, generational status decreases. Older persons are more likely to be first generation, although the differences among the age groups are not great: about 5%-7% of the non-elderly are first generation, versus 9%-11% of the elderly. In contrast, only 2%-3% of those under age 50 are second generation, versus 30% of the 50-64 age group, 51% of the 65-74 age group, and 66% of those age 75 and over.

For the third generation, the relationship with age is strong, declining from 92% of those under age 35 to only 23% of those age 75 and over. A reasonable percentage of elderly are now third generation Americans.

Table 4-7 shows that Jews on the West Shore are much less likely to be second generation (by 8% to 23%) and are much more likely to be third generation (by 88% to 69%) than Jews on the East Shore.

Table 4-8 shows that, compared with other Jewish communities, Greater Harrisburg has a relatively low percentage of first generation Jews (7%), comparing to 6% in Columbus, 8% in Boston, and 11% in Detroit. The 74% third generation is about equal to Orlando (73%), but is much higher than all other communities in the table. Compared with Jews nationwide, Greater Harrisburg is more likely to be third generation (by 74% to 62%) and less likely to be second generation (by 19% to 27%). Compared to Jews in Pennsylvania as a whole, Greater Harrisburg has a somewhat higher percentage of first generation and a lower percentage of second generation Jews.

Generation is used in this report as a variable to help explain levels of observance and "Jewishness." The general theory is that, as a person is further removed from the European experience, assimilation increases.

Table 4-6 Generational Status by Age of Respondent					
Generation	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75 +
First	6.0%	5.3%	7.2%	9.3%	10.5%
Second	2.1	3.5	30.4	51.4	66.2
Third and higher	92.0	91.2	62.4	39.4	23.4
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	90	143	75	72	77
Proj. # of Hhlds	781	1,168	592	352	304

Table 4-7 Generational Status by Area		
Generation	East Shore	West Shore
First	7.9%	3.8%
Second	23.4	8.4
Third and higher	68.7	87.8
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	345	112
Projected Number of Households	2,300	900

Table 4-8 Generational Status Comparison with Other Communities				
Community	Year	1st Generation	2nd Generation	3rd Generation +
Harrisburg	1994	7%	19	74
Orlando	1993	7%	20	73
Boston	1985	8%	28	61
Quad Cities	1989	13%	29	58
Columbus	1992	6%	39	55
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	10%	35	55
San Francisco	1988	15%	34	51
Detroit	1991	11%	45	44
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	11%	46	43
Tampa	1982	6%	51	43
Miami	1994	20%	37	43
Toronto	1991	27%	37	36
Miami	1982	26%	43	32
South Broward	1990	18%	55	27
West Palm Beach	1987	9%	68	23
NJPS (US)	1990	11%	27	62
NJPS (PA)	1990	2%	24	75

Months in Residence

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they spend more than two months per year away from their permanent residence. A total of 7.9% of households (250 households) indicated such behavior. 3.3% of all households (about 100 households) spend their time away from Harrisburg in Florida. About 1.5% of all households (50 households) indicate that they are away for more than two months per year, but that they are travelling during this time.

Length of Residence

Table 4-9 shows that 21 % of all households (650 households) have moved to Greater Harrisburg within the past 5 years. Another 11 % have arrived during the past 5-9 years. Thus, 32 % of all households have been living in the area for fewer than ten years. 19 % have been here for 10-19 years, and 50 % , for 20 or more years.

Table 4-9 examines length of residence by geographic area. West Shore has the greater percentage of new residents (0-4 years), at about 26 % , versus 19 % in East Shore. East Shore has the highest percentage (70 %) in the area for 10 or more years, versus 63 % in West Shore.

Table 4-9 Length of Residence by Geographic Area			
Length of Residence	East Shore	West Shore	All
0 - 4 years	18.5 %	25.7 %	20.5 %
5 - 9	11.4	10.7	11.2
10 - 19	17.3	22.6	18.8
20 +	52.8	41.0	49.5
Total	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %
10+ Years	70.1 %	63.6 %	68.3 %
Sample Size	345	112	457
Proj. # of Households	2,300	900	3,200

Table 4-10 Length of Residence by Geographic Area			
Length of Residence	East Shore	West Shore	Total
0 - 4 years	64.6 %	35.4 %	100.0 %
5 - 9	73.0 %	27.0 %	100.0 %
10 and over	73.7 %	26.3 %	100.0 %

Table 4-11 Length of Residence Comparison with Other Communities					
		Years			
Community	Year	0-4	5-9	10-19	20+
Toledo	1982	7%	5	88	
Rhode Island	1987	7%	10	51	32
Rochester	1987	9%	10	15	67
Louisville	1991	11%	7	16	67
Miami	1994	12%	10	24	55
Worcester	1987	13%	12	75	
San Antonio	1991	13%	11	76	
Detroit	1991	13%	87%		
Miami	1982	15%	22	30	33
Boston	1985	18%	10	72	
New Orleans	1988	19%	19	39	24
South Broward	1990	19%	21	45	16
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	19%	20	35	26
St. Paul	1992	20%	11	14	54
Manchester	1983	41%		18	41
Harrisburg	1994	21%	11	19	50
Essex-Morris NJ	1986	21%	20	59	
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	23%	22	41	14
West Palm Beach	1987	24%	30	38	8
Tampa	1980	27%	22	51	
Atlantic City	1985	28%	22	27	23
St. Louis	1982	32%	24	44	
Orlando	1993	32%	20	30	18

Table 4-11 Length of Residence Comparison with Other Communities					
		Years			
Community	Year	0-4	5-9	10-19	20+
Philadelphia	1983	32 %	68		
Tidewater	1988	34 %	19	22	25
Kansas City	1985	35 %	22	26	17
Milwaukee	1983	40 %	24	36	
Dallas	1989	48 %	23	18	11
Washington, DC	1983	48 %	20	20	12
Denver	1981	52 %	14	27	
Phoenix	1983	61 %	39		
NJPS (US)	1990	29 %	18	30	23
NJPS (PA)	1990	29 %	7	16	48

Table 4-11 shows length of residence in Greater Harrisburg in comparison with other Jewish communities. The percentage of long-term residents (20 or more years) in Greater Harrisburg (50%) is relatively high, and only 4 of the comparison Jewish communities [Rochester (67%), Louisville (67%), Miami (55%), and St. Paul (54%)] are higher. It compares with 23% for all American Jews. The percentage in residence for 0-4 years (21%) is at about the center of American Jewish communities and is much lower than Philadelphia (32%). Thus, comparatively, Greater Harrisburg is not an area of significant immigration. The 21% in residence for less than 5 years compares with 29% nationally.

Table 4-10 also shows length of residence by geographic area, but the rows add to 100% instead of the columns. Thus, **Table 4-10** is useful for examining where new and long-term residents have settled. About two-thirds (65%) of new residents have settled in East Shore and 35% in West Shore. East Shore also contains 74% of those in residence for 10 years or more.

Table 4-12 shows the relationship between length of residence and household structure. Excluding ``other household structures,'' 43 % of recent migrants to the area (0-4 years) are households with children. This percentage is much lower than for households moving to the area 5-9 years ago (86%). Thus, the conclusion can be reached that Greater Harrisburg is attracting a lower *percentage* of families with children in the past 5 years as was the case for the previous 5 years, but the absolute number of families who moved in within the past five years is 250, versus 290 5-9 years ago. [The interpretation of **Table 4-12** needs to be tempered by the fact that a household with children might have moved in 10 or more years ago, but currently it contains a non-elderly (or elderly) couple.]

Table 4-12 also indicates that almost one in four (24%) recent migrants are non-elderly couples and 22% are non-elderly singles.

Table 4-12 Household Structure by Length of Residence (Excludes ``Other'' Households)				
Household Structure	0 - 4 Years	5 - 9 Years	10 - 19 Years	20+ Years
Households with Children	42.6%	86.2%	63.9%	29.2%
Non-Elderly Couple	24.2	4.4	11.9	26.7
Non-Elderly Single	22.4	2.0	8.1	11.5
Elderly Couple	5.8	1.5	7.4	17.0
Elderly Single	5.0	5.9	8.8	15.7
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	80	46	79	252
Projected Number of Households	587	337	504	1,356

Length of Residence at Current Address

Table 4-13 shows length of residence at one's current address. Overall, 41% are in their current residence for less than 5 years, 18% for 5-9 years, 19% for 10-19 years, and 21% for more than 20 years. The percentage in residence at their current address for less than 5 years is higher in West Shore (47% versus 39%) than in East Shore.

For comparison (**Table 4-14**), the percentage in their current home for less than 5 years (41%) is relatively high in Harrisburg, comparing to 23% in Cleveland, 28% in Atlantic City, 33% in Miami, 35% in Baltimore, 40% in Milwaukee. It is much lower than the 72% in Detroit.

The 41% for Greater Harrisburg in residence for 0-4 years is lower than the 44% for US Jews and is about equal to the 39% for Pennsylvania Jewish households in general. The 21% in residence for 20 or more years compares to 16% for Jewish households nationwide and 30% for Pennsylvania Jewish households in general.

Table 4-13 Length of Residence at Current Address by Geographic Area			
Length of Residence	East Shore	West Shore	All
0 - 4 years	39.1%	46.6%	41.2%
5 - 9	18.5	17.3	18.2
10 - 19	18.6	20.6	19.2
20 and over	23.8	15.5	21.4
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	345	112	457
Proj. # of Hhlds	2,300	900	3,200

Table 4-14 Length of Residence at Current Address Comparison with Other Communities					
		Years			
Community	Year	0-4	5-9	10-19	20+
New Orleans	1988	20%	18	32	30
Cleveland	1987	23%	15	24	38
Toledo	1982	27%	20	53	
San Antonio	1991	27%	20	48	
South Broward	1990	28%	22	40	10
Atlantic City	1985	28%	22	27	23
St. Paul	1981	30%	15	20	28
St. Louis	1982	32%	24	44	
Miami	1994	33%	19	27	22
Palm Springs	1987	33%	45	22	
Kansas City	1985	35%	22	26	17
Baltimore	1985	35%	23	27	15
Miami	1982	35%	25	28	12
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	39%	26	28	8

Table 4-14 Length of Residence at Current Address Comparison with Other Communities					
		Years			
Community	Year	0-4	5-9	10-19	20+
Milwaukee	1983	40 %	24	36	
Harrisburg	1994	41 %	18	19	21
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	41 %	25	29	6
Hartford	1982	66 %		34	
Toronto	1990	45 %	22	33	
Washington, DC	1983	48 %	20	20	12
Denver	1981	52 %	14	27	
Orlando	1993	55 %	22	19	5
Detroit	1991	72 %			18
NJPS (US)	1990	44 %	17	23	16
NJPS (PA)	1990	44 %	8	19	30

State or Country of Origin

Respondents were asked what state or country they resided in prior to living in Greater Harrisburg. One finding is seen in **Table 4-15**: 29% of respondents always lived in Harrisburg. 14% moved to Harrisburg from Philadelphia, 5% from Pittsburgh, and 9% from elsewhere in Pennsylvania. Thus, 57% have either always lived in Harrisburg or moved to Harrisburg from other places in Pennsylvania. New York State accounts for 10% of all respondents. The Northeast (excluding Pennsylvania) accounts for 18% of respondents. In total, 75% derive from the Northeast, 12% from the South, 6% from the Midwest and 4% from the West. Only 4% of respondents moved to Greater Harrisburg from a foreign country.

The data suggest that only about 10 households contain a person whose last previous address was in Israel.

Note that **Table 4-4** shows *place of birth* for all persons in Jewish households. This section shows the last previous place of residence prior to living in Harrisburg for the respondent only.

Table 4-15 Place of Previous Residence of Respondents Shows individually all places accounting for 1% or more (Sample Size = 457, Projected # of Households = 3,200)	
Location	%
Harrisburg	28.7%
Philadelphia	13.7
New York	9.5
Other Pennsylvania	9.0
Pittsburgh	5.2
New Jersey	4.8
Maryland and DC	4.2
Ohio	2.1
Florida	1.8
Virginia	1.6
California	1.3
Alabama	1.2
Illinois	1.2
Massachusetts	1.2
Russia	1.1
Michigan	1.0
New Hampshire	1.0
Pennsylvania Total	56.7%
Other Northeast	17.9%
South Total	12.0%
Midwest Total	6.2%
West Total	3.6%
Total US	96.4%
Israel	0.3%
Eastern Europe	2.0%
Western Europe	1.3%
Total Foreign	3.6%

Moving Plans

Respondents were asked about the probability that they would move within the next three years. It should be remembered that, in such a question, respondents are being asked about ``prospective behavior.'' Some people have trouble projecting their behavior, and unforeseen events may very well change a decision at some point in the future.

9% of all households indicated that they will definitely move within the next three years. 11% indicated probably and 76% indicated either probably not or definitely not (**Table 4-16**). 4% indicated that they did not know if they will move. 5% of all respondents indicated definite plans to move out of the Greater Harrisburg area.

Tables 4-16 and 4-17 cover similar information using different response categories. **Table 4-16** shows that the indicated likelihood of mobility in Greater Harrisburg (20% definitely or probably) is higher than in West Palm Beach (13%) and Sarasota (12%), but is slightly lower than Miami (23%) and Orlando (22%). The 9% who indicated they will definitely move is similar to the percentages found in Florida communities (**Table 4-17**). If we equate the 20% who indicate they are definitely or probably moving in Greater Harrisburg to the response ``very likely'' (which was used in the community studies shown in **Table 4-17**), we see that Greater Harrisburg is toward the center of the comparison communities. The 20% in Greater Harrisburg can be compared with 26% for Jews nationwide and 22% for Jews in Pennsylvania.

Table 4-18 examines moving plans by geographic area. The percentage indicating definite plans to move does not vary by region. About 20% in East Shore indicated they would definitely or probably move within the next three years, versus 21% of those in West Shore. About equal percentages in each area indicate plans to move out of Greater Harrisburg.

Table 4-19 shows that 21% of the under age 35 group answered definitely moving, versus only 4%-6% of those age 35 and over. The percentage definitely not moving increases from 19% of those under age 35 to 69% of those age 75 and over. Those under age 35 (14%) are much more likely to be definitely moving out of Greater Harrisburg than any other age group.

Table 4-20 shows that persons who are divorced indicate the greatest likelihood of moving, 26% are definitely or probably moving. This group was also less likely to own their residence (**Table 4-3**). Widows are most likely to indicate that they will definitely not move (56%), versus 29%-40% of the other marital status groups. Relatively little difference among the marital status groups exists in the percentage moving out of Greater Harrisburg.

Table 4-21 indicates that non-elderly singles (21%) are the most likely to indicate that they will definitely move. On the other hand, 62% of elderly singles indicate that they will definitely not move within the next three years. 15% of non-elderly singles indicate definite plans to move out of Greater Harrisburg.

Table 4-16 Moving Plans Comparison with Other Communities						
Community	Year	Definitely	Probably	Probably Not	Definitely Not	Don't Know
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	4 %	8	40	38	10
West Palm Beach	1987	5 %	8	35	47	6
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	6 %	10	34	47	3
Miami	1994	9 %	14	30	42	5
Harrisburg	1994	9%	11	41	35	4
Orlando	1993	10%	12	32	38	9

Table 4-17 Moving Plans Comparison with Other Communities				
Community	Year	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not at All Likely
Cleveland	1987	10 %	5	85
Tidewater	1988	11 %	17	72
Miami	1982	12 %	18	70
Rhode Island	1987	13 %	14	73
Houston	1975	17 %	14	69
Philadelphia	1984	20 %		80
Louisville	1991	20 %	12	68
San Francisco	1988	24 %	21	52
Dallas	1989	29 %	21	47
Columbus	1990	33 %	67	
Boston	1985	38 %		62
Toronto	1990	45 %		55
NJPS (US)	1990	26 %	21	53
NJPS (PA)	1990	22 %	17	61

Table 4-18 Moving Plans by Geographic Area			
Moving Plans	East Shore	West Shore	All
Definitely	8.2%	9.7%	8.6%
Probably	11.4	11.1	11.3
Probably Not	40.6	42.4	41.1
Definitely Not	36.4	31.5	35.0
Don't Know	3.5	5.4	4.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	345	112	457
Proj. # of Households	2,300	900	3,200
Definitely Moving out of Greater Harrisburg	4.9%	6.1%	5.3%

Table 4-19 Moving Plans by Age of Respondent					
Moving Plans	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75 +
Definitely	20.9%	3.6%	6.3%	4.9%	5.1%
Probably	22.6	11.6	4.8	4.5	1.6
Probably Not	33.5	48.5	50.5	37.1	18.1
Definitely Not	18.5	32.2	37.3	48.4	68.6
Don't Know	4.5	4.2	1.2	5.1	6.7
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	90	143	75	72	77
Projected # of Households	781	1,168	592	352	304
Definitely Moving out of Greater Harrisburg	13.6%	3.0%	1.2%	3.4%	3.1%

Table 4-20 Moving Plans by Marital Status				
Moving Plans	Married	Widowed	Divorced	Single
Definitely	8.3%	5.0%	10.9%	11.6%
Probably	12.2	4.2	15.0	8.4
Probably Not	42.5	32.1	37.2	40.2
Definitely Not	32.6	55.5	29.4	39.7
Don't Know	4.4	3.2	7.4	0.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	340	52	23*	42
Projected Number of Households	2,406	256	189	349
Definitely Moving out of Greater Harrisburg	5.7%	3.1%	7.2%	2.7%

Table 4-21 Moving Plans by Household Structure					
Moving Plans	Households with Children	Non-Elderly Couple	Non-Elderly Single	Elderly Couple	Elderly Single
Definitely	7.8%	3.9%	20.5%	4.0%	6.7%
Probably	10.7	7.3	33.4	1.6	5.2
Probably Not	49.6	48.2	23.9	31.9	23.0
Definitely Not	28.2	38.2	20.1	52.8	62.3
Don't Know	3.7	2.4	2.1	9.6	2.8
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	154	71	39	71	66
Proj. # of Households	1,258	579	336	307	307
Definitely Moving out of Greater Harrisburg	5.6%	0.0%	14.9%	2.4%	4.6%

Expected Destination for Movers

All respondents answering that they either were definitely or probably moving within the next three years were asked where they expect to move. 1% expect to move to another location in the same neighborhood, 5% to a different neighborhood in the Greater Harrisburg area, and 10% out of Greater Harrisburg (**Table 4-22**).

Table 4-23 compares the above results with other communities. Greater Harrisburg, with 80% saying that they have no plans to move, shows itself to be a more stable community than is the case for many of the other cities in the table. It compares to 85% in Cleveland, 45% in Washington, and 56% in Baltimore. The percentage planning to move out of this metropolitan area (10%) is toward the middle of the comparison communities. The percentage planning to move within Greater Harrisburg (7%) is quite low compared to American Jewish communities, and is about equal to the Florida communities of West Palm Beach (8%), Sarasota (8%), Miami (7%), and Orlando (9%).

Of those planning a move to a different neighborhood in Greater Harrisburg (170 households), half live in zip code 17110.

Table 4-22 Expected Destinations of Movers		
Destination	%	Number
Different Place in Same Neighborhood	1.3 %	42
Different Neighborhood in Greater Harrisburg	5.3	170
Other Pennsylvania	2.4	77
Other United States	7.4	237
Foreign Country	.3	10
Don't Know/No Response	3.1	99
Not Moving	80.2	2,566
Total	100.0%	3,200
Sample Size	457	
Projected Number of Households	3,200	

Table 4-23 Expected Destination for Movers Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Moving Within Metro Area	Moving Out of Metro Area	Don't Know	No Plans to Move
South Broward	1990	13 %	2	4	81
West Palm Beach	1987	8 %	2	2	88
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	8 %	2	3	87
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	8 %	5	3	84
Miami	1982	7 %	5	18	70
St Louis	1982	11 %	5	5	80
Minneapolis	1981	11 %	5	0	84
Cleveland	1987	10 %	5	0	85
Richmond	1983	11 %	7	5	78
St Paul	1981	7 %	7	0	86
Orlando	1993	9 %	8	4	79
Washington DC	1983	19 %	8	27	45
Chicago	1981	16 %	8	16	60
Atlantic City	1985	13 %	9	11	67
San Francisco	1988	31 %	9	6	55
Rhode Island	1987	16 %	9	2	73
Milwaukee	1983	13 %	10	17	60
Harrisburg	1994	7 %	10	3	80
Kansas City	1985	29 %	11	7	53
Phoenix	1983	26 %	11	3	60
Miami	1994	7 %	12	4	77
Los Angeles	1979	26 %	12	5	56
Baltimore	1985	26 %	13	5	56
Rochester	1987	15 %	15	3	67
Dallas	1989	29 %	16	4	50
NJPS (US)	1990	29 %*	15	3	53
*% moving within the state of residence					

Adult Children in Harrisburg

Respondents age 40 and over were asked if they have adult children living in the Greater Harrisburg area. Overall, 43 % of Jewish households in Greater Harrisburg in which someone is over age 40 have adult children living in the area.

Table 4-24 indicates that some difference exists in the response between East Shore (45 %) and West Shore (39%). For all age groups 50 and over, a little more than half report adult children in the area. Households with children still at home are least likely to report adult children. Elderly couples (57 %) are more likely to have adult children in Harrisburg than are elderly singles (44 %).

These results are also generally related to income, decreasing from more than half of those earning under \$50,000 to 31 % of the \$50,000-\$100,000 group, to 38 % of the \$100,000 and over group.

In results not shown in a table, 44 % of synagogue members and 42 % of nonmembers have an adult child in Greater Harrisburg.

In results not shown in a table, 39 % of JCC members and 46 % of nonmembers have an adult child in Greater Harrisburg.

In results not shown in a table, 54 % of UJC donors and 46 % of non-donors have an adult child in Greater Harrisburg.

Table 4-24 % of Households With Adult Child in Greater Harrisburg			
Variable		Sample Size	Projected # of Households
All Households Age 40+	43.0%	315	2,010
Geographic Area			
East Shore	44.6%	245	1,449
West Shore	39.1%	70	561
Age of Respondent			
Under 50	28.6%	96	786
50 - 64	51.8%	71	563
65 - 74	52.1%	71	354
75 and over	53.3%	77	308
Household Structure			
Household with Children	22.6%	65	611
Non-Elderly Couple	44.2%	60	547
Elderly Couple	56.7%	71	352
Elderly Single	44.2%	65	346
Household Income			
Under \$25,000	55.1%	50	374
\$25 - \$50,000	50.6%	48	420
\$50 - \$100,000	31.4%	76	808
\$100,000 and over	38.2%	38	410

Chapter 5

Demographic Profile

Chapter Table of Contents

Chapter Highlights	64
Age/Sex Distribution	66
Household Size	76
Household Structure	82
Latch Key Households	89
Marital Status	90
Level of Secular Education	96
Employment Status	102
Housing Value	106
Household Income	110
Voter Registration	114

Chapter Highlights

- 28% of the Jewish population of Greater Harrisburg (2,406 persons) is age 35-49.
- 13% (1,114 persons) are age 65 and over.
- About 2,311 children under age 18 live in Greater Harrisburg (27% of the population).
- The median age is 37.5 years. Thus, Greater Harrisburg has a relatively young Jewish population compared to Jews nationally.
- About 51% of the population is female, which is consistent with Jews nationally.
- The median age in East Shore is 37; in West Shore, 39.
- 73% of children and 84% of the elderly live in East Shore.
- The average household size (2.6759) is the highest household size of any Jewish community completing a study since 1980, except for Manchester and Essex-Morris NJ. It is higher than that found in the National Jewish Population Survey (2.63). The percentage of single-person households (20%) is one of the lowest in the country.
- The average household size in East Shore (2.6572) is slightly lower than in West Shore (2.7234).
- The most common household type is a married couple with children at home (38%, or about 1,216 households). Married couples with no children at home (28%, or 886 households) are the next largest group, followed by single persons living alone (20%, about 640 households). The percentage of married couples with children is one of the highest of the comparison Jewish communities.
- 10% are single persons living alone under age 65 and 10% are elderly singles living alone, mostly elderly women.
- Only 1.3% of households are single parent families and only 3.3% of children are being raised in such families.
- 69% of households with children are in East Shore, as are 88% of elderly singles.
- 36% of households with children (age 0-17) are latch key households (both spouses working full time). In households with children under age 13, 34% are latch key.

Chapter Highlights

- Household structure does not vary significantly by geographic area.
- About 75% (4,715) of adults are currently married; about 25% (1,572) are currently single, with most of these being single and never married (15% or 930 persons). Another 6% (352) are currently widowed and 4% are currently divorced (245 persons). 8% have been widowed and 17% have been divorced. 16% of adults are on their second marriage. 85% of adults have been married at some point.
- The percentage who are currently married is among the highest in the country.
- Only about 2% of the adult population does not have a high school degree, versus 22% of the American population in general. About 19% have only graduated high school, 12% have graduated high school and have had some college; another 6% have a 2-year college degree. About 29% have only graduated a four-year college and 28% also have a graduate degree. Thus, 60% of the population has a degree from a four-year college. About 3% have a medical or dental degree; another 5%, a law degree.
- 70% of males have a college degree, versus 53% of females. Even for those under age 50, this difference in education between men and women persists: 47% of males between ages 35-49 have a graduate degree, versus 35% of females.
- 56% of adults are employed full time, 16% are retired, 11% are employed part time, and 9% are homemakers. In addition, 6% are students, 2% were unemployed at the time of the survey, and 1% were disabled.
- The percentage who are employed full time (56%) is among the highest of the comparison Jewish communities.
- The median value of homes in which Jewish households reside is about \$124,500. The median value in East Shore is \$118,000; and in West Shore, \$144,300.
- The median household income is \$54,700. Income is highest between the ages of 35-64 (\$69,000), for non-elderly couples (\$68,500), in households with children (\$64,600), and in West Shore (\$64,000).
- 91% claim to be registered to vote. For those in residence for less than 5 years, it is 84%. Only 83% of those under age 35 are registered.

Age/Sex Distribution

The age/sex distribution of a population is among the most important demographic indicators of a population. This distribution is shown for the Jewish population of Greater Harrisburg in **Table 5-1**. Greater Harrisburg is a relatively young Jewish community, with 27% (2,311) age 17 and under and 13% (1,114) age 65 and over. For comparison, 14% of all residents of Dauphin County are age 65 and over, as are 13% of all residents of Cumberland County. In addition, another 160 persons live in institutions, most of whom are elderly.

Of the comparison communities shown on **Table 5-2**, Harrisburg has the highest percentage of the population age 19 and under, tying it with San Diego (30%) and Houston (30%).¹ The percentage age 19 and under ranges from 5%-8% in Palm Beach County to 11% in Sarasota, 12% in South Broward, 18% in Miami, and 25% in Orlando to 26% in Boston and Washington. Nationally, 23% of American Jews fall in this age category, as do 23% of Jews in Pennsylvania.

For the comparison communities shown on **Table 5-3**, Greater Harrisburg has a relatively low percentage of the population age 60 and over. The 17% age 60 and over for Greater Harrisburg compares to three-quarters in South Palm Beach, 63% in Sarasota, 37% in Miami, 30% in Pittsburgh, 23% in Philadelphia, 20% in San Francisco, 15% in Orlando, 12% in Boston, and 12% in Atlanta. Great variation is seen in this statistic from 10% to 76%, depending on the community. Nationally, about 17% of American Jews fall in this age group. Thus, Greater Harrisburg is about equal to American Jews on this measure, although it is about equal to Jews in Pennsylvania (18%).

About 805 children of preschool age (0-5) live in Jewish households in Greater Harrisburg, as do 950 children between the ages of 6 and 12 (for which enrollment in Jewish schools, for those who are Jewish, is the goal—see Chapter 8) (**Table 5-1**). About 556 teenagers (aged 13-17) live in Jewish households in Greater Harrisburg. 8% of the population in Jewish households (651) is age 18-24; 11% (950), 25-34; 19% (1,593), 35-44; 15% (1,310), 45-54; 8% (668), 55-64, 7% (626), age 65-74, and 6% (488), age 75 and over. 28% of the population (2,406) are age 35-49 ('`baby boomers'').

The birth rate is about 14.7 per thousand. That is, for every 1,000 Jews in Greater Harrisburg, 15 children are born each year. About 127 babies are born to persons in Jewish households each year. The birth rate in the United States is 16 per thousand.

The 22.4% under age 15 compares to 20.1% for all residents of Pennsylvania and 22.0% of all Americans. The 13.0% age 65 and over compares to 15.8% for all residents of Pennsylvania and 12.7% of all Americans. The 12.7% is expected (according to the Population Reference Bureau) to 16.4% by the year 2020.

¹ Comparisons with other communities are made on the basis of age 19 and under and age 60 and over due to data availability.

Table 5-1 Age\Sex Distribution						
Age Group	Males	Females	Total	# Males	# Females	# Persons
0 - 4	4.3%	3.1%	7.4%	368	265	633
5 - 9	4.3	3.4	7.7	368	291	659
10 - 14	3.9	3.4	7.3	334	291	625
15 - 19	3.8	3.6	7.4	325	308	633
20 - 24	2.2	2.4	4.6	188	206	394
25 - 29	1.6	3.1	4.7	137	265	402
30 - 34	2.9	3.5	6.4	248	300	548
35 - 39	3.8	5.1	8.9	325	437	762
40 - 44	5.1	4.6	9.7	437	394	831
45 - 49	4.5	5.0	9.5	385	428	813
50 - 54	3.4	2.4	5.8	291	206	497
55 - 59	2.0	1.9	3.9	171	163	334
60 - 64	2.1	1.8	3.9	180	154	334
65 - 69	1.9	1.8	3.7	163	154	317
70 - 74	1.4	2.2	3.6	120	188	308
75 - 79	.9	1.3	2.2	77	111	188
80 - 84	.9	1.2	2.1	77	103	180
85 - 89	.5	.7	1.2	43	60	103
90 or over	.0	.2	0.2	0	17	17
Total	49.5%	50.7%	100.0%	4,239	4,341	8,580

Table 5-1 Age\Sex Distribution						
Age Group	Males	Females	Total	# Males	# Females	# Persons
Alternative Age Categories						
0 - 5	5.5%	3.9%	9.4%	471	334	805
6 - 12	5.9	5.2	11.1	505	445	950
13 - 17	3.8	2.7	6.5	325	231	556
18 - 24	3.4	4.2	7.6	291	360	651
25 - 34	4.5	6.6	11.1	385	565	950
35 - 44	8.9	9.7	18.6	762	831	1,593
45 - 54	7.9	7.4	15.3	676	634	1,310
55 - 64	4.1	3.7	7.8	351	317	668
65 - 74	3.3	4.0	7.3	283	343	626
75 - 84	1.8	2.5	4.3	154	214	368
85 and over	0.5	0.9	1.4	43	77	120
Total	49.5%	50.7%	100.0%	4246	4351	8597
Cumulative Age Categories						
75 and over	2.3%	3.4%	5.7%	197	291	488
65 and over	5.6%	7.4%	13.0%	480	634	1,114
60 and over	7.7%	9.2%	16.9%	659	788	1,447
18 and over	34.4%	39.0%	73.4%	2,946	3,340	6,286
Median Age	37.5	37.5	37.5			

Table 5-2
Age 19 and Under
Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	%	Community	Year	%
Harrisburg	1994	30%	Richmond	1983	24%
San Diego	1979	30%	New Orleans	1988	24%
Houston	1987	30%	Phoenix	1983	24%
Los Angeles	1979	29%	Philadelphia	1984	23%
Nashville	1982	28%	San Francisco	1988	23%
Kansas City	1985	27%	Chicago	1982	23%
Milwaukee	1983	27%	Worcester	1987	22%
Minneapolis	1981	27%	Rochester	1988	22%
Toledo	1986	26%	Pittsburgh	1984	22%
Seattle	1979	26%	Denver	1981	21%
Washington, DC	1983	26%	New York	1981	21%
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	26%	Miami	1982	20%
Boston	1985	26%	Rhode Island	1987	20%
Atlanta	1984	26%	St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	20%
St Paul	1992	26%	San Antonio	1991	19%
St Louis	1982	25%	Miami	1994	18%
Detroit	1991	25%	South Broward	1990	12%
Orlando	1993	25%	Atlantic City	1985	11%
Louisville	1991	25%	Sarasota-Manatee	1992	11%
Tidewater	1988	25%	West Palm Beach	1987	8%
Cleveland	1987	25%	South Palm Beach	1986	5%
Dallas	1989	24%	NJPS (US)	1990	23%
Baltimore	1985	24%	NJPS (PA)	1990	23%

Table 5-3
Age 60 and Over
Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	%	Community	Year	%
South Palm Beach	1986	76 %	Richmond	1983	21 %
West Palm Beach	1987	67 %	St Paul	1992	20 %
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	63 %	Seattle	1979	20 %
South Broward	1990	55 %	SF Bay Area	1988	20 %
Miami	1982	44 %	Nashville	1982	20 %
Miami	1994	37 %	New Orleans	1988	19 %
Atlantic City	1985	35 %	Phoenix	1983	19 %
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	34 %	Chicago	1982	18 %
Rhode Island	1987	32 %	Tidewater	1988	17 %
Pittsburgh	1984	30 %	Kansas City	1985	17 %
San Antonio	1991	29 %	Harrisburg	1994	17 %
Worcester	1987	27 %	Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	16 %
Toledo	1982	26 %	San Diego	1979	16 %
Cleveland	1987	25 %	Orlando	1993	15 %
Rochester	1988	24 %	Dallas	1989	15 %
Detroit	1991	24 %	Denver	1981	15 %
New York	1981	23 %	Boston	1985	12 %
Baltimore	1985	23 %	Washington DC	1983	12 %
Louisville	1991	23 %	Los Angeles	1979	12 %
Philadelphia	1984	23 %	Atlanta	1984	12 %
Milwaukee	1983	23 %	Houston	1987	10 %
St Louis	1982	22 %	NJPS (US)	1990	17 %
Minneapolis	1981	21 %	NJPS (PA)	1990	18 %
Nashville	1982	21 %			

Table 5-1 also shows that 51% of the population is female. **Table 5-4** shows that Greater Harrisburg has a relatively low percentage female compared to other American Jewish communities because of its relatively young age structure. Surprisingly, the disparity between males and females in the upper age categories is not great: 5.6% of the population are males age 65 and over, 7.4% are females. For comparison, 52% of the general population of Dauphin County and 52% of the general population of Cumberland County is female.

The median age for both the male and the female population is 37.5 years. This means that half the population is over age 37.5 and half is under this age. For comparison, the median age for all persons in Dauphin County is 34.0; in Cumberland County, 33.5.

Table 5-4 Percentage Female Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	%	Community	Year	%
Atlantic City	1985	56%	Baltimore	1985	51%
Miami	1982	56%	Minneapolis	1981	51%
San Diego	1979	56%	Milwaukee	1983	51%
South Broward	1990	55%	Tampa	1980	51%
West Palm Beach	1987	54%	Orlando	1993	51%
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	54%	Harrisburg	1994	51%
Miami	1994	54%	Kansas City	1985	51%
Louisville	1991	53%	Nashville	1982	51%
St Louis	1982	53%	Essex Morris NJ	1986	51%
South Palm Beach	1986	53%	Rochester	1987	51%
Cleveland	1981	53%	Worcester	1987	51%
New Orleans	1987	52%	Atlanta	1984	50%
Rhode Island	1987	52%	San Francisco	1988	50%
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	52%	Dallas	1989	49%
Richmond	1983	51%	St Paul	1994	49%
Nashville	1982	51%	Washington	1983	48%
NJPS (PA)	1990	54%	NJPS (US)	1990	51%

Table 5-5 presents the age distribution for each geographic area. The median age differs only slightly by region. Half the population is over age 37 in East Shore, half is over age 39 in West Shore. Notice that West Shore is older not because of having more elderly (see next paragraph), but because one third of its population is age 40-54.

In East Shore, the percentage under age 18 (28% - 1,705 persons) is slightly greater than in West Shore (25% - 620 persons). The percentage age 60 and over does vary significantly between the regions, from 19% in East Shore to only 10% in West Shore. In contrast, West Shore has much higher percentages in the 45-54 age group (24%), versus only 12% in East Shore.

While **Table 5-5** presents the age distribution in each geographic subarea (the columns add to 100%), **Table 5-6** shows where the various age groups live (the rows add to 100%). Most children (aged 17 and under) live in East Shore, with 73% in this area. 78% of pre-school age children (0-5 years old) live in East Shore, versus 22% in West Shore. A greater percentage of 6-12 year olds live in East Shore (74%) than in West Shore (26%). 63% of teenagers (13-17) live in East Shore.

From 65%-72% of the non-elderly adult age groups are found in East Shore, but 84% of those age 65 and over (excluding those in the Jewish Home without their own private telephone number) also live in East Shore.

Table 5-5 Age by Geographic Area		
Age Group	East Shore	West Shore
0 - 4	8.2%	5.0%
5 - 9	8.5	5.9
10 - 14	7.4	7.2
15 - 19	6.3	10.3
20 - 24	4.8	3.9
25 - 29	4.6	4.7
30 - 34	6.5	6.0
35 - 39	9.0	8.6
40 - 44	9.3	10.7
45 - 49	7.9	13.3
50 - 54	4.0	10.4
55 - 59	4.1	3.0
60 - 64	4.2	3.0
65 - 69	4.6	1.5
70 - 74	4.0	2.7
75 - 79	2.7	0.9
80 - 84	2.0	2.1
85 - 89	1.5	0.2
90 or over	0.2	0.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Table 5-5 Age by Geographic Area		
Age Group	East Shore	West Shore
Alternative Age Categories		
0 - 5	10.3%	7.1%
6 - 12	11.6	9.9
13 - 17	5.7	8.3
18 - 24	7.5	7.6
25 - 34	11.1	10.7
35 - 44	18.3	19.3
45 - 54	11.9	23.7
55 - 64	8.3	6.0
65 - 74	8.6	4.2
75 - 84	4.7	3.0
85 and over	1.7	0.2
Total	100.0%	100.0
Cumulative Percentages		
75 and over	6.4%	3.2%
65 and over	15.0%	7.4%
60 and over	19.2%	10.4%
18 and over	72.1%	74.7%
Sample Size	865	301
Proj. # of Individuals	6,112	2,451
Median Age	37.1	38.8

Table 5-6 Age by Geographic Area <i>(Note: Table adds to 100% across the rows)</i>					
Age Group	East Shore	West Shore	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Individuals
0 - 5	78.3%	21.7	100.0%	97	805
6 - 12	74.4%	25.6	100.0%	121	950
13 - 17	63.0%	37.0	100.0%	70	556
18 - 24	71.1%	28.9	100.0%	83	651
25 - 34	71.9%	28.1	100.0%	108	950
35 - 49	66.8%	33.2	100.0%	298	2,406
50 - 64	65.1%	34.9	100.0%	150	1,165
65 - 74	84.3%	15.7	100.0%	123	625
75 & over	83.8%	16.2	100.0%	116	488
Summary Table					
65 & over	83.5%	16.5	100.0%	239	1,114
17 & under	73.0%	27.0	100.0%	288	2,311

Household Size

Table 5-7 shows that the household size for Greater Harrisburg is 2.6759. This is one of the highest household sizes for the Jewish comparison communities, where household sizes vary between 1.8 and 2.9 (**Table 5-8**). Only Essex-Morris NJ has a household size higher than Harrisburg. The 2.7 compares to 2.5 in Pittsburgh, 2.5 in Baltimore, and 2.6 in Cleveland. For US Jewish households as a whole, there are 2.6 persons per household, equal to that for American households in general in the 1990 US census. The average household size for all households in Dauphin County from the 1990 US Census is 2.50; for Cumberland County, 2.66.

Note that average household in the United States for all American households has declined from 5.8 in 1790 to 4.9 in 1890, to 3.3 in 1960, to 2.6 in 1993.

Table 5-7 shows that about 20% of households in Greater Harrisburg are single-person households, 34% are two-person households, 18% are three-person households, and about 28% of households contain four persons or more. **Table 5-9** shows that the percentage of one-person households is among the lowest in the table. It is only higher than four communities and is lower than about 25. The 20% compares with 23% for Jewish households nationwide and with 22% in San Francisco, 23% in Boston, 23% in Sarasota, and 29% in Richmond. The 20% is just slightly higher than the 19% in Essex-Morris NJ and the 18% in Orlando.

The percentage of households in Harrisburg with four or more persons (28%) is lower than only Washington (33%), Essex-Morris NJ (35%), Cleveland (36%), and Manchester (36%), but is higher than about 25 cities. It compares to 23% for Jews nationwide.

Table 5-7 also shows household size by geographic area. Household size varies slightly by geographic area. Both East Shore and West Shore have average household sizes of about 2.7. The percentage of one-person households is slightly higher in East Shore (21%) than in West Shore (17%).

Table 5-7 Household Size by Area			
Household Size	East Shore	West Shore	All
1	21.1 %	17.2 %	20.0 %
2	35.0	30.4	33.7
3	15.6	24.8	18.2
4	16.5	21.0	17.7
5	9.1	4.3	7.8
6+	2.7	2.3	2.5
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0. %
4+	28.3 %	27.6%	28.0 %
Average	2.6572	2.7234	2.6759
Sample Size	345	112	457
Proj. # of Hhlds	2300	900	3200

Table 5-8
Average Household Size Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	Average	Community	Year	Average
Palm Springs	1986	1.8	Louisville	1991	2.5
Quad Cities	1990	2.0	Kansas City	1985	2.5
South Palm Beach	1986	2.0	New Orleans	1988	2.5
West Palm Beach	1987	2.0	Detroit	1991	2.5
South Broward	1990	2.0	Pittsburgh	1984	2.5
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	2.0	Worcester	1987	2.5
Tidewater	1988	2.2	Baltimore	1985	2.5
Miami	1982	2.2	Milwaukee	1983	2.5
Denver	1981	2.2	Toledo	1982	2.5
Los Angeles	1979	2.2	Rochester	1980	2.5
Miami	1994	2.2	SF Bay Area	1988	2.5
Atlantic City	1985	2.3	Chicago	1982	2.6
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	2.3	Minneapolis	1981	2.6
Atlanta	1984	2.3	St Louis	1982	2.6
Washington DC	1983	2.3	Nashville	1982	2.6
New York	1981	2.4	Columbus	1990	2.6
Phoenix	1983	2.4	Houston	1987	2.6
Rhode Island	1987	2.4	Toronto	1991	2.6
Rochester	1988	2.4	San Antonio	1991	2.6
Richmond	1983	2.4	Orlando	1993	2.6
Dallas	1989	2.4	Cleveland	1987	2.6
St Paul	1992	2.4	Harrisburg	1994	2.7
US Census	1990	2.6	Manchester	1983	2.7
NJPS (US)	1990	2.6	Essex Morris NJ	1986	2.9
NJPS (PA)	1990	2.6			

Table 5-9
Number of Persons Per Household
Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	4+
Los Angeles	1979	33%	36	12	13	6	1	20
Miami	1982	32%	42	11	9	4	2	15
Miami	1994	31%	42	12	10	4	2	16
South Broward	1990	31%	50	9	8	2	1	11
Denver	1981	30%	37	16	13	4	1	18
Quad Cities	1990	29%	39	12	13	5	1	19
Richmond	1983	29%	35	12	17	7	1	25
Dallas	1989	28%	34	13	20	5	1	26
St. Paul	1981	27%	39	15	12	7	2	21
Kansas City	1985	27%	46	14	11	2	0	13
Rhode Island	1987	26%	38	15	16	4	1	21
Atlantic City	1985	26%	40	16	14	3	0	17
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	24%	45	12	14	3	1	18
South Palm Beach	1986	24%	68	3	4	1	0	5
Nashville	1982	24%	34	16	16	10	2	28
Louisville	1991	24%	37	16	18	5	1	24
Toledo	1982	24%	37	16	15	7	1	23
Pittsburgh	1984	23%	37	17	15	6	2	23
Baltimore	1985	23%	35	17	15	9	0	24
New Orleans	1988	23%	42	13	16	4	2	22
West Palm Beach	1987	23%	64	7	5	1	0	6
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	23%	63	5	7	1	0	8
Boston	1985	23%	38	20	15	4	0	19

Table 5-9 Number of Persons Per Household Comparison with Other Communities								
Community	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6	4+
Washington, D.C.	1983	23%	31	16	20	10	3	33
Atlanta	1984	22%	35	20	16	7	1	24
San Francisco	1988	22%	37	18	17	5	0	22
St. Louis	1982	22%	37	17	15	9	2	26
Chicago	1982	21%	36	21	12	10	2	24
Harrisburg	1994	20%	34	18	18	8	2	28
Cleveland	1981	19%	34	16	17	14	5	36
Essex-Morris Counties, NJ	1986	19%	30	16	24	9	2	35
Orlando	1993	18%	39	19	17	5	2	24
Manchester	1983	15%	30	19	25	8	3	36
NJPS (US)	1990	23%	36	18	15	8		23
NJPS (PA)	1990	16%	14	20	10	10		20

Household Structure

Table 5-10 reports the structure of Jewish households in Greater Harrisburg. This variable is a combination of age, sex, and the relationships of persons in the household to one another. The most common household type is a married couple with children at home (38%, or about 1,216 households). The second most common group is married couples with no children at home, at 28% (886 households). 12% are married age 50-64 with no children and 10% are married elderly couples (307 households). Single persons living alone (20%, about 640 households) is the next largest group and is about equally split between elderly and non-elderly singles. Notice that for elderly singles, most are women (8% versus 2%). This imbalance between males and females for this age group is consistent with the findings of many demographic studies.

Only 1.3% of households (42 households) contain a single parent and 7% contain a married couple with an adult child (18 or older).

Table 5-11 is divided into two parts. The first section is a detailed comparison with Florida cities, for which such information is available. The second section shows more general information for a larger group of cities. The percentage of singles living alone in Greater Harrisburg (20%) has been discussed above under the ``Household Size'' section. The percentage of elderly singles (10%) is much lower than all Florida communities, save Orlando (5%). The disparity between the percentage of male and female single person elderly households, noted above for Greater Harrisburg, is also evident in the other cities. The percentage of singles under age 65 (10%) is about equal to Miami (11%) and St. Petersburg (9%), and is lower than Orlando (13%). It is higher than West Palm Beach (4%), Sarasota (6%), and South Broward (6%).

About 28% of households are married couples without children. This figure is lower than about 11 cities in the table and is higher than about 5. This figure compares with 27% in Baltimore, 30% in Orlando, 46% in South Broward, 61% in West Palm Beach, and 57% in Sarasota. The 28% compares with 28% for all American households in the 1990 US Census.

About 10% of households are married couples *age 65 and over* without children. The 10% married couples *age 65 and over* without children compares with 32% in South Broward, 34% in Miami, 44% in West Palm Beach, 39% in Sarasota, and 11% in Orlando.

Table 5-10 Household Structure (Sample Size = 457)		
Household Structure	%	# of Households
Single Persons Living Alone		
Single Male Under Age 65	5.2%	166
Single Female Under Age 65	5.2	166
Single Male Age 65 and over	1.8	58
Single Female Age 65 and over	7.8	250
Single Under 65	10.4	333
Single 65 and over	9.6	307
■ Total Single Persons Living Alone	20.0%	640
Couples—No Children		
Married Couple Under 35	3.6	115
Married Couple 35-49	2.8	90
Married Couple 50-64	11.7	374
Married Couple 65 and over	9.6	307
■ Total Couples—no children	27.7%	886
■ Married Couples—Children Under 18	38.0%	1,216
Other Household Structures		
Single Parent Family	1.3	42
Single Parent with Adult Child	1.1	35
Married Couple with Elderly Parent	0.2	6
Roommates	2.9	93
Married Couple—Adult Child	6.8	218
Adult Single with Elderly Parent	0.8	26
Two elderly sisters	0.7	22
Couple with Children and Elderly Parents	0.7	22
■ Total Other Household Structures	14.5	464
Total	100.0%	3,200
% of Households with Children Led by a Single Parent	3.3%	

Table 5-11
Detailed Household Structure Comparison with Florida Communities

Household Structure	1994 Miami	1994 St. Peters- burg	1994 Harris- burg, PA	1993 Orlando	1992 Sarasota- Manatee	1990 South Broward	1987 West Palm Beach	1982 Miami
Single Persons Living Alone								
Single Male, Age 65 +	4 %	4 %	2 %	1 %	4 %	7 %	3 %	5 %
Single Female, Age 65 +	17	11	8	4	13	18	16	17
Single, Under Age 65	11	9	10	13	6	6	4	6
Total Singles	31 %	24 %	20 %	18 %	23 %	31 %	23 %	28 %
Couples—No Children								
Married Couple, Under 35	3	2	4	4	0	1	2	3
Married Couple, 35-64	11	16	15	15	18	13	15	12
Married Couple, 65 +	20	22	10	11	39	32	44	23
Total Married Couple— No Children	34 %	40 %	28 %	30 %	57 %	46 %	61 %	37 %
Married, Kids Under 19	20	24	38	33	11	12	10	22
Single Parent Family	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	5
Other	16	11	12	19	8	9	5	8
Total	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

The percentage of married couples with children (38 %) is lower than only Essex-Morris NJ (46 %) and Toronto (40 %). It is much higher than West Palm Beach (10 %), Sarasota (11 %), and South Broward (12 %), and is higher than Orlando (33 %). It is also higher than Baltimore (36 %), Houston (36 %), Detroit (35 %), and Dallas (29 %). Compared with all US households (36 %), Greater Harrisburg Jews have a similar percentage of married with children.

Finally, the percentage of single parent families (1.3 %) is much less than the US rate of 9 %. This rate is also low compared to other Jewish communities, although **Table 5-11** shows that this percentage varies between 1 %-5 %. Only 3.3 % of households containing children are single parent households. 27 % of all US children are currently being raised in a single parent household.

Table 5-11 continued Household Structure Comparison with Other Communities <i>(Totals may not add to 100% because ``other'' household types are not shown)</i>					
Community	Year	Singles	Married No Children	Married with Children	Single Parent Family
Orlando	1993	18%	30	33	1
Essex-Morris Counties, NJ	1986	19%	27	46	4
Harrisburg	1994	20%	29	38	1
Detroit	1991	21%	39	35	5
Baltimore	1986	22%	27	36	5
West Palm Beach	1987	23%	61	10	1
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	23%	57	11	1
Boston	1985	23%	51	24	2
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	24%	40	24	1
Tidewater	1988	24%	42	32	2
Toronto	1991	24%	28	40	4
Rhode Island	1987	26%	35	29	3
St Paul	1992	27%	24	28	5
Miami	1982	28%	37	22	5
SF Bay Area	1988	28%	28	34	5
Dallas	1990	28%	29	29	2
Miami	1994	31%	33	20	2
South Broward	1991	31%	46	12	2
Houston	1987	31%	30	36	3
Louisville	1991	70%		30	
US Census	1990	25%	28	36	9

Table 5-12 shows the household structure for the two geographic areas in Greater Harrisburg. For simplicity, a few of the categories containing very low percentages of households have been collapsed under the ``Other Household Structures'' heading. In East Shore, 21% are single persons living alone as are 17% in West Shore. Single age 65 and over is much greater in East Shore (12%) than in West Shore (4%). The percentage of singles under age 65 is slightly lower in East Shore 9% than in West Shore 13%.

The percentage of married couples without children does not vary significantly by region, at about 28% in East Shore and 26% in West Shore. 12% in East Shore are couples age 65 and over without children, compared to 4% in West Shore. 36% in East Shore are married with children, versus 42% in West Shore.

Table 5-12 Household Structure by Geographic Area		
Household Structure	East Shore	West Shore
Single Persons Living Alone		
Single Male Under Age 65	4.6%	7.0%
Single Female Under Age 65	4.8	6.2
Single Male Age 65 and over	2.0	1.3
Single Female Age 65 and over	9.7	2.8
Single 65 and over	11.7	4.1
Total Single Persons	21.1	17.3
Couples—No Children		
Married Couple Under 35	3.6	3.4
Married Couple 35-49	1.5	6.1
Married Couple 50-64	11.5	12.2
Married Couple 65 and over	11.7	4.4
■ Total Couples—no children	28.3	26.1
■ Married—Kids Under 18	36.4	42.2
Other Household Structures		
Single Parent Family	1.5	.8
Roommates	2.9	2.7
Married Couple-Adult Child	6.3	7.9
Other Household Structures	3.5	3.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	345	112
Projected Number of Households	2,300	900
Hhlds with Children Led by Single Parent	4.0%	1.9%

Table 5-13 examines the geographic distribution of the major household structure categories. Most elderly singles (88%) live in East Shore, and only 12% live in West Shore. About one-third of non-elderly singles live in West Shore and 65% in East Shore. 66% of non-elderly couples without children live in East Shore and 34% in West Shore. 87% of elderly couples are in East Shore, versus 13% in West Shore. 69% of married couples with children are in East Shore and 31% are in West Shore.

Note that East Shore has a disproportionate share of elderly singles and elderly couples.

Table 5-13 Household Structure by Geographic Area (Note: Table adds to 100% across the rows)			
Household Structure	East Shore	West Shore	All
Elderly Singles	88.0%	12.0	100%
Non-Elderly Singles	64.5%	35.5	100%
Couples—No Children			
Non-Elderly	66.0%	34.0	100%
Elderly Couple 65 and over	87.2%	12.8	100%
■ Married with Kids Under 18	69.2%	30.8	100%

Latch Key Households

Latch key households are defined as households with children in which both parents (or *the* parent in a single family household) are employed full time. 36% of households with children (about 450 households) are latch key households. Alternatively, if we add to the definition that such children must be age 12 or under, then 30% (about 375 households) of households with children are latch key households.

Table 5-14 Latch Key Households Comparison with other Communities			
Community	Year	Children Age 0-17 at Home	Children Age 0-12 at Home
West Palm Beach	1994	40%	29%
Pinellas County	1994	37%	29%
Miami	1994	37%	30%
Harrisburg	1994	36%	34%

Marital Status

Table 5-15 shows the marital status of Jews in Greater Harrisburg. About 75% (4715) are currently married; about 25% (1572) are currently single, with most of these being single and never married (15% or 930 persons). Another 6% are currently widowed (352 persons) and 4% (245) are currently divorced. 8% have been widowed and 17% have been divorced. 16% of adults are on their second (or subsequent) marriage. 85% of adults have been married at some point.

Table 5-16 shows that Jews in Greater Harrisburg have one of the highest rates of marriage of the comparison communities (75%), although this percentage is lower than seven communities, including West Palm Beach (82%) and Sarasota (79%). The 75% marriage rate is considerably higher than Orlando (68%) and Miami (67%) and is much higher than the figure for Jews in the US as a whole (63%).

The percentage who are currently single, never married (15%) is at about the middle of the comparison communities. The rate of widowship (6%) is about equal to the US figure for Jews (8%), but is higher than only about 6 communities. The percentage currently divorced (4%) is higher than only 2 of the Jewish communities. Compared with US Jews, Jews in Greater Harrisburg are more likely to be married (by 75% to 63%) and less likely to be single, never married (by 15% to 22%), widowed (by 6% to 8%), or divorced (by 4% to 7%).

Table 5-15 shows the marital status for residents of the two geographic areas. The percentage of adults who are currently married is slightly higher in West Shore (78%) than in East Shore (74%). The percentage of divorced, remarried is much higher in West Shore, by 19% to 11%.

Table 5-15
Current Marital Status by Geographic Area

Marital Status	East Shore	West Shore	All
Married for first time	60.3 %	56.0%	59.0%
Divorced, remarried	10.9	19.4	13.4
Widowed, remarried	2.8	2.2	2.6
Single, never married	14.5	15.6	14.8
Currently Divorced	4.1	3.5	3.9
Currently Widowed	6.7	3.0	5.6
Separated	0.0	.4	.6
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Currently Married	74.0	77.6	75.0
Ever Divorced	15.0	22.9	17.3
Ever Widowed	9.5	5.2	8.2
Ever Married	85.5	84.1	84.5
On second marriage	13.7	21.6	16.0
Sample Size	650	228	878
Proj. # of Adults	4407	1831	6286

Table 5-16
Current Marital Status Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	Married	Single (Never Married)	Widowed	Divorced
Manchester	1983	89%	3	2	6
Toledo	1982	85%	2	9	4
West Palm Beach	1987	82%	4	12	3
Cleveland	1987	82%	6	8	4
Detroit	1991	82%	5	8	5
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	79%	5	11	5
Miami	1982	77%	4	14	5
Harrisburg	1994	75%	15	6	4
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	75%	10	8	6
Tidewater	1988	74%	9	10	6
Atlanta	1984	74%	14	4	8
Rhode Island	1987	71%	16	9	4
South Broward	1990	71%	9	17	3
San Antonio	1991	71%	7	22	
Kansas City	1985	70%	17	7	5
Nashville	1982	70%	17	8	5
Essex-Morris NJ	1986	70%	20	6	4
Dallas	1989	69%	20	4	7
San Francisco	1988	69%	20	4	7
Worcester	1987	69%	14	17	
Orlando	1993	68%	22	6	4
Tampa	1980	68%	17	8	6
St Paul	1992	68%	21	6	5

Table 5-16
Current Marital Status Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	Married	Single (Never Married)	Widowed	Divorced
Baltimore	1985	68%	19	9	5
St Louis	1982	68%	9	17	6
Miami	1994	67%	14	13	6
Rochester	1980	67%	23	6	4
Atlantic City	1985	67%	13	13	6
Richmond	1983	67%	14	12	7
Milwaukee	1983	67%	14	9	10
Minneapolis	1981	66%	22	7	5
Houston	1987	66%	20	7	7
New York	1981	65%	15	11	9
Chicago	1982	65%	23	6	6
Quad Cities	1989	64%	11	18	7
Denver	1981	64%	23	4	9
Columbus	1990	63%	30	2	5
Phoenix	1983	63%	18	9	10
Philadelphia	1984	61%	23	6	10
Boston	1985	61%	29	4	5
Washington DC	1983	61%	27	4	7
Los Angeles	1979	57%	17	12	14
NJPS (US)	1990	63%	22	8	7
NJPS (PA)	1990	65%	23	5	7

Tables 5-17 and 5-18 show marital status by age group for males and females. The percentage of adults who are currently married peaks at around 92% for males age 50-74 and for females age 50-64. Only 43% of males and 55% of females under age 35 are currently married. For the age 75 and over group, 81% of males and 32% of females are currently married. Divorce is highest among those age 35-49 (6%-7%), irrespective of sex. For the 50-64 age group, 6% of males are currently divorced, versus only 1% of females. Over 94% of Jewish adults in Greater Harrisburg over age 35 have been married.

The percentage who have ever been divorced among males increases from 5% of those under age 35 to 23% of those age 35-49, to 34% of those age 50-64. It then sharply declines to less than 10% of elderly men. For females, a similar pattern is seen: 6% of those under age 35 have been divorced, as have about one in four (24%) of those age 35-64 and about 5% of the elderly. Changing societal mores probably account for the fact that only 7% of those age 75 and over have been divorced.

Table 5-17 Current Marital Status by Age, Males					
Marital Status	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+
Married for first time	39.6%	68.7%	57.6%	77.9%	69.5%
Divorced, remarried	3.8	17.0	27.7	10.2	7.4
Widowed, remarried	.0	1.8	5.9	4.9	3.9
Single, never married	55.1	6.3	.0	5.6	3.8
Currently Divorced	1.4	6.2	5.9	.0	.0
Currently Widowed	.0	.0	2.9	1.3	15.5
Separated	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Currently Married	43.4	87.5	91.2	93	80.8
Ever Divorced	5.2	23.2	33.6	10.2	7.4
Ever Widowed	.0	1.8	8.8	6.2	19.4
Ever Married	44.8	93.7	100	94.3	96.3
Divorce Rate	11.6	24.7	33.6	10.8	7.7
On second marriage	3.8	18.8	33.6	15.1	11.3
Sample Size	77	142	79	53	45
Proj. # of Adults	657	1161	651	289	189

Table 5-18 Current Marital Status by Age, Females					
Marital Status	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+
Married for first time	50.8%	66.5%	69.2%	53.3%	23.5%
Divorced, remarried	4.2	18.0	21.3	2.1	2.4
Widowed, remarried	.0	1.1	1.3	12.9	6.2
Single, never married	41.9	5.2	2.0	3.5	4.2
Currently Divorced	2.1	6.5	1.3	1.4	4.8
Currently Widowed	.0	.6	4.9	26.7	58.8
Separated	1.1	2.2	.0	.0	.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Currently Married	55.0	85.6	91.8	68.3	32.1
Ever Divorced	6.3	24.5	22.6	3.5	7.2
Ever Widowed	.0	1.7	6.2	39.6	65
Ever Married	58.2	94.9	98	96.4	95.7
Divorce Rate	10.8	25.8	23.1	3.6	3.6
On second marriage	54.2	19.1	22.6	15	8.6
Sample Size	106	156	71	70	71
Proj. # of Adults	885	1,279	528	351	294

Note that the divorce rate shown is the percentage ever divorced divided by the percentage ever married.

Level of Secular Education

Only about 2% of the adult population does not have a high school degree, versus 22% of the American population in general (**Table 5-19**). About 19% have only graduated high school, 12% have graduated high school and had some college; another 6% have a 2-year college degree. About 29% have only graduated a four-year college and an additional 28% also have a graduate degree. In total, 60% of the adult population has a degree from a four-year college. About 3% have a medical or dental degree; another 5%, a law degree.

The differences shown in **Table 5-19** between males and females are significant. 35% of males have a graduate degree, versus only 21% of females. 70% of males have a college degree, versus 53% of females. Even for those under age 50, this difference in education between men and women persists: 47% of males between ages 35-49 have a graduate degree, versus 35% of females (**Tables 5-21 and 5-22**).

Table 5-20 compares the level of secular education in Greater Harrisburg with other Jewish communities. The levels of education in Greater Harrisburg are higher than most American Jewish communities. The percentage with high school or less (22%) is about average, but the percentage with a graduate degree (28%) is significantly lower than only 5 communities, Washington (48%), San Francisco (40%), Manchester (39%), New Orleans (38%), and St. Paul (34%). It compares to 23% in Baltimore, 22% in Philadelphia, and 18% in Orlando.

The 22% in Harrisburg with a high school degree or less compares with 39% in Philadelphia, 36% in Rochester, 31% in Baltimore, 24% in Cleveland, 20% in Tidewater, and 15% in Washington. The percentage with high school or some college (52%) is a little higher than that found by the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey. The percentage with a graduate degree is also higher than the results for all US Jews.

The 32% with a college degree compares with 21% for the American public in general and 29% for US Jews. This helps to explain the high income levels.

There are 325 Jews in Harrisburg with a law degree and 190 with a medical degree.

Table 5-19 Level of Secular Education by Sex (Adults Age 18 and Over)			
Highest Degree Earned	Male	Female	Total
Less than High School	2.1 %	2.5 %	2.3 %
High School	12.9	24.9	19.2
High School and Some College	12.2	12.4	12.3
Graduated 2-year college	3.2	7.7	5.6
Graduated 4-year college	30.3	27.8	28.9
Some graduate school	4.6	3.6	4.0
Master's Degree	14.6	14.6	14.6
Doctorate	5.0	2.5	3.7
Nurse	.0	1.4	.7
Medical Doctor	5.5	.4	2.8
Dentist	.5	.0	.2
Law Degree	8.5	2.3	5.2
Other Professional Degree	.6	.0	.3
Total	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %
4-Year College Degree +	69.6 %	52.6 %	60.4 %
Graduate Degree	34.7 %	21.2 %	27.5 %
Sample Size	396	474	870
Projected # of Adults	2946	3340	6286

Table 5-20
Level of Secular Education Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	High School or less	Some College	College Degree	Graduate Degree
Atlantic City	1985	53 %	12	22	12
South Broward	1990	43 %	18	21	16
Miami	1982	41 %	23	24	12
Philadelphia	1984	39 %	16	23	22
Palm Springs	1986	38 %	24	24	14
West Palm Beach	1987	38 %	19	29	14
Rochester	1988	36 %	5	29	30
St Louis	1982	33 %	22	27	18
Kansas City	1985	33 %	21	23	19
Los Angeles	1979	32 %	25	26	18
New York	1981	31 %	18	31	20
Baltimore	1985	31 %	19	26	23
Miami	1994	30 %	18	31	21
Louisville	1991	29 %	8	32	32
Seattle	1979	29 %	18	26	27
Toledo	1982	28 %	22	26	24
Tampa	1980	27 %	24	24	25
Rhode Island	1987	26 %	20	25	30
Minneapolis	1981	25 %	29	28	19
Cleveland	1987	24 %	22	32	22
Phoenix	1983	24 %	25	33	17
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	24 %	28	30	19
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	23 %	24	33	20

Table 5-20 Level of Secular Education Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	High School or less	Some College	College Degree	Graduate Degree
Harrisburg	1994	22%	18	32	28
St Paul	1992	22%	16	28	34
Chicago	1982	22%	27	25	26
Worcester	1987	45%		30	25
Milwaukee	1983	22%	20	32	26
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	21%	15	30	29
Dallas	1987	34%		40	25
Orlando	1993	20%	28	34	18
Tidewater	1988	20%	25	34	21
Boston	1985	19%	51		29
Quad Cities	1989	19%	29	32	21
Washington DC	1983	15%	16	24	48
San Francisco	1988	15%	14	31	40
New Orleans	1988	15%	20	27	38
Manchester	1983	13%	21	27	39
Nashville	1982	52%		28	22
US Census	1990			21%	
NJPS (US)	1990	49%		29	22
NJPS (PA)	1990	46%		32	32

Tables 5-21 and 5-22 show the relationship between age, sex, and education. For males, 47% of the 35-49 age group have a graduate degree, versus 35% of females. At all age levels, males are more highly educated than are females. The differences are particularly pronounced among the elderly. Note that only 6% of women age 75 and over have a graduate degree, versus 11% of men, but this difference is also significant even for those under age 35, at 11% versus 23%. In this youngest age group, 56% of males, but only 48% of females have a college degree.

Table 5-23 shows that those in West Shore have somewhat higher levels of education than is the case in East Shore. In West Shore, 65% have a college degree or a graduate degree, versus 59% in East Shore.

Table 5-21 Level of Secular Education by Age, Males					
Highest Degree Earned	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75 +
No Degree	4.5%	.0%	1.1%	3.9%	7.8%
High School	36.1	15.6	18.4	36.4	53.1
Graduated 2-year college	3.3	1.9	6.2	1.4	3.6
Graduated 4-year college	33.3	35.9	37.8	33.8	24.2
Graduate Degree	22.8	46.5	36.5	24.5	11.1
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
4-year College Degree +	56.1%	82.4%	74.3%	58.3%	35.3%
Sample Size	77	142	79	53	45
Proj. # of Adults	657	1161	651	289	189

Table 5-22 Level of Secular Education by Age, Females					
Highest Degree Earned	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75 +
No Degree	2.5%	1.1	1.3%	2.1%	10.7
High School	38.4	23.2	35.3	65.8	65.7
Graduated 2-year college	10.8	3.9	10.7	6.6	11.1
Graduated 4-year college	37.0	37.2	28.8	20.5	6.4
Graduate Degree	11.3	34.6	23.8	5.0	6.2
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
4-year College Degree +	48.3%	71.8%	52.6%	25.5%	12.6%
Sample Size	106	156	71	70	71
Proj. # of Adults	885	1,279	528	351	294

Table 5-23 Level of Secular Education by Geographic Area		
Highest Degree Earned	East Shore	West Shore
No Degree	2.5%	1.8%
High School	32.2	30.0
Graduated 2-year college	6.4	3.6
Graduated 4-year college	34.5	29.3
Graduate Degree	24.4	35.3
Total	100	100
4-year College Degree +	58.9%	64.6%
Sample Size	650	228
Proj. # of Adults	4407	1831

Employment Status

Table 5-24 shows that 56% of adults are employed full time, 15% are retired, 11% are employed part time, and 9% are homemakers. In addition, 6% are students, 2% were unemployed at the time of the survey, and 1% were disabled. The unemployment rate [currently unemployed/(employed part time + employed full time)] is about 3%.

Table 5-24 also shows that males are significantly more likely to be employed full time (by 71% to 42%) and females are much more likely to be homemakers (by 17% to 0%). Females are more likely to be employed part time, by 14% to 8%.

Table 5-25 shows the employment status for Greater Harrisburg as compared to other Jewish communities. The percentage of persons employed full time in Greater Harrisburg (56%) is less than in than Dallas (63%) and Tidewater (60%) and is about equal to Orlando (57%), Cleveland (56%), and Manchester (56%). It is higher than San Francisco (49%) and much higher than the Florida communities. It compares to 53% of US Jews. The percentage retired (15%) is, excluding the Florida retirement communities, about average compared with the other communities. The 15% retirement rate in Greater Harrisburg is equal to that of all US Jews from the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey.

Table 5-24 Employment Status by Sex			
Employment Status	Males	Females	All
Employed Full Time	70.7%	42.4%	55.7%
Employed Part Time	7.5	13.5	10.7
Retired	12.6	18.0	15.4
Homemaker	.0	16.6	8.5
Disabled	1.5	.4	0.9
Unemployed	1.7	2.6	2.2
Student	5.9	6.6	6.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	396	474	870
Proj. # of Adults	2,961	3,325	6,286

Table 5-25 Employment Status Comparison with Other Communities								
Community	Year	Full Time	Part Time	Retired	Home-maker	Students	Unem-ployed	Unemploy-ment Rate
Dallas	1989	63 %	10	11	9	5	3	4 %
Seattle	1990	72 %		12	7	2	4	5 %
Tampa	1980	60 %	10	22	8			NA
Tidewater	1988	60 %	5	19	14	1	1	2 %
Orlando	1993	57 %	8	17	8	7	3	5 %
Cleveland	1987	56 %	9	14	18	3	2	3 %
Harrisburg	1994	56 %	11	15	9	6	2	3 %
Manchester	1983	56 %	17	9	12	1	5	7 %
Baltimore	1985	50 %	14	15	11	7	1	2 %
SF Bay Area	1988	49 %	14	13	10	9	5	8 %
Quad Cities	1989	48 %	12	22	16	1	1	2 %
Toledo	1982	47 %	10	19	17	7 %		NA
Miami	1994	43 %	9	35	7	5	1	2 %
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	42 %	9	36	6	4	1	2 %
Miami	1982	32 %	7	38	19	1	3	7 %
South Broward	1990	27 %	9	47	12	2	2	4 %
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	23 %	9	55	11	1	1	3 %
Palm Springs	1986	24 %	8	61	11	1	5	14 %
West Palm Beach	1987	19 %	8	63	8	1	1	5 %
NJPS (US)	1990	53 %	11	15	9	8	3	4 %
NJPS (PA)	1990	52 %	11	13	11	11	1	2 %

Table 5-26 shows that the percentage employed full time varies little by area. About 59% are employed full time in West Shore, versus 55% in East Shore. The percentage retired is lower in West Shore (10%) than in East Shore (18%).

Table 5-26 Employment Status by Geographic Area		
Employment Status	East Shore	West Shore
Employed Full Time	54.5%	58.5%
Employed Part Time	10.5	11.1
Retired	17.7	10.0
Homemaker	7.9	11.0
Disabled	.7	1.4
Unemployed	2.4	1.8
Student	6.3	6.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	650	228
Proj. # of Adults	4407	1831

Tables 5-27 and 5-28 show employment status by age for males and females. The percentage employed full time is greatest for males age 35-49 (92%). For females in the same age bracket, only 57% are employed full time. Part-time employment is greatest for females age 35-64 (19%).

Only small percentages of female elderly are employed full time: 8% of those age 65-74 and 1% of those age 75 and over, but 37% of males aged 65-74 are employed full time. For the under age 35 category, 25% of males and 23% of females are students.

Table 5-27 Employment Status by Age, Males					
Employment Status	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75 +
Employed Full Time	55.4%	91.5%	82.1%	36.6%	7.9%
Employed Part Time	13.9	6.6	3.5	6.9	6.3
Retired	.0	.0	7.7	56.5	82.5
Homemaker	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
Disabled	.0	.0	6.7	.0	.0
Unemployed	5.7	.6	.0	.0	3.2
Student	25.0	1.2	.0	.0	.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	77	142	79	53	45
Proj. # of Adults	657	1161	651	289	189

Table 5-28 Employment Status by Age, Females					
Employment Status	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75 +
Employed Full Time	47.2%	57.3%	43.9%	8.1%	.8%
Employed Part Time	10.7	18.7	19.4	3.3	.8
Retired	.0	.0	14.0	76.4	87.2
Homemaker	13.7	20.7	18.4	12.2	8.3
Disabled	.0	.6	.0	.0	2.1
Unemployed	4.9	1.7	4.2	.0	.0
Student	23.4	1.1	.0	.0	.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	106	156	71	70	71
Proj. # of Adults	885	1279	528	351	294

Housing Value

Table 5-30 shows housing values for all households and by area. About 10% own or rent residences that they would value under \$50,000. Another 25% value their home at \$50,000-\$99,999. About 67% put their housing values at over \$100,000; including 9%, at over \$250,000. The median housing value is about \$124,500. The median value of housing is higher than the comparison Florida communities, except for Sarasota-Manatee, \$135,200 (**Table 5-29**).

These housing values are based upon respondents' perceptions and *may not* represent actual selling prices. However, many persons are recent migrants who are knowledgeable about their purchase price. Many persons have a reasonable idea of the selling values of similar houses in their neighborhood. On the other hand, it is also possible that some people remember what they paid for their dwelling and are unaware of changes in the housing market. About 23% of respondents were unable to provide an answer.

Housing values are significantly higher in West Shore (**Table 5-30**). The median housing value is \$144,300 in West Shore, versus \$118,000 in East Shore.

The value of housing for different age groups is shown in **Table 5-31**. The 35-49 age group lives in the most expensive housing: the median value of housing for those in this group is about \$141,700. Those age 50-64 live in housing almost as expensive, at \$135,700. The median declines to \$71,000 for those age 75 and over. Note as well that 31% in the oldest category live in housing valued at under \$50,000.

Table 5-29 Housing Value Comparison with Other Communities		
Community	Year	Median Value
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	\$135,200
Harrisburg	1994	\$124,500
Miami	1994	\$111,000
Orlando	1993	\$105,800
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	\$90,800
South Broward	1990	\$85,100
West Palm Beach	1987	\$73,000
US Census	1990	\$79,100

Table 5-30 Housing Value by Geographic Area			
Housing Value	East Shore	West Shore	All
Under \$50,000	9.7%	3.7%	8.7%
\$50 - \$99,999	28.3	16.2	24.9
\$100 - \$149,999	33.3	34.0	33.5
\$150 - \$249,999	19.3	35.9	24.0
\$250 - \$499,999	8.4	7.2	8.0
\$500,000 and over	1.1	2.9	1.6
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	345	112	457
Proj. # of Households	2300	900	3200
Median Value	\$118,000	\$144,300	\$124,500

Table 5-31 Housing Value by Age of Respondent					
Housing Value	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75 +
Under \$50,000	11.4%	2.8%	1.4%	20.8%	31.4%
\$50 - \$99,999	39.7	18.6	16.3	21.1	44.2
\$100 - \$149,999	25.4	34.3	45.1	32.1	22.9
\$150 - \$249,999	16.4	32.6	25.8	16.7	1.6
\$250 - \$499,999	5.9	10.3	10.1	4.4	.0
\$500,000 and over	1.2	1.4	1.4	5.0	.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	90	143	75	72	77
Projected # of Households	781	1168	592	352	304
Median Value	\$98,600	\$141,700	\$135,700	\$112,600	\$71,000

Table 5-32 shows housing value by Jewish identification. Reform Jews (median \$166,900) live in the most expensive homes, followed by Conservative Jews (\$125,100), and the Orthodox (\$92,500). The median housing values for those calling themselves Just Jewish is \$113,900.

Table 5-33 shows that those who own their homes (\$134,900) live in much more expensive units than those who rent (\$74,100). Synagogue members (\$132,100) live in more expensive units than non-members (\$116,700).

Table 5-32 Housing Value by Jewish Identification				
Housing Value	Orthodox	Conservative	Reform	Just Jewish
Under \$50,000	12.6%	5.7%	3.7%	13.3%
\$50 - \$100,000	44.0	25.0	20.7	12.9
\$100 - \$150,000	37.4	38.4	26.4	28.0
\$150 - \$200,000	3.6	20.8	41.4	21.7
\$200,000 and over	2.4	10.1	15.5	8.2
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	58	180	93	126
Proj. # of Households	304	1043	704	1027
Median Value	\$92,500	\$125,100	\$166,900	\$113,900

Table 5-33 Housing Value by Home Ownership and Synagogue Membership				
Housing Value	Own	Rent	Synagogue Member	Non member
Under \$50,000	2.8%	30.0%	4.8%	11.2%
\$50 - \$100,000	21.5	41.5	20.4	29.3
\$100 - \$150,000	36.8	19.1	38.6	28.4
\$150 - \$200,000	28.1	4.8	25.4	22.5
\$200,000 and over	10.8	4.5	10.7	8.6
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	325	127	269	188
Proj. # of Households	2326	874	1574	1625
Median Value	\$134,900	\$74,100	\$132,100	\$116,700

Household Income

Respondents were asked their household income before taxes in 1993. About 71% answered this question. The type of bias introduced by the lack of a response from 29% of the respondents is unknown. It should be emphasized that not all 29% represent refusals. In some cases, the household member interviewed did not refuse, he/she simply did not know the amount.

Overall, 8% (about 259 households) of households earned under \$10,000; 12%, from \$10,000-\$25,000; 26%, from \$25,000-\$49,999; 24%, from \$50,000-\$74,999; 12%, from \$75,000-\$99,999; and 19%, over \$100,000 (**Table 5-34**). The median income is about \$54,700: this implies that half of households earn over \$54,700 and half, under \$54,700.

Table 5-35 shows how the income in Greater Harrisburg compares with other communities. It should be remembered in using this table, however, that the data have not been adjusted for inflation, nor for interurban differences in cost of living. Nevertheless, it is clear that Greater Harrisburg is one of the wealthier Jewish communities. The median income of \$54,700 is much above the average for all US Jewish households of \$39,000 and all US households (\$34,000). It is below only San Antonio (\$65,300), Toronto (\$55,000) and Detroit (\$55,000). It is higher than Orlando (\$45,700), Columbus (\$42,000), Baltimore (\$35,700), and all of the Florida communities.

Table 5-34 shows that income varies significantly by geographic area, with West Shore (median of \$64,000) being more wealthy than East Shore (\$52,600).

Table 5-34			
1993 Household Income by Geographic Area			
Income	East Shore	West Shore	All
Under \$10,000	9.0%	5.7%	8.1%
\$10 - \$24,999	12.1	11.1	11.8
\$25 - \$49,999	26.0	24.8	25.6
\$50 - \$74,999	27.7	15.0	24.1
\$75 - \$99,999	10.7	14.0	11.6
\$100 - \$149,999	7.8	17.4	10.6
\$150 - \$199,999	3.7	3.5	3.6
\$200,000 and over	3.0	8.5	4.6
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	345	112	457
Proj. # of Households	2300	900	3200
Median Income	\$52,600	\$64,000	\$54,700

Table 5-35 Household Income Comparison with Other Communities		
Community	Year	Median Income
San Antonio	1991	\$65,300
Toronto	1990	\$55,000
Detroit	1990	\$55,000
Harrisburg	1994	\$54,700
Palm Springs	1986	\$48,000
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	\$47,500
Miami	1994	\$45,900
Orlando	1993	\$45,700
Manchester	1983	\$44,300
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	\$42,000
Columbus	1991	\$42,000
Dallas	1989	\$42,000
Rhode Island	1987	\$40,900
Rochester	1988	\$40,000
St Paul	1992	\$39,300
Kansas City	1985	\$38,000
South Broward	1990	\$36,700
Baltimore	1985	\$35,700
Houston	1987	\$33,000
West Palm Beach	1987	\$31,000
Toledo	1982	\$30,150
Atlantic City	1985	\$30,000
Miami	1982	\$22,359
NJPS (US)	1990	\$39,000
US Census	1990	\$34,213
US Census (<i>Whites Only</i>)	1990	\$35,975

The household income for different age groups is shown in **Table 5-36**. Income peaks in the 35-64 age ranges, with a median of about \$69,000. Those under age 35 have a median income of \$40,700. The 75 and over age group earns about \$18,700 less than those who are younger (age 65-74).

Table 5-37 shows household income by household structure. Median income is highest at \$68,500 for non-elderly couples. Elderly singles at \$11,300 are the least affluent group. Non-elderly singles have a median income of \$29,500.

Table 5-36 1993 Household Income by Age of Respondent					
Income	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75 +
Under \$10,000	11.5%	3.1%	1.7%	6.0%	38.9%
\$10 - 24,999	16.8	4.0	1.7	33.6	28.8
\$25 - 49,999	34.6	24.3	16.0	27.5	21.3
\$50 - 74,999	21.2	25.8	38.1	12.4	8.2
\$75 - 99,999	9.1	13.2	18.0	7.6	2.8
\$100 - \$149,999	3.9	16.3	14.4	7.0	.0
\$150 - \$199,999	1.6	5.4	6.5	.0	.0
\$200,000 and over	1.2	7.8	3.5	6.0	.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	90	143	75	72	77
Proj. # of Households	781	1168	592	352	304
Median Income	\$40,700	\$68,000	\$70,100	\$34,500	\$15,800

Table 5-37 1993 Household Income by Household Structure					
Income	Households with Children	Non-Elderly Couple	Non-Elderly Single	Elderly Couple	Elderly Single
Under \$10,000	2.2%	.0%	22.6%	.0%	47.1%
\$10 - \$24,999	5.4	1.7	20.8	27.9	32.5
\$25 - \$49,999	26.6	20.9	36.7	39.6	7.6
\$50 - \$74,999	27.0	37.0	14.6	10.1	9.1
\$75 - \$99,999	12.2	16.4	5.2	9.6	1.4
\$100 - \$149,999	14.3	14.5	.0	6.0	2.2
\$150 - \$199,999	5.1	4.5	.0	.0	.0
\$200,000 and over	7.2	5.1	.0	6.7	.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	154	71	39	71	66
Proj. # of Hhlds	1258	579	336	307	307
Median Income	\$64,600	\$68,500	\$29,500	\$39,000	\$11,300

A special analysis of household income was undertaken for the two most important zip code areas. In zip 110, 17% earn under \$25,000, 23% earn \$25-50,000, 45% earn \$50-100,000, and 16% earn \$100,000 and over. In zip 112, 13% earn under \$25,000, 23% earn \$25-50,000, 38% earn \$50-100,000, and 26% earn \$100,000 and over.

Voter Registration

Table 5-38 shows that about 91 % of Jews in Greater Harrisburg claim to be registered to vote. For comparison, according to the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey, 88 % of American Jews are registered to vote, as are 85 % of Jews in Pennsylvania.

Little difference exists by geographic area (**Table 5-39**). Registration rates increase from only 83 % of those under age 35 to 97 % of those age 65-74 and 91 % of those age 75 and over. Those in residence for less than five years (84 %) are least likely to be registered. Registration rates also increase with income, from about 79 % of those earning under \$25,000 to about 98 % of those earning over \$100,000.

Table 5-38 Voter Registration Comparison with Other Communities		
Community	Year	% Registered
Miami	1994	88 %
Orlando	1993	90 %
Seattle	1990	90 %
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	91 %
Harrisburg	1994	91 %
NJPS (US)	1990	88 %
NJPS (PA)	1990	85 %
All Americans	1991	71 %

Table 5-39 Voter Registration			
Variable	% Registered	Sample Size	Proj. # of Adults
All Respondents	90.7 %	457	6286
Geographic Area			
East Shore	90.1 %	345	4407
West Shore	92.3 %	112	1831
Age of Respondent			
Under 35	82.9 %	90	1542
35 - 49	91.8 %	143	2440
50 - 64	95.2 %	75	1179
65 - 74	96.9 %	72	640
75 and over	91.2 %	77	483
			Proj. # of Hhlds
Length of Residence			
0 - 4 years	83.9 %	80	662
5 - 9	91.9 %	46	349
10 - 19	88.2 %	79	602
20 or more	94.3 %	252	1590
Household Income			
Under \$25,000	78.7 %	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	89.1 %	83	819
\$50 - \$100,000	94.1 %	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	98.4 %	57	602

Chapter 6

Religious Profile

Chapter Table of Contents

Chapter Highlights	118
Current Jewish Identification	120
Current Religious Practices	130
Light Chanukah Candles	132
Attend a Passover Seder	136
Have a Mezuzah on the Front Door	141
Keep Kosher	145
Light Sabbath Candles	150
Refrain From Use of Electricity on the Sabbath	155
Have a Christmas Tree in the Home	158
Synagogue Attendance	162
Intermarriage	172
The Children of Intermarriage	178

Note that this chapter shows results for conversionary households, although the sample size for this group is small. While these results are generally consistent with the patterns found in other Jewish demographic studies, they should be treated with caution.

Chapter Highlights

- 10% of Greater Harrisburg Jews consider themselves Orthodox; 33%, Conservative; 4%, Reconstructionist, 22%; Reform; and 32%, ``Just Jewish.'
- Greater Harrisburg has one of the highest percentages of persons identifying themselves as Just Jewish and one of the highest percentages of Orthodox Jews among the comparison Jewish communities.
- The percentage who are Orthodox is much higher among the elderly. The percentage who are Conservative ranges from 30%-40% of all age groups. The percentage Reform runs 21%-26% of all age groups under age 75. It is only 6% of those age 75 and over. The percentage Just Jewish is higher among the younger age groups.
- 36% of households with children indicate they are Just Jewish. 6% are Orthodox, 27% are Conservative, 5% are Reconstructionist, and 26% are Reform.
- About 71% always light Chanukah candles, 66% always attend a Passover Seder, and 61% have a Mezuzah on their front door. Thus, practices that involve one time per year (light Chanukah candles, attend Passover Seder) or once every few years (Mezuzah) are practiced by over 60% of the community. 23% keep a kosher home and 15% light Sabbath candles. 8% also keep kosher outside the home and 4% refrain from the use of electricity on the Sabbath. 30% always, usually, or sometimes have a Christmas tree.
- For the Passover Seder and for lighting Chanukah candles, there is no diminution of practice among younger persons. For the Mezuzah, Sabbath candles, keeping kosher, and refraining from electrical use, there is a significant decline in observance among young people. Younger people are also more likely to have a Christmas tree: more than one in four homes of persons under age 50 always have a tree, versus about 3% in the homes of the elderly.
- Households with children are as likely or more likely to engage in the Jewish ritual practices than households without children. They are also much more likely to have a Christmas tree.
- Synagogue members are more likely to be observant than are non-members. Those who consider themselves Orthodox and Conservative practice more rituals than those who call themselves Reform or Just Jewish.
- Intermarried households are much less likely to be performing Jewish religious practices than are in-married households. They are more likely to have a Christmas tree. Conversionary households are much more like the in-married than the intermarried.
- 6% of in-married households always, usually, or sometimes have a Christmas tree, versus 78% of intermarried households.

Chapter Highlights

- A trip to Israel has a significant positive correlation with level of observance. If the trip is with a Jewish group rather than a general group, households are more likely to be following the various Jewish religious practices. However, either type of trip to Israel seems to have a significant positive correlation with Jewish religious practice.
- 17% never attend religious services; another 10% indicated that they attend only for weddings and bar and bat mitzvah ceremonies. About 21% go only on the High Holidays. 22% go a few times a year and 29% go once a month or more. Only about 10% go once a week or more. About 73% attend on the High Holidays. About 50% of non-members of synagogues attend services on the High Holidays.
- The percentage never attending (27%) is one of the higher rates in the country and in the range of Miami (25%), Boston (28%), and Detroit (30%). The percentage attending once per month or more is one of the highest in the country as well.
- Attendance at services *does decline* for the younger age groups. Attending at least once per month is characteristic of about 17% of those under age 35, 29% of those age 35-49, 35% of those age 50-64, 43% of those age 65-74, and 38% of those age 75 and over.
- In households with children, about 34% never attend services and 29% go once per month or more.
- About 56% of currently married couples involve two born Jews (termed an ``in-marriage''). In 11% of cases, the marriage involves one partner who has converted to Judaism and one partner who was born Jewish (termed a ``conversionary'' marriage). About 33% are intermarriages in which one partner is Jewish and the other was neither born Jewish nor converted (termed an ``intermarriage'').
- For marriages in which the respondent was over age 65, 90% involve two Jews. On the other hand, 52% of those marriages involving persons under age 35 are intermarriages as are 37% of those aged 35-49 and 29% of those age 50-64. The 56% in-marriage rate (between two born Jews) is the lowest of any comparison community and compares with a 68% rate in the National Jewish Population Survey. Overall, 20% of married Jews in Harrisburg are married to someone not currently Jewish.
- A smaller percentage of the children of intermarriages are being lost to Judaism in Harrisburg than is the case nationally. Of the 2,311 children in the community, 802 are being raised in intermarriages, 319 in conversionary marriages, and 1,192 in marriages in which both parents were born Jewish. 57% of children being raised in intermarriages are currently Jewish, compared with 65% in Miami, 47% in Sarasota, 39% in Orlando, and 25% in St. Paul. Nationally, 28% of children being raised in intermarriages are being raised Jewish.

Current Jewish Identification

Respondents were asked whether they *considered* themselves Orthodox, Conservative, Reconstructionist, Reform, or ``Just Jewish.'' This is a self-definition, and not one that is necessarily based upon synagogue membership. 10% (304 households) consider themselves Orthodox; 33% (1,043 households), Conservative; 4% Reconstructionist (122 households), 22% (704 households), Reform; and 32% (1,027 households), Just Jewish (**Table 6-1**).

Table 6-3 compares Jewish identification in Greater Harrisburg with other Jewish communities. Greater Harrisburg has one of the higher percentages of Orthodox in the country. The 10% Orthodox figure is just about equal to Cleveland (8%), Miami (9%), New Orleans (10%), and Toronto (10%). It is 5% in Philadelphia. Percentage Orthodox ranges from a low of 2% to 13% in New York and Pittsburgh, and 20% in Baltimore. The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey found 6% Orthodox in the country as a whole and 2% in Pennsylvania.

The percentage Conservative (33%) is at about the middle of the comparison communities. It compares to 29% in Houston, 32% in Columbus, 33% in Boston, 35% in Washington, 38% in Rochester, 41% in Philadelphia, and 44% in Pittsburgh. Nationally, 27% consider themselves Conservative, as do 32% in Pennsylvania as a whole.

The percentage Reform (22%) is the lowest of any comparison community. It compares to 25% in Philadelphia, 29% in Baltimore, and 37% in Pittsburgh. Nationally, 33% consider themselves Reform, as do 30% in Pennsylvania as a whole.

The percentage Just Jewish (32%) is higher than all but three communities: Orlando (35%), St. Petersburg (35%), and San Francisco (36%). It compares to 29% in Philadelphia, 6% in Pittsburgh, and 16% in Baltimore. Nationally, 34% consider themselves Just Jewish, as do 36% in Pennsylvania as a whole.

In general, Jews in Greater Harrisburg are more Orthodox and more Just Jewish than most comparison communities. It is less Reform and has about an average rate of Conservative Jews.

Note that because only 3.8% of respondents selected Reconstructionist, a separate column or row for Reconstructionist Jews can not be shown in most tables in this report. We *can* answer questions like: "What percentage of Jews on the East Shore are Reconstructionist?" as shown by **Table 6-1**. Because of the small sample size, we *can not* reliably answer questions like: "What percentage of Reconstructionist Jews attend a Seder?" as would be shown in **Table 6-14** if the sample size were sufficient.

Table 6-1 shows Jewish identification by geographic area. The percentage of Orthodox Jews is higher in East Shore (12%) than in West Shore (3%). Conservative Jews form their largest percentages in East Shore (38%), versus only 20% in West Shore. Self-identifying Reconstructionist Jews form a larger percentage on the West Shore (11%), probably because of the existence of a Reconstructionist congregation in Mechanicsburg. Reform Jews comprise about the same percentage on both shores. West Shore, at 44%, is much more likely to be Just Jewish than East Shore, at 28%.

Table 6-2 also shows Jewish identification by area except that the rows add to 100%. (Results can not be shown for Reconstructionist Jews because of the small sample size.) 92% of Orthodox live on East Shore, as do 83% of Conservative Jews. Lower percentages of those who are Reform and Just Jewish live on the West Shore: 70% for Reform Jews and 62% for the Just Jewish.

Table 6-1 Jewish Identification by Geographic Area			
Jewish Identification	East Shore	West Shore	All
Orthodox	12.1%	2.7%	9.5%
Conservative	37.8	19.5	32.6
Reconstructionist	1.2	10.5	3.8
Reform	21.4	23.6	22.0
Just Jewish	27.5	43.7	32.1
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	345	112	457
Proj. # of Households	2300	900	3200

Table 6-2 Jewish Identification by Geographic Area					
Jewish Identification	East Shore	West Shore	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Orthodox	91.8%	8.2	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	83.1%	16.9	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	69.7%	30.3	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	61.6%	38.4	100.0%	126	1027

Table 6-3 Jewish Identification Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Orthodox	Conservative	Reform	Just Jewish
San Francisco	1988	3 %	19	42	36
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	3 %	23	39	36
Orlando	1993	2 %	33	30	35
Harrisburg¹	1994	10%	33	22	32
Miami	1994	9 %	34	26	32
Miami	1982	11 %	35	24	30
South Broward	1990	5 %	37	28	30
Manchester	1983	2 %	23	47	29
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	2 %	23	47	29
Philadelphia	1984	5 %	41	25	29
Los Angeles	1979	5 %	33	35	28
Toronto	1990	10 %	39	24	27
West Palm Beach	1987	3 %	43	30	25
New York	1990	13 %	35	29	23
Washington, DC	1983	3 %	35	38	22
Detroit	1991	7 %	38	34	21
Boston	1985	4 %	33	42	21
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	6 %	38	34	20
Columbus	1990	7 %	32	41	20
Chicago	1982	6 %	35	39	20
Rochester	1988	5 %	38	39	20
Houston	1985	5 %	29	47	19
New York	1981	14 %	33	34	19

¹Table omits 4 % identifying themselves as Reconstructionist in Harrisburg.

Table 6-3 Jewish Identification Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Orthodox	Conservative	Reform	Just Jewish
Dallas	1989	4%	31	48	18
St. Paul	1992	2%	43	29	17
Hartford	1982	6%	38	40	17
Baltimore	1985	20%	35	29	16
Kansas City	1985	7%	38	38	16
Worcester	1987	6%	29	49	16
Palm Springs	1986	7%	39	38	16
Atlantic City	1985	6%	46	29	15
Atlanta	1984	5%	42	37	15
Rhode Island	1987	7%	47	32	14
Worcester	1987	6%	29	49	14
Milwaukee	1983	7%	27	52	14
St. Louis	1982	8%	26	52	14
Richmond	1983	8%	42	36	14
Tampa	1980	2%	43	41	13
Tidewater	1988	7%	48	33	12
Atlanta	1983	12%	42	35	11
Minneapolis	1981	5%	53	32	10
New Orleans	1988	10%	19	63	9
San Antonio	1991	6%	36	49	9
Louisville	1991	14%	38	40	8
Pittsburgh	1984	13%	44	37	6
Cleveland	1987	8%	37	50	5
Quad Cities	1989	2%	53	40	5
NJPS (US)	1971	9%	56	24	11

Table 6-3 Jewish Identification Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Orthodox	Conservative	Reform	Just Jewish
NJPS (US)	1990	6%	27	33	34
NJPS (PA)	1990	2%	32	30	36

Table 6-4 indicates that the percentage who are Orthodox is much higher as age increases. For those under age 50, about 5% are Orthodox. This increases to 9% of those age 50-64, 18% of those age 65-74, and 31% of those age 75 and over.

The percentage who are Conservative is just over 30% for all three non-elderly age groups. It rises to 37% of those age 65-74, and to 40% of those age 75 and over.

The percentage Reconstructionist is low among all age groups, but peaks at 6% for those age 50-64.

The percentage Reform is 21%-26% for all age groups below age 75, but is only 6% for those age 75 and over. The percentage Just Jewish declines with age from 39% of those under age 35, to 35% of those age 35-49, to 31% of those age 50-64, to 17% of those age 65-74 and 21% of the age 75 and over group.

Table 6-4 Jewish Identification by Age					
Jewish Identification	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75 +
Orthodox	5.6%	4.1%	9.3%	17.5%	30.9%
Conservative	31.3	30.3	32.1	37.2	40.3
Reconstructionist	1.8	5.3	5.9	2.0	1.6
Reform	22.3	25.1	21.4	26.0	6.2
Just Jewish	39.0	35.2	31.3	17.4	21.1
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	90	143	75	72	77
Proj. # of Households	781	1168	592	352	304

Table 6-5 also shows Jewish identification by age but the rows of the table add to 100%. (Reconstructionist Jews can not be shown in this table because of their small sample size.) About half of Orthodox Jews are age 65 and over; about 30% are under age 50. About 24% of Conservative Jews are age 65 and over; about 57% are under age 50. Thus, Conservative Jews are younger than Orthodox Jews. Only 16% of Reform Jews are age 65 and over and two-thirds are under age 50. 70% of the Just Jewish are under age 50 and only 12% are age 65 and over.

Table 6-6 indicates that about 36% of households with children consider themselves Just Jewish; 26%, Reform; 5% Reconstructionist; 27% Conservative; and, 6% Orthodox. Non-elderly singles tend to identify as Just Jewish (44%), while elderly couples tend to identify as Conservative (39%). Elderly singles are about evenly split between Orthodox (32%) and Conservative (36%). Non-elderly couples are most likely to be Conservative (33%), followed by Just Jewish (30%), and Reform (24%).

Table 6-5 Jewish Identification by Age of the Respondent								
Jewish Identification	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Orthodox	14.5%	15.8	18.1	20.5	31.1	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	23.4%	34.0	18.2	12.7	11.7	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	24.7%	41.6	18.0	13.1	2.7	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	29.6%	40.1	18.1	6.0	6.2	100.0%	126	1027

Table 6-6 Jewish Identification by Household Structure					
Jewish Identification	Households with Children	Non-Elderly Couple	Non-Elderly Single	Elderly Couple	Elderly Single
Orthodox	5.5%	7.8%	3.2%	15.3%	32.3%
Conservative	27.2	32.6	31.2	39.2	35.8
Reconstructionist	4.9	6.1	2.0	2.3	1.6
Reform	26.3	24.0	19.2	24.3	8.2
Just Jewish	36.1	29.5	44.4	19.0	22.1
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	154	71	39	71	66
Proj. # of Hhlds	1258	579	336	307	307

Table 6-7 indicates that 7% of those moving into Greater Harrisburg in the past 5 years are Orthodox, 28% are Conservative, 2% are Reconstructionist, 24% are Reform, and 40% are Just Jewish. These percentages differ only slightly from the totals shown in **Table 6-1**, except that the percentage Just Jewish (40%) is higher than is the case for all residents (32%).

Table 6-8 shows that the percentage of Orthodox declines from first (40%) to second (20%) to third generation (4%). The percentage Conservative is highest for the second generation, at 44% and is lowest for the first, at 4%. Reform Judaism increases from 7% of the first generation to 14% of the second and 26% of the third. The percentage Just Jewish is highest for the first generation (46%), followed by the third generation (35%), and the second (18%). The first generation is 46% are Just Jewish and 40% are Orthodox.

Table 6-9 shows that synagogue members are more likely to identify themselves as Orthodox (15%) than non-members (4%). The same is true for Conservative (by 52% to 14%). About 20% of synagogue members consider themselves Reform, as do 23% of non-members. The percentage considering themselves Just Jewish is only 7% among members, but is 56% among non-members.

Table 6-9 also shows that 52% of those interviewed in intermarriages identify themselves as Just Jewish; only 18% of the in-married couples identify themselves as Just Jewish. 23% of in-married couples identify as Reform, versus 28% of the intermarried. Reconstructionist reach their highest percentage among the conversionary couples (14%).

A survey of the synagogues (**Table 7-4**) shows that 19% of members are members of Orthodox synagogues, 55% are members of Conservative synagogues, 5% are members of a Reconstructionist synagogue, and 21% are members of Reform synagogues. Recall that self identification is 10% Orthodox, 33% Conservative, 4% Reconstructionist, 22% Reform, and 32% Just Jewish. If the Just Jewish are removed from the self-identification, self identification becomes 15% Orthodox, 49% Conservative, 6% Reconstructionist, and 32% Reform. The differences between self-identification and actual membership is related to the different propensities of Reform, Conservative, Reconstructionist, and Orthodox Jews to join synagogues.

Table 6-7 Jewish Identification by Length of Residence				
Jewish Identification	0-4 Years	5-9 Years	10-19 Years	20 + Years
Orthodox	6.6%	12.0%	6.5%	11.2%
Conservative	27.6	21.9	25.8	39.7
Reconstructionist	2.1	5.9	4.9	3.6
Reform	24.0	30.6	22.7	19.0
Just Jewish	39.6	29.6	40.2	26.5
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	80	46	79	252
Proj. # of Households	662	349	602	1590

Table 6-8 Jewish Identification by Generation			
Jewish Identification	1st Generation	2nd Generation	3rd + Generation
Orthodox	40.1%	20.3%	3.8%
Conservative	4.4	44.0	32.1
Reconstructionist	3.3	3.8	3.9
Reform	6.5	13.9	25.7
Just Jewish	45.7	18.0	34.5
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	30*	120	303
Proj. # of Hhlds	214	614	2371

Table 6-9 Jewish Identification by Synagogue Membership and Intermarriage					
Jewish Identification	Member	Non-Member	In-married	Conversionary Marriage	Inter-marriage
Orthodox	15.4%	3.7%	11.5%	10.0%	0.0%
Conservative	52.0	13.9	45.9	29.0	12.3
Reconstructionist	4.7	3.0	2.4	14.4	6.9
Reform	20.6	23.4	22.6	28.8	28.4
Just Jewish	7.3	56.1	17.7	17.8	52.4
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	269	188	182	29*	83
Proj. # of Hhlds	1574	1626			
Proj. # Marriages			1176	239	698

Current Religious Practices

Tables 6-10 to 6-21 examine five Jewish religious practices, while **Tables 6-22** and **6-23** examine one Christian practice followed by some persons living in Jewish households. Some questions were asked with the responses ``always,'' ``usually,'' ``sometimes,'' and ``never'' (Seder, Chanukah candles, Sabbath candles). The ensuing discussion focuses on the extreme ends of the scale: the percentage ``always'' and the percentage ``never.'' Other questions were asked with a ``yes'' or ``no'' answer (mezuzah, kosher home, kosher outside home). On these types of questions, some respondents may overstate their level of observance.

The practices are discussed in the order of observance by Jews in Greater Harrisburg. Thus, lighting Chanukah candles, observed by 71 % of Greater Harrisburg households, is discussed first, while refraining from electrical use on the Sabbath, observed by only 4%, is discussed last.

Table 6-10 summarizes the overall findings. As shown in the table, rituals that require less regular and less frequent attention are more likely to be practiced by more Jews in Greater Harrisburg. Thus, the activity that must be done only every few years at best (when one moves into a new residence) is practiced by a large percentage, with 61 % having a mezuzah on their front door. Practices that involve one time per year (light Chanukah candles, attend Passover Seder) are always practiced by more than two-thirds of the respondents. Lighting Sabbath candles, a once per week activity, is only always practiced by 15 %; keeping kosher in the home, by 23 %; and keeping kosher in and out of the home, by 8 %. Finally, having a Christmas tree is always practiced by about 21 % of households.

86.0% of households contain one or more individuals who ``usually'' or ``always'' do *at least one* of the following:

- 1) Light Chanukah candles
- 2) Attend a Passover Seder
- 3) Light Sabbath candles
- 4) Keep kosher inside their home
- 5) Keep kosher outside their home

If putting a mezuzah on the front door is added to the list, than the percentage increases to 87.5%.

The second part of **Table 6-10** shows the results for households with children. Households with children are more likely to light Chanukah candles (by 77% to 71%), and are less likely to keep a kosher home and light Sabbath candles. This is clearly important, for it is households with children who have the greatest impact on Jewish continuity.

Table 6-10 Summary Findings on Religious Practices (Sample Size = 457, Projected Number of Households = 3200)					
Practice	Always or Yes	Usually	Sometimes	Never	Total
Light Chanukah Candles	70.7%	9.2	5.4	14.8	100.0%
Attend Passover Seder	65.7%	9.3	12.7	12.3	100.0%
Mezuzah on Door	61.1%			38.9	100.0%
Kosher in Home	23.0%			77.0	100.0%
Kosher In/Out of Home	8.3%			91.7	100.0%
Light Sabbath Candles	15.0%	11.5	27.5	46.0	100.0%
Refrain from Electricity on the Sabbath	4.3%			95.7	100.0%
Have a Christmas Tree	20.6%	2.5	6.9	69.9	100.0%
For Households with Children (Sample Size = 154, Number of Households = 1258)					
Light Chanukah Candles	77.3%	10.3	3.2	9.3	100.0%
Attend Passover Seder	67.3%	11.4	10.9	10.4	100.0%
Mezuzah on Door	59.7%			40.3	100.0%
Kosher in Home	18.4%			81.6	100.0%
Kosher In/Out of Home	8.8%			91.2	100.0%
Light Sabbath Candles	11.5%	14.6	26.5	47.4	100.0%
Refrain from Electricity on the Sabbath	4.0%			96.0	100.0%
Have a Christmas Tree	33.9%	4.3	7.8	54.0	100.0%

Light Chanukah Candles

71 % of respondents say that they always light Chanukah candles, the most practiced of the Jewish religious practices (**Table 6-10**). 9 % usually light, 5 % sometimes, and 15 % never.

The percentage responding always is the second highest of the comparison communities shown in **Table 6-11**, which vary from 48 % in Sarasota to 72 % in Worcester. The percentage who never light Chanukah candles (15 %) is one of the lowest among the comparison communities. Only in St. Paul is the percentage never lighting candles *significantly* lower, at 10 % The percentage always doing so (71 %) is significantly higher than is the case for all US Jews as a whole (57 %) and for Jews in Pennsylvania (63 %).

Observance shows no consistent relationship with age, although it is highest for the under 35 age group (**Table 6-12**). Observance is highest for the first generation (80 %), followed by the second (75 %), and the third (69 %).

About 75 % always light Chanukah candles in East Shore, versus only 59 % in West Shore.

Chanukah is a ``child-oriented'' activity. About 77 % of households with children always follow this practice. 68 % of elderly couples without children and 60 % of non-elderly couples without children follow the practice, as do 68 % of elderly singles and 56 % of non-elderly singles.

Not surprisingly, 85 % of synagogue members light Chanukah candles, versus 57 % of non-members. 25 % of non-members never light candles.

Those who consider themselves Orthodox (98 %) and Conservative (86 %) are more likely to light candles than are the Reform (68 %) or Just Jewish (47 %). 34 % of the Just Jewish never light. Those involved in intermarriages (59 %) are much less likely to always light Chanukah candles than are the in-married (85 %). 25 % in intermarriages never light Chanukah candles.

86 % of those who have been to Israel with a Jewish group always light Chanukah candles, versus 81 % of those who have been to Israel on a general trip. Only 63 % of those who have not been to Israel always light.

Table 6-11
Light Chanukah Candles Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	48 %	11	14	28
Quad Cities	1989	49 %	20	11	21
SF Bay Area	1988	56 %	8	15	21
Miami	1982	57 %	20		24
West Palm Beach	1987	58 %	9	11	22
New Orleans	1988	60 %	5	13	19
Atlanta	1983	61 %	13	9	17
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	62 %	5	10	23
South Broward	1990	64 %	6	8	22
Orlando	1993	64 %	10	10	16
Miami	1994	65 %	8	11	17
Toronto	1991	65 %	8	7	20
St. Louis	1982	66 %	6	8	20
Dallas	1989	68 %	8	10	14
St Paul	1992	69 %	21		10
Rhode Island	1987	69 %	7	7	17
Harrisburg	1994	71 %	9	5	15
Rochester	1988	71 %	7	9	13
Worcester	1987	72 %	7	8	13
Louisville	1991	73 %	8	7	12
Chicago	1990	84 %			16
New York	1990	76 %			24
New York	1981	81 %			19
Detroit	1991	78 %		22	
Palm Springs	1986	61 %		39	
Columbus	1991	69 %		31	
NJPS (US)	1990	57 %	8	12	23
NJPS (PA)	1990	63 %	21		16

Table 6-12 Light Chanukah Candles							
Variable	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Households	70.7%	9.2	5.4	14.8	100.0%	457	3200
Age							
Under 35	77.3%	6.0	5.5	11.2	100.0%	90	781
35 - 49	69.0%	14.5	1.7	14.7	100.0%	143	1168
50 - 64	66.8%	8.6	5.5	19.2	100.0%	75	592
65 - 74	70.7%	3.1	6.7	19.6	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	67.3%	5.4	17.1	10.2	100.0%	77	304
Generation							
First	80.4%	.0	3.3	16.3	100.0%	30*	214
Second	75.1%	2.9	7.7	14.3	100.0%	120	614
Third and higher	68.8%	11.6	4.7	14.9	100.0%	303	2371
Area							
East Shore	75.3%	8.4	5.33	11.0	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	58.8%	11.4	5.5	24.4	100.0%	112	900

Table 6-12 Light Chanukah Candles							
Variable	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Household Structure							
Hhlds with Kids	77.3%	10.3	3.2	9.3	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Eld Couple	59.5%	10.0	4.3	26.3	100.0%	71	579
Non-Eld Single	56.4%	17.9	9.4	16.4	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	68.4%	2.3	13.0	16.3	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	68.1%	5.4	10.1	16.5	100.0%	66	307
Synagogue Membership							
Members	85.3%	5.3	4.6	4.7	100.0%	269	1574
Non-members	56.5%	13.0	6.1	24.5	100.0%	188	1625
Jewish Identification							
Orthodox	98.4%	.8	.8	.0	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	86.2%	4.7	3.6	5.6	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	67.9%	14.3	7.9	9.9	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	46.6%	13.2	6.7	33.5	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage							
In-married	85.3%	3.7	3.9	7.0	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	75.5%	18.7	2.9	2.9	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarried	59.3%	10.3	5.2	25.3	100.0%	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel							
No	62.6%	11.0	5.5	20.9	100.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	81.0%	9.5	3.9	5.6	100.0%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	85.5%	3.0	6.5	5.0	100.0%	90	582

Attend a Passover Seder

Attending a Passover Seder is the second most observed of the Jewish religious practices, with 66% saying that they always do so, 9% usually, 13% sometimes, and 12% never (**Table 6-13**). Like Chanukah, Passover is family oriented.

The percentage always attending a Seder is toward the middle of the comparison Jewish communities (**Table 6-13**). It compares with 54% in Sarasota and Orlando and with 79% in Baltimore. The percentage who always attend varies from only 31% in Washington to 82% in Toronto. The Greater Harrisburg figure is higher than the findings in the National Jewish Population Survey for all US Jews (55%) and for Jews in Pennsylvania (57%). The percentage who never attend (12%) is also relatively high compared with the other communities, but is lower than the findings in the National Jewish Population Survey for all US Jews (18%) and for Jews in Pennsylvania (19%).

Observance shows no consistent relationship with age (**Table 6-14**), although it is highest for the oldest group and lowest for the age 35-49 group (where children are often present).

Observance is at 64% for first-generation Jews and 63% for the third generation, but is much higher at 77%, for the second generation. 13% of first and third generation Jews never attend a Seder.

Attendance at a Seder is higher in East Shore (71%) than it is in West Shore (51%).

Non-elderly couples (55%) are least likely to always attend a Seder, followed by non-elderly singles (62%). For households with children, 67% always attend a Seder and 8% never do. 72% of elderly singles always attend and 8% never do.

About 86% of synagogue members always attend, versus only 46% of non-members. 23% of non-members never attend.

Those who consider themselves Orthodox (96%) and Conservative (87%) are significantly more likely to follow this practice than are those who are Reform (67%) or Just Jewish (33%). 31% of the Just Jewish in Greater Harrisburg never attend, versus small percentages of the other three groups.

In in-married households, 84% always attend, versus only 38% in intermarried households. In intermarried households, 25% never attend.

92% of those who have been to Israel with a Jewish group always attend a Seder, versus 79% of those who have been to Israel on a general trip. Only 53% of those who have not been to Israel always attend.

Table 6-13
Attend a Passover Seder
Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Washington, DC	1987	31 %	12	31	26
St Louis	1982	36 %	15	18	32
SF Bay Area	1988	53 %	12	22	13
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	54 %	14	18	14
Orlando	1993	54 %	12	20	14
South Broward	1990	56 %	14	16	15
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	56 %	9	16	19
Quad Cities	1989	57 %	16	20	6
West Palm Beach	1987	60 %	15	15	10
Harrisburg	1994	66 %	9	13	12
Miami	1994	67 %	10	14	9
New Orleans	1988	69 %	6	12	12
Rochester	1988	69 %	11	13	7
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	69 %	9	11	7
Kansas City	1985	69 %	7	14	10
Atlanta	1983	69 %	9	12	10
Miami	1982	70 %	19		11
Dallas	1989	71 %	7	15	6
St Paul	1992	73 %	9	18	
Atlantic City	1985	73 %	7	11	9
Worcester	1987	78 %	4	10	7
Baltimore	1985	79 %	7	8	6
Louisville	1991	80 %	7	6	7

Table 6-13 Attend a Passover Seder Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Toronto	1990	82 %	6	6	6
Chicago	1990	93 %			7
Chicago	1981	89 %			11
New York	1990	92 %			8
New York	1981	87 %		13	
Philadelphia	1984	89 %		11	
Detroit	1991	84 %		16	
Columbus	1990	75 %		25	
Palm Springs	1986	71 %		29	
NJPS (US)	1990	55 %	10	16	18
NJPS (PA)	1990	57 %	24		19

Table 6-14 Attend a Passover Seder							
Variable	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Households	65.7%	9.3	12.7	12.3	100.0%	457	3200
Age							
Under 35	69.8%	7.1	10.0	13.2	100.0%	90	781
35 - 49	60.2%	11.6	14.0	14.1	100.0%	143	1168
50 - 64	66.4%	9.0	14.4	10.1	100.0%	75	592
65 - 74	65.8%	11.2	11.3	11.7	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	74.6%	4.8	12.8	7.8	100.0%	77	304
Generation							
First	64.2%	16.3	6.5	13.0	100.0%	30*	214
Second	77.3%	6.9	9.5	6.3	100.0%	120	614
Third and higher	62.7%	9.3	14.2	13.8	100.0%	303	2371
Area							
East Shore	71.6%	8.4	11.7	8.3	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	50.8%	11.7	15.1	22.4	100.0%	112	900
Household Structure							
Hhlds with Kids	67.3%	11.4	10.9	10.4	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Eld Couple	55.4%	9.2	15.3	20.1	100.0%	71	579
Non-Eld Single	62.0%	12.1	19.7	6.3	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	65.3%	11.0	10.5	13.2	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	71.6%	6.7	13.7	8.1	100.0%	66	307

Table 6-14 Attend a Passover Seder							
Variable	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Synagogue Membership							
Members	86.3%	6.7	6.3	.8	100.0%	269	1574
Non-members	45.8%	11.9	18.9	23.4	100.0%	188	1625
Jewish Identification							
Orthodox	96.0%	2.4	1.6	.0	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	87.0%	6.1	4.7	2.2	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	66.7%	9.4	16.8	7.2	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	33.4%	13.5	22.0	31.1	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage							
In-married	83.8%	5.2	8.5	2.5	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	64.7%	11.9	13.0	10.4	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarried	38.0%	17.2	20.2	24.6	100.0%	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel							
No	53.4%	11.9	15.7	19.1	100.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	78.9%	4.6	14.3	2.1	100.0%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	92.4%	6.4	.0	1.2	100.0%	90	582

Have a Mezuzah on the Front Door

Having a mezuzah on the door is the third most observed Jewish religious practice, with 61 % saying that they have put a mezuzah on the front door (**Table 6-16**). This percentage is among the lowest in any of the comparison communities shown in **Table 6-15**. Only Orlando (59%) and Sarasota (55%) have lower percentages. In comparison, 77 % in Miami and 79 % in South Broward have a mezuzah on their door, as do 62 % in Boston, and 70 % in Philadelphia.

This practice increases from only 47 % of those under age 35 to 59 % of those age 35-49, to about 71 % of those age 50-74 and 75 % of those age 75 and over. First- (50%) and third-generation (58%) Jews are less likely to have a mezuzah on their front door than are second-generation Jews (77%). This practice is followed more often in East Shore (68%) than in West Shore (42%) (**Table 6-16**).

About 77% of elderly couples, 66% of elderly singles, 63 % of non-elderly couples and 60 % of households with children have a mezuzah, versus only 41 % of non-elderly singles.

Not surprisingly, 86 % of synagogue members have a mezuzah, versus 37 % of non-members. Those who consider themselves Orthodox (89%), and Conservative (88%) are significantly more likely to follow this practice than those who identify themselves as Reform (63%) or Just Jewish (25%). In Miami, 62 % of the Just Jewish have a mezuzah on their front door. This illustrates that the Just Jewish in a community like Greater Harrisburg are far more assimilated than the Just Jewish in a larger Jewish community like Miami. Miami is also an older Jewish community.

Intermarried couples are much less likely to have a mezuzah (34%) than are those who have intermarried (87%). In Miami, half of intermarried couples have a mezuzah. In Greater Harrisburg, intermarried couples appear to be further outside the Jewish community than in Miami.

Only 48% of those who have not been to Israel have a mezuzah on their front door, versus 79% of those who have been on a general trip and 85% of those who have been on a Jewish trip.

Table 6-15
Have a Mezuzah on Front Door
Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	% Yes
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	55 %
Orlando	1993	59 %
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	61 %
Chicago	1981	61 %
Harrisburg	1994	61 %
Boston	1985	62 %
Dallas	1989	64 %
New York	1981	66 %
West Palm Beach	1987	69 %
Quad Cities	1989	69 %
Philadelphia	1984	70 %
Toledo	1983	73 %
St. Louis	1982	76 %
Miami	1994	76 %
Miami	1982	77 %
South Broward	1990	79 %

Table 6-16 Have a Mezuzah on Front Door			
Variable	Have a Mezuzah on Front Door	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Households	61.1%	457	3200
Age			
Under 35	46.8%	90	781
35 - 49	58.5%	143	1168
50 - 64	71.3%	75	592
65 - 74	71.9%	72	352
75 and over	75.1%	77	304
Generation			
First	50.3%	30*	214
Second	76.5%	120	614
Third and higher	57.8%	303	2371
Area			
East Shore	68.4%	345	2300
West Shore	42.3%	112	900
Household Structure			
Households with Children	59.7%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	62.7%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	40.5%	39	336
Elderly Couple	77.3%	71	307
Elderly Single	65.5%	66	307

Table 6-16 Have a Mezuzah on Front Door			
Variable	Have a Mezuzah on Front Door	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Households	61.1%	457	3200
Synagogue Membership			
Members	85.6%	269	1574
Non-members	37.2%	188	1625
Jewish Identification			
Orthodox	89.1%	58	304
Conservative	87.5%	180	1043
Reform	63.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	24.7%	126	1027
Type of Marriage			
In-married	87.2%	182	1176
Conversionary	65.2%	29*	239
Intermarried	33.6%	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel			
No	47.7%	269	1955
On General Trip	78.6%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	85.1%	90	582

Keep Kosher

About 23% of Greater Harrisburg Jews say that they keep kosher in their home, including 8% who also keep kosher outside their home. (**Table 6-19**). This percentage (23%) is somewhat difficult to compare to the other communities in **Table 6-17**, because this question was asked as a ``Yes''/``No'' question, while other communities have used an ``always, usually, sometimes, never'' format. Even so, comparing the percentage ``no'' (77%) with the percentage never in other communities, leads to the conclusion that Greater Harrisburg has about an average rate of keeping a kosher home. Also, many of the communities that have asked this question have asked if the household ``always, usually, sometimes, or never'' buys kosher meat. ``Sometimes'' in this context can mean buying pre-packaged kosher hot dogs. This is no indication of observance. Vegetarians would report that they never buy kosher meat. This is also no indication of observance.

People who ``always'' buy kosher meat can be considered to keep a kosher home. On that basis, the 23% in Greater Harrisburg compares with 4%-7% in San Francisco, Sarasota, Orlando, New Orleans and Dallas and with 20%-30% in Miami, Rochester, Rhode Island, Atlantic City, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, and Toronto. **Table 6-18** shows only those communities (mostly in Florida) which have asked the kosher question in the manner asked in Harrisburg. On this table, the level of keeping kosher is seen to be the highest of any community.

Keeping kosher in the home increases with age, from about 16% of those under age 50 to about 29% of the 50-74 age group, and 45% of those age 75 and over. 45% of the first generation keeps a kosher home, versus 40% of the second, but only 16% of the third. A similar decline with generation is shown for keeping kosher in the home only. Keeping kosher in the home is highest for elderly singles (46%) and lowest for non-elderly singles (12%). Households with children are also not as likely to keep kosher in the home (18%). 27% on the East Shore keep a kosher home, versus only 14% on the West Shore.

Table 6-17 Keep Kosher in Home Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Toronto	1991	30%	4	5	61
Baltimore	1985	24%	2	16	58
Rhode Island	1987	22%	4	16	57
Atlantic City	1985	22%	3	10	65
Miami	1982	21%	3		76
Rochester	1988	21%	2	8	68
St Louis	1982	19%	2	16	63
Worcester	1987	18%	2	4	75
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	18%	7	17	58
Louisville	1991	16%	3	20	61
Cleveland	1987	15%	13		72
Washington, DC	1987	11%	3	28	58
Kansas City	1985	11%	1	13	75
Atlanta	1983	10%	4	19	66
New Orleans	1988	7%	1	3	86
Dallas	1989	7%	1	7	84
SF Bay Area	1988	4%	2	5	90
New York	1981	30%			70
Pittsburgh	1984	26%			74
New York	1990	25%			75
Harrisburg	1994	23%			77
Detroit	1991	19%			81
Toledo	1983	18%			82

Table 6-17 Keep Kosher in Home Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Hartford	1983	17%			83
Quad Cities	1989	11%			89
Tidewater	1988	11%			89
Palm Springs	1986	10%			90
Columbus	1990	12%		88	
NJPS (US)	1990	15%	5	24	56
NJPS (PA)	1990	9%	29		52

Table 6-18 Keep Kosher in Home and In and Out of Home Comparison with Other Communities				
Community	Year	In Home Only	In and Out of Home	Total In Home
Harrisburg	1994	15%	8%	23%
West Palm Beach	1987	13%	9%	22%
St Paul	1992	12%	4%	16%
South Broward	1990	10%	5%	15%
Miami	1994	8%	12%	20%
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	6%	4%	10%
Orlando	1993	6%	3%	9%
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	5%	3%	8%

About 14% of synagogue members keep kosher in and out of the home, versus 3% of non-members. 39% of members keep a kosher home, versus 8% of non-members. Thus, 61% of members are not at all kosher, versus 92% of non-members.

Orthodox (91%) and Conservative Jews (35%) are more likely to be kosher in the home than are Reform Jews (2%) or the Just Jewish (5%). For Orthodox Jews, 39% keep kosher in the home only. For Conservative Jews, 8% keep kosher in and out of the home and 27% keep kosher in the home only. 35% keep kosher in in-married households; 2% do so in intermarried households.

42% of those who have been to Israel on a Jewish trip keep kosher, as do 33% of those who have been to Israel on a general trip and 14% of those who have not been to Israel.

Table 6-19						
Observance of the Kosher Laws						
Variable	Kosher In Home Only	Kosher In/Out of Home	Not Kosher	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Households	14.6%	8.4%	77.0%	100.0%	457	3200
Age						
Under 35	7.1%	9.7	83.2	100.0%	90	781
35 - 49	10.5%	5.9	83.6	100.0%	143	1168
50 - 64	22.3%	5.9	71.8	100.0%	75	592
65 - 74	22.7%	7.7	69.6	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	25.3%	20.1	54.6	100.0%	77	304
Generation						
First	10.1%	34.7	55.2	100.0%	30*	214
Second	27.5%	12.6	59.9	100.0%	120	614
Third and higher	11.3%	4.8	83.4	100.0%	303	2371
Area						
East Shore	16.6%	10.0	73.3	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	9.6%	4.1	86.3	100.0%	112	900

Table 6-19 Observance of the Kosher Laws						
Variable	Kosher In Home Only	Kosher In/Out of Home	Not Kosher	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Households	14.6%	8.4%	77.0%	100.0%	457	3200
Household Structure						
Hhlds with Kids	9.6%	8.8	81.6	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Eld Couple	16.3%	6.6	77.1	100.0%	71	579
Non-Eld Single	7.8%	4.2	88.0	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	18.8%	8.9	72.3	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	30.0%	16.0	53.9	100.0%	66	307
Synagogue Membership						
Members	24.5%	14.1	61.3	100.0%	269	1574
Non-members	5.0%	2.7	92.2	100.0%	188	1625
Jewish Identification						
Orthodox	39.1%	51.5	9.4	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	27.2%	7.9	65.0	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	0.0%	0.0	98.5	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	2.7%	3.0	94.5	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage						
In-married	21.3%	13.2	65.5	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	23.2%	7.1	69.6	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarried	1.0%	1.0	98.0	100.0%	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel						
No	10.0%	3.8	86.2	100.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	20.1%	13.1	66.8	100.0%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	24.2%	18.1	57.7	100.0%	90	582

Light Sabbath Candles

Lighting Sabbath candles is the sixth most practiced of the Jewish religious practices, with 15% saying that they always do so (**Table 6-20**). 12% usually do, 28% sometimes do and 46% never do.

The 15% always is relatively low among the comparison cities, which vary from about 9% in San Francisco, Orlando, and Sarasota, to 35% in Toronto (**Table 6-20**). The percentage who never light Sabbath candles (46%) is higher than only six of the comparison communities, and is lower than that found in the National Jewish Population Survey for both the US (58%) and Pennsylvania (60%). The percentage who always light Sabbath candles (15%) is about equal to that found in the National Jewish Population Survey for the US (14%) and is higher than the result for Pennsylvania (11%).

A significant difference exists in the percentage of always lighting Sabbath candles (15%) and the practices discussed above (23% for kosher in the home 61%-71% for the others.). The level of observance is most likely lower because this ritual needs to be practiced once per week.

Always lighting Sabbath candles shows a significant relationship with age, from only 8% of those under age 35, to 11%-14% of those age 35-64, to 27% of those age 65-74, to 36% of those age 75 and over. The practice declines from 41% of first-generation Jews to 26% of the second generation and 10% of those of third or higher generation.

18% on the East Shore always light Sabbath candles, versus 6% on the West Shore. 39% on the East Shore never light, versus 64% on the West Shore.

About 12% of households with children always light Sabbath candles. The rate is lowest for non-elderly singles, at 2%. The rates for elderly couples (29%) and elderly singles (37%) are highest. About 26% of synagogue members always light Sabbath candles, versus only 4% of non-members. Orthodox Jews (68%) are much more likely to light Sabbath candles than are Conservative Jews (17%), Reform Jews (8%) or the Just Jewish (3%). 24% of those in in-married households always light, versus only 1% of those in intermarriages.

29% of those who have been to Israel with a Jewish group always light Sabbath candles, versus 24% of those who have been to Israel on a general trip. Only 8% of those who have not been to Israel always light.

Table 6-20
Light Sabbath Candles
Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
SF Bay Area	1988	9%	7	25	59
Orlando	1993	9%	7	29	54
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	9%	5	25	60
Quad Cities	1989	12%	8	26	54
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	14%	7	28	51
Washington, DC	1987	15%	6	22	58
Harrisburg	1994	15%	12	28	46
Dallas	1989	16%	8	27	49
South Broward	1990	17%	7	22	53
West Palm Beach	1987	18%	5	22	55
Atlanta	1983	18%	10	24	48
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	18%	7	23	49
St Paul	1992	19%	81		
New Orleans	1988	19%	10	25	45
Kansas City	1985	20%	7	22	50
St. Louis	1982	20%	8	19	54
Atlantic City	1985	21%	8	17	53
Rochester	1988	22%	11	25	42
Miami	1994	22%	7	21	50
Worcester	1987	23%	9	28	40
Baltimore	1985	23%	9	22	45
Rhode Island	1987	24%	7	26	42
Louisville	1991	25%	13	26	37

Table 6-20 Light Sabbath Candles Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Miami	1982	29%	22		49
Toledo	1983	33%	14	25	29
Toronto	1991	35%	7	20	38
Boston	1985	31%		69	
New York	1990	43%			57
New York	1981	39%			61
Detroit	1991	33%		67	
Columbus	1991	22%		78	
Seattle	1979	63%		37	
NJPS (US)	1990	14%	6	22	58
NJPS (PA)	1990	11%	29		60

Table 6-21 Light Sabbath Candles							
Variable	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Households	15.0%	11.5	27.5	46.0	100.0%	457	3200
Age							
Under 35	8.2%	1.8	29.9	60.1	100.0%	90	781
35 - 49	10.5%	14.5	24.6	50.3	100.0%	143	1168
50 - 64	14.4%	14.6	31.4	39.5	100.0%	75	592
65 - 74	27.4%	13.4	32.2	27.0	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	36.4%	16.3	19.0	28.4	100.0%	77	304
Generation							
First	41.3%	6.5	16.3	35.9	100.0%	30*	214
Second	26.2%	14.0	27.6	32.2	100.0%	120	614
Third and higher	9.6%	11.0	28.6	50.7	100.0%	303	2371
Area							
East Shore	18.4%	12.8	29.7	39.0	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	6.3%	8.1	21.7	63.9	100.0%	112	900
Household Structure							
Hhlds with Kids	11.5%	14.6	26.5	47.4	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Eld Couple	14.0%	9.2	22.9	53.9	100.0%	71	579
Non-Eld Single	2.1%	3.2	30.0	64.8	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	28.8%	17.9	27.5	25.8	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	36.5%	13.0	20.5	30.0	100.0%	66	307
Synagogue Membership							
Members	26.2%	17.9	36.6	19.4	100.0%	269	1574
Non-members	4.2%	5.3	18.7	71.8	100.0%	188	1625

Table 6-21 Light Sabbath Candles							
Variable	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Households	15.0%	11.5	27.5	46.0	100.0%	457	3200
Jewish Identification							
Orthodox	67.8%	12.2	14.7	5.3	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	17.0%	18.5	39.3	25.2	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	7.6%	10.6	27.8	53.9	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	2.9%	2.7	17.9	76.5	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage							
In-married	24.4%	16.8	34.6	24.3	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	15.6%	14.4	33.7	36.3	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarried	1.0%	8.7	17.7	72.5	100.0%	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel							
No	8.0%	9.9	25.2	56.8	100.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	23.6%	11.3	29.3	35.8	100.0%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	28.8%	17.2	32.9	21.1	100.0%	90	582

Refrain from the Use of Electricity on the Sabbath

Refraining from using electricity on the Sabbath is the least observed Jewish religious practice on the list, with 4% saying that they do so (**Table 6-22**). This compares to 7% in Miami. This practice shows no strong relationship with age, although it is highest for those age 75 and over (10%). First- (17%) and second-generation (7%) Jews are more likely refrain from electrical use than are third or higher-generation Jews (2%). This practice is followed slightly more often in East Shore (5%) than in West Shore (3%).

About 4% of households with children refrain from electrical use. The same is true for 7% of elderly couples and elderly singles. Only 2% of non-elderly singles and 4% of non-elderly couples follow this practice.

Not surprisingly, 8% of synagogue members observe this, versus only 1% of non-members. Those who consider themselves Orthodox (21%) are much more likely to refrain from electrical use than Conservative Jews (6%). Well under 1% of the Reform and the Just Jewish follow this practice. 1% of intermarried couples observe this practice, but 8% of inmarried couples.

10% of those who have been to Israel with a general group refrain from electrical use, versus 4% of those who have been to Israel on a Jewish trip. Only 3% of those who have not been to Israel refrain from electrical use.

Table 6-22 Refrain from Use of Electricity on the Sabbath			
Variable	Refrain From Use	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Households	4.3%	457	3200
Age			
Under 35	4.2%	90	781
35 - 49	2.9%	143	1168
50 - 64	3.5%	75	592
65 - 74	5.5%	72	352
75 and over	10.1%	77	304
Generation			
First	17.4%	30*	214
Second	6.7%	120	614
Third and higher	2.4%	303	2371
Area			
East Shore	5.0%	345	2300
West Shore	2.6%	112	900
Household Structure			
Households with Children	4.0%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	3.6%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	2.1%	39	336
Elderly Couple	6.8%	71	307
Elderly Single	7.4%	66	307
Synagogue Membership			
Members	8.0%	269	1574
Non-members	.7%	188	1625

Table 6-22 Refrain from Use of Electricity on the Sabbath			
Variable	Refrain From Use	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Households	4.3%	457	3200
Jewish Identification			
Orthodox	20.6%	58	304
Conservative	6.3%	180	1043
Reform	.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	.9%	126	1027
Type of Marriage			
In-married	7.8%	182	1176
Conversionary	2.9%	29*	239
Intermarried	1.0%	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel			
No	2.6%	269	1955
On General Trip	4.4%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	9.9%	90	582

Have a Christmas Tree in the Home

About 21 % of households containing Jewish members always have a Christmas tree, 3 % usually do, 7 % sometimes do, and 70 % never do (**Table 6-24**). **Table 6-23** shows that the percentage who always have a tree is higher than every community in the table. The percentage who never have a tree (70 %) is about the lowest in the table, higher than only Orlando (68 %) and equal to San Francisco (70 %). The percentage who never have a tree in Greater Harrisburg (70 %) is higher than that found in the NJPS for all US Jews (65 %) and for Pennsylvania (67 %). The percentage who always have a tree (21 %) is about equal to that for all US Jews (22 %). **For the following discussion, always, usually, and sometimes responses are added together.**

Always, usually or sometimes having a tree is more common for those under age 50, at about 40 %, than for those age 50-64 (23 %), or for the elderly (9 % for the 65-74 group and 2 % for the 75 and over group) About 23 % of first generation Jews always, usually, or sometimes have a tree, versus 12 % of second generation Jews and 36 % of third and higher generation Jews (**Table 6-24**).

About 25 % on the East Shore always, usually, or sometimes have a tree, versus 42 % on the East Shore.

About 46 % of households with children always, usually, or sometimes have a tree as do 32 % of non-elderly couples. Elderly singles (7 %) and elderly couples (6 %) are least likely to always, usually, or sometimes have a tree.

9 % of synagogue members sometimes, usually, or always have a tree, versus half of those who are not members. No Orthodox Jews have a Christmas tree and such is the case for only 9 % of those who consider themselves Conservative, versus 35 % of Reform Jews and 57 % of the Just Jewish. In Miami, only 21 % of the Just Jewish have a Christmas tree, showing the much greater level of assimilation of the Just Jewish in Greater Harrisburg.

Of intermarried couples, 60 % always have a tree (versus 4 % of the in-married); 6 %, usually; 12 %, sometimes; and only 22 % never do. Only 6 % of in-married couples always, usually, or sometimes have a tree. 20 % of conversionary households always have a tree (Remember that the sample size for conversionary households is rather small.) In other words, 94 % of the in-married never have a tree, versus 22 % of the intermarried.

Of those who always have a Christmas tree, 58 % also always light Chanukah candles; 27 % never do so. Of those who always light Chanukah candles, 17 % always have a tree.

Of those who always, usually, or sometimes have a Christmas tree, 49 % always light Chanukah candles and 64 % always or usually light Chanukah candles. 30 % never light Chanukah candles.

Table 6-23
Have a Christmas Tree in Home
Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Miami	1994	5 %	2	5	89
South Broward	1990	5 %	2	4	89
Toronto	1991	5 %	1	4	90
Rochester	1988	6 %	3	6	85
Worcester	1987	7 %	3	6	84
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	8 %	3	6	83
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	8 %	1	4	84
St. Louis	1982	8 %	2	5	85
Rhode Island	1987	8 %	2	3	87
Dallas	1989	8 %	4	9	79
West Palm Beach	1987	19 %			81
Louisville	1991	9 %	2	6	84
Atlantic City	1985	9 %	2	3	86
New York	1990	17 %			83
Baltimore	1985	9 %	2	5	84
Washington, DC	1983	10 %	3	10	77
Kansas City	1985	13 %	2	6	79
Quad Cities	1989	14 %	86		
SF Bay Area	1988	15 %	3	11	70
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	16 %	4	7	74
Orlando	1993	18 %	4	10	68
Harrisburg	1994	21 %	3	7	70
Columbus	1990	23 %		77	
NJPS (US)	1990	22 %	4	9	65
NJPS (PA)	1990	33 %			67

Table 6-24 Have a Christmas Tree in Your Home							
Variable	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Households	20.6%	2.5	6.9	69.9	100.0%	457	3200
Age							
Under 35	29.4%	2.3	6.8	61.5	100.0%	90	781
35 - 49	27.1%	5.2	9.5	58.2	100.0%	143	1168
50 - 64	16.1%	.0	6.7	77.2	100.0%	75	592
65 - 74	3.4%	.0	5.4	91.2	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	2.3%	.0	.0	97.7	100.0%	77	304
Generation							
First	19.3%	.0	3.3	77.4	100.0%	30*	214
Second	9.4%	.0	2.6	88.0	100.0%	120	614
Third and higher	23.8%	3.3	8.4	64.4	100.0%	303	2371
Area							
East Shore	17.0%	1.8	6.7	74.6	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	29.9%	4.2	7.6	58.2	100.0%	112	900
Household Structure							
Hhlds with Kids	33.9%	4.3	7.8	54.0	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Eld Couple	21.4%	1.9	9.0	67.7	100.0%	71	579
Non-Eld Single	.0%	.0	9.5	90.5	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	1.6%	.0	4.0	94.4	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	4.6%	.0	2.3	93.1	100.0%	66	307
Synagogue Membership							
Members	5.4%	.9	2.7	91.0	100.0%	269	1574
Non-members	35.3%	4.0	11.0	49.7	100.0%	188	1625

Table 6-24 Have a Christmas Tree in Your Home							
Variable	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Households	20.6%	2.5	6.9	69.9	100.0%	457	3200
Jewish Identification							
Orthodox	.0%	.0%	.0%	100%	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	3.9%	.7	4.4	91.0	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	22.6%	2.9	9.9	64.6	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	41.3%	5.0	10.4	43.3	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage							
In-married	3.8%	.6	1.8	93.8	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	20.3%	2.8	17.1	59.8	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarried	59.6%	6.4	12.2	21.8	100.0%	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel							
No	29.0%	3.4	10.0	57.7	100.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	10.3%	2.0	3.1	84.6	100.0%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	4.4%	.0	1.2	94.4	100.0%	90	582

6% of those who have been to Israel with a Jewish group always, usually, or sometimes have a tree, versus 15% of those who have been to Israel on a general trip. 42% of those who have not been to Israel always, usually, or sometimes have a tree.

Synagogue Attendance

Respondents were asked how frequently they currently attend synagogue services. (Note that in intermarriages, if the non-Jewish spouse was interviewed, he/she was asked this question for the Jewish spouse.) As shown in **Table 6-25**, 17% never attend services; another 10% indicated that they attend only for weddings and bar and bat mitzvahs. About 21% attend only on the High Holidays. About 22% attend a few times a year and 12% attend once a month. 8% attend a few times a month and 8% attend once a week. Thus, about 73% attend on the High Holidays, 27% never go except perhaps for special occasions, and 29% go once a month or more.

These figures are compared with other communities in **Table 6-26**. The percentage who never attend in Greater Harrisburg (27%) is higher than 21 of the comparison communities and lower than 10. The percentage who never attend varies from 9%-10% in Toronto, Kansas City, Dallas, and Baltimore, to about one-third in West Palm Beach, Atlanta, Sarasota, and Orlando. New York has a much higher rate of non-attendance (39%). The rate of non-attendance in Greater Harrisburg (27%) equals that for the US as a whole (27%), but is higher than for Pennsylvania Jews (21%). Of significant interest is that the percentage who often attend is *higher* than all but three cities, St. Paul (34%), West Palm Beach (31%), and Dallas (31%). Thus, the community contains large numbers who never attend and large numbers who go frequently.

Attendance patterns for males and females, as seen in **Table 6-25**, show an interesting pattern. Men are much more likely to never attend, by 33% to 24%. Women, on the other hand, are more likely to attend once per month or more, by 34% to 22%.

Table 6-25 also shows that, as expected, synagogue members are much more likely to attend services than are non-members, with 53% of members attending services once a month or more, versus only 7% of non-members. About 97% of members attend services on the High Holidays, versus about 50% of non-members.

Table 6-25 Attendance at Services by Sex and Synagogue Membership					
Frequency	Males	Females	Members	Non-members	Total
Never	23.1%	13.9%	2.9%	31.2%	17.3%
Only Weddings-Bar(t) Mitzvah	10.0	9.9	.4	19.2	10.0
Only High Holidays	24.9	19.3	17.7	24.8	21.3
A Few Times/Year	20.0	23.1	25.7	18.3	21.9
About Once a Month	6.2	14.9	21.0	2.8	11.7
Few Times a Month	7.5	8.3	15.8	.4	8.0
Weekly	4.6	9.6	12.6	3.0	7.7
Several Times a Week	3.7	1.0	3.7	.4	2.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Never + Only Wedding, etc.	33.1%	23.8%	3.3%	50.4%	27.3%
Once/month or more	22.0%	33.8%	53.1%	6.6%	29.4%
Sample Size	159	298	269	188	457
Proj. # of Individuals	2946	3340			
Proj. # of Households			1574	1625	3200

Table 6-26
Attendance at Services
Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	** Never	High Holidays Only	Less than 1/Month	1/Month or more
New York	1990	39%	61		
Orlando	1993	34%	20	45	21
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	33%	22	21	24
Atlanta	1983	33%	30	24	13
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	32%	17	23	28
West Palm Beach	1987	32%	24	14	31
Manchester	1983	30%	11	44	15
Detroit	1991	30%	42		
New York	1981	30%	27	22	21
Boston	1985	28%	36	28	8
Harrisburg	1994	27%	21	22	30
Miami	1994	25%	36	19	22
Hartford	1982	24%	24	48	
Miami	1982	24%	30	29	17
SF Bay Area*	1988	23%	24	48	19
St Paul	1992	20%	13	33	34
Seattle	1979	20%	30	30	20
South Broward	1990	19%	29	33	19
St. Louis	1982	18%	30	38	14
Rochester	1988	17%	24	39	20
Chicago	1990	16%			
Washington, DC	1983	16%	14	61	9

Table 6-26
Attendance at Services
Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	** Never	High Holidays Only	Less than 1/Month	1/Month or more
Atlantic City	1985	15%	31	39	15
Columbus	1990	13%	56	12	19
New Orleans	1988	14%	62	13	12
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	12%	18	45	21
Rhode Island	1987	11%	21	48	19
Worcester	1987	11%	14	54	22
Baltimore	1985	10%	22	50	18
New Orleans	1988	13%	58	12	11
Dallas	1989	10%	12	45	31
Kansas City	1985	10%	15	64	11
Toronto	1991	9%	18	51	22
Louisville	1991	6%	26	44	25
NJPS (US)	1990	27%	33	18	22
NJPS (PA)	1990	21%			29

*Proportions in the SF Bay Area total more than 100%, as respondents may have indicated more than one attendance pattern
 In New York (1990) 16% attend weekly. In Chicago (1990), 9% attend weekly.

**Never includes only on special occasions.

Table 6-27 analyzes the relationship between age and service attendance patterns. Attendance at services *does decline* for the younger age groups. 29% of the under 35 group never attend, as do 33% of the 35-49 group. It is considerably lower for those over age 50. Notice the difference between the two elderly groups. For those age 65-74, 15% never attend. This increases to 23% of those age 75 and over. This may be attributable to health problems. Attending once per month increases with age, from only 17% of those under age 35, to 29% of those age 35-49, to 35% of those age 50-64, to 43% of those age 65-74. It then declines to 38% of those age 75 and over.

Table 6-27					
Attendance at Services by Age					
Frequency	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75 +
Never	19.3%	20.0%	13.9%	9.8%	16.8%
Only Wedding/Bar(t) Mitzvah	10.1	13.4	7.8	4.9	6.3
Only High Holidays	24.7	19.8	19.0	22.1	22.2
A Few Times/Year	28.7	18.1	24.1	20.5	16.5
About Once a Month	10.3	14.0	7.2	17.0	9.4
Few Times a Month	2.1	8.2	15.0	9.4	7.1
Weekly	2.4	5.9	9.3	15.2	17.3
Several Times a Week	2.4	.6	3.7	1.1	4.4
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Never + Only Weddings, etc	29.4%	33.4%	21.7%	14.7%	23.1%
Once/month or more	17.2%	28.7%	35.2%	42.7%	38.2%
Sample Size	90	143	75	72	77
Proj. # of Households	781	1168	592	352	304

Table 6-28 demonstrates that the percentage never attending synagogue services increases with increasing generation, from 17% of the first, to 21% of the second, to 30% of the third. The percentage attending once per month or more is about the same for the first and second generation (about 46%), but drops to only 24% for the third-generation.

Table 6-28 Attendance at Services by Generation			
Frequency	1st	2nd	Third +
Never	6.7%	13.1%	19.3%
Only Weddings/ Bar(t) Mitzvah	9.8	7.7	10.6
Only High Holidays	10.0	19.2	22.9
A Few Times/Year	27.0	15.5	23.3
About Once a Month	16.7	9.5	11.9
Few Times a Month	3.3	15.2	6.3
Weekly	16.5	16.7	4.6
Several Times a Week	10.0	3.2	1.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Never + Only Weddings, etc.	16.5%	20.8%	29.9%
Once/month or more	46.5%	44.6%	23.8%
Sample Size	30*	120	303
Proj. # of Households	214	614	2371

Table 6-29 shows that 34% of households with children never go to services and that 29% attend once per month or more. 41% of elderly couples and elderly singles attend on a regular basis as do 29% of non-elderly couples and 19% of non-elderly singles. 17%-20% of elderly singles, elderly couples, and non-elderly singles never attend, versus 25% of non-elderly couples.

Table 6-29					
Attendance at Services by Household Structure					
Frequency	Households with Children	Non-Elderly Couple	Non-Elderly Single	Elderly Couple	Elderly Single
Never	20.7%	17.2%	8.4%	12.2%	13.9%
Only Weddings/ Bar(t) Mitzvah	13.4	8.0	8.6	7.7	4.3
Only High Holidays	16.3	30.6	25.9	21.9	22.9
A Few Times/Year	21.1	15.8	38.3	16.9	17.7
About 1/Month	15.4	6.6	4.2	10.5	16.4
Few Times a Month	6.8	12.7	6.5	12.5	3.9
Weekly	4.4	5.4	8.1	15.4	18.2
Several Times/Week	2.0	3.8	.0	2.9	2.8
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Never + Only Weddings, etc.	34.1%	25.2%	17.0%	19.9%	18.2%
1/month or more	28.6%	28.5%	18.8%	41.3%	41.3%
Sample Size	154	71	39	71	66
Proj. # of Hhlds	1258	579	336	307	307

Table 6-30 shows attendance at services for the two geographic areas. Only 22% never attend in East Shore, versus about 40% on the West Shore. For attending once per month or more, 33% on the East Shore do so, versus only 20% on the West Shore.

Table 6-30 Attendance at Services by Geographic Area		
Frequency	East Shore	West Shore
Never	15.5%	21.9%
Only Weddings/Bar(t) Mitzvah	6.8	17.9
Only High Holidays	20.6	23.1
A Few Times/Year	23.8	17.3
About Once a Month	11.6	12.1
Few Times a Month	9.6	3.9
Weekly	9.6	3.0
Several Times/Week	2.5	.8
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Never + Only Weddings, etc.	22.3%	39.8%
Once/month or more	33.3%	19.8%
Sample Size	345	112
Projected # of Households	2300	900

Table 6-31 demonstrates that Orthodox Jews attend services more frequently than Conservative Jews, who attend more than Reform Jews, who attend more than the Just Jewish. 3 % of Orthodox Jews never go, versus 9% of Conservative Jews, 22% of the Reform Jews and 58% of the Just Jewish. 72% of Orthodox Jews go once per month or more, versus 44% of Conservative Jews, 20% of Reform Jews, and 7% of the Just Jewish

Table 6-31 Attendance at Services by Jewish Identification				
Frequency	Orthodox	Conservative	Reform	Just Jewish
Never	0.8%	6.2%	11.9%	38.3%
Only Weddings/Bar(t) Mitzvah	2.4	3.0	10.0	19.6
Only High Holidays	7.0	19.9	27.8	21.4
A Few Times/Year	17.7	27.4	30.0	13.4
About Once a Month	9.6	19.0	13.2	3.4
Few Times a Month	11.9	15.4	4.5	.7
Weekly	39.0	7.6	2.5	2.5
Several Times/Week	11.5	1.6	.0	.7
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Never + Only Weddings, etc.	3.2%	9.2%	21.9%	57.9%
Once/month or more	72.0%	43.6%	20.2%	7.3%
Sample Size	58	180	93	126
Proj. # of Households	304	1043	704	1027

Table 6-32 shows that those who have been to Israel on either a Jewish trip (42%) or a general trip (47%) are more likely to attend services on a regular basis than those who have not been to Israel (19%). About 36% of those who have not been to Israel never attend, versus 14% of those who have been on a general trip and 13% of those who have been on a Jewish trip. It could be that trips to Israel result in greater attendance levels, or it could be that those who attend more often are more likely to make a trip to Israel. The two behaviors tend to be mutually reinforcing.

Table 6-32 Attendance at Services by Visits to Israel			
Frequency	Not Been to Israel	On General Trip	On Jewish Trip
Never	23.6%	5.0%	10.2%
Only Weddings/Bar(t) Mitzvah	12.8	8.5	2.3
Only High Holidays	23.0	18.2	18.8
A Few Times/Year	20.7	21.8	26.4
About Once a Month	8.0	20.7	13.7
Few Times a Month	4.0	12.1	14.3
Weekly	6.6	9.7	9.4
Several Times a Week	.5	4.1	4.8
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Never + Only Weddings, etc.	36.4%	13.5%	12.5%
Once/month or more	19.1%	46.6%	42.2%
Sample Size	269	95	90
Proj. # of Households	1955	666	582

Intermarriage

Table 6-33 shows that 56% of currently married couples (1,175 marriages) involve two born Jews (termed an ``in-marriage''). In 11% of cases (239 marriages), the marriage is an in-marriage involving one partner who has converted to Judaism (termed a ``conversionary'' marriage). About 33% are intermarriages (697 marriages) in which one partner is Jewish and the other was neither born Jewish nor converted (termed an ``intermarriage''). Note that of marriages between one born Jew and one non-born Jew, only about 26% involve conversion.

Compared with the National Jewish Population Survey, the 56% in-marriage rate is lower than the 68% for Jews nationwide and is the lowest rate of any comparison Jewish community, save Seattle (53%) (**Table 6-34**). The 56% in-marriage rate (between two born Jews) is lower than Miami (92%), Tidewater (82%), Cleveland (79%), Pittsburgh (79%), Detroit (78%), and Dallas (68%). The conversion rate is at about the middle of American Jewish communities. The conversion rate of 25% is much higher than the 13% nationwide rate, but is lower than only 5 communities in the table.

Table 6-33 also illustrates intermarriage by age. For marriages in which the respondent was age 65 and over, 90% involve two born Jews. On the other hand, only 37% of marriages for the under age 35 involve two born Jews, as do 49% of marriages of those between 35-49 and 61% of those age 50-64. Thus, intermarriage increases significantly with declining age.

The percentage of conversionary marriages is also much higher for the younger age groups, declining from 12%-14% of those under age 50 to 11% of the 50-64 group, to less than 10% of the elderly.

Note that Line B of **Table 6-33** shows the percentage of married Jewish persons (rather than couples) who are married to someone not **born** Jewish. 63% of Jews under age 35 are married to persons not born Jewish, compared with 19% in Miami. This percentage declines to 51% of the 35-49 age group, to 39% of those age 50-64, and to about 10% of those age 65 and over. Finally, note that while 33% *of marriages* are intermarriages and 11% *of marriages* are conversionary marriages, 44% of married born Jews are married to someone not born Jewish.

Note that Line C of **Table 6-33** shows the percentage of married Jewish persons (rather than couples) who are married to someone not **currently** Jewish. 35% of Jews under age 35 are married to persons not currently Jewish. This percentage declines to 23% of the 35-49 age group, to 17% of those age 50-64, and to less than 5% of those age 65 and over.

Note that in the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey, roughly 90% of the married children of intermarried parents were married to non-Jews. 4% of the children of these intermarriages are being raised as Jews.

Table 6-33 Intermarriage by Age (Except for lines B and C, Table shows percentage of married couples in each category.)						
Marriage Type	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65 - 74	75+	All
In-married	37.0%	48.5%	60.6%	90.4%	89.5%	55.6%
Conversionary	11.5	14.6	10.8	.0	7.8	11.3
Intermarried	51.5	36.9	28.7	9.6	2.7	33.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	42	113	68	45	26*	294
Proj. # of Marriages	357	126	532	218	89	2113
A. Conversion Rate: Percentages <i>of marriages</i> between a born Jew and a person not born Jewish in which a conversion occurs	18.3%	28.3%	27.3%	0.0%	74.3%	25.5%
B. Percentage of married Jews married to someone not born Jewish	62.8%	51.3%	39.3%	9.5%	10.4%	44.1%
C. Percentage of married Jews married to someone not currently Jewish	34.7%	22.6%	16.7%	5.0%	1.4%	19.8%

Table 6-34 Intermarriage Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	In-marriage	Conversionary	Intermarried	Conversion Rate
Miami	1982	92 %	3 %	5 %	38 %
Montreal	1991	91 %		9 %	
South Broward	1990	88 %	3 %	9 %	25 %
Manchester	1983	88 %	4 %	8 %	33 %
West Palm Beach	1987	87 %	4 %	9 %	31 %
Rhode Island	1987	86 %	7 %	8 %	47 %
Toronto	1990	84 %	6 %	10 %	38 %
Miami	1994	83 %	5 %	12 %	28 %
Chicago	1981	83 %	4 %	13 %	24 %
Tidewater	1988	82 %	8 %	10 %	44 %
Atlanta	1985	80 %	6 %	14 %	30 %
Cleveland	1987	79 %	4 %	17 %	19 %
Pittsburgh	1984	79 %	9 %	13 %	41 %
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	78 %	5 %	17 %	23 %

Table 6-34 Intermarriage Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	In-marriage	Conversionary	Intermarried	Conversion Rate
Detroit	1991	78 %	7 %	15 %	32 %
St Paul	1992	76 %	7 %	16 %	30 %
Chicago	1990	74 %	6 %	20 %	23 %
San Antonio	1991	74 %	13 %	13 %	50 %
Houston	1985	71 %	29 %		
Dallas	1989	68 %	9 %	24 %	27 %
Orlando	1993	59 %	9 %	32 %	22 %
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	58 %	14 %	29 %	32 %
Harrisburg	1994	56 %	11 %	33 %	25 %
Seattle	1990	53 %	7 %	40 %	15 %
NJPS (US)	1990	68 %	4 %	28 %	13 %
NJPS (US) (for 1985-1990 marriages)	1990	43 %	4 %	52 %	7 %

Table 6-35 shows a special analysis of intermarriage by place of birth. An intermarriage was defined as involving a locally-born person if the Jewish spouse was born in Harrisburg. An inmarriage was defined as involving a locally-born person if either spouse was born in Harrisburg. The intermarriage rate for locally born marriages is 25%, versus 37% for non-locally born marriages.

About three of four marriages for the first and second generation involve two born Jews, but such is the case for only half of the third or higher generation. For the third generation, more than one in three marriages are intermarriages. The intermarriage rate in East Shore is 29%, versus 43% in the West Shore. The percentage of conversionary marriages in East Shore (10%) is lower than in West Shore (16%).

In households with children, only 48% of marriages are in-marriages. 40% are intermarriages and 13% are conversionary. In only about 25% of marriages between a born Jew and a person not born Jewish (in which there are currently children) does a conversion take place.

90% of elderly couples are in-married, versus only 51% of non-elderly couples. 77% of synagogue members, but only 31% of non-members are in-married. 58% of non-members are intermarried.

In-marriage declines from 85% of the Orthodox to 78% of the Conservative to only 50% of the Reform and 34% of the Just Jewish groups. 37% of Reform Jews and 59% of the Just Jewish are intermarried. About 78% of those who have been to Israel on a Jewish trip and 70% of those who have been on a general trip are in-married, versus only 43% of those who have not been to Israel.

Table 6-35 Intermarriage						
Variable	In-Marriage	Conversionary	Inter-marriage	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Marriages
All Marriages	55.6%	11.3	33.0	100.0%	294	2113
Place of Birth						
Born Locally	67.6%	7.5	24.9	100.0%	99	650
Non-Local	50.3%	13.0	36.6	100.0%	195	1463
Generation						
First	74.0%	5.2	20.8	100.0%	19*	135
Second	75.7%	6.0	18.3	100.0%	66	361
Third and higher	49.4%	13.1	37.6	100.0%	207	1616

Table 6-35 Intermarriage						
Variable	In-Marriage	Conversionary	Inter-marriage	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Marriages
All Marriages	55.6%	11.3	33.0	100.0%	294	2113
Area						
East Shore	61.6%	9.5	28.9	100.0%	221	1504
West Shore	40.8%	15.9	43.4	100.0%	73	609
Household Structure						
Hh with Kids	47.6%	12.9	39.5	100.0%	126	1141
Non-Eld Couple	51.1%	9.3	39.6	100.0%	71	644
Elderly Couple	89.7%	2.4	7.9	100.0%	68	328
Synagogue Membership						
Members	77.2%	11.5	11.3	100.0%	181	1120
Non-members	31.3%	11.1	57.5	100.0%	113	993
Jewish Identification						
Orthodox	84.9%	15.1	0.0	100.0%	28*	158
Conservative	77.6%	10.0	12.4	100.0%	106	695
Reform	49.9%	12.9	37.2	100.0%	71	532
Just Jewish	33.7%	6.9	59.4	100.0%	74	615
Any Adult Been to Israel						
No	42.9%	12.6	44.9	100.0%	166	1219
On General Trip	69.5%	7.5	23.0	100.0%	65	488
On Jewish Trip	77.6%	12.3	10.1	100.0%	61	406

The Children of Intermarriage

Table 6-36 shows what is happening to the children of intermarriages. When both parents are born Jewish in 99% of cases, the respondent indicated that the children were born Jewish and are currently Jewish. In conversionary marriages, 78% of the children were born Jewish and 95% are currently Jewish. But in intermarriages, 50% of the children were born Jewish and 57% are currently Jewish.

Thus, 79% of children with at least one Jewish parent were born Jewish and 84% are being raised Jewish. Thus, about 800 children are being raised in intermarriages, 320 in conversionary marriages, and 1,200 in marriages where both parents were born Jewish.

Table 6-37 shows that the percentage of children being raised Jewish in intermarried households (57%) is lower than Miami (65%), but is higher than in Sarasota (47%), and Orlando (39%), West Palm Beach (33%), and St. Paul (25%). Finally, the 57% compares to 28% nationally.

Table 6-36 The Children of Intermarriage				
Status of Child	Intermarried	Conversionary	In-married	All children
Child Born Jewish	50.8%	78.3%	98.7%	79.3%
Child Not Born Jewish	49.2	21.7	1.3	20.7
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Child Currently Jewish	56.6%	95.2%	98.7%	83.6%
Child not Currently Jewish	43.4	4.8	1.3	16.4
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	86	32	137	225
Projected # of Children	802	319	1192	2311

Table 6-37 The % of Children Who are Jewish Comparison with Other Communities				
Community	Year	In-married	Conversionary	Intermarried
Miami	1994	99 %	100 %	65 %
Harrisburg	1994	99%	95%	57%
Sarasota	1992	100 %	100 %	47 %
Orlando	1993	100 %	94 %	39 %
West Palm Beach	1994	100 %	100 %	33 %
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	100 %	100 %	29 %
St Paul	1992	100 %	97 %	25 %
NJPS	1990			28 %

Chapter 7

Synagogue and Organizational Memberships

Chapter Table of Contents

Chapter Highlights	182
Synagogue Membership	184
Results of Synagogue Survey	190
Profile of Synagogue Members	194
Importance of Synagogue Cost as a Reason for Joining and Not Joining a Synagogue . . .	196
Jewish Organizational Membership	198
Jewish Community Center Membership	203
Major Reason for Not Joining the JCC	206
Activities a JCC Could Offer	209
Jewish Community Center Participation	211
Association with the Jewish Community	213
Overall Involvement in Jewish Activity	214

Chapter Highlights

- About 49.3% of households indicate current membership in a synagogue. A survey of the local synagogues indicates that about 51.5% of households are members. These two percentages are much closer than is the case in most Jewish community studies.
- Greater Harrisburg's rate of synagogue membership (49%) is at about the middle of the comparison Jewish communities, which vary from 26%-27% in Los Angeles, Palm Springs, South Broward, and Atlanta to 70% or over in such places as Pittsburgh, San Antonio, and Rhode Island. The 49% figure is higher than Chicago (44%), but lower than Baltimore (55%), and Cleveland (58%). It is much higher than the 39% figure from the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) for all American Jewish households. It is also higher than the NJPS figure for Pennsylvania (43%).
- About 77% of households are currently synagogue members or have been members in the past and/or plan to become members in the future. That is, about three of four households join a synagogue at some point in their adult life.
- Younger respondents are much less likely to join synagogues than older respondents. 30% of those under age 35 belong, versus more than two-thirds of the elderly.
- 43% of households with children are currently synagogue members. 26% of such households indicate that they have never joined, and will never join, a synagogue.
- Membership in synagogues increases among higher income levels. Only 33% of those earning less than \$25,000 per year belong. This figure rises to 66% of households in the \$100,000 and over category. About 38% of those earning between \$25,000-\$49,999 belong to a synagogue, as do 53% of those earning \$50,000 - \$99,999. It is interesting to note the positive relationship between income and membership, given that only 18% of the respondents indicated ``cost'' as a ``very important'' factor in their decision to join, or not join, a synagogue.
- Only 27% of those in residence for 0-4 years belong, versus about 45% of those in residence for 5-19 years and 60% of those in residence for 20 or more years.
- Only 18% of intermarried couples have joined a synagogue, versus 74% of the in-married couples.

Chapter Highlights

- Households that join a JCC and other Jewish organizations are also more likely to join a synagogue.
- 80% of those who have been to Israel on a Jewish trip belong to a synagogue, versus 65% of those who have been on a general trip and 35% of those who have not been to Israel.
- About 42% of households contain someone who is currently a member of a Jewish organization.
- About 31% of households claim current membership in the JCC. The 31% membership rate is among the highest in the country. About 41% participate in the JCC. The participation rate is the highest among eight comparison communities. The actual membership rate (based upon information received from the JCC) is 30%, an unchanged percentage from 1985 when both the population and JCC membership was 18% higher.
- About 59% of households are ``associated'' with the Jewish community in that they belong to a synagogue and/or the JCC and/or a Jewish organization.
- Only 5% of households belong to the JCC and not to a synagogue. 46% belong to neither the JCC nor a synagogue, and 26% belong to both. 6% belong only to a Jewish organization and belong to neither the JCC nor to a synagogue.
- ``No need for the services offered'' is the major reason given for not joining the JCC, with 36% of respondents providing this answer. Distance from home was mentioned by 20%, cost was cited by 18%, and no time by 7%.
- When non-members were asked what activity the JCC could offer that would make them consider joining, 40% responded ``don't know,' ' and 22% said ``nothing, not interested.' ' 5% indicated adult education, 4% social programs, 3% a health club, and 3% a gymnasium.
- 91% of households are associated with the community (belong to the JCC and/or synagogue and/or Jewish organization) **and/or** always or usually practice a Jewish ritual, **and/or** give to a Jewish charity.

Synagogue Membership¹

Table 7-1 shows that about 49% of households indicate *current* synagogue membership. **Table 7-2** shows this rate to be in about the middle of the comparison communities, which vary from 26%-27% in Los Angeles, Palm Springs, South Broward, and Atlanta, to 70% in Pittsburgh and Rhode Island, 77% in San Antonio, 84% in St. Paul, and 90% in Toledo. The 49% figure is higher than Chicago (44%), but lower than Baltimore (55%) and Cleveland (58%). It is much higher than the 39% figure from the 1990 National Jewish Population Study and somewhat higher than the results for all of Pennsylvania (43%).

Another 8% have been members of a synagogue in the past (since becoming an adult) and plan to join again in the future. About 11% have belonged in the past, but will not join in the future; 9% were not members in the past, but will join in the future, and 23% are not now, have never been (since becoming an adult), and indicate that they will never be synagogue members. Thus, about 77% of households are currently synagogue members or have been members in the past and/or plan to become members in the future. That is, about three of four households join a synagogue at some point in their adult life.

Table 7-3 compares these lifetime membership patterns with other Jewish communities. The percentage who will never affiliate varies from 18% in Sarasota to 27% in Cleveland. Thus Greater Harrisburg, at 23%, is near the middle of this scale. The results seem to indicate that about 75%-80% of American Jews do join a synagogue at some point in their adult life. This speaks to the fact that synagogues can be considered ``gateway institutions'' and the necessity for Federations to enter into cooperative programs to keep people within the Jewish community.

Synagogue membership increases with increasing age, from only 31% of the under age 35 group, to 45% of the 35-49 group, to 60% of those age 50-64, to 71% of the 65-74 age group. It then declines some (perhaps due to health issues) to 67% of those age 75 and over. The fact that many people join when they have school-age children is reflected by the higher membership in the 35-49 group and the fact that 21% of those under age 35 indicate an intention to join in the future. Notice that about 30% of those under age 50 indicate that they will never join, versus around 10% of those over age 50 (**Table 7-1**).

Notice that the percentage who belonged in the past, but have no intention of joining again in the future, rises from 4% of those under age 35 to 23% of those age 75 and over.

¹Community studies tend to overestimate the percentage of a community belonging to a synagogue. Many persons who used to belong to a synagogue still attend synagogue on the High Holidays, as well as for various other functions, and will indicate membership when in fact they are not actually paying dues. An attempt was made to minimize this problem by asking if the household is ``paying dues'' to a synagogue. Even with an anonymous survey, there may be a certain perceived stigma attached to saying that one is not a member. In this case, however, as will be seen below, the survey makes a reasonable prediction of the true level of synagogue membership.

First-generation Jews (44%) and third generation Jews (44%) are less likely to join than are second-generation Jews (71%). The percentage who will never join is highest for the first (37%) and third generation (26%) and lowest for the second generation (4%).

About 44% of households with children are synagogue members. (In Detroit, 80% of households with children were affiliated with a synagogue; in Sarasota-Manatee, however, this figure was only 34%; in Orlando, 43%; in St. Petersburg, 49%, and in Miami, 55%). About 72% of elderly couples and 67% of elderly singles are currently members.

The least likely group to currently belong is non-elderly singles, at 32%. For elderly singles living alone, 20% were members in the past but will not join in the future. Of considerable communal concern is the 26% of households with children who indicate that they never will be synagogue members, although some of these are remarriages where the existing children are the children of the non-Jewish spouse.

Table 7-1 also shows that membership in synagogues increases among higher income levels. Only 33% of those earning less than \$25,000 per year belong. This figure rises to 66% of households in the \$100,000 and over category. About 38% of those earning between \$25,000-\$49,999 belong to a synagogue, as do 53% of those earning \$50,000 - \$99,999. It is interesting to note the positive relationship between income and membership, given that only 18% of the respondents indicated ``cost'' as a ``very important'' factor in their decision to join, or not join, a synagogue (**Table 7-6**).

Current membership is much higher in East Shore (56%) than in West Shore (32%). Also, 18% in East Shore indicate they have never and never will be members, versus 34% in West Shore. Given the small number of synagogues on the West Shore, this is not a surprising result.

Table 7-1 also shows that affiliation increases from about 27% for those in residence for less than five years to about 43% for those in residence for 5-9 years, to 48% of those in residence for 10-19 years, to 60% of those in residence for 20 or more years. This is consistent with many other Jewish communities. When people first move into an area, they often stay in a temporary residence. They may also want to examine different synagogues before joining. Thus, there is often a delay after people move into an area before they join a synagogue.

Table 7-1 also examines the relationship between synagogue membership and Jewish identification. Membership is about 80% for the Orthodox and Conservative households, but is only 46% for the Reform and only 11% for the Just Jewish. 55% of the Just Jewish indicate they will never be members. About 18% of those who call themselves Reform will never belong.

Intermarriage is strongly related to synagogue membership. Only 18% of households containing an intermarriage belong to a synagogue (13% in the National Jewish Population Survey), versus 74% of households in which there is an in-marriage, and 54% in conversionary households (Note the low sample size of 29 conversionary couples.). 37% of intermarried households will never join a synagogue and 23% have belonged, but will not join again; for conversionary households 12% will never belong; for in-married households, 10%.

Table 7-1 shows that JCC members (86%) and members of Jewish organizations (80%) are far more likely to join a synagogue than are non-JCC members (34%) and non-members of Jewish organizations (28%). This is consistent with the notion that membership encourages membership. (See **Table 7-15**.) Also note that only 5% of JCC members will never join a synagogue, versus 30% of non-members.

A significant difference in membership is related to whether someone in the household has been to Israel: 80% of households in which someone has been to Israel on a Jewish trip belong to a synagogue and 65% who have been on a general trip have joined, versus only 35% of households in which no one has been to Israel. Only 16% of those who have been to Israel on a general trip will never belong, as will 3% who went on a Jewish trip, versus 31% of those who have never been to Israel.

Table 7-1
Membership In a Synagogue

Variable	Current Member	Was Member in Past, Will Join in Future	Not a Member in the Past, Will Join in Future	Was Member in Past, Will NOT Join in Future	Never Has Been and Never Will Be	Total	Sample Size	Projected # of Households
All	49.3	8.2	8.6	11.2	22.6	100.0%	457	3,200
Age of Respondent								
Under 35	30.6%	15.6	20.7	3.7	29.4	100.0%	90	781
35-49	45.2%	7.0	7.7	9.3	30.8	100.0%	143	1168
50-64	60.0%	10.1	1.8	18.5	9.5	100.0%	75	592
65-74	71.3%	.0	3.9	11.3	13.5	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	66.5%	.0	.0	23.3	10.2	100.0%	77	304
Generation								
First	43.9%	13.5	.0	5.8	36.8	100.0%	30*	214
Second	71.3%	2.9	4.5	17.1	4.3	100.0%	120	614
Third or higher	43.8%	9.2	10.5	10.2	26.2	100.0%	303	2371
Household Structure								
Hhlds with Kids	43.3%	11.4	11.1	8.4	25.9	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	50.6%	4.8	3.8	17.1	23.6	100.0%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	32.0%	13.8	19.3	5.3	29.7	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	71.7%	.0	2.3	12.7	13.3	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	67.4%	.0	2.3	19.6	10.8	100.0%	66	307
Income								
Under \$25,000	33.3%	7.8	11.9	15.5	31.5	100.0%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	37.7%	4.3	14.1	8.0	36.0	100.0%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	52.8%	11.3	6.9	9.1	19.9	100.0%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	65.5%	1.6	3.3	17.0	12.5	100.0%	57	602
Geographic Area								
East Shore	56.0%	7.9	9.9	8.0	18.2	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	32.3%	9.0	5.5	19.4	33.8	100.0%	112	900

Table 7-1
Membership In a Synagogue

Variable	Current Member	Was Member in Past, Will Join in Future	Not a Member in the Past, Will Join in Future	Was Member in Past, Will NOT Join in Future	Never Has Been and Never Will Be	Total	Sample Size	Projected # of Households
Length of Residence								
0 - 4 years	27.4%	7.7	23.9	9.5	31.5	100.0%	80	662
5 - 9 years	42.6%	13.8	13.7	5.3	24.6	100.0%	46	349
10 - 19 years	48.4%	12.2	1.2	14.8	23.4	100.0%	79	602
20 or more years	60.2%	5.7	4.0	11.9	18.2	100.0%	252	1590
Current Jewish Identification								
Orthodox	80.3%	2.3	3.5	9.6	4.3	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	78.4%	7.7	6.5	6.7	.7	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	46.0%	13.0	10.5	12.2	18.2	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	11.3%	6.2	11.3	16.3	54.8	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage								
In-married	73.5%	7.2	4.2	5.1	9.9	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	53.8%	5.6	11.5	17.1	12.1	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarried	18.3%	10.0	11.2	23.1	37.3	100.0%	83	698
Current Member of the JCC								
JCC Members	85.6%	2.6	4.7	2.4	4.7	100.0%	172	976
NOT JCC Members	33.5%	10.7	10.3	15.1	30.4	100.0%	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization								
Organization Member	79.5%	5.5	5.1	5.5	4.5	100.0%	221	1344
Not a Member	28.2%	9.8	11.0	15.4	35.6	100.0%	231	1856
Any Adult in Household Been to Israel								
No	34.8%	9.9	10.9	13.6	30.8	100.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	64.7%	5.4	1.7	12.4	15.9	100.0%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	80.4%	6.2	9.1	1.2	3.1	100.0%	90	582

Table 7-2 Synagogue Membership Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	%	Community	Year	%
Los Angeles	1979	26	Tidewater	1988	52
Palm Springs	1986	26	Essex-Morris NJ	1986	53
South Broward	1990	27	Rochester	1988	55
Atlanta	1985	27	Baltimore	1985	55
Seattle	1990	33	Milwaukee	1983	56
SF Bay Area	1988	33	Cleveland	1987	58
Phoenix	1983	33	Worcester	1987	60
Orlando	1993	34	Hartford	1982	60
Miami	1994	36	New Orleans	1988	66
Miami	1982	38	St. Louis	1982	66
Washington, DC	1983	39	Richmond	1983	67
New York	1990	39	Kansas City	1985	67
New York	1981	40	Tampa	1980	67
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	40	Manchester	1983	68
West Palm Beach	1987	41	Pittsburgh	1984	70
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	43	Rhode Island	1987	70
Chicago	1981	44	Louisville	1991	77
Chicago	1990	44	San Antonio	1991	77
Columbus	1990	46	Nashville	1982	78
Toronto	1991	48	Minneapolis	1981	79
Harrisburg	1994	49	Quad Cities	1989	83
Detroit	1991	50	St. Paul	1981	84
Atlantic City	1985	51	Toledo	1982	90
Houston	1985	51	NJPS (PA)	1990	43
Dallas	1989	52	NJPS (US)	1990	39

Table 7-3
Lifetime Synagogue Membership
Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	Current Member	Was Member in Past, Will Join in Future	Not a Member in the Past, Will Join in Future	Was Member in Past, Will NOT Join in Future	Never Has Been and Never Will Be
Cleveland	1987	58%	15			27
Dallas	1989	52%	7	5	14	24
Harrisburg	1994	49%	8	9	11	23
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	43%	10	3	26	18
West Palm Beach	1987	41%	34%			25
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	40%	9	5	20	26
Miami	1994	37%	11	6	23	24
Orlando	1993	34%	15	11	15	25
South Broward	1990	28%	11	7	34	19

Results of Synagogue Survey

In addition to the survey of 457 households, a survey was conducted of the 8 synagogues in the Greater Harrisburg area (**Table 7-5**). Within the area, there are 3 Orthodox, 2 Conservative, 1 Reconstructionist, and 2 Reform synagogues. **Table 7-4** shows that, of the 1,647 current synagogue members, 18.5% belong to an Orthodox synagogue, 55.3% to a Conservative synagogue, 4.8% to a Reconstructionist synagogue, and 21.4% to a Reform synagogue.

Given that there are 3,200 households and the survey indicates that 49.3% are current synagogue members, implies that 1,577 households are members of synagogues. According to the survey of synagogues, the actual number (**Table 7-5**) is 1,647 or 51.5%. This 2.2% error (49.3% versus 51.5%) is remarkably low for a Jewish community study.

Table 7-8 also shows that synagogue membership has not changed significantly since 1985. Note that in 1985, 16% belonged to an Orthodox synagogue, 62% belonged to a Conservative synagogue, 5% to the Reconstructionist synagogue, and 17% to a Reform synagogue. Thus, this distribution has shifted toward more Orthodox memberships, fewer Conservative memberships, and more Reform memberships.

40 households left the synagogue they belonged to in 1993. Some died, others left the area and some switched congregations. 73 households joined congregations during 1993.

Four synagogues run Hebrew schools (**Table 7-8**). 292 students age 5-12 are enrolled in these schools. Another 70 children age 13-18 are enrolled in pre-confirmation and confirmation programs at synagogues. For the 6-12 year olds, 0% are in an Orthodox school, 36% are in a Conservative school, and 64% are in a Reform school. For the 13-18 year olds, 0% are in an Orthodox school, 79% Conservative, and 21% Reform. See Chapter 8 for further analysis of these data.

More than 300 adults enrolled in Jewish educational programs at 5 synagogues during 1993.

Four synagogues run youth group programs with 228 students. 65% of the students are in Conservative youth group programs and 35% are in Reform youth group programs.

48 children became B'nai Mitzvah in 1993: 10% in an Orthodox synagogue, 35% in a Conservative synagogue, and 54% in a Reform synagogue.

Table 7-4 Synagogue Type Comparison with Other Communities				
Community	Year	Orthodox	Conservative	Reform
Miami	1994	22%	41	37
Harrisburg*	1994	19%	55	21
Miami	1982	18%	51	30
Hartford	1982	14%	50	36
South Broward	1990	16%	56	28
West Palm Beach	1987	5%	65	30
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	3%	34	63
Orlando	1993	3%	61	36
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1990	2%	33	65
*5% belong to a Reconstructionist synagogue				

Table 7-5
Results of Survey of Synagogues

			Number of Members					Number for 1994				
Synagogue	Zip City	Type	1985	1993	1994	93-94 Drop Outs	93-94 New Joins	Family	Single Parents	Elderly	Young Family	Single
Kesher Israel	17110 Harrisburg	Orthodox	200	222	219	3	0	90		94		35
Machzeike Hadas	17110 Harrisburg	Orthodox	40	45	45			30		10		5
B'nai Jacob	17057 Middletown	Orthodox	25	40	40							
Chisuk Emuna	17110 Harrisburg	Conservative	270	234	241	2	12	145				116
Temple Beth El	17110 Harrisburg	Conservative	730	670	670	21	28	288	68	109	35	170
Temple Beth Shalom	17055 Mechanicsburg	Reconstruc- tionist	74	75	86	4	8	47	3	21	9	7
Ohev Sholom	17110 Harrisburg	Reform	280	298	313	10	25					
Beth Tikvah	Carlisle	Reform		40	40							
Total			1,619	1,624	1,654	40	73	600	71	234	44	333

Table 7-5 (continued): Results of Survey of Synagogues											
			Students					Dues			
Synagogue	Zip & City	Draws from Zips	Pre Bar(t) Mitzvah Hebrew School	Post Bar(t) Mitzvah Hebrew School	Adult Education	Youth Group		Family	Single	Date Began	Years at Location
Kesher Israel	17110 Harrisburg	17110 17112 17109	0	0		0	3	400	290	1919	47
Machzeike Hadas	17110 Harrisburg	17110			75	10	2	180	180	1905	10
B'nai Jacob	17057 Middletown										
Chisuk Emuna	17110 Harrisburg	17110 17112 17109 17170	23	25	48		7	700	400	1883	38
Temple Beth El	17110 Harrisburg		83	30	100	149	10	660	330	1926	68
Temple Beth Shalom	17055 Mechanicsburg	17055 17011	36	0	29	29	6	750	525	1971	20
Ohev Shalom	17110 Harrisburg	17110 17102 17109	150	15	50	40	20			1852	50 +
Beth Tikvah	Carlisle	17007 17013									
Total			292	70	302	228	48				

Profile of Synagogue Members

While the discussion above shows the percentage of each population group who belong to a synagogue, this section develops a profile of those households who belong to a synagogue.

- 15% are under 35, 33% are 35-49, 23% are 50-64, 16% are 65-74, and 13% are 75 and over.
- 6% are first generation, 28% are second, and 66% are third generation or higher.
- 40% are households with children, 21% are non-elderly couples, 16% are elderly couples, 15% are elderly singles, and 8% are non-elderly singles.
- 14% earn under \$25,000, 20% earn \$25,000-\$50,000, 40% earn \$50,000-\$100,000, and 26% earn \$100,000 and over.
- 82% live in East Shore and 19% in West Shore.
- 11% are in residence 0-4 years, 10% for 5-9 years, 19% for 10-19 years, and 61% for 20 or more years.
- 15% consider themselves Orthodox; 52%, Conservative; 5%, Reconstructionist; 21%, Reform, and 7% are Just Jewish.
- 77% of married members are in-married, 12% are in conversionary marriages, and 11% are in intermarriages.
- 53% are JCC members and 67% are members of Jewish organizations.
- 27% have been to Israel on a Jewish trip, 30% on a general trip, and 43% have not been to Israel.
- 6% gave nothing to Jewish charities in the past year, 17% gave under \$100, 39% gave \$100-\$500, 15% gave \$500-\$1000, and 24% gave \$1,000 and over.
- 81% donated to UJC in the past year, 8% were asked to give to UJC but declined to do so, and 11% claim not to have been asked.
- 20% gave nothing to UJC in the past year, 29% gave under \$100, 29% gave \$100-\$500, 8% gave \$500-\$1000, and 12% gave over \$1000.
- 11% gave nothing to non-Jewish charities in the past year, 36% gave under \$100, 36% gave \$100-\$500, 7% gave \$500-\$1000, and 10% gave \$1,000 and over.

Importance of Cost as a Reason for Joining or Not Joining a Synagogue

In most communities, pundits indicate that cost is the main reason people do not join synagogues. In fact, only 18% of respondents indicate that cost is an important factor in whether or not they join. In addition, 19% said somewhat important, 59% said not at all important, and 6% did not know. The 58% who indicate that cost is not at all important is higher than any of the comparison communities in **Table 7-6**, except for St. Petersburg (59%). Keep in mind that there may be a reluctance on the part of some respondents to admit to financial constraints.

In Miami, Orlando, and Sarasota, this question was asked in a set of questions which had respondents also rate the importance of the quality of the rabbi, the friendliness of a congregation, their own personal religious convictions, the need to send children to religious school, their own need to identify with the Jewish community, and distance from home. In each case, cost was rated either the least or second least important factor in whether people join synagogues.

The importance of cost is highest for those under age 35 (23%) and age 75 and over (29%). No difference is seen between females (17%) and males (19%). Cost is seen as more important in East Shore (20%) than in West Shore (11%) (**Table 7-7**).

Cost is most important to those calling themselves Reform Jews, at 24%, versus 15%-18% of the other Jewish identification groups. It is less important to in-married couples (12%) and conversionary couples (14%), than those in intermarriages (26%). Synagogue members (11%) are much less likely to rate cost as very important than do non-members (24%).

The percentage indicating very important declines from 25% of those earning under \$25,000, to 18%-20% of those earning \$25,000 to \$99,999, to 0% of those earning over \$100,000.

Table 7-6 Importance of Cost in Your Decision to Join or Not Join a Synagogue (Sample Size = 457, Projected Number of Households = 3,200)						
Community	Year	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not at All Important	Don't Know	Total
Orlando	1993	37.1 %	35.9	19.8	7.3	100.0 %
Miami	1994	24.6 %	29.1	31.7	14.6	100.0 %
Sarasota	1992	20.7 %	30.1	40.1	9.0	100.0 %
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	19.7 %	15.5	58.7	6.1	100.0 %
Harrisburg	1994	17.5 %	18.5	58.1	5.9	100.0 %

Table 7-7
Importance of Cost
as a Reason for Joining or Not Joining a Synagogue

Variable	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not at All Important	Don't Know	Total	Sample Size	Projected # of Households
All Respondents	17.5%	18.5	58.1	5.9	100.0%	457	3,200
Age of Respondent							
Under 35	23.0%	22.6	42.2	12.2	100.0%	90	781
35-49	12.8%	22.2	64.3	.6	100.0%	143	1168
50-64	16.2%	8.0	72.2	3.6	100.0%	75	592
65-74	13.0%	16.8	57.0	13.2	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	28.9%	15.9	48.9	6.3	100.0%	77	304
Sex							
Male	18.7%	15.4	59.7	6.2	100.0%	159	1180
Female	16.8%	20.2	57.2	5.8	100.0%	298	2020
Geographic Area							
East Shore	20.0%	17.6	26.6	5.8	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	11.0%	20.6	62.1	6.3	100.0%	112	900
Current Jewish Identification							
Orthodox	15.9%	7.7	62.5	13.9	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	14.8%	22.5	58.5	4.3	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	23.6%	21.8	49.5	5.1	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	18.0%	13.5	62.1	6.5	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage							
In-married	12.4%	20.0	66.1	1.4	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	14.4%	34.4	51.2	.0	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarried	25.8%	10.5	58.6	5.1	100.0%	83	698
Current Synagogue Member							
Synagogue Members	11.1%	18.8	67.1	3.1	100.0%	269	1574
Non-Members	23.7%	18.2	49.5	8.7	100.0%	188	1625
Household Income							
Under \$25,000	24.9%	12.5	51.1	11.6	100.0%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	17.7%	21.3	54.0	7.0	100.0%	83	819
50 - \$99,999	19.7%	16.2	61.4	2.7	100.0%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	.0%	24.9	72.6	2.5	100.0%	57	602

Jewish Organizational Membership

Special Note: Table 7-8 is to be used with the next four sections of the text. First, for comparison purposes, this table repeats the information on the percentage of each group belonging to a synagogue. Second, the percentage belonging to a Jewish organization is shown. Third, the table shows current membership in the Jewish Community Center. Next the table indicates the percentage of each group that have participated in the JCC during 1993. Finally, the table shows the percentage that is associated with the Jewish community, that is, who belong to a synagogue and/or a Jewish organization (B'nai B'rith, Hadassah, etc.) and/or the JCC.

Table 7-8 shows that 42 % of households indicate that someone in the household currently belongs to a Jewish organization. **Table 7-9** shows that Greater Harrisburg has a moderate rate of organizational membership among the comparison communities, which range from 26% in New York, 27% in Columbus, 28% in Boston, and 31% in Philadelphia, to 47% in Detroit, 55% in Pittsburgh, 62% in Cleveland, and 82% in Rochester. The percentage in Greater Harrisburg is higher than that for US Jews as a whole (27%) and for Jews in Pennsylvania (23%).

5.6% of households contain someone who is an organizational member, but belongs to neither the JCC nor to a synagogue.

Organizational membership shows a significant difference by age. For those under age 35, about 28% belong to a Jewish organization. For those age 35-49, 39% belong. This rises to about 41% of those age 50-64, 62% of those age 65-74, and 68% of those age 75 and over. About 42% of first- and 37% of second-generation Jews belong, versus 62% of the second. About 39% of households with children are organizational members. Elderly couples (66%) and elderly singles (69%) are likely to belong to an organization. Non-elderly singles are unlikely to join, at 22%.

Membership in organizations is also related to income, running only 29% for those earning under \$25,000, to 33% of those earning \$25,000-\$49,999, to 45% of those earning \$50,000-\$99,999, to 51% of those earning \$100,000 and over.

Membership is higher in East Shore (48%) than it is in West Shore (26%). Membership increases with increasing length of residence, from 28% of those in Greater Harrisburg for 0-4 years to 34% of those in residence for 5-9 years, to 44% of those in the area for 10-19 years, to 49% for those in residence for 20 or more years.

Table 7-8 also examines the relationship between organizational membership and Jewish identification. Membership is relatively high for those identifying as Orthodox (67%) and Conservative (62%) and much lower for the Reform (40%) and the Just Jewish (16%). Only 18% of households containing an intermarriage belong to an organization, versus 64% of households in which everyone is Jewish. In conversionary households, 32% belong to an organization.

Table 7-8 shows that JCC members (81 %) and members of synagogues (67 %) are more likely to join than are non-JCC members (25 %) and non-members of synagogues (17 %). These findings are consistent with the idea that ``joiners are joiners.'' It is also interesting to note that some JCC members responded in the negative to this question, perhaps because they do not think of the JCC as an ``organization.''

A significant difference in membership is related to whether someone in the household has been to Israel: 72 % of households in which someone has been to Israel on a Jewish trip belong to an organization, as do 55 % of those who have been to Israel on a general trip, versus only 29 % of households in which no one has been to Israel.

Table 7-8 Current Memberships							
Variable	Synagogue	Organi- zation	JCC Member	JCC Participant	Associated	Sample Size	Projected # of Households
All Respondents	49.3 %	42.0 %	30.5 %	40.7 %	59.3 %	457	3,200
Age of Respondent							
Under 35	30.6 %	28.0 %	20.4 %	32.2 %	44.8 %	90	781
35-49	45.2 %	38.6 %	24.6 %	35.2 %	54.9 %	143	1168
50-64	60.0 %	41.2 %	29.5 %	38.9 %	65.4 %	75	592
65-74	71.3 %	62.4 %	54.3 %	62.1 %	78.3 %	72	352
75 and over	66.5 %	68.0 %	52.9 %	62.5 %	79.0 %	77	304
Generation							
First	43.9 %	41.6 %	45.8 %	55.6 %	67.7 %	30*	214
Second	71.3 %	61.7 %	46.8 %	55.6 %	80.1 %	120	614
Third or higher	43.8 %	36.6 %	24.5 %	35.3 %	52.9 %	303	2371
Household Structure							
Hhlds with Kids	43.3 %	38.5 %	31.7 %	41.6 %	56.3 %	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	50.6 %	41.8 %	24.9 %	37.9 %	59.8 %	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	32.0 %	21.7 %	5.6 %	14.5 %	38.6 %	39	336
Elderly Couple	71.7 %	66.0 %	54.7 %	63.0 %	76.6 %	71	307
Elderly Single	67.4 %	68.9 %	54.4 %	64.0 %	83.0 %	66	307
Income							
Under \$25,000	33.3 %	29.1 %	19.4 %	32.0 %	46.6 %	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	37.7 %	32.6 %	21.0 %	32.9 %	43.3 %	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	52.8 %	45.4 %	34.0 %	43.7 %	63.2 %	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	65.5 %	50.9 %	37.8 %	52.4 %	73.6 %	57	602
Geographic Area							
East Shore	56.0 %	48.3 %	38.6 %	49.2 %	66.8 %	345	2300
West Shore	32.3 %	26.2 %	9.8 %	19.3 %	40.1 %	112	900

Table 7-8 Current Memberships							
Variable	Synagogue	Organi- zation	JCC Member	JCC Participant	Associated	Sample Size	Projected # of Households
All Respondents	49.3 %	42.0 %	30.5 %	40.7 %	59.3 %	457	3,200
Length of Residence							
0 - 4 years	27.4 %	27.7 %	19.1 %	35.1 %	41.4 %	80	662
5 - 9 years	42.6 %	34.2 %	27.5 %	37.1 %	58.7 %	46	349
10 - 19 years	48.4 %	44.0 %	24.9 %	33.2 %	59.6 %	79	602
20 or more years	60.2 %	48.8 %	38.0 %	46.7 %	66.7 %	252	1590
Current Jewish Identification							
Orthodox	80.3 %	66.7 %	69.3 %	76.1 %	92.2 %	58	304
Conservative	78.4 %	61.8 %	42.3 %	57.8 %	83.6 %	180	1043
Reform	46.0 %	40.0 %	27.9 %	34.0 %	56.9 %	93	704
Just Jewish	11.3 %	15.9 %	11.0 %	19.7 %	24.3 %	126	1027
Type of Marriage							
In-married	73.5 %	64.1 %	50.2 %	61.0 %	82.5 %	182	1176
Conversionary	53.8 %	32.2 %	24.5 %	37.8 %	65.2 %	29*	239
Intermarried	18.3 %	17.6 %	10.5 %	19.0 %	31.3 %	83	698
Current Member of a Synagogue							
Synagogue Members		67.2 %	52.6 %	65.4 %	100.0 %	269	1574
Non Members		17.1 %	9.0 %	16.9 %	19.8 %	188	1625
Current Member of the JCC							
JCC Member	85.6 %	80.5 %		100.0 % ²	100.0 %	172	976
Non-Member	33.5 %	25.0 %		14.8 %	41.4 %	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization							
Member	79.5 %		58.8 %	69.5 %	100.0 %	221	1344
Non-Member	28.2 %		10.4 %	20.6 %	30.8 %	231	1856
Any Adult in Household Been to Israel							
No	34.8 %	28.5 %	14.6 %	25.2 %	44.9 %	269	1955
On General Trip	64.7 %	55.2 %	41.7 %	54.5 %	75.3 %	95	666
On Jewish Trip	80.4 %	72.2 %	71.0 %	77.3 %	89.5 %	90	582

²Assumed to be 100%. JCC members were not asked if they had participated in activities at the JCC.

Table 7-9 Organizational Membership Comparison with Other Communities		
Community	Year	% Belong
New York	1990	26%
Los Angeles	1979	27%
Columbus	1991	27%
Boston	1985	28%
Orlando	1993	30%
Philadelphia	1984	31%
New York	1981	33%
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	36%
Chicago	1981	37%
West Palm Beach	1987	38%
Miami	1994	38%
SF Bay Area	1988	38%
Harrisburg	1994	42%
South Broward	1990	44%
Dallas	1989	46%
Essex-Morris Counties, NJ	1986	47%
Detroit	1990	47%
Rhode Island	1987	47%
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	51%
Cleveland	1987	53%
Pittsburgh	1984	55%
Atlanta	1985	57%
Miami	1982	61%
Rochester	1980	82%
NJPS (US)	1990	27%
NJPS (PA)	1990	23%

Jewish Community Center Membership

Table 7-8 shows that 31 % of households indicate current JCC membership. **Table 7-10** shows that this membership rate is one of the highest found in any demographic study, surpassed only by Tidewater (35%) and Manchester (35%). It is much higher than New York (15%), Orlando (17%), and Pittsburgh (27%). It is well above the national figure of 17%.

JCC membership is lowest among younger respondents, at 20% for those under age 35 and peaks for the elderly at more than 50%. About 46% of the first and second-generation belong, versus 25% of the third generation. About 32% of households with children are JCC members, versus 55% for elderly couples and elderly singles and only 6% for non-elderly singles (**Table 7-8**).

JCC membership can also be seen to be higher for those earning \$50,000 and over, at more than one third, but runs only about 20% for those earning under \$50,000.

Membership is lower in West Shore, at 10%, than in East Shore at 39%. Membership runs about 19% for those in residence for under 5 years. It increases to about one in four of those in residence for 5-19 years, and is 38% for those in residence for more than 20 years.

Table 7-8 also examines the relationship between JCC membership and Jewish identification. Orthodox Jews (69%) are much more likely to join the JCC, than are the Conservative (42%) and Reform Jews (28%), and the Just Jewish households (11%). Intermarriage is related to JCC membership. Only 11% of households containing an intermarriage belong, versus 50% of households in which both spouses were born Jewish and 25% of conversionary households.

Table 7-8 also shows that synagogue members (53%) and members of Jewish organizations (59%) are more likely to join the JCC than are synagogue non-members (9%) and non-members of Jewish organizations (10%).

A significant difference in membership is related to whether someone in the household has been to Israel: 71% of households in which someone has been to Israel on a Jewish trip belong to the JCC as do 42% of those who have been to Israel on a general trip, versus 15% of households in which no one has been to Israel.

Information obtained from the JCC indicates that there are currently (1994) 946 members of the JCC, compared to 935 in 1993, and 956 in 1992. In addition, 38 non-Jewish households belong to the JCC.

The largest numbers of members come from zips 17110 (556) and 17112 (154). 541 member units are families, 5 are single parent families, 281 are elderly, and 119 are single.

194 children attend day camp, 84 attend day care, and 34 attend preschool/nursery school.

Table 7-10 JCC Membership Comparison with Other Communities		
Community	Year	% Belong
Miami	1982	7 %
Miami	1994	8 %
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	11 %
New York	1981	12 %
South Broward	1990	12 %
Dallas	1989	13 %
West Palm Beach	1987	13 %
New York	1991	15 %
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	16 %
Orlando	1993	17 %
Essex-Morris Counties, NJ	1986	17 %
Minneapolis	1981	23 %
Columbus	1990	25 %
Pittsburgh	1984	27 %
St. Louis	1982	30 %
Harrisburg	1994	31 %
Rochester	1980	31 %
Tidewater	1988	35 %
Manchester	1983	35 %
NJPS (US)	1990	17 %

The overlap among memberships is also examined in **Table 7-11**. 26% of the community belongs to both the JCC and a synagogue. 23% belong only to a synagogue and 5% belong only to the JCC. The problem, of course, is that 46% belong to neither organization. Recall as well that 86% of JCC members belong to a synagogue. Thus, the organizations should be viewed as complementary, rather than competing. Comparing the results with Florida communities shows that Harrisburg has the highest percentage who belong to both (26%) and is tied at 23% for the lowest percentage who belong only to a synagogue.

Table 7-11 Overlapping Memberships Comparison with Other Communities (Sample Size = 457, Projected Number of Households = 3,200)					
Community	Year	Belong to the JCC and a Synagogue	Belong to only Synagogue	Belong to only JCC	Belong to neither
Miami	1994	5.6%	30.9	2.4	61.0
Orlando	1993	11.1%	22.8	6.1	60.0
Miami	1982	4.0%	33.7	2.7	59.7
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	8.5%	31.6	2.6	57.3
West Palm Beach	1987	10.9%	30.0	2.5	56.5
South Broward	1990	8.2%	30.6	5.7	55.6
Sarasota	1992	11.6%	31.8	5.1	51.5
Harrisburg	1994	25.8%	23.4	4.6	46.2

Major Reason for Not Joining the JCC

Respondents who are not currently members of the JCC were asked the major reason they do not belong. In interpreting the results keep in mind that the question was asked as follows: ``What is the major reason you have not joined the Jewish Community Center? Would you say it is distance from your home, cost, quality of the facility, you have no need for the services offered, operating hours, or some other reason?''

``No need for services offered'' was the most popular reason, at 36%. Distance from home was mentioned by 20% and cost by 18%. No time (an answer not read to the respondent), by 7% (**Table 7-12**). ``Quality of the facility,'' although it was one of the reasons suggested to the respondent, was selected by only 1.7%.

``No need'' was a more important reason in West Shore (41%), than in East Shore (34%). As expected by the location of the JCC in East Shore, only 13% in that region indicated that distance was an issue, versus 31% in West Shore. Cost (25%) was much more important in East Shore (25%) than in West Shore (7%), perhaps reflecting the income differential.

Compared to Miami (49%) and St. Petersburg (47%), which are elderly communities, those in Harrisburg (37%) are less likely to respond ``no need.' Distance is cited more often, as is cost (**Table 7-13**).

Table 7-12 Major Reason for Not Joining the JCC (Sample Size = 285, Projected # of Households = 224)			
Reason	East Shore	West Shore	All
No need	33.8%	40.9%	36.4%
Distance from home	13.3	31.0	19.8
Cost	24.6	7.1	18.1
No time	8.7	4.7	7.2
Just moved here	2.1	4.2	2.9
Quality of the facility	2.7	.0	1.7
Sick/Disabled	1.6	1.1	1.4
Lack of information	2.0	.0	1.2
Other	11.2	11.0	11.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 7-13 Major Reason for Not Joining the JCC Comparison with Other Communities			
Reason	Miami	St. Petersburg/Clearwater	Harrisburg
No need	49%	47%	37%
Distance from home	11	16	20
Cost	14	9	18
No time	7	11	7
Just moved here	0	0	3
Quality of the facility	3	4	2
Sick/Disabled	4	1	1
Lack of information	2	0	1
Other	10	11	11
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

For the approximately 50 respondents who indicated that distance to the JCC is the major reasons they do not belong, the following table shows the cities (or areas) in which they reside:

City	Zip	Percentage
Carlisle	17013	15.8%
Mechanicsburg	17055	14.1
Camp Hill	17011	12.3
Harrisburg	17101 and 17102	8.0
Hummelstown	17036	7.9
Enola	17025	5.9
Duncannon	17020	3.9
Linglestown	17112	4.0
Boiling Springs	17007	3.9
Elizabethtown	17022	3.1
Colonial Park	17109	2.7
Etters	17319	2.0
Hershey	17033	1.9
Palymra	17078	7.0
New Cumberland	17070	2.0
Lawnton	17111	2.0
Lewisberry	17339	2.0
	17570	1.4
		100.0%

Activities the JCC Could Offer that Would Make You Consider Joining

Respondents who are not currently members of the JCC were asked to name up to three activities the JCC could offer that would make them consider joining. Respondents who are currently JCC members were asked to name three activities they would like to see in the new expanded facility. This was asked as an open ended question, that is, no answers were suggested to the respondent (Table 7-14).

Among current JCC members, 29% could not provide an answer and 3% indicated that although they are members, they had no ideas for activities that could be added that would interest them. The most popular responses were preschool programs (12%), teenage programs (10%), a health club (7%), and elderly programs (7%)

Among non-members, 40% could not provide an answer and 22% indicated there were no activities that would make them consider joining. Thus, fully two-thirds of non-members could not name activities that could be added that would interest them. The most popular response was adult education (5%). A large number of different answers achieved small percentages, indicating that no single program would act to increase the membership significantly.

Table 7-14 Activities the JCC Could Offer That Would Make You Consider Joining		
Reason	Current JCC Members	Non-JCC Members
Don't know	29.4	40.4
Nothing, not interested	2.7	22.1
Preschool programs	11.6	2.8
Adult Education	4.7	4.8
Health Club	7.3	3.3
Teenage programs	9.9	1.7
Elderly programs	6.8	2.0
Social Programs	3.0	3.6
Swimming pool	5.3	2.4
Cultural Programs	4.6	2.4
Gymnasium	2.0	2.8
Singles Programs	1.3	1.4
Arts/Dance	1.0	1.4
Summer Day Camp	1.2	1.3
Seminars/workshops	.3	1.6
Music programs	1.1	1.0
Other	7.8	5.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	172	285
Projected Number of Households	976	2225

Jewish Community Center Participation

Table 7-15 shows that 41 % of households indicate that someone in their household participated in some kind of JCC program during the past year. Also, about 10% more participate than join. The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey shows that about 10% of Jews participated in the JCC activity in the past year. **Table 7-15** shows that Greater Harrisburg Jews are much more likely to participate in the JCC than is the case nationally, or in the Florida communities.

Table 7-15 JCC Participation Comparison with Other Communities		
Community	Year	% Participate
West Palm Beach	1987	16%
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	19%
South Broward	1990	22%
Miami	1994	24%
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	27%
New York	1990	29%
Orlando	1993	36%
Harrisburg	1990	41%
NJPS (US)	1990	10%

Table 7-8 shows that participation is much higher for the elderly (about 62 %) than for the non-elderly (about 32 %-39 %). The first (56 %) and second (56 %) generations are much more likely to participate than is the third (35 %). 64 % of elderly singles and couples participate, but only 42 % of households with children do so. Non-elderly singles (15 %) are least likely to participate.

Participation rates are much higher for those earning over \$100,000 (52 %). For those earning under \$50,000, about one-third participate. 44 % of those earning \$50,000-\$99,999 participate. Participation is higher in East Shore (49 %) than in West Shore (19 %).

Participation is lower for those in residence for less than 20 years, at about one in three, versus almost half (47 %) of those in residence for 20 or more years.

Table 7-8 also examines the relationship between participation and Jewish identification. For Orthodox Jews, 69% are members, but 76% participate, For Conservative Jews, 42% are members, but 58% participate. For Reform Jews, 28% belong and 34% participate. About 19% of those who identify themselves as ``Just Jewish'' participate.

Intermarriage is related to participation. Only 19% of households containing an intermarriage participate, versus 61% of households in which everyone is Jewish.

Table 7-8 also shows that members of synagogues (65%) are more likely to participate in JCC activities than are non-members of synagogues (17%). Members of a Jewish organization are also more likely to participate than are non-members, by 70% to 21%. Notice that about 15% of non-JCC members indicate that they participate.

A significant difference in participation is related to whether someone in the household has been to Israel: 77% of households in which someone has been to Israel on a Jewish trip participate, as do 55% of those who have been to Israel on a general trip, versus 25% of households in which no one has been to Israel.

Association with the Jewish Community

While synagogue membership, JCC membership, and organizational membership often imply differing levels of involvement in the Jewish community, it is instructive to examine ``overall association.'' Someone is defined as associated with the Jewish community (for the purpose of this analysis) if they belong to a synagogue and/or the JCC and/or a Jewish organization. **Table 7-8** shows that 59% of households are associated, by this definition, compared with 53% in South Broward and Miami, 46% in Orlando, and 62% in Sarasota-Manatee, the only other communities to develop this measure (**Table 7-16**).

Association is highest for those age 65 and over, at about 79%. Only 45% of those under age 35 are associated, versus about 55% of those age 35-49, and 65% of those age 50-64. Lower levels of association are seen for the third generation, at 53%, versus about 80% for the second generation, and 68% for the first.

About 56% of households with children and 77% of elderly couples are associated. Only 39% of non-elderly singles are associated. Association is much higher for those earning over \$100,000 (74%) than those earning under \$50,000 (45%). Association is higher in East Shore (67%) than is the case in West Shore (40%). **Table 7-8** also shows a relationship with length of residence, increasing from only 41% of those in residence for less than five years to about 67% of those in residence for 20 or more years.

About 92% of Orthodox Jews are associated, as are 84% of Conservative Jews and 57% of Reform Jews, versus only 24% of the Just Jewish households. Inter-marriage is related to association. Only 31% of households containing an inter-marriage are associated, versus 83% of in-married households and 65% of conversionary households.

A significant difference in participation is related to whether someone in the household has been to Israel: 90% of households in which someone has been to Israel on a Jewish trip associate as do 75% of those who have been to Israel on a general trip, versus 45% of households in which no one has been to Israel.

Table 7-16 Associated with the Jewish Community		
Community	Year	% Participate
St Paul	1992	0.68
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	62 %
Harrisburg	1994	59%
South Broward	1990	53 %
Miami	1994	53 %
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	49 %
Orlando	1993	46 %

Overall Involvement in Jewish Activity

For summarization purposes, **Table 7-17** repeats the information on overlap between synagogue and JCC membership in the top section. It then repeats information from **Table 7-8** on memberships. That 86% always or usually do some Jewish rituals, a result from the previous chapter, is also shown as the 68% figure for giving to Jewish charities shown in the final chapter of this report.

The bottom of **Table 7-17** shows that 91% either practice some ritual or give to a Jewish charity. 88% either practice a ritual or associate (are a member of something). 74% either associate or donate. Most importantly, 91% of Jewish households in Greater Harrisburg are doing something Jewish: they belong to something and/or give to Jewish charities and/or always or usually perform some Jewish ritual.

Table 7-17 Memberships, Philanthropy and Ritual Practice (Sample Size = 457, Projected Number of Households = 3,200)	
Activity	Percentage
Belong to the JCC and a Synagogue	25.8%
Belong to only Synagogue	23.4%
Belong to only JCC	4.6%
Belong to neither	46.2%
Total	100.0%
Synagogue Membership	49.2%
Organizational Membership	42.0%
JCC Member	30.5%
JCC Participant	40.7%
Associate (synagogue, JCC, or organization member)	59.3%
Practice (Always or Usually attend Passover, light Chanukah candles, light Sabbath candles or keep kosher)	86.0%
Give to a Jewish Charity	67.8%
Practice or Give	90.9%
Practice or Associate	88.1%
Associate or Give	73.6%
Associate, Practice, or Give	91.3%

Chapter 8

Jewish Education

Chapter Table of Contents

Chapter Highlights	218
Formal Jewish Education of Adults	219
Type of Formal Jewish Education of Adults	222
Children in Preschool	224
Type of Education of Children	226
Formal Jewish Education of Children	227
The Yeshiva Academy	230
Quality of Hebrew School Education	232

Chapter Highlights

- About 85 % (92 % of men; 78 % of women) of all Jewish adults over age 18 have received some formal Jewish education as a child. Women of all ages are less likely to have received any Jewish education.
- Overall, of Jewish adults with a Jewish education, 19% went to a Jewish day school, 78% to a synagogue school, and about 4% went to a tutor.
- Having had a day school education is more likely to be the case for *younger* adults.
- The survey indicates that about 26% of Jewish children ages 0-5 are currently enrolled in Jewish preschool. Only about 44% of Jewish children in a preschool are in a Jewish preschool. An actual count of children in Jewish preschools suggests that about 22% of Jewish children age 0-5 are in a Jewish preschool.
- About 66% of children ages 6-12 and 22% of children age 13-17 are currently enrolled in a Jewish educational program.
- 75% of children are in public school, 4% in non-Jewish private school, and 21% are in the Yeshiva Academy. Thus, the Yeshiva Academy is getting about 83% of the private school market.
- 80% of Jewish children will eventually receive some Jewish education.
- Overall, 75% of Jewish children have attended (or are attending) Jewish education. Another 5% have not yet been sent, but will definitely or probably be sent in the future. For 20% of the children, the parents have not yet sent the child and will probably not or definitely not send the child.
- About 23% of the households with children currently have a child in The Yeshiva Academy. 10% of households with children have never heard of the Yeshiva Academy, 51% have heard of the Yeshiva Academy, but did not seriously consider sending their child(ren). 15% have heard of the Yeshiva Academy and seriously considered sending their child but chose not to do so. The results imply that about 60% of those who seriously consider the Yeshiva Academy send their children.
- The most important reasons people do not send their children to the Yeshiva Academy were belief in the public school system (26%), the school is too religious (16%), and distance (10%).

Note that unlike other chapters, which present results for all individuals in Jewish households, be they Jewish or not, this chapter is based only upon those persons who are currently Jewish.

Formal Jewish Education of Adults

About 85% of all Jewish adults (92% of men; 78% of women) over age 18 have received some formal Jewish education as a child (**Table 8-1**). **Table 8-3** shows that Greater Harrisburg has one of the highest rates among the comparison Jewish communities, and it is much higher than the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (67%).

Women of all ages are much less likely to have received some Jewish education than men (**Table 8-1**). At least 87% of each male age group has received some Jewish education. An increasing proportion of women are receiving some Jewish education. Only 64% of those age 75 and over received some Jewish education, versus about three-fourths of those age 35-74 and 88% of those under age 35.

Overall, there appears to be an increase in the proportion of adults receiving some Jewish education, mostly due to females. This is in keeping with findings of the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey.

Table 8-1 % of Adults with a Formal Jewish Education by Age and Sex (Born Jews Only)						
	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75 +	All
All Adults	90.4%	85.3%	86.4%	81.5%	75.8%	85.4%
Males	93.1%	91.4%	94.0%	87.1%	92.2%	91.9%
Females	88.1%	77.6%	75.6%	76.6%	63.5%	78.4%
Sample Size (Males)	61	120	66	49	43	339
Sample Size (Females)	74	101	54	61	64	354
Sample Size	135	221	120	110	107	693
Proj. # Males	537	996	558	272	183	2547
Proj. # Females	612	788	393	313	245	2353
Proj # Adults	1149	1784	951	585	428	4900

Table 8-2 shows that levels of Jewish education do not vary between West Shore (84 %) and East Shore (86 %).

Table 8-2 % of Adults with a Formal Jewish Education by Geographic Area (Born Jews Only)		
	East Shore	West Shore
Had Jewish education	85.9%	84.1%
No Jewish education	14.1	15.9
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	540	153
Proj. # of Adults	3655	1245

Table 8-3 % of Jewish Adults with a Formal Jewish Education Comparison with Other Communities		
Community	Year	%
Orlando	1993	65 %
Miami	1982	66 %
West Palm Beach	1987	67 %
South Broward	1990	67 %
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	70 %
Philadelphia	1984	74 %
Miami	1994	75 %
New York	1990	75 %
Manchester	1983	75 %
Baltimore	1985	78 %
Columbus	1990	80 %
Rhode Island	1987	82 %
Boston	1985	82 %
Louisville	1991	83 %
Harrisburg	1990	85 %
Dallas	1990	87 %
NJPS (US Jewish Adults)	1990	67 %
NJPS (PA)	1990	

Type of Formal Jewish Education of Adults

For all Jewish adults, 15% had no Jewish education, 16% went to day school, 66% went to Hebrew School, and 3% had a tutor.

Overall, **of Jewish adults *with* a Jewish education**, 19% went to day school, 78% to Hebrew School, and 4% went to a tutor (**Table 8-4**).

By age for males (for those with a Jewish education), about 13% of the elderly had a day school education. This increases to about one in five of the non-elderly. A similar pattern is found for females. Of those with a Jewish education, 28% of females under age 35 went to day school.

Overall, there is very little difference in the percentage of males and females receiving a day school education.

There is no difference in the percentage receiving a day school education between East Shore and West Shore.

Table 8-4 Type of Jewish Education of Adults who Had a Jewish Education						
Variable	Day School	Hebrew School	Tutor	Total	Sample Size	Projected # of Adults
All Adults	18.6%	77.9	3.6	100.0%	590	4185
Male Jewish Adults						
Under 35	21.5%	77.1	1.4	100.0%	59	500
35-49	20.2%	79.0	.8	100.0%	107	910
50-64	21.4%	78.6	.0	100.0%	62	525
65-74	13.8%	84.5	1.7	100.0%	43	237
75 and over	12.4%	76.0	11.6	100.0%	40	169
Female Jewish Adults						
Under 35	27.7%	67.1	4.0	100.0%	68	539
35-49	13.5%	79.9	6.6	100.0%	83	611
50-64	12.2%	83.3	4.5	100.0%	43	297
65-74	13.0%	80.7	6.3	100.0%	48	240
75 and over	6.2%	80.4	13.4	100.0%	40	156
Sex						
Male	19.5%	78.8	1.6	100.0%	273	2340
Female	16.8%	76.8	6.0	100.0%	282	1845
Area						
East Shore	18.6%	77.9	3.3	100.0%	462	3140
West Shore	17.5%	78.2	4.4	100.0%	131	1047

Children in Preschool

A survey of the JCC, Yeshiva Academy, and Machzeike Hadas was used to estimate current enrollment in Jewish preschools. This figure has been divided by the number of Jewish children to produce an estimate of the percentage of children in preschool. (Synagogues do not run any preschools.)

Approximately 118 Jewish children attend the JCC preschool, 23 attend the Yeshiva Academy, and 10 attend Machzeike Hadas. This totals 151 children. Thus, about 22% of Jewish children ages 0-5 are currently enrolled in Jewish preschool.

According to the survey, 42% of preschool age children are not enrolled in preschool, 26% are enrolled in Jewish preschool (compared to the 22% mentioned above based on a survey of the preschools) and 33% in non-Jewish preschool. Thus, Jewish pre-schools are receiving about 44% of the market (**Table 8-5**). In the Coral Springs area of Fort Lauderdale and in Sarasota, a survey of households of children of preschool age found that about 50% of Jewish children were sent to Jewish preschool as was the case for 26% in Orlando and 80% in Miami (**Table 8-6**).

Table 8-5 Preschool Education <i>(Born Jewish Children Only)</i>						
Variable	Enrolled in Jewish Preschool	Enrolled in Non-Jewish Preschool	Not enrolled in Preschool	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Children
All	25.8%	32.5	41.6	100.0%	87	685

Table 8-6 % of Children in Preschool who are in Jewish Preschool Comparison with Other Communities		
Community	Year	%
Orlando	1993	26%
Harrisburg	1994	44%
Miami	1994	80%
Coral Springs (Broward County, FL)	1991	50%
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	50%

Type of Education of Children

Table 8-7 shows that 75% of children are in public school, 4% in non-Jewish private school, and 21% are in the Yeshiva Academy. Thus, the Yeshiva Academy is getting about 83% of the private school market. The percentage of 13-17 year olds in Yeshiva Academy is lower than the percentage of 6-12 year olds because there is no program for 9th-12th grade at the Yeshiva Academy.

The 75% in public school compares to 71% in St Petersburg and to 65% in Miami. The 4% in non-Jewish private schools compares to 11% in Miami and 13% in St. Petersburg. The 21% in the Yeshiva Academy compares to 24% in day schools in Miami and 16% in St. Petersburg.

Table 8-7 Type of School for Jewish Children							
Variable	Public School	Non-Jewish Private School	Yeshiva Academy	Total	% of Private School Students in Yeshiva Academy	Sample Size	Projected # of Jewish Children
All Jewish Children	74.9%	4.4	20.7	1	82.5%	161	1188
Age of Child							
6-12	67.5%	5.3	27.2	100.0%	83.7%	101	758
13-17	87.7%	3.1	9.2	100.0%	NA	60	430
Sex							
Male	75.1%	2.3	22.6	100.0%	92.0%	89	666
Female	74.6%	7.1	18.3	100.0%	70.0%	72	522

Formal Jewish Education of Children

A total of 758 Jewish children ages 6-12 reside in Greater Harrisburg. According to the synagogue survey, 292 children (**Table 7-5**) of this age are in synagogue schools, implying that only 38.5% of children are currently being provided a Jewish education in a synagogue school. Another 189 Jewish children age 6-12 are in the Yeshiva Academy and 22 are in the school at Machzeike Hadas, meaning that 27.8% of children are being provided a day school education. In all, 66.3% of children age 6-12 are receiving some form of Jewish education. Of the 430 Jewish children ages 13-17, 70 are enrolled in synagogue schools and 25 in day school. Another 40 children are in the Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies who are not also enrolled in a synagogue school. Thus, only 31.4% are currently enrolled (**Table 8-10**).

42% of 6-12 year olds currently receiving a Jewish education are enrolled in a day school.

Table 8-10 shows a comparison with other communities on the percentage of Jewish children enrolled in a Jewish school. Particularly compared to the other studies that have collected the data in the same manner (see the footnote to the table), Harrisburg has a particularly high percentage attending in the 6-12 year old category. The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey suggests that about 50% of children with at least one Jewish parent are currently enrolled in Jewish education.

Note, however, that about 80% of children will eventually receive some Jewish education (**Table 8-8**). Thus, high proportions of Jewish children will receive some Jewish education at some point in their childhood. The percentage of children who will receive some Jewish education is, however, lower than 3 of the 4 Florida communities in **Table 8-9**.

Little difference may be seen in the propensity to give a child a Jewish education between those age 6-12 and those age 13-17 and between males and females.

Table 8-8 Formal Jewish Education of Jewish Children						
Variable	Has enrolled child in Jewish Education	Not yet enrolled, but will definitely or probably enroll child	Not yet enrolled and will probably not or definitely not enroll child	Total	Sample Size	Projected # of Children
All Jewish Children	75.1 %	5.4	19.5	100.0 %	161	1188
Age of Child						
6-12	71.9 %	8.8	19.3	100.0 %	101	758
13-17	80.6 %	0	20.9	100.0 %	60	430
Sex						
Male	73.5 %	6.8	19.7	100.0 %	89	666
Female	77.0 %	3.6	19.3	100.0 %	72	522

Table 8-9 Formal Jewish Education of Jewish Children Ages 6-17 Comparison with Other Communities				
Community	Year	Has enrolled child in Jewish Education	Not yet enrolled, but will definitely or probably enroll child	Not yet enrolled and will probably not or definitely not enroll child
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	82 %	6	13
Miami	1994	80 %	9	12
Harrisburg	1994	75 %	5	20
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	71 %	4	25
Orlando	1993	65 %	21	13

Table 8-10
Children Currently Enrolled in Jewish Education
Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	6-12 Year Olds	13-17 Year Olds
Worcester	1987	95 %	51 %
SF Bay Area	1988	90 %	42 %
Rochester	1988	85 %	42 %
Cleveland	1987	83 %	49 %
Pittsburgh	1984	83 %	47 %
Baltimore	1985	79 %	37 %
Dallas	1989	76 %	43 %
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	76 %	28 %
Louisville	1994	70 %	40 %
Harrisburg*	1994	66 %	31 %
Atlantic City	1985	59 %	19 %
Washington, DC	1983	57 %	15 %
South Broward	1990	55 %	23 %
Miami*	1994	51 %	24 %
Orlando*	1993	47 %	9 %
St Petersburg*	1994	40 %	23 %
Quad Cities	1989	64 %	
New York	1990	56 %	
Philadelphia	1984	48 %	
Sarasota-Manatee*	1992	26 %	
West Palm Beach*	1987	25 %	
NJPS	1990	50 %	

* Data are based upon actual enrollments in Jewish schools (obtained from a survey of the schools) divided by the estimated number of Jewish children in each community. Other communities have based their estimates on telephone survey data, asking respondents if each child is enrolled in religious school. This is a partial explanation of the lower values in these two communities.

The Yeshiva Academy

About 23 % of households with children currently have a child in the Yeshiva Academy (**Table 8-11**). Only 10 % of households with children have never heard of the Yeshiva Academy, 51 % have heard of the Yeshiva Academy, but did not seriously consider sending their child(ren). 15 % have heard of the Yeshiva Academy, and seriously considered sending their child and chose not to do so.

The results imply that about 60 % of those who seriously consider the Yeshiva Academy send their children.

Table 8-11 Market Segments for Yeshiva Academy (Sample Size = 80, Projected Number of Households = 1258)	
Category	Percentage
Never Heard of Yeshiva Academy	10.4%
Have Children in Yeshiva Academy now	23.3
Heard of Yeshiva Academy, but did not seriously consider sending child	51.1
Heard of Yeshiva Academy, seriously considered sending child, but did not send child	15.2
Total	100.0%

76% of students come from zip 17110, 8% from 17112, 4% from 17109, and 3% from 17111. In 1994, the school had 214 student compared to 200 in 1992 and 150 in 1985. 35 students left the school without graduating in 1993-94 and 34 new students were enrolled. Tuition is \$4,000, with no multiple child discounts. There are no children from intermarried couples in the school

The school started on North 3rd Street in 1944 and has been at its current location (100 Vaughn Street) since 1956.

Table 8-12 shows the reasons people who seriously considered sending their children did not do so. Respondents were not provided with answers from which to select. Rather, this was an open-ended question. Respondents could provide as many answers as they desired.

The most important reasons in Harrisburg for not sending a child to the Yeshiva Academy were belief in the public school system (26%), the school is too religious (16%), and distance (10%).

The most important reasons in St. Petersburg were belief in the public school system (25%), cost (24%), and distance (19%).

Table 8-12 Reasons for Not Sending Child to the Yeshiva Academy Households Who Have Heard of the Yeshiva Academy (Sample Size = 69, Projected Number of Households = 1,132)	
Reason	Percentage
Believe in Public School	25.8%
School is too Religious	15.7%
Don't Know	12.3%
Distance	10.0%
Cost	7.9%
Quality of the Education	6.4%
Size of the Student Body	0.0%
Extracurricular Activities	0.0%
Length of School Day	0.0%
Quality of the Physical Plant	0.0%

Quality of Hebrew School Education

Respondents with Jewish children at home who have sent the children to a Hebrew School (but not a day school) were asked to rate the quality of their children's Hebrew School education. 32.9% indicated it is (was) excellent, 52.0% good, 8.6% fair, and 6.6% poor. In some cases (for example, with a new resident of the area), the response may not reflect local Hebrew schools.

The sample size for this question was only 41.

Chapter 9

Services for the Jewish Community

Chapter Table of Contents

Chapter Highlights	233
Familiarity with Jewish Agencies	235
Familiarity with the Jewish Home	238
Familiarity with the Yeshiva Academy	241
Familiarity with the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg	244
Familiarity with the Jewish Family Service	247
Familiarity with the B'nai B'rith Housing	250
Familiarity with the Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies	253
Quality of Services Provided by Jewish Agencies	256
Preference for Jewish-Sponsored Services for Family Problems	260
College Attended of those Under Age 30	264

The United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg (UJC) is the local Jewish Federation.

Chapter Highlights

- 47% of respondents indicated that they are very familiar, 31% are somewhat familiar, and 22% are not at all familiar with the Jewish Home.
- 37% of respondents indicated that they are very familiar, 37% are somewhat familiar, and 26% are not at all familiar with the Yeshiva Academy.
- 36% of respondents indicated that they are very familiar, 40% are somewhat familiar, and 24% are not at all familiar with the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg. Only 5% of synagogue members are not at all familiar, compared to 42% of non-members.

Chapter Highlights

- 26% of respondents indicated that they are very familiar, 37% are somewhat familiar, and 38% are not at all familiar with Jewish Family Service.
- 19% of respondents indicated that they are very familiar, 37% are somewhat familiar, and 44% are not at all familiar with the B'nai B'rith Housing.
- 14% of respondents indicated that they are very familiar, 22% are somewhat familiar, and 64% are not at all familiar with Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies.
- Only 5% of synagogue members are not at all familiar with the United Jewish Community versus 42% of non-members.
- 64% of those earning under \$25,000 are not at all familiar with B'nai B'rith Housing.
- The United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg, the Jewish Home, and Jewish Family Service are relatively more known in Greater Harrisburg than is true in most of the comparison Jewish communities.
- Overall, the Jewish Home has, by far, the highest excellent rating (66%). 39% believe the Yeshiva Academy is excellent. About one third gave an excellent rating to JFS and to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg. Only 28% thought that B'nai B'rith Housing is excellent and 20% rated the Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies as excellent. If the responses poor and fair are defined as negative responses, then 17% gave negative replies concerning the High School, 15% to B'nai B'rith Housing, 11% to the United Jewish Community, 10% to the Yeshiva Academy, and 2% to the Jewish Home.
- About 18% of households would very much prefer, 21% would somewhat prefer, 49% would have no preference, and 12% would rather not use a Jewish-sponsored counseling services. The percentage who would very much prefer is relatively low compared to other Jewish communities.
- 17% of students go to Pennsylvania State University, 19% go to a local college, 40% go elsewhere in Pennsylvania, 21% go to other northeastern schools, and 20% go to college outside the northeast. In total, 81% of students leave the local area to go to college.

Familiarity with Jewish Agencies

Respondents were asked if they are very familiar, somewhat familiar, or not at all familiar with each of the six agencies/programs listed in **Table 9-1**. The Jewish Home has the highest profile, with 47% indicating they are very familiar with the agency. More than one in three respondents were very familiar with the Yeshiva Academy and with the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg (UJC). About one in four say they are very familiar with Jewish Family Service (JFS), but only one in five are very familiar with B'nai B'rith Housing, despite a controversy about a rent increase at the facility that was featured in the secular press a few weeks before the survey. Also contributing to the relatively low level of familiarity is the fact that very few of the residents in B'nai B'rith Housing are in fact Jewish. Finally, only 14% are very familiar with the Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies.

About one in four respondents indicated that they are not at all familiar the Jewish Home, the Yeshiva Academy, and the UJC. 38% are not at all familiar with JFS and 44% with B'nai B'rith Housing. Almost two-thirds are not at all familiar with the Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies.

Table 9-1 Familiarity with Jewish Agencies (Sample Size = 457, Number of Households = 3200)				
Agency	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Total
Jewish Home	47.2%	30.6	22.2	100.0%
Yeshiva Academy	36.8%	37.4	25.7	100.0%
United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg	36.2%	39.9	23.8	100.0%
Jewish Family Service	25.7%	36.7	37.6	100.0%
B'nai B'rith Housing	19.1%	36.5	44.4	100.0%
Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies	14.3%	21.9	63.9	100.0%

Table 9-2 shows that the level of being very familiar with UJC (the local Federation) (36%) is higher than all of the Florida communities, Manchester, and Louisville, although it is lower than Dallas (42%). The level of being not at all familiar (24%) is much lower than St. Petersburg (50%) and Orlando (50%) and is about equal to Miami (25%) and Manchester (26%). It is considerably lower than all the other communities in the table.

Table 9-2 Familiarity with Federation (UJC) Comparison with Other Communities				
Community	Year	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at All Familiar
Dallas	1990	42%	46	12
Harrisburg	1994	36%	40	24
Louisville	1991	34%	42	24
Miami	1994	29%	46	25
Manchester	1983	74%		26
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	20%	46	35
South Broward	1990	21%	36	43
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	17%	33	50
Orlando	1993	15%	34	50
West Palm Beach	1987	12%	71	17

Table 9-3 shows that the level of being very familiar (47%) with the Jewish nursing home is much higher than in the three Florida communities and Louisville. The level of not at all familiar is much lower than the other communities.

Table 9-3 Familiarity with the Local Jewish Nursing Home Comparison with Other Communities				
Community	Year	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at All Familiar
Harrisburg	1994	47%	30	22
Louisville	1991	36%	49	15
Miami	1994	20%	35	45
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	18%	29	54
South Broward	1990	15%	36	49

Table 9-4 shows that the level of being very familiar (26%) with the Jewish Family Service is much higher than any of the other communities in the table except Louisville, and the level of being not at all familiar (38%) is lower than all of the other communities as well.

Table 9-4 Familiarity with the Jewish Family Service Comparison with Other Communities				
Community	Year	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at All Familiar
Louisville	1991	38%	44	17
Harrisburg	1994	26%	37	38
Miami	1994	19%	39	42
Orlando	1993	17%	42	41
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	15%	33	52
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	15%	36	48
South Broward	1990	12%	34	54

Familiarity with the Jewish Home

Table 9-5 shows that 47% of respondents indicated that they are very familiar, 31% are somewhat familiar, and 22% are not at all familiar with the Jewish Home.

Table 9-5 also shows that the level of very familiar increases significantly with age, from only 33% of those under age 35, to 40% of the 35-49 age group, to 56% of the 50-64 age group, to 62% of the 65-74 age group, and to 78% of those age 75 and over. Given the age of the clientele in the home, this is not surprising. Non-elderly singles (26%) are least likely to be very familiar with Jewish Home and elderly singles (77%) and elderly couples (60%) are most likely to be very familiar. The level of very familiar shows no consistent relationship with income, although it is higher for those earning \$50,000 and over.

The level of familiarity in East Shore (56%) is much higher than is the case in West Shore (26%). 43% in West Shore are not at all familiar. This is to some extent related to the fact that younger age groups live in the West Shore and that the Jewish Home is located in East Shore.

Familiarity increases with increasing lengths of residence, from 30% of new residents (0-4 years in Greater Harrisburg), to more than 40% of those in residence from 5-19 years, to 57% of those in residence for 20 or more years.

Orthodox (75%) and Conservative Jews (60%) are more likely to be very familiar than are Reform Jews (48%) or the Just Jewish (27%). Intermarried couples (35%) are much less likely to be very familiar than those who are in-married (59%) or involved in conversionary marriages (43%). 33% of those in intermarriages are not at all familiar with the Jewish Home.

Households in which someone has been to Israel on a Jewish trip (64%) are more likely to be very familiar with the Jewish Home than are households in which no one has been to Israel (41%) or someone has been on a general trip (50%).

72% of JCC members say they are very familiar with the Jewish Home; only 36% of non-members are very familiar.

Finally, members of Jewish organizations (65%) are more likely to be very familiar than are non-members (35%) and synagogue members (59%) are more likely to be very familiar than are non-members (36%).

Table 9-5 Familiarity with the Jewish Home						
Variable	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	47.2%	30.6	22.2	100.0%	457	3200
Age of Respondent						
Under 35	33.3%	32.9	33.8	100.0%	90	781
35-49	39.6%	37.5	22.8	100.0%	143	1168
50-64	55.7%	31.2	13.1	100.0%	75	592
65-74	62.2%	18.5	19.3	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	78.0%	11.0	11.0	100.0%	77	304
Household Structure						
Households with Children	42.6%	38.9	18.5	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	51.6%	27.0	21.4	100.0%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	25.5%	32.3	42.1	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	59.5%	20.5	20.0	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	76.6%	11.8	11.6	100.0%	66	307
Income						
Under \$25,000	42.2%	21.0	36.8	100.0%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	34.8%	34.3	30.9	100.0%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	52.9%	28.1	19.0	100.0%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	46.3%	42.1	11.6	100.0%	57	602
Geographic Area						
East Shore	55.7%	30.5	13.9	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	25.7%	31.0	43.3	100.0%	112	900

Table 9-5 Familiarity with the Jewish Home						
Variable	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Length of Residence						
0 - 4 years	29.8%	19.7	50.5	100.0%	80	662
5 - 9 years	40.0%	36.8	23.2	100.0%	46	349
10 - 19 years	44.3%	37.5	31.1	100.0%	79	602
20 or more years	57.1%	31.1	11.8	100.0%	252	1590
Current Jewish Identification						
Orthodox	74.6%	16.8	8.6	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	59.7%	30.4	9.9	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	47.5%	31.6	20.9	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	27.1%	31.4	41.5	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage						
In-married	59.3%	31.1	9.6	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	42.6%	48.9	8.5	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarriage	34.5%	32.9	32.6	100.0%	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel						
No	41.2%	32.8	26.0	100.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	50.4%	29.2	20.4	100.0%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	64.3%	24.6	11.0	100.0%	90	582
Current Member of a JCC						
JCC Members	71.8%	25.5	2.7	100.0%	172	976
NOT JCC Members	36.4%	32.9	30.7	100.0%	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization						
Jewish Organization Member	65.4%	28.2	6.4	100.0%	221	1344
Not a Member	34.9%	33.0	32.1	100.0%	231	1856
Current Member of a Synagogue						
Synagogue Member	59.1%	35.0	5.9	100.0%	269	1574
Not a Member	35.7%	26.4	37.9	100.0%	188	1625

Familiarity with the Yeshiva Academy

Table 9-6 shows that 37% of respondents indicated that they are very familiar, 37% are somewhat familiar, and 26% are not at all familiar with the Yeshiva Academy.

Table 9-6 shows that the level of very familiar is much lower for those under age 35 (20%) than is the case for the other age groups. This is an important result in the sense that it is this group that will soon be providing children to the school. Only about one-third of those age 35-49 are very familiar. This rises to 52% of those age 50-64. Thus, an important finding here is that the level of very familiar increases with age among the non-elderly groups.

The most familiar household type is elderly singles (50%). Much more importantly, only 36% of households with children indicate they are very familiar with the school, although only 17% are not at all familiar. Only 17% of non-elderly singles are very familiar.

The level of very familiar shows no consistent relationship to income, but the level of not at all familiar does decline significantly with income, from 46% of those earning under \$25,000 to only 7% of those earning over \$100,000.

Levels of familiarity are much higher in East Shore (43%) than in West Shore (22%). This is not surprising, given the location of the Yeshiva Academy in East Shore and the generally higher levels of East Shore observance shown in Chapter 6.

Familiarity increases significantly with length of residence, from 17% of recent residents (0-4 years) to 48% of long-term residents (20 or more years). 53% of new residents are not at all familiar, versus 28% of those in residence for 5-9 years, 21% of those in residence 10-19 years, and 16% for those in residence more than 20 years.

74% of Orthodox Jews are very familiar, versus 57% of Conservative Jews, and only 19% of Reform Jews and the Just Jewish. 25% of Reform Jews and 44% of the Just Jewish are not at all familiar. 51% of in-married households are very familiar, versus only 30% of conversionary households, and only 20% of those in intermarriages.

Households in which someone has been to Israel on a Jewish trip (53%) are more likely to be very familiar with the Yeshiva Academy than are households in which someone went on a general trip (45%), or households in which no one has been to Israel (29%).

JCC members are much more likely than are non-members to be very familiar, by 64% to 25%.

Finally, members of Jewish organizations (56%) are more likely to be very familiar than are non-members (24%) and synagogue members (53%) are more likely to be very familiar than are non-members (21%).

Table 9-6 Familiarity with the Yeshiva Academy						
Variable	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	36.8%	37.4	25.7	100.0%	457	3200
Age of Respondent						
Under 35	19.9%	42.4	37.7	100.0%	90	781
35-49	35.6%	42.7	21.7	100.0%	143	1168
50-64	51.6%	33.5	14.9	100.0%	75	592
65-74	39.1%	31.4	29.5	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	53.6%	19.3	27.1	100.0%	77	304
Household Structure						
Households with Children	36.0%	47.4	16.6	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	41.3%	32.6	26.1	100.0%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	17.2%	37.4	45.4	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	39.8%	29.4	30.8	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	50.2%	21.1	28.7	100.0%	66	307
Income						
Under \$25,000	35.0%	18.7	46.3	100.0%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	24.0%	36.8	39.2	100.0%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	42.7%	40.6	16.7	100.0%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	39.3%	53.3	7.4	100.0%	57	602
Geographic Area						
East Shore	42.6%	37.0	20.5	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	22.2%	38.7	39.1	100.0%	112	900

Table 9-6
Familiarity with the Yeshiva Academy

Variable	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Length of Residence						
0 - 4 years	16.8%	30.5	52.8	100.0%	80	662
5 - 9 years	29.1%	42.6	28.4	100.0%	46	349
10 - 19 years	34.6%	44.3	21.1	100.0%	79	602
20 or more years	47.7%	36.6	15.7	100.0%	252	1590
Current Jewish Identification						
Orthodox	74.0%	17.8	8.3	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	56.5%	31.0	12.5	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	19.0%	55.8	25.2	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	19.1%	37.0	43.8	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage						
In-married	51.0%	37.9	11.1	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	29.8%	43.7	26.4	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarriage	20.0%	46.4	33.6	100.0%	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel						
No	29.3%	38.6	32.1	100.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	45.3%	39.0	15.7	100.0%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	53.0%	31.5	15.5	100.0%	90	582
Current Member of a JCC						
JCC Members	63.5%	32.1	4.5	100.0%	172	976
NOT JCC Members	25.1%	39.8	35.1	100.0%	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization						
Jewish Organization Member	55.8%	35.4	8.8	100.0%	221	1344
Not a Member	23.8%	39.0	37.1	100.0%	231	1856
Current Member of a Synagogue						
Synagogue Member	52.9%	37.3	9.8	100.0%	269	1574
Not a Member	21.2%	37.6	41.2	100.0%	188	1625

Familiarity with the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg

Table 9-7 shows that 36% of respondents indicated that they are very familiar, 40% are somewhat familiar, and 24% are not at all familiar with the United Jewish Community. Note that this question produces an overestimation of the true level of familiarity. Some respondents provide a ``false positive'' response to this question, because they confuse UJC (Federation) with the JCC. In addition, because the name ``United Jewish Community'' is relatively generic, a person could reply positively over the phone because they mishear the question. The interviewing team reported a number of instances for which it was clear that some in the general Jewish public confuse agencies.

Table 9-2 shows that the level of being very familiar with UJC (36%) is higher than all of the Florida communities and Manchester, although it is lower than Dallas (42%). The level of being not at all familiar (24%) is much lower than St. Petersburg (50%) and Orlando (50%), and is about equal to Miami (25%) and Manchester (26%). It is considerably lower than all the other communities in the table.

Table 9-7 shows that the level of very familiar shows some relationship with age, with only 17% of those under age 35 being very familiar, versus 32% of those age 35-49, and more than 50% of those age 50 and over. Non-elderly singles (21%) show the lowest level of familiarity and elderly couples (52%) and elderly singles (52%), the highest. Levels of ``not at all familiar'' are lowest for elderly couples at 13% and highest for non-elderly singles, at 34%.

Familiarity increases with increasing income, from about one in four of those earning under \$50,000 to 49% of those earning over \$100,000. Levels of being very familiar are much greater in East Shore (42%) than West Shore (22%). Familiarity increases with length of residence, from 13% of recent residents (0-4 years), to 34% of those in residence for 10-19 years, to 49% of those in residence for 20 or more years.

Orthodox Jews (61%) and Conservative Jews (56%) are much more likely to indicate that they are very familiar than are Reform Jews (29%) and the Just Jewish (15%). 48% of the Just Jewish are not at all familiar. Intermarried couples (14%) and conversionary couples (33%) are much less likely to be very familiar with United Jewish Community than are in-married couples (54%).

Households in which someone has been to Israel on a Jewish trip (63%) or a general trip (46%) are more likely to be very familiar with the United Jewish Community than are households in which no one has been to Israel (25%). 64% of JCC members say they are very familiar with the United Jewish Community, versus 24% of non-members. Because UJC offices are at the JCC, this is not a surprising finding.

Finally, members of Jewish organizations (60%) are more likely to be very familiar than are non-members (20%) and synagogue members (56%) are more likely to be very familiar than are non-members (18%).

Table 9-7 Familiarity with the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg						
Variable	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	36.2%	39.9	23.8	100.0%	457	3200
Age of Respondent						
Under 35	16.7%	46.2	37.1	100.0%	90	781
35-49	31.6%	43.7	24.7	100.0%	143	1168
50-64	52.9%	33.9	13.2	100.0%	75	592
65-74	50.0%	34.8	15.2	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	55.9%	27.1	17.0	100.0%	77	304
Household Structure						
Households with Children	32.0%	45.8	22.2	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	41.0%	34.4	24.6	100.0%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	21.4%	44.8	33.8	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	51.6%	35.9	12.5	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	52.1%	26.1	21.8	100.0%	66	307
Income						
Under \$25,000	23.0%	40.8	36.2	100.0%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	26.1%	35.6	38.3	100.0%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	40.3%	40.9	18.8	100.0%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	49.0%	40.4	10.6	100.0%	57	602
Geographic Area						
East Shore	41.7%	39.7	18.6	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	22.3%	40.6	37.1	100.0%	112	900

Table 9-7 Familiarity with the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg						
Variable	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Length of Residence						
0 - 4 years	13.0%	38.7	48.3	100.0%	80	662
5 - 9 years	27.1%	43.6	29.3	100.0%	46	349
10 - 19 years	34.2%	44.1	21.7	100.0%	79	602
20 or more years	48.8%	38.0	13.2	100.0%	252	1590
Current Jewish Identification						
Orthodox	61.0%	30.3	8.7	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	56.4%	33.6	10.0	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	28.8%	53.1	18.1	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	15.3%	37.2	47.5	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage						
In-married	53.9%	36.2	10.0	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	32.6%	43.9	23.5	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarriage	14.1%	49.7	36.1	100.0%	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel						
No	25.1%	45.1	29.8	100.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	45.7%	38.1	16.2	100.0%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	62.8%	25.2	12.0	100.0%	90	582
Current Member of a JCC						
JCC Members	64.0%	32.5	3.6	100.0%	172	976
NOT JCC Members	24.1%	43.2	32.7	100.0%	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization						
Jewish Organization Member	59.6%	32.4	7.9	100.0%	221	1344
Not a Member	20.1%	46.1	33.8	100.0%	231	1856
Current Member of a Synagogue						
Synagogue Member	55.6%	39.8	4.6	100.0%	269	1574
Not a Member	17.5%	40.1	42.4	100.0%	188	1625

Familiarity with the Jewish Family Service

Table 9-8 shows that 26 % of respondents indicated that they are very familiar, 37 % are somewhat familiar, and 38 % are not at all familiar with the Jewish Family Service (JFS).

Table 9-4 shows that the level of being very familiar (26%) with the Jewish Family Service is much higher than any of the other communities in the table, and the level of being not at all familiar (38%) is lower than all of the other communities as well.

Table 9-8 also shows that the level of very familiar shows no consistent relationship with age, except that those under age 35 are less likely to be very familiar (11 %) than the other age groups (28%-35 %). Widowed persons (43 %) are more likely to be very familiar than are the divorced (32 %), the single, never married (32 %), or the married (22 %).

Non-elderly singles (18 %) are least likely to be very familiar with JFS. 50 % of this group is not at all familiar with JFS. Elderly couples (33 %) and elderly singles (34 %) are most likely to be very familiar, compared to households with children (26 %) and non-elderly couples (25 %).

Familiarity increases with income, from about 23 % of those earning under \$50,000 to almost one-third of those earning over \$50,000. East Shore residents (30 %) are much more likely to be very familiar than those in West Shore (15 %). Familiarity increases once a household is in the area for more than 5 years: only 15 % of those in residence for less than 5 years are very familiar, versus more than one in four of those in residence for more than 5 years.

About 38 % of Orthodox and Conservative Jews are very familiar, versus only 21 % of Reform Jews and 13 % of the Just Jewish. Intermarried couples (11 %) are much less likely to be very familiar than those who are in-married (39 %).

Households in which someone has been to Israel on a Jewish trip (38 %) are more likely to be very familiar with the JFS than are households in which no one has been to Israel (22 %) or someone has been on a general trip (28 %). 42 % of JCC members say they are very familiar with the JFS; only 18 % of non-members are very familiar.

Finally, members of Jewish organizations (41 %) are more likely to be very familiar than are non-members (15 %) and synagogue members (37 %) are more likely to be very familiar than are non-members (15 %).

Table 9-8
Familiarity with the Jewish Family Service

Variable	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	25.7%	36.7	37.6	100.0%	457	3200
Age of Respondent						
Under 35	11.1%	34.8	54.1	100.0%	90	781
35-49	27.5%	36.3	36.3	100.0%	143	1168
50-64	33.2%	42.8	24.0	100.0%	75	592
65-74	31.4%	39.4	29.2	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	35.4%	28.3	36.3	100.0%	77	304
Marital Status						
Married	22.4%	37.9	39.7	100.0%	340	2406
Widowed	43.4%	27.7	29.0	100.0%	52	256
Divorced	32.4%	39.6	28.0	100.0%	23*	189
Single	31.8%	33.7	34.5	100.0%	42	349
Household Structure						
Households with Children	26.1%	39.6	34.3	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	25.2%	37.0	37.8	100.0%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	17.6%	32.6	49.9	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	32.9%	37.3	29.8	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	34.3%	29.2	36.5	100.0%	66	307
Income						
Under \$25,000	22.0%	23.8	54.2	100.0%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	22.8%	28.9	48.3	100.0%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	30.6%	43.0	26.3	100.0%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	32.0%	40.8	27.3	100.0%	57	602
Geographic Area						
East Shore	29.8%	38.0	32.2	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	15.3%	33.5	51.2	100.0%	112	900

Table 9-8
Familiarity with the Jewish Family Service

Variable	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Length of Residence						
0 - 4 years	15.0%	25.3	59.7	100.0%	80	662
5 - 9 years	26.3%	26.9	46.8	100.0%	46	349
10 - 19 years	28.7%	36.8	34.6	100.0%	79	602
20 or more years	28.9%	43.7	27.4	100.0%	252	1590
Current Jewish Identification						
Orthodox	38.0%	42.9	19.1	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	37.7%	40.6	21.7	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	20.7%	44.4	34.8	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	13.1%	23.3	63.6	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage						
In-married	38.8%	40.3	20.9	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	14.9%	39.0	46.1	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarriage	11.0%	36.8	52.2	100.0%	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel						
No	21.5%	32.5	46.0	100.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	28.0%	45.8	26.1	100.0%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	37.6%	41.1	21.3	100.0%	90	582
Current Member of a JCC						
JCC Members	42.4%	47.0	10.5	100.0%	172	976
NOT JCC Members	18.4%	32.2	49.4	100.0%	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization						
Jewish Organization Member	40.7%	40.2	19.1	100.0%	221	1344
Not a Member	15.4%	34.9	49.7	100.0%	231	1856
Current Member of a Synagogue						
Synagogue Member	36.8%	48.9	14.3	100.0%	269	1574
Not a Member	15.0%	25.0	60.1	100.0%	188	1625

Familiarity with B'nai B'rith Housing

Table 9-9 shows that 19% of respondents indicated that they are very familiar, 37% are somewhat familiar, and 45% are not at all familiar with the B'nai B'rith Housing. Note that just a brief time before the survey, a controversy concerning a rent increase at this facility was given play in the local secular press. This may have heightened awareness of the facility. One should also note that only a handful of the residents of this facility are Jewish.

Table 9-9 shows that the level of very familiar shows a relatively strong relationship with age, from 6% of those under age 35, to 17% of those age 35-49, to 32% of those age 50-64. Familiarity then declines to about 27% of the elderly. Since the apartments house Jewish elderly, the low level of familiarity of those under age 50 is not surprising.

Elderly couples (27%), elderly singles (24%), and non-elderly couples (22%) are more likely to be very familiar than are the other household types. Levels of very familiar increase from 13%-14% of those earning under \$50,000 to 21% of those earning \$50,000 and over.

Levels of familiarity are higher in East Shore (21%) than in West Shore (13%). Levels of being not at all familiar are lower in East Shore (41%) than in West Shore (52%). The location of these apartments in East Shore doubtlessly influences these results.

Familiarity increases with length of residence, from about 3% of those in residence for less than 5 years to more than 27% of those in residence for 20 or more years.

Orthodox (36%) and Conservative (23%) Jews are more likely to be very familiar than are Reform Jews (19%) or the Just Jewish (11%). 28% of the in-married are very familiar, versus only 8% of the intermarrieds.

Households in which someone has been to Israel on a Jewish trip (23%) or a general trip (26%) are more likely to be very familiar with the B'nai B'rith Housing than are households in which no one has been to Israel (16%). 31% of JCC members say they are very familiar with the B'nai B'rith Housing. About 14% of JCC non-members indicate they are very familiar with the B'nai B'rith Housing.

Finally, members of Jewish organizations (30%) are more likely to be very familiar than are non-members (12%) and synagogue members (25%) are more likely to be very familiar than are non-members (14%).

Table 9-9
Familiarity with B'nai B'rith Housing

Variable	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	19.1%	36.5	44.5	100.0%	457	3200
Age of Respondent						
Under 35	6.3%	25.2	68.5	100.0%	90	781
35-49	16.9%	42.8	40.3	100.0%	143	1168
50-64	31.5%	40.0	28.5	100.0%	75	592
65-74	27.1%	38.1	34.9	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	26.8%	33.1	40.2	100.0%	77	304
Household Structure						
Households with Children	16.7%	39.1	44.3	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	22.4%	38.6	39.1	100.0%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	17.9%	25.4	56.7	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	26.7%	46.4	26.8	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	23.7%	26.1	50.2	100.0%	66	307
Income						
Under \$25,000	12.6%	23.7	63.7	100.0%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	13.7%	31.1	55.2	100.0%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	22.3%	44.2	33.5	100.0%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	20.0%	48.1	31.9	100.0%	57	602
Geographic Area						
East Shore	21.3%	37.4	41.3	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	13.4%	34.3	52.3	100.0%	112	900

Table 9-9 Familiarity with B'nai B'rith Housing						
Variable	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Length of Residence						
0 - 4 years	2.7%	23.8	73.5	100.0%	80	662
5 - 9 years	11.8%	52.9	35.3	100.0%	46	349
10 - 19 years	20.2%	31.1	48.7	100.0%	79	602
20 or more years	27.1%	40.2	32.7	100.0%	252	1590
Current Jewish Identification						
Orthodox	35.5%	31.6	32.9	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	23.2%	40.2	36.7	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	18.9%	39.5	41.5	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	10.5%	29.8	59.7	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage						
In-married	27.7%	39.9	32.4	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	17.3%	43.9	38.8	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarriage	8.0%	45.3	46.7	100.0%	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel						
No	15.8%	36.5	47.7	100.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	25.9%	31.7	42.5	100.0%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	22.7%	42.2	35.1	100.0%	90	582
Current Member of a JCC						
JCC Members	30.6%	37.0	32.4	100.0%	172	976
NOT JCC Members	14.0%	36.3	49.7	100.0%	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization						
Jewish Organization Member	29.6%	38.9	31.5	100.0%	221	1344
Not a Member	11.8%	35.1	53.0	100.0%	231	1856
Current Member of a Synagogue						
Synagogue Member	24.5%	46.7	28.8	100.0%	269	1574
Not a Member	13.9%	26.7	59.5	100.0%	188	1625

Familiarity with the Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies

Table 9-10 shows that 14% of respondents indicated that they are very familiar, 22% are somewhat familiar, and 64% are not at all familiar with the Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies. Because of the specialized nature of the service offered by the High School, it is not surprising that the familiarity with this ``agency'' is lower than is the case for the agencies discussed above.

Table 9-10 shows that the level of very familiar increases from 10% of these under age 35, to 21% of those age 50-64, and then declines to less than 12% of the elderly. Thus, the group probably most likely to have high school students at home is also the group with the highest level of familiarity.

Singles, whether non-elderly (3%) or elderly (9%), are much less likely to be very familiar than are the other household types. 16% of households with children are very familiar and 60% are not at all familiar. Since this is the target group for this service, this low profile should probably be addressed. A special analysis was undertaken of households containing a 12-18 year old child. In these households, 28% are very familiar, 26% are somewhat familiar and 46% are not at all familiar. Thus, familiarity increases as children enter their teenage years. Another analysis shows that for the 60% of households with children who are not at all familiar, 4% are Orthodox, 14% Conservative, 6% Reconstructionist, 37% are Reform, and 40% are Just Jewish.

Familiarity also increases with income, from only 5% of those earning under \$25,000 up to more than 20% of those earning \$50,000 and over.

Levels of familiarity are higher in East Shore (16%) than in West Shore (9%). Levels of being not at all familiar are lower in East Shore (61%) than in West Shore (73%). Familiarity increases with length of residence, from about 4% of those in residence for less than five years to about 18% of those in residence for 10 or more years.

Orthodox Jews are less familiar (19%) than are Conservative Jews (25%). 54% of Orthodox Jews are not at all familiar with the High School. Only 12% of Reform Jews and 3% of the Just Jewish are very familiar. 24% of the in-married are very familiar, versus only 7% of the intermarried.

Households in which someone has been to Israel on a Jewish trip (26%) or a general trip (23%) are more likely to be very familiar with the High School than are households in which no one has been to Israel (8%). 25% of JCC members say they are very familiar with the High School. About 10% of JCC non-members indicate they are very familiar with the High School.

Finally, members of Jewish organizations (26%) are more likely to be very familiar than are non-members (6%) and synagogue members (24%) are more likely to be very familiar than are non-members (5%).

Table 9-10 Familiarity with Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies						
Variable	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	14.3%	21.9	63.9	100.0%	457	3200
Age of Respondent						
Under 35	9.6%	11.7	78.6	100.0%	90	781
35-49	16.4%	25.6	58.0	100.0%	143	1168
50-64	21.2%	24.3	54.5	100.0%	75	592
65-74	11.6%	25.3	63.1	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	7.5%	24.8	67.7	100.0%	77	304
Household Structure						
Households with Children	15.5%	24.7	59.7	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	14.9%	19.2	66.0	100.0%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	3.2%	20.5	76.3	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	10.5%	31.5	58.0	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	9.1%	18.2	72.7	100.0%	66	307
Income						
Under \$25,000	4.7%	12.6	82.7	100.0%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	10.5%	17.9	71.7	100.0%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	21.4%	22.7	55.9	100.0%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	21.9%	33.0	45.1	100.0%	57	602
Geographic Area						
East Shore	16.4%	23.1	60.5	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	8.8%	18.7	72.5	100.0%	112	900

Table 9-10 Familiarity with Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies						
Variable	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not at all Familiar	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Length of Residence						
0 - 4 years	4.1 %	9.7	86.2	100.0 %	80	662
5 - 9 years	9.8 %	23.0	67.2	100.0 %	46	349
10 - 19 years	19.2 %	25.9	54.9	100.0 %	79	602
20 or more years	17.6 %	25.2	57.2	100.0 %	252	1590
Current Jewish Identification						
Orthodox	19.4 %	26.3	54.3	100.0 %	58	304
Conservative	25.1 %	37.5	37.4	100.0 %	180	1043
Reform	11.5 %	12.7	75.8	100.0 %	93	704
Just Jewish	3.3 %	8.9	87.8	100.0 %	126	1027
Type of Marriage						
In-married	23.9 %	32.2	44.0	100.0 %	182	1176
Conversionary	12.0 %	17.4	70.6	100.0 %	29*	239
Intermarriage	6.5 %	12.2	81.3	100.0 %	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel						
No	8.0 %	20.8	71.2	100.0 %	269	1955
On General Trip	23.1 %	22.5	54.4	100.0 %	95	666
On Jewish Trip	25.5 %	25	49.5	100.0 %	90	582
Current Member of a JCC						
JCC Members	24.7 %	27.2	48.1	100.0 %	172	976
NOT JCC Members	9.7 %	19.6	70.8	100.0 %	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization						
Jewish Organization Member	26.4 %	27.3	46.3	100.0 %	221	1344
Not a Member	5.8 %	18.4	75.8	100.0 %	231	1856
Current Member of a Synagogue						
Synagogue Member	23.7 %	33.9	42.4	100.0 %	269	1574
Not a Member	5.2 %	10.2	84.6	100.0 %	188	1625

Quality of Service Provided by Jewish Agencies

Table 9-11 shows respondents' ratings of the quality of the six Jewish agencies. Only those respondents who indicated that they were either very familiar or somewhat familiar with each agency were asked to rate its quality. Some of the respondents who rated the agencies have used their services in 1993, while others have not. Note that many respondents who indicated that they were only ``somewhat familiar'' with an agency were unable to provide a rating for that agency.

Overall, the Jewish Home has, by far, the highest excellent rating (66%). About one-third gave an excellent rating to JFS and the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg. Only 28% thought that B'nai B'rith Housing is excellent and only 20% rated the Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies as excellent.

If the responses fair and poor are defined as negative responses, than 17% of respondents gave negative replies concerning the High School, 15% to B'nai B'rith Housing, and 12% to the United Jewish Community.

The Jewish Community Center was not rated on this scale. For information about the JCC, see Chapter 7.

Table 9-11 Quality of Service Provided by Jewish Agencies						
Quality Rating	Jewish Home	Yeshiva Academy	Harrisburg High School of Jewish Studies	B'nai B'rith Housing	Jewish Family Service	United Jewish Community
Excellent	65.5%	38.8%	19.9%	28.3%	35.8%	33.7%
Good	32.7	51.7	62.7	57.1	55.6	54.5
Fair	1.2	7.6	14.6	12.1	7.9	10.5
Poor	0.6	2.0	2.8	2.5	.7	1.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Sample Size	330	262	112	171	216	310
Proj. # of Hhlds	2185	1730	735	1113	1400	2051

Table 9-12 shows that the ratings for The Jewish Home in Harrisburg are the highest in the country among the 12 Jewish nursing homes that have been rated in community studies.

Table 9-12 Quality of Service Provided by the Local Jewish Nursing Home Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Harrisburg	1994	66%	33	1	1
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	59%	35	5	2
Worcester	1987	57%	37	4	3
Dallas	1989	56%	41	4	0
Rochester	1988	47%	43	5	4
Miami	1994	39%	52	5	4
South Broward	1990	39%	45	12	3
Essex-Morris, NJ (Nursing Home #2)	1986	41%	49	3	6
Essex-Morris, NJ (Nursing Home #1)	1986	33%	52	8	7
Louisville	1991	28%	51	14	7
Baltimore (Nursing Home #2)	1985	19%	72	9	0
Baltimore (Nursing Home #1)	1985	17%	61	16	6

Table 9-13 shows that the JFS in Harrisburg has about an average rating of excellent among the JFS's in the country. Note as well that the percentage rating JFS as poor or fair (9%) is among the lowest in the country. Poor plus fair ratings vary from 0% in East Bay to 7% in Rochester, to as high as 27% in Sarasota (due to problems in the agency corrected by changing the JFS director prior to the Sarasota survey).

Table 9-13 Quality of Service Provided by Jewish Family Service Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Louisville	1991	48%	43	7	2
Worcester	1987	42%	52	5	3
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	42%	41	13	4
Dallas	1989	39%	53	6	2
San Francisco	1988	38%	50	0	12
Rochester	1988	37%	53	7	0
South Broward	1990	36%	45	12	7
Harrisburg	1994	36%	56	8	1
San Jose, CA	1988	33%	50	17	0
Miami	1994	32%	53	13	2
Orlando	1993	32%	48	11	9
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	31%	61	8	0
Baltimore	1985	30%	54	13	0
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	27%	45	14	13
East Bay, CA	1988	25%	75	0	0

Table 9-14 shows that the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg (34% excellent) received far better ratings than Orlando (23%), but is about equal to South Broward (36%), Sarasota (37%), and Miami (33%). Note as well that the 11% negative rating is in the range of South Broward (14%), Miami (14%), and Sarasota (11%), but is much lower than Orlando (24%).

The 1% poor rating for Harrisburg is the lowest of all the communities.

Table 9-14					
Quality of Service Provided by the Federation Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	37%	53	7	4
South Broward	1990	36%	51	11	3
Harrisburg	1994	34%	55	10	1
Miami	1994	33%	53	9	5
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	31%	53	13	4
Orlando	1993	23%	53	16	8

Preference for Jewish-Sponsored Counseling Services

Table 9-16 shows that 18% of households indicated that they would very much prefer Jewish-sponsored counseling if they found themselves in need of such. Another 21% would somewhat prefer, 49% would have no preference, and 12% would rather not use Jewish services if they needed individual or family counseling. **Table 9-15** shows that the rate for very much prefer (16%) is low compared with the other communities, although it is about equal to Baltimore (15%). The percentage with no preference (43%) is higher than most of the comparison cities, and compares to 37% in Baltimore. (Note that **Table 9-15** includes ``don't know'' responses.)

The percentage of respondents indicating that they would very much prefer Jewish-sponsored counseling shows no consistent relationship with age, varying from about 15% of those under age 35 to only 9% of those age 35-49, to 27% of those age 50-64, to 23% of those age 65-74, to 47% of those age 75 and over. Single persons (47%) are much more likely to have indicated a strong preference for Jewish counseling than are married (17%), divorced (12%), and widowed (12%) respondents.

Elderly singles (46%) are more likely to very much prefer Jewish counseling than non-elderly couples (22%) and non-elderly singles (18%). Only 9% of households with children indicate they would very much prefer Jewish-sponsored services.

Table 9-16 also shows that the percentage responding very much prefer shows no consistent relationship with income, although it is much higher for those earning \$25,000 and over, at 39%. Those in East Shore (20%) were much more likely to indicate very much prefer than those in West Shore (13%).

56% of Orthodox Jews very much prefer Jewish services, compared to about 20% of Conservative Jews, 12% of Reform Jews, and only 10% of the Just Jewish. Intermarriage is related to preference for Jewish sponsorship as well, with only 2% of households containing an intermarriage responding very much prefer, versus 24% of households in which everyone is born Jewish. In intermarried households, 76% have no preference.

Table 9-16 shows that JCC members are much more likely to prefer Jewish counseling than are non-members, by 30% to 13%. Jewish organization members (24%) are more likely to have responded very much prefer than did non-members (14%). Synagogue members (26%) are more likely to have responded very much prefer than did non-members (11%).

These results are confirmed by **Table 10-3**, which shows that most of those using counseling services are not using these services under Jewish auspices. Also, preference for Jewish counseling may imply preference for rabbinical counseling or preference for Jewish Family Service counseling.

Table 9-15
Preference for Jewish-Sponsored Counseling Services
Comparison with Other Communities

Community	Year	Very Much Prefer	Somewhat Prefer	Have No Preference	Rather Not Use Jewish	Don't Know
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	36%		57	2	6
Miami	1994	29%	21	26	10	14
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	28%	19	35	7	11
South Broward	1990	27%	21	37	5	11
Rochester	1988	26%	29	35	6	4
West Palm Beach	1987	23%	39	36	2	
Louisville	1991	20%	24	39	6	10
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	20%	22	30	13	15
Harrisburg	1994	16%	18	43	10	12
Baltimore	1985	15%	33	37	11	4
Dallas	1989	10%	37	41	9	3
Worcester	1987	10%	25	44	18	3
Louisville	1991	20%	24	39	6	10

Table 9-16 Preference for Jewish-Sponsored Counseling Services (Don't Know Responses Omitted)							
Variable	Very Much Prefer	Somewhat Prefer	Have No Preference	Rather Not Use	Total	Sample Size	Projected Number of Households
All	18.2%	20.9	49.1	11.8	100.0%	457	3200
Age of Respondent							
Under 35	15.0%	25.0	51.8	8.2	100.0%	90	781
35-49	8.8%	17.0	63.0	11.3	100.0%	143	1168
50-64	26.9%	18.7	36.6	17.8	100.0%	75	592
65-74	22.9%	23.6	33.5	19.9	100.0%	72	352
75 and Over	46.7%	28.6	21.8	3.0	100.0%	77	304
Marital Status							
Married	16.8%	21.4	50.3	11.5	100.0%	340	2406
Divorced	11.9%	21.7	61.8	4.7	100.0%	52	256
Widowed	11.7%	15.6	45.3	27.4	100.0%	23*	189
Single	46.5%	19.6	21.7	12.2	100.0%	42	349
Household Structure							
Hh with Children	8.6%	17.3	63.0	11.1	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	21.8%	21.3	42.3	14.7	100.0%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	17.5%	28.2	41.9	12.5	100%	39	336
Elderly Couple	18.9%	30.6	37.0	13.5	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	46.3%	23.1	21.0	9.6	100.0%	66	307
Income							
Under \$25,000	39.1%	18.7	28.7	13.5	100.0%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	12.5%	19.6	59.9	8.0	100.0%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	13.6%	26.2	48.3	11.9	100.0%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	9.1%	16.8	64.8	9.4	100.0%	57	602
Geographic Area							
East Shore	20.4%	24.9	41.3	13.4	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	12.8%	11.4	67.7	8.0	100.0%	112	900

Table 9-16 Preference for Jewish-Sponsored Counseling Services (Don't Know Responses Omitted)							
Variable	Very Much Prefer	Somewhat Prefer	Have No Preference	Rather Not Use	Total	Sample Size	Projected Number of Households
Current Jewish Identification							
Orthodox	55.8%	31.0	7.0	6.2	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	20.0%	29.3	37.2	13.5	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	12.1%	12.2	62.6	13.1	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	10.3%	15.0	64.2	10.5	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage							
In-married	24.1%	25.0	34.7	16.3	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	12.4%	18.7	66.0	3.0	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarriage	1.5%	16.0	76.2	6.2	100.0%	83	698
Current Member of a JCC							
JCC Member	30.2%	22.6	29.2	17.9	100.0%	172	976
Not JCC Member	13.3%	20.2	57.1	9.3	100.0%	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization							
Org. Member	23.5%	23.9	36.4	16.2	100.0%	221	1344
Not a Member	13.5%	19.0	58.7	8.8	100.0%	231	1856
Current Member of a Synagogue							
Synagogue Member	25.5%	22.4	37.9	14.2	100.0%	269	1574
Not a Member	11.2%	19.6	59.7	9.5	100.0%	188	1625

College Attended by Those Under Age 30

As B'nai B'rith is forced to revise its level of support for Hillel, it will probably fall upon the Federation movement to participate more and more in the funding of this agency. The question that is being addressed is which campuses should be funded by which Federations or should some national ``pool" be established to fund Hillel nationally.

To provide input into this decision, the survey asked the name of the college attended by each adult under age 30 (who went to college or is currently in college). 17% go to Pennsylvania State University, 7% to the Harrisburg Area Community College (HACC), 5% to Widener, 4% to Cornell and 4% to the University of Delaware. The remainder attend one of more than 20 other institutions (**Table 9-17**).

19% go to a local, Harrisburg area, school. 40% go elsewhere in the Commonwealth. Thus, 59% go to an in-state school. 21% go elsewhere in the Northeast and 20% go outside the Northeast.

In total more than 80% leave the area for college. Those who go to college locally are probably more likely to settle in Harrisburg when they the graduate.

Table 9-17 Colleges Attended By Those Under Age 30 (Sample Size = 124, Projected Number of Individuals = 880)		
School or Region	% Currently Attending or Attended	Number of Students Over Past 10 Years
Individual Schools with 4% or more of Jewish College Students from Harrisburg		
Pennsylvania State University	17.3%	152
Harrisburg Area Community College (HACC) (local)	7.1	62
Widener (local)	5.0	44
Cornell	4.4	39
University of Delaware	4.1	36
Others	62.1	546
Total	100.0%	880
By Geographic Region		
Local Colleges	18.6%	164
Other Pennsylvania Schools	40.1	352
Other Northeastern Schools	21.0	185
Schools Outside Northeast	20.3	179
Grand Total	100.0%	880
Total of Schools Outside Local area	81.4%	716

Chapter 10

Social Service Needs

Chapter Table of Contents

Chapter Highlights	267
Disabilities	268
Need for Selected Social Services	271

Chapter Highlights

- 14% of households contain someone who is disabled, About 5% are disabled and need help on a daily basis.
- 30% of elderly couples have a disabled household member. The rate is 27% in households earning under \$25,000.
- In the past year, 16% of households needed counseling; 3% needed home health care.
- 14% of households containing single adult members needed programs for singles.
- 3% of household containing elderly members needed retirement housing with resident services.
- 0.3% of household containing elderly members needed senior day care.
- 7% of household containing elderly members needed nursing home care.

Disabilities

About 14% of respondents indicated that someone living in their household has some kind of physical, mental, or other health condition which has lasted for six months or more and which limits or prevents employment, educational opportunities, or daily activities (**Table 10-1**). (Note that the wording used for this question is that same as that used by the US census.) (Each respondent defined ``condition'' for him/herself.) For comparison, 18% of households in West Palm Beach, 17% in Sarasota, 15% in Miami, 12% in Tidewater, and 10% in Orlando contain a disabled person. The rate is well above the national figure for American Jews of 4% (**Table 10-2**).

16% in East Shore report a disability, compared to only 9% in West Shore. About 30% of elderly couples report a person disabled as do 31% of elderly singles. For non-elderly singles (8%) and non-elderly couples (15%) the rate is also high. Only 8% of households with children contain a disabled member. 27% of households earning under \$25,000 contain a disabled person, versus 16% of those earning \$25,000 - \$49,999, but only about 11% of those earning \$50,000-\$100,000, and 3% of those earning \$100,000 and over.

5% of households contain a person with a disability that requires daily supervision. For comparison, 2% in South Broward, 7% in Miami, and 4% in West Palm Beach, Orlando, St. Petersburg, and Sarasota-Manatee need assistance on a daily basis (**Table 10-2**).

The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey indicated that 4.0% of US Jewish adults are disabled, with 1.3% needing daily assistance. For Pennsylvania, the NJPS indicated that x.x% are disabled, with x.x% needing daily assistance.

Table 10-1 Disabilities					
Variable	(No Assistance Needed) Someone Disabled	Needs Assistance On Daily Basis	Total Disabled	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Households	8.8%	5.1%	13.9	457	3200
Area					
East Shore	9.6%	6.5%	16.1	345	2300
West Shore	6.9%	1.6%	8.5	112	900
Household Structure					
Households with Children	3.3%	4.3%	7.6	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	10.8%	3.7%	14.5	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	6.1%	2.1%	8.2	39	336
Elderly Couple	22.0%	8.1%	30.1	71	307
Elderly Single	16.6%	14.0%	30.6	66	307
Household Income					
Under \$25,000	19.3%	8.1%	27.4	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	10.8%	5.5%	16.3	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	6.1%	4.4%	10.5	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	2.5%	.0%	2.5	57	602

Table 10-2 Percentage of Households Containing a Disabled Person Comparison with Other Communities			
Community	Year	% of Households Containing a Disabled Person	% of Households with a Disabled Person Requiring Assistance on a Daily Basis
West Palm Beach	1987	18 %	4 %
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	18 %	4 %
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	17 %	4 %
Miami	1994	15 %	7 %
Harrisburg	1994	14 %	5 %
South Broward	1990	13 %	2 %
Tidewater	1988	12 %	NA
Orlando	1993	10 %	4 %
Palm Springs	1986	10 %	NA
Rhode Island	1987	10 %	NA
Dallas	1985	9 %	NA
NJPS (US)	1990	4 %	1 %
NJPS (PA)	1990		

Need for Selected Social Services

While the best indicators of social service needs include such items as age, household structure and income, respondents were asked directly about their need for six social services in the past year. If a household indicated they needed a service, the respondent was asked if they had received the help. If they received the help, they were asked if they had received the help from a Jewish agency (**Table 10-3**).

About 16% of households had a need for marital, family, or individual counseling. Most of those who needed counseling received it, with 2% receiving help from a Jewish agency or rabbi and 14% receiving help from a non-Jewish agency or private practitioner. Thus, the vast majority of Jews do not seek help for family problems at Jewish Family Service or with a rabbi.

13% of households containing a single adult needed programs for singles, although 7% did not use such programs. Of those using programs, about two-thirds used Jewish programs (this result is based upon a small sample).

7.3% of elderly households needed nursing home care. Some of the interviews were completed with persons in the Jewish Home. Almost all of those receiving nursing home care used the Jewish Home. This result is consistent with the high profile and the high ratings shown for the Jewish Home in the previous chapter.

Only 3.4% of elderly households needed retirement housing and those sampled using retirement housing are not using Jewish retirement housing. This result is consistent with our knowledge of the number of Jewish residents in B'nai B'rith Housing (about 18 of about 230 units). No resident of B'nai B'rith Housing was interviewed in the survey.

Only 2.9% needed home health care. Almost everyone who needed it, received the help, but almost all of the help was through non-Jewish agencies.

About .3% of elderly households had a need for senior day care.

Table 10-3 Need for Selected Social Services in the Past Year					
Social Service	Did Not Need Help	Received Jewish Help	Received Other Help	No Help Received	Total
Marital, Family or Individual Counseling	83.9%	2.1	13.7	.3	100.0%
Programs for Singles (of households containing a non-married person)	86.5%	4.3	2.4	6.8	100.0%
Nursing Home Care (of elderly households)	92.6%	6.9	.6	.0	100.0%
Retirement Housing (of elderly households)	96.6%	.0	3.1	.3	100.0%
Home Health Care	97.1%	.3	2.6	.1	100.0%
Senior Day Care (of elderly households)	99.7%	.0	.0	.3	100.0%

Table 10-4 shows the percentage of various population groups who needed each of the six social services. Counseling needs are greater in intermarried households (24%) than in households in which both spouses are Jewish (15%). Households with children (26%) are most likely to have indicated a need for counseling, while elderly households are least likely to indicate a need. This could be due to the fact that elderly persons in the United States are less attuned to using counseling services than younger people. Those earning under \$25,000 (13%) are less likely to indicate a need than those earning over \$25,000 (about 20%).

For home health care, 11 % of elderly couples indicate a need for this service. In households with a non-elderly single person, 22 % indicate a need for singles programming.

Note that blank spaces are left in **Table 10-4** if the service does not apply to a particular group or if the researcher felt that a particular service's relationship with a particular variable (such as income) was not relevant, or if the sample size was too small.

Table 10-4
Need for Selected Social Services

Variable	Counseling	Home Health	Singles	Retire- ment Housing	Senior Day Care	Nursing Home Care	Sample Size	Proj. # of Hhlds
All Households*	16.1%	2.9%	13.5%	3.4%	.3%	7.4%	457	3200
Area								
East Shore	16.8%	3.4%	14.7%	2.4%	.3%	8.0%	345	5,059
West Shore	15.7%	1.6%	11.1%	8.2%	.0%	4.8%	112	2,237
Type of Marriage								
In-Marriage	14.9%	2.8%	5.9%				245	5,179
Conversionary	14.5%	5.8%	5.0%				50	2,588
Intermarriage	24.0%	1.0%	5.7%				110	1,951
Household Structure								
Hhlds with Kids	26.4%	1.1%					124	3,212
Non-Eld Couple	14.2%	.0%					109	2,380
Non-Eld Single	13.5%	.0%	21.9%				48	1,158
Elderly Couple	2.8%	10.6%		4.0%	.0%	4.6%	162	2,874
Elderly Single	8.1%	6.3%		5.4%	.8%	15.0%	107	1,938
Household Income								
Under \$25,000	12.6%	5.1%					156	3,889
\$25 - \$49,999	18.9%	2.0%					139	3,837
\$50 - \$99,999	19.4%	1.4%					110	3,199
\$100,000 +	22.5%	1.6%					69	2,081

*For singles programs, percentages are of households containing someone who is single and under age 65. For retirement housing, senior day care and nursing home care, percentages are of households containing an elderly person.

Table 10-5 shows that the 16% needing counseling in Greater Harrisburg is much higher than in the three Florida comparison communities. This is probably due to the great proportion of elderly in the Florida communities who do not see themselves with a need for counseling.

Table 10-6 indicates about the same level of demand for singles programs (among households with a single person under age 65) as is the case in Miami and Harrisburg.

Table 10-5 Need for Counseling Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Did Not Need Help	Received Jewish Help	Received Other Help	No Help Received
South Broward	1990	95 %	2	2	1
Miami	1994	91 %	3	5	1
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	91 %	2	6	2
Harrisburg	1994	84%	2	14	0

Table 10-6 Need for Singles Programs Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Did Not Need	Used Jewish Program	Used Other Program	Did Not Use
Miami	1994	90 %	5	1	4
Harrisburg	1994	87%	4	2	7
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	82 %	7	2	10

Chapter 11

Israel

Chapter Table of Contents

Chapter Highlights	275
Percentage of Households in which Someone Has Been to Israel	276
Emotional Attachment to Israel	281

Chapter Highlights

- 40% of households report that one or more members have visited Israel. This figure is about average for American Jewish communities that have completed studies.
- 20% have been to Israel on a Jewish-sponsored trip.
- For households with children, 19% have had one of those children go to Israel, half on a Jewish trip.
- Respondents were asked: ``How emotionally attached are you to Israel? Extremely attached, very attached, somewhat attached, or not attached?'' The results show that 13% are extremely attached, 29% are very attached, 42% are somewhat attached, and 16% are not attached. This question was also asked in the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey. Jews in Greater Harrisburg express about the same levels of attachment to Israel as do Jews by religion in the NJPS. The levels of attachment are, however, lower than those found in Miami.
- Being extremely attached to Israel shows no consistent relationship with age, although 25% of those under age 35 are not attached. 20% of those on West Shore are not attached. For the Just Jewish, only 10% are extremely attached and 28% are not attached.

Percentage of Households in which Someone Has Been to Israel

Table 11-1 shows that 40% of households report that one or more members have visited Israel. This rate is about average compared with the other American Jewish communities listed in **Table 11-2**. It compares to 38% in Pittsburgh and Rochester, 36% in Baltimore, 33% in Philadelphia, and 32% in Atlantic City.

Overall, 20% of households have had someone go to Israel on a trip sponsored by a Jewish group and 20% have had someone go on a trip not sponsored by a Jewish group. This compares with 23% (for Jewish trips) and 31% (for general trips) in Miami, and with 15% (for Jewish trips) and 20% (for general trips) in St. Petersburg/Clearwater, the only other communities to report the data in this way.

For those under age 35, 43% report a household member having been to Israel. This percentage declines for those age 35-49 to 34%, but then increases to 39% for those age 50-64, 51% for those age 65-74, and then to only 41% of those age 75 and over. The decline for the 75 and over population is probably related to the smaller household size in these older households. For Jewish trips to Israel, the percentage is highest, at about one of four, for the youngest age group (23%) and for the two older age groups (about 25%).

Almost half of elderly couples and elderly singles have had a members of the household go to Israel, about half of these with a Jewish group. Note also that 38% of households containing children have had at least one member go to Israel. In 20% of households with children, the trip was sponsored by a Jewish group. Thus, of the 1,258 households with children, 483 have had a member go to Israel. More importantly, for households with children, 19% (239) have had *one of those children* go to Israel, 10% on a Jewish trip.

Non-elderly singles are least likely to have been on a trip to Israel (24%), with only 7% going on a Jewish trip.

Reflecting the cost of such a trip, 24% of those earning under \$25,000 have gone, versus 54% of those earning \$100,000 or more. By region, more households on the East Shore (42%) have been to Israel than on the West Shore (33%). For Jewish trips, this difference also is evident (23% versus 13%).

Orthodox (56%) and Conservative Jews (53%) are more likely to have gone than are Reform Jews (38%). The Just Jewish group (22%) is the least likely to have gone. Orthodox (34%) and Conservative Jews (35%) are much more likely to have gone on a Jewish trip than are Reform Jews (16%) or the Just Jewish (5%). Only 22% of those in intermarried households have gone, versus 57% of those in in-married households. Only 6% of intermarried households have been on a Jewish trip.

72% of households which are JCC members contain someone who has visited Israel, versus only 26% of non-members. 59% of households which are currently organizational members contain someone who has visited Israel, versus only 26% of non-members. 59% of households which are currently synagogue members contain someone who has visited Israel, versus only 21% of non-members.

Finally, **Table 11-1** shows that 58% of those who donated to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg in the past year have been to Israel, 31% on a Jewish trip. For those who were asked to make a donation, but declined to do so, 28% have been to Israel, 13% on Jewish trip. 18% of those who were not asked for a donation have been to Israel, 8% on a Jewish trip.

Table 11-1 Someone in Household Has Been to Israel				
Variable	% Someone in Household to Israel	Someone in Household to Israel on a Jewish Trip	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	39.7%	20.1%	457	3200
Age of Respondent				
Under 35	42.7%	23.2%	90	781
35-49	34.4%	17.5%	143	1168
50-64	39.2%	15.2%	75	592
65-74	50.6%	24.5%	72	352
75+	40.6%	26.4%	77	304
Household Structure				
Households with Children	38.4%	20.3%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	43.8%	18.5%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	23.7%	7.4%	39	336
Elderly Couple	49.4%	24.8%	71	307
Elderly Single	48.4%	29.0%	66	307
Income				
Under \$25,000	24.3%	14.2%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	30.7%	13.1%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	40.3%	19.0%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	54.3%	22.4%	57	602
Geographic Area				
East Shore	42.4%	23.0%	345	2300
West Shore	32.9%	12.7%	112	900

Table 11-1
Someone in Household Has Been to Israel

Variable	% Someone in Household to Israel	Someone in Household to Israel on a Jewish Trip	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Current Jewish Identification				
Orthodox	56.4%	33.9%	58	304
Conservative	53.4%	34.9%	180	1043
Reform	38.4%	16.3%	93	704
Just Jewish	21.8%	4.5%	126	1027
Type of Marriage				
In-married	57.3%	30.3%	182	1176
Conversionary	36.1%	20.8%	29*	239
Intermarriage	21.8%	5.8%	83	698
Current Member of a JCC				
JCC Members	71.5%	45.7%	172	976
NOT JCC Members	25.8%	8.9%	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization				
Jewish Org.	59.4%	34.0%	221	1344
Not a Member	25.5%	9.7%	231	1856
Current Member of a Synagogue				
Synagogue Member	58.6%	33.6%	249	4,031
Not a Member	21.4%	7.0%	367	8,975
Donation Market Segments				
Gave to UJC	58.0%	30.5%	252	1459
Asked, Did not Give	27.8%	13.4%	40	349
Not Asked to Give	18.4%	7.6%	155	1392

Table 11-2
Someone in Household Been to Israel
Comparison with Other Cities

Community	Year	%	Community	Year	%
Toronto	1990	63 %	Dallas	1989	37 %
Miami	1994	55 %	Baltimore	1985	36 %
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	53 %	St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	35 %
South Broward	1992	52 %	Washington, DC	1983	35 %
Rhode Island	1987	46 %	Columbus	1991	34 %
West Palm Beach	1987	45 %	Worcester	1987	34 %
Miami	1982	46 %	Orlando	1993	34 %
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	44 %	Philadelphia	1984	33 %
SF Bay Area	1988	43 %	Boston	1985	33 %
Cleveland	1987	42 %	Richmond	1983	33 %
Nashville	1980	41 %	New Orleans	1988	32 %
Harrisburg	1994	40 %	Atlantic City	1985	32 %
Detroit	1990	40 %	Quad Cities	1989	31 %
Pittsburgh	1984	38 %	Chicago	1982	30 %
Rochester	1988	38 %	Hartford	1982	27 %
New York	1981	37 %	St. Louis	1982	27 %
NJPS	1971	16 %	NJPS	1990	26 %

NJPS only asked if the respondent had been to Israel. Thus, the NJPS figures are not comparable to those in the community studies, which have asked if anyone in the household has been to Israel.

Emotional Attachment to Israel

Respondents were asked: ``How emotionally attached are you to Israel? Extremely attached, very attached, somewhat attached, or not attached?'' The results show that 13 % are extremely attached, 29 % are very attached, 42 % are somewhat attached, and 16 % are not attached (**Table 11-3**).

This question was also asked in the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey. For ``Jews by religion'' in this survey, 13 % answered extremely attached, 23 % very attached, 47 % somewhat attached and 17 % not attached. For ``secular Jews'' in this survey, 2 % answered extremely attached, 6 % very attached, 35 % somewhat attached, and 54 % not attached. Thus, Jews in Greater Harrisburg express somewhat higher levels of attachment to Israel than do Jews by religion in the NJPS. The levels of attachment are, however, much lower than those found in Miami and are about equal to those found in St. Petersburg/Clearwater (**Table 11-4**).

Attachment to Israel (being extremely attached) shows no consistent relationship with age, except that 24 % of those age 75 and over indicated they are very attached. This is an important result because current wisdom has been that younger persons are not as committed to Israel as are older persons. Notice, however, that the highest percentage of persons who are not at all attached is among those under age 35 (25 %).

Attachment to Israel by household structure shows that 13 % of respondents in households with children responded very attached and 17 % not attached. Elderly singles (23 %) show the greatest level of attachment.

No relationship is seen with income, except that 21 % of those earning less than \$25,000 responded extremely attached. 16 % on the East Shore are extremely attached, versus 7 % on the West Shore.

Orthodox Jews (40 %) are much more attached than are Conservative Jews (15 %). 10 % of the Just Jewish are extremely attached, versus only 5 % of the Reform. 28 % of the Just Jewish are not at all attached, versus only 18 % of the Reform and 5 % of Orthodox and Conservative Jews. Only 5 % of those in intermarried households are extremely attached, versus 19 % of those in in-married households.

Having been to Israel has an effect on attachment to Israel. About 6 % of those who have not been to Israel are extremely attached, versus 19 % of those who have been on a general trip and 29 % of those who have been on a Jewish trip. 22 % of those who have not been to Israel are not attached.

Table 11-3 Emotional Attachment to Israel						
Variable	Extremely Attached	Very Attached	Somewhat Attached	Not Attached	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	13.2%	28.9	41.9	16.0	457	3200
Age of Respondent						
Under 35	14.3%	20.7	40.6	24.5	90	781
35-49	10.3%	27.1	48.8	13.9	143	1168
50-64	11.0%	37.2	36.1	15.8	75	592
65-74	15.2%	38.7	35.8	10.3	72	352
75 and over	23.6%	29.4	37.4	9.6	77	304
Household Structure						
Hhlds with Children	12.8%	23.7	46.8	16.7	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	12.9%	33.1	35.0	19.0	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	12.7%	22.1	49.1	16.0	39	336
Elderly Couple	16.6%	41.3	30.2	11.9	71	307
Elderly Single	22.5%	32.0	37.5	8.0	66	307
Income						
Under \$25,000	21.4%	30.2	33.2	15.2	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	10.1%	17.0	55.8	17.1	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	14.2%	33.2	38.1	14.5	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	12.0%	33.8	39.8	14.4	57	602
Geographic Area						
East Shore	15.5%	29.9	40.2	14.3	345	2300
West Shore	7.2%	26.2	46.3	20.4	112	900
Current Jewish Identification						
Orthodox	40.2%	35.2	19.7	4.9	58	304
Conservative	15.3%	38.8	39.6	6.2	180	1043

Table 11-3 Emotional Attachment to Israel						
Variable	Extremely Attached	Very Attached	Somewhat Attached	Not Attached	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Reform	4.6%	28.2	49.0	18.2	93	704
Just Jewish	10.3%	17.6	44.1	28.0	126	1027
Type of Marriage						
In-married	19.0%	42.0	28.3	10.6	182	1176
Conversionary	5.8%	18.8	59.3	16.0	29*	239
Intermarriage	5.3%	18.7	46.5	29.6	83	698
Anyone Adult in Household Been to Israel						
No	6.2%	22.7	49.1	22.1	269	1955
On General Trip	19.3%	38.3	32.5	9.9	95	666
On Jewish Trip	28.8%	38.4	29.9	2.8	90	582
Current Member of a JCC						
JCC Members	22.9%	38.0	32.4	6.6	172	976
NOT JCC Members	8.8%	24.7	46.2	20.3	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization						
Organization Member	21.7%	39.2	31.6	7.5	221	1344
Not a Member	6.9%	21.5	48.8	22.8	231	1856
Current Member of a Synagogue						
Synagogue Member	17.6%	37.7	36.7	8.0	269	1574
Not a Member	8.8%	20.1	47.1	24.0	188	1625
Donation Market Segments						
Gave to UJC	17.5%	37.2	38.0	7.4	252	1459
Asked, Did not Give	.0%	28.2	53.0	18.8	40	349
Not Asked to Give	10.3%	17.6	45.0	27.0	155	1392

23% of JCC members are extremely attached, versus 9% of non-members. 7% of members are not attached, versus 23% of non-members.

22% of Jewish organizational members, but only 7% of non-members are extremely attached. 18% of synagogue members, but only 9% of non-members are extremely attached. 24% of non-members are not at all attached.

Finally, those who donated to UJC in the past year(18%) are more likely to be extremely attached than are those who were asked, but did not give (0%) or those who were not asked (10%).

Table 11-4 Emotional Attachment to Israel Comparison with Other Communities					
Community	Year	Extremely	Very	Somewhat	Not Attached
St Petersburg /Clearwater	1994	11%	26	44	20
Harrisburg	1994	13%	29	42	16
Miami	1994	20%	22	39	19
NJPS (Jews by religion)	1990	13%	23	47	17
NJPS (secular Jews)	1990	2%	6	39	53

Chapter 12

Anti-Semitism

Chapter Table of Contents

Chapter Highlights	285
Personal Experience with Anti-Semitism in the Past Year in Greater Harrisburg	286
Perception of Anti-Semitism in Greater Harrisburg	290

Chapter Highlights

- Overall, 21 % indicated that they have experienced anti-Semitism in Greater Harrisburg in the past year. This rate is about average for an American Jewish community, and is identical to Baltimore.
- Experience with anti-Semitism in Greater Harrisburg is higher among younger age groups.
- Overall, 10% indicated that they feel ``a great deal'' of anti-Semitism exists in Greater Harrisburg. 47% feel there is ``a moderate amount''; 38%, ``a little''; and 7%, ``none at all.'' This is a relatively low rate of perception of anti-Semitism compared with other American Jewish communities.
- The perception of anti-Semitism increases significantly for the elderly, although experience with anti-Semitic incidents in the past year is much higher among the young.
- Households with children and those age 50-64 have relatively low rates of perception of anti-Semitism. Perception of anti-Semitism is higher in East Shore than in West Shore. 24 % of elderly couples see no anti-Semitism in Greater Harrisburg.

Personal Experience with Anti-Semitism in the Past Year in Greater Harrisburg

Overall, 21 % indicated that they have experienced anti-Semitism in Greater Harrisburg in the past year (**Table 12-1**). This rate is about average for an American Jewish community, but is lower than that found in Orlando (31 %), Washington (28 %), Atlantic City (24 %), and Rochester (23 %). It is equal to that found in Baltimore (21 %) (**Table 12-2**).

Note that no definition was given to respondents of an anti-Semitic act. Each respondent used their own definition.

Younger respondents, who are more likely to be in mixed residential and work environments than are older respondents, also experience more anti-Semitism. Experience with anti-Semitism declines from about 32 % of those under age 35, to about 10 % of those age 65 and over. 23 % of females experienced anti-Semitism, versus 18 % of males. Widows (16 %) (who are generally older) experience less anti-Semitism than the other marital status groups. Divorced (28 %) and single, never married persons (26 %) are most likely to report an anti-Semitic incident.

Households with children (26 %) and non-elderly singles (33 %) experience more anti-Semitism than the other household types. **More importantly, about 176 (14 %) households with children indicate that one of their children experienced anti-Semitism in the past year.**

Little relationship can be seen with income. Those on the West Shore (where there is no concentration of Jews) (26 %) are more likely to report anti-Semitism than those on the East Shore (19 %), where many Jews live in a strong Jewish neighborhood.

Orthodox Jews (6 %), probably because almost all live in the core area of Jewish settlement on the East Shore, are least likely to report anti-Semitism. 24 % of Conservative and 16 % of Reform Jews experienced anti-Semitism, as did 27 % of the Just Jewish. Intermarried couples (23 %) are as likely to experience anti-Semitism as in-married couples (23 %). Non-JCC members (23 %) report higher levels than JCC members (17 %). Little difference is seen between members and non-members of Jewish organizations. 19 % of synagogue members experienced anti-Semitism, versus 24 % of non-members.

Table 12-1 Personally Experienced Anti-Semitism in the Past Year in Greater Harrisburg			
Variable	%	Sample Size	Proj. # of Hhlds
All Respondents	21.1%	457	3200
Age of Respondent			
Under 35	32.0%	90	781
35-49	21.3%	143	1168
50-64	19.7%	75	592
65-74	8.1%	72	352
75 and over	11.3%	77	304
Sex			
Males	18.3%	159	1180
Females	22.9%	298	2020
Marital Status			
Married	20.6%	340	2406
Divorced	27.8%	52	256
Widows	15.7%	23*	189
Single	26.2%	42	349
Household Structure			
Hh with Children	25.9%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	18.4%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	33.3%	39	336
Elderly Couple	9.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	11.7%	66	307

Table 12-1 Personally Experienced Anti-Semitism in the Past Year in Greater Harrisburg			
Variable	%	Sample Size	Proj. # of Hhlds
Income			
Under \$25,000	20.5%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	22.3%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	24.3%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	22.5%	57	602
Geographic Area			
East Shore	19.3%	345	2300
West Shore	26.4%	112	900
Current Jewish Identification			
Orthodox	6.4%	58	304
Conservative	23.7%	180	1043
Reform	16.3%	93	704
Just Jewish	26.6%	126	1027
Type of Marriage			
In-married	22.8%	182	1176
Conversionary	17.4%	29*	239
Intermarried	22.6%	83	698
Current Member of a JCC			
JCC Members	17.2%	172	976
Not JCC Members	23.1%	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization			
Jewish Org. Member	21.6%	221	1344
Not a Member	21.3%	231	1856
Current Member of a Synagogue			
Synagogue Member	18.9%	269	1574
Not a Member	23.6%	188	1625

Table 12-2 Personal Experience with Anti-Semitism in the Past Year Comparison with Other Communities		
Community	Year	Yes
Orlando	1993	31 %
Tidewater (<i>in past few years</i>)	1988	29 %
Washington, DC	1983	28 %
St. Louis	1982	26 %
Atlantic City	1985	24 %
West Palm Beach (<i>in past 3 years</i>)	1987	24 %
Rochester	1988	23 %
Kansas City	1985	23 %
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	22 %
Worcester	1987	22 %
Dallas	1989	22 %
Harrisburg	1994	21 %
Baltimore	1985	21 %
SF Bay Area	1988	17 %
Miami	1994	14 %
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	13 %
South Broward	1990	12 %

Perception of Anti-Semitism in Greater Harrisburg

Excluding the don't know responses, 10% indicated that they feel ``a great deal'' of anti-Semitism exists in Greater Harrisburg (**Table 12-3**). 47% feel there is ``a moderate amount''; 38%, ``a little''; and 7%, ``none at all.'' This is a low rate of perception of anti-Semitism compared with other American Jewish communities (**Table 12-4**, which includes don't know responses, unlike **Table 12-3**). The 9% with ``a great deal'' (shown in **Table 12-4**) is higher than only 5 communities and is lower than 12. It compares to 26% in Miami, 17% in Baltimore, 16% in Orlando, 12% in Dallas, 10% in Columbus, 8% in Washington, 7% in Sarasota, and 5% in San Francisco. (Most of the don't know responses are from people who have been living in Greater Harrisburg for only a short period and did not feel qualified to provide a response.)

The perception of anti-Semitism increases significantly for the elderly. For those under age 65, 6%-9% perceive a great deal, versus 14% of those age 65-74 and 21% of those age 75 and over. Males (7%) are somewhat less likely to respond a great deal than females (12%). 26% of widows perceive a great deal, versus 8%-12% of the other marital status groups.

Elderly singles (26%) perceive much more anti-Semitism than the other household structure types. One in four elderly couples perceive no anti-Semitism in the local area.

Perception of anti-Semitism declines with increasing income, from 13% of the lowest income group to 2% of the highest income group.

Even though those on the West Shore live in a less Jewish area, only 5% perceive a great deal, versus 12% on the East Shore. The Just Jewish (14%) show a higher rate of perceived anti-Semitism than those who are Orthodox (8%), Conservative (9%), or Reform (7%). 6% of in-married couples perceive a great deal, versus 11% of the intermarried.

Finally, members of the JCC are less likely than non-members to perceive a great deal of anti-Semitism, by 5% to 12%. Members of Jewish organizations and synagogues do not differ from non-members of these groups.

Table 12-3 Perception of Anti-Semitism in Greater Harrisburg (Omits Don't Know)							
Variable	A Great Deal	A Moderate Amount	A Little	None at All	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Hhlds
All	9.8%	46.9	37.5	6.8	100.0%	457	3200
Age of Respondent							
Under 35	8.2%	44.1	43.0	4.8	100.0%	90	781
35-49	8.5%	47.3	39.7	4.5	100.0%	143	1168
50-64	6.3%	45.1	39.0	9.6	100.0%	75	592
65-74	14.0%	58.5	23.2	4.3	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	20.9%	43.1	28.1	7.9	100.0%	77	304
Sex							
Male	6.9%	44.5	43.0	5.5	100.0%	159	1180
Female	11.5%	48.3	34.2	6.0	100.0%	298	2020
Marital Status							
Married	8.2%	48.5	37.8	5.5	100.0%	340	2406
Divorced	11.6%	40.9	32.3	15.2	100.0%	52	256
Widowed	25.6%	45.4	20.2	8.8	100.0%	23*	189
Single	8.1%	40.6	51.3	.0	100.0%	42	349
Household Structure							
Hh with children	6.1%	44.8	44.5	12.4	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Eld Couple	8.3%	43.6	42.1	14.4	100.0%	71	579
Non-Eld Single	12.9%	54.5	25.7	2.0	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	9.5%	65.4	21.7	23.6	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	26.1%	39.9	25.2	18.0	100.0%	66	307

Table 12-3 Perception of Anti-Semitism in Greater Harrisburg (Omits Don't Know)							
Variable	A Great Deal	A Moderate Amount	A Little	None at All	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Hhlds
Income							
Under \$25,000	13.0%	43.4	30.7	12.9	100.0%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	9.5%	48.2	39.8	2.5	100.0%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	7.4%	47.2	39.7	5.6	100.0%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	1.8%	54.0	42.6	1.7	100.0%	57	602
Geographic Area							
East Shore	11.6%	47.3	36.5	4.6	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	4.8%	45.7	40.4	9.1	100.0%	112	900
Current Jewish Identification							
Orthodox	7.5%	57.5	31.3	3.7	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	9.0%	54.6	34.1	2.4	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	7.4%	40.2	46.3	6.0	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	13.8%	39.7	37.3	9.3	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage							
In-married	5.7%	58.1	32.9	3.3	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	6.3%	36.3	45.1	12.3	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarried	10.7%	36.5	49.1	3.7	100.0%	83	698
Current Member of a JCC							
JCC Members	4.6%	62.2	30.4	2.8	100.0%	172	976
Not Members	12.1%	39.9	40.8	7.2	100.0%	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization							
Org. Member	9.3%	57.2	31.0	2.5	100.0%	221	1344
Not a Member	10.3%	39.9	42.0	7.7	100.0%	231	1856
Current Member of a Synagogue							
Member	9.9%	54.7	31.5	3.9	100.0%	269	1574
Not a Member	9.6%	38.6	44.0	7.8	100.0%	188	1625

Table 12-4 Perception of Anti-Semitism Existing in Community Comparison with Other Communities						
Community	Year	A Great Deal	A Moderate Amount	A Little	None at All	Don't Know
Miami	1994	26%	36	20	2	15
Toronto	1991	25%	44	26	2	3
South Broward	1990	20%	32	24	6	17
Miami	1982	19%	40	31	6	5
St. Louis	1982	18%	39	29	7	7
Baltimore	1985	17%	49	26	2	5
Orlando	1993	16%	40	26	7	11
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	14%	36	27	13	10
Dallas	1989	12%	54	28	2	6
Atlantic City	1985	12%	36	32	10	9
Columbus	1991	10%	41	36	3	10
Kansas City	1985	10%	42	33	8	7
Harrisburg	1994	9%	41	33	5	13
Washington, DC	1983	8%	45	38	4	6
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	7%	31	28	13	19
Worcester	1987	7%	40	39	8	6
Rochester	1988	6%	45	42	4	4
SF Bay Area	1988	5%	37	47	5	6

Chapter 13

The Community Review

Chapter Table of Contents

Chapter Highlights	295
Market Penetration of the <i>Community Review</i>	296
Profile of Readers of the <i>Community Review</i>	300
Perception of the Quality of the <i>Community Review</i>	301
Preference for Editorial Content	304

Chapter Highlights

- About 61% of respondents indicated that they read or receive the *Community Review*, implying that about 1,950 households receive the paper.
- Readership increases from about 42% of those under age 35, to about three-fourths of those age 50 and over.
- Overall, respondents rate the quality of the *Community Review* quite highly. About 24% of respondents view it as excellent, 60% as good, 15% as fair, and 1% as poor.
- Respondents were asked their preference for editorial content in the *Community Review*. The answers "local" and "national/international" news were read to the respondent. The answer "equally" had to be volunteered by the respondent. Note that the results are based upon the respondents who read or receive the paper and felt themselves qualified to answer the question. About 65% of respondents answered local. 21% answered national/international, and 14% responded "equally."

Market Penetration of The Community Review

About 61% of respondents indicated that they read or receive the *Community Review* (the UJC newspaper), implying that about 1,950 households read or receive the paper (**Table 13-1**). The actual circulation is 2,120, including an unknown number of copies mailed to households outside the Greater Harrisburg area and to non-Jews, including libraries. The survey, thus, provides an excellent "prediction" of actual readership. Note that the paper is mailed to all JCC members and to all UJC donors giving \$25 and over. Someone who is asked to give to UJC (and does not) must pay for the paper. Advertisers are mailed the paper at no charge and subscriptions are taken.

The percentage reading or receiving the paper is at about the center of the comparison communities in **Table 13-2**. For the remainder of this discussion, "reading or receiving" is referred to as "readership."

Readership is only 42% of those under age 35. In general readership increases with age, to about 58% of those age 35-49 and about three-fourths of those age 50 and over. Those who are widowed (66%) are more likely to read or receive the paper than are those who are married (60%). The divorced (47%) are least likely to read the paper. Elderly singles (77%) and elderly couples (76%) are most likely to read the paper; only 41% of non-elderly singles read the paper, as do 59% of households with children.

Those earning over \$100,000 per year are more likely (78%) to receive the paper than are those earning less. Only about 44% of those earning under \$50,000 read the paper, as do 67% of those earning \$50,000 - \$100,000. Readership rates are much higher in East Shore (67%) than in West Shore (46%).

Receipt of the paper increases from only 33% of those in residence for 0-4 years, to over two-thirds of those in residence for ten or more years. This is not a surprising finding. It does emphasize the need to try to integrate newcomers into the community at an early date.

Orthodox (89%) and Conservative Jews (80%) are much more likely to read the paper than are Reform Jews (61%). Only 31% of the Just Jewish indicate they read the paper. 83% of in-married couples, but only 34% of intermarried couples read the paper. Those who have been to Israel on a Jewish trip (87%) are most likely to receive the paper, followed by those who have been on a general trip (76%), and those who have not been to Israel (48%).

JCC members (97%) are more likely to read the paper than are non-members (45%). Jewish organization members (89%) are more likely to read the paper than are non-members (41%). Synagogue members (89%) are more likely to read the paper than are non-members (33%).

94% of UJC donors read the paper, versus 58% of those who turned down a gift, and 18% of those who were not asked.

Table 13-1 Percentage Reading or Receiving the <i>Community Review</i>			
Variable	<i>Community Review</i> Readership	Sample Size	Projected # of Households
All Respondents	60.9%	457	3200
Age of Respondent			
Under 35	42.3%	90	781
35-49	57.7%	143	1168
50-64	75.7%	75	592
65-74	71.9%	72	352
75 and over	79.9%	77	304
Marital Status			
Married	59.7%	340	2406
Widowed	65.7%	52	256
Divorced	46.9%	23*	189
Single	76.2%	42	349
Household Structure			
Households with Children	59.4%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	60.1%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	40.7%	39	336
Elderly Couple	76.2%	71	307
Elderly Single	77.1%	66	307
Income			
Under \$25,000	43.0%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	44.8%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	66.9%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	78.0%	57	602

Table 13-1 Percentage Reading or Receiving the <i>Community Review</i>			
Variable	<i>Community Review</i> Readership	Sample Size	Projected # of Households
Geographic Area			
East Shore	66.6%	345	2300
West Shore	46.3%	112	900
Length of Residence			
0 - 4 years	32.7%	80	662
5 - 9 years	53.6%	46	349
10 - 19 years	66.9%	79	602
20 or more years	72.1%	252	1590
Current Jewish Identification			
Orthodox	89.0%	58	304
Conservative	80.1%	180	1043
Reform	60.9%	93	704
Just Jewish	31.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage			
In-married	83.2%	182	1176
Conversionary	66.9%	29*	239
Intermarried	34.4%	83	698
Been to Israel			
No	48.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	76.4%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	86.7%	90	582
Current Member of a JCC			
JCC Members	97.2%	172	976
NOT JCC Members	44.9%	285	2224

Table 13-1 Percentage Reading or Receiving the <i>Community Review</i>			
Variable	<i>Community Review</i> Readership	Sample Size	Projected # of Households
Current Member of a Jewish Organization			
Jewish Organization Member	89.0%	221	1344
Not a Member	40.8%	231	1856
Current Member of a Synagogue			
Synagogue Member	89.2%	269	1574
Not a Member	33.2%	188	1625
Donation Market Segments			
Gave to UJC	93.8%	252	1459
Asked, Did not Give	58.4%	40	349
Not asked to Give	17.5%	155	1392

Table 13-2 Percentage Reading the Local Jewish Newspaper Comparison with other Communities		
Community	Year	% Reading
Sarasota-Manatee*	1992	73%
South Broward*	1992	63%
Pittsburgh	1984	63%
Harrisburg*	1994	61%
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	54%
Orlando	1993	42%
Miami	1992	34%
*Newspapers are published by the Federations and distributed to the Federation's mailing list.		

Profile of Readers of the Community Review

While the discussion above shows the percentage of each population group who read the *Community Review*, this section develops a profile of those people who do read the paper.

- 17% are under 35, 35% are 35-49, 23% are 50-64, 13% are 65-74 and 13% are age 75 and over.
- 73% are married, 12% are single never married, 5% are divorced, and 10% are widowed.
- 15% earn under \$25,000, 20% earn \$25,000-\$50,000, 42% earn \$50,000-\$100,000, and 25% earn \$100,000 and over.
- 79% live in East Shore and 21% in West Shore.
- 14% are Orthodox, 43% are Conservative, 5% are Reconstructionist, 22% are Reform, and 16% are Just Jewish.
- 71% of married readers are in-married, 12% are in conversionary marriages, and 18% are in intermarriages.
- 26% have been to Israel on a Jewish trip, 26% on a general trip, and 48% have not been to Israel.
- 49% are JCC members, 61% are members of a Jewish organization, and 73% are synagogue members.
- 79% donated to the UJC in the past year, 9% were asked but declined to give, and 11% were not asked to give.

Perception of the Quality of The Community Review

Overall, respondents rated the quality of the *Community Review* quite highly (**Table 13-3**). Note that the results are based upon the respondents who read or receive the paper and felt themselves qualified to answer the question. About 24% of respondents view it as excellent, 60% as good, 15% as fair, and 1% as poor. **Table 13-4** indicates that this paper is about average compared to the ratings of the four Florida newspapers.

Perceived quality does not vary consistently with age, although the age 75 and over group has the highest excellent rating, at 37%, and the under age 35 and age 50-64 group were most likely to provide a fair rating. Those who are single (37%) are more likely to have rated the paper excellent than were those who are married (24%). 40% of elderly singles rated the quality as excellent, versus 20%-23% of the other household types.

The perceived quality of the paper does not vary consistently with income, although those earning under \$25,000 (46%) are much more likely to rate the paper as excellent. Those in East Shore (25%) rate the paper slightly higher than those in West Shore (21%).

Orthodox Jews (36%) are more likely to rate the paper excellent than are Conservative Jews (26%), Reform Jews (24%), or the Just Jewish (11%).

JCC members (27%) are more likely to rate the paper excellent than are non-members (21%). Jewish organization members (29%) view the paper more positively than non-members (16%) and synagogue members (28%) view the paper more positively than non-members (13%).

Table 13-3 Perception of the Quality of the <i>Community Review</i> (Omits Don't Know)							
Variable	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All	24.3%	59.8	14.6	1.3	100.0%	288	1372
Age of Respondent							
Under 35	16.0%	61.2	22.7	.0	100.0%	33	207
35-49	26.6%	60.7	10.6	2.1	100.0%	86	482
50-64	19.3%	60.7	20.0	.0	100.0%	56	331
65-74	24.2%	63.4	12.4	.0	100.0%	50	173
75 and over	37.3%	50.7	8.1	3.9	100.0%	63	180
Marital Status							
Married	23.7%	61.4	13.2	1.7	100.0%	215	1019
Widowed	17.7%	58.7	23.6	.0	100.0%	39	137
Single	36.8%	52.4	10.7	.0	100.0%	23*	148
Household Structure							
Hhds with Kids	23.4%	61.3	13.3	1.9	100.0%	93	606
Non-Eld Couple	19.5%	61.5	19.0	.0	100.0%	41	266
Elderly Couple	20.0%	60.6	15.1	4.3	100.0%	54	191
Elderly Single	39.6%	53.9	6.5	.0	100.0%	51	192
Income							
Under \$25,000	46.4%	45.0	8.6	.0	100.0%	37	198
\$25 - \$49,999	22.3%	68.4	8.3	1.0	100.0%	41	265
\$50 - \$99,999	23.2%	54.7	19.5	2.6	100.0%	73	573
\$100,000 +	21.3%	71.3	7.5	.0	100.0%	43	336

Table 13-3 Perception of the Quality of the <i>Community Review</i> (Omits Don't Know)							
Variable	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Geographic Area							
East Shore	25.3%	59.3	13.9	1.6	100.0%	238	1092
West Shore	20.6%	62.1	17.3	.0	100.0%	50	280
Current Jewish Identification							
Orthodox	36.0%	47.5	16.5	.0	100.0%	51	195
Conservative	25.9%	58.3	15.0	.8	100.0%	134	622
Reform	23.7%	66.5	9.8	.0	100.0%	58	295
Just Jewish	11.4%	60.1	22.4	6.1	100.0%	33	196
Current Member of a JCC							
Members	27.7%	55.0	14.8	2.5	100.0%	162	686
NOT Members	21.0%	64.7	14.3	.0	100.0%	126	686
Current Member of a Jewish Organization							
Org. Member	29.1%	57.3	11.6	2.0	100.0%	194	871
Not a Member	16.0%	64.3	19.7	.0	100.0%	94	501
Current Member of a Synagogue							
Syn. Member	28.3%	57.1	14.0	.7	100.0%	235	1028
Not a Member	12.7%	68.1	16.3	2.9	100.0%	53	344

Table 13-4 Perception of the Quality of the Local Jewish Newspaper Comparison with Other Communities						
Community	Year	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	38%	53	8	1	100%
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	28%	56	14	2	100%
Harrisburg	1994	24%	60	15	1	100%
Orlando	1993	24%	57	16	2	100%
South Broward	1992	12%	57	27	5	100%

Preference for Editorial Content

Currently, the *Community Review* carries only local news. Respondents were asked their preference for editorial content in the *Community Review*. The answers ``local'' and ``national/international'' were read to the respondent. The answer ``equally'' had to be volunteered by the respondent (**Table 13-5**). Note that the results are based upon the respondents who read or receive the paper and felt themselves qualified to answer the question. About 65% of respondents answered local. 21% answered national/international, and 14% responded ``equally.''

Younger respondents were more likely to answer local, declining from 76% for the under age 35 group to about 55% of the two elderly groups. The percentage responding national/international shows no consistent relationship with age. Income and geographic area show no consistent relationship with the responses.

The Just Jewish (70%) are somewhat more likely to have responded local than Orthodox (63%), Conservative (62%), or Reform Jews (64%).

Those who have been to Israel on a general trip (29%) are more likely to have responded national/international than those who have been on a Jewish trip (18%) or who have not been to Israel (18%).

JCC members do not differ significantly in their responses from non-members. Jewish organization members (63%) are less likely to say local than are non-members (69%) and synagogue members (19%) are less likely to indicate national/international than non-members (27%) .

64% of UJC donors indicate local, versus 80% of those who are asked and do not give and 56% of those not asked to give. Those not asked are more likely to say national/international.

Table 13-5 Preference for Editorial Content of the <i>Community Review</i> (Omits Don't Know)						
Variable	Local	National/ International	Equally	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All	64.9%	20.8	14.3	100.0%	239	1646
Age of Respondent						
Under 35	75.7%	21.8	2.5	100.0%	33	298
35-49	65.8%	20.2	14.0	100.0%	72	570
50-64	64.7%	26.7	8.6	100.0%	46	382
65-74	55.1%	14.5	30.5	100.0%	39	199
75 and over	55.8%	16.2	28.0	100.0%	49	196
Income						
Under \$25,000	59.9%	26.1	14.1	100.0%	29*	217
\$25 - \$49,999	75.1%	12.0	12.9	100.0%	37	349
\$50 - \$99,999	64.9%	28.4	6.6	100.0%	61	657
\$100,000 +	65.8%	15.4	18.8	100.0%	39	423
Geographic Area						
East Shore	65.2%	20.8	14.1	100.0%	196	1307
West Shore	63.7%	21.0	15.3	100.0%	43	339
Current Jewish Identification						
Orthodox	62.7%	26.3	11.0	100.0%	44	242
Conservative	62.2%	17.9	19.9	100.0%	107	721
Reform	64.4%	20.8	14.9	100.0%	50	374
Just Jewish	70.0%	28.9	1.1	100.0%	26*	227
Anyone Adult in Household Been to Israel						
No	69.2%	17.9	12.8	100.0%	102	779
On general trip	59.9%	29.0	11.1	100.0%	57	400
On Jewish trip	62.5%	17.7	19.8	100.0%	80	469

Table 13-5 Preference for Editorial Content of the <i>Community Review</i> (Omits Don't Know)						
Variable	Local	National/ International	Equally	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Current Member of the JCC						
JCC Member	64.0%	19.0	17.0	100.0%	137	848
Not a Member	65.7%	22.7	11.5	100.0%	102	798
Current Member of a Jewish Organization						
Org. Member	62.5%	21.0	16.6	100.0%	159	1029
Not a Member	68.5%	21.0	10.5	100.0%	78	617
Current Member of a Synagogue						
Syn. Member	64.3%	18.7	17.0	100.0%	193	1213
Not a Member	66.5%	26.7	6.8	100.0%	46	433
Donation Market Segments						
Gave to UJC	64.0%	20.2	15.8	100.0%	192	1346
Asked, Did not Give	79.5%	11.2	9.3	100.0%	21*	145
Not Asked to Give	55.9%	34.2	9.9	100.0%	20*	156

Chapter 14

Philanthropic Profile

Chapter Table of Contents

Chapter Highlights	308
Overall Levels of Donation to Jewish and Non-Jewish Charities and to the UJC	309
Overall Levels of Giving	310
Jewish Charities	310
United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg	312
Non-Jewish Charities	318
Contributions to Jewish Charities and Non-Jewish Charities Compared	320
Contributions to Jewish Charities	322
Contributors and Non-Contributors to the UJC	326
Contributions to the UJC	330
Contributions to Non-Jewish Charities	334
Preference for Israel/Local Allocation	338
Provisions for Jewish Charities in Will	342

UJC (the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg) is the local Jewish Federation.

When making comparisons of the dollar amounts given to charities to other Jewish communities, the reader is cautioned to consult the tables for the year that each community completed its study. These comparisons clearly do not account for differences in cost of living or inflation.

Note that Jewish charitable donations include donations to UJC, but exclude synagogue dues, tuition, and Israel Bonds.

Chapter Highlights

- Overall, 69% reported that they contributed to Jewish charities in the past year, 74% to non-Jewish charities, and 46% to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg.
- 31% reported that they gave no money to Jewish charities in the past year. 23% gave under \$100 and 24% gave \$100-\$500. 22% gave \$500 and over, including 13% who gave \$1,000 and over. The 69% contributing to Jewish charities is toward the middle of the comparison Jewish communities, but compares to 56% from the National Jewish Population Survey.
- 54% reported that they made no donation to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg (UJC) in the past year. 44% were not contacted for a donation and 11% were contacted, but chose not to give. 20% gave under \$100 and 15% gave \$100-\$500. 10% gave \$500 and over, including 6% who gave \$1,000 and over. The 46% reported rate of giving is at about the center of the comparison communities.
- 26% report that they gave no money to non-Jewish charities in the past year. 33% gave under \$100 and 27% gave \$100-\$500. 14% gave \$500 and over, including 7% who gave \$1,000 and over. The percentage giving \$500 and over to non-Jewish charities is slightly higher than the percentage giving \$500 and over to UJC.
- A larger percentage of people give \$500 and over to Jewish (22%) than to non-Jewish charities (14%).
- The percentage donating to Jewish charities increases precipitously, from 48% of those under age 35 to about 83% of those age 65 and over.
- Inter-marriage is correlated with donation levels to all Jewish charities. 10% of in-married couples do not give, versus 55% of the intermarried.
- The percentage being asked to give to the UJC increases from 37% of those under age 35 to 72% of those age 65 and over.
- Trips to Israel also is correlated with giving to UJC. 57% of those who have been to Israel on a Jewish trip gave \$100 and over, versus 38% of households in which someone has been to Israel on a general trip, and 16% of households in which no one has been to Israel.

Chapter Highlights

- Synagogue membership also is related to giving to the UJC. 79% of synagogue members donate, versus 21% of the non-members.
- Respondents were asked the following question: ``On the whole, would you rather see more of the money collected by the UJC used for local Jewish needs or sent to Israel and overseas?'' 49% selected local and 9%, Israel and overseas. 31% volunteered ``about equal'' as an answer. 11% responded ``whatever UJC thinks is best.''
- 14% of respondents age 50 and over have a will with a provision for a Jewish charity.

Overall Levels of Donation to Jewish and Non-Jewish Charities and to the UJC

This section discusses the reported levels of donations in the past year to all Jewish charities, to non-Jewish charities, and to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg. Each respondent defined ``charitable contribution'' for him/herself. It should be stated that respondents are somewhat likely to ``overstate'' their level of charitable giving, even in an anonymous survey. More importantly, despite assurances to the contrary, some respondents might have felt that questions concerning donations to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg were leading to an appeal for funds, and may have overstated their giving to the UJC. In other cases, people pay for and attend events at UJC. They may consider these fees to be a charitable donation, but they are not counted as such by the UJC. Many people may confuse the UJC with the Jewish National Fund—people who buy a tree often think they have donated to UJC.

Note as well that, because the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg is a Jewish charity, respondents included their gifts to the UJC in their answers to questions about Jewish charities. Finally, the following section discusses the overall levels of philanthropy. Later sections of this chapter examine the levels of donations for different population subgroups.

Overall Levels of Giving

Overall, 69% reported that they contributed to Jewish charities in the past year, 74% to non-Jewish charities, and 46% to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg. (**Table 14-1**). Thus, like seven cities and the National Jewish Population Survey in the comparison table (**Table 14-2**), giving to Jewish charities is lower than to non-Jewish charities. For four communities, the levels of giving to Jewish and non-Jewish charities is about equal. A later section of this chapter examines the overlap between giving to Jewish and non-Jewish charities.

Jewish Charities. 31% report that they gave no money to Jewish charities in the past year. 23% gave under \$100, and 24% gave \$100-\$500. 22% gave \$500 and over, including 13% who gave \$1,000 and over (**Table 14-1**). Respondents were instructed to exclude synagogue dues, tuition, and Israel Bonds from their answers.

Notice that the 69% contribution rate to Jewish charities is toward the middle of the Jewish communities in **Table 14-2**. It is higher than San Francisco (60%), Orlando (58%), Worcester (55%), and Houston (47%). It is considerably lower than Pittsburgh (93%), Chicago (76%), Sarasota-Manatee (76%), and Miami (71%). It is about equal to Baltimore (66%) and is higher than the rate (56%) in the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey for the US as a whole. It is also higher than the 58% for Jews in Pennsylvania.

Table 14-3 examines just those households who *did give* to Jewish philanthropies. 34% gave under \$100. This rate (34%) is toward the upper end of the comparison communities in the table. It compares to 85% in Boston, 43% in Orlando, 31% in San Francisco, 21% in Sarasota, and 26% in West Palm Beach.

The percentage who gave over \$1,000 (20%) is higher than average. It is below Palm Springs (45%), Sarasota-Manatee (30%), West Palm Beach (21%), Miami (20%), South Broward (20%), and Toronto (19%). It is about equal to Rochester (18%) and Baltimore (17%). It is higher than Atlantic City (12%), Orlando (12%), and Boston (6%).

Table 14-1 Levels of Donation to Jewish and Non-Jewish Charities, and to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg in the Past Year (Sample Size = 457, Projected Number of Households = 3200)			
Level of Donation	Non-Jewish Charities	Jewish Charities*	United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg
Not Asked to Give			43.5%
Asked, but not give			10.9%
Nothing	26.1%	31.3%	54.4%
Under \$100	33.4	23.1	19.9
\$100 - \$499	26.8	24.1	15.4
\$500 - \$999	6.5	8.1	4.0
\$1,000 - \$2,499	4.6	7.9	3.6
\$2,500 - \$4,999	1.4	2.9	.7
\$5,000 - \$9,999	.5	1.1	1.7
\$10,000 - \$24,999	.7	.5	.2
Over \$25,000	.0	1.0	.2
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Summary			
Do Contribute	73.9	68.7	45.6
\$500 and over	13.7	21.5	10.4
\$1,000 and over	7.2	13.4	6.4
*Includes donations to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg			

United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg. 54% reported making no donation to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg in the past year. 44% were not contacted for a donation and 11% were contacted, but chose not to give. 20% gave under \$100 and 15% gave \$100-\$500. 10% gave \$500 and over, including 6% who gave \$1,000 and over (**Table 14-1**).

Notice that the 46% contribution rate to UJC is about average compared to the communities in **Table 14-4**. It compares to 36% in New York, 39% in Boston and Columbus, 58% in Baltimore, 62% in Pittsburgh, and 74% in Cleveland. It is much higher than the rate found by the National Jewish Population Survey (34%).

The right hand side of **Table 14-4** examines just those households who *did give* to Federations. 17% (of givers) gave over \$1,000. This is one of the higher rates in the country and is about equal to San Francisco (17%), Worcester (17%), and Dallas (16%). It is higher than the Florida communities of Miami (13%), West Palm Beach (11%), Orlando (11%) and South Broward (11%). It is lower than Sarasota (20%).

Note that because 46% of respondents indicated a UJC gift in the past year, this survey implies that the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg received gifts from 1,459 households in the past year. Actually, the number of households giving a gift was 1,519. This is only a 3.9% error.

The 26% contributing \$100 or more compares to 21% of American Jews and 41% of Canadian Jews.

Table 14-2 Percentage Contributing to Jewish Charities and Non-Jewish Charities Comparison with Other Communities			
Community	Year	To Jewish Charities	To Non-Jewish Charities
Boston	1985	95 %	
Pittsburgh	1984	93 %	92 %
Palm Springs	1986	92 %	
Louisville	1991	91 %	89 %
West Palm Beach	1987	91 %	84 %
New Orleans	1988	89 %	91 %
Atlantic City	1985	83 %	
St. Louis	1982	78 %	
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	77 %	78 %
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	76 %	81 %
Chicago	1990	76 %	
Rochester	1988	76 %	76 %
Tidewater	1988	75 %	
Toronto	1990	75 %	
Minneapolis	1981	73 %	
Miami	1994	71 %	65 %
St. Paul	1992	70 %	
Harrisburg	1994	69%	74%
Chicago	1981	69 %	
New York	1981	68 %	40 %
South Broward	1990	71 %	56 %
Baltimore	1985	66 %	74 %

Table 14-2 Percentage Contributing to Jewish Charities and Non-Jewish Charities Comparison with Other Communities			
Community	Year	To Jewish Charities	To Non-Jewish Charities
Dallas	1989	66 %	59 %
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	65 %	74 %
Los Angeles	1979	65 %	
New York	1990	64 %	67 %
SF Bay Area	1988	60 %	72 %
Orlando	1993	58 %	71 %
Worcester	1987	55 %	74 %
Houston	1986	47 %	
NJPS (US)	1990	56 %	67 %
NJPS (PA)	1990	58 %	

Table 14-3 Dollar Amounts Contributed to Jewish Charities Comparison with Other Communities <i>(includes only households who donate to Jewish Charities)</i>					
Community	Year	Under \$100	\$100 - \$500	\$500 - \$1,000	Over \$1,000
Palm Springs	1986	21 %	22	11	45
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	21 %	33	16	30
Pittsburgh	1984	29 %	25	13	23
St. Louis	1982	32 %	30	17	21
West Palm Beach	1987	26 %	41	11	21
Miami	1994	32 %	38	12	20
Harrisburg	1994	34 %	35	12	20

Table 14-3 Dollar Amounts Contributed to Jewish Charities Comparison with Other Communities <i>(includes only households who donate to Jewish Charities)</i>					
Community	Year	Under \$100	\$100 - \$500	\$500 - \$1,000	Over \$1,000
Toronto	1990	25%	39	17	19
Minneapolis	1981	49%	26	10	15
SF Bay Area	1988	31%	44	11	15
Chicago	1981	56%	23	8	13
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	32%	41	14	13
Orlando	1993	43%	36	9	12
New York	1981	52%	30	7	10
Rochester	1988	67%		15	18
Dallas	1989	72%		11	17
Washington	1983	72%		11	17
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	75%		10	17
Baltimore	1985	74%		8	16
Boston	1985	85%	9	6	6
Louisville	1991	52%		11	34
Worcester	1987	63%		14	24
Atlantic City	1985	81%		7	12
New Orleans	1988	52%		27	21
South Broward	1990	69%		10	20
St. Paul	1992	80%		20	

Table 14-4 Contributions to the Jewish Federation Comparison with Other Communities <i>(Respondents who ``Don't Know'' if they gave are assumed to be non-givers)</i>					
			Amount Contributed		
Community	Year	% Who Give	\$1-\$499	\$500-\$1,000	\$1,000 +
San Francisco Bay Area	1988	25	72 %	11	17
New York	1981	26			
Orlando	1993	30	85 %	4	11
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	33	82 %	8	10
New York	1990	36			
Boston	1985	39			
Columbus	1990	39			
Miami	1994	37	78 %	9	13
Detroit	1990	43			
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	43	65 %	15	20
Washington, DC	1983	44			
Harrisburg	1994	46	73 %	10	17
Worcester	1987	46	73 %	10	17
Houston	1986	47			
South Broward	1990	52	83 %	5	11
Dallas	1989	53	78 %	6	16
West Palm Beach	1987	56	83 %	6	11
Baltimore	1985	58	87 %	3	9
Essex-Morris Counties, NJ	1986	52	82 %	6	13
St Paul	1992	55			
Rochester	1988	56	77 %	11	12
New Orleans	1988	57	71 %	9	20

Table 14-4 Contributions to the Jewish Federation Comparison with Other Communities <i>(Respondents who ``Don't Know'' if they gave are assumed to be non-givers)</i>					
			Amount Contributed		
Community	Year	% Who Give	\$1-\$499	\$500-\$1,000	\$1,000 +
Toronto	1990	60			
Louisville	1991	60	64 %	13	28
Atlantic City	1985	61	83 %	6	11
Pittsburgh	1984	62			
Manchester	1983	73	67 %	10	23
Cleveland	1987	74			
Palm Springs	1986	75			
Quad Cities	1989	75	75 %	12	13
St. Louis	1982	76			
NJPS (US)	1990	34			

Non-Jewish Charities. 26 % reported that they gave no money to non-Jewish charities in the past year. 33 % gave under \$100 and 27 % gave \$100-\$500. 14 % gave \$500 and over and 7 % gave \$1,000 and over. (**Table 14-1**).

Notice that the 74 % contribution rate to non-Jewish charities is at the middle of the comparison communities in **Table 14-5**. It is higher than Miami (65 %), South Broward (56 %), Dallas (59 %), and New York (67 %). It is about equal to Rochester (76 %), Orlando (71 %), San Francisco (72 %), and Baltimore (74 %). It is lower than Sarasota (81 %) and Pittsburgh (92 %). It is higher than the rate found by the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (67 %).

The right hand side of **Table 14-5** examines just those households who *did give* to non-Jewish philanthropies in the past year. 81 % gave under \$500. This rate is about average for American Jewish communities.

Table 14-5 Contributions to Non-Jewish Charities Comparison with Other Communities <i>(Respondents who ``Don't Know'' if they gave are assumed to be non-givers)</i>					
			Amount Contributed		
Community	Year	Do Give	\$1-\$500	\$500-\$1,000	\$1,000 +
New York	1990	67%			
New York	1981	40%			
South Broward	1990	56%	85%	5	9
Dallas	1989	59%	81%	10	9
Miami	1994	65%	83%	8	9
Detroit	1990	65%			
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	71%	84%	8	8
Orlando	1993	71%	88%	8	4
SF Bay Area	1988	72%	76%	13	11
Worcester	1987	74%	86%	6	8
Baltimore	1985	74%	93%	4	2
Harrisburg	1994	74%	81%	9	10
St Paul	1992	76%	83%	17	
Rochester	1988	76%	72%	12	16
Essex-Morris, NJ	1986	78%	88%	6	5
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	81%	77%	9	14
Washington, DC	1983		82%	9	9
St. Louis	1982		83%	9	9
West Palm Beach	1987	84%	75%	13	11
New Orleans	1991	91%	80	11	9
Pittsburgh	1984	92%	76%	11	13
NJPS (US)	1990	67%			

Contributions to Jewish Charities and Non-Jewish Charities Compared

An interesting comparison can be made between giving to Jewish and non-Jewish charities. Notice that a larger percentage of people give \$500 and over to Jewish (22 %) than to non-Jewish charities (14 %). Likewise, at the \$1,000 and over giving level, 13 % gave this amount to Jewish charities, but only 7 % to non-Jewish charities (**Table 14-1**).

Table 14-6 shows that 7% give only to Jewish charities and 18% give only to non-Jewish charities. 61 % give to both and only 13 % of households do not give any charitable contributions. This is an 87% giving rate to some charity, Jewish or non-Jewish.

About 1 % of significant givers (\$500 or more) to Jewish charities do not give to non-Jewish charities. About 3 % of significant givers (\$500 or more) to non-Jewish charities do not give to Jewish charities.

Respondents were asked to report their household charitable donations in the categories shown in **Table 14-1**. 41 % of respondents were in the same category on both Jewish and non-Jewish charities. 31 % were in a higher giving category on Jewish charities. 28 % were in a higher giving category on non-Jewish charities.

Table 14-6 Overlapping Jewish and Non-Jewish Giving Patterns (Sample Size = 457, Projected Number of Households = 3200)			
Category	Harrisburg 1994	Miami 1994	Pinellas 1994
Give only to Jewish charities	7.3%	18.1 %	9.4 %
Give only to non-Jewish charities	18.0%	12.5	17.6
Give to Jewish and non-Jewish charities	61.3%	53.0	56.0
Non-givers	13.4%	16.5	17.0
Total	100.0%	100.0 %	100.0 %
Give \$500 or more to non-Jewish and non-giver to Jewish	3.2%	2.1 %	2.6 %
Give \$500 or more to Jewish and non-giver to non-Jewish	0.7%	4.5 %	1.4 %
In same giving category on Jewish and non-Jewish charities	41.3%	42.7 %	45.0 %
In higher giving category on Jewish charity	31.0%	39.7	30.5
In higher giving category on non-Jewish charity	27.7%	17.7	24.5
Total	100.0%	100.0 %	100.0 %

Contributions to Jewish Charities

Table 14-7 shows the reported levels of contributions to Jewish charities for the Jewish population as a whole and for a variety of population subgroups. **Respondents were instructed to exclude synagogue dues and Israel Bond purchases from their answers.** 31 % report giving no money to Jewish charities in the past year. 23 % gave under \$100 and 24 % gave \$100-\$500. 21 % gave \$500 and over, including 13 % who gave \$1,000 and over.

The percentage not donating declines with age, from 52 % of those under age 35 to 36 % of those age 35-49, to about 15 % of those age 50 and over. The percentage giving \$500 or more increases with age, from 10 % of those under age 35, up to about one-third of those age 50-74. It then declines to only 16 % of those age 75 and over.

By generation, the first and third generation and higher is the most likely to not make any contributions to Jewish charities. 41 % of the first and 35 % of the third generation do not donate, versus about 15 % of the second generation. 25 % of the first generation donate \$500 or more, versus 29 % of the second, and about 19 % of the third generation and higher generation.

Non-elderly singles are the least likely to be making contributions to Jewish charities: 46 % do not. Only 18 % of elderly couples and elderly singles do not give. About 27 % of non-elderly couples and 35 % of households with children do not give. Thus, about one in three households with children are not setting an example of giving for their offspring.

Examining giving levels of \$500 or more, 21 % of households with children are in this category, as are about 28 % of non-elderly couples and 32 % of elderly couples. Only 7 % of non-elderly singles give \$500 or more. A major change is seen between elderly couples (32 %) and elderly singles (21 %). This implies that, when one becomes widowed, giving patterns change significantly.

As would be expected, as income increases, the percentage who donate, and the percentage who donate large amounts, increases. 47 % of those earning under \$25,000 are givers, versus about 68 % of those in the \$25,000-\$49,999 category, 77 % of those earning \$50,000-\$99,999, and 80 % of those earning \$100,000 and over. Giving at the level of \$500 or more increases from 4 % of those earning under \$25,000, to 9 % of those earning \$25,000-\$49,999 to 46 % of those earning \$100,000 and over.

The percentage giving to Jewish charities is much higher in East Shore (73 %) than in West Shore (57 %). The percentage giving \$500 or more in East Shore (25 %) is also much higher than in West Shore (13 %).

Table 14-7
Contributions to Jewish Charities (Rows add to 100%)

Variable	Do Not Give	Under \$100	\$100-\$499	\$500-\$999	\$1,000+	\$500 +	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	31.3%	23.1	24.1	8.1	13.3	21.4	457	3200
Age of Respondent								
Under 35	52.0%	20.5	17.3	5.7	4.4	10.1	90	781
35-49	35.7%	19.2	25.3	6.0	13.9	19.9	143	1168
50-64	13.5%	25.3	28.3	13.2	19.7	32.9	75	592
65-74	16.4%	26.0	22.3	10.7	24.7	35.4	72	352
75 and over	17.1%	38.3	28.8	9.9	5.8	15.7	77	304
Generation								
First	41.0%	19.1	14.6	3.6	21.6	25.2	30*	214
Second	15.1%	32.9	23.1	13.4	15.6	29.0	120	614
Third or higher	34.7%	20.7	25.3	7.2	12.1	19.3	303	2371
Household Structure								
Hh with Children	35.1%	17.2	26.5	8.4	12.8	21.2	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	27.0%	16.1	29.0	9.9	18.0	27.9	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	46.2%	34.8	12.4	2.2	4.4	6.6	39	336
Elderly Couple	17.8%	24.3	26.0	13.6	18.2	31.8	71	307
Elderly Single	18.1%	34.0	26.7	5.9	15.3	21.2	66	307
Income								
Under \$25,000	52.8%	32.4	11.1	2.2	1.6	3.8	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	31.8%	28.1	30.9	6.0	3.2	9.2	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	22.8%	20.4	28.6	9.8	18.5	28.3	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	19.7%	4.3	30.0	18.0	28.1	46.1	57	602
Geographic Area								
East Shore	26.9%	21.9	26.3	9.4	15.3	24.7	345	2300
West Shore	43.0%	26.3	18.1	4.7	8.0	12.7	112	900

Table 14-7 shows that as length of residence increases, so does giving level, suggesting that people give more as they become bonded to a community. The lowest rate of giving is for those with the shortest length of residence. 46% of those in residence for 0-4 years give. This increases to about 67% of those in residence 5-19 years and to 79% for those in residence for 20 years or more. The percentage giving \$500 or more does not vary consistently with length of residence, although it is far lower for new residents (8%).

Those who identify themselves as Just Jewish are least likely to be making donations: 55% are non-givers, versus 8% of Orthodox Jews, 17% of Conservative Jews and 33% of Reform Jews. The percentage giving \$500 or more declines from 40% of Orthodox Jews, to 30% of Conservative Jews, to 23% of Reform Jews, to 5% of the Just Jewish.

Intermarriage has is correlated with donation levels. 10% of in-married couples do not give, versus 55% of the intermarried. 41% of in-married couples give \$500 and over, versus 6% of the intermarried.

Trips to Israel also is correlated with donation levels. 42% of those who have not been to Israel do not give, versus 14% of households in which an adult has been on a general trip or a Jewish trip. 11% of those who have not been to Israel give \$500 and over, versus about 31% of those who have been to Israel on a general trip, and 48% of those who have been to Israel on a Jewish trip.

Synagogue membership also is correlated with donation levels, even though synagogue dues were not included in the totals. 6% of synagogue members do not give, versus 55% of non-members. 39% of members give \$500 and over, versus 5% of non-members. The differences are wide as well for JCC members and non-members (5% versus 43% not giving and 53% versus 8% giving \$500 and over) and for Jewish organization members and non-members (4% versus 49% not giving and 44% versus 6% giving \$500 and over).

58% of those people who decline to give when asked by UJC *do* give to other Jewish charities, 19% at \$100 and over. Also, 30% of persons who are not asked by UJC to give are donors to other Jewish charities, with about 9% giving \$500 and over. These findings indicate additional potential for donations to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg if these persons can be identified and approached.

Table 14-7—continued Contributions to Jewish Charities (Rows add to 100%)								
Variable	Do Not Give	Under \$100	\$100-\$499	\$500-\$999	\$1,000+	\$500 +	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	31.3%	23.1	24.1	8.1	13.3	21.4	457	3200
Length of Residence								
0 - 4 years	53.9%	25.7	12.3	5.8	2.2	8.0	80	662
5 - 9 years	32.7%	13.6	25.6	11.7	16.4	28.1	46	349
10 - 19 years	32.0%	20.9	29.7	4.9	12.5	17.4	79	602
20 + years	20.8%	25.0	26.9	9.5	17.8	27.3	252	1590
Current Jewish Identification								
Orthodox	7.8%	20.9	31.1	15.7	24.4	40.1	58	304
Conservative	16.8%	19.0	34.0	9.0	21.2	30.2	180	1043
Reform	33.4%	20.0	23.2	11.1	12.3	23.4	93	704
Just Jewish	55.0%	26.9	12.6	2.4	3.0	5.4	126	1027
Type of Marriage								
In-married	10.2%	17.9	31.0	14.4	26.5	40.9	182	1176
Conversionary	31.3%	19.1	33.2	3.5	12.9	16.4	29*	239
Intermarried	55.4%	16.7	21.9	5.9	.0	5.9	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel								
No	42.1%	28.5	18.7	7.1	3.6	10.7	269	1955
On General Trip	13.7%	19.1	36.6	9.8	20.8	30.6	95	666
On Jewish Trip	14.4%	9.5	28.4	9.7	38.1	47.8	90	582
Current Member of a Synagogue								
Synagogue Member	5.7%	16.6	38.7	14.5	24.4	38.9	269	1574
Not Member	54.9%	29.1	10.6	2.2	3.2	5.4	188	1625
Current Member of a JCC								
JCC Member	5.4%	13.3	28.0	18.5	34.9	53.4	172	976
Not JCC Member	42.5%	27.4	22.4	3.7	4.1	7.8	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization								
Org. Member	4.4%	14.8	36.4	15.6	28.8	44.4	221	1344
Not Member	49.2%	29.0	15.9	3.1	2.9	6.0	231	1856
Donation Market Segments								
Gave to UJC	.0%	22.9	39.1	13.3	24.7	38.0	252	1459
Asked, Did not Give	41.9%	39.0	10.7	3.4	5.1	8.5	40	349
Not Asked to Give	70.1%	19.5	6.9	2.9	.6	3.5	155	1392

Contributors and Non-Contributors to the UJC

Table 14-8 examines several variables crosstabulated with a variable that divided respondents into three categories: 1) persons who reported making a donation to the UJC campaign in the past year; 2) persons who did not make a donation, but were contacted by the UJC in the past year to do so; and 3) persons who did not make a donation and were not asked to make a donation in the past year. 54% gave no money to the UJC in the past year. 11% were asked to give, but chose not to and 44% were not asked. A number of other Jewish community studies that have asked respondents why they do not give have found that the most important reason was that they were not contacted. Thus, this table is particularly important in analyzing which groups are not being reached.

Table 14-9 shows that the percentage of people not being asked to give is higher in Greater Harrisburg (44%) than in Sarasota (37%) and West Palm Beach (37%), but is lower than in Miami (51%), Orlando (55%), and St. Petersburg (59%). The percentage being asked and declining to give (11%) is about equal to the Florida comparison communities.

The percentage not being asked is highest for those under age 35, at 63% (**Table 14-8**). This percentage declines precipitously to about 38% of those age 35-49, to 22% of those age 50-64, and then to about 28% of those age 65 and over. The percentage who gave increases from 26% of those under age 35, to about 52% of those age 35-49, to about two-thirds of those age 50 and over. The elderly are less likely to turn the UJC down when asked.

By generation, just under half of the first generation are not asked, as are 42% of the third and higher generation, versus only 26% of the second generation. Only 3% of the first generation are asked and are not giving.

The three household types that are least likely to be contacted are non-elderly singles (53%), households with children (41%), and non-elderly couples (38%). 23% of elderly couples and 34% of elderly singles are not asked. Only 35% of non-elderly singles give to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg.

A significant relationship exists between not being asked and income. 64% of those earning under \$25,000 are not being asked. This percentage declines to 49% for those earning \$25,000-\$49,999, 33% of those earning \$50,000-\$99,999, and only 19% of those earning \$100,000 and over.

East Shore has a higher rate of giving than West Shore, by 55% to 41% and a lower rate of not being asked: 35% in East Shore are not asked, versus about 50% in West Shore.

Table 14-8 Contributors and Non-Contributors to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg						
		Did Not Give				
Variable	Gave to UJC	Asked	Not Asked	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	45.6%	10.9	43.5	100.0%	457	3200
Age of Respondent						
Under 35	25.6%	11.6	62.8	100.0%	90	781
35-49	51.9%	10.6	37.5	100.0%	143	1168
50-64	66.6%	11.7	21.7	100.0%	75	592
65-74	68.2%	3.6	28.2	100.0%	72	352
75 and over	66.8%	4.1	29.2	100.0%	77	304
Generation						
First	48.9%	3.3	47.8	100.0%	30*	214
Second	65.2%	9.2	25.6	100.0%	120	614
Third or higher	47.7%	10.4	41.9	100.0%	303	2371
Household Structure						
Hh with children	48.1%	10.9	41.0	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	54.8%	7.3	37.9	100.0%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	35.2%	11.6	53.2	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	73.6%	3.2	23.2	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	62.0%	4.2	33.8	100.0%	66	307
Income						
Under \$25,000	25.7%	10.6	63.7	100.0%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	44.4%	6.9	48.7	100.0%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	55.3%	11.9	32.8	100.0%	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	73.4%	8.0	18.6	100.0%	57	602
Geographic Area						
East Shore	55.2%	10.1	34.7	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	41.4%	8.5	50.1	100.0%	112	900

Table 14-8 shows that shorter lengths of residence entail higher rates of UJC not having asked for a gift (**Table 14-8**). For those in residence for 0-4 years, 70% were not asked to give. This is the case for 46% of those in residence for 5-9 years, for 35% of those in residence 10-19 years, and for about 26% of those in residence for 20 years or more. Only 24% of those in residence for less than five years are givers. About 46% of those in residence for 5-19 years are givers, as are about 66% of those in residence for 20 or more years. Clearly this points to the need for procedures to identify and welcome new residents in as expeditious a manner as possible.

Those who identify themselves as Orthodox and Conservative are most likely to be contacted: about one in five of such persons indicate that they were not contacted. 40% of Reform Jews claim that they were not contacted in the past year, as do 64% of the Just Jewish. About 3 in four Orthodox (75%) and Conservative Jews (73%) make a donation to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg, versus 47% of Reform Jews, and 25% of the Just Jewish.

Intermarriage is correlated with being asked to donate. 13% of in-married couples were not contacted, versus 67% of the intermarried. 78% of the in-married donate, versus only 19% of the intermarried.

Trips to Israel also is correlated with being contacted. 16% of those who have been to Israel on a Jewish trip were not contacted, versus 20% of households in someone has been on a general trip and 52% of those who have not been to Israel. 78% of those who have been on a Jewish trip are givers, versus 73% of those who went on a general trip, and 37% of those who have not been to Israel.

Synagogue membership also is correlated with UJC's ability to reach people. 11% of synagogue members claim to not have been contacted, versus 66% of the non-members. There is no difference between the two groups in their propensity to turn down a request from UJC. 81% of members give, versus only 23% of non-members. 91% of synagogue members who were asked gave a gift, versus only 68% of non-members.

The differences are similar for JCC members and non-members. 8% of JCC members were not contacted, as is the case for 53% of non-JCC members. 5% of members turned UJC down, versus 12% of non-members. 87% of JCC members give gifts to UJC, versus 36% of non-members.

Only 13% of organization members were not reached, versus 56% of non-members. Only 5% of members turned down a request for a gift, versus 13% of non-members. 82% of organization members made a gift, versus 31% of non-members.

Table 14-8—continued Contributors and Non-Contributors to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg						
		Did Not Give				
Variable	Gave to UJC	Asked	Not Asked	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All	45.6%	10.9	43.5	100.0%	457	3200
Length of Residence						
0 - 4 years	23.9%	5.9	70.2	100.0%	80	662
5 - 9 years	44.8%	9.5	45.7	100.0%	46	349
10 - 19 years	47.6%	17.9	34.5	100.0%	79	602
20 + years	65.5%	8.2	26.3	100.0%	252	1590
Current Jewish Identification						
Orthodox	75.1%	2.7	22.2	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	72.6%	7.8	19.6	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	47.3%	12.7	40.1	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	24.6%	11.2	64.2	100.0%	126	1027
Type of Marriage						
In-married	77.6%	9.0	13.4	100.0%	182	1176
Conversionary	56.6%	4.6	38.8	100.0%	29*	239
Intermarried	18.9%	14.2	66.9	100.0%	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel						
No	36.5%	11.8	51.7	100.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	72.8%	6.8	20.4	100.0%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	77.6%	6.0	16.4	100.0%	90	582
Current Member of a Synagogue						
Syn. Member	81.1%	8.4	10.5	100.0%	269	1574
Not Member	23.0%	10.9	66.0	100.0%	188	1625
Current Member of a JCC						
JCC Member	86.9%	5.2	7.9	100.0%	172	976
Not Member	35.9%	11.6	52.5	100.0%	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization						
Org. Member	81.8%	4.9	13.3	100.0%	221	1344
Not Member	30.5%	13.3	56.2	100.0%	231	1856

Table 14-9 Donation Market Segments Comparison with Other Communities				
Community	Year	Donated	Asked, But Did not Give	Not Asked to Give
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	52%	12	37
West Palm Beach	1987	56%	8	37
Harrisburg	1994	46%	11	44
Miami	1994	37%	12	51
Orlando	1993	30%	15	55
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	33%	9	59

Contributions to the UJC

Table 14-10 shows the levels of contributions to the UJC for the Jewish population as a whole and for a variety of population subgroups. 54% reported giving no money to the UJC in the past year. 20% gave under \$100 and 15% gave \$100-\$500. 10% gave \$500 and over, including 6% who gave \$1,000 and over. The percentage of persons giving and not giving has been discussed above, so this discussion, for the most part, examines the percentage giving \$100 or more to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg.

The percentage giving \$100 or more increases from 13% of those under age 35 to about 30% of those age 35-64, to 47% of those age 65-74. It then drops to 24% of those age 75 and over.

The second generation (39%) is more likely to give \$100 and over than is the first (22%) and the third and higher (25%).

Non-elderly singles (16%) are the least likely to be giving \$100 or more to the UJC. 45% of elderly couples give \$100 or more, as do about 29% of households with children and 31% of elderly singles.

As would be expected, as income increases, the percentage who donate \$100 or more increases from 5% of those earning under \$25,000, to 16% of those in the \$25,000-\$49,999 categories, to 35% of those earning \$50,000-\$99,999, to 61% of those earning \$100,000 and over.

Those in East Shore (31%) are much more likely to be giving \$100 or more than is the case for West Shore (19%).

Table 14-10
Contributions to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg (Rows add to 100%)

Variable	Do Not Give	\$100 or Less	\$100-\$499	\$500-\$999	\$1,000+	\$100 +	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	54.4%	19.9	15.4	4.0	6.4	25.8	457	3200
Age of Respondent								
Under 35	80.0%	7.0	10.7	1.3	1.0	13.0	90	781
35-49	49.6%	20.6	17.6	4.9	7.4	29.9	143	1168
50-64	35.9%	32.3	13.4	6.0	12.5	31.9	75	592
65-74	31.8%	21.2	25.4	7.8	13.8	47.0	72	352
75 and over	36.4%	39.4	21.9	2.2	.0	24.1	77	304
Generation								
First	52.9%	25.4	11.5	3.3	6.9	21.7	30*	214
Second	37.5%	23.6	28.2	2.5	8.2	38.9	120	614
Third or higher	54.6%	20.0	14.1	4.8	6.5	25.4	303	2371
Household Structure								
Hh with Children	53.7%	17.3	17.1	5.1	6.9	29.1	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	47.7%	27.9	12.2	2.7	9.6	24.5	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	68.5%	15.2	9.9	6.4	.0	16.3	39	336
Elderly Couple	28.6%	26.6	26.1	8.1	10.5	44.7	71	307
Elderly Single	38.1%	31.1	21.3	3.4	6.1	30.8	66	307
Income								
Under \$25,000	72.1%	22.6	3.8	.0	1.5	5.3	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	55.2%	28.4	15.7	.7	.0	16.4	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	45.3%	20.1	17.4	5.1	12.1	34.6	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	28.1%	11.2	27.0	13.8	19.8	60.6	57	602
Geographic Area								
East Shore	46.5%	22.8	18.2	4.5	8.1	30.8	345	2300
West Shore	64.0%	17.1	11.8	3.7	3.4	18.9	112	900

Table 14-10 shows that those in residence for 0-4 years (10%) are less likely to give \$100 and over than those in residence for 5-9 years (22%) or those in residence more than 10 years (about one-third).

Those who identify themselves as Just Jewish (8%) are less likely to be making donations of \$100 or more than are Orthodox (40%), Conservative (44%), and Reform Jews (28%).

Intermarriage is correlated with donation levels. 50% of in-married couples give \$100 and over, versus 5% of the intermarried.

Trips to Israel also is correlated with donation levels. 57% of those who have been to Israel on a Jewish trip give \$100 and over, versus 38% of those who have been on a general trip, and 16% of those who have not been to Israel.

Synagogue membership also is correlated with donation levels. 50% of synagogue members give \$100 and over, versus 7% of the non-members. The difference is similar for JCC members and non-members (61% versus 14% giving \$100 and over) and for Jewish organization members and non-members (56% versus 9% giving \$100 and over).

Table 14-10—continued Contributions to the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg (Rows add to 100%)								
Variable	Do Not Give	Under \$100	\$100-\$499	\$500-\$999	\$1,000+	\$100 +	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	54.4%	19.9	15.4	4.0	6.4	25.8	457	3200
Length of Residence								
0 - 4 years	77.0%	13.4	8.1	1.4	.0	9.5	80	662
5 - 9 years	56.2%	21.6	14.3	1.9	6.0	22.2	46	349
10 - 19 years	54.8%	14.2	20.0	7.3	3.7	31.0	79	602
20 + years	37.2%	27.4	19.2	4.9	11.3	35.4	252	1590
Current Jewish Identification								
Orthodox	24.9%	35.4	28.5	4.6	6.7	39.8	58	304
Conservative	29.6%	26.7	25.7	6.6	11.3	43.6	180	1043
Reform	57.0%	15.3	15.6	4.3	7.7	27.6	93	704
Just Jewish	77.2%	14.8	3.4	1.8	2.8	8.0	126	1027
Type of Marriage								
In-married	24.4%	26.1	27.2	6.8	15.5	49.5	182	1176
Conversionary	46.0%	26.0	18.7	6.2	3.1	28.0	29*	239
Intermarried	84.6%	10.7	3.2	1.6	.0	4.8	83	698
Anyone in Household Been to Israel								
No	65.9%	18.1	11.6	2.6	1.7	15.9	269	1955
On General Trip	29.3%	32.8	22.8	6.8	8.4	38.0	95	666
On Jewish Trip	24.1%	19.2	26.4	7.3	23.0	56.7	90	582
Current Member of a Synagogue								
Syn. Member	20.5%	29.2	29.4	7.9	13.0	50.3	269	1574
Not Member	78.7%	14.1	4.8	1.1	1.3	7.2	188	1625
Current Member of a JCC								
JCC Member	14.2%	24.6	29.1	11.1	21.0	61.2	172	976
Not Member	66.6%	19.8	11.2	1.5	1.0	13.7	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization								
Org. Member	20.0%	23.9	32.2	8.3	15.6	56.1	221	1344
Not Member	70.9%	19.8	6.4	1.7	1.2	9.3	231	1856

Contributions to Non-Jewish Charities

Table 14-11 shows the reported levels of contributions to non-Jewish charities for the Jewish population as a whole and for a variety of population subgroups. 26% report giving no money to non-Jewish charities in the past year. 33% gave under \$100 and 27% gave \$100-\$500. 14% gave \$500 and over, including 7% who gave \$1,000 and over.

The percentage not donating is highest for the young and the old, unlike for Jewish charities (for which older people make higher contributions). The percentage giving \$500 or more peaks at 22% for those ages 35-49. It is only 6% for those under age 35 and 1% for those age 75 and over.

By generation, the first generation is the least likely to make any contributions to non-Jewish charities. 41% of the first generation does not donate, versus about 20% of the second and third and higher generation. The first generation (4%) is least likely to give \$500 or more, versus the second generation (9%), and the third and higher (17%).

31% of non-elderly singles do not give to non-Jewish charities. 23% of elderly couples and 14% of non-elderly couples do not give. One-third of elderly singles do not give, but only 17% of households with children do not give.

Elderly singles (3%) are the least likely to be making contributions of \$500 or more to non-Jewish charities. 13%- 18% of the other household types give \$500 or more.

As would be expected, as income increases, the percentage who donate, and the percentage who donate large amounts, increases. 43% of those earning under \$25,000 are non-givers, versus about 25% of those in the \$25,000-\$49,999 categories and 15% of those earning \$50-\$99,999, and only 4% of those earning \$100,000 and over. Giving at the level of \$500 or more increases from 3% of those earning under \$50,000, to 16% of those earning \$50,000-\$99,999, to 50% of those earning \$100,000 and over.

The higher percentage of non-givers is in East Shore (23%), versus 16% in West Shore. 11% in East Shore and 23% in West Shore give \$500 and over. This is the opposite relationship to that found for giving to Jewish charities.

Table 14-11
Contributions to NON-Jewish Charities (Rows add to 100%)

Variable	Do Not Give	Under \$100	\$100-\$499	\$500-\$999	\$1,000+	\$500 +	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	26.1%	33.4	26.8	6.5	7.2	13.7	457	3200
Age of Respondent								
Under 35	33.3%	36.4	24.1	3.6	2.6	6.2	90	781
35-49	15.2%	33.8	28.6	12.6	9.7	22.3	143	1168
50-64	10.8%	32.9	40.8	1.5	14.0	15.5	75	592
65-74	27.0%	33.9	24.1	7.9	7.1	15.0	72	352
75 and over	30.2%	48.1	20.8	.9	.0	0.9	77	304
Generation								
First	40.8%	43.8	11.9	3.5	.0	3.5	30*	214
Second	20.2%	40.5	30.1	1.2	8.0	9.2	120	614
Third or higher	19.8%	33.5	29.8	8.6	8.2	16.8	303	2371
Household Structure								
Hh with Children	17.2%	35.2	30.2	8.3	9.1	17.4	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	14.4%	29.3	37.7	5.2	13.3	18.5	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	30.5%	34.6	22.2	8.5	4.2	12.7	39	336
Elderly Couple	22.6%	41.5	20.5	6.9	8.5	15.4	71	307
Elderly Single	33.6%	36.4	26.6	3.3	.0	3.3	66	307
Income								
Under \$25,000	43.1%	45.2	8.5	3.1	.0	3.1	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	25.2%	46.1	26.2	2.5	.0	2.5	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	15.3%	31.9	36.6	9.1	7.2	16.3	106	1142
\$100,000 and over	4.2%	13.1	32.5	17.2	33.1	50.3	57	602
Geographic Area								
East Shore	23.4%	36.6	28.6	5.1	6.3	11.4	345	2300
West Shore	16.1%	32.9	28.5	11.5	11.0	22.5	112	900

Table 14-11 shows that the percentage who do not give to non-Jewish charities is lower for those in residence for less than ten years (about 28%) than for those in residence for ten or more years (about 18%). No consistent relationship is seen for giving \$500 or more.

The Orthodox (32%) and the Just Jewish (31%) are the most likely to be non-givers, versus 13% of Conservative and 16% of Reform Jews. 23% of Reform Jews give \$500 or more, versus 1% of the Orthodox, 12% of Conservative, and 16% of the Just Jewish.

Intermarried couples have a slightly greater propensity to not give to non-Jewish charities. 16% of in-married couples do not give, versus 20% of the intermarried. Even less difference exists for giving \$500 or more to non-Jewish charities, with 21% of intermarried couples giving \$500 and over, versus 18% of the in-married.

Trips to Israel also is correlated with donation levels. Only about 15% of those who have been to Israel on a Jewish trip or a general trip do not give, versus 26% of households in which no one has been to Israel. About 22% of those who have been to Israel on a Jewish trip give \$500 or more, versus 14% of those who have not been to Israel and 9% of those who have been on a general trip.

Synagogue membership also is correlated with donation levels. 11% of synagogue members do not give, versus 31% of non-members. 17% of synagogue members give \$500 or more, versus 13% of non-members. JCC membership also is correlated with donation levels. 9% of JCC members do not give, versus 27% of non-members. 21% of JCC members give \$500 or more, versus 12% of the non-members.

Organizational membership also is correlated with donation levels. 10% of organizational members do not give, versus 30% of the non-members. 20% of organizational members give \$500 or more, versus 11% of non-members.

75% of those people who decline to give when asked by UJC do give to non-Jewish charities, 14% at \$500 and over. Also, 63% of persons who are not asked by UJC to give are donors to non-Jewish charities, with about 11% giving \$500 and over. Only 9% of UJC donors do not give to non-Jewish charities.

Table 14-11—continued
Contributions to NON-Jewish Charities (Rows add to 100%)

Variable	Do Not Give	Under \$100	\$100-\$499	\$500-\$999	\$1,000+	\$500 +	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	26.1%	33.4	26.8	6.5	7.2	13.7	457	3200
Length of Residence								
0 - 4 years	27.1%	40.9	25.3	3.9	2.0	5.9	80	662
5 - 9 years	28.1%	41.3	18.4	2.0	10.1	12.1	46	349
10 - 19 years	17.9%	26.2	33.3	11.2	11.5	22.7	79	602
20 +years	18.5%	35.4	30.6	7.8	7.7	15.5	252	1590
Current Jewish Identification								
Orthodox	32.1%	39.5	27.0	.0	1.4	1.4	58	304
Conservative	13.4%	39.9	34.5	5.4	6.9	12.3	180	1043
Reform	15.8%	30.4	30.9	8.7	14.3	23.0	93	704
Just Jewish	31.3%	31.4	21.4	9.4	6.6	16.0	126	1027
Type of Marriage								
In-married	15.6%	29.8	36.6	5.6	12.4	18.0	182	1176
Conversionary	19.0%	45.7	29.6	2.8	2.9	5.7	29*	239
Intermarried	20.1%	30.5	28.0	12.5	8.8	21.3	83	698
Any Adult Been to Israel								
No	25.5%	36.6	23.6	8.4	5.9	14.3	269	1955
On General Trip	14.9%	34.9	41.5	3.4	5.3	8.7	95	666
On Jewish Trip	14.0%	32.9	31.2	5.5	16.4	21.9	90	582
Current Member of a Synagogue								
Syn. Member	10.8%	36.4	36.3	6.8	9.8	16.6	269	1574
Not Member	31.3%	34.8	21.3	7.0	5.6	12.6	188	1625
Current Member of a JCC								
JCC Member	8.6%	31.3	39.1	7.4	13.7	21.1	172	976
Not Member	26.8%	37.4	24.1	6.7	5.1	11.8	285	2224
Current Member of a Jewish Organization								
Org. Member	9.6%	31.4	39.4	7.8	11.8	19.6	221	1344
Not Member	29.9%	37.7	21.2	6.4	4.8	11.2	231	1856
Donation Market Segments								
Gave to UJC	8.9%	35.6	37.9	6.7	10.8	17.5	252	1459
Asked, Did not Give	24.6%	44.9	16.2	11.9	2.4	14.3	40	349
Not Asked to Give	36.7%	32.8	20.0	5.4	5.1	10.5	155	1392

Preference for Israel/Local Allocation

A difficult question facing every Federation concerns determining the percentage of the campaign funds spent in the local area, versus the percentage that is sent for needs in Israel and overseas. Traditionally, the United Jewish Community of Greater Harrisburg has sent about half of the funds collected to Israel and overseas. A number of Federations have begun to gradually change the formula, keeping more money locally, and sending less to Israel and overseas.

Respondents were asked the following question: "On the whole, would you rather see more of the money collected by the UJC used for local Jewish needs or sent to Israel and overseas?" Notice (**Table 14-12**) that 49% selected local and 9%, Israel and overseas. The answers "about equal," and "whatever UJC thinks is best" were not read to the respondent. 31% volunteered "about equal" as an answer. 11% responded "whatever UJC thinks is best."

Table 14-13 shows that the percentage preferring local needs (49%) is higher than all of the Florida communities except Orlando (61%). The 31% indicating "about equal" is lower than only Miami (34%) and St. Petersburg (35%).

Table 14-12 shows that respondents who are very familiar with UJC did not answer this question in a significantly different way than did all respondents. West Shore (53%) shows a greater preference for local needs than East Shore (48%).

The local option is more popular with those under age 65 (49%-55%) than those age 65 and over (35%). The percentage saying Israel does not vary consistently with age. Elderly respondents were much more likely to volunteer the response "whatever UJC thinks best."

Males were more likely to indicate local (57% versus 45%) and less likely to respond about equal (27% versus 33%).

57% of households with children responded local, while elderly couples (38%) and elderly singles (33%) were least likely to have responded local. 25% of elderly singles volunteered the response "whatever UJC thinks best." 17% of elderly singles responded Israel and overseas.

Table 14-12 Preferences for UJC Allocations							
Variable	Local	Israel and Overseas	About Equal	Whatever UJC Thinks Best	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents	49.3%	8.9	31.2	10.6	100.0%	457	3200
Very Familiar with UJC	45.5%	8.4	33.5	12.6	100.0%	188	1219
Geographic Area							
East Shore	47.9%	9.8	29.6	12.7	100.0%	345	2300
West Shore	53.1%	6.3	35.4	5.2	100.0%	112	900
Age of Respondent							
Under 35	54.6%	12.3	26.6	6.5	100.0%	90	781
35-49	53.3%	3.3	35.5	7.9	100.0%	143	1168
50-64	49.4%	12.2	26.7	11.7	100.0%	75	592
65-74	34.7%	15.3	31.7	18.3	100.0%	72	352
75 +	34.9%	8.0	34.6	22.5	100.0%	77	304
Sex							
Male	56.6%	8.6	27.4	7.5	100.0%	159	1180
Female	45.1%	9.0	33.4	12.4	100.0%	298	2020
Household Structure							
Hh with Children	57.2%	5.5	31.4	5.8	100.0%	154	1258
Non-Elderly Couple	49.8%	6.0	29.4	14.8	100.0%	71	579
Non-Elderly Single	52.5%	9.1	28.5	9.9	100.0%	39	336
Elderly Couple	38.2%	7.3	39.1	15.4	100.0%	71	307
Elderly Single	32.5%	16.7	26.0	24.8	100.0%	66	307
Current Jewish Identification							
Orthodox	33.3%	16.0	31.3	19.4	100.0%	58	304
Conservative	39.5%	5.2	43.0	12.3	100.0%	180	1043
Reform	52.5%	9.9	31.3	6.3	100.0%	93	704
Just Jewish	61.9%	11.0	17.0	10.2	100.0%	126	1027
Synagogue Membership							
Member	41.6%	8.6	39.2	10.6	100.0%	269	1574
Not Member	57.1%	9.1	23.2	10.6	100.0%	188	1625

Table 14-12 Preferences for UJC Allocations							
Variable	Local	Israel and Overseas	About Equal	Whatever UJC Thinks Best	Total	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
Any Adult Been to Israel							
No	57.1%	7.2	25.2	10.5	100.0%	269	1955
On General Trip	37.2%	11.4	44.4	7.0	100.0%	95	666
On Jewish Trip	37.4%	11.4	35.7	15.5	100.0%	90	582
Income							
Under \$25,000	39.7%	14.1	29.3	16.9	100.0%	72	637
\$25 - \$49,999	59.0%	10.0	22.3	8.7	100.0%	83	819
\$50 - \$99,999	48.5%	9.8	34.0	7.7	100.0%	106	1142
Over \$100,000	49.0%	5.0	32.1	13.9	100.0%	57	602
Donation Market Segments							
Gave to UJC	41.9%	8.2	38.1	11.8	100.0%	252	1459
Asked, Did not Give	75.4%	7.4	17.1	.0	100.0%	40	349
Not Asked to Give	52.5%	10.3	24.9	12.3	100.0%	155	1392
Gave to UJC in the Past Year							
Nothing	57.5%	9.7	23.2	9.6	100.0%	161	1741
Under \$100	49.3%	3.9	36.5	10.3	100.0%	85	637
\$100 - \$500	34.8%	14.6	42.6	8.0	100.0%	77	505
\$500 and over	38.1%	7.1	35.7	21.4	100.0%	42	317
\$1,000 and over	38.5%	9.9	29.2	22.3	100.0%	26*	196

Orthodox (33%) and Conservative Jews (40%) were the least likely to respond local. This rises to 53% of Reform Jews and 62% of the Just Jewish. 16% of the Orthodox indicated Israel and overseas.

Synagogue members (42%) are less likely to indicate local needs than non-members (57%). For those who have been to Israel, only 37% said local if they went on a general or a Jewish trip. 57% of those who have not been to Israel indicated local. Little difference exists in responding Israel if one has been to Israel, although those who have been to Israel are much more likely to respond ``about equal.''

40% of those earning less than \$25,000 responded local, versus 49%-59% of those earning over \$25,000. Israel appears to be a more popular choice among those of lower income. This is probably because most of those of lower income are older.

Those who donated to UJC (42%) are less likely to select the local option than are those who were asked but declined to give (75%). As levels of giving increase, the tendency to select the local option declines. Support for this option declines significantly, from about 58% of those who give nothing to 36% of those giving \$100 - \$500. The local option is slightly more popular among those giving \$500 and over and \$1,000 and over. (Note the low sample sizes in these latter two cases.)

Table 14-13 Preferences for Federation Allocations Comparison to Other Communities					
Community	Year	Local	Israel and Overseas	About Equal	Whatever Federation Thinks Best
Orlando	1993	61%	8	28	4
Harrisburg	1994	49%	9	31	11
West Palm Beach	1987	47%	17	16	19
St Petersburg/Clearwater	1994	46%	9	35	11
Sarasota-Manatee	1992	44%	24	21	11
Miami	1994	39%	13	34	14
South Broward	1990	38%	23	28	11

Provision for Jewish Charities in Wills

Table 14-14 shows the results of a question in which respondents age 50 and over were asked if they have a will with a provision for a Jewish charity. This question derives from the recent emphasis in Federations around the country to increase Foundation giving.

14% of such households (185 households) have a will in which they have made such a provision. As might be expected, it is higher for those age 65 and over (15%) and lower for those age 50-64 (9%).

It is much lower for the Just Jewish (4%) than for the Orthodox (11%), Conservative (16%), and Reform (16%). It is also higher for synagogue members (16%) than non-members (4%).

Having been on a Jewish trip to Israel has a very significant impact, with 23% of such households having such a provision. Having been on a general trip appears to have no correlation with provision.

26% of those with incomes of \$100,000 and over have such a provision, versus less than 8% of those earning under \$100,000.

16% of donors to UJC have such a provision. Provision rises with levels of giving to UJC from 1% of those who are non-givers to UJC, to 11% of those giving under \$100, to 19% of those giving \$100 - \$500. The rate is higher for those giving \$500 and over (20%) and those giving \$1,000 and over (29%). (Note the small sample sizes in the latter two cases.)

A special analysis was undertaken of the 29 respondents who indicated they have a provision in their will. 2% are currently non-givers to UJC, 35% give under \$100, 31% give \$100-\$500, 7% give \$500-\$1,000, and 25% give \$1,000 and over. 14% are Orthodox, 53% are Conservative, 24% are Reform, and 9% are Just Jewish.

Table 14-14 Have a Will with Provisions for Jewish Charity (Age 50 and Over)				
Variable		Projected Number of Provisions	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents (Age 50+)	14.4%	185	219	1288
Age of Respondent				
50-64	9.2%	45	63	493
65-74	16.3%	50	63	304
75 +	13.7%	36	66	260
Current Jewish Identification				
Orthodox	11.1%	20	39	179
Conservative	16.2%	76	85	469
Reform	15.5%	35	36	225
Just Jewish	3.6%	13	52	370
Synagogue Membership				
Member	16.2%	126	152	775
Not Member	3.6%	18	67	513
Any Adult Been to Israel				
No	9.4%	69	121	731
On General Trip	6.3%	19	150	309
On Jewish Trip	22.6%	56	48	247
Income				
Under \$25,000	4.7%	16	45	337
\$25 - \$49,999	8.2%	26	40	316
\$50 - \$99,999	8.5%	37	45	435
Over \$100,000	26.3%	53	20*	201
Donation Market Segments				
Gave to UJC	16.1%	135	147	841
Not Asked to Give	.0%	0	49	348

Table 14-14 Have a Will with Provisions for Jewish Charity (Age 50 and Over)				
Variable		Projected Number of Provisions	Sample Size	Proj. # of Households
All Respondents (Age 50+)	14.4%	185	219	1288
Gave to UJC in the Past Year				
Nothing	.6%	3	64	465
Under \$100	10.8%	44	66	406
\$100 - \$500	16.5%	0	46	256
\$500 and over	20.0%	32	27*	161
\$1,000 and over	28.7%	28	15*	99