

JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS

HARRIS J. FRANK, PRESIDENT

HENRIETTA FREEDMAN, CHAIRPERSON
COMMUNITY SERVICES PLANNING COMMITTEE

MARTIN S. KRAAR, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY COMMITTEE

FRANKLIN A. JACOBS, CHAIRPERSON

RABBI AARON BOROW

DR. JOSEPH FEDER

ROBERT GREENSTEIN

DR. MAURICE L. HIRSCH, JR.

RABBI JERROLD M. LEVY

JEROME RASKAS

DR. FRED J. ROSENBAUM

MAHLON RUBIN

WALLACE R. ROWITCH

DR. ROSALIE STERNECK

STAFF

AUBREY HERMAN, ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
NANCY BUGUSLAW, DIRECTOR, PLANNING & BUDGETING

FOREWORD

The Jewish Federation of St. Louis is pleased to present this full and comprehensive Demographic Study of our vibrant Jewish community. The Jewish community now has accurate information on the size, age, mobility patterns and ritual practices of our population.

This project started under the leadership of Dr. Michael Karl, who appointed a task force, while Chairman of the Community Services Planning Committee, to investigate the feasibility of a full and complete population study.

Under the careful and untiring leadership of Franklin A. Jacobs, Demographic Study Chairman, the three year study has evolved into a document which will be a cornerstone for long-range planning for services and growth in the St. Louis Jewish community. My personal thanks to Frank and his outstanding committee for this exceptional piece of work.

We know that our Synagogues, organizations and constituent agencies who were fully involved in the study will be able to work together in creating, delivering and modifying program services with this information.

Without the devoted expertise of Dr. Gary Tobin, consultant, this Demographic Study could not have become a positive model for the country. Our special thanks and commendation to Dr. Tobin, who worked so patiently with the community these past three years and has been responsible for the in-depth quality of the results.

We look forward to the implementation of the Study with great excitement and hope that this demographic analysis will be a tool in helping the Jewish community of St. Louis to be guided along a most constructive path of service delivery in the years to come.

Harris J. Frank
President
Jewish Federation of St. Louis

December 1982

PREFACE

It is a great pleasure to write the preface to this report. It is the author's only opportunity to speak as a person, as opposed to the objective analyst one must be in writing a study of this kind. It is also the space that is allotted to feelings, as opposed to merely numbers.

I have thoroughly enjoyed the opportunity to work with the Jewish Federation of St. Louis. The learning experience has been wonderful. I have met hundreds of people in scores of meetings and made many friends. This has been an exciting project. People throughout the community have helped with this project.

The Federation staff has been supportive and helpful. Marty Kraar and Aubrey Herman have taken a keen interest in the study and will insure its full usage as a tool for planning. Nancy Boguslaw offered valuable editorial assistance. David Rabinovitz was supportive at the beginning, and other Federation staff have reviewed, advised, proofread and performed many other helpful tasks.

The Demographic Study Committee listed at the beginning of this report consists of delightful people with whom to work. They advised me at every step and were always helpful. As chairmen of the Community Services Planning Committee, Dr. Michael Karl and Harvey Harris were important supporters of the study. As the current chairwoman of the committee, Henrietta Freedman will play a key role in the study's implementation phase. The interviewers who worked with Survey Research Service were also exceptional, most notably Marcia Gillerman and Ellen Mittenthal.

The staff at Washington University was wonderful. Peter Welbrock did complicated computer work, and Barbara Shamir was instrumental in the data management of the project. The project could not have been completed without

her exceptional skills. Kathy Simon and Julie Lipsman assisted in editing and proofreading. Cheryl Coffey typed hundreds of pages, and sometimes it must have seemed like hundreds of times. Angie O'Donnell typed the final draft and prepared the report for its final printing. Carol Lundgren did the proofreading, and her keen eye caught errors other pairs of eyes could not find.

Help was also provided by scholars around the world. These include Sid Goldstein, Bernie Lazerwitz, Marshall Sklare and, especially, Calvin Goldschieder. Al Chenkin at the Council of Jewish Federations was extremely helpful. We talked often, and his experience with Jewish demographic studies cannot be matched.

My most special thanks go to Barry Giller and Frank Jacobs. For the first two years of the project, Barry steered me through the most unfamiliar waters of Jewish communal organizations and committee structure. He spent hours and days with me on this project. It was his skill, guidance and encouragement that kept me going at the most difficult phases of the project. And in spite of his determination to remain professionally detached, we have become close friends. This friendship, I believe, he will always regret.

Working with Frank Jacobs was terrific. As head of the Demographic Study Committee, we worked together very closely for the past three years. His chairmanship was characterized by professionalism, good humor and unwavering support. Without Frank Jacobs' support of my work, I do not believe this project would have been as successful as it has been.

Gary A. Tobin, Ph.D.
Urban Studies Program
Washington University, St. Louis

INTRODUCTION

St. Louis is a vibrant Jewish community with a well-developed network of membership organizations, congregations and service agencies. During the past decade, the Jewish Federation of St. Louis and other Jewish social service agencies have devoted significant resources to their planning activities. The most recent demographic study of the St. Louis Jewish community, however, was conducted a quarter of a century ago, in 1954. It was narrow in scope and provided limited information in regard to population size, population movement and age composition. Consequently, many community planning decisions utilized available data from sources such as self-studies, agency statistics, government census data, the 1970 Council of Jewish Federations National Demographic Study and leadership perceptions. The latter sources offered a limited amount of information, but more thorough data were needed. With an increasing number of complex decisions to be made in an era of diminishing resources, community institutions could plan more effectively with current data on the character and social service needs of the Jewish population.

The following report has seven sections. The first section provides data that describe the Jewish community in terms of age, education, marital patterns and other population characteristics. The second part depicts the Jewish population in terms of its religious characteristics. Synagogue membership, intermarriage and religious observances are among the topics covered in this section. The third part analyzes the usage patterns and attitudes towards communal services offered in the Jewish community. Volunteer patterns, projected use of services and giving patterns are discussed in this section. The fourth section describes the processes by which the study was conceived, funded and conducted. The purpose of the demographic study, along with the planning process, is summarized in this

section. The fifth part of this report describes the methodology used to construct the sample frame from which the interviewed households were drawn. The sixth section is comprised of all tables in the study. The final section consists of appendices, including a reproduction of the survey instrument that was used in the interviewing.

The data presented in this report are the results of over three years of planning, promotion, field work and analysis. A thorough demographic profile of the St. Louis Jewish community is presented, summarizing the data that were collected from over 900 personal interviews completed between May and December 1981.

Not all of the data that were collected in the survey process are presented in this report. Further analysis and uses of other data can be conducted as part of the ongoing planning functions of the Federation and its constituent agencies. The data are stored on computer tape and should be useful for years to come.

The analysis in this report is presented using frequency distributions of responses and cross-tabulations of particular aspects of the data. More complicated statistical tools were used in examining the data, but the most basic and easy to understand statistics are presented here. Tables are included at the end of each section. The Federation staff made a number of requests concerning the preparation of the report. First, the consultant was instructed to minimize interpretations of the data and to present as simply as possible in tables and text a summary of the data. Second, data from all the questions were requested to be included in the final report. Policy recommendations are made in a separate report entitled "Executive Summary."

In addition to examining the data from the St. Louis survey, similar studies from other Jewish communities were analyzed as well. Cleveland, Boston, Providence and Denver are among the 20 community surveys that were

consulted in order to better understand the St. Louis data. The 1980 census data for St. Louis City and County were also explored. Together with the studies from other Jewish communities, the 1980 census provided benchmarks by which to examine the survey results.

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

The interviewers were instructed to record all of the respondents' and spouses' comments, even the mundane, highly personal or seemingly irrelevant comments. These recorded words offer a rich supplement to the statistical data and shed a great deal of light on the feelings and attitudes of the St. Louis Jewish community.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	
PREFACE	i
INTRODUCTION	iii
POLICY SUMMARY	I
PART I. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	1
A. Household Size/Composition	1
B. Population Size	2
C. Mobility/Nativity	3
D. Geographic Location	8
E. Neighborhood Preference	10
F. Length of Residency	10
G. Housing	11
H. Sex	12
I. Race	12
J. Age	12
K. Children	13
L. Education	14
M. Marital Status	16
N. Occupation	17
O. Employment	18
P. Income	20
Q. Disability	22
PART II. RELIGIOUS PROFILE	23
A. Religious Identity	23
B. Intermarriage	29
C. Family Religious Background	32
D. Religious Education	32
E. Evaluating Jewish Education	34
F. Synagogue and Temple Affiliation	36
G. Religious Practices	40
PART III. SERVICES AND COMMUNITY	43
A. Needs of the Elderly	43
B. Service Uses and Priorities	46
C. Volunteerism	55
D. Patterns of Giving	56
E. Jewish Federation of St. Louis	57
F. Jewish Community Centers Association	59
G. St. Louis Jewish Light	63
H. Health Care and Jewish Hospital	64
I. Anti-Semitism	65
J. Israel	67
K. Political Patterns	70

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
PART IV. ORGANIZING THE STUDY	73
A. Increased Demand for Demographic Information	73
B. Stage One: Preliminary Investigation/Study Approval	73
C. Study Scope	75
D. Stage Two: Design/Field Work	75
E. Selection of Methodology	76
PART V. METHODOLOGY	78
A. Constructing the Sample Frame	78
1. Obtaining Current Lists	80
2. Collection of Old Lists	85
3. Collection of Old Lists From the Synagogues	85
4. Old Lists From the Jewish Community Centers Association	87
5. Lists From the Jewish Light	88
6. Collection of Old Lists From Agencies	88
7. The Processing of the Lists	90
8. Processing Old Lists From the Synagogues	90
9. Processing Old Lists From the Jewish Community Centers Association	91
10. Processing Old Lists Compiled From the Jewish Light	91
11. Processing of Miscellaneous Old Lists	92
B. Results	92
1. Old Synagogue Lists	92
2. Marriage Lists	92
3. Confirmation Lists	92
4. Ex-members Lists	93
5. High Holy Day Lists	93
6. Results of Collection of Lists From the Jewish Community Centers Association	93
7. Results of Collections of Lists From the Jewish Light	94
8. Results of Collection of Miscellaneous Lists	94
C. The List-Merging Process	95
1. Stage One: Key punching the Sample Frame	96
2. Stage Two: Merging Two Tapes	96
D. Costs and Benefits of Constructing the Sample Frame	99
E. Sampling	102
F. The Survey Instrument	103
G. Field-Work: Process and Results	107

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
PART VI. TABLES	111
PART VII. APPENDICES	
Appendix I. Distinctive Jewish Surnames	AI-1
Appendix II. Survey Instrument	AII-1
Appendix III. Sample Letters Mailed to Respondents	AIII-1

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
TABLE P1: NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN HOUSEHOLD	111
TABLE P2: SEX	111
TABLE P3: RACE	111
TABLE P4: MARITAL STATUS	112
TABLE P5: HAVE YOU BEEN MARRIED MORE THAN ONCE?	112
TABLE P6: NUMBER OF MULTIPLE MARRIAGES	112
TABLE P8: AGE OF JEWISH POPULATION	113
TABLE P10: NUMBER OF ADOPTED CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD	113
TABLE P16: CURRENT RELIGION	114
TABLE P17: RELIGION AT BIRTH	114
TABLE P18: HAVE YOU EVER HELD ANOTHER FAITH?	114
TABLE P19: DID YOU FORMALLY CONVERT TO JUDAISM?	115
TABLE P20-22: WHAT IS/WAS YOUR PARENTS' RELIGION?	115
TABLE P21-23: IF JEWISH, WHAT IS/WAS YOUR PARENTS' RELIGIOUS IDENTITY?	116
TABLE P25: HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR RELIGIOUS IDENTITY?	116
TABLE P26: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT INTERMARRIAGE?	117
TABLE P27: ARE YOU PLANNING TO MOVE DURING THE NEXT THREE YEARS?	118
TABLE P28: IS ANYONE IN THE HOUSEHOLD PLANNING TO MOVE DURING THE NEXT THREE YEARS?	118
TABLE P30: WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT PREFERENCE FOR THE RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION OF YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?	119
TABLE P31: HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE JEWISH COMPOSITION OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD IN WHICH YOU NOW LIVE?	119
TABLE P32: WHEN DID YOU MOVE INTO YOUR PRESENT RESIDENCE?	120
TABLE P33: ZIP CODE - PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS	120
TABLE P35: WHERE DID YOU LIVE JUST BEFORE YOU MOVED INTO THIS RESIDENCE?	121

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

	PAGE
TABLE P36: WHEN DID YOU MOVE INTO THE ST. LOUIS AREA?	121
TABLE P37a: WAS ST. LOUIS YOUR PLACE OF BIRTH?	121
TABLE P37b: PLACE OF RESIDENCE PRIOR TO ST. LOUIS	122
TABLE P38A: PLACE OF BIRTH	123
TABLE P38b: STATE OF BIRTH	124
TABLE P40: ARE YOU A NATURALIZED CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES?	125
TABLE P41: WHEN DID YOU COME TO THE UNITED STATES TO STAY?	126
TABLE P42: DID YOU PRIMARILY SPEAK A LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?	126
TABLE P45: WHAT IS THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF SCHOOLING YOU HAVE COMPLETED?	127
TABLE P46: ARE YOU CURRENTLY ATTENDING SCHOOL?	127
TABLE P47: IF IN SCHOOL, WHAT LEVEL ARE YOU CURRENTLY ATTENDING?	128
TABLE P51: WHAT WAS YOUR FAMILY'S RELIGIOUS IDENTITY WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?	128
TABLE P52: HOW MANY YEARS OF FORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION HAVE YOU RECEIVED?	128
TABLE P55: RELIGIOUS EDUCATION	129
TABLE P57: WHAT KIND OF RELIGIOUS TRAINING DID YOUR PARENTS HAVE?	129
TABLE P58: WERE YOU BAR/BAT MITZVAH?	130
TABLE P59: WERE YOU CONFIRMED?	130
TABLE P61: DO YOU HAVE A LASTING DISABILITY WHICH AFFECTS YOU IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING WAYS?	130
TABLE P62b: TOTAL NUMBER OF WEEKS WORKED LAST YEAR (1980)	131
TABLE P62c: NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED PER WEEK (1980)	132
TABLE P62d: NUMBERS OF WEEKS SPENT LOOKING FOR A JOB (1980)	134
TABLE P63: PRIMARY PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT	134
TABLE P65: MAIN OCCUPATION BY CATEGORY	135

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

	PAGE
TABLE P65a: MAIN OCCUPATION	136
TABLE P67: DO YOU HAVE ANOTHER OCCUPATION, BESIDES YOUR MAIN WORK, FOR WHICH YOU ARE PAID OR EARN AN INCOME?	142
TABLE P70: OCCUPATIONAL TYPE	142
TABLE P71: PARENTS' OCCUPATION	143
TABLE P72: FATHER'S OCCUPATIONAL TYPE	144
TABLE P-Z1: TOTAL POPULATION ACCORDING TO ZIP CODE	145
TABLE PH1-PZ: MEAN HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY ZIP CODE	145
TABLE E1: IF YOU ARE GOING TO STAY IN THE ST. LOUIS AREA, DO YOU EXPECT THAT YOU WILL HAVE ANY CHANGES IN YOUR HOUSING NEEDS IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS?	146
TABLE E3: HOW SAFE WOULD YOU SAY YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD IS?	146
TABLE E4: HAVE YOU USED ANY OF THESE COMMUNITY SERVICES IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS?	147
TABLE E5: DO YOU HAVE PROBLEMS OBTAINING THE SERVICES YOU WOULD LIKE TO USE?	147
TABLE E6: HOW DO YOU USUALLY GET YOUR FOOD SHOPPING DONE?	148
TABLE E7: HOW CONVENIENT ARE THE FOLLOWING TO YOUR CURRENT RESIDENCE?	148
TABLE E8: HOW MANY HOSPITALIZATIONS HAVE YOU HAD IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS?	149
TABLE E9: DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN WHO LIVE IN THE ST. LOUIS AREA?	149
TABLE E10: HOW MANY TIMES PER MONTH, ON THE AVERAGE, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU AND MEMBERS OF YOUR FAMILY SEE EACH OTHER?	149
TABLE R1: DO YOU CURRENTLY BELONG TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE?	150
TABLE R2: TO WHAT TYPE OF SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE DO YOU CURRENTLY BELONG?	150
TABLE R3: IF YOU DO NOT CURRENTLY BELONG TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE, DID YOU EVER BELONG TO ONE AFTER YOU WERE GROWN UP?	150

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

	PAGE
TABLE R4: IF YOU USED TO BELONG TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE (BUT ARE NOT CURRENTLY AFFILIATED), WHAT TYPE WAS IT?	151
TABLE R5: REASONS FOR NOT BELONGING TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE	151
TABLE R6: WHAT IS YOUR SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR NOT BELONGING TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE?	152
TABLE R7: DID YOUR PARENTS BELONG TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?	152
TABLE R8: TO WHAT TYPE OF SYNAGOGUE DID YOUR PARENTS BELONG?	153
TABLE R9: WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING CEREMONIAL OBJECTS DO YOU HAVE IN YOUR HOME?	153
TABLE R10: HOW OFTEN WOULD YOU SAY EACH OF THE FOLLOWING PRACTICES IS OBSERVED BY YOUR HOUSEHOLD?	154
TABLE R11: EVEN IF YOU DON'T CURRENTLY BELONG TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE, HOW OFTEN (ON A YEARLY AVERAGE) DO YOU ATTEND SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE SERVICES?	155
TABLE R12: HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE QUALITY OF THE JEWISH EDUCATION YOUR CHILDREN ARE RECEIVING OR HAVE RECEIVED?	155
TABLE R13: HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE QUALITY OF THE JEWISH EDUCATION THAT YOU RECEIVED?	156
TABLE R14: HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU FEEL IT IS FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING SUBJECTS TO BE INCLUDED IN A JEWISH EDUCATIONAL CURRICULUM?	157
TABLE R15: WHICH OF THESE DO YOU FEEL IS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT SUBJECT TO BE TAUGHT IN A JEWISH SCHOOL?	158
TABLE H1: HOW MANY ROOMS DO YOU HAVE IN YOUR LIVING QUARTERS?	159
TABLE H2: WHAT TYPE OF PAYMENT IS USED FOR YOUR LIVING QUARTERS?	159
TABLE H7: IS YOUR HOME A CONDOMINIUM?	159
TABLE H7A: IS YOUR HOME A CO-UP?	160
TABLE H9: WHEN WAS YOUR HOME ORIGINALLY CONSTRUCTED?	160
TABLE H10: WHICH OF THESE BEST DESCRIBES THE BUILDING YOU LIVE IN?	161

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

	PAGE
TABLE H15: HOW MANY AUTOMOBILES ARE KEPT AT HOME FOR USE BY MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD?	161
TABLE HP1: DOES YOUR FAMILY HAVE A PRIVATE PHYSICIAN?	162
TABLE HP2: HAVE YOU HAD A HOSPITALIZATION IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS?	162
TABLE HP3: WHAT IS THE LAST HOSPITAL YOU HAVE USED?	162
TABLE HP4: OF WHAT TYPE WAS YOUR MOST RECENT HOSPITAL CARE?	163
TABLE HP5: ARE YOU CONFINED TO A WHEELCHAIR OR OTHERWISE DISABLED?	163
TABLE HP6: IF YOU HAVE A DISABILITY, WHAT LIMITATIONS DOES IT CAUSE?	163
TABLE HP7: IS THERE ANYONE IN THE HOUSEHOLD WHO NEEDS ANY ASSISTANCE IN PERFORMING EVERYDAY FUNCTIONS?	164
TABLE HP8: HAVE YOU SEEN A PHYSICIAN, FOR ANY REASON, IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS?	164
TABLE C1: HAVE YOU EVER BELONGED TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?	165
TABLE C2: IF NOT CURRENTLY A MEMBER OR HAVE NEVER BEEN A MEMBER, WHAT IS THE MAIN REASON YOU DON'T CURRENTLY BELONG TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?	165
TABLE C3: DO YOU OR YOUR FAMILY CURRENTLY BELONG TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?	166
TABLE C4: WHAT ARE THE REASONS THAT YOU USE OR HAVE USED THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?	166
TABLE C5: WHAT IS YOUR SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR USING THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?	167
TABLE C6: HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE PROGRAMS THAT YOU HAVE USED AT THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?	167
TABLE C7: HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE QUALITY OF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMS THAT YOU HAVE USED AT THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?	168
TABLE C10: GENERALLY, IS BEING NEAR TO JEWISH INSTITUTIONS IMPORTANT TO YOU?	169

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

	PAGE
TABLE C11: DO YOU HAVE TRANSPORTATION ACCESS PROBLEMS TO JEWISH INSTITUTIONS?	169
TABLE C12: DO YOU RECEIVE THE <u>ST. LOUIS JEWISH LIGHT</u> ?	170
TABLE C13: WHICH OF THESE NEWS CATEGORIES IN THE <u>ST. LOUIS JEWISH LIGHT</u> DO YOU USUALLY READ?	170
TABLE C14: WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE SHOULD BE THE PRIORITY OF THESE SERVICES IN THE JEWISH COMMUNITY?	171
TABLE C15: DO YOU BELIEVE THAT YOU OR SOMEONE IN YOUR FAMILY WILL USE THESE SERVICES IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS?	172
TABLE C15-IN1: NOW TELL ME IF YOU BELIEVE THAT YOU OR SOMEONE IN YOUR FAMILY WILL LIKELY USE EACH OF THESE SERVICES SOMETIME IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS (BY INCOME).	173
TABLE F1: DO YOU FEEL THAT A JEW HAS A GREATER OBLIGATION TO JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES THAN TO GENERAL COMMUNITY PHILANTHROPIES?	175
TABLE F2: WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES WOULD YOU SAY ARE CURRENTLY PART OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS' ONGOING FUNCTIONS?	175
TABLE F3: HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU BELIEVE EACH OF THESE FUNCTIONS SHOULD BE?	176
TABLE F4: WHICH OF THESE DO YOU BELIEVE SHOULD BE THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT FUNCTION OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS?	177
TABLE F5-6: HOW MUCH PER YEAR DOES YOUR HOUSEHOLD CONTRIBUTE TO JEWISH AND TO NON-JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES?	177
TABLE F7: HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE PROGRAMS OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS?	178
TABLE F8-10: HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK (ON AN AVERAGE) DO YOU CURRENTLY SPEND ON VOLUNTEER WORK WITH JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS?	178
TABLE F9: FOR WHICH ORGANIZATION(S) DO YOU SPEND YOUR VOLUNTEER TIME?	179
TABLE F11: HAVE YOU MADE A CONTRIBUTION TO THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS IN THE LAST TWO YEARS?	179
TABLE F12: WHAT ARE YOUR SOURCES OF INFORMATION CONCERNING THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS?	180

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

	PAGE
TABLE F13: WHAT IS YOUR SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT SOURCE OF INFORMATION CONCERNING THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS?	180
TABLE M1: HAVE YOU EVER VISITED ISRAEL?	181
TABLE M2: DO YOU INTEND TO VISIT ISRAEL?	181
TABLE M3: DO YOU BELIEVE AMERICAN JEWS HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO AID ISRAEL?	181
TABLE M4: DO YOU APPROVE OF THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF AID BY AMERICAN JEWS FOR THE JEWS OF ISRAEL?	182
TABLE M5: HOW MUCH ANTI-SEMITISM DO YOU THINK THERE IS IN THIS COMMUNITY?	183
TABLE M6: IN WHAT WAYS DOES THE ANTI-SEMITISM WHICH YOU HAVE PERCEIVED MANIFEST ITSELF?	183
TABLE M7: HAVE YOU PERSONALLY EXPERIENCED ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS?	184
TABLE M8: HOW MUCH EXPERIENCE HAVE YOU HAD WITH ANTI-SEMITISM IN YOUR LIFETIME?	184
TABLE M9: HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING ARE TO THE JEWISH PEOPLE?	185
TABLE M10: WHAT IS YOUR POLITICAL AFFILIATION?	186
TABLE M11: DO YOU USUALLY VOTE FOR THE DEMOCRATIC OR REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE?	186
TABLE M12: DID YOU VOTE IN THE 1980 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION?	186
TABLE M13: WHO DID YOU VOTE FOR IN THE 1980 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION?	187
TABLE M14: DID YOU VOTE IN THE 1976 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION?	187
TABLE M15: WHO DID YOU VOTE FOR IN THE 1976 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION?	187
TABLE IN1: INCOME OF JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS	188
TABLE PCH3a: AGE OF CHILDREN	189
TABLE PCH4: MARITAL STATUS - CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD	189
TABLE PCH6: TYPE OF SCHOOL - CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD	190

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

	PAGE
TABLE PCH7: DISABILITY - CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD	190
TABLE PCH14: CHILDREN'S JEWISH EDUCATION	191
TABLE PCH15: INFORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION - CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD	191
TABLE MD1: LISTS USED TO CONSTRUCT SAMPLE FRAME	192
TABLE MD2: PROCESSING NONCURRENT LISTS OF JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS LISTS OF JEWISH POPULATION	197
TABLE MD3: RECORDS OF LIST PROCESSING - PERCENT OF SINGLE ENTRIES BY LIST	200
TABLE MD4: NUMBER AND PERCENT OF SINGLE ENTRIES BY LIST TYPE	207
TABLE MD5: FREQUENCY OF CURRENT AFFILIATION WITH JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS	208
TABLE MD6: NUMBER OF CONTACTS MADE	209
TABLE MD7: FIELD WORK RESULTS: ZIP CODE DISTRIBUTION BY CATEGORY	210
TABLE MD8: NUMBER OF CURRENT AFFILIATIONS WITH JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS FOR SAMPLE CATEGORIES	212
TABLE P2-P1: NUMBER OF PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD, BY ZIP CODE	214
TABLE P1-CH1: HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN, BY ZIP CODE	215
TABLE P2-IN1: INCOME BY SEX FOR RESPONDENT WHO IN 1980 WORKED 40 WEEKS OR MORE PER YEAR AND 35 HOURS OR MORE PER WEEK	215
TABLE P8-25: RELIGIOUS IDENTITY BY AGE	216
TABLE P8-26: INTERMARRIAGE ATTITUDES BY AGE	217
TABLE P8-30: NEIGHBORHOOD COMPOSITION PREFERENCE BY AGE	218
TABLE P8-45: EDUCATION BY AGE	219
TABLE P8-P65: OCCUPATION BY AGE	220
TABLE P8-P65- PCH1: WOMEN WHO WORK 40 WEEKS OR MORE PER YEAR AND WHO WORK 35 HOURS OR MORE PER WEEK AND WHO HAVE CHILDREN	221
TABLE P8-Z: ZIP CODE BY AGE	222

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

	PAGE
TABLE P8-R1: TEMPLE AND SYNAGOGUE AFFILIATION BY AGE	223
TABLE P8-R10a: RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE (LIGHTING CANDLES ON FRIDAY NIGHT) BY AGE	223
TABLE P8-R10i: RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE (HAVING A CHRISTMAS TREE) BY AGE	224
TABLE P8-R10j: RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE (STAYING HOME ON HIGH HOLIDAYS) BY AGE	224
TABLE P8-R11: SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE AT LEAST ONCE A YEAR BY AGE	225
TABLE P8- R1102: SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE ON HIGH HOLIDAYS BY AGE	225
TABLE P8-R15: CHOICE OF MOST IMPORTANT SUBJECT IN JEWISH EDUCATION BY AGE	226
TABLE P8-H15: NUMBER OF AUTOMOBILES IN HOUSEHOLD BY AGE	227
TABLE P8-HP3: CHOICE OF HOSPITAL BY AGE	227
TABLE P8-C10: IMPORTANCE OF PROXIMITY TO JEWISH INSTITUTIONS BY AGE	228
TABLE P8-F9-1: TEMPLE AND SYNAGOGUE VOLUNTEERISM BY AGE	228
TABLE P8-M4a: OPINION ON WHETHER JEWS SHOULD SEND MONEY TO ISRAEL BY AGE	229
TABLE P8-M4e: OPINION ON WHETHER JEWS SHOULD LOBBY FOR ISRAEL BY AGE	229
TABLE P8-M4g: OPINION ON WHETHER JEWS SHOULD SUPPORT U.S. ARMY IN ISRAEL BY AGE	230
TABLE P8-M7: ANTI-SEMITISM EXPERIENCED IN PAST 12 MONTHS BY AGE	230
TABLE P8-M8: ANTI-SEMITISM EXPERIENCED IN OWN LIFETIME BY AGE	231
TABLE P8-M10: POLITICAL AFFILIATION BY AGE	231
TABLE P8-IN1: INCOME BY AGE	232
TABLE P16S BY MA1: RELIGION OF SPOUSE BY YEAR OF MARRIAGE	233
TABLE RI-IN1: INCOME BY AFFILIATION WITH SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE	233
TABLE C15-P8: NOW TELL ME IF YOU BELIEVE THAT YOU OR SOMEONE IN YOUR FAMILY WILL LIKELY USE EACH OF THESE SERVICES SOMETIME IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS.	234

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

	PAGE
TABLE M10 BY XIN1: POLITICAL AFFILIATION (BY INCOME)	236
TABLE M11 BY XIN1: DO YOU USUALLY VOTE DEMOCRATIC OR REPUBLICAN? (BY INCOME)	237
TABLE M13 BY XIN1: WHO DID YOU VOTE FOR IN THE 1980 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION? (BY INCOME)	238
TABLE M15 BY XIN1: WHO DID YOU VOTE FOR IN THE 1976 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION? (BY INCOME)	239
TABLE INI-P22: INCOME, BY ZIP CODE	240
TABLE XZP8A BY MF21: PARENTS OF RESPONDENT AND SPOUSE IF PRESENT BY AGE	241

POLICY SUMMARY
THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY

Gary A. Tobin
Washington University

December 1982

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report* is to summarize some of the key findings of the St. Louis demographic study and to make policy recommendations based on that study. Conclusions were rarely drawn in the report, and no policy suggestions were made in that study. This report, however, is designed as a policy guide. It represents the view of the consultant, and other interpretations may be drawn from the data.

*This section was originally printed as a separate report.

Table of Contents

1. PURPOSES AND USES OF THE STUDY.	I
2. POLICY HIGHLIGHTS	II
3. DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY REPORTS AND TAPES	II
A. Demographic Study Final Report	
B. Executive Summary	
C. Technical Aspects of List-Merging Process	
D. Computer Tape and Code Book	
E. Women and Volunteerism: A Survey of Young Women's Council for Education Program Participants	
4. STATISTICAL HIGHLIGHTS.	IV
5. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS.	VIII
A. Unifying Factors	
B. Population	
C. Geographic Location of the Population	
D. Data and Planning	
E. Marital Status	
F. Age	
G. Childbearing	
H. Education	
I. Intermarriage	
J. Occupation	
K. Housing	
L. Disability	
M. Synagogue Affiliation	
N. Synagogue Location	
O. Jewish Community Centers Association	
P. Jewish Federation of St. Louis	
Q. <u>St. Louis Jewish Light</u>	
R. Volunteerism	
S. Israel	
T. Anti-Semitism	
U. Political Patterns	
6. SERVICE USES AND PRIORITIES	XVII
7. METHODOLOGY	XXIII

1. PURPOSES AND USES OF THE STUDY

The increased demand for demographic information came from the Federation's planning mechanism, the Community Services Planning Committee. It was in this forum that the need for a demographic study was determined. The continuous requirement for critical information, coupled with the continuing requests from congregations, organizations and Jewish communal service agencies, sparked the study process.

The requests for information were linked to a wide range of community concerns such as changing family patterns, population shifts, intermarriage, increase in one-parent families and the needs of the elderly and youth population. These issues were among several areas that fostered the request for demographic information to assist policy-making. Through the Federation's community planning process, a demographic study was discussed and subsequently supported by the Federation's Endowment Fund. A Demographic Study Committee was appointed, and chaired by Frank Jacobs.

The survey was designed so that data were produced that have multiple uses. Among these are the use of data to aid:

- resource allocation;
- program planning and development;
- fund-raising;
- structuring service delivery systems;
- priority ranking;
- data base development, and
- community education.

The data base can be used as a reference tool for these and other community planning activities.

2. POLICY HIGHLIGHTS

All services studied in the survey will be needed to some extent in the Jewish community. The following points summarize some of the most important service needs:

1. Anti-Semitism touches a significant number of St. Louis Jews. Programs to combat anti-Semitism will continue to be of major importance.
2. All services for the elderly will continue to be pressing. A concentration of low income elderly remains that is not being adequately serviced.
3. The demand for Jewish day school education can be expected to grow.
4. The need for nursing home care is likely to continue to grow, along with intermediate housing needs for the elderly.
5. Programs for the handicapped - the physically, emotionally and behaviorally disabled - are pressing. The survey comments reveal this area to be the least satisfactory in terms of service by the Jewish community.
6. Day care needs are mounting. The quality and kind of day care must be a major service concern of the Jewish population.
7. Drug and alcohol abuse are a significant problem for a small minority of the population. The Jewish community should consider programs to service this population.
8. Unemployment is a growing problem, and job training and placement can be expected to be an increasing need.

3. DEMOGRAPHIC STUDY REPORTS AND TAPES

The study has been divided into basically five products. They are:

A. Demographic Study Final Report

This report aggregates the data gathered in the survey process, and presents them in the form of frequency distributions, cross-tabulations and text.

At the request of the Jewish Federation of St. Louis, interpretations of the data have been kept to a minimum in this report. The report is intended to be used as a reference document, and all answers to all parts of the survey were included in the report.

B. Policy Summary

The policy summary includes highlights and policy recommendations. It is not intended to be a comprehensive policy discussion, but rather a guide to some of the key issues that emerged in the examination of the data.

C. Technical Aspects of List-Merging Process

This technical report describes in detail the processes used in list-merging to create the sample frame. It will be of interest to other communities that might be interested in undertaking a demographic study and using lists to draw a sample.

D. Computer Tape and Code Book

All the data are stored on computer tape, and a code book to that tape has been prepared. This data bank can be used for further research and planning.

E. Women and Volunteerism: A Survey of Young Women's Council for Education Program Participants

At the request of the Jewish Federation of St. Louis and the Women's Division of the Federation, special attention was devoted to changing women's roles and volunteer patterns. A separate survey instrument was developed, a subsample drawn, and a separate report prepared containing the results of this special survey.

4. STATISTICAL HIGHLIGHTS*

Some of the most important statistics are listed below:

Population Size

- The Jewish population of St. Louis is 53,500.

Population Characteristics

- Twenty-two percent of the Jewish households are single persons, and another 36.7% are two-person households.
- Twelve percent of the married adults have been married at least one time before.
- Twenty-two percent of the population is over the age of 60, and over 16% is over the age of 65.

Neighborhood and Mobility

- Eighty percent of the households said that they are not planning to move within the next three years. Of those that are planning a move, most will be within the same general area or out of the metropolitan area.
- Seventy-one percent of those sampled prefer to live in a neighborhood that is at least 25% Jewish.
- Fifty percent of the households have been in their current residence less than six years.
- Thirty-eight percent of the Jewish households have moved to the St. Louis area since 1960.
- Eleven percent of the households over 60 believe that their neighborhood is pretty unsafe or not safe at all.
- Being close to Jewish institutions is very important to 31% of the households and is not important to 37% of the households.

Place of Birth

- Fifty percent of the respondents and spouses were not born in St. Louis.
- Eleven percent of the adults in St. Louis were born in Eastern Europe, 2% in Germany and less than 1% in Israel. Over 2% were born elsewhere around the world.

*Percentages are rounded to nearest decimal point. Totals may exceed 100% due to rounding error.

- Twenty percent of the foreign-born Jews in St. Louis have come to the United States since 1975.

Education

- Eighty percent of the people between 21-35 have finished college. About 40% of those in this age group have an advanced degree.

Employment and Disability

- Two percent of the population is disabled to some extent.
- Three percent of the adult men and 2% of the women are looking for employment.
- Twenty-nine percent of the employed population works within the City of St. Louis.
- Twenty-seven percent of the adults are classified in sales occupations, including business owners; 22% are in the professions, and 16% are in managerial and administrative positions.
- Eight percent of the employed adults have more than one paid job.
- Thirty-three percent of the respondents and spouses are self-employed.

Income

- Thirteen percent of the households earn less than \$10,000 per year, and about 7% of the households earn more than \$100,000 per year.
- Jewish men who work full-time are in much higher income categories than Jewish women who work full-time. Under 10% of the men earn less than \$20,000 per year, as opposed to over 33% of the women.
- Forty percent of the households over 65 years of age earn less than \$10,000 per year.

Housing and Transportation

- Seventy-two percent of the households are in owner-occupied living quarters. About 8% of the households live in condominiums.
- Nine percent of the households do not own any automobiles. About 29% of the households 65 or older have no automobiles.

Religious Characteristics

- Twenty-six percent of all households currently have no affiliation with any Jewish organization.

- Sixty-six percent of the households currently belong to a synagogue or temple. Of those who do belong, 60% are Reform, 26% are Conservative, 13% are Orthodox, and 1.2% are Traditional.
- Thirty percent of those households who do not currently belong said that high costs are a reason for not belonging, and 22% said that costs are the single most important reason for not belonging.
- Fifty-three percent of the households never light candles on Friday night, 42% never have a Passover seder in their home, and 20% never light Chanukah candles.
- Seventy-three percent of the households always stay home from work on the High Holidays, but 13% never do so.
- Five percent of the households always walk to synagogue or temple.
- Nineteen percent always buy kosher meat for the home.

Jewish Education

- Seventeen percent of the households rank the quality of their children's Jewish education as excellent, while almost 30% rank it as fair, poor or very poor.
- Forty-nine percent of the households believe that Hebrew or Talmud is a very important part of a Jewish educational curriculum.
- Thirty-nine percent of the households believe that Jewish philosophy and ethics is the single most important subject to be taught in a Jewish school.
- Eighteen percent of all adults have had no formal Jewish education.
- Sixty-eight percent of the men and 7% of the women were bar/bat mitzvah.

Intermarriage

- The intermarriage rate since 1975 is about 25%. Between 1965-74 it was about 19%, and between 1950-64 it was about 6%.
- Forty-one percent of all adults do not believe that religion should be a concern in the choice of a marriage partner.

Services for the Elderly

- Sixty-seven percent of the households over 60 years of age have not used the Jewish Community Centers Association in the past 12 months.
- Ten percent of those over 60 years of age have access problems obtaining the services that they need.

- Eleven percent of the households over 60 have no family at all in the St. Louis area, and another 1% never see their families.
- Housing for the elderly is seen by 33% of the households as the first most important service priority of the Jewish community.

Philanthropies, Volunteerism and the Jewish Federation

- Sixty-two percent of all adults feel that a Jew has a greater obligation to Jewish philanthropies than to general community philanthropies.
- Forty-two percent of those sampled believe that the Jewish Federation's single most important function should be raising and allocating funds for service uses of St. Louis Jews, 11% believe overall community planning is the single most important function, and 12% believe raising and allocating funds for Israel is the single most important function.
- Twenty percent of the households make a contribution of \$100 or less per year to Jewish philanthropies, including synagogues or temples.
- Seventy-two percent of the households do no volunteer work at all for Jewish organizations, and another 7% spend less than one hour per week--a total of 79% spending less than one hour per week.
- The St. Louis Jewish Light is the single most important source of news about the Federation for 57% of the households.

Jewish Hospital

- Jewish Hospital was the hospital used by 47% of the households.

Israel

- Twenty-seven percent of the households have made a trip to Israel.
- Eighty percent of those sampled believe that Jews have an unqualified responsibility to aid Israel, and another 14% said yes, depending on the type of aid--a total of 94%.

Anti-Semitism

- Twenty-five percent of those sampled have experienced anti-Semitism in the last 12 months.

Political Patterns

- Forty percent of St. Louis Jews identify themselves as Democrats, 13% as Republicans and 43% as Independents.
- Ninety percent of the adults sampled voted in the 1980 presidential election.

5. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Jewish community in St. Louis is diverse in terms of place of origin, use of services, political affiliation, attitudes about intermarriage, neighborhood and religious observance. Indeed, St. Louis Jewry can be described as a number of "subcommunities," classified by place, class and behavior. The Jewish community cannot always be considered as a singular group. As the Federation and other institutions and organizations make policy decisions, diversity, complexity and conflicting needs will increasingly play a role.

A. Unifying Factors

While much differentiates the community into subgroups, other factors strongly unite the Jewish community. The data show strong bonds or near unanimity of belief or behavior in the following areas:

- support for Israel and
- preference to live in a neighborhood with at least some other Jews.

The desire to support Israel and live in at least a somewhat Jewish neighborhood are the most dominant uniting factors.

B. Population

The Jewish population of the St. Louis area is approximately 53,500, significantly lower than the 60,000 figure that has been used for some time. It should not be expected that the Jewish population in St. Louis will grow in the near future, and it will probably decrease due to patterns of out-migration and small family size. *Planning decisions should be based on the assumption of a no-growth or generally shrinking population for at least the next five years.* The only factor that would likely reverse this trend is a major economic boom in the St. Louis metropolitan area that increases employment opportunities and attracts migrants of all religions to the area.

C. Geographic Location of the Population

The rapid westward push of Jewish population has stalled, at least temporarily. Indeed, a higher proportion of the children under 5 years of age are in University City than are in Chesterfield. Many observers have assumed that "all" the young Jewish households, the vanguard of population movements as a whole, have moved westward. University City, Olivette and Clayton remain strong centers of Jewish population for all age groups. Furthermore, the data reveal no predictable move out of these enclaves. It is impossible to evaluate, however, what will happen when housing market conditions change. An enormous pent-up demand for newer housing may be building that will again push more of the Jewish population into the western section of the Jewish enclave. On the other hand, the desirability of the housing stock east of Lindbergh in terms of style, location and type may remain attractive, despite shifting housing market conditions. At this point, however, a large proportion of the Jewish population lives in the eastern part of the Jewish corridor.

It is recommended that no permanent institutional or locational decisions be made on the assumption that the Jewish population will continue to move westward. Great care must be taken to examine different population cohorts, the services that they use and their characteristics before locational decisions are made. Currently, the Millstone campus is more ideally suited than any other location in terms of accessibility to both ends of the corridor. Annex facilities might be considered for particular services in University City and Chesterfield in rented or leased space. However, permanent facility relocation at this time might be unwise.

Certain elderly, youth, disabled and other groups have access problems no matter where facilities are located. This access deprivation is due primarily

to health and transportation factors, and these are not problems that can be addressed through service location alone, but through other mechanisms. The Jewish population is geographically compact in the context of the entire metropolitan area, but it is spread out from Kingshighway to Chesterfield. Given these distances, households without automobiles or family assistance or a person in poor health or with a disability will have access difficulties. Attempts will have to be made to bring these persons to the services or to deliver the services, but facility relocation is not likely to be of much help for certain groups. A campus as it now exists is highly desirable with the decentralization of certain services as a desired goal.

D. Data and Planning

An important recommendation of this study concerns the further use of data. Much data is contained in the final report. But these findings can be greatly expanded and studied by further examination of the data. All data are stored on computer tape and can be retrieved as needed for planning purposes. *It is recommended that the Federation develop an "on-line" information retrieval system.* Such a system requires:

- adequate computer facilities;
- trained personnel in computer programming and information retrieval, and
- trained personnel in data analysis.

Costs for this system should be shared by all users.

The Federation should also consider developing a system for the general dissemination of the information contained in the study. Educational forums and workshops on the use of the data would be useful. Such a system falls within the general coordinating functions of the Federation.

E. Marital Status

The divorce rate is climbing, but not at the rate that popular myth might lead us to believe. Furthermore, most people who divorce tend to remarry. Intermarried Jews have a higher divorce rate than Jews who marry within the faith. The number of single-parent households, less than 5% of all households, is also not as alarming as it would seem, since many households remarry. *It appears that programs designed for divorced and separated individuals during transitional phases should be considered, as well as programs for households that are single-parent for longer periods of time.*

F. Age

The Jewish population of St. Louis is an older one when compared to the general St. Louis County population or the national population. Services for the elderly will continue to be a major need in the community. It should be noted, however, that a substantial proportion of the elderly, because of income, family support, geographic location and other factors, do not need a major service delivery effort. They may desire the same kinds of services, however, as the general population. Furthermore, a substantial proportion of the elderly are being serviced by Jewish organizations in a number of ways.

A sizable minority of the elderly in the Jewish community, however, are "service poor." Because of location, disability, lack of transportation and lack of family support, this population lives in poverty or near poverty and geographic isolation. Much of the demand for housing for the elderly comes from this group. It is not clear that more new housing units are the only answer. *Increased services in existing neighborhoods in crime prevention, transportation and other social and human services should also be considered. A variety of in-home, in-neighborhood, day care and other services should be*

considered by the Federation and other agencies as an alternative to building more housing units.

G. Childbearing

The St. Louis Jewish community should not expect a "baby boom." The projected number of children is two per household for those who will have children, and is substantially lower for all households. The mean age of having the first child is later in this generation than the former, and the mean number of children is smaller. School-age populations will probably continue to be relatively stable, with slight "jumps" that do not necessarily imply a long-term increase. *All institutions should plan for a relatively stable population of young people.*

H. Education

The Jews of St. Louis are increasingly more educated than each previous generation, although the current generation of Jewish women still is not achieving the same level of education as Jewish men. Jewish children are increasingly being educated in Jewish day schools, both Orthodox and Conservative, and an increasing number of households intend to send their children to such schools when they reach school age. *The community should expect to make a continued increase in resources for day school education as the demand for this service continues to grow.*

I. Inter-marriage

The intermarriage rate is steadily increasing, reaching the current rate of 25% of all marriages since 1975. This includes multiple marriages and all population cohorts. A substantial proportion of Jews in all age categories believe that religion should not be a concern in the choice of marriage

partners. The Jews in the survey who were divorced were more likely than the married Jewish population to have had a non-Jewish partner. It should be expected that the rate of intermarriage will continue to increase. *Programs for intermarried couples and the children of these households will need to be implemented.*

J. Occupation

The Jews of St. Louis have occupations primarily in four categories: professional; managerial; sales, and homemaker. The homemaker and sales categories are declining with each generation, and the professional and managerial categories are increasing. The proportion of men working in self-employed occupations is decreasing. A majority of the women work, including married women and women with children, although most of them work part-time. *Day care needs can be expected to be considerable, and the Federation should explore various methods to facilitate the planning of high-quality day care in the Jewish community.*

Unemployment for Jews in St. Louis is much lower than the general population, but it is not insignificant. *Job assistance and training programs are a vital community need.* As the population ages and the proportion of partially disabled persons increases, employment rehabilitation programs will become more important.

K. Housing

The vast majority of the Jewish population lives in owner-occupied dwellings. As the population ages, it should be expected that other housing types, primarily apartments and condominiums, will be more attractive to a growing proportion of the population. *The demand for all kinds of alternatives to single-family housing--nursing homes, day care for the*

elderly and other types of arrangements for the elderly--will continue to be pressing. Furthermore, the physically disabled population will probably continue to grow, and will need special housing facilities.

L. Disability

A significant proportion of the St. Louis Jewish population suffers from a disability that either limits access to services or prevents the individual from gainful employment. The interview comments reveal a particularly urgent service need for individuals with emotional, mental or behavioral disorders. Many households have no institution or agency in the Jewish community that they feel handles these service needs. *The Federation should explore the service needs of the disabled with particular emphasis on day care or intermediate housing facilities for the emotionally and behaviorally disordered child and adult.* Facilities for the physically disabled will also be pressing.

M. Synagogue Affiliation

A majority of the Jewish households in St. Louis are affiliated with a temple or synagogue. Of those that are not affiliated, membership dues and a variety of miscellaneous other reasons account for nonaffiliation. Special programs for youth, elderly, singles and other groups should be considered by the temples and synagogues. These institutions are geographically dispersed, are accessible to nearly all of the population and could serve as localized service centers. *Furthermore, synagogues and temples should consider ways to finance the large number of households that do not belong because of high costs or to make available and more well-known.*

N. Synagogue Location

Nearly all of the areas of the Jewish population are being serviced by a

synagogue or temple. Only one temple, however, is located in the City of St. Louis. A substantial number of Jewish households are located within the city limits. *A small synagogue in the Central West End, with particular emphasis on attracting households between the ages of 18-35 and those over 60, should be considered by the Jewish community.* Other synagogues or temples that are now considering relocation would be wise to exercise extreme caution. The current housing trends are stifling geographic movement, and the data reveal no expected major move of the population in the next few years. A synagogue move now would probably result in a shifting of current membership from one synagogue to another, but would not necessarily add to the total membership of the community.

O. Jewish Community Centers Association

The JCCA is generally rated very highly in terms of its accessibility and the quality of its programs. The high turnover is due to a tendency to drop membership when a particular service is no longer needed, as opposed to dissatisfaction with the JCCA itself. *The JCCA must constantly offer new programs and adjust to changing life styles to continue to attract the Jewish population.* Since quality is not perceived to be a major problem by most users, variety, convenience and innovation will be most important in attracting and keeping members. Some elderly, particularly those in the 63130 zip code, do have accessibility problems to the JCCA.

P. Jewish Federation of St. Louis

The Federation is generally well-perceived by those who are aware of its functions and purposes. A large proportion of the population, however, is unaware of both. The Federation should consider programs that will help to better familiarize the community with its functions. The primary source of

information about the Federation is the Jewish Light. *The Federation should consider making the Light available to all Jewish households as a means of familiarizing the community with the purpose and activities of the Federation, as well as other organizations and institutions.*

Q. St. Louis Jewish Light

The Jewish Light is thoroughly read by almost all of its readers. During the list-merging process it was found that the mailing list needs updating in terms of deleting old addresses and duplications. *For efficiency purposes, the Jewish Light should consider ways to update its mailing list.*

R. Volunteerism

The participation in volunteer efforts is not as high as it might be in the Jewish community. The Federation and other organizations and institutions should devote further study and analysis in developing ways to attract volunteers. Special emphasis should be given to finding appropriate times and tasks for the new generation of working women, since women traditionally have played a major role in volunteer efforts. *The recommendations put forward in the study of Women and Volunteerism for the Women's Division should be considered carefully.*

S. Israel

Support for Israel in the St. Louis Jewish community is extremely strong. Well over 90% of those sampled believe that American Jews have a responsibility to aid Israel. Levels of support for varying kinds of aid do differ, and there is a very small minority of Jews who can be defined as "anti-Israel."

Over 92% of those sampled believe American Jews should send money to Israel. It should not be expected that this support will decrease. While

some of those interviewed criticized certain Israeli government policies, they were quick to add that this did not diminish their support for the State of Israel, its purposes or its people. The data confirm this support.

T. Anti-Semitism

Anti-Semitism has been experienced by nearly all of those sampled at some time in their lives. Older adults have experienced a great deal more anti-Semitism. For those under 35, over 60% said that they personally experienced little anti-Semitism in their lifetime. On the other hand, 40% of those under 35 and 25% of the entire population said that they experienced anti-Semitism in the last 12 months. *These data indicate that anti-Semitism is still widespread, and that continued efforts to combat it are extremely important and must remain a top priority in the Jewish community.*

II. Political Patterns

The Jewish community is split by age, income and other factors in terms of voting patterns for presidential candidates. Income level, often a proxy for class, plays a significant role as a factor in a presidential choice. The "Jewish vote" cannot be assumed to belong to any party. There is a small proportion of Jews in St. Louis who identify themselves as Republicans. Furthermore, a very high percentage of Jews vote.

6. SERVICE USES AND PRIORITIES

One of the most important parts of the survey is contained in a few detailed questions about those priorities that the respondents place on certain services that might be offered in the Jewish community, and what services individuals think that they or their families might use. This section discusses the results concerning service uses.

Geographic access and convenience of location of Jewish institutions is a major concern in Jewish community services planning. Respondents were first asked, "Generally, is being near to Jewish institutions important to you?" About 30.8% said that it was very important to be near Jewish institutions, and 31.9% said that it was somewhat important. Over 36% said that it was not important at all to be near Jewish institutions, and 1.4% did not know. Respondents were then asked, "Is transportation a problem in using Jewish institutions?" About 5.8% of the population said that transportation is always a problem, and 11.9% said that transportation is sometimes a problem. Almost 81% of the respondents said that transportation is never a problem. Transportation access problems are primarily a function of age and disability, as found in examining cross-tabulations of these two factors.

Programs for the handicapped will be used by 6.4% of the households, or over 1,300 households. Vocational or educational guidance and aptitude testing will be used by 10.2% of the households, or over 2,000 households, and help in finding a job by 10%, or over 2,000 households. Yet only 8.4% of the households said that they would use the Jewish Employment & Vocational Service, indicating either a lack of familiarity with the services offered or a desire to use the services elsewhere. Similarly, 9.5% of the respondents said that someone in the household will use the Jewish Family & Children's Service, while the combined proportion of households that would use family care and counseling (10.7%); marital, parent-child or individual counseling (8.5%); child adoption services (4.4%), and other services is much higher. Over 400 households said that they will require services to assist in drug abuse problems, and a similar number will need services for alcohol abuse problems.

Clearly, the service need is enormous. No service is to be unused. When the potential "don't know" pool is considered, the service load may be even

higher. The questions, of course, are:

- How many of these services can be offered through Jewish organizations?
- Do people want these services offered; can they be paid for by the user, or must they be subsidized?
- How can the differences in people's perceptions of priorities be reconciled against the services that people say that they will use?

For example, only 5.4% of the respondents gave a high priority to general recreational services, yet over 37% said that they will use such services. Oppositely, only 7% of the respondents said that nursery schools and day care are a top priority in the Jewish community, yet over 20% of the households said that they will use these services. Respondents placed a very heavy emphasis on the priority of services for the elderly, while a wide array of other services will demand a great deal of attention if needs are to be met.

The service usage questions were cross-tabulated by age and income separately and as three-way cross-tabulations. Other statistical tests also were used to determine if the age and income variables had a separate influence on projected service usage, and both variables do have such an influence, as well as family composition, number of children and age of the children.

Few of the services will be used across the board, without age as a factor. General recreational programs, youth camps and educational programs are among the services that will be used by the younger households. Some very interesting factors emerge in this analysis. While 13.6% of the households under the age of 60 said that they will need housing for the elderly in the next five years, 34.5%, or over one-third, of the households over 60 said that they might use housing for the elderly (of those who said that they knew at all). Looked at another way, over 45% of those who said that they will need housing for the elderly are under 60 years of age, and an equal proportion, over 45%, of the

households that said they will need transportation for the elderly are also under 60 years. What accounts for this pattern is that some proportion of these households actually have a person over 60 in them, even though the respondent is not, or the respondent is in the 55-60 age group and is projecting future use. Other households fit neither of these categories. Thus, it is apparent that certain households were indicating potential use for someone else in their extended family. Perhaps this accounts for the differences between the proportion of households over 60 years of age that said they will need housing, as opposed to the higher proportion of respondents who said that housing is needed.

Income is also a determinant of which services will be used. Lower income households are more likely than higher income households to use vocational help, family counseling care, housing for the elderly (45% of those under \$20,000), transportation for the elderly and programs for the handicapped. Higher income households are more likely to use day care and nursery schools, with many of these being two-worker households. Even though higher income households will use family counseling or marital counseling at approximately the same rates as lower income households, they are less likely to use the Jewish Family & Children's Service or general recreational facilities. Youth camps and other family-oriented services are more likely to be used by middle income families.

Respondents were given a comprehensive list of community services and asked the following question:

Now let's talk specifically about some agencies and services which are sometimes offered to the Jewish community by Jewish agencies. Now tell me which three of these you believe would be most important in terms of the priorities of the Jewish community. Tell me which you think is the most important, the second most important and the third most important.

Housing for the elderly is by far ranked the most important priority service in the Jewish community. Over 33% of the respondents listed this as the most important service priority. Next of primary importance is the Jewish Family & Children's Service, with 9.3%, and family counseling and care, with 6.1%. Nursing homes and educational programs were listed as the top priority by about 5% of the respondents.

When asked to list the second most important need in the community, services for the elderly still dominate the public view, with almost 16% listing housing for the elderly, 10.2% checking transportation for the elderly and 11.2% checking nursing homes as the second most important priority service in the Jewish community. When asked the third most important service needed in the Jewish community, 10.3% checked housing for the elderly, 8.8% checked day care for the elderly, and 7.5% checked nursing homes. Looking at the same draft in another way, almost 60% of the respondents listed housing for the elderly as the first, second and third most important service. No other service is so prominent as a perceived need on the part of the respondents. Nursing homes were listed by 24.1% of the respondents as one of the top service priorities, and the Jewish Family & Children's Service was listed by 22.3%. Transportation for the elderly was listed as first, second or third by 19.3% of the respondents, educational programs by 16.0% and day care for the elderly by 16.9%. The lowest priorities were given to Reform and Conservative day schools and to drug and alcohol abuse assistance programs, all with less than 2% of the respondents checking these variables first, second or third. Preschools and day care account for 7% of the first, second and third categories.

The question that was also asked after the respondents assessed community service needs was: "Now tell me if you believe that you or someone in your

family will likely use each of these services sometime in the next five years." This question was designed to assess what kinds of services are likely to be needed in the St. Louis community, as opposed to what people believe are the community's needs. One of the most interesting facts is that 18.6% of the respondents said that they will need housing for the elderly in the next five years, a number equal to the number of elderly who said that they will have a change in housing needs sometime in the next five years. Yet, as seen in the elderly services section, a smaller proportion said that they will need assisted housing. What accounts for this difference? Most likely, family members believe that an elderly relative will need housing assistance, but the elderly respondents themselves do not.

It should be noted that no fewer than 2% of these households said that any particular service would be needed by their household sometime in the next five years, or a minimum of 400 households needing any particular service. In this particular table, the "don't knows" are particularly significant, constructing a pool of potential users as well as those who said that they definitely will be using a particular service.

The greatest service demands will be for cultural programs (38.4%), general recreational facilities (37.3%) and educational programs (37.2%). About 20.6% of the households said that they will use some youth activities services. A total of 20.3% of the households said that they will have a need for day care or nursery school services, and 25.2% expect to be part of services that help combat anti-Semitism. For some services, the relatively small percentages translate into a relatively heavy service load in terms of households. For example, only 4.4% of the households said that they will use child adoption services, yet this translates into over 900 households, while another 8.2% of the households do not know if they will need this service.

About 3.7% of the households, or over 750 households, said that they would use a Reform day school, and 4.1%, or over 900 households, said that they would use a Conservative day school. Clearly, some of the respondents were confusing the meaning of day school with afternoon Hebrew school. But even given this confusion, a substantial interest is present for both types of day schools.

It might be expected that proximity to Jewish institutions would be more important to the older adults as opposed to other age groups. Proximity is about equally important to most groups, with a larger population (37%) of the over 65 group saying that proximity is not important, as opposed to 42% of the 51-65 age group and 30% of the under 30 group. On the other hand, 37% of the over 65 group said that proximity to Jewish institutions is very important, as opposed to 28% of the under 35 group. Clearly the variable is not one that is largely dependent on age.

7. METHODOLOGY

The sample frame for this study was constructed by collecting and merging a wide variety of lists. By merging such a large set of lists, nearly all segments of the Jewish population were included in the sample frame, allowing for as true a universe as possible from which to draw a sample.

The compilation of current lists, old membership lists (to find former affiliates) and a variety of other lists included the broad spectrum of the Jewish population. The methodology was designed to minimize bias, and households that are usually omitted using only a Federation list were included in the sample frame. Personal interviews were conducted.

A sample of 1,550 households was selected. Of these, the breakdown of the results is summarized below:

- Completed: 922 (84 telephone)
- Refusals: 238
- "Can't Locates": 150
- Non-Jews: 149
- "Moved Out-of-Towns": 52
- Other: 39 (vacation, ill health, etc.)

The known Jewish households in St. Louis consist of those households in the completed, refusal and other categories--a total of 1,189 households:

- 77.5% completion;
- 20.0% refusal, and
- 2.5% other.

The acceptance rate was approximately 78%, excellent for contemporary survey research. The results of reported statistics are accurate within plus or minus 5%.

I. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

A. Household Size/Composition

Table P1 shows the distribution of households by size. About 22% of the households are one person, and 37% have two persons. About 17% of the households have three persons, while 15% have four persons. About 8% have five people and 2% six persons. The mean household size is 2.56.

About 7.7% of the households have another adult living in the household - a person who is neither a spouse nor a child. About 24% of the other adults are a parent of either the respondent or the spouse - with 18% of the other adults being mothers (reflecting the tendency of women to outlive men). Another 1.1% of the other adults are grandparents living within the household. About 2.2% of the Jewish households in St. Louis have a parent living with them. Another 17.2% of the other adults are brothers and sisters of the respondent or spouse. Another 20% of the other adults are related to the respondent or spouse in other ways: aunt; uncle; cousin; etc. A total of 64% of the other adults in Jewish households are relatives of either the respondent or spouse. Of the remainder, 15% are roommates, 4.6% are partners, 5.7% are paid employees, and 8% are other categories: visitors; boarders; etc.

Sixty-one percent (61%) of the other adults are female, 95.5% are white, and 4.5% are black. The mean age of the other adults is 57, with the majority being over 60 years of age. In terms of marital status, 35.6% of the other adults are widowed, and 33.3% have never been married. Fifteen percent (15%) are currently married, and 13.8% are divorced or separated. Many of these other adults (26%) are living in the household with a disability, far more than the rest of the population. About 47% of the other adults do not currently work. Of those who do work, one-third are working less than 36 weeks per year.

About 8.8% of these adults are currently looking for employment. The majority of the other adults (56%) have moved into the residence since 1979, suggesting either temporary arrangements or a surge in these arrangements. The former is more likely, particularly among those who are recently divorced or separated.

Table PCH-3a shows the age distribution of children living at home with their parents. A number of factors are striking about this table. First, no evidence, as indicated by other tables as well, is present of a "baby boom." The age distribution shows that fewer babies are being born now than 10 years ago. Projected or planned number of children is not much different. In addition, Table PCH-4 shows that 1.1% of the children living at home are either divorced or separated, and 0.4% are married and living at home.

B. Population Size

The estimate of the number of Jewish households in the St. Louis area is 53,555, plus or minus 10%. The sample frame yielded 22,732 households after the list-merging process. Of these, 9.6% or 2,182, were found through the interviewing process to be non-Jews, leaving a base of 20,550 on which other adjustments were made. These included a 5.3% move out-of-town factor, or 1,089 households. This left 19,461 to which were added 432 (2.1%) households, or the number of 1981 in-migrants that would not show up on any list. This left a total of 19,893 households. A 5% totally unaffiliated estimate, 1,027 households, was also added. This gives a total estimate of 20,920 households, plus or minus 10%.

The estimated population size is derived by multiplying the average household size by the number of households. The average household size is 2.56, giving an estimated population of 53,555. This is the best estimate of the current Jewish population, January 1982, in St. Louis, including

nonaffiliates, recent immigrants and all other subgroups who are Jewish. This also includes college students who live at home during the summer. This estimate makes no adjustments for the number of non-Jews living in these households.

C. Mobility/Nativity

Because Jews have not been listed regularly by religion in the United States Census, their population movements have been difficult to trace. In addition to the current survey data, two sources have been used to give approximate locations of the Jews in the St. Louis area before 1941. First, synagogues have been listed with addresses in the Polk's City Directory. Coupled with the Russian foreign-born and children of Russian foreign-born listed by ward and, later, census district, locations of the Jewish population can be approximately traced. Of course, not all synagogues have been located centrally in relation to the Jewish population. Nor are all the Russian foreign-born necessarily Jewish. But together, these two indicators provide outlines of Jewish population movements before 1941. In his discussion of racial and ethnic groups in St. Louis in 1929, Merle Fainsod states:

Because of the kaleidoscopic changes in the location of the Jewish population of St. Louis, it is extremely difficult to deal with it in a scientific manner...the only certainty is its movement, a fact to which the sudden appearance of synagogues and "kosher" delicatessen signs along the path of march bear mute witness.¹

The indicators of Jewish movement in St. Louis are easily recognized because they have appeared so often. The Jews have never been a stationary population. No other group in St. Louis seems to have been so mobile. Within

¹Merle Fainsod, "The Influence of Racial and National Groups in St. Louis Politics (1908-1928)," p. 40. Master of Arts, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., 1929.

70 years the Jews have managed to move from downtown to the outer edges of West Central St. Louis County.

Third, housing discrimination tended to make Jews move in a more concentrated fashion than other groups. Restrictive covenants prevented Jews from moving to many parts of the city. Fourth, the bulk of St. Louis Jews, like their counterparts in other American cities, chose not to assimilate at the price of giving up their Jewish identity. This phenomenon is translated into geographical proximity.

This set of factors has combined to produce the second trend in St. Louis population growth. Just as the movement has been unidirectional, any Jewish movement has involved almost the entire Jewish population of the area. The movement of Italians, Irish or Germans may have involved partial abandonment of one colony and the establishment of a second one. Other ethnic groups have had multiple enclaves. Jews, however, move as a group.

The third trend that characterizes Jewish mobility is the rapidity of the movement. No other immigrant group in St. Louis has moved so quickly from one area to another. This quick Jewish movement has been due primarily to the rapid economic progress of the Jews.

This dramatic upward mobility produces a fourth pattern. The Jewish enclave is never stable. As one enclave would empty into a second area, the second would be forming a third. By the time a Jewish area has become established, the new Jewish sector has begun to develop beyond it. The tendency has been like leapfrogging, with some Jews moving straight from the first to the third enclave, but with most moving from the second to the third. For example, while some Jews were still moving to the West End from the old 19th Ward, many Jews would move to University City. Subsequently, some Jews would move to University City from the old 19th Ward, but most would move to

the West End. When the old 19th Ward was emptied, the West End would be the Jewish province, with the movement into University City already substantially established. Since the arrival of the largest portion of the St. Louis Jewish community at the turn of this century, the Jews have had five centers of population. About every 15 years the Jews have been found in a new area of St. Louis. The first trend associated with this mobility is the direction of the movement. It has been a direct westward thrust. While the Germans in St. Louis moved both north and south, or the blacks moved both west and north, the Jews have made a unidirectional movement. This pattern has a number of probable causes. The original Jewish population was of German extraction and began to arrive in the middle of the 19th century. Reform-oriented, they tended to assimilate with the native population, and were thus concentrated in the native West End wards. It is likely that the Eastern European Jews continually pushed westward to attain the same status as the German Jews.

The separation of the German and the Russian Jews reflects the pattern prevalent throughout the nation at the turn of the century. The pattern found in Detroit is similar to the St. Louis experience:

...the social, economic, and religious differences which separated Jew from Jew in late nineteenth century Detroit continued to grow in the early twentieth century...The few attempts at bridging the social barriers between German and Russian Jews failed to achieve the desired results, and the majority of the city's German Jews refused to associate with the immigrants. Thus, for all intents and purposes, the Jews of Detroit formed two separate communities at the outbreak of World War I.¹

This pattern is reflected in the locational differences of Reform and Orthodox synagogues. Secondly, the housing amenities were most attractive for upwardly mobile Jews in the westward corridor.

¹Robert Rockaway, "Ethnic Conflict in an Urban Environment: the German and Russian Jew in Detroit, 1881-1941," American Jewish Historical Quarterly, LX, December 1971, p. 150.

The continual upward movement certainly explains some of the outward movement, but it does not explain the other patterns of Jewish population movements - unidirection, for example. This phenomenon can only be explained by the careful examination of the culture: behavior; beliefs; attitudes, and values. Just as important as the pattern descriptions, however, are the internal dynamics of Jewish residential decision-making. The survey data provide insights into these decision processes.

The "kaleidoscopic" nature of Jewish population movement is well-documented in Table P33. In 1941, most of the Jewish households (about 39%) were still in the West End portion of the city. Another 18.6% were in "other" zip codes, these located primarily east in the central city. But at the same time, over 34% of the households were already in 63130 in University City and 12% in Clayton and Richmond Heights. About 2% of the households were in Ladue, Olivette and Creve Coeur. Thus, in 1941, some of the Jewish population remained in the old 19th Ward of the city, the West End population center was already being challenged as the center by University City, while the nascent signs of movement into Central West County were already apparent. In 1961, University City was clearly the center of Jewish population, with 45% of the households, while the West End had only 3% of the Jewish households. The population of Jewish households in Clayton declined a bit with just above 11%. The 63132 zip code grew to 19% of the Jewish households, while 63124 and 63141 together contained over 12% of the Jewish households.

Of all the adults interviewed in this survey, 50.4% were born in St. Louis and another 33.5% were born elsewhere in the United States; 11.3% were born in Eastern Europe, 1.9% in Germany and 0.5% in Israel. About 2.4% of the adults were born in other countries around the world (see Table P38). Of those not born in the United States, 72% have become naturalized citizens (see Table P40).

Of the foreign-born Jews in St. Louis, 29.2% arrived before mid-1920 in the great wave of Eastern European immigration that swept the United States before the immigration restrictions of the mid-1920s. The end of World War II saw another group of Jews arriving in St. Louis, when 18.8% of the foreign Jews came here in the 1940s and 1950s. Not until 1975 did the next wave begin, when Israelis and Soviet Jews arrived, accounting for most of the 20.3% of St. Louis foreign-born Jews who have arrived since 1975 (see Table P41). About 18.8% of the adult population spoke a language other than English as their primary language when they were growing up. Over 11% of the population spoke Yiddish as a primary language, 0.6% spoke Hebrew, and 6.5% spoke a variety of other languages (see Table P42).

Respondents were asked, "Are you planning to move in the next three years?" About 80% of the households indicated that they planned no move. Of the total households, about 4.8% were not sure where they would move, while another 4% said that they would move out-of-town. Most respondents (7.7%) said that they plan to move within the same general area. About 2.1% said that they will move further west, while 1.2% said that they will move further east. Only 0.2% said they will move to the City of St. Louis. The data indicate that we should expect no dramatic changes in population location, but rather a general continuation of past trends (see Table P27).

Of those people planning to move out of the metropolitan area, the largest proportion (42.5%) plan to stay in Missouri. The only other meaningful trend that can be seen is for households planning to move to the Sun Belt, with 25% of those planning to move having notions of moving to California, Florida, Arizona and Hawaii.

Respondents were also asked to indicate if someone in the household was

planning to move, even if the household itself was not moving. About 4.8% of the households reported that within three years a child in the household would establish a new household of his or her own within the St. Louis area. Another 5.7% of the households reported that one of their children could be leaving the St. Louis area. About 2.8% of the households reported some adult in the household would be moving within the St. Louis area, while 2.3% reported that an adult in the household would be leaving the St. Louis area. Divorce, separation, education and the need for institutional care are among the reasons that new households form from existing households within the area.

D. Geographic Location

Table P-Z1 shows the distribution of the Jewish population by zip code and the distribution of households by zip code. Interestingly, there is little difference to be noted. The reason for this can be seen in Table P2-H which shows the average household size by zip code. Note the little difference by zip code in this average.

By 1981, University City had clearly lost its place as the center of Jewish population, containing only 13% of the households, while the 63131/63141 zip code areas held almost 34% of the Jewish households. The growth areas of Ballwin and Chesterfield, in 63011 and 63017, had over 12% of the households. The proportion of Jewish households in 63132 was just under 13%, with about 10% in 63105/63117 and 9% in 63124. About 3% of the Jewish households were in 63108/63110 and 63112.

The movement out of University City is also documented in Table P35, which shows the prior place of residence for those Jews moving within the St. Louis area. Of the current households, 34% lived in University City just prior to their present residence. Examination of both origin and current residence

shows that the major movement was westward in the 1960s and 1970s, and the current propensity is to move within the same basic area, as shown in Table P27. These data, as well as Table P35, would seem to indicate that another major move westward is not forthcoming in the next three years. This, of course, must be examined in the context of the current housing slump and associated high interest rates and housing costs. Households are forced to seek less expensive housing than is available in West County. It is impossible to predict the outcome when, and if, the market conditions change dramatically.

Tables P27 and P36 show the great degree of mobility into and out of the St. Louis metropolitan area. Of those households planning a move in the next three years, about one-third intend to leave the St. Louis area. Table P36 shows the continued movement of households into the St. Louis area. The greatest proportion of non-St. Louis natives moved here before 1949, many of them immigrants from Eastern Europe. Since almost 50% of the respondents were not born in St. Louis, a great proportion of the current households have moved here since 1960.

The immediate prior place of residence of those residents who were not born in St. Louis can be seen in Table P37b. Almost 20% came from outside of the United States. Almost 22% came from elsewhere in Missouri and 14% from Illinois. Almost 8% came from New York, 4% from Ohio, 5% from Massachusetts, 3% from Pennsylvania, 4% from California and 3% from Texas. Examination of the city of origin (this table is not reprinted) shows that most of the St. Louis immigrants came from a few select large cities, which might be expected given the urban nature of the Jewish population in the United States. Table P38b, which shows the state or country in which people were born, basically reveals the same patterns.

E. Neighborhood Preference

Respondents were asked to choose their neighborhood preference in terms of religious composition. About 16.5% of the respondents said that they did not care about religious composition, with another 2.5% stating that their preference depended on other factors. Approximately 6.7% of the respondents said they preferred to live in a neighborhood that is 100% Jewish, with another 15.1% preferring a neighborhood that is at least 75% Jewish. Thirty-nine percent (39.2%) of the respondents would like to live in a neighborhood that is at least 50% Jewish, making a total of 61% of the respondents preferring a neighborhood that is at least 50% Jewish. Not a single respondent indicated that they would like to live in a neighborhood with no other Jews, while only 4.1% of the respondents said they preferred a neighborhood that had less than 25% Jews (see Table P30). It appears that most respondents have found a neighborhood of their preference, with 49.1% estimating that they live in a neighborhood of at least 50% Jews (see Table P31).

Age is not a major factor in determining preference for a Jewish or a non-Jewish neighborhood. Only the over 65 age group shows any predilection to live in a neighborhood that is 100% Jewish, with 16% stating this preference. With this exception, other age groups are moderately consistent in the proportion of their neighborhood that they would like to be Jewish (see Table P8-30).

F. Length of Residency

Length of residency patterns reflect the generally high mobility patterns of other Americans: the tendency to move from one housing unit to another. At the time the survey was taken, 5.8% of the households had been at their current residence for less than one year. Another 20.2% of the households had been at

their current address less than three years, with another 24.2% moving between 1975-1978. In total, more than 50% of the Jewish households in St. Louis had been at their current address less than six years. Only 10.7% of the households had been at their current address since 1950, with only 2% having moved into their current residence before 1950 (see Table P32).

G. Housing

This section discusses the housing characteristics of the Jewish population: home ownership patterns; rents; housing size, and other pertinent housing characteristics. These data can be used to help evaluate future housing needs of the elderly, access questions for the handicapped and other service-related issues. The questions in this section of the survey were modeled after the United States Census.

Over 72% of the sampled households own their own homes, and about 28% rent their units (see Table H2). Fifty-five percent (55%) of the households have seven or more rooms. About 10% of the households have a monthly mortgage amount of less than \$100 per month, and slightly more than 8% of the households have a monthly mortgage amount of more than \$800 per month.

Automobile ownership must be considered along with housing characteristics in order to examine service accessibility. Most access problems are somewhat ameliorated by the fact that only 9% of the households do not have any automobiles. Another 30.2% of the households have one automobile, 46.1% have two automobiles, and 14.7% of the households have three or more automobiles.

Table P8-H15 indicates that the nonownership of automobiles is almost completely a function of age. Of the households without any automobiles, 84% are over the age of 65. Only 1.9% of the households under 35 are without an automobile, less than 1% of the age group between 36-50 and less than 4% of the

51-65 age group. Yet 29% of the over 65 group is without an automobile. It is the "car-less" population that usually is the most troubled by service access problems.

H. Sex

Table P2 shows the distribution of the population by sex. About 47.4% of the population is male and 52.6% is female. Of the respondents and spouses, 45.8% are men and 54.2% are women (this excludes children and other adults).

I. Race

As might be expected, Table P3 shows that the vast majority of those living in Jewish households are white, with only about 0.6% being non-Caucasian. Of these, most are black, with less than 0.1% being of other races. Few racial intermarriages exist, but there is some slight tendency to adopt nonwhite children.

J. Age

Table P8 shows the age distribution of the St. Louis Jewish population. About 25% of the population is under the age of 21. A large population cohort (about 14%) is between the ages of 21-30. This represents the post World War II "baby boom" children in their twenties. About 14% of the population is in its thirties, with 12% in the 40-50 age bracket. Another 13% of the population is between 50-60. Twenty-two-and-one-half percent (22.5%) of the population is over the age of 60. Of these, 16.6% are over 65. Eleven-and-one-half percent (11.5%) are over 70, and 3.2% of the population is over the age of 80. The mean age of Jews in St. Louis is 39.8.

The number of households with persons over 60 is much higher than the

population itself. Over 35% of the households have at least one person over 60 in them. Many elderly persons live by themselves; spouses under 60 may have a spouse over 60, and some households have other adults, either parents or siblings over 60, living in their households. This accounts for the high number of households with persons over 60.

Table P8-Z shows the geographic distribution of the population by age group. A heavy concentration of the over 65 age group is in the 63124, 63130 and 63132 zip code areas, accounting for 46% of the over 65 group. About 26% of over 65 group live in 63141. Another 14% of the over 65 group live in the 63105/63117 zip codes. Only 2% of the over 65 group live in 63011 and 6% in 63017, largely in nursing homes or retirement centers. The largest group of under 20 population is in 63131/63141, with 43% of this age group in these two zip codes. Only 5% of the under 20 age group are in 63124, and under 4% are in 63011. About 13% of the under 20 group are in 63017. Individuals in the 21-35 age group are more decentralized than other age groups, with 11% in "other" zip codes than those associated with the Jewish population center; 7.4% are in 63011 and 9% are in 63017.

k. Children

The St. Louis Jewish community is not likely to experience a major "baby boom" in the near future. The number of children they will have will be small, averaging only two per household for those having children.

About 4.3% of the households have at least one adopted child. Of these, 2.1% of the households have adopted one child, 2.0% have adopted two children, and only 0.2% have adopted three children. No household was recorded as having had adopted more than three children (see Table P10). The mean age for having the first child for women is 24.6, and the mean age for fathering the first

child for men is 27.9 years.

The location of households with children is shown in Table P2-CH1. Almost 58% of the households have no children at all living in them. The households with children between the ages of infancy and 5 years old are divided almost evenly in areas east and west of Lindbergh. Fourteen percent (14%) of the children under 5 years old are in 63130, almost 13% in 63132, 10.5% in 63105 and 63117, 4% in 63124 and 1.5% in the City of St. Louis - a total of about 43%. The largest proportion of children under 5 (a total of 31%) live in 63131 and 63141, and 12% live in 63017. About 3% of the children under 5 are in 63011, and 11% are in "other" zip codes. The pattern changes for children between the ages of 6-18, with 39% in the eastern zip codes, 45% in 63141 and 63131, and another 14% in 63017. It is difficult to assess if households tend to move out of the eastern zip codes when the children are of school age or if a more permanent residential pattern has been established for families with young children to be evenly distributed throughout the Jewish corridor.

L. Education

The data show the degree to which the Jewish population in St. Louis has been educationally mobile. Data was collected for the educational level of the respondent and spouse, each of their parents and all of the grandparents. Examined by age of respondent and spouse, an educational profile of the population is provided. Each successive generation has been better educated, for both men and women.

The educational level of the adult population is shown in Table P45. About 19.5% of the Jewish population have less than a high school education, and 21.5% have graduated high school. Over 21% of the adults sampled have some college, and almost 22% have a college degree. Almost 3% of those sampled have

some masters degree work, with another 10% having finished masters work.

About 4.3% of the adult population, those over 21, are currently enrolled in school. Of these, 6% are at the high school level, 25.3% finishing college work, 23.8% working on masters degrees and 14.9% working on Ph.D. degrees. Another 12% are working on medical or law degrees, and almost 17.9% are in educational programs of another kind (see Table P47).

Educational levels are quite different by age group, with steady gains in educational achievement with each successive generation. This progression in educational achievement can be seen in two ways: by examining the educational levels of the parents and grandparents of the sampled population, and by looking at different age divisions of the respondents and spouses themselves. Of those respondents and spouses over 65 years of age, 35% have less than a high school education, and 33% have a high school education. About 9% have finished college, and 6.4% have an advanced degree. Educational levels steadily increase, with 34% of the 51-65 age group having a college or advanced degree, 62% of the 36-50 age group having a college or advanced degree and 80% of the 21-35 age group having a college or advanced degree. Of the latter age group, 21-35, about 40% have an advanced degree, and 95% have had at least some college (see Table P8-45).

Different educational levels still exist between men and women, even though these differences are smaller than for prior generations. For the age group between 21-35, 67% of the women have completed a college education or have an advanced degree, with 26% having an advanced degree. Of the men in this age group, 81% have completed college or have an advanced degree, with 46% having an advanced degree. The biggest proportional difference for men's educational level is seen between the 36-50 age group, with 75% of the men having finished college or having an advanced degree, and the 51-65 age group,

with 48% having finished college or having an advanced degree. Similarly for women, 50% of the 36-50 age group have finished college or have an advanced degree, as opposed to 21% of the 51-65 age group.

The types of schools that are attended by Jewish children in St. Louis are seen in Table PCH6. Over 57% of the children attending school are in a public elementary or secondary school, 3.4% are in a Jewish elementary or secondary school, 4.3% are in a private elementary or secondary school with no religious affiliation, and 0.2% are in a Christian elementary or secondary school. About 14% of the children are in a public college, junior college or public university, and 9.5% are in a private school of higher education. About 11% of the students are in "other" types of schools. Looked at another way, of the children in elementary or secondary schools, about 88% are in public schools, 5.5% are in religious schools, and 6.6% are in nonreligious private schools.

M. Marital Status

About 68% of the households, or more than two-thirds, consist of married partners. Another 17% of the respondents are widowed. Only 5.1% of the households are divorced, with less than 1% being separated. About 8.7% of the Jewish households in St. Louis consist of persons who have never been married. Another 0.5% of the respondents are unmarried but living with a person of the opposite sex (see Table P4).

The proportion of households that are currently divorced or separated is rather small, about 6%. The proportion of households with one or more of the married partners having a prior marriage is much higher. Of the households with current marriages, about 12.5% of both the respondents and the spouses have been married before (see Table P5). One percent of the adults in the community have been married more than twice (excluding parents and grown

children living in households) (see Table P6).

N. Occupation

Occupational data were collected that would allow for later comparison to the general population. For instance, educational, geographic, religious and occupational data were collected for three generations, in order to trace occupational mobility in the Jewish population.

Occupations are classified according to categories established by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. These categories from the U.S. Bureau of Census are reprinted in Table P65. The Jewish population is basically employed in three categories: managerial; professional, and sales. These three occupational groups account for 65.2% of the respondents and their spouses. Of these, 15.8% are managers, 22.3% are professionals, and 27.1%, the single largest category, are in sales-related occupations. Another 15.6% list their occupation as homemaker, and 9.5% are in administrative support occupations, including clerical positions. Occupational profiles are much different when evaluated by different age and sex categories.

About 3.2% of the adult population are physicians, 5.5% are teachers, 2.5% are lawyers-a total of 11.2% in these three occupational categories. Four percent (4.1%) are secretaries.

Of the Jewish men in St. Louis, 23.1% are in managerial positions, 25.5% in professional occupations and 39.4% in sales occupations, including proprietors and owners of manufacturing firms. These three occupational categories account for about 88% of the Jewish male population. Interestingly, about 0.6% of the Jewish men list their occupation as homemaker.

The profile for women is considerably different. The single largest category is homemaker - about 28%, or almost one-third of the women. The

remainder finds 1.9% in the service occupations and 16.7% in the administrative support occupations. About 9.7% are in the managerial category and 17.8% in professional positions. Approximately 16.7% of the women are employed in sales, but far fewer in managerial or proprietary positions than men (see Table P65-A).

A steady progression from certain occupational strata to others by generation can be seen in Table P8-P65, which shows occupational categories for respondents and spouses by age. In the under 35 age group, 21% are in the managerial class, and another 35% are professionals - a total of 56%. Another 16% are in sales-related occupations. Less than 10% of this age group are classified as homemakers. Approximately 23% of the over 65 age group are classified as homemakers, 30% are in sales-related occupations, 12% are in administrative support, and only 8% are classified as professionals.

0. Employment

The mean number of weeks worked by employed Jewish women in St. Louis was 27.1, and the median number of weeks worked was 36. The average number of hours per week worked by women was 21.2, and the median was 20. The mean number of hours per week worked by men was 44, and the median was 43.

About 24% of the adult population did not work in 1981, including 10% of the men and 36.5% of the women. This includes the disabled, unemployed, retired, people who choose to be homemakers and a variety of other individuals. It should be noted, however, that a majority of women did work in 1981, many of them part-time. Of the men, less than 3% worked less than 26 weeks per year, as opposed to 9% of the women. About 70.9% of the men worked 50-52 weeks per year, as opposed to 36.3% of the women.

Of the men, 2.4% worked less than 20 hours per week, as opposed to 10.9%

of the women. About 35% of the women worked 35 hours per week or more at a paid job, and about 5% of the women worked 50 hours per week or more at a paid job. Over 74% of the men worked 35 hours per week or more at a paid job, and 32% worked 50 hours per week or more. Over 5% of the men worked 70 hours per week or more at a paid job.

Place of work and place of residence have strong relationships to one another, whereby places of work influences where people choose to live. Table P63 shows the major places of employment for the Jewish population. A little over 12% of the workers are employed in the Central Business District, and 10.6% in the Central West End, primarily in the medical centers. Another 5.8% work elsewhere in the City of St. Louis - a total of 28.7% working in the City of St. Louis. Almost 15% work in the Clayton/Richmond Heights area, and over 15% work in 63141. About 5% work in 63130, 5% in 63132 and another 4% in 63017. Over 21% work elsewhere in St. Louis County - a total of 65.1% working in St. Louis County. About 4% work in other parts of the metropolitan area, the East Side, St. Charles and other outlying areas.

About 8% of the employed adults have more than one job for which they are paid (see Table P67). Of these second jobs, about 16% are teachers, many being substitute or Sunday school teachers. Almost 33% have part-time sales-related jobs, either running their own business or selling in part-time positions. The remainder are primarily "free-lancing" their professional skills, as musicians, writers, photographers or other such skills.

About 62% of the population is employed by somebody else for wages, salary or commissions, including 50.6% of the men and 74.1% of the women. Twenty-three percent (23%) are self-employed in their own business or professional practice that is incorporated, including 32% of the men and 12% of the women. About 10% of the population falls into the nonincorporated business

or professional practice category, including 13% of the men and 7% of the women. Over 4% of the men and 2.7% of the women (3.6% of the total) are working with pay in a family business. Just about 1% of the women, and no recorded proportion of the men, are working without pay in a family business.

The fathers of the respondents and spouses tend to be more likely to be self-employed in a nonincorporated business (27%) than their sons (only 13%). They are also more likely (3%) to be working with pay in a family business. The sons are more likely to be employed in their own incorporated businesses than their fathers, showing a switch from small businesses to incorporated professional practices and bigger businesses (see Table P72).

Unemployment is not unknown among the Jewish population, with 3.2% of the men and 1.9% of the women spending at least one week looking for employment (see Table P62d).

P. Income

The income distribution of the St. Louis Jewish population is shown in Table IN1. The median household income is about \$35,000. Yet 5.2% of the households have an income of less than \$5,000 per year, and another 3% less than \$10,000 per year. A substantial number of Jewish households, then, are below or near the nationally defined poverty level. In all, there are about 1,000 Jewish households in St. Louis having an income less than \$5,000 per year, and a total of 2,800 households with less than \$10,000 per year.

Another 16.2% of the population can be classified as having a moderate income, between \$10,000-20,000 per year. About 31.5% of the households are making over \$50,000 per year, with 7.2% earning more than \$100,000 per year. The large majority of Jewish households in St. Louis are middle income, but poverty among certain subgroups does exist.

Wide differentials are present in terms of income by different age groups (see Table P8-IN1). In the age group over 65, almost 40% of the households have an income of under \$10,000 per year, and another 26% have an annual income of less than \$20,000 - a total of 66% having an income less than \$20,000 per year. Similarly, in the age group 21-35, where income potential has not peaked, about 29% of these households earn under \$20,000 per year. On the other hand, in the age group 36-50, only 3% of the households earn less than \$10,000 per year, and 8% earn between \$10,000-20,000 annually. Almost 44% of the households in this age bracket earn more than \$50,000 per year. The age group between 51-65 shows similar income characteristics.

Table P2-IN1 shows the income levels of respondents by sex, for those individuals who work full-time (40 weeks per year or more and 35 hours per week or more). Of the men, about 49% earn \$50,000 or more per year, with 11.4% earning \$100,000 or more per year. For women, 18% earn \$50,000 or more per year, with 4.5% earning more than \$100,000. Almost 7% of the men earn less than \$20,000 per year, and 34% of the women earn less than \$20,000 per year.

Low-income Jewish households are more heavily concentrated where the younger and older populations are concentrated. About 9% of those households earning less than \$10,000 per year are located in the 63108, 63110 and 63112 zip code areas, and 18% of them are in the 63130 area. Over 16% of the households earning less than \$10,000 are in 63132, and 21% live in 63131/63141. On the other hand, 13% of the households earning \$100,000 or more are in 63105/63117, almost 40% in 63131/63141, and 18% in 63124 - a total of 71% of the \$100,000 household income earners. Looked at another way, about 40% of the households in 63130 earn less than \$20,000, while 20% of the households in 63131/63141 earn less than \$20,000 per year (see Table IN1-2).

Q. Disability

Nonemployed populations may add to the service needs of the community. Disabled persons are very often unable to work as seen in Table P61. About 4.6% of the adult population has a disability that limits the kind of work that can be done at the job, with another 2.4% having a disabling condition that prevents the person from having a job at all. Other measures, need for daily assistance, for example, show a sizable proportion of the adult and child population having some disabling condition. Most of these are elderly, and some are already being serviced in nursing homes. However, these data do show that about 2.4% of the adult population is disabled to the point of not being able to work.

II. RELIGIOUS PROFILE

A. Religious Identity

Table P16 shows the current religion of the respondents and spouses. The interviewers were instructed to conduct the interview with the Jewish member or members of the household, which is why 98% of the respondents are Jewish. The other 2% are accounted for in this way: 1.1% of the Jews interviewed identify themselves as having "no religion," even if they were born Jewish. About 0.5% of those sampled consider themselves as having more than one religion, or something other than Jewish, or as having no religion. Still another 0.3% of the respondents are Catholic or Protestant. In one of the anomalies of social research about Jews, these individuals said that they were still Gentiles and did not identify themselves as Jews; however they said they were "more Jewish than their spouses." More than 10% of the spouses are not currently Jewish. About 3.5% of the spouses are currently Protestant, 3.7% are Catholic, 2.2% are no religion, and 1.1% are some other religion.

Religion of respondents and spouses at birth can be seen in Table P17. It shows that 2.7% of the respondents who are currently Jewish were born or raised as a different religion, primarily Catholic (1%) and Protestant (1.2%), and the remainder were born as either no religion or some other religion. In addition, about 13.5% of the spouses were born into another religion, meaning about 3.5% of the spouses have converted, either formally or informally, to Judaism. The former religions of those converted spouses are about evenly split between Catholic and Protestant. The proportion of households with current non-Jewish spouses (10.5%) added to the proportion of converted respondents (2.7%) and the proportion of spouses who have converted (3.5%) gives a total of 16.7% of the current marriages which have a spouse or

respondent who was not Jewish at birth.

The majority of both respondents and spouses who consider themselves Jewish, but who were born into another religion, have not undertaken formal conversion to Judaism (see Table P19). Of the respondents, 52.6% have not undergone formal conversion, 5.3% have had a formal Orthodox conversion, 7.9% have had a Conservative conversion, and 31.6% have had a Reform conversion. Of the spouses who were born into another religion, 66.7% have not had a formal conversion to Judaism, while 3.3% were converted to Orthodox Judaism, 11.7% to Conservative Judaism and 16.7% to Reform Judaism.

Respondents and spouses were asked about their current Jewish religious identity, even if "you do not belong to a temple or synagogue." About 8.1% consider themselves Orthodox, 25.9% Conservative, 52.0% Reform and 1.3% Traditional. Another 8.6% consider themselves "just Jewish" with no specific classification, and 4.0% consider themselves to have some other kind of Jewish identification (see Table P25).

The proportion of people who consider themselves Orthodox is diminishing substantially in St. Louis. Table P8-25 indicates how people define their Jewish identity by different age groups. While more than 21% of the over 65 age group identify themselves as Orthodox, less than 2% of the 21-35 age group identify themselves as Orthodox. Indeed, a higher proportion of this age group (2.4%) consider themselves Traditional. The proportion of Jews who consider themselves Conservative is fairly consistent by age group, with about 30% of the over 65 group and 24% of the 21-35 age group. The proportion of those Jews considering themselves Reform is also declining, from 62.2% of the 51-65 age group to 51.2% of the 21-35 age group. A substantial proportion of the 21-35 age group (about 16%) consider themselves to be "just Jewish," with no other identification.

Much concern has been expressed in recent years about the number of children who are joining cults. Respondents were asked if any of their children belonged to cults. About 1.1% of the households indicated that they have children in cults, including Hare Krishna, Jews for Jesus and a number of others. The data indicate, however, that cults are not a major phenomenon for almost 99% of the Jewish households in St. Louis, or, if children do join cults, their stay in them is very temporary.

There are some individuals who were born and raised as Jews, but feel no religious sense at all. As one man stated:

I was Jewish in a social sense. I had no religious instructions or traditions; my parents wanted to be assimilated; they were moving away from the practice of Judaism. I don't brag about being Jewish; we are a race; we are Semites from the Mideast. The practices of the religion have no meaning to me. They don't have much practical value. I'm not down on Judaism. I'm out on my own.

Like the comments of some other respondents, this individual revealed a sense of believing that he is a Jew for reasons that have nothing to do with religious training or beliefs. Another responded that Judaism is "not a religion, but a tightness of family traditions."

One individual explained that he had a strong Jewish identity, and even though he married a Gentile and insisted that the wedding not be Christian, he is raising his children as Christians. He explained:

Even though I married a non-Jew and a priest married us, I wanted two things: to break the glass and no mention of Jesus. There are no advantages for Jews to band together, although my parents did it to improve their standard of living. It's not true anymore. I think the Jewish community is diminishing after my parents' generation. I feel a strong Jewish identity, but don't see the need to proclaim it or raise my kids Jewish. I am self-oriented; my wife is group-oriented. She wants to belong. She would convert if people encouraged it. No one pushes it. So the kids are raised Presbyterian. Our kids know they are not Jewish. They'd tell you what church they go to. My parents probably mind but don't say anything.

On the opposite side is a man who said that "all four children married

non-Jews. All spouses consider themselves Jewish, and all children are being raised Jewish."

Some individuals who have married Gentiles expressed concern about it. One man said:

The thing that scares me is the fact that so many Jews are marrying non-Jews. There are both my sister and myself in my family who have married non-Jews. I plan to raise my children as Jewish. The fact that so many are getting away from their Jewish faith, though, worries me.

More comments were recorded about peoples' feelings about religion, their Judaism and their religious practices than on any other subject. Indeed, almost as many different views, feelings and attitudes were recorded about religious beliefs, practices and attitudes as there were interviews. Individuals had stories to tell, complaints to air, philosophies to expand and doubts to share. Some had moving personal stories to tell about their gaining or losing faith as a Jew, and the meaning of being Jewish to them. All kinds of arrangements are made concerning philosophies of Judaism and religious practices, as illustrated by this respondent:

My spouse follows Jewish concepts, but is not Jewish. She was brought up Baptist, but she has not practiced the religion for years. I believe that Judaism is a race rather than a religion. My wife made the choice to bring up our children Jewish. I didn't ask her to do it. We currently belong to a temple with a temporary withdrawal.

One woman said, "Judaism is simply tightness of family traditions and not the religion I grew up with." Another man, married to a Gentile, said that:

I believe in ethics and teachings, but our religion is outdated, as in kosher laws and other observances. It was 1974, the last time I attended temple. The Talmud is out of date. I have definite viewpoints about being Jewish.

Another woman said that:

I am an atheist. In Judaism everything is based on the dollar as far as observing the laws. It costs twice as much to buy kosher food. Everything is done because they tell you to do it. I believe in the here and now.

One woman said simply, "I don't bother with religion, and I don't care if I am Jewish or not."

Some people who are intermarried are alienated from their religion and practicing another religion. Two examples are recounted below:

I was raised Jewish, but no longer practice the religion and joined the Unitarian Church with my husband. However, I still feel Jewish culturally, and feel other strong ties to them. I have not found the Jewish community hospitable to newcomers or nonobservers, even before marriage. I feel that establishing a strong Jewish identity is crucial to continuing the Jewish religion. In my own experience, I would have preferred more community religious involvement to offset an inadequate religious home life. I feel there should be better education for the non-Jewish community about Jewish people. Personally, I have wondered if I had it to do over again, if I should have persevered in establishing a Jewish identity in St. Louis and finding a Jewish mate. I deeply enjoy the Unitarian Church because of its freedom to believe, but I still have a sense of my Jewish cultural background.

And this comment:

I am Jewish by birth, but do not know if I am really one now because I have Christian leanings. My spouse is not Jewish and has never been Jewish. In general, I think that the Jewish people that I have met are very closed-minded and narrow in regards to other kinds of religions.

Observance, feeling Jewish roots or identity rarely do translate into the same things for many of the Jews who were surveyed. One man said that "I am Jewish in my heart even if I don't observe holidays or practices." Another man said that "I don't observe holidays or practices." Another man said that "I don't observe, but I still feel Jewish. I feel being Jewish is a cultural, moral and hereditary thing, and from all those points of view I feel Jewish." One woman said that she is a "nonpracticing Jew," adding that "I am very confused. My mother did not tell me I was half Jewish until my father died."

Some Jews are simply "anti-organized religion." As one man said, "Although I was born and raised Jewish, I have no affiliation with the Jewish community. I am Jewish by heritage, not religion. I am part of the Jewish counterculture."

Others are disinterested. "I was raised a Jew but am no longer active in the Jewish faith, and I haven't continued any interest. I am studying to be a lawyer which takes up most of my time." Another man, who escaped from Hitler in 1939, said that "I don't deny I am a Jew, but I don't wear a banner. I don't like a professional Jew. It makes me uncomfortable to be around that kind of person."

Some Jews see themselves as "humanists" or "nonactive Jews"--somehow still Jewish, if not believing in ritual or religious teachings. One woman explained that:

I didn't want to be confirmed. I thought it was silly. No, I don't believe in formal aspects of any religion. I don't deny being Jewish. I see both Christian and Jewish people.

One woman said that "we don't believe in organized religion because of a bad Sunday school experience for our daughter." This kind of comment was recorded a number of times.

On the other hand, many respondents had many positive, warm and happy comments to make about their religious feelings and experiences. One 84-year-old woman said, "I am still reading and studying as much about Judaism as possible. I love my faith and people." One woman told of her positive feelings about her religious home life:

My great-grandparents emigrated from Germany in the middle of the last century. My parents set a wonderful example for my sister and I. We always had Friday night dinners with prayers said before the meal. Our Shabbos dinners were the highlight of the week.

Some people noted a drift toward more observance and a greater sense of Jewish identity and religious commitment. One couple, raised as Reform Jews, said:

Religion must make a difference. It might depend on the person, though my thoughts are changing. We were brought up very Reform. We are both becoming much more Jewish in feeling. My youngest wants to be bat mitzvah, and she is studying for it.

Others echoed this growing feeling of being Jewish and wanting to know more about the religion. Some people have willingly converted to the Jewish faith, as explained by one young woman:

At the age of 12 I felt that Judaism was the religion for me. My father and mother were Methodist and Catholic and would not allow formal conversion until I was 18. I studied with a rabbi secretly from 12 to 18 on my own. My husband was raised Jewish.

The two best illustrations of the complexity of the Jewish identity and feelings toward religion can be seen in the two comments that follow, one from a man whose father did not want him to be "too" Jewish and one from a couple who thinks St. Louis is not "Jewish" enough.

I would get a dime for each page I could read out of the Siddur from my grandparents. My maternal grandfather was a yeshiva scholar and wanted me to be a rabbi. My father said he would drown me if I did. My grandfather's sister had a son who was a rabbi, and he had two sons who were rabbis. One of the biggest problems we face is in-fighting between various Jewish communities: Orthodox; Conservative, and Reform. If you put 50 Jews in a room and ask a question you will get 50 answers.

Compared to Jews in New York and Philadelphia, who we are more familiar with, St. Louis Jews are more diluted. There are more red-haired, blond Jews in St. Louis than anywhere we've been. The St. Louis Jews act more like Gentiles. In New York, Jews are in the majority and act like Jews. Here they are in the minority, and they try to act like everybody else. Even the religious practices here seem less and tend to be more Reform. This is the only place we've seen Jews use the temple on Sunday.

B. Intermarriage

Feelings about intermarriage can be seen in Table P26. Over 22% of the respondents and spouses believe that a Jew should never marry a non-Jew under any circumstances, and another 14.1% believe that a Jew should marry a non-Jew only if the spouse agrees to a formal conversion to Judaism. About 13.1% view the question in terms of prospective children, with 1.8% believing intermarriage is permissible only if no children are planned, and 11.3% if the

spouse agrees to raise the children as Jews, with formal conversion not being necessary. Almost 41.1% of the sampled adults believe, however, that a Jew should marry a non-Jew as long as the two people care about each other and that religion should not be a concern, and another 2.7% said that they did not care. This question was structured with closed responses. As can also be seen in Table P26, no significant differences were recorded on this issue between men and women.

Feelings about intermarriage vary by age group. While 38% of the respondents over 65 believe that "a Jew should never marry a non-Jew under any circumstances," under 12% of the 21-35 age group have this belief. Agreement about formal conversion is fairly consistent by age group. Interestingly, almost 19% of the 21-35 age group believe that "a Jew should marry a non-Jew only if the spouse agrees to raise the children as Jews." This proportion is higher than any other age group. At the same time, 53% of the 21-35 age group believe that "a Jew should marry a non-Jew as long as the two people care about each other. Religion should not be a concern," as opposed to 39% of the over 65 age group. This sentiment is the most prevalent with a plurality of each age group voicing this opinion (see Table P8-26).

Changing rates of intermarriage over time between Jews and non-Jews are seen in Table P16s-M1. Less than 1% of the marriages recorded before 1949 were between Jews and non-Jews, but this figure could tend to lower among widowed adults because the religion of the spouses was not recorded if the spouse was not living at the time the survey was taken. For marriages between 1950-1964, 6% of the spouses were non-Jews. This figure jumped to 19% for marriages between 1965 and 1974. For the marriages of 1975 and after, 25% of the spouses were non-Jews.

The question of intermarriage was emotional for some respondents and others dismissed it as a trivial concern. Jews marrying Gentiles produces a

whole range of thoughts, feelings and arrangements between individuals and families. These comments reveal some of those. At times they seem to be contradictory, yet they reflect the wide range of feelings and attitudes. One woman said:

I was broad-minded when my sons were dating, and they both married non-Jewish girls. My preference now is a Jewish mate for them, believe me. I worry living now with a non-Jewish daughter-in-law.

Another woman said that her choice of neighborhood had much to do with her fears of her children marrying non-Jews: "I wanted my kids to meet Jews, so we moved here from Granite City. I would have felt guilty if I had stayed there and they married Gentiles."

Some people make religious compromises when they intermarry, working out suitable arrangements. One man married to a non-Jewish woman said, "She goes with me to temple on the High Holy Days, and I will in turn go to church with her on Christian holidays, but I don't kneel and pray at church."

Others prefer to lose their Jewish identity completely when they intermarry, as explained by this respondent:

We have a sound marriage, but I don't think I'd encourage intermarriage. There is some inevitable confusion for the child. For instance, the father might not be of the same religion that they are being raised. My children are being raised Catholics. They can't identify with my religion. I think that I'd say my whole sense of what I really am as far as religious identity is really very conflicting and not at all settled any more than it was as a child. My perception is that Jewish people have very restricted ideas to claim Jewish identity. It is not a generous spirit. I wouldn't be recognized as a Jew because my wife is a Gentile and I don't practice Judaism.

A few individuals stated their dislike for Jewish men (on the part of Jewish women), and vice versa:

I think today Jewish divorced people prefer to interdate, and they all have inflated egos. I prefer to date Gentile men. They aren't as conceited. I would still prefer to remarry a Jew. In the long run, it is easier not to have religious barriers.

One woman, not happy with the idea of intermarriage, shared in the feelings of many of the respondents when she said, "The couple should be treated warmly and not ostracized. That will leave the door open to bringing up the children in the Jewish tradition."

C. Family Religious Background

The Jewish identification of the parents of the respondents and spouses while they were growing up can be seen in Table P21-23. Over 54% of the mothers and 58% of the fathers of the sampled adults were raised as Orthodox Jews, about 18% were raised as Conservative, and 25% of the mothers and 22% of the fathers were raised as Reform. A very small proportion of mothers and fathers were raised as converted Jews. About 92% of the mothers and fathers were raised as Jews, over 3% as Protestants and over 3% as Catholics (see Table P20-22).

The religious identity of the family of respondents and spouses when they were growing up can be seen in Table P51. Over 39% considered themselves Orthodox, 23.2% Conservative, 32.3% Reform and 1% Traditional. Less than 1% considered themselves more than one religion, and 3.7% considered themselves something other than these categories (see Table P51).

D. Religious Education

Completed Jewish education of the respondents and spouses is shown in Table P55. Seventeen percent (17%) of the adults have had no Jewish education, and 49.1% have been to Sunday school. About 36.8% of the respondents and spouses have had afternoon Hebrew school training. In addition, 12% have had private tutoring, and 2.2% have been to all-day school. About 2% have been to Yiddish school and 3.2% to adult classes. Yeshiva high school has been attended by 1.3% of the respondents and spouses and yeshiva college by 1.1%.

Another 4.9% of the respondents and spouses have had some other kind of Jewish education.

Differences for men and women can also be seen in Table P55. The proportion of women with no Jewish education is twice as high as that of men, and while 53% of the men have had afternoon Hebrew school education, only 22.7% of the women have had the same training. More women than men, however, 53.6% versus 44%, have had some Sunday school training.

Differences by sex are even more pronounced for the parents of the respondents and spouses, with over 45% of the mothers having no religious education, 26.4% having Sunday school training and 13.2% having attended afternoon Hebrew school. Over 19% of the fathers had no religious education, 16.6% had Sunday school training, and 42.1% had afternoon Hebrew school training. Note that the proportion of both men and women with no religious education has decreased from their parent's generation (see Table P57).

The differences by sex in religious training for respondents and spouses can be seen in the proportion that have been either bar/bat mitzvah or confirmed. About 35% of the respondents and spouses have been bar/bat mitzvah, including 67.5% of the men and only 6.5% of the women (see Table P58). On the other hand, about 33.6% of the men have been confirmed, while 44.5% of the women have been confirmed (see Table P59).

The Jewish education patterns of the children of the respondents can be seen in Table PCH-14, which shows the types of education for children who have completed their Jewish training, for those currently enrolled and for those not yet started. For all three groups, between 3-5% of the children are being raised as Christians or other religions. About 80% of all children receive Sunday school education, and about 32% of current enrollees are receiving afternoon Hebrew school training. There is also a rise in the proportion of

children attending all-day schools. While 4.3% of the children who have completed their Jewish education went to Jewish all-day schools, 7.7% are currently enrolled, and 11% of the children who will receive Jewish education will receive it at an all-day school.

The majority of the population has had at least six-10 years of formal Jewish education, with 46.3% having had at least that much education and with another 10.7% having had 11 years or more. Over 22% of the respondents and spouses have had one-five years of formal Jewish education, and 3.2% have had less than one year. Over 17% of the adults have had no formal Jewish education (see Table P52).

E. Evaluating Jewish Education

Respondents were asked to rank their own and their children's Jewish education in terms of quality. Of those with children, 13% of the households had no Jewish education for their children. Only 17.5% ranked the quality as excellent, and 31.9% ranked it as good. Another 22.8% ranked it as fair, and 7% said that the quality of their children's Jewish education was poor or very poor (see Table R12).

About 17% of the respondents had no Jewish education themselves; only 12% ranked their education as excellent and 31.7% as good. About 15.2% said that their own Jewish education was poor or very poor, and 24% thought it was fair (see Table R13).

Respondents were given a list of subjects that might be included in a Jewish educational curriculum and asked to indicate if they believed that the subject was very important, somewhat important or not very important as a component in Jewish education. This list of subjects can be seen in Table R14. In each case, almost 50% of the respondents believed that the subject was very

important, and in most cases, between 75-80% of the respondents believed the subject was a very important part of the Jewish educational curriculum. These included Bible, postbiblical Jewish history, Israel, the meanings of the Jewish festivals, Jewish observances, Jewish philosophy and ethics and the Holocaust. The only two exceptions to their uniform high support were the Talmud and Hebrew, believed to be very important by 48.9% and 48.8% of the respondents respectively. (The total is high, but not as high as the other subjects.)

Respondents were then instructed to pick the single most important subject that should be taught in a Jewish school. The most picked item was Jewish philosophy and ethics, with almost 38.8% of the respondents believing that this is the most important subject to be taught. About 17.3% ranked the Bible as most important, and 10% picked Jewish observances. Another 8.4% picked the Holocaust (see Table R15).

Differences are present by age in perception of priorities in Jewish education. Some of these differences can be explained by the higher rate of Orthodoxy among the over 65 age group. Much greater emphasis is placed on Jewish philosophy and ethics among households below the age of 65 as opposed to over 65, and much less emphasis is placed on the Bible: 15% of the under 35 group said that this is the most important subject to be taught in Jewish education, as opposed to 29% of the over 65 group. This is the most significant difference by age in terms of Jewish education (see Table P8-R15).

A few respondents made comments about the purpose and quality of Jewish education. The comments about Jewish education were generally negative. Commented one man, "They should teach Hebrew translation in English so one understands what it means. It is ridiculous the way they teach it." Another man stated, "Jewish education should place greater emphasis on ethics and philosophy to survive; Jewish education must be more relevant to our everyday

lives." One woman felt that education was the most important problem for the Jewish community:

I think the level and quality of Jewish education is not only appalling, but is probably the single biggest problem that the American Jewish community as a whole will be facing over the coming decades. If they can't overcome that, there won't be much point to providing most other Jewish services.

Like income, age is also a factor in affiliation rates with synagogues and temples (see Table P8-R1). About 46% of the households in the 21-35 age group belong to a synagogue or temple, as opposed to 77% of the 36-50 age group and 75% of the 51-65 age group. About 64% of the over 65 age group belong to a synagogue or temple. Other statistical tests show that both age and income are factors in nonaffiliation and that neither has a statistically spurious relationship with affiliation.

F. Synagogue and Temple Affiliation

The survey indicates that approximately 65.6% of the households currently belong to a synagogue or temple (see Table R1). This figure is substantially higher than shown when the sample frame was constructed. A number of explanations can account for the difference. A check was made, however, and it was found that total membership had soared between 1979-1980, when the lists were collected, and 1981, when the survey was conducted.

Of those households who do currently belong to a synagogue, 12.7% belong to Orthodox synagogues, 25.7% to Conservative synagogues and 60.2% to Reform temples. Another 1.2% described their affiliation as Traditional, and 0.3% identified their affiliation as "other" (see Table R2).

Of those households who do not currently belong, 57% have had an affiliation with a temple or synagogue since they have been adults (see Table R3). This means that 84% of the households have belonged to a synagogue or

temple at sometime during their adult life. Past affiliations in terms of Orthodox, Conservative and Reform are identical to the proportions of those who are currently affiliated (see Table R4).

Table R5 shows the reasons respondents listed for not belonging to a synagogue or temple. Respondents were given a list of factors and instructed to list all factors that were pertinent for them. Distance was listed by the smallest proportion as affecting their decision to belong - only 3.9% checked this factor. "Bad experience in Sunday school or Hebrew school" was checked by 5.5% of those who do not belong to a synagogue or temple, and "don't have the time" was checked by 8.5%.

About 11.4% of those who do not belong "have never been and are just not interested," while 18.9% "used to belong and are no longer interested." Twelve percent (12.0%) of those who do not belong have resigned because they were affiliated to educate their children and that education is completed, while 4.2% have resigned because their own education is completed. The two largest factors, however, were "costs," checked by almost 30% of those who do not belong, and "other," 35.6%. The "other" category indicated a broad array of reasons which are described in the comments gathered by the interviewers (see Table R6).

Synagogue and temple attendance patterns can be seen in Table R11. About 13.1% of the respondents never attend services. On the other end of the spectrum, 1.2% attend every day, 8% attend on most Saturdays, and 4.5% attend on most Friday nights. About 44.8% attend an occasional bar/bat mitzvah, 43% attend an occasional Saturday or Friday night service, and 30.4% attend festival celebrations such as Purim or Sukkot. About 78.2% of the respondents attend High Holiday services.

Tables P8-R11 and P8-R1102 show some interesting patterns concerning

synagogue attendance for different age groups. An almost equal proportion (about 16%) of the over 65 age group and under 35 age group never attend synagogue. Only 9% of the 51-65 age group and 11% of the 36-50 age group never attend synagogue. Similarly, 72% of the over 65 age group attend synagogue on the High Holidays; the proportion increases to around 83% for the 36-65 age group and drops again to 77% for the 21-35 age group.

Many respondents complained of the costs of synagogues and temples. Table R1-In1 shows that the greater the income, the greater the likelihood of a household belonging to a synagogue or temple. While over 76% of the households with incomes greater than \$50,000 per year are affiliated, the proportion declines to 62.5% for the \$30,000-49,999 income range, and between 55-58% for the \$10,000-29,999 income range. A majority (56.5%) of the households with incomes under \$10,000 per year do not belong to a temple or synagogue.

About 82% of the parents of the respondents and spouses belonged to a temple or synagogue at the time that the respondents and spouses were growing up (see Table R7). Of these affiliations, 42.1% were Orthodox, 23.4% were Conservative, and 33.4% were Reform, with 1% being raised as something else (see Table R8).

One of the persistent themes of the comments of people who do not belong to a temple or synagogue, or who are otherwise unaffiliated, can be traced to personal experiences that have broken their religious faith. One woman said simply, "Religion is not so important. My husband was killed in the Warsaw Ghetto." Another woman said, "My sense of the value of religion has changed since my husband died. I used to be a religious person, but religion hasn't done me a lot of good." One other respondent said that she quit the synagogue when her young daughter drowned.

Holocaust experiences, the death of one's children and other personal

tragedies are among the many types of experiences that have alienated some people from their faith and from their ties to the organized Jewish community.

Some respondents use synagogues as they do other social service agencies, as opposed to places of worship. The "client service" provided seems to be primarily Jewish education. Some people no longer belong because their children's education is finished, or do not yet belong because their children are not of religious school age. As one woman explained:

I have future plans to belong to put the kids through Sunday school. It costs too much for the amount of time I'd use a temple or synagogue now.

Complaints about costs of synagogues and temples were basically threefold: they were too high; the forms of assistance were not well-known, and embarrassing procedures were used to determine if a family needed assistance. One man said that the screening committees "humiliate people." One young couple reported that "we were married in a temple, but they turned us down for membership as we could not afford the dues." Another divorced woman said that:

I think that it's hard for single parents to raise their children Jewish with the cost of temple and other Jewish educational costs. There should be some kind of assistance for single parents that is more well-known.

Some complaints were recorded about the types of synagogues and temples in St. Louis, mainly that the Reform temples were "too Reform" and that the Conservative synagogues were "too Orthodox." One man observed, "I don't feel there is a truly Conservative congregation in St. Louis. The Conservative ones are the same as Orthodox." Another man commented, "I think there is a need for synagogues that aren't so extreme - a more traditional Reform, not one bordering on Christianity." One woman complained that temples are "too large and impersonal." Another woman said that they are "social clubs," and still another will not go to services because she hates buying tickets for the High Holidays.

G. Religious Practices

The religious practices of the community are seen in Table R10. The question was developed to explore levels of religious observance. The question was asked, "How often would you say each of the following practices is observed by your household?" Of the religious practices listed, the use of a mikvah was the least observed - almost 96.6% of the households said that they never use a mikvah. The next least observed practice was walking to synagogue - about 90.8% of the households never do so. Only 4.8% of the households said that they always walk to synagogue, with 4.4% saying that they usually or sometimes walk. Similarly, only 11.2% of the households said that they never eat nonkosher meat outside the house, even though 18.9% of the households indicated that they always buy kosher meat for inside their own home. About one-third of the households that bring only kosher meat inside the house sometimes eat nonkosher meat outside the house. About 63.2% of the households never bring kosher meat inside the home. About 14.9% of the households always keep two sets of dishes, while 82.6% never keep two sets of dishes. When cross-tabulated, the data show that those who always eat kosher meat inside and outside the home, use two sets of dishes and always walk to synagogue comprise less than 5% of the households in St. Louis.

Chanukah and Passover are generally observed, with 20.3% of the households saying that they never light Chanukah candles and 71.2% of the households always attending a Passover Seder in or outside of their home. Yet only 20.1% of the households always light candles on Friday night, while 53.5% never do so. About 73.5% of the households never work or go to school on the High Holidays. The statistic of 13% who never stay home on the High Holidays corresponds to the population that has never been affiliated with a temple or synagogue.

Some portion of the Jewish households have adopted the secularized aspects of Christian holidays. While 85.6% of the households never have a Christmas tree, about 7.8% always have one, and another 6.6% sometimes or usually have one - a total of 14.4% of the Jewish households always, sometimes or usually having a Christmas tree in their homes. At the same time, 3.1% always have an Easter egg hunt, and another 7% sometimes or usually do so - a total of 10.1% of the Jewish households that have an Easter egg hunt.

As with synagogue attendance, there is a group of about 12-13% of the population that is very observant in terms of Orthodox Jewish ritual and a group of 12-15% that is not very observant of any Jewish practices and has adopted some Christian practices.

About 79.5% of the households have a menorah in the house, a number that corresponds to the households that indicate that they light Chanukah candles. About 76.3% of the households noted that they have a mezuzah in the house. Sixty-one percent (61.3%) of the households have a Kiddush cup, leaving almost 40% of the households that do not have a Kiddush cup (see Table R9).

The change from Orthodox to Reform and other Jewish identification has been accompanied by a change in observance patterns as well. For example, over 32% of the over 65 age group always light candles on Friday night, while the proportion steadily decreases with age. For the 21-35 age group, only 10% in this group always light candles on Friday night. Almost 64% of the people in this age bracket never light candles on Friday night, as opposed to 54% in the over 65 age bracket (see Table P8-R10a). At the same time, while 93% of the over 65 age group never have a Christmas tree in the house, this proportion drops to 80% for the 21-35 age group, with 13% in this age bracket always having a Christmas tree (see Table P8-R10). Similarly, the proportion of each age group that stays home from work on the High Holidays is consistent for

persons over the age of 35 - between 77-79% - while only 58% of the 21-35 age bracket always stay home from work on the High Holidays (see Table P8-R10j).

Just as there is a group of Jews who believe that religious observance or ritual is undesirable, another group believes that Jewish communal facilities do not have enough Jewish aspects to them. As one man stated:

I don't think there is enough "Yiddishkeit" in the Federation, and the JCCA isn't any different from any other recreational facility. Jews should be different in that way.

III. SERVICES AND COMMUNITY

A. Needs of the Elderly

A special section of the survey was designed to assess the needs, attitudes and service usage of the elderly. All households with the respondent over 60 were asked to respond to this special part of the survey, although many households with a spouse over 60 also answered this part of the survey. Over 39% of the households had at least one member over the age of 60. The age of 60 was chosen because many of the questions were designed to test for uses five years into the future, when the respondents in this section would reach the age of 65.

One of the major concerns in the Jewish community is providing adequate housing for its elderly. Respondents were asked if they expected a change in their housing needs over the next five years. About 73% said no housing change was expected, with about 27% saying that some change was expected. About 10% of the elderly indicated that they would be leaving the St. Louis area, which means that almost 37% of the elderly who expect a housing change plan to leave the St. Louis area. Presumably, these data reflect a trend noted in other communities, where a number of elderly households move to Sun Belt areas when they retire.

About 4% of the elderly respondents believe that they will need a smaller house, 2.3% will need a lower rent, 0.3% will need a unit with no stairs, and 2.3% believe that someone in the household will need institutional care. Another 1.7% will need alternative housing because their apartment was converted to a condominium, and 1.3% desire a safer neighborhood. About 5.6% of the elderly will want a change in housing for a variety of miscellaneous reasons (see Table E1).

Most elderly Jews do not consider neighborhood safety to be a major problem. About 36% consider their neighborhood to be very safe, while another 52% judge their neighborhood to be pretty safe - a total of 88%. A small proportion (9.6%) of the elderly Jewish population feel that their neighborhood is pretty unsafe, and 1.5% see their neighborhood as not safe at all (see Table E3).

Of the households over 60 in St. Louis, about 73% have at least one child in the St. Louis area. How often do people over 60 see their children or other members of their family? Table E10 shows this information. Eleven percent (11.1%) of those over 60 have no family at all, and 1.2% never see the family that they do have in St. Louis. The majority (57%) see their families five times per month. About 6.6% of the elderly see their families only once per month, and another 6.6% see their families twice per month.

About 73% of the elderly in St. Louis have not been hospitalized within the last 12 months, with 18.5% having had only one hospitalization and 6.8% having been hospitalized twice. About 3.9% of the elderly have been in the hospital three or more times during the last 12 months (see Table E8).

Table E4 shows the proportion of the over 60 population that has used particular services in the last 12 months. Failure to utilize a particular service may be a matter of need, cost, convenience, familiarity or other factors. As discussed previously, most of the elderly stated that they have no problems obtaining services. The highest usage has been of temples and synagogues - 72.1% in the last year. Yet 28% of the elderly population did not attend synagogue once in the previous 12 months. The next most frequently used services were a library (45.9%), the JCCA (33.2%), public transportation (25.6%), telephone information service (23.6%) and police (14.1%). Note that two-thirds of the population over 60 did not use the JCCA in the previous 12

months.

When asked if they had any problem in obtaining services, about 90% of those over 60 said that they had no problems at all in obtaining the services that they needed. About 3% of the elderly stated that they had access problems, 0.6% noted financial problems, 0.9% did not know what services are available, 1.8% stated health problems, while 3.5% noted a variety of other problems (see Table E5). Again, we see about 10% of the elderly population with service problems.

Table E6 shows why service access is not a major problem for most of the population over 60 - they drive their own car. About 70% of the Jews 60 or over use their own car to go shopping, giving them access not only to shopping, but other services as well. Another 13.7% of the elderly are driven by relatives to do their shopping, and 1.8% are driven by a friend. About 2.4% walk, another 3% take a bus, and 0.9% take a taxi. About 1.5% have their groceries delivered, and 6.8% shop by using a variety of other methods.

Other services are not widely used. Homemakers, meals on wheels and day care services are being used by no more than about 2% of the elderly population using each service. Meals at a nutrition center, the Multi-Service Senior Center and social worker services are all being used by 8.3% or less of the population over 60, yet most of the population is being serviced in some way.

Most households over 60 consider their residences to be convenient to most services, including shopping (87.7%), transportation (38.6%) and temple or synagogue (79.3%). Two-thirds of the elderly believe that their residence is convenient to the JCCA, while one-third do not. This service is concluded to be the least convenient of those listed in this questionnaire (see Table E7).

The data about housing, services, family support and contracts indicate

that the vast majority of Jews over 60 years of age have no service, housing and financial problems. Many do not need services or housing assistance, while others are finding that their needs are already being met by the Jewish communal service organizations, by family members or by friends. Service needs appear to be much more a function of health and income, as opposed to the number of years that an individual has accumulated.

With this in mind, there seems to be a small minority of elderly who for a variety of reasons such as health, income, lack of family contacts, accessibility, etc., are not adequately being serviced by the Jewish community. It is difficult to pinpoint the exact number of people, but it would appear to be around 10% of the population over 60, or about 1,200 individuals. In terms of proportions, the percentage is small. In terms of individuals, it represents a sizable minority within the St. Louis area.

B. Service Uses and Priorities

One of the most important parts of the survey was contained in a few detailed questions about those priorities that the respondents placed on certain services that might be offered in the Jewish community, and what services individuals thought that they or their families might use. This section discusses the results concerning service uses.

Geographic access and convenience of location of Jewish institutions is a major concern in Jewish community services planning. Respondents were first asked, "Generally, is being near to Jewish institutions important to you?" About 30.8% said that it was very important to be near Jewish institutions, and 31.9% said that it was somewhat important. Over 36% said that it was not important at all to be near Jewish institutions, and 0.7% did not know. Respondents were then asked, "Is transportation a problem in using Jewish

institutions?" About 5.8% of the population said that transportation is always a problem, and 11.9% said that transportation is sometimes a problem. Almost 81% of the respondents said that transportation is never a problem. Transportation access problems are primarily a function of age and disability, as found in examining cross-tabulations of these two factors.

Programs for the handicapped will be used by 6.4% of the households, or over 1,300 households. Vocational or educational guidance and aptitude testing will be used by 10.2% of the households, or over 2,000 households, and help in finding a job will be used by 10%, or over 2,000 households. Yet only 8.4% of the households said that they would use the Jewish Employment & Vocational Service, indicating either a lack of familiarity with the services offered or a desire to use the services elsewhere. Similarly, 9.5% of the respondents said that someone in the household will use the Jewish Family & Children's Service, while the combined proportion of households that will use family care and counseling (10.7%); marital, parent-child or individual counseling (8.5%); child adoption services (4.4%), and other services is much higher. Over 400 households said that they will require services to assist in drug abuse problems, and a similar number will need services for alcohol abuse problems (see Table C15).

Clearly, the service need is enormous. No service is to be unused. When the potential "don't know" pool is considered, the service load may be even higher. The questions, of course, are:

- how much of these services can be offered through Jewish organizations;
- do people want these services offered; can they be paid for by the user or must they be subsidized, and
- how can the differences in people's perceptions of priorities be reconciled against the services that people say that they will use?

For example, only 5.4% of the respondents gave a high priority to general recreational services, yet, over 37% said that they will use such services. On the other hand, only 7% of the respondents said that nursery schools and day care are a top priority in the Jewish community, yet over 20% of the households said that they will use these services. Respondents placed a very heavy emphasis on the priority of services for the elderly, while a wide array of other services will demand a great deal of attention if needs are to be met.

The service usage questions were cross-tabulated by age and income separately and as three-way cross-tabulations. Other statistical tests were also used to determine if the age and income variables had a separate influence on projected service usage. Both variables do have such an influence, as do family composition, number of children and the age of the children. In Table C15-P8 projected service usage is categorized by a group age 59 and under, and a group over 60.

Few of the services will be used across the board, without age as a factor. General recreational programs, youth camps and educational programs are among the services that will be used by the younger households. Some very interesting factors emerge in this analysis. While 13.6% of the households under the age of 60 said that they will need housing for the elderly in the next five years, 34.5%, or over one-third, of the households over 60 said that they might use housing for the elderly (of those who said that they knew at all). Looked at another way, over 45% of those who said that they will need housing for the elderly are under 60 years of age, an equal proportion, over 45%, of the households that said that they will need transportation for the elderly are under 60 years. What accounts for this pattern is that some proportion of these households actually have a person over 60 in them even

though the respondent is not, or the respondent is in the 55-60 age group and is projecting future use. Other households fit neither of these categories. Thus, it is apparent that certain households were indicating potential use for someone else in their extended family. Perhaps this accounts for the differences between the proportion of over 60 age households that said that they will need housing as opposed to the higher proportion recorded, as well as for transportation.

Income is also a determinant of which services will be used. Lower income households are more likely than higher income households to use vocational help, family counseling care, housing for the elderly, transportation for the elderly and programs for the handicapped. Higher income households are more likely to use day care and nursery schools, with many of these being two-worker households. (Even though higher income households will use family counseling or marital counseling at approximately the same rates as lower income households, they are less likely to use the Jewish Family & Children's Service or general recreational facilities. Youth camps and other family-oriented services are more likely to be used by middle income families.

Respondents were given a comprehensive list of community services and asked the following questions:

Now let's talk specifically about some agencies and services which are sometimes offered to the Jewish community by Jewish agencies. Now tell me which three of these you believe would be most important in terms of the priorities of the Jewish community. Tell me which you think is the most important, the second most important and the third most important.

Table C14 shows the list of the services and the ranking that was given by the respondents. It also has a column that shows the total percentage of the respondents that either listed a service as first, second or third as a priority.

Housing for the elderly is by far ranked the most important priority service in this Jewish community. Over 33% of the respondents listed this as the most important service priority. Next of primary importance was the Jewish Family & Children's Service, with 9.3%, and family counseling and care, with 6.1%. Nursing homes and educational programs were listed as the top priority by about 5% of the respondents.

When asked to list the second most important need in the community, services for the elderly still dominate the public view. Almost 16% listed housing for the elderly as the second most important service, 10.2% checked transportation for the elderly, and 11.2% checked nursing homes. When asked the third most important service needed in the Jewish community, 10.3% checked housing for the elderly, 8.8% checked day care for the elderly, and 7.5% checked nursing homes. Looking at the same draft in another way, almost 60% of the respondents listed housing for the elderly as the first, second or third most important service. No other service is so prominent as a perceived need on the part of the respondents. Nursing homes were listed by 24.1% of the respondents as one of the top service priorities, and the Jewish Family & Children's Service was listed by 22.3%. Transportation for the elderly was listed as first, second or third by 19.3% of the respondents, educational programs by 16.0% and day care for the elderly by 16.9%. The lowest priorities were given to Reform and Conservative day schools and to drug and alcohol abuse assistance programs, all with less than 2% of the respondents checking these variables first, second or third. Nursery schools and day care account for 7% of the first, second and third categories.

Table C15 shows the results of the question that was asked after the respondents assessed community service needs: "Now tell me if you believe that you or someone in your family will likely use each of these services

sometime in the next five years." This question was designed to assess what kinds of services are likely to be needed in the St. Louis community, as opposed to what people believe are the community's needs. One of the most interesting facts is that 18.6% of the respondents said that they will need housing for the elderly in the next five years, a number equal to the number of elderly who said that they will have a change in housing needs sometime in the next five years. Yet, as seen in the elderly services section, a smaller proportion said that they will need assisted housing. What accounts for this difference? Most likely, family members believe that an elderly relative will need housing assistance, but the elderly respondents themselves do not.

It should be noted that no fewer than 2% of these households said that any particular service would be needed by their household sometime in the next five years, or a minimum of 400 households needing any particular service. In this table the "don't knows" are especially significant, constructing a pool of potential users as well as those who said that they definitely will be using a particular service.

The greatest service demands will be for cultural programs (38.4%), general recreational facilities (37.3%) and educational programs (37.2%). About 20.6% of the households said that they will use some youth activities services. A total of 20.3% of the households said that they will have a need for day care or nursery school services, and 25.2% expected to be part of services that help combat anti-Semitism. For some services, the relatively small percentages translate into a relatively heavy service load in terms of households. For example, only 4.4% of the households said that they will use child adoption services, yet this translates into over 900 households, while another 8.2% of the households said they do not know if they will need this service. About 3.7%, or 750, of the households said that they would use a

Reform day school, and 4.1%, well over 900 households, said that they would use a Conservative day school. Clearly, some of the respondents were confusing the meaning of day school with afternoon Hebrew school. But even given this confusion, a substantial interest is present for both types of day schools.

It might be expected that proximity to Jewish institutions would be more important to older adults as opposed to other age groups. Table P8-C10 indicates that proximity is about equally important to most age groups, with a larger population (38%) of the over 65 group saying that proximity is not important, as opposed to 42% of the 51-65 age group and 30% of the under 35 group. On the other hand, 37% of the over 65 group said that proximity to Jewish institutions is very important, as opposed to 28% of the under 35 group. Clearly the variable is not one that is largely dependent on age.

The respondents had many comments to make about the range, quality, location and efficiency of social services delivered in the Jewish community. People talked about the St. Louis Jewish Light, the Jewish Federation, the Jewish Center for Aged and other organizations, institutions and agencies. Commonly, individuals complained if they could not obtain satisfactory services for themselves or their family.

A vocal and angry group of people were those interviewed who had either a physically, emotionally or mentally disabled person in the household. They were extremely bitter, feeling that the Jewish community in St. Louis is not addressing the needs of the handicapped. One man said simply:

They need to help the handicapped a lot more than they do. Christians do a lot better for their handicapped. They need direction.

Another woman said:

I am bitter over what I feel has been a glaring void in the Jewish community for years: residential facilities for the

retarded. I have a 29-year-old son at home. I feel that the Jewish community has ignored his needs and that it has been hypocritical. This has affected my involvement in the Jewish community generally.

Another man simply said, "I would like to see the Jewish community serving young handicapped adults in a social fashion."

Anyone who was interviewed who had a disabled person, particularly mentally disabled, in the household felt that the Jewish community services in this area are abysmal.

Other comments made about services, not reflecting any general consensus, are listed below:

The senior citizens are treated like children by the organizations.

I think Jewish social services are not well-run; lots of waste; the JCA is not well-managed. The social workers don't know what is going on. The place is just not run like a business, and the doctors who work in it aren't around enough.

Not much facilities in neighborhood. Would use more services if they were closer to University City.

There should be better services provided by the Jewish Federation, especially for family services and especially the adoption unit. We had a bad experience adopting a child through the Jewish Federation. We asked for a different social worker, but they refused. We will stop our contributions to the Jewish Federation.

This echoes a common theme about the Federation that will be illustrated elsewhere. One individual's bad experience with an agency's procedures produced a negative feeling toward the Federation which translated into a refusal to give to the Federation.

I didn't like the way they ran the Covenant House. They let outsiders come in with plenty of money and eat up the tenants' meals. They take up the reservations.

One of the biggest needs of the Jewish community is the enlargement of the Jewish Center for Aged. The waiting list is too long. It needs to be doubled in size.

Our family received a scholarship for youths to visit Israel. We are very pleased with this program. It enabled our son to visit Israel. We thought the program was well-administered.

I wish they would move Jewish Hospital closer to the community it serves, which is St. Louis County.

We had a bad experience in our family with the Family & Children's Service. We needed household assistance because of illness, and the service that was offered was inadequate and very costly, so we went elsewhere.

Respondents tended to be less than global in their discussions of Jewish communal services. Good individual experiences elicited positive comments, and negative personal experiences tended to produce equally negative discussions. Other than a consensus among families of the handicapped, no other general theme emerged among the discussions about services except that they ought to be good and ought to be accessible.

The issue of housing for the elderly takes a very personal focus in the St. Louis community for those who live in such housing, who have relatives in this type of housing or who want to live in subsidized units. Comments about the housing were generally very positive. As one resident of Covenant House said, "I like it here at the Covenant House. Our floor is like one big happy family. We do for one another." Other residents also echoed this sentiment.

On the other hand, some bitterness exists among elderly individuals who were trying to become residents and could not do so. One woman stated her own personal frustration when she rejected the interview on the first contact:

I have been trying for years to get into the Covenant and CHAI House. Go get your information from someone else. I wouldn't help the Federation with anything.
After consenting to the interview, she said:

Covenant House and CHAI House have turned me down. I have arthritis and a bad heart and have been in intensive care two times. I want desperately to get in.

Aside from personal frustration from individuals or their families, some people commented that they believe that the screening procedures for choosing residents are not adequate. The primary focus of this belief was that higher income individuals without real need were becoming residents. As one man

stated, "The guidelines require more study for housing for the elderly in some cases. They have some wealthy families in some of the elderly housing."

C. Volunteerism

The respondents were asked to indicate the amount of time that they spend doing volunteer work for Jewish and non-Jewish organizations. The results can be seen in Table F8-10. About 71.9% of the respondents do no volunteer work at all for Jewish organizations, and 7.3% do between zero and one hour of volunteer work per week - or a total of about 80% doing less than one volunteer hour per week for Jewish organizations. About 13.6% of the respondents average one-five volunteer hours per week for Jewish organizations, and 3.7% average six-10 hours per week. About 1.2% spend 11-20 hours per week volunteering for Jewish organizations, and 1.6% spend more than 20 hours per week as volunteers for Jewish organizations.

The great majority of Jews are not choosing to do volunteer work for non-Jewish organizations as opposed to Jewish groups. Almost 81% of the Jews surveyed spend zero time volunteering for non-Jewish organizations, and 6.8% spend less than one hour per week - a total of 88% spending less than one volunteer hour per week for non-Jewish organizations. About 10.3% work one-five hours per week for non-Jewish organizations; 2.2% spend six or more hours per week in this way.

Of those who do spend at least one hour per week on Jewish volunteer work, for which organizations do they work? The results are seen in Table F9. About 31.6% of the volunteers spend some of their volunteer time with a synagogue or temple, 18.3% with the Jewish Federation, 13.6% with the JCCA, 30.3% with a women's group and 5.1% with a men's group. Over 38.6% spend some of their volunteer time with a variety of other Jewish organizations and

institutions. Among these are Jewish Hospital, Miriam and many others. Clearly, no single institution or group of institutions or organizations dominate in the St. Louis area in attracting Jews to do volunteer work.

Synagogue and temple volunteer work holds no special attraction for one age group or another. Synagogues and temples attract more volunteers than any other organization or institution - 32% of those over 65 and 34% under 35 (of those who volunteer). About 31% of those between 36-65 who volunteer for any organization do so for a synagogue or temple.

D. Patterns of Giving

One of the purposes of the survey was to assess patterns of volunteer work and monetary contributions to both Jewish and non-Jewish philanthropies. The respondents were asked, "Do you feel that a Jew has a greater obligation to Jewish philanthropies than to general community philanthropies?" About 3.0% of the survey population said they do not know how they feel, while 12.7% think that a Jew has a greater obligation to general community philanthropies, and 22.5% believe that equal obligations to Jewish and non-Jewish philanthropies are in order. The majority (61.8%) believe that a Jew has a greater obligation to Jewish philanthropies (see Table F1).

The difference in emphasis can be seen in patterns of giving to Jewish and non-Jewish philanthropies. While 34% of the households give \$500 or more a year to Jewish philanthropies, a little over 15% of the households give \$500 or more per year to non-Jewish philanthropies. About 9% of the households give nothing to either Jewish or non-Jewish philanthropies. Approximately 20% of the households contribute \$100 or less to Jewish philanthropies, and 27% contribute \$100-500 annually to Jewish philanthropies. About 19% of the Jewish households make a contribution of \$1,000 or more to Jewish

philanthropies. Only 7.5% of the households make a contribution of \$1,000 or more to non-Jewish philanthropies (see Table F5-6).

E. Jewish Federation of St. Louis

The section of the survey on the Jewish Federation was constructed with the aid of both Federation staff and lay committees. The section was designed to answer questions about perceptions of the Federation and patterns of volunteerism and giving. This section of the survey was also designed for further detailed use by the Federation. Table F11 shows that 76% of the respondents have made a contribution to the Federation in the last two years. The way people in the Jewish community learn about the Federation can be seen in Table F12. The respondents were given a list of possible sources of information about the Federation and asked to check all of those from which they learn about the Federation. The St. Louis Jewish Light was checked by over 78% of the respondents and word of mouth by about 49% of the respondents. Direct Federation solicitation was the third most checked response, with 37% checking this factor. About 22% said they learn about the Federation from congregational or other organizational bulletins, and 6% said that they do not have any source of information about the Federation. The single most important source of information can be seen in Table F13. Almost 57% of the respondents listed the St. Louis Jewish Light as their main source of information about the Federation, and 15.4% listed word of mouth as their main source. About 9.6% indicated that direct Federation solicitation is their main source of information. Only 2.9% listed congregational or other organizational bulletins as their chief source of news about the Federation, and 5.6% did not know what their main source of information is.

The Federation was concerned with the community's familiarity with its

purpose and functions. Respondents were asked, "Which of the following categories would you say are currently part of the St. Louis Jewish Federation's ongoing functions?" The results can be seen in Table F2. Respondents were most sure that the Federation raises and allocates funds for Israel (83.5%) and raises and allocates funds for the service uses of St. Louis Jews (81.6%). About 75% of the respondents said that the Federation's ongoing functions include sponsoring lectures and services on public affairs issues of Jewish interest, raising and allocating funds for Russian Jews and Jewish communities worldwide other than Israel, and raising and allocating funds for service uses of the American Jewish community. About 67% of the respondents believe that the Federation trains Jewish community leaders, and 64% believe that the Federation does overall community planning for the St. Louis area. These were the least chosen functions of the Federation. Table F3 shows the results of the question, "How important do you believe each of these functions should be?" In no category did more than 8.8% of the respondents believe that the functions listed were not important. Raising and allocating funds for service uses of St. Louis Jews was listed as very important by 78.2% of the respondents, more than any other category. About 68% of the respondents listed raising and allocating funds for Israel as very important. Between 55-58% listed each of the other categories as a very important function of the Jewish Federation.

The respondents were asked to rank the quality of the Federation's programs, as can be seen in Table F7. Only 12.9% ranked the quality as excellent, and 34.8% as good - a total of 47.7% as good or excellent. Yet a very small proportion (1%) ranked them as very poor, and 1.1% ranked them as poor - only a total of 2.1% with a negative evaluation of the Federation's overall quality. Another 7.2% ranked them as fair. A sizable group (29.6%),

however, said they did not know enough about the Federation to make an evaluation, and another 13% said they were unsure, also due largely to unfamiliarity. A total of 42.6% of the respondents said they were too unfamiliar or unsure about the Federation's programs to make an evaluation of its programs.

After ranking specific Federation functions in terms of importance, the respondents were instructed to choose what they believe ought to be the single most important function of the Jewish Federation. About 15.1% of the respondents indicated that they did not know. About 3.3% indicated that training Jewish community leaders is the most important function, and 3.1% thought sponsoring lectures and seminars on public affairs issues of Jewish interest should be the most important function of the Jewish Federation. A little over 4.1% of the respondents believe the Federation should place its greatest emphasis on providing or raising funds for Russian Jews and Jewish communities worldwide other than Israel, and 7.6% think the greatest priority should be on raising and allocating funds for the American Jewish community. Eleven percent (11%) place the greatest need of the Federation on overall community planning for the St. Louis area, and 11.7% believe that raising and allocating funds for Israel should have the top priority. The single largest proportion (42.4%) believe that the Federation should place its greatest emphasis on raising and allocating funds for service uses of the St. Louis Jewish community (see Table F4).

F. Jewish Community Centers Association

Table C1 shows that 64.7% of these households have at one time belonged to the JCCA, even if they do not have a current membership. This confirms the finding of the sample from the merging process, which found a great deal of

turnover in the JCCA membership. Table C2 shows the reason for either resigning a JCCA membership or never having had a JCCA membership. Certain factors are not very significant. Only 0.5% of the respondents listed "don't like to belong to a Jewish organization" as a reason for not belonging. The quality of the staff or services also do not seem to be problems: only 0.9% listed "poor quality of services," and 1.4% listed "problems with staff" as the main reason for not belonging to the JCCA. "Poor scheduling of services" was listed by 2.1% of the respondents. A total of 4.4% do not belong because of poor staff, poor services or scheduling problems. Over 21% of those who do not belong said that they are simply "too busy," and 18.5% cited the location of the JCCA as a major problem, saying it is "inconvenient to get there." About 16.3% cited "financial reasons" as a barrier to JCCA membership. Almost 10% said that "they used a service that is no longer needed," and the largest proportion (39.3%) are "not interested in the services." Table C3 shows that 29.8% of the households currently have a JCCA membership. Table C4 shows the reasons given for use of the JCCA, for current and past members. Respondents were asked to list all the reasons that they use or have used the JCCA, even if they were not current members. The factor that was listed most often was "provides a number of services for me and/or my family," with 70% checking this factor. "Cultural and educational activities" was checked by 31% of the respondents, "like to be part of a Jewish social environment" by about 30%, "want to have or want my children to have Jewish social contacts" by 27%, and a variety of other reasons by 22%. "Convenience to my residence" was checked by only 16% of the respondents, and "convenience to my work" by 5%.

Respondents were then instructed to give the single most important reason for using the JCCA. Over 48% listed "provides a number of services for me and/or my family" as the single most important reason for the using the

center. Almost 10% listed "like to be part of a Jewish social environment" as the most important reason, almost 11% listed "cultural and educational activities," and about 9% listed "want to have or want my children to have Jewish social contacts." A variety of other reasons were listed by 18% of the respondents as the primary reason for using the JCCA. Convenience to either work or residence each were listed by fewer than 1% of the respondents as the main reason for using the JCCA (see Table C5).

The ranking of the quality of JCCA programs can be seen in Table C6. Overall, the JCCA received high marks. About 32% ranked the overall quality as excellent and 48% as good - a total of 80% as excellent or good. About 11% of the respondents ranked the quality as fair and 1.2% as poor. Only 0.9% ranked the overall quality as very poor - a total of 2% as poor or very poor. About 7% did not know how to rank the quality of JCCA programs.

The ranking of individual programs is shown in Table C7. This table was constructed without the "don't knows" computed in the percentages, even though it is an attitudinal question. The percentage of "don't knows" was as high as 71% on certain programs, and close examination of the tables showed that some individuals were responding about services that they had not used and were answering "don't know." Therefore, the tables were computed without the "don't know" response. The most highly ranked program at the JCCA by the program's users is day care, with 65.7% ranking it as excellent and 25.7% ranking it as good. The least highly ranked program is family programming and group services, with 24.3% ranking it as excellent and 57.3% as good. It must be noted that even this relatively "low" ranking finds an "excellent-good" total of 81%, which is very positive. The senior adults program and preschool program had excellent ratings of 49.6% and 45.6% respectively. Interestingly, the preschool program also had the highest proportion of negative approval,

with 7.3% saying that the preschool service was poor or very poor. About 5% of the respondents ranked the quality of the family programming and group services as poor or very poor. All other programs had a poor or very poor ranking of under 3% of the respondents. Clearly, all of the programs were ranked highly, with each program receiving an "excellent-good" ranking by at least 80% of the program users.

The majority of comments about the JCCA had an interesting pattern. They were generally neither positive nor negative, but rather suggestions for improvement, expanded services or different services. Some elderly complained about transportation access to the JCCA, and other people complained about the number of non-Jews who belong, arguing that the JCCA must "remain a center of Jewish activity, since no other Jewish organization can do this." A number of people said that they would like the JCCA "to build farther out in West County." Other comments were as follows:

My wife is totally disabled from multiple sclerosis and is in a wheelchair. We would like to use the JCCA services, but cannot because they are not equipped for handicapped.

In other major cities you do not have to be a member to send your child to the JCCA nursery school.

They need more social mixers at the JCCA so Jews can meet one another of their age - college age. They should send invitations. The "shiksas" are getting all the Jewish boys.

The programs at the JCCA are good but poorly organized.

The JCCA facilities are great, and the staff is poor.

What should the Jewish Community Centers Association do other than what they are doing now? The JCCA is geared more for smaller children. They need more teen-age activities. There is a need for good teen-age Jewish programs either at the JCCA or elsewhere.

It is fair to say that the Jewish community wants the JCCA to do almost everything, and to do it well.

G. St. Louis Jewish Light

Table C12 shows that 82.5% of the respondents receive the St. Louis Jewish Light. This proportion is substantially higher than was shown in the construction of the sample frame of households that receive the Jewish Light, which was approximately 60%. This discrepancy may be accounted for by the information about the study that was disseminated through the newspaper. Organized affiliations and other factors were shown to be consistent among refusals, completions and "can't locates," so the example is not skewed in any other way.

Table C13 shows the results of the question, "Which of these news categories in the St. Louis Jewish Light do you usually read?" The most read part of the newspaper (82.6%) is news about Jewish life in St. Louis. An almost equal proportion (81.4%) read the birth, marriage, engagement and obituary sections. The least read parts of the paper are news about Jews in other foreign countries (71%) and news about the Jewish Federation (71.1%). Still, these are substantially big proportions. About 74% read reviews, 75% read news about Jewish life throughout the U.S., and 77% read news about Israel.

The Jewish Light is generally well-received, and many people had positive comments about the newspaper. One elderly man said, "I'm glad for the Jewish Light. It ties the Jewish community together." Others echoed the basic sentiment that the Light was an important community organ.

The only consistent complaints about the Light were the following:

- "It has too much news on the Federation, and not enough on other subjects."
- "It is a public display/showcase for big wheels and rich Jews."

Other than these two criticisms, however, little was said about the

Light.

H. Health Care and Jewish Hospital

During the past five years, 54.8% of the adult population has used a hospital (see Table HP2). Of these, 46.5% used Jewish Hospital, 21.4% used Barnes, and 10.3% used St. John's. Another 4.7% used St. Luke's East and 0.5% used St. Luke's West, with the remainder using a variety of other hospitals (see Table HP3). Most of the hospitalizations (over 75%) were inpatient. About 11.1% of the hospital care was emergency room care, and 12.7% of the hospital care was for outpatient service (see Table HP4).

A substantial proportion (3.3%) of the adult population is disabled, including 1.4% of the adult population that is confined to a wheelchair. Of the disabled, only 9.2% do not have some difficulty in obtaining the services that they need, while over 59.3% have some severe access problems with services (see Tables HP5 and HP6). Furthermore, 7.5% of the households have at least one family member who needs some form of daily assistance, split about evenly among those who need help all the time, most of the time and occasionally (see Table HP7).

Almost 95% of the households said that they have a private family physician (see Table HP1). Only 16% of the adult population has not seen a physician in the last 12 months. Approximately 56.5% have seen a physician for a checkup, 13% for an acute health problem, 9% for a chronic problem, 1% for emergency care and 4.5% for other reasons (see Table HP8).

Substantial differences are present by age group for hospital usage. Jewish Hospital is used by 65% of the over 65 age group, but by less than 32% of the under 35 age group. A similar proportion of hospital users, between 18-21%, use Barnes Hospital. Over 14% of the under 35 age group use St.

John's Hospital, 11% use St. Luke's West, under 3% use Missouri Baptist, and 17% use a variety of other hospitals. Less than 2% of the over 65 age group use St. Luke's West, and 4.4% of this age group use St. John's (see Table P8-HP3).

I. Anti-Semitism

Respondents were asked to assess how much anti-Semitism there is in the community. About 7.3% of the respondents believe that there is no anti-Semitism in the community, and 29.4% believe that there is little anti-Semitism - a total of 36.7% of the respondents believing there is little or no anti-Semitism. About 39.3% of the respondents believe that there is a moderate amount of anti-Semitism in the community, and 17.5% believe that there is a great deal of anti-Semitism in the community - a total of 56.8% who believe that there is a moderate amount or a great deal of anti-Semitism in the St. Louis area. About 6.5% did not know (see Table M5). A substantial minority (about 25%) indicated that they have personally experienced anti-Semitism in the last 12 months (see Table M7).

Respondents were also asked to indicate how much anti-Semitism they have experienced during their lifetime. Only 10.3% of the respondents have personally experienced no anti-Semitism in their lifetime. About 45.2% have experienced a little in their lifetime - a total of 55.5% who have personally experienced little or no anti-Semitism. Approximately 28.6% have experienced a moderate amount of anti-Semitism, and 15% have experienced a great deal - a total of 43.6% (see Table M8).

Many Jews see anti-Semitism existing in a wide array of areas. The prevalence of anti-Semitism is least pervasive in housing; about 32% see manifestations of anti-Semitism in this area. Anti-Semitism is seen as most

prevalent in social clubs; some 60% of the respondents see confirmation in this area. Other areas where anti-Semitism has been noted are as follows: politics, 42%; schools, 44%; employment, 49%; informal relations, 52%, and business, 54% (see Table M6). Clearly, anti-Semitism is seen as a pervasive problem, touching many areas.

As might be expected, the amount of anti-Semitism experienced in a lifetime varies by age group, with 20% of those over 65 but only 7% of those under 35 experiencing a great deal of anti-Semitism in their lifetime. However, little variation was shown by age group of those saying that they had experienced no anti-Semitism in their lifetime. Over 60% of those under 35 said they experienced little anti-Semitism in their lifetime. Thus, some improvement seems to have been noted, but the problem does not seem to have vanished for younger Jews (see Table P8-M8). Interestingly, it is the younger age group that has had the greatest exposure to anti-Semitism in the last 12 months, with 40% of those under 35 experiencing anti-Semitism in the last year, 32% in the 36-50 age group, 27% in the 51-65 age group and only 7% in the over 65 age group (see Table P8-M7). The variety and number of social and business contacts for younger Jews may account for this difference.

The differences in perceptions of anti-Semitism as shown in the tables depend on age, place of birth and other factors. Many comments concerning anti-Semitism came from pogrom and Holocaust survivors and recent Russian immigrants. One woman said:

All Germans don't like Jews. The "goyim" killed my mother in Poland. It was a revolution, and they choked her to death. They killed my 9-year-old sister too. All Gentile people don't like Jews.

One man described his experience during the Holocaust:

I was in a concentration camp, and when I got out I didn't feel as strongly about God because of what I saw happen. God wanted me to live, I guess. I was in 14 camps. I had to dig up the dead and

burn them. It was Hell on earth. We fought for food and worked 12 to 15 hours a day. It was all propaganda that caused the hatred for the Jews. The dictatorship just needed someone to hate.

And a recent arrival from the Soviet Union gave his account:

Until 1972, Jews in Russia were allowed to go to synagogues, so my wife's father was an Orthodox Jew. After the revolution in 1917, it took time to destroy all houses of worship for Jews and Gentiles. Anti-Semitism in Russia is very prevalent. Jews can no longer become physicians or lawyers or be in government. They insult Jews in the streets, especially the kids yelling insults to other kids. We are happy that our kids can be raised as Jews and get a Jewish education.

One woman, whose husband is not Jewish, said he is "always making jokes about Jews." Others reported having coworkers use phrases such as "Jew him down." Some respondents reported having their first experiences with anti-Semitism at college, coming from more isolated Jewish upbringings and neighborhoods. One man said:

I saw a great deal of anti-Semitism in my youth. As youths, because of the prejudice, we wanted to be Americans rather than Jews. We lived in a neighborhood where we were the minority, and we were teased. We told our parents that we did not want to practice all of the Jewish customs because we didn't want to be different. Now all this has changed.

Experiences with anti-Semitism in Girl Scout troops, work, housing, business and a wide variety of other places were recounted by the respondents. Some advocated personal action, such as speaking up if someone made anti-Semitic remarks, and some wanted public education about anti-Semitism. One man suggested that he would "like to see more exposing of major corporations who are practicing anti-Semitism. I would like to see the Jewish people educated about these companies and their products."

J. Israel

About 27% of the respondents have visited Israel (see Table M1). When asked if they intended to visit Israel in the future only 33.2% gave a

definitive "no" answer. About 25% said "maybe," 36.9% said "yes," and about 4.9% said they "don't know" (see Table M2).

Respondents were asked, "Do you believe American Jews have a responsibility to aid Israel?" Only 3.3% of the respondents said "no." The vast majority (79.6%) said "yes," and 13.8% said that the responsibility was dependent on the type of aid that was offered. Another 3.3% did not know (see Table M3).

The respondents were given a card with various forms of aid to Israel listed on it and were asked to indicate whether they strongly approved, moderately approved, moderately disapproved, strongly disapproved or did not know. The types of support for Israel can be found in Table M4, along with the recorded responses. The choices ranged from the least active, sending money, to the most active, supporting the use of U.S. military troops in Israel if Israel's security is threatened.

A strong support exists among St. Louis Jews for sending money to Israel with 71.9% strongly approving and 20.4% moderately approving - a total of 92.3%. About 5% moderately or strongly disapprove of this form of aid, and 2.6% said they did not know. The levels of support for buying Israel Bonds showed 57.2% strongly approving and 32.7% moderately approving - a total of 89.9%. Note that the level of strong approval is lower than that recorded for sending money to Israel.

When asked if Jews should belong to Zionist organizations, 14.6% said that they did not know, the largest proportion recording "don't know" in this series of questions on support for Israel. The comments of the respondents reveal that this is largely due to their unfamiliarity with the meaning and purpose of such organizations. Furthermore, 21.8% of the respondents moderately or strongly disapprove of Jews belonging to such organizations,

equaled only by the disapproval given to sending U.S. military troops to Israel. Only 32.4% of the respondents strongly approve of Jews belonging to Zionist organizations.

Clearly the respondents do not classify visiting Israel as a "Zionist" activity, since 63.2% strongly approve of this activity and 27.4% moderately approve - a total of 90.6%. Only 3.7% of the respondents disapprove of this activity. Strong support also is present for Jews lobbying in the political system on behalf of Israel. Fifty-seven percent (57.1%) strongly approve of such lobbying, and 23.9% moderately approve - a total of 81%. About 11.2% of the respondents disapprove, with 3.9% voicing strong disapproval. Approximately 7.7% of the respondents said they did not know how they feel about this activity.

Strong support exists among St. Louis Jews for sending U.S. military supplies to Israel. Sixty-eight percent (68.1%) of the respondents strongly approve of such aid, with 19.6% moderately approving - a total of 87.7%. Only 7.1% of those surveyed disapprove of this activity. Furthermore, 48.3% strongly approve of sending U.S. military personnel to Israel if Israel's security is threatened, and 19.4% moderately approve - a total of 67.7%. On the other hand, 9.8% of the Jews questioned said they did not know, and 22.5% disapprove, with 13.2% strongly disapproving. Clearly, support for Israel is very strong, with two-thirds of those surveyed supporting direct U.S. military involvement if necessary.

Tables P8-M4a, P8-M4e and P8-M4g show individual differences in level of support for Israel by age group. Of the over 65 age group, 82% strongly approve of the sending of money to Israel, while 69% of the under 35 age group strongly approve. Yet lobbying in support of Israel, a more active role, has nearly equally strong approval from all age groups, with the strongest

disapproval coming from the over 65 age group, with 15% disapproving or strongly disapproving of this activity. A majority of each age category, except the 36-50 group, indicated support for the use of the U.S. military if Israel's security is threatened, with the under 35 age group being the least disapproving of this action and the 51-65 age group being the most disapproving. Obviously, age is not the key factor in determining support for Israel, as it is in so many other categories.

While most people are overwhelmingly supportive of Israel, a minority of Jews are not very supportive, and an even smaller group is actually anti-Israel. One woman stated:

We are very anti-Zionist. We want no part of Israel. We are pro-Jewish, but not Zionist. We visited the Middle East in January 1967. The government in Israel wants to gain land continually. It has no real plan for peace until it has all the land it wishes.

A few other individuals, representing a small proportion of the comments about Israel, emphasized their anti-Zionist feelings, rather than any dissatisfaction with Israeli policies or people.

Most comments about Israel were very positive. A number of respondents said that they made a trip to Israel and found it to be a "religious" experience. Others said such a trip made them feel more "nationalistic." Some of the respondents stated that they were worried about Israel and that there is a need for Jews to be supportive. Interestingly, however, a relatively small number of the respondents chose to talk about Israel at all. Religious matters and social services were much more dominant as subjects of discussion.

K. Political Patterns

Jews have long been part of the Democratic coalition forged during the New Deal. How much has this allegiance changed in the past 50 years? A

series of questions was used to monitor changing political patterns among Jews. When asked if they considered themselves a Democrat, Republican, Independent or something else, only 12.6% of the respondents said they were Republicans. Yet less than half (40.3%) said they consider themselves Democrats. The largest proportion (42.5%) identify themselves as Independents, with 1.6% considering themselves something else. About 3% did not know (see Table M10).

When asked if they usually vote Democratic or Republican, only 14.6% said that they usually vote Republican, and 42% said that they usually vote Democratic. But a substantial minority (35.3%) said that they have no special patterns (see Table M11). But the rate of voting is extraordinarily high; 90.5% of the respondents voted in the 1980 presidential election, and 90.4% voted in the 1976 presidential election (see Tables M12 and M14).

The results of these elections are shown in Tables M13 and M15. A bare plurality of Jews voted for Carter (46.9%), compared to 44.3% for Reagan in 1980. About 8.5% of the vote went to other candidates. In 1976, 58.1% of the respondents voted for Carter, and 39.5% voted for Ford, with only 1.3% of the vote going to other candidates.

Even though the last presidential election shows Jews almost equally divided for Ford and Carter, the age breakdown of political affiliation seen in Table P8-M10 does not reveal any drift of younger people toward identification with the Republican party, with only 15% of the under 35 age group considering themselves as Republicans, as opposed to 14% of the 36-50 age group, 8% of the 51-65 age group and 15% of those over 65. Yet 51% of the Jews over 65 consider themselves to be Democrats, as opposed to 38% of the 51-65 age group and 33% of the 36-50 age group. The proportion of those under 35 who identify themselves as Democrats goes up to 44%. Those under 35 or

over 65 are much less likely to identify themselves as Independents. Clearly, the Democratic Party holds some attraction for younger Jews, but it is not clear that they will remain Democrats as they move into other age brackets, and as the income data show, into higher income brackets.

Income is a major factor in determining political affiliation and voting tendencies, as seen in Tables M10 by XIN1, M11 by XIN1, M13 by XIN1 and M15 by XIN1. About 57% of the households with incomes under \$10,000 per year consider themselves Democrats, as opposed to 33% of those with incomes between \$30,000-50,000 and 22% of those with incomes over \$100,000 per year. The higher income brackets find increasing proportions of the households as Independent (the \$50,000-100,000 bracket is slightly less inclined to consider themselves as Independents).

Stated political affiliation is reflected in Table M11 by XIN1, where the respondent was asked, "Do you usually vote Democratic or Republican?" Lower income households are much more inclined to vote Democratic, but higher income households, except for those over \$100,000, are not necessarily likely to vote Republican. About 40% of the over \$50,000 per year income households said that they are not likely to vote either Democratic or Republican.

Carter held a clear majority of the under \$30,000 per year households in 1980, while Reagan attracted 48% of the vote in the \$30,000-50,000 households, 52% of the \$50,000-100,000 households, and 69% of the \$100,000 plus households. In 1976, similar, but less sharp, income differences can be noted among Jews. As income increases so did the tendency to vote for Ford, with Ford attracting 57% of the \$100,000 households and Carter attracting 80% of the under \$10,000 per year households.

IV. ORGANIZING THE STUDY

A. Increased Demand for Demographic Information

The Federation's planning mechanism, the Community Services Planning Committee, provided an effective forum to discuss the need for a demographic study. The continuous requirement for critical information, coupled with the continuing requests from congregations, organizations and Jewish communal service agencies, sparked the demand for such a study.

The requests for information were linked to a wide range of community concerns such as change of family patterns, population shifts, intermarriage, increase in one-parent families and the needs of the elderly and youth populations. These issues were among several areas that fostered the demand for demographic information to assist policymaking. Through the Federation's community planning process, the need for a demographic study was discussed and subsequently supported by the Federation's Endowment Fund.

Study Time Frame

The time frame for the study spans approximately five years, which can be divided into four stages:

- Stage One: Preliminary Investigation/Study Approval
(January 1979 - April 1980)
- Stage Two: Design/Field Work
(May 1980 - November 1981)
- Stage Three: Preparation of Report and Interpretation of Demographic Data
(December 1981 - June 1982)
- Stage Four: Implementation

B. Stage One: Preliminary Investigation/Study Approval

The president of the Federation, Harry Epstein, appointed a Demographic

Planning Committee in 1978, composed of a broad cross section of the Jewish community. The committee was asked to explore the best way to proceed in conducting the demographic study. Frank Jacobs was appointed to chair this committee. At its initial meeting, the committee received consultations from the Council of Jewish Federations staff; the Council of Jewish Federations research consultant, Al Chenkin, and the Federation's associate executive director, Barry Giller. The discussion enabled the Federation to develop a work program that provided clarity, focus and planning discipline for the research efforts. The committee was sensitive to the need for producing a study document that would provide concrete data for its consumers: community service agencies; congregations, and organizations. The Federation was most interested in creating a report that was useful to its potential users. A document was needed that could be used as a practical community planning tool.

The process to determine need and scope was lengthy, but it proved to be prudent in creating a supportive community environment for the study. The potential users of the study were involved very early in the planning process through formal and informal meetings and communiques. All community organizations were asked to respond to the following requests:

- Do you feel a demographic study would be of value to your organization?
- If yes, what areas of information would be helpful to you?
- How would this information be utilized?

Several months were required to receive responses; however, it is important to note that these efforts to involve the community users to help define the need and scope of the study proved extremely helpful in gaining cooperation throughout the course of the study.

In addition to the responses from the various Jewish community

organizations and institutions, the committee also reviewed the written demographic materials of other communities and made selective phone calls to other Federations to gain from their demographic experiences. This step provided invaluable information on scope and other important aspects of the study.

C. Study Scope

After receiving information from various Jewish community institutions, the committee recognized the importance of going far beyond the scope of the 1954 Federation study. The information and interest requested by the various respondents indicated that both demographic and attitudinal subject areas needed exploration. Requests were noted for attitudinal information in such areas as perceptions of agencies and organizations, utilization of agency services, community perception of service needs and others. There was also deep interest in individuals who were not affiliated with a synagogue or other Jewish organization. Considering these specific concerns and planning goals, the committee directed the consultant to design a study framework that would provide a comprehensive community profile, with both demographic and attitudinal data.

D. Stage Two: Design/Field Work

The second phase of the project, Design/Field Work, required extensive interaction among Federation committees, staff and the consultant. The committee was actively involved in defining the scope and primary issues of the study and reviewed the survey instrument for clarity, content and study objectives. The Demographic Planning Committee was also part of selecting the most suitable methodology to achieve the study objectives.

The list from which households would be selected for interviews and the

creation of a sample frame required approximately one year to assemble. The Federation secured membership lists from almost every Jewish community institution, congregation and membership organization.. The data generated from the sample alone provided an enormous amount of information to the planning committee. This information is provided in this report.

In addition to asking various Jewish communal groups to help shape this study, they were also asked to publicize the study through newsletters, presentations and verbal announcements at meetings, congregation services, etc. Each group was asked to urge its supporters to participate in an interview if they were selected through the sampling procedures. In addition to these efforts, the Federation also utilized the St. Louis Jewish Light to coordinate the publication of articles on the demographic study throughout various stages of the study. Again, this helped to create a positive community environment to maximize cooperation among Jewish communal organizations and individuals.

E. Selection of Methodology

After reviewing experiences of other communities, the committee evaluated different methodological approaches in light of study objectives. A "methodology" is simply the combination of steps taken to compile such a study. The committee discussed the consequences of each methodological approach with the consultant and shifted its initial course of action from a mail questionnaire to a personal interview methodology. Mail questionnaires are often impractical because they usually have very low return rates.

The committee also discussed the use of volunteers or a professional survey research firm. The length and complexity of the survey instrument, time considerations and administrative concerns led to the decision to use professional interviewers. All interviewing was completed between May and

November 1981. The data were coded and keypunched for a computer program developed at Washington University. The data will be stored and kept on a confidential basis.

V. METHODOLOGY

This section covers a wide range of methodological issues. It analyzes the usefulness of collecting lists, the biases it might introduce into the sample frame and the costs and benefits of conducting a study in the manner chosen in St. Louis. It is hoped that this section will prove to be of value to other Jewish communities that will undertake their own demographic studies, and will serve as a complete explanation of how the data were gathered in St. Louis.

A. Constructing the Sample Frame

Constructing the sample frame to pull a sample of the Jewish households is the most difficult aspect of studying the Jewish population. The sample frame is the "universe" of Jewish households from which a representative random sample could be drawn. Religion is not included in the United States Census, and the national Jewish community conducts no national census. A random sample can only be representative if the sample frame truly represents the Jewish community. In a sense, an informal census count of households must be undertaken before the population can be studied.

Such an undertaking presents a Pandora's box of methodological, financial and theoretical problems. Such an undertaking is obviously cost prohibitive on a national scale, and most individual communities do not have the resources to conduct a census of their own. Deciding who to count raises another set of questions. How is a Jew to be identified? Someone who was born Jewish, (mother or father), someone who is raised Jewish, someone who marries a Jew or someone who says that he or she is a Jew are among the kinds of definitional questions that have to be asked.

Administratively, of course, such a project would be impossible. In

order to identify the Jewish households, all households in the area would have to be contacted. In effect, the U.S. Census would have to be recreated with a "screen" for religion. Jews, of course, have been traditionally opposed to any such procedure. In addition, the costs would be exorbitant.

Most communities solve this problem by sampling the Jewish population that is most active through the institutional structures: i.e., using contributor lists from the local umbrella philanthropic institutions - usually the Jewish Federation. This list is most easily obtained, since it is usually the local Jewish Federation that sponsors demographic studies. But theoretical problems plague this technique. First, only part of the Jewish population would be sampled. Excluded from the sample frame would be:

- those who have never made a contribution, and
- those who once made a contribution and have been removed from the lists as nongivers.

Large segments of the Jewish population are potentially lost from such a sample frame. Obviously, a tremendous bias is built into this sample frame. It would tend to exclude the young, the mobile, the old, the former-affiliates and many who consider themselves somewhat marginal to the organized Jewish community.

A variety of other methodologies have been employed to study Jewish populations. Most involve fairly complicated techniques to construct the sample frame, all with their particular problems. Among these are the use of distinctive Jewish surnames, random digit dialing and area sampling.

The sample frame for this study was constructed by collecting and merging a wide variety of lists, which can be seen in Table MD1. By merging such a large set of lists, nearly all segments of the Jewish population are included in the sample frame, allowing for as true a universe as possible from which to draw a sample.

Using this methodology, however, does have two biases. First, the most recent migrants to the metropolitan area who have not had any contact with the institutional Jewish community will be excluded from the sample frame. There is no evidence, however, that recent migrants as a group have lower affiliation rates than longer-term residents. Second, some Jews in the metropolitan area who have never had an affiliation with any Jewish organization, even as children, will be excluded. These are the most marginal people in terms of the study purposes.

The compilation of current lists, old membership lists (to find former affiliates) and a variety of other lists includes the broad spectrum of the Jewish population. As this analysis will show, the methodology was designed to minimize bias. Households that are usually omitted using only a Federation list would be included in the sample frame.

1. Obtaining Current Lists

Letters were sent out in mid-August 1980, with follow-up correspondence mailed two weeks later. These letters, written under the signature of the chairman of the Demographic Study Committee, a lay committee of the Jewish Federation, served the dual purpose of publicizing the Jewish Federation's intent to conduct a demographic study, as well as enlisting the participation and cooperation of those in receipt of these letters. The letters requested that their organizational membership lists and rosters from 1976-1981 be made available to the Federation office for compilation of the study's sample frame. Additionally, organizational heads were asked to alert their constituencies regarding the importance of this study, as well as to include suggestions that they felt would be of value to the interviewing questionnaire.

The initial letters and follow-up correspondence were sent to the

following:

- the presidents and directors of all Jewish Federation constituent and beneficiary agencies;
- the presidents and rabbis of all synagogues and temples, and
- all Jewish organizations, including the regional offices of national and overseas beneficiary agencies, Jewish schools and educational institutions, chapter levels of women's and men's organizations and all other known Jewish organizations.

Graphs were developed so that the individual responses of all letter recipients could be crosschecked. Information on these graphs included the name, address and telephone number of the person to whom the letter was mailed; whether the person planned to promote the study among his or her individual constituency, and whether membership lists were made available.

These graphs were grouped according to the following three categories:

- synagogues;
- constituent agencies, and
- all other Jewish organizations.

During the months of September 1980 through March 1981, an intensive telephone follow-up was directed to all letter recipients. Often, telephone respondents needed additional information on the study, its purposes and sponsorship. Clarification was also needed regarding the specific uses of such membership lists. Four types of problems developed over the issue of membership lists. First, there was concern on the part of the organizational leaders that such rosters be used only for study purposes. Second, a number of organizations initially refused to submit rosters, noting that a policy decision had to be made on the national level to release such information. Third, certain smaller organizations felt that, due to insufficient clerical assistance, rosters would be difficult to accumulate. Fourth, a few small groups believed that the study would be of no value to them and, therefore,

did not want to release their membership lists.

The Demographic Study Committee took an active role during this period, with many of the members taking the responsibility for individual organizations. Each member used available contacts to help explain the purpose of the study and obtain membership lists.

The Women's Division of the Federation was helpful in contacting certain women's organizations and obtaining mailing lists, i.e., B'nai B'rith Women, American Mizrahi Women and Hadassah. It is important to note that on occasion administrative assistants and secretaries were also helpful in collecting rosters. In November 1980, as many as 60 of 125 lists had not been obtained. The refusal of various agencies to relinquish their lists accounted for most of the absent lists.

Beginning in March 1981, weekly meetings were held with the people involved in the final stages of the list accumulation. Agenda items included which organizations still had not responded with their lists, as well as the mass retrieval of names through confirmation lists, Jewish Light engagement and marriage announcements, distinctive Jewish surnames in the telephone directories, etc. A "snowball" collection of unaffiliates was also undertaken at this time. A "snowball list" begins with the identification of totally unaffiliated individuals, who are in turn asked to provide names of other such individuals.

During the last week in April 1981, a final letter was sent to all synagogues, agencies and organizations that submitted membership lists and rosters to the Federation. Included in this mass mailing was a cover letter from the demographic study chairman, a copy of the letter which prospective survey respondents would receive, a letter of explanation as to the purpose of the study and a listing of all cooperating organizations as of that date.

Finally, over 125 lists were collected, with only two organizations refraining because they could not obtain clearance from their national organizations.

The process of collecting the membership lists was important for a number of reasons. First, the study was publicized to all Jewish organizations and institutions in the area. This would make the field work less difficult since many groups and individuals would become familiar with the study. Such familiarity could help reduce the refusal rate. Second, the Jewish Federation, as the umbrella organization, was able to foster cooperation among nearly all organizations. Finally, enough interest was generated that the study would be used as a planning and policy tool, rather than just as a population count.

Table MD3 shows all the lists that were used in constructing the sample frame. In all, over 150 lists were actually keypunched. The lists were divided into the following categories:

- Temples and Synagogues;
- St. Louis Jewish Light;
- Agencies and Organizations;
- Organization Chapters;
- Boards of Directors;
- Distinctive Jewish Surnames;
- Miscellaneous;
- Elderly Housing, and
- Old Lists.

Column 1 shows the final number of households for each list type that remained in the sample frame after manual removal of duplicates, inaccurate addresses, businesses, recorded deaths, out-of-towners and other factors. Therefore, the number of total households is often lower than the list total

that was originally keypunched, since replacements (new members, new community residents) were not recorded. The list-merging process was completed during the summer of 1981 and is the most accurate picture of the composition of household location and affiliation patterns at that point (minus affiliations made after each list was printed).

Column 2 shows the number of entries that came from that list and no other list - that is, the households that belong to or are connected with that entity and no other. Column 3 shows the percentage of each list that came from that list and no other.

In all, some 63,300 household names (excluding distinctive Jewish surnames) remained after manual cleaning and other deletions. Ultimately, this list would be used to provide a basis to estimate the final number of Jewish households. This figure will be adjusted from field work statistics to provide an estimate of the total number of Jewish households in the area. Caution must be taken to emphasize that this figure is an estimate.

In constructing Table MD3, a couple of technical problems should be noted. First, boards of directors were compiled with rosters that often included business, as opposed to residential, addresses. These were manually converted. Some of the errors occurred in this process. A person serving as a board of directors member would show as a single entry if the business address remained. For example, Sam W. might belong to six organizations, residential address, 6 Oak Avenue. But if Sam W. was listed also at 1000 Main Street, a business address, he would appear as a single entry for the organization for which that address was recorded. Many of the business addresses were automatically deleted through a programming effort, but some could not be deleted.

The Jewish Family & Children's Service New Americans list presented the

opposite problem. Recent Russian immigrants tend to live in clusters in certain areas, often at the same street address. Where apartment numbers were unavailable, the computer had no way to distinguish four families with the same surname at the same street address and thus merged these entries into one household. As a result, the number of these households shown in this list declined from almost 900 to 320. This drop is partially due to the large number of elderly persons who have moved to congregant housing. Most of the drop is due to computer programming problems with this list.

2. Collection of Old Lists

The collection of old lists can be divided into four sections:

- those from synagogues;
- those from the Jewish Community Centers Association (JCCA);
- those from the biweekly columns in the Jewish Light, and
- those from agencies.

Of these four, the largest task was to collect the JCCA'S old lists, due to the numerous resignations each year. The most difficult task was the collection of old lists from synagogues, since these were not usually compiled in any form. The summary of this process can be seen in Table MD2.

3. Collection of Old Lists From the Synagogues

Although the synagogues in St. Louis were very cooperative in submitting their current membership lists, the collection of the old lists was a much more difficult task. Four different lists were requested:

- lists of marriages since 1965;
- lists of confirmands from 1965-1970;
- lists of past members, and
- High Holy Day lists of nonmembers.

The marriage lists were very difficult to collect, since synagogues rarely kept records. Marriage records are generally kept by the individual rabbi who performs the ceremony. In many cases the rabbi was not available and, consequently, neither were the lists. Further problems arose when the rabbi's records were obtained but were illegible, incomplete or used only the Hebrew names of the married couple.

When the marriage lists were collected, very often the names of the parents were also recorded. In cases where the rabbi could spare the time, the work was substantially reduced. He could often give present addresses of the couple and their parents and often know if these individuals still belonged to his synagogue. Only five out of a possible 19 synagogues were able to furnish records of their marriages.

The confirmation lists of the synagogues were the simplest to collect. Most synagogues have a program at their confirmation service that lists those children being confirmed, as well as their parents. Some of the programs had the addresses of the parents (albeit an old address), but for the most part only the names were included.

By collecting these lists of confirmands from 1965-1970, it was hoped that many young people in the 20-30 age group would be collected who might not have joined a synagogue or agency as an adult. Furthermore, parents of confirmands were also included in a separate list. Many members no longer retain their affiliation with temples and synagogues after their children are confirmed. Again, it was useful for the rabbi to be present for the completion of the lists, since he could distinguish between current members and also give information as to the current whereabouts of people on the lists.

The collection of lists of ex-members varied in difficulty between the

different synagogues. The smaller and newer synagogues presented no problem; the small synagogues only had a few ex-members, and the new synagogues had not been formed long enough for a large number of people to leave.

The real problems came with the large, established synagogues and temples. For example, Temple Israel has a membership of over 1,500 people, and to compile a list of all the people who had resigned over the past 10 years would have been prohibitively expensive. The problem was not only the sheer size of the task. In most cases, the synagogues' records were haphazard and often illegible. The ex-member lists were, therefore, only collected from five synagogues.

The High Holy Day lists were collected in the hope of finding people who did not belong to a synagogue. These lists were hard to find, but when obtained, they were easy to compile. Indeed, only in two cases was the information readily available. Many synagogues did not sell such tickets since they only allowed their own members to attend. Other synagogues kept no records.

4. Old Lists From the Jewish Community Centers Association

The JCCA by its very nature has a high turnover of members. Membership must be renewed annually, and the service needs of individual users are constantly changing. Consequently, many people leave while some rejoin at a later date. Each year, the JCCA has between 1,000 and 1,500 resignations. Resignations were assembled from 1974-1980. Many of these resignations are non-Jewish families. Of the Jewish families who resigned from the JCCA, it is possible that they do not belong to any other organization. The sporting facilities of the JCCA are very attractive to those people in the 20-30 year age group, and, so consequently, the JCCA resignations would be a good place to collect these names. The lists were already compiled. New addresses and

zip codes had to be traced from directories.

5. Lists From the Jewish Light

Sources of information to be obtained from the Jewish Light, the local Jewish newspaper, were:

- marriages;
- engagements, and
- births.

Every issue of the Jewish Light from 1976-1981 was used to compile these three lists in the hope of collecting the names of young couples about to be married, actually married or having just become parents. All of these were important, since Jewish couples very often become involved within the Jewish community only after they have children.

The job of actually compiling these lists was long and tedious, since the Jewish Light was then a biweekly paper. Fortunately, bound copies of the newspapers were available, which made the task more convenient but did not reduce the volume of work.

6. Collection of Old Lists From Agencies

Most of the Jewish agencies and organizations in St. Louis have fairly stable memberships, so if one were to obtain a previous year's membership roster, then it would vary only slightly from the present year's. Several old membership rosters were, however, obtained (e.g., Hadassah and Jewish Hospital Auxiliary lists), and these were compared to the most recent lists. As expected, the difference was negligible, and further investigation showed that, in the vast majority of cases, the reason people discontinued their membership was death or a move out-of-town. Most old lists from organizations were not keypunched for computer use in the sample frame.

The JCCA Singles list was worth pursuing. It supplied names that might not be on any other list. Although there was no reason why these people should be young, it was felt that unmarried people were less likely to join synagogues or agencies and were, therefore, less likely to show up on other current lists. A list of single people would therefore be of great use in the compilation of a complete list.

There were also other miscellaneous lists that were collected. One of these was the "snowball list" that included names of people that personal contacts knew to be Jewish but did not expect to appear on any of the lists. The compilation of this list served two purposes:

- to collect more names for the sample frame, and
- as a check - if the names on the "snowball list" also appeared on other lists, then it would be a sound assumption that the sample frame includes a lot of "unlikely" names.

Another miscellaneous list collected was a typical Jewish surnames list. This was formed from a distinctive Jewish surnames list used to compile a sample frame in past studies.* "Jewish surnames" could also be considered German. The list was compiled by using the telephone directory and copying every name. It was realized during the compilation that this list must be used with caution. There was no guarantee any of the people were Jewish but, if the sample frame was complete, it would then be possible to check how many of the people from the Jewish surnames list were included and then draw conclusions as to how good a sample frame could be composed using this methodology.

*This list, both the short list of 35 names and the large list of 105 names, is reprinted in Appendix 1.

7. The Processing of the Lists

Compared to the processing of the old lists, the collection and compilation of the new lists was an easy task. All of the lists that were current did not need any processing at all, since we assumed that the names were correct and the addresses were up-to-date. The lists that were compiled, however, were a different matter: the major problem was that the lists collected dated from 1965 (confirmation lists) to 1980 (JCCA resignation lists). With high mobility, many of these people could have either moved within St. Louis (in which case the new address had to be found), moved out of St. Louis or died (in which case the names had to be removed from the sample frame). The problem was solved using a recent telephone and street directory and months of manual tracking through these directories.

8. Processing Old Lists From the Synagogues

For the most part, all of the old lists collected from the synagogues were compiled from files that were not in any particular order. The names collected included the addresses from the time they were filed. The processing of the lists took two forms:

- lists already with addresses, and
- lists that did not include addresses.

For lists that already included the addresses, the names were verified in the telephone directory. If the addresses on the list and in the directory matched, then the name was kept. If the addresses did not comply, a choice was made if the person was indeed the same one, or whether he was different. In most cases this task was fairly simple, but in others, the choice was impossible to make and so the name was dropped rather than include too many non-Jews in the sample frame. If no trace of the person could be found, then the name was omitted. One of the major problems was people who were not

listed in the telephone directory, since it was not possible to tell if these people were still at the same address. Because of this, it is likely that some people were omitted who still lived at the same address and could, therefore, have been included, while others were included that were not the same person and might not be Jewish.

9. Processing Old Lists From the Jewish Community Centers Association

The first problem of this list was to exclude all those people who were non-Jewish. The task was made easier with the help of the JCCA staff. Once only the Jewish people who resigned remained on the list, then the process similar to that used for the lists from the synagogues was used. At the end of this two-step process, the aggregate number of people included on the six JCCA resignation lists was reduced by about 70%.

There were, however, other complications with the JCCA lists. Very often the memberships were for a young son or daughter, and so his or her name would not be in the telephone directory. This led to the names being omitted even if the family still resided at the same address.

10. Processing Old Lists Compiled From the Jewish Light

These lists were processed in very much the same way as the synagogue lists. As with the synagogue lists, some of the names collected included addresses and others did not. In both cases, the names were verified in the telephone and street directory. There were several reasons for the names to be omitted from the Jewish Light list:

- The name could not be found.
- The family had moved, and there was no way to tell if an alternative address for the same name was the same family.
- The name was not listed in the directory.

11. Processing of Miscellaneous Old Lists

The typical Jewish surnames list did not need to be processed except to find the relevant zip codes for each of the addresses. The "snowball list" only needed minimal editing, since it was compiled by personal friends and associates and so the chances of the addresses being incorrect were small. Zip codes, however, were needed.

B. Results

1. Old Synagogue Lists

Out of a possible 19 synagogues and temples the following numbers of lists were collected:

- Marriage lists: 5
- Confirmation lists (parents and confirmands): 8
- Ex-member lists: 5
- High Holy Day guest lists: 2

The numbers of lists illustrate the problem of compiling them.

2. Marriage Lists

Adding together all of the five marriage lists collected, there were 1,750 names of which 810 were found in the telephone directory or in reverse directories. This means that 46% of the names collected were actually used as part of the sample frame.

3. Confirmation Lists

Of the confirmands, 4,754 names were collected and 1,013 were used, so only 21% of the names collected were used.

If one were to look at the individual confirmation lists, it appears that the collection of the names of the confirmands' parents yielded higher results

than the confirmands themselves. This supports our supposition that the most difficult names to collect are the younger, unmarried section of the population, and that if couples have children then they are easier to trace. The other problem is that many of the confirmands are females who are likely to have changed their name and, therefore, are difficult to trace.

4. Ex-member Lists

Altogether, using the five lists collected, the total number of names compiled was 585, of which, after the processing, 343 were used, representing 58.6% of the total number of names collected. However, some of the figures may well be misleading in two cases:

- Traditional Congregation of Creve Coeur is a newer, smaller synagogue, and resignations were few (44 in number) and recent making it more likely that they could be traced.
- The Nusach Hari-B'nai Zion Congregation figures of 142 names being collected and 136 used were only this high because the rabbi systematically went through the names. Not only did he personally look through the list himself to omit those people who had died or moved out-of-town, but he also knew of the present whereabouts of most of the people.

5. High Holy Day Lists

Since lists were only available from two synagogues, the usefulness of High Holy Day lists is difficult to assess. In one case, Shaare Zedek Synagogue, 23 names were collected and 20 were used. In the other case, B'nai El Temple, 130 were collected and only 27 used. The Shaare Zedek names were collected using only the 1980 list but the B'nai El list was compiled using several years, so they are difficult to compare. What is obvious is that the more recent a list is, the easier it is to trace the people on it.

6. Results of Collection of Lists From the Jewish Community Centers Association

Adding together all six years of lists collected, a total of 10,806 names

were used. Of these, 5,195 people were considered to be Jewish. The number of names used from the total 10,806 was 3,305, or 30.6%, however, the percentage used from just the Jewish names collected was 63.6%.

7. Results of Collection of Lists From the Jewish Light

Of the three lists collected - the births, marriages and engagements - the most useful was the births list, since 63.2% of the names collected were used. The least useful list was the engagement list, but this was anticipated since the people did not necessarily live in St. Louis. The same problem was apparent with the marriage list: although the marriage was reported in the St. Louis Jewish Light, the married couple did not necessarily live in St. Louis. About 41% of the engagements and 43% of the marriages from the Jewish Light were used.

8. Results of Collection of Miscellaneous Lists

Both the JCCA Singles group and the "snowball list" were well worth collecting. In both cases, over 90% of the names were used. With the "snowball list" this high rate was to be expected, since it was compiled by people who knew the people on the list.

Processing the old lists was a gigantic task. In all, over 21,000 households were manually traced. Of these, 15,400 were believed to be Jewish households, of which 7,200 were located in the metropolitan area, or 34% of the 21,000 names that were assembled. Confirmands were the most difficult to find, given their age, mobility and women changing surnames when married. The question remains: was this search worth the effort?

The answer can be seen in Table MD4. The miscellaneous lists and old lists generated 1,400 names that were single entry, coming from these lists and no other. This represents almost 8% of the households, a sizable group of

nonaffiliates. This includes many young households who would normally be excluded from this sample frame.

Examination of Table MD4 shows that more than 7,600 households, almost 40%, came from only one list. Each type of list produced households for the sample frame that would otherwise have been omitted. Using only the Jewish Light mailing list, adjusting for non-Jews and wrong addresses, would have excluded about 10,000 households from the sample frame. Table MD5 shows that picking up the most marginal households has been a success. Over 25%, or more than 5,500 households in the sample frame, currently belong to no organization. They may receive the Jewish Light, or once have belonged to an organization, or live in housing for the elderly, but they have no other current organizational affiliation. Another 27% of the households in the sample frame, some 5,565, currently belong to only one organization. A total of 53% of the households have one or no current affiliations.

Obviously, the most marginal households have been excluded (some of these were included by using all distinctive Jewish surnames in the telephone directory). Given the nature of the study, it is not likely that these most marginal households would have agreed to an interview in any case, or been likely to utilize services offered by the Jewish community.

C. The List-Merging Process

Once all the lists had been collected and processed, it then remained to reduce the number of entries so that there were no duplicates at all. To achieve this end, three major steps were undertaken:

- All the names were keypunched into a computer tape.
- Duplicates were located using computer and manual methods and removed.

- The sample could then be drawn from the list using computer methods.

1. Stage I: Key punching the Sample Frame

An independent data processing firm was hired to keypunch nearly all the names onto a tape. The following variables were used:

- surname;
- first initial;
- street number;
- street name;
- apartment number;
- zip code, and
- list code.

To make certain that the keypunching was accurate, verification was also completed. In all, almost 40,000 names were taken from the 155 lists given (excluding the Jewish Light and JCCA), as can be seen from the frequency distribution of the lists. The maximum number of entries was from the distinctive Jewish surnames list, over 3,000, ranging to an entry of only seven (Agudath Israel Synagogue membership list). Two large lists, the St. Louis Jewish Light and the JCCA lists, were on a separate tape.

2. Stage II: Merging Two Tapes

Although this stage would seem to be fairly simple, many problems were encountered that could only be solved using manual methods. The Jewish Light list and the JCCA current membership list were on a separate tape. This created a problem, since the format of the variables on these two lists not only differed from each other but also from the format of the variables on the tape with the remaining lists on it.

The JCCA list had 5,454 names, making it small enough to clean manually.

Not only were the names in reverse order on occasion (i.e., first name before surname), but there were commas and asterisks which would have affected any computer manipulation that could be done. All 5,454 names therefore were individually examined and corrected so they were compatible with the major tape. The Jewish Light list was far larger (13,000 entries). Since it was not compatible with the major tape, it was rekey punched into a similar format to the major list.

While these two tapes were being prepared, the other 155 lists were matched for duplicates, and those duplicates were merged together using computer techniques. This brought the total number of entries down from about 40,000 names to about 22,000 names. The problems encountered were minor errors in spelling, street numbers, zip code digits, etc., that might result from the original lists or through keypunching. For example, even though duplicate names existed, if there were ever the slightest difference in spelling, e.g., GOLDBERG with an E rather than GOLDBURG with a U, it might well be the same person with one of the entries spelled incorrectly. There was no way the computer, however, could recognize that the two were the same people. One alternative available was to match duplicates using street numbers or street names. This method was not possible because seven elderly housing complexes were of the same address and also because it is quite common for relatives to live in the same building.

Although the number of entries from the 150 lists had been reduced to 22,000, these names had to be examined for duplicates. Most of the time this was relatively simple, since the major reason the computer could not detect a duplicate was because of an obvious spelling mistake (e.g., the name COHEN would be spelled CHOEN). When the names were initially matched to detect duplicates, the surname, street number, street name, apartment number and zip

code had to be similar, and so if any of these five variables differed or did not exist then it was left to a manual search.

After this lengthy process had been undertaken, the final two lists, the JCCA current membership list and the Jewish Light list, were ready to be merged with the other 155 lists, which in terms of entries had been reduced to about 21,000 names via the computer and manual matching techniques. Once merged, the number of entries increased to about 40,000. A similar process was then undertaken as before: the list was first reduced by using a computer matching process and then another manual matching session.

The manual matching was more difficult this second time, since the two extra lists added, the JCCA current membership list and the Jewish Light list, were both full of mistakes. The Jewish Light list caused some technical problems since many of the addresses were not residences, but were business addresses of Jewish households and of those firms that advertised in the newspaper. The other problem with the Jewish Light list was that it was not completely up-to-date with current addresses. Some newspapers were sent out to addresses that were no longer occupied by the people the newspaper should have reached. The final problem with the Jewish Light list was that sometimes two newspapers were distributed to the same household. This was very difficult to identify.

The computer technique used, that of matching similar entries, was efficient except for two factors:

- The technique was not flexible enough to account for slight deviations.
- Information could be lost after a list duplicate of an entry was found and merged.

The second problem was resolved during the second manual sort. The information that would be lost was the list code. A complete list of all the

participating Jewish households in St. Louis was desired, but also the sample frame could yield valuable data if the source of each entry would be retained. During the second manual sort, these codes were added back to the corresponding name using an earlier list that had not been processed to the point of losing this particular information.

Once all this had been performed, the list that remained had no duplicate entries; the names, addresses and zip codes had all been checked and any business addresses (as far as could be told) were removed. This complete list was then used as the sample frame from which our sample could be drawn.

D. Costs and Benefits of Constructing the Sample Frame

The benefits of constructing the sample frame using all organizational lists as opposed to a single list can be summarized as follows:

1. The process of collecting the lists fosters a cooperative process between the Federation and other organizations. As the purposes of the study are explained and cooperation is solicited, organizations will play a more active role in promoting the study.

Furthermore, as each organization contributed its list, it was asked to indicate its data needs, issues and concerns for the organization and its planning needs. The larger organizations each met on at least two occasions to solicit and refine questions for inclusion in the survey instrument. At least 40 organizations and institutions submitted data requests, and representatives from 20 organizations met individually or in groups to discuss input into the questionnaire. This process insured that the study would be actively used as a planning tool. This process, of course, could be accomplished without the list collection procedure. However, the issue of

releasing the lists sparked a great deal of self-interest in the study which would have been much more difficult to generate without such a process.

Caution had to be taken not to solicit more requests for input into the questionnaire than could be reasonably handled. For the most part, data requests fell into broad, common categories. Where this was not the case, efforts were made to accommodate at least some of the data needs of those who requested it. The survey instrument was lengthy as a result, but not unmanageable.

2. The types of data that are generated through that sample frame cannot be obtained through other sampling methodologies. They are the following:

a. Total number of households and total population. This method offers the best tool for estimating population (after average household size is obtained from the sample). Records of non-Jewish households, moves out-of-town and deaths uncovered from the field work can all be used to ascertain the completeness of the sample frame. Of course, the estimate will be just that, but it is likely to be the best one.

b. Complete organizational affiliation data. These include:

- i. The proportion of households affiliated with synagogues and temples.
- ii. The proportion of organizational activity that is non-Jewish (to be estimated from field results).
- iii. The geographic distribution of the total population and by subgroups such as Orthodox, Conservative or Reform Jews and by each organization.
- iv. The cross-affiliation patterns of each organization by other organizations.
- v. The membership patterns of boards of directors of organizations.

Some of these data could be obtained through the sample, such as geographic distribution. But most of the data would not be available due to

the small number of cases in the appropriate categories. The compilation of such a sample frame, then, provides a data set that would not be otherwise available and can serve as both an addition to and a check on the sample itself.

While there are many benefits of such a sample frame, the costs in time and money are not trivial. The sample frame took two years to compile, beginning with the initial correspondence about the study to all organizations and the final list-merging process. Two Federation personnel, lay committee members, 20 paid part-time workers, two full-time graduate students and three months of consultant's time were spent in compiling the sample frame. Hard costs of keypunching, tapes and computer time also added to the financial total: over \$15,000 and computer costs of a far greater amount. Sorting tens of thousands of names is an expensive process.

The rationale for this expense can be seen in Table MD3. The single entry household table (Table MD4) shows that about 455 elderly households are unaffiliated with any organization or institution (other than housing); some 1,200 households were picked up using old lists or miscellaneous lists such as the "snowball list." About 1,000 households belong to temples and synagogues and to no other organization. Each list, therefore, was important in picking up the most marginal households. The sample will show how these households might compare to the more affiliated households in terms of religious observances, intermarriages, age, etc.

Because the aggregation of multiple lists uses addresses of members, telephone numbers and unlisted telephones are included. Those without telephones can be contacted through the mail and then in person. Furthermore, households can be traced by requesting address corrections instead of forwarding the letter. This avoids the bias of using distinctive Jewish

surnames' telephone listings only or "eyeballing" a directory looking for clusters of Jewish names for random digit dialing. Address corrections allow for a mechanism to record household movement and avoid replacement of selected names.

E. Sampling

Once the complete sample frame had been conducted, then all that was left to do was to:

- choose the sample size, and
- choose the actual sample.

The major problems with choosing the sample size were that a similar sample frame had never been constructed. Therefore, no internal way to check for its accuracy was available. This meant that there was no prior information as to how many cases in the sample frame:

- had moved away;
- had died;
- were not Jewish;
- would refuse to be interviewed, or
- other difficulties.

From past studies we estimated a 20% refusal rate, but guesses had to be made as to other factors. Since the funds available were to enable 1,000 interviews, a sample size of 1,500 names was chosen, with estimates of non-Jews, etc. to account for the remainder.

To choose the actual sample, various computer techniques were explored; statistical packages usually have a random sampling program, but from past experiences it was shown that the samples selected from these tend not to be truly random. Finally, a method was used that assigned a random number to

each case in the sample frame. This was determined by what time of day the case was read by the computer. The sample frame was sorted by the random variable assigned to it so that all the names were in a random order. This technique was used to avoid clustering.

The names were then selected by reassigning a new random variable, again determined by the time of day the case was read. If the variable was less than a number the computer calculated by dividing the total number of cases by the required sample size then the case was selected. Once a case was selected the number of the required sample was reduced by one and the process started again. This continued until the required sample size was chosen.

F. The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument included over 150 questions containing over 800 variables, separate distinct units of information. The survey instrument is reprinted in Appendix II. These questions were contained in 11 sections, which are listed below.

- Interviewer and Field Work Data;
- Basic Demographic Information, Respondent and Spouse;
- Service Needs of the Elderly;
- Religious Identification, Practice and Education;
- Housing Characteristics;
- Health Care Services;
- Jewish Community Centers Association Usage and Needs Assessment;
- Jewish Communal Service Needs Assessment;
- Jewish Federation of St. Louis-Volunteer Patterns, Giving Patterns and Program Assessment;
- Israel, Anti-Semitism, Political Behavior, and
- Addendums: Marriage; Children, and Other Adults in Household-

Demographic Profile.

A number of variables were recorded concerning the interviewer and the interviewing process. These include:

- Religion of interviewer. This variable will show if Jewish or non-Jewish interviewers tend to produce higher refusal rates. The field work shows refusals were equally divided between Jewish and non-Jewish interviewers.
- Time of interview. These data will be used to examine the time of day and the days of the week that are best to interview different subgroups in the population.
- Length of interview. The average length of the interview will be compiled, noting particularly any difference between personal and telephone interviews.
- Telephone vs. personal interview. This variable will help evaluate any substantial differences in the quality of the interview vis a vis these distinct interviewing methods. Particular emphasis will be given to the service-oriented sections of the survey.
- Reason for refusals. These data, along with the affiliation patterns of refusals, will help profile this segment of the population. The stated reasons for refusal will facilitate some evaluation of possible bias as a result of refusals. This variable is discussed in the next section.
- The attitude of the respondent was also noted as excellent, good, fair or poor. This variable will be used to examine the collective attitudes of certain subgroups and to test how attitude might influence willingness to answer particular questions, such as income.

These variables were included to help guide further research in the field, as well as to make substantive evaluations about the interviewing process in the St. Louis study.

One section of the survey provides data in the following areas for both respondent and spouse in the household:

- household size;
- sex;
- race;
- marital status;

- marital history;
- age;
- fertility;
- religious background;
- religious background of parents and grandparents;
- geographic mobility;
- place of birth;
- citizenship status;
- immigration history;
- primary and secondary spoken languages;
- parents' and grandparents' educational background;
- parents' and grandparents' religious educational background;
- occupational and employment profile;
- parents' and grandparents' occupational profile, and
- mother's employment history.

Each section was designed with a particular set of client users in mind. Indeed, each of the institutions or organizations that might use the data for planning purposes was involved in supplying questions and information to help construct the survey instrument. A list of the organizations supplying such information, either through written communication or group discussions, is listed below:

- St. Louis Rabbinical Council;
- St. Louis Rabbinical Association;
- St. Louis Jewish Light;
- Jewish Community Centers Association;
- American Jewish Committee;
- American Jewish Congress;

- Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith;
- H. F. Epstein Hebrew Academy;
- Jewish Center for Aged;
- Jewish Family & Children's Service;
- Jewish Employment & Vocational Service;
- Jewish Hospital of St. Louis;
- B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation;
- Jewish Community Relations Council;
- Central Agency for Jewish Education;
- The Delcrest, and
- Jewish Federation of St. Louis.

In some cases, such as the JCCA, three or four program directors had input, or, in the case of the Federation, the entire staff was asked to participate in the input of the survey design. Individual temples and synagogues, organizational chapters, religious schools, school administrators and others played a role in the questionnaire construction. In all, over 40 institutions and over 250 individuals actively contributed to the construction of the survey instrument to insure maximum community usage of the data.

Furthermore, the survey instruments used in demographic studies from Jewish communities from all over the United States were assembled and examined. In all, some 30 survey schedules were examined. Some of the questions were duplicated for the St. Louis study. In addition, wherever possible, the identical language of the 1980 United States Census questions was used. This will allow for direct comparisons to the larger non-Jewish population, particularly in the areas of housing type and family characteristics.

G. Field Work: Process and Results

The field work began in May 1981 and finished in November of the same year. A firm of professional interviewers, Survey Research Service, St. Louis, Mo., was retained. Over 25 interviewers were utilized during this six months, with nine interviewers completing the vast majority of the interviews. A sample of 1,550 households was selected. Of these, the breakdown of the results is summarized below:

- Completed: 922 (84 telephone)
- Refusals: 238
- Non-Jews: 149
- "Can't Locates": 150
- "Moved Out-of-Towns": 52
- Other: 39 (vacation, ill health, etc.)

The known Jewish households in St. Louis consist of those households in the completed, refusal and other categories, a total of 1,199 households:

- 77% completion;
- 20% refusal, and
- 3% other.

The acceptance rate was approximately 77%, excellent for contemporary survey research. Many of these households had to be contacted many times. A letter was sent to each of the selected households informing them that they had been selected for the interview. A copy of this letter is attached in Appendix III. Following this initial contact the interviewer called the household to set up an appointment. Hard-to-reach households and those without telephones were contacted in person to complete the interview. Telephone calls and contacts were made at all different times of the day and night and all seven days of the week to insure maximum participation.

On the first round over 450 households refused. A follow-up letter was sent again to these households along with post cards to the households that could not be located by telephone or in person. Interviewers also checked with neighbors of the selected households to see when they might be home, or if they moved and where. First-round refusals were given to other interviewers, so that the household would have a "fresh" contact. In addition, calls were made from Washington University to urge selected households to participate. Some households were contacted as many as six times before they consented to an interview. By these persistent methods, the refusal rate was reduced to 20% (see Table MD6).

This also involved completing some 84 interviews by telephone. A decision was made to complete these interviews with households who agreed to an interview only if it took place over the telephone. It was decided that the importance of including reluctant households in the interview process outweighed any potential loss in quality that might result from an interview being completed by telephone instead of in person.

Even with much advance publicity, many households had no idea that the study was under way. This reflects that many households do not receive the Jewish Light or belong to Jewish organizations.

In addition to reducing the refusals, "can't locates" were also kept at a minimum by tracing households through leaving post cards at the household (attached in Appendix III), as well as multiple visits to households that were rarely home. Upon the initial mailing contact address corrections were requested as opposed to forwarding, so as to follow each selected household. In this way some 150 households, or 10% of the sample, were shown to have new addresses where the interviewers then contacted them. About 80 households had

no forwarding address, and these comprised the bulk of the "can't locates."

In addition, some 52 households were recorded as moving out-of-town.

Initial resistance and final refusals fell into basically five categories:

- Ill health, primarily among the elderly. Many of the elderly felt put upon by the idea of a lengthy interview.
- General suspicion about survey research. Many people felt the interview was an invasion of privacy.
- Disinterest in the Jewish aspect of the survey.
- Fear of solicitation. Some people believed that the survey was somehow involved with fund-raising and wanted no part of such effort.
- Too busy. Some simply did not feel that they had an hour to spend on such a project.

Tables MD7 and MD8 show the breakdown of the 1,550 selected households in the sample terms of zip code distribution and the number of organizations to which each household belonged.

Comparisons between the different components of the sample can be made.

The following summary points can be made:

- Geographic Distribution of Sample Components

*Refusals tend to be slightly higher in the noncentral zip codes than completions/conversions (7.1% vs. 2.6%).

*"Can't locates" and "moved out-of-towns" are more heavily concentrated in 63105 and 63130, reflecting the more highly mobile students and young households affiliated with universities, medical centers, etc., who live in rental housing.

*Non-Jews are located primarily in non-Jewish population center zip codes and account for most of such households in the sample.

- Synagogue Affiliation

*"Can't locates" and "moved out-of-towns" have very low synagogue affiliation rates (26% and 15%).

*Refusals are slightly less affiliated with synagogues than

completions.

- Organizational Affiliation

*Refusals are marginally less likely to be associated with an organization than completions.

*"Moved out-of-towns" and "can't locates" are significantly less likely to have more than two affiliations, but are not much different than the completions in terms of total nonaffiliation.

The "can't locates" and "moved out-of-towns" have geographic location and synagogue affiliation patterns that differ substantially from the completions. Many of these individuals came from the distinctive Jewish surnames list, the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation list, the "snowball list" and other similar lists.

GUIDE TO TABLES

These TABLES are presented in the sequence in which they were asked in the survey instrument, which is reported in the Appendix. The LETTER sequence is as follows:

P
E
R
H
HP
C
F
M
IN
PCH
MD

Following this set of TABLES are the CROSS-TABULATIONS, also printed in the same LETTER sequence as above.

TABLE P1

NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN HOUSEHOLD

<u>People in Household</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
One	203	22.1
Two	337	36.7
Three	152	16.6
Four	139	15.1
Five	69	7.5
Six	17	1.9
Seven	1	0.1

TABLE P2

SEX

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Male	1112	47.4
Female	1235	52.5

TABLE P3

RACE

<u>Race</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
White	2292	99.4
Black	13	0.6
Other	1	0.0

TABLE P4

MARITAL STATUS
(respondents)

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Now married	622	68.0
Widowed	155	16.9
Divorced	47	5.1
Separated	6	0.7
Never married	80	8.7
Living with partner of opposite sex	5	0.5

TABLE P5

HAVE YOU BEEN MARRIED MORE THAN ONCE?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Multiple Marriages</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	182	12.5
No	1279	87.5

TABLE P6

NUMBER OF MULTIPLE MARRIAGES
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Number of Marriages</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
One	166	93.3
Two	10	5.6
Three	1	0.6
Four or more	1	0.6

TABLE P8

AGE OF JEWISH POPULATION
(all members of household)

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-5	136	5.7
6-10	119	5.1
11-15	157	6.8
16-20	173	7.5
21-25	142	6.1
26-30	177	7.6
31-35	181	7.8
36-40	153	6.6
41-45	136	5.9
46-50	124	5.8
51-55	152	6.6
56-60	139	6.0
61-65	137	5.9
66-70	118	5.1
71-75	112	4.8
76-80	80	3.5
81-85	44	1.9
86-90	19	0.8
91-95	9	0.4
100 or more	2	0.1

TABLE P10

NUMBER OF ADOPTED CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD

<u>Number of Children</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
One	19	2.1
Two	13	2.0
Three	2	0.2

TABLE P16

CURRENT RELIGION
(respondents and spouses)

Religion	Respondent		Spouse	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Jewish	898	98.0	561	89.5
Protestant	2	0.2	22	3.5
Catholic	1	0.1	23	3.7
No religion	10	1.1	14	2.2
Other	4	0.4	7	1.1

TABLE P17

RELIGION AT BIRTH
(respondents and spouses)

Religion	Respondent		Spouse	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Jewish	879	97.3	531	86.5
Protestant	11	1.2	38	6.2
Catholic	9	1.0	32	5.2
No religion	3	0.3	6	1.0
Other	1	0.1	7	1.1

TABLE P18

HAVE YOU EVER HELD ANOTHER FAITH?
(respondents and spouses)

Held Another Faith	Number	Percent
No	1476	96.9
Yes, Protestant	21	1.4
Yes, Catholic	16	1.1
Yes, more than one religion	2	0.1
Yes, other	8	0.5

TABLE P19

DID YOU FORMALLY CONVERT TO JUDAISM?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Conversion</u>	<u>Respondent</u>		<u>Spouse</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No	20	52.6	40	66.7
Yes, Orthodox	2	5.3	2	3.3
Yes, Conservative	3	7.9	7	11.7
Yes, Reform	12	31.6	10	16.7
Other	1	2.6	1	1.7

TABLE P20-22

WHAT IS/WAS YOUR PARENTS' RELIGION?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Religion</u>	<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Jewish	1415	92.1	1417	92.6
Protestant	56	3.6	52	3.4
Catholic	54	3.5	47	3.1
No religion	5	0.3	6	0.4
More than one religion	2	0.1	0	0.0
Other	5	0.3	9	0.6

TABLE P21-23

IF JEWISH, WHAT IS/WAS YOUR PARENTS' RELIGIOUS IDENTITY?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Religious Identity</u>	<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Born or raised Orthodox Jew	750	54.6	799	58.7
Born or raised Conservative Jew	256	18.6	245	18.0
Born or raised Reform Jew	344	25.1	298	21.9
Converted Orthodox Jew	0	0.0	1	0.1
Converted Conservative Jew	5	0.4	5	0.4
Converted Reform Jew	12	0.9	7	0.5

TABLE P25

HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR RELIGIOUS IDENTITY?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Religious Identity</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Orthodox	122	8.1
Conservative	391	25.9
Reform	785	52.0
More than one religion	2	0.1
Traditional	19	1.3
Just Jewish	130	8.6
Other	60	4.0

TABLE P26

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT INTERMARRIAGE?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Feelings About Intermarriage</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Men</u>		<u>Women</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
A Jew should never marry a non-Jew under any circumstances	341	22.1	154	22.4	179	21.7
A Jew should marry a non-Jew only if the spouse agrees to a formal conversion to Judaism	218	14.1	102	14.8	111	13.5
A Jew should marry a non-Jew only if no children are planned	27	1.8	12	1.7	15	1.8
A Jew should marry a non-Jew only if the spouse agrees to raise the children as Jews; formal conversion is not necessary	175	11.3	65	9.4	107	13.0
A Jew should marry a non-Jew as long as the two people care about each other; religion should not be a concern	634	41.1	289	42.0	332	40.3
Don't care	41	2.7	21	3.0	20	2.4
Other	9	0.6	3	0.4	6	0.7
Don't know	89	5.7	4	5.8	49	5.9

TABLE P27

ARE YOU PLANNING TO MOVE DURING THE NEXT THREE YEARS?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes, within same general area	66	7.6
Yes, to the City of St. Louis	2	0.2
Yes, to a suburb further from the City of St. Louis than the current address	13	2.1
Yes, to a suburb closer to the City of St. Louis than the current address	10	1.2
Yes, out of the metropolitan area	35	4.1
Perhaps, not sure	41	4.8
No, not moving	688	79.7
Other	3	0.3

TABLE P28

IS ANYONE IN THE HOUSEHOLD PLANNING TO MOVE
DURING THE NEXT THREE YEARS?

<u>Planning to Move</u>	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Child within the St. Louis area	736	95.2	40	4.8
Child out of the area	775	94.3	47	5.7
Adult within the St. Louis area	797	97.1	23	2.8
Adult out of the area	802	97.7	19	2.3

TABLE P30

WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT PREFERENCE FOR THE RELIGIOUS
COMPOSITION OF YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD?

<u>Composition</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
100% Jewish	61	6.7
75% Jewish	138	15.1
50% Jewish, 50% non-Jewish	358	39.2
More than 25% Jewish, but less than 50% Jewish	88	9.6
Less than 25% Jewish	37	4.1
No other Jews	0	0.0
It depends	23	2.5
Don't care	17	16.5
Don't know	57	6.2

TABLE P31

HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE JEWISH COMPOSITION OF THE
NEIGHBORHOOD IN WHICH YOU NOW LIVE?

<u>Neighborhood Composition</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
About 100% Jewish	28	3.0
At least 75% Jewish	149	15.3
About 50% Jewish and 50% non-Jewish	273	29.8
Between 25% Jewish and 50% Jewish	170	18.6
Less than 25% Jewish	227	24.8
There are no other Jews in this neighborhood	17	1.9
Don't know	52	5.7

TABLE P32

WHEN DID YOU MOVE INTO YOUR PRESENT RESIDENCE?

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1981	53	5.8
1979-1980	185	20.2
1975-1978	221	24.2
1970-1974	151	16.5
1960-1969	137	20.5
1950-1959	98	10.7
1949 or earlier	18	2.0
Never lived elsewhere	1	0.1

TABLE P33

ZIP CODE - PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS

<u>Zip Code</u>	<u>Percent (1941)</u>	<u>Percent (1961)</u>	<u>Percent (1981)</u>
63105/63117	12.1	11.3	9.8
63108/63110/63112	38.6	3.1	3.3
63131/63141	0.9	6.5	33.6
63124	0.9	5.6	8.5
63132	0.5	18.9	12.7
63130	34.2	45.4	12.9
63011	0.0	0.0	4.0
63017	0.0	0.1	8.4
All other zip codes	18.6	9.0	3.8

TABLE P35

WHERE DID YOU LIVE JUST BEFORE YOU MOVED INTO THIS RESIDENCE?
(of those who lived in the St. Louis area and have moved)

<u>Zip Code</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
63108/63110/63112	55	4.3
63105/63117	163	13.1
63131/63141	197	15.4
63124	53	4.5
63132	152	11.9
63130	440	34.3
63011	19	1.4
63017	35	2.7
All other zip codes	156	12.4

TABLE P36

WHEN DID YOU MOVE INTO THE ST. LOUIS AREA?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1979-1980	66	9.6
1975-1978	107	15.6
1970-1974	87	12.7
1960-1969	108	15.9
1950-1959	75	10.9
1949 or earlier	241	35.2

TABLE P37a

WAS ST. LOUIS YOUR PLACE OF BIRTH?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>St. Louis Place of Birth</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	678	50.3
No	670	49.7

TABLE P37b

PLACE OF RESIDENCE PRIOR TO ST. LOUIS
(respondents and spouses)

<u>State</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Alabama	2	0.2
Alaska	2	0.2
Arizona	0	0.0
Arkansas	7	0.8
California	31	3.7
Colorado	4	0.5
Connecticut	6	0.7
Delaware	0	0.0
District of Columbia	2	0.2
Florida	10	1.2
Georgia	8	1.0
Hawaii	0	0.0
Idaho	0	0.0
Illinois	112	13.5
Indiana	9	1.1
Iowa	7	0.8
Kansas	8	1.0
Kentucky	6	0.7
Louisiana	4	0.5
Maine	2	0.2
Maryland	8	1.0
Massachusetts	39	4.7
Michigan	10	1.2
Minnesota	10	1.2
Mississippi	3	1.0
Missouri	181	21.8
Montana	1	0.1
Nebraska	0	0.0
Nevada	0	0.0
New Hampshire	2	0.2
New Jersey	13	1.6
New Mexico	0	0.0
New York	63	7.6
North Carolina	2	0.2
North Dakota	0	0.0
Ohio	33	4.0
Oklahoma	3	0.4
Oregon	2	0.2
Pennsylvania	24	2.9
Rhode Island	0	0.0
South Carolina	3	0.4

TABLE P37b
(continued)

<u>State</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
South Dakota	3	0.4
Tennessee	11	1.3
Texas	22	2.7
Utah	0	0.0
Vermont	1	0.1
Virginia	3	0.4
Washington	0	0.0
West Virginia	2	0.2
Wisconsin	4	0.5
Wyoming	0	0.0
U.S. - don't know state	0	0.0
Eastern Europe	105	12.7
Germany-Austria	14	1.7
Israel	8	1.0
Other country	11	1.3
Western Europe	23	2.8

TABLE P38A

PLACE OF BIRTH
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Place</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
St. Louis area	666	50.3
Elsewhere in the United States	443	33.5
Eastern Europe	149	11.3
Germany-Austria	25	1.9
Israel	7	0.5
Other country	32	2.4

TABLE P38b

STATE OF BIRTH
(respondents and spouses)

<u>State</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Alabama	2	0.2
Alaska	0	0.0
Arizona	0	0.0
Arkansas	7	0.5
California	10	0.8
Colorado	2	0.2
Connecticut	5	0.4
Delaware	3	0.2
District of Columbia	0	0.0
Florida	4	0.3
Georgia	3	0.2
Hawaii	0	0.0
Idaho	0	0.0
Illinois	86	6.6
Indiana	12	0.9
Iowa	10	0.8
Kansas	1	0.1
Kentucky	5	0.4
Louisiana	4	0.3
Maine	0	0.0
Maryland	6	0.5
Massachusetts	31	2.4
Michigan	6	0.5
Minnesota	10	0.8
Mississippi	5	0.4
Missouri	681	52.0
Montana	0	0.0
Nebraska	3	0.2
Nevada	0	0.0
New Hampshire	0	0.0
New Jersey	12	0.9
New Mexico	1	0.1
New York	90	6.9
North Carolina	2	0.2
North Dakota	0	0.0
Ohio	27	2.1
Oklahoma	3	0.2
Oregon	0	0.0
Pennsylvania	32	2.4
Rhode Island	1	0.1
South Carolina	0	0.0

TABLE P38b
(continued)

STATE OF BIRTH
(respondents and spouses)

<u>State</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
South Dakota	0	0.0
Tennessee	7	0.5
Texas	10	0.8
Utah	1	0.1
Vermont	0	0.0
Virginia	3	0.2
Washington	1	0.1
West Virginia	0	0.0
Wisconsin	5	0.4
Wyoming	0	0.0
U.S. - don't know state	1	0.1
Eastern Europe	158	12.1
Germany-Austria	26	2.0
Israel	7	0.5
Other country	17	1.3
Western Europe	8	0.6

TABLE P40

ARE YOU A NATURALIZED CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Citizenship</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes, a naturalized citizen	165	71.7
No, not a citizen	55	23.9
Born abroad of American parents	10	4.3

TABLE P41

WHEN DID YOU COME TO THE UNITED STATES TO STAY?
 (those not born in the United States)
 (respondents and spouses)

<u>Year Arrived</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Before 1900	2	0.9
1900-1919	60	23.3
1920-1929	42	19.8
1930-1939	10	4.7
1940-1949	20	9.4
1950-1959	20	9.4
1960-1969	7	3.3
1970-1975	8	3.8
Since 1975	43	20.3

TABLE P42

DID YOU PRIMARILY SPEAK A LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH
 WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?
 (respondents and spouses)

<u>Language</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes, Yiddish	179	11.7
Yes, Hebrew	9	0.6
Yes, other	100	6.5
No, spoke primarily English	1246	81.2

TABLE P45

WHAT IS THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF SCHOOLING YOU HAVE COMPLETED?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>School Level</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1st or less	6	0.4
2nd	3	0.2
3rd	2	0.1
4th	1	0.1
5th	1	0.1
6th	7	0.5
7th	4	0.3
8th	48	3.1
9th	17	1.1
10th	44	2.9
11th	22	10.7
12th	331	21.5
Some college	330	21.5
Finished college degree	334	21.7
Some work on masters	45	2.9
Completed masters	153	10.0
Some Ph.D. work	25	1.6
Finished Ph.D.	23	1.5
M.D.	55	3.6
Law degree	44	2.9
Other	32	2.1
No formal education	9	0.6

TABLE P46

ARE YOU CURRENTLY ATTENDING SCHOOL?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Currently in School</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	66	4.3
No	1484	95.7

TABLE P47

IF IN SCHOOL, WHAT LEVEL ARE YOU CURRENTLY ATTENDING?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Level</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
12th	4	6.0
College	17	25.3
Masters	16	23.8
Ph.D.	10	14.9
M.D.	3	4.5
Law degree	5	7.5
Other	12	17.9

TABLE P51

WHAT WAS YOUR FAMILY'S RELIGIOUS IDENTITY WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Religious Identity</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Orthodox	560	39.2
Conservative	331	23.2
Reform	461	32.3
More than one religion	9	0.6
Traditional	14	1.0
Other	53	3.7

TABLE P52

HOW MANY YEARS OF FORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION HAVE YOU RECEIVED?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Number of Years</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	250	17.6
Less than one year	45	3.2
One-five years	317	22.3
Six-10 years	659	46.3
11 years or more	153	10.7

TABLE P55

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION
(respondents and spouses)

Response	Total	Percent	Men		Women	
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Percent	Yes	Percent
No schooling	242	17.6	74	11.1	168	22.2
Sunday school	699	49.1	292	44.0	407	53.6
Afternoon Hebrew school	524	36.8	352	53.0	172	22.7
All-day school	31	2.2	20	3.0	11	1.4
Private tutor	171	12.0	110	16.6	61	8.0
Yiddish school	27	1.9	13	2.0	14	1.8
Adult classes	45	3.2	16	2.4	29	3.8
Yeshiva high school	18	1.3	15	2.3	3	0.4
Yeshiva college	15	1.1	11	1.7	4	0.5
Other	70	4.9	32	4.8	38	5.0

TABLE P57

WHAT KIND OF RELIGIOUS TRAINING DID YOUR PARENTS HAVE?
(respondents and spouses)

Education	Mother		Father	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No schooling	335	45.1	153	19.1
Sunday school	196	26.4	133	16.6
Afternoon Hebrew school	98	13.2	337	42.1
All-day school	19	2.6	36	4.5
Private tutor	45	6.1	89	11.1
Yiddish school	23	3.1	44	5.5
Adult classes	13	1.8	6	0.8
Yeshiva high school	2	0.3	16	2.0
Yeshiva college	0	0.0	20	2.5
Other	47	6.3	62	7.8

TABLE P58

WERE YOU BAR/BAT MITZVAH?
(respondents and spouses)

Response	Total		Men		Women	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	514	34.9	461	67.5	51	6.5
No	960	65.1	222	32.5	787	93.5

TABLE P59

WERE YOU CONFIRMED?
(respondents and spouses)

Response	Total		Men		Women	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	579	39.4	228	33.6	351	44.5
No	891	60.6	679	66.4	437	55.5

TABLE P61

DO YOU HAVE A LASTING DISABILITY WHICH AFFECTS YOU IN ANY
OF THE FOLLOWING WAYS?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Extent of Disability</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Limits the kind or amount of work you can do at the job	70	4.6
Prevents you from working at a job	36	2.4
Limits or prevents you from using public transportation	5	0.3
No such disabling condition	1420	92.8

TABLE P62b

TOTAL NUMBER OF WEEKS WORKED LAST YEAR (1980)
(respondents and spouses)

Number of Weeks	Total		Men		Women	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0	328	24.1	67	10.1	253	36.5
1	3	0.2	0	0.0	3	0.4
2	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.3
3	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
4	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
5	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
6	5	0.4	2	0.3	3	0.4
8	7	0.5	1	0.2	6	0.9
10	5	0.4	2	0.3	3	0.4
12	14	1.0	1	0.2	13	1.9
13	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
14	3	0.2	1	0.2	2	0.3
15	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
16	6	0.4	2	0.3	4	0.6
18	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.3
20	16	1.2	4	0.6	12	1.7
22	2	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
24	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
25	6	0.4	3	0.5	3	0.4
26	19	1.4	7	1.1	12	1.7
28	4	0.3	1	0.2	3	0.4
30	15	1.1	5	0.8	10	1.4
32	6	0.4	2	0.3	4	0.6
34	2	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
35	3	0.2	0	0.0	3	0.4
36	14	1.0	4	0.6	10	1.4
38	3	0.2	1	0.2	2	0.3
39	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.3
40	40	2.9	11	1.7	29	4.2
41	2	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
42	2	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
43	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
44	9	0.7	6	0.9	3	0.4
45	8	0.6	1	0.2	7	1.0
46	12	0.9	4	0.6	8	1.2
47	9	0.7	6	0.9	3	0.4
48	64	4.7	40	6.1	24	3.5
49	23	1.7	18	2.7	5	0.7
50	202	14.8	126	19.1	76	11.0
51	35	2.6	27	4.1	8	1.2
52	482	35.4	313	47.7	167	24.1

TABLE P62c

NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED PER WEEK (1980)
(respondents and spouses)

Number of Hours	Total		Men		Women	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0	326	24.2	67	10.4	252	36.6
1	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
2	4	0.3	2	0.3	2	0.3
3	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
4	6	0.4	2	0.3	4	0.6
5	7	0.5	3	0.5	4	0.6
6	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
8	12	0.9	1	0.2	11	1.6
9	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.0
10	11	0.8	1	0.2	10	1.5
11	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
12	9	0.7	0	0.0	9	1.3
14	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
15	19	1.4	1	0.2	18	2.6
16	14	1.0	3	0.5	11	1.6
18	3	0.2	1	0.2	2	0.3
20	50	3.7	9	1.4	41	6.0
21	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
22	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
23	2	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
24	11	0.8	3	0.5	8	1.2
25	25	1.9	10	1.5	15	2.2
28	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
30	44	3.3	10	1.5	34	4.9
32	6	0.4	1	0.2	5	0.7
34	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.3
35	32	2.4	17	2.6	15	2.2
36	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
37	5	0.4	0	0.0	5	0.7
38	6	0.4	1	0.2	5	0.7
40	329	24.5	186	28.6	143	20.8
42	4	0.3	4	0.6	0	0.0
43	2	0.1	2	0.3	0	0.0
44	2	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
45	70	5.2	50	7.7	20	2.9
47	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
48	22	1.6	16	2.5	6	0.9
49	2	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
50	122	9.1	98	15.1	24	3.5

TABLE P62c
(continued)

Number of Hours	Total		Men		Women	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
51	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0.0
52	2	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
53	2	0.1	2	0.3	0	0.0
54	2	0.1	2	0.3	0	0.0
55	40	3.0	33	5.1	7	1.0
56	5	0.4	3	0.5	2	0.3
60	73	5.4	65	10.0	8	1.2
62	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0.0
63	2	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
65	16	1.2	14	2.2	2	0.3
66	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0.0
70	14	1.0	13	2.0	1	0.1
72	7	0.5	7	1.1	0	0.0
75	3	0.2	3	0.5	0	0.0
79	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
80	10	0.7	7	1.1	3	0.4
85	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0.0
88	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0.0
90	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0.0
97	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
98	3	0.2	2	0.3	1	0.1

TABLE P62d

NUMBER OF WEEKS SPENT LOOKING FOR A JOB (1980)
(respondents and spouses)

Number of Weeks	Total		Men		Women	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0	1350	97.5	614	96.8	722	98.1
1	2	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
2	4	0.3	0	0.0	4	0.5
4	3	0.2	2	0.3	1	0.1
6	2	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
7	2	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
8	4	0.3	3	0.5	1	0.1
12	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
15	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0.0
16	4	0.3	2	0.3	2	0.3
17	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0.0
20	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
22	2	0.1	2	0.3	0	0.0
26	2	0.1	2	0.3	0	0.0
40	2	0.1	1	0.2	1	0.1
44	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0.0
52	2	0.1	2	0.3	0	0.0

TABLE P63

PRIMARY PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT
(respondents and spouses)

Area	Number	Percent
Central West End-Medical Centers (63108/63110)	92	10.6
Central Business District	107	12.3
Other - St. Louis City	58	5.8
63105/63117	127	14.6
63124	18	2.1
63130	42	4.8
63132	43	4.9
63141	134	15.4
63017	36	4.1
Other - St. Louis County	186	21.3
Other	35	4.1

TABLE P65

MAIN OCCUPATION BY CATEGORY
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Executive, administrative, managerial	245	15.8
Professional specialty	338	22.3
Technicians and related support	16	1.0
Sales	414	27.1
Administrative support, including clerical	151	9.5
Service	19	1.1
Farming, forestry, fishing	1	0.1
Mechanics and repairers	30	0.8
Precision production	12	0.6
Operators, fabricators, laborers	12	0.6
Transportation and material moving	5	0.3
Homemakers	235	15.6
Other	52	3.4

TABLE P65a

MAIN OCCUPATION
(respondents and spouses)

OCCUPATION	Total		Men		Women	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Executive, Administrative and Managerial Occupations</u>						
Chief executives and general administrators, public administration	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Administrators and officials, public administration	14	0.9	5	0.7	9	1.1
Financial managers	5	0.3	1	0.1	4	0.5
Managers, marketing, advertising and public relations	14	0.9	11	1.6	3	0.4
Administrators, education and related fields	6	0.4	2	0.3	4	0.5
Managers, properties and real estate	11	0.7	6	0.9	5	0.6
Managers and administrators, n.e.c.	130	8.6	100	14.3	30	3.5
Accountants and auditors	27	1.8	17	2.4	10	1.2
Underwriters	2	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1
Other financial officers	3	0.2	2	0.3	1	0.1
Management analysts	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Personal training and labor relations specialists	5	0.3	2	0.3	3	0.4
Buyers, wholesale and retail trade, except farm	12	0.8	8	1.1	4	0.5
Purchasing agents and buyers, n.e.c.	2	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1
Inspectors and compliance officers, exc. construction	6	0.4	3	0.4	3	0.4
Management-related occupations, n.e.c.	5	0.3	1	0.1	4	0.5
<u>Professional Specialty</u>						
Architects	6	0.4	5	0.7	1	0.1
Aerospace engineers	3	0.2	2	0.3	1	0.1
Chemical engineers	3	0.2	3	0.4	0	0.0
Agricultural engineers	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Electrical and electronic engineers	14	0.9	11	1.6	3	0.4
Industrial engineers	4	0.3	4	0.6	0	0.0
Mechanical engineers	3	0.2	3	0.4	0	0.0
Engineers, n.e.c.	11	0.7	10	1.4	1	0.1
Computer systems analysts and scientists	9	0.6	5	0.7	3	0.4
Operations and systems researchers and analysts	2	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1

TABLE P65a
(continued)

OCCUPATION	Total		Men		Women	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Chemists, except biochemists	7	0.5	7	1.0	0	0.0
Biological and life scientists	4	0.3	2	0.3	2	0.2
Physicians	49	3.2	45	6.4	4	0.5
Dentists	8	0.5	8	1.1	0	0.0
Veterinarians	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Optometrists	3	0.2	3	0.4	0	0.0
Podiatrists	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Health diagnosing practitioners, n.e.c.	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Registered nurses	8	0.5	0	0.0	8	1.0
Pharmacists	8	0.5	8	1.1	0	0.0
Dietitians	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Occupational therapists	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.2
Physical therapists	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Speech therapists	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Therapists, n.e.c.	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Medical science teachers	2	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1
Health specialties teachers	2	0.1	2	0.3	0	0.0
Education teachers	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
English teachers	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Foreign language teachers	3	0.2	0	0.0	3	0.4
Law teachers	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Postsecondary teachers, subject not specified	5	0.3	3	0.4	2	0.2
Teachers, prekindergarten and kindergarten	15	1.0	0	0.0	15	1.8
Teachers, elementary school	16	1.0	1	0.1	15	1.8
Teachers, secondary school	3	0.2	1	0.1	2	0.2
Teachers, special education	11	0.7	1	0.1	10	1.2
Teachers, n.e.c.	24	1.6	2	0.3	22	2.6
Counselors, educational and vocational	8	0.5	4	0.6	4	0.5
Economists	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Psychologists	9	0.6	3	0.4	0	0.0
Social workers	12	0.8	2	0.3	10	1.2
Clergy	6	0.4	6	0.9	0	0.0
Religious workers, n.e.c.	3	0.2	0	0.0	3	0.4
Lawyers	39	2.5	32	4.6	7	0.8
Authors	5	0.3	3	0.4	2	0.2

TABLE P65a
(continued)

OCCUPATION	Total		Men		Women	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Sales workers, parts	4	0.3	4	0.6	0	0.0
Sales workers, other commodities	44	2.9	25	3.6	19	2.3
Sales counter clerks	4	0.3	0	0.0	4	0.5
Cashiers	6	0.4	0	0.0	6	0.7
Street and door-to-door sales workers	3	0.2	3	0.4	0	0.0
News vendors	2	0.1	2	0.3	0	0.0
Sales support occupations, n.e.c.	34	2.3	14	2.0	20	2.4
<u>Administrative Support, Including Clerical</u>						
Supervisors, general office	4	0.3	0	0.0	4	0.5
Computer operators	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Secretaries	63	4.1	0	0.0	63	7.5
Typists	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Interviewers	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Hotel clerks	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Transportation ticket and reservation agents	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Receptionists	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Personnel clerks, except payroll and timekeeping	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.2
Library clerks	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
File clerks	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.2
Records clerks	6	0.4	0	0.0	6	0.7
Bookkeepers, accounting and auditing clerks	36	2.3	4	0.6	32	3.8
Payroll and timekeeping clerks	3	0.2	1	0.1	2	0.2
Billing clerks	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.2
Postal clerks, exc. postal service	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Stock and inventory clerks	3	0.2	2	0.3	1	0.1
Insurance adjusters, examiners and investigators	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.2
General office clerks	13	0.8	2	0.3	11	1.3
Bank tellers	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.2
Data-entry keyers	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.2
Teacher's aides	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Administrative support occupations, n.e.c.	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.2

TABLE P65a
(continued)

OCCUPATION	Total		Men		Women	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Technical writers	5	0.3	2	0.3	3	0.4
Designers	4	0.3	0	0.0	4	0.5
Musicians and composers	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Painters, sculptors, craft-artists and artists	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Photographers	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Artists, performers and related workers, n.e.c.	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Editors and reporters	9	0.6	4	0.6	5	0.6
Announcers	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
<u>Technicians and Related Support</u>						
Clinical laboratory technologists and technicians	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Dental hygienists	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.2
Radiologic technicians	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.2
Licensed practical nurses	2	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1
Health technologists and technicians, n.e.c.	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.2
Electrical and electronic technicians	4	0.3	4	0.6	0	0.0
Technicians, n.e.c.	3	0.2	1	0.1	2	0.2
<u>Sales and Sales-Related Occupations</u>						
Owns own business, noninventory	54	3.5	47	5.7	7	0.8
Consulting business	3	0.2	1	0.1	0	0.0
Owns manufacturing firm	10	0.7	9	1.3	2	0.2
Supervisors and proprietors, sales occupations	142	9.3	108	15.4	33	4.0
Insurance sales occupations	13	0.8	12	1.7	1	0.1
Real estate sales occupations	22	1.4	7	1.0	15	1.8
Securities and financial services sales occupations	10	0.7	7	1.0	3	0.4
Advertising and related sales occupations	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Sales occupations, other business services	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Sales representatives, mining, manufacturing and wholesale	22	1.4	17	2.4	5	0.6
Sales workers, apparel	31	2.0	10	1.4	21	2.5
Sales workers, shoes	3	0.2	3	0.4	0	0.0
Sales workers, furniture and home furnishings	6	0.4	4	0.6	2	0.2

TABLE P65a
(continued)

OCCUPATION	Total		Men		Women	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Service</u>						
Sheriffs, bailiffs and other law enforcement officers	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Supervisors, food preparation and service occupations	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Bartenders	2	0.1	2	0.3	0	0.0
Waiters and waitresses	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Cooks, except short-order	4	0.3	0	0.0	4	0.5
Miscellaneous food preparation occupations	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Dental assistants	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Hairdressers and cosmetologists	3	0.2	0	0.0	3	0.4
Guides	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Ushers	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Public transportation attendants	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Personal service occupations, n.e.c.	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
<u>Farming, Forestry and Fishing</u>						
Farmers, except horticultural	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
<u>Precision Production, Craft and Repair</u>						
Aircraft engine mechanics	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Household appliance and power tool repairers	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Miscellaneous electrical and electronic equipment repairers	2	0.1	2	0.3	0	0.0
Specified mechanics and repairers, n.e.c.	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Mechanics and repairers, not specified	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Supervisors, n.e.c.	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Painters, construction and maintenance	3	0.2	3	0.4	0	0.0
Plumbers, pipefitters and steamfitters	3	0.2	3	0.4	0	0.0
Supervisors, production occupations	4	0.3	3	0.4	1	0.1
Machinists	2	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1
Precision stone and metal workers (jewelers)	2	0.1	2	0.3	0	0.0
Furniture and wood finishers	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Dressmakers	7	0.5	0	0.0	7	0.8

TABLE P65a
(continued)

OCCUPATION	Total		Men		Women	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Miscellaneous precision apparel and fabric workers	5	0.3	0	0.0	5	0.6
Hand molders and shapers, except jewelers	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Butchers and meat cutters	6	0.4	6	0.9	0	0.0
Bakers	2	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.2
<u>Machine Operators, Assemblers and Inspectors</u>						
Textile cutting machine operators	2	0.1	2	0.3	0	0.0
Textile sewing machine operators	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Pressing machine operators	3	0.2	2	0.3	1	0.1
Miscellaneous textile machine operators	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
Machine operators, not specified	4	0.3	2	0.3	2	0.2
Assemblers	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1
<u>Transportation and Material Moving</u>						
Truck drivers, heavy	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Taxicab drivers and chauffeurs	2	0.1	2	0.3	0	0.0
Stock handlers and baggers	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
Laborers, except construction	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0
<u>Other</u>						
Homemakers	239	15.6	4	0.6	234	28.0
Students	12	0.8	5	0.7	7	0.8
Unpaid workers in family business	18	1.2	0	0.0	18	2.2
Occupation not reported	20	1.4	3	0.3	17	1.9

TABLE P67

DO YOU HAVE ANOTHER OCCUPATION, BESIDES YOUR MAIN WORK,
FOR WHICH YOU ARE PAID OR EARN AN INCOME?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	124	8.1
No	1536	91.9

TABLE P70

OCCUPATIONAL TYPE

<u>Occupational Type</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Men</u>		<u>Women</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Working for somebody else as employee of private company, business or individual, for wages, salary or commissions	719	61.7	329	50.6	386	74.1
Self-employed in own business, professional practice or other that is incorporated	268	23.0	206	31.7	62	11.9
Self-employed in own business, professional practice or other that is not incorporated	123	10.5	84	12.9	38	7.3
Working without pay in family business	4	0.3	0	0.0	4	0.8
Working with pay in family business	42	3.6	28	4.3	14	2.7
Other	10	0.9	3	0.5	7	1.3
TOTAL	<u>1,166</u>		<u>650</u>		<u>511</u>	

TABLE P71

PARENTS' OCCUPATION

Age	Executive, Administrative, Managerial		Professional		Technicians		Sales		Administrative Support		Service	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-40	59	3.44	235	13.71	12	0.70	293	17.09	157	9.16	12	0.70
41-60	39	1.51	78	3.02	1	0.04	361	13.99	105	4.07	15	0.58
Over 60	11	0.67	20	1.22	11	0.67	166	10.13	0	0.00	25	1.53

Age	Farming, Forestry		Mechanics, Repairers		Precision Production		Operators, Fabricators, Laborers		Transportation		Homemakers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-40	1	0.06	2	0.12	3	0.18	3	0.18	1	0.06	803	46.85
41-60	0	0.00	6	0.23	60	2.32	19	0.74	4	0.15	1485	57.54
Over 60	1	0.06	5	0.31	60	3.66	6	0.37	12	0.73	1111	67.69

Age	Other	
	Number	Percent
21-40	133	7.76
41-60	408	15.81
Over 60	211	12.87

TABLE P72

FATHER'S OCCUPATIONAL TYPE
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Occupational Type</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Working for somebody else as employee of private company, business or individual, for wages, salary or commissions	545	36.4
Self-employed in own business, professional practice or other that <u>is</u> incorporated	410	27.4
Self-employed in own business, professional practice or other that <u>is not</u> incorporated	403	26.9
Working <u>without</u> pay in family business	2	0.1
Working with pay in family business	124	8.3
Other	14	0.9

TABLE P-Z1

TOTAL POPULATION ACCORDING TO ZIP CODE

<u>Zip Code</u>	<u>Percent</u>
63011	4.3
63017	9.2
63043	1.8
63105	8.7
63108	2.1
63110	0.3
63112	0.7
63114	0.7
63117	1.3
63119	0.3
63122	0.2
63124	9.0
63130	12.3
63131	2.8
63132	12.7
63141	30.8
63144	0.3
Other	2.5

TABLE PH1-PZ

MEAN HOUSEHOLD SIZE BY ZIP CODE

<u>Zip Code</u>	<u>Mean</u>
63131/63141	2.8
63105/63117	2.5
63124	2.3
63130	2.3
63132	2.5
63011	2.6
63017	2.7
63108/63110/63112	1.9

TABLE E1

IF YOU ARE GOING TO STAY IN THE ST. LOUIS AREA, DO YOU EXPECT THAT YOU WILL
HAVE ANY CHANGES IN YOUR HOUSING NEEDS IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS?
(households over 60 years of age)

<u>Housing Change</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Move from St. Louis area	30	9.3
Move into a smaller house	12	4.0
Move to lower rent	7	2.3
Move to housing with no stairs	1	0.3
Need institutional care	7	2.3
Apartment is being converted into condominiums	5	1.7
Move to a safer neighborhood	4	1.3
Other	17	5.6

TABLE E3

HOW SAFE WOULD YOU SAY YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD IS?
(households over 60 years of age)

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very safe	117	36.1
Pretty safe	170	52.5
Pretty unsafe	31	9.6
Not safe at all	5	1.5
Don't know	1	0.3

TABLE E4

HAVE YOU USED ANY OF THESE COMMUNITY SERVICES IN THE PAST
12 MONTHS?
(households over 60 years of age)

<u>Service</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Library	155	45.9
Public transportation	87	25.6
Jewish Community Centers Association	113	33.2
Homemaker services	8	2.4
Meals-on-wheels to residence	6	1.8
Meals at a nutrition center	19	5.6
Home health care	11	3.2
Day care service	4	1.2
Legal aid	6	1.8
Temple or synagogue	245	72.1
Police department	48	14.1
Fire department	4	1.2
Telephone information service	80	23.6
Social worker	14	4.1
Multi-Service Senior Center	19	5.6
Alcohol abuse treatment organization	0	0.0
Other	4	1.2

TABLE E5

DO YOU HAVE PROBLEMS OBTAINING THE SERVICES
YOU WOULD LIKE TO USE?
(households over 60 years of age)

<u>Problem</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No problems	305	90.0
Can't get to them	11	3.2
Cost too much	2	0.6
Don't know what services are available	3	0.9
Health problems	6	1.8
Other	12	3.5

TABLE E6

HOW DO YOU USUALLY GET YOUR FOOD SHOPPING DONE?
(households over 60 years of age)

<u>Method of Shopping</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Walk	8	2.4
Bus	10	3.0
Taxi	3	0.9
Own car	235	69.9
Get driven by relative	46	13.7
Get driven by friend	6	1.8
Food delivery	5	1.5
Other	23	6.8

TABLE E7

HOW CONVENIENT ARE THE FOLLOWING TO YOUR CURRENT RESIDENCE?
(households over 60 years of age)

<u>Service</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Convenient for shopping	291	87.7
Convenient to transportation	238	88.6
Convenient to residences of family	263	79.2
Convenient to residences of friends	289	86.8
Convenient to the Jewish Community Centers Association	223	67.6
Convenient to medical services	268	80.5
Convenient to temple or synagogue	257	79.3

TABLE E8

HOW MANY HOSPITALIZATIONS HAVE YOU HAD IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS?
(households over 60 years of age)

<u>Number of Hospitalizations</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
One	63	18.5
Two	23	6.8
Three	7	2.1
Four	4	1.2
Five	1	0.3
Six or more	1	0.3
None	247	72.7

TABLE E9

DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN WHO LIVE IN THE ST. LOUIS AREA?
(households over 60 years of age)

<u>Any Children</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	247	72.6
No	88	25.9

TABLE E10

HOW MANY TIMES PER MONTH, ON THE AVERAGE, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU
AND MEMBERS OF YOUR FAMILY SEE EACH OTHER?
(households over 60 years of age)

<u>Frequency of Family Visits</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
One time	22	6.6
Two times	22	6.6
Three times	18	5.4
Four times	39	11.7
Five or more times	189	55.9
No family in St. Louis	37	11.1
No visits	4	1.2

TABLE R1

DO YOU CURRENTLY BELONG TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE?

<u>Affiliated</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	500	65.6
No	314	34.4

TABLE R2

TO WHAT TYPE OF SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE DO YOU CURRENTLY BELONG?

<u>Type</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Orthodox	76	12.7
Conservative	154	25.7
Reform	361	60.2
Traditional	7	1.2
Other	2	0.3

TABLE R3

IF YOU DO NOT CURRENTLY BELONG TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE,
DID YOU EVER BELONG TO ONE AFTER YOU WERE GROWN UP?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	191	56.3
No	145	43.2

TABLE R4

IF YOU USED TO BELONG TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE (BUT ARE
NOT CURRENTLY AFFILIATED), WHAT TYPE WAS IT?

<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Orthodox	31	15.6
Conservative	62	31.2
Reform	102	51.3
Traditional	4	2.0

TABLE R5

REASONS FOR NOT BELONGING TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE
(list all those that apply)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Never have been and just not interested	35	11.4
Used to belong but no longer interested	58	18.9
Costs too much	91	29.6
Went mainly for educational training for children which is now completed	38	12.4
Moved too far away from a synagogue or temple	12	3.9
Bad experience in Sunday school or Hebrew school	17	5.5
Don't have the time	26	8.5
Went mainly for my own educational training which is now completed	13	4.2
Other	109	35.6
Don't know	8	2.6

TABLE R6

WHAT IS YOUR SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR NOT BELONGING
TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE?

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Never have been and just not interested	29	9.6
Used to belong but no longer interested	33	11.0
Costs too much	65	21.6
Went mainly for educational training for children which is now completed	23	7.6
Moved too far away from a synagogue or temple	8	2.7
Bad experience in Sunday school or Hebrew school	9	3.0
Don't have the time	22	7.3
Went mainly for my own educational training which is now completed	4	1.3
Other	108	35.9

TABLE R7

DID YOUR PARENTS BELONG TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE WHEN YOU WERE
GROWING UP?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Affiliated</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No	276	18.5
Yes	1220	81.6

TABLE R8

TO WHAT TYPE OF SYNAGOGUE DID YOUR PARENTS BELONG?
(IF AFFILIATED)
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Synagogue</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Orthodox	513	42.1
Conservative	285	23.4
Reform	407	33.4
Traditional	4	0.3
Other	9	0.7

TABLE R9

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING CEREMONIAL OBJECTS DO YOU HAVE IN YOUR HOME?

<u>Ceremonial Object</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Mezuzah	698	76.3
Menorah	728	79.5
Kiddish cup	560	61.3

TABLE R10

HOW OFTEN WOULD YOU SAY EACH OF THE FOLLOWING PRACTICES IS OBSERVED
BY YOUR HOUSEHOLD?

Religious Practices	Always		Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Light candles on Friday night	183	20.1	71	7.8	169	18.6	486	53.5
Have a Passover Seder in my home	288	31.7	113	12.4	122	13.4	385	42.4
Attend a Passover Seder outside my home	359	39.5	154	16.9	206	22.6	191	21.0
Buy kosher meat for my home	172	18.9	21	2.3	142	15.6	575	63.2
Eat nonkosher meat outside my home	687	75.6	72	7.9	48	5.3	102	11.2
Use two sets of dishes in my home	136	14.9	9	1.0	13	1.4	752	82.6
Walk to synagogue or temple	44	4.8	6	0.7	34	3.7	826	90.8
Light Chanukah candles	603	66.3	53	5.8	69	7.6	185	20.3
Have a Christmas tree	71	7.8	16	1.8	44	4.8	779	85.6
Stay home from work or school								
on High Holidays	666	73.5	66	7.3	56	6.2	118	13.0
Have an Easter egg hunt in my house	28	3.1	21	2.3	43	4.7	813	89.9
Use a mikvah	14	1.5	1	0.1	16	1.8	877	96.6

TABLE R11

EVEN IF YOU DON'T CURRENTLY BELONG TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE, HOW OFTEN
(ON A YEARLY AVERAGE) DO YOU ATTEND SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE SERVICES?*

<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Never	118	13.1
High Holidays	703	78.2
Occasional bar/bat mitzvah	403	44.8
Festivals like Purim, Sukkot	273	30.4
Most Friday nights	40	4.5
An occasional Saturday or Friday night	386	43.0
Most Saturdays	72	8.0
Daily, or almost daily	11	1.2
Other	88	9.8

*Percent may be more than 100%; multiple answers were given.

TABLE R12

HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE QUALITY OF THE JEWISH EDUCATION
YOUR CHILDREN ARE RECEIVING OR HAVE RECEIVED?

<u>Quality</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Excellent	127	17.5
Good	289	31.9
Fair	165	22.8
Poor	33	4.6
Very poor	17	2.3
No Jewish education for children	94	13.0

TABLE R13

HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE QUALITY OF THE JEWISH EDUCATION
THAT YOU RECEIVED?

<u>Quality</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Excellent	110	12.2
Good	286	31.7
Fair	216	24.0
Poor	98	10.9
Very poor	39	4.3
No Jewish education	152	16.9

TABLE R14

HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU FEEL IT IS FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING SUBJECTS
TO BE INCLUDED IN A JEWISH EDUCATIONAL CURRICULUM?

Subject	Very Important		Somewhat Important		Not Very Important		Don't Know	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Jewish philosophy and ethics	685	75.1	163	17.9	27	3.0	37	4.1
Bible	705	77.2	148	16.2	29	3.2	31	3.4
Jewish observances	682	74.8	168	18.4	36	3.9	26	2.9
Holocaust	703	77.3	139	15.3	32	3.5	36	4.0
Postbiblical Jewish history	652	71.4	185	20.3	34	3.7	42	4.6
Other	141	18.4	15	2.0	5	0.7	606	79.0
The meanings of the Jewish festivals	738	80.9	128	14.0	19	2.1	27	3.0
Israel	696	76.2	160	17.5	30	3.3	27	3.0
Hebrew	445	48.8	259	28.4	166	18.2	41	4.5
Talmud	445	48.9	277	30.4	127	14.0	61	6.7

TABLE R15

WHICH OF THESE DO YOU FEEL IS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT
SUBJECT TO BE TAUGHT IN A JEWISH SCHOOL?

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Jewish philosophy and ethics	310	38.8
Bible	138	17.3
Jewish observances	80	10.0
Holocaust	67	8.4
Postbiblical Jewish history	56	7.0
Other	42	5.3
The meanings of the Jewish festivals	41	5.1
Israel	26	3.3
Hebrew	21	2.6
Talmud	19	2.4

TABLE H1

HOW MANY ROOMS DO YOU HAVE IN YOUR LIVING QUARTERS?

<u>Number of Rooms</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
One room	10	1.1
Two rooms	9	1.0
Three rooms	49	5.4
Four rooms	65	7.2
Five rooms	117	13.0
Six rooms	152	16.9
Seven rooms	192	21.3
Eight rooms	148	16.4
Nine or more rooms	156	17.3

TABLE H2

WHAT TYPE OF PAYMENT IS USED FOR YOUR LIVING QUARTERS?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Owned or being bought by you or by someone else in this household	648	72.1
Rented for cash rent	248	27.6
Occupied without payment or cash rent	3	0.3

TABLE H7

IS YOUR HOME A CONDOMINIUM?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	69	7.7
No	827	92.3

TABLE H7A

IS YOUR HOME A CO-OP?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	6	0.7
No	891	99.3

TABLE H9

WHEN WAS YOUR HOME ORIGINALLY CONSTRUCTED?

<u>Date</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1979-1980	48	5.6
1975-1978	83	9.7
1970-1974	101	11.8
1960-1969	262	30.7
1950-1959	157	18.4
1949 or earlier	203	23.8

TABLE H10

WHICH OF THESE BEST DESCRIBES THE BUILDING YOU LIVE IN?

<u>Type of Building</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
A mobile home or trailer	0	0.0
A one-family house detached from any other house	569	63.2
A one-family house attached to one or more houses	26	2.9
A building for two families	28	3.1
A building for three-four families	63	7.0
A building for five-nine families	62	6.9
A building for 10-19 families	52	5.8
A building for 20-49 families	50	5.5
A building for 50 or more families	50	5.5
Other	1	0.1

TABLE H15

HOW MANY AUTOMOBILES ARE KEPT AT HOME FOR USE BY
MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD?

<u>Number of Automobiles</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	82	9.0
One	274	30.2
Two	418	46.1
Three	133	14.7

TABLE HP1

DOES YOUR FAMILY HAVE A PRIVATE PHYSICIAN?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	869	94.8
No	48	5.2

TABLE HP2

HAVE YOU HAD A HOSPITALIZATION IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	840	54.8
No	694	45.2

TABLE HP3

WHAT IS THE LAST HOSPITAL YOU HAVE USED?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Hospital</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Barnes	178	21.4
Jewish	386	46.5
St. John's	86	10.3
St. Luke's East	39	4.7
St. Luke's West	4	0.5
Other	82	9.9
Don't know	12	1.4

TABLE HP4

OF WHAT TYPE WAS YOUR MOST RECENT HOSPITAL CARE?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Type Of Hospital Care</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Emergency room only	94	11.1
Outpatient	108	12.7
Inpatient	638	75.2
Clinic	5	0.6
Other	3	0.4

TABLE HP5

ARE YOU CONFINED TO A WHEELCHAIR OR OTHERWISE DISABLED?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No	1479	96.7
Yes, wheelchair	22	1.4
Other disability	29	1.9

TABLE HP6

IF YOU HAVE A DISABILITY, WHAT LIMITATIONS DOES IT CAUSE?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Limitations</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Severely limits access to receiving services	42	59.3
Somewhat limits access	22	28.9
Does not limit access to services at all	7	9.2
Don't know	5	6.6

TABLE HP7

IS THERE ANYONE IN THE HOUSEHOLD WHO NEEDS ANY ASSISTANCE
IN PERFORMING EVERYDAY FUNCTIONS?

<u>Needs Daily Assistance</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes, all the time	21	2.3
Yes, most of the time	21	2.3
Yes, occasionally	26	2.9
No, not at all	838	92.5

TABLE HP8

HAVE YOU SEEN A PHYSICIAN, FOR ANY REASON, IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS?
(respondents and spouses)

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No	244	16.0
Checkup	862	56.5
Acute problem	198	13.0
Chronic problem	138	9.0
Emergency	15	1.0
Other	68	4.5

TABLE C1

HAVE YOU EVER BELONGED TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	592	64.7
No	321	35.1

TABLE C2

IF NOT CURRENTLY A MEMBER OR HAVE NEVER BEEN A MEMBER,
WHAT IS THE MAIN REASON YOU DON'T CURRENTLY BELONG
TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Financial reasons	93	16.3
too busy	121	21.1
Not interested in the services	225	39.3
Poor scheduling of services	12	2.1
Inconvenient to get there	106	18.5
Don't like to belong to a Jewish organization	3	0.5
Used a service that is no longer needed	57	9.9
Problems with staff	8	1.4
Poor quality of services	5	0.9
Other	65	11.3

TABLE C3

DO YOU OR YOUR FAMILY CURRENTLY BELONG TO THE
JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	252	29.8
No	593	70.0
Don't know	2	0.2

TABLE C4

WHAT ARE THE REASONS THAT YOU USE OR HAVE USED THE
JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?

<u>Reason for Service Use</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Convenient to my residence	92	16.1
Convenient to my work	29	5.1
Cultural and educational activities	181	31.2
Like to be part of a Jewish social environment	169	29.6
Provides a number of services for me and/or my family	399	70.0
Want to have or want my children to have Jewish social contacts	151	26.5
Other	126	22.1

TABLE C5

WHAT IS YOUR SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR USING
THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?

<u>Reason for Service Use</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Convenient to my residence	5	0.9
Convenient to my work	3	0.5
Cultural and educational activities	61	10.6
Like to be part of a Jewish social environment	55	9.6
Provides a number of services for me and/or my family	280	48.9
Want to have or want my children to have Jewish social contacts	53	9.3
Other	102	17.8
Don't know	10	1.7

TABLE C6

HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE PROGRAMS THAT YOU HAVE
USED AT THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Excellent	181	31.8
Good	274	48.1
Fair	63	11.1
Poor	7	1.2
Very poor	5	0.9
Don't know	40	7.0

TABLE C7

HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE QUALITY OF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMS THAT YOU HAVE USED
AT THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION?

Program	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Very Poor	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Day care	23	65.7	9	25.7	2	5.7	1	2.9	0	0.0
Preschool	31	45.6	25	36.8	7	10.3	3	4.4	2	2.9
Health and physical education	158	37.6	226	53.8	28	6.7	7	1.7	1	0.2
Senior adults programs	55	49.6	50	45.0	5	4.5	0	0.0	1	0.9
Family programming and group services	25	24.3	59	57.3	14	13.6	4	3.9	1	1.0
Cultural arts	85	37.0	129	56.1	16	7.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Volunteer programs	26	33.3	46	59.0	4	5.1	2	2.6	0	0.0
Camps	92	37.9	119	49.0	28	15.2	3	1.2	1	0.4

TABLE C10

GENERALLY, IS BEING NEAR TO JEWISH INSTITUTIONS IMPORTANT TO YOU?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very important	282	30.8
Somewhat important	292	31.9
Not important	335	36.6
Don't know	6	0.7

TABLE C11

DO YOU HAVE TRANSPORTATION ACCESS PROBLEMS
TO JEWISH INSTITUTIONS?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Always	53	5.8
Sometimes	109	11.9
Never	740	80.9
Don't know	13	1.4

TABLE C12

DO YOU RECEIVE THE ST. LOUIS JEWISH LIGHT?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	755	82.5
No	157	17.2
Don't know	1	0.1

TABLE C13

WHICH OF THESE NEWS CATEGORIES IN THE ST. LOUIS JEWISH LIGHT
DO YOU USUALLY READ?

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
News about Israel	653	77.2
Birth, marriage, engagement, obituary sections	686	81.4
News about Jews in other foreign countries	598	70.9
News about Jewish life throughout the U.S.	635	75.3
News about Jewish life in St. Louis	696	82.6
News about the Jewish Federation of St. Louis	599	71.1
Reviews of plays, books, movies and television shows	626	74.3

TABLE C14

WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE SHOULD BE THE PRIORITY OF THESE SERVICES IN THE JEWISH COMMUNITY?

Service	First Most Important		Second Most Important		Third Most Important		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Vocational or educational guidance and aptitude testing	15	1.7	15	1.7	14	1.6	5.0
Family counseling and care	55	6.1	29	3.2	28	3.1	12.4
Housing for the elderly	300	33.1	142	15.8	93	10.3	59.2
Transportation for the elderly	34	3.8	92	10.2	48	5.3	19.3
Youth activities	29	3.2	39	4.3	36	4.0	11.5
Youth camps	7	0.8	9	1.0	11	1.2	3.0
Child adoption services for Jewish households	10	1.1	5	0.6	5	0.6	2.3
Cultural programs	22	2.4	26	2.9	29	3.2	8.5
Marital, parent-child or individual counseling	20	2.2	16	1.8	22	2.4	6.4
Nursing homes	49	5.4	101	11.2	68	7.5	24.1
Programs for the handicapped	12	1.3	26	2.9	38	4.2	8.4
Educational programs	53	5.9	48	5.3	43	4.8	16.0
Programs that help combat anti-Semitism	29	3.2	31	3.4	54	6.0	12.6
General recreational facilities	11	1.2	11	1.2	27	3.0	5.4
Scholarships for youths to visit Israel	2	0.2	6	0.7	11	1.2	2.1
Day care for preschool children	16	1.8	18	2.0	16	1.8	5.6
Nursery schools	3	0.3	7	0.8	3	0.3	1.4
Help finding a job	6	0.7	15	1.7	15	1.7	4.1
Financial assistance if you had a financial problem	7	0.8	7	0.8	25	2.8	4.4
Day care for the elderly	21	2.3	52	5.8	79	8.8	16.9
Jewish Family & Children's Service	84	9.3	54	6.0	63	7.0	22.3
Jewish Employment & Vocational Service	14	1.5	33	3.7	34	3.8	9.0
A loan fund for higher education	7	0.8	15	1.7	19	2.1	4.6
A Reform day school	5	0.6	3	0.3	3	0.3	1.2
A Conservative day school	7	0.8	1	0.1	6	0.7	1.6
Assistance for individuals or families with drug abuse problems	3	0.3	4	0.4	7	0.8	1.5
Assistance for individuals or families with alcohol abuse problems	0	0.0	1	0.1	1	0.1	0.2
Other	13	1.4	15	1.7	9	1.0	4.1
Don't know	71	7.8	80	8.9	95	10.5	27.2

TABLE C15

DO YOU BELIEVE THAT YOU OR SOMEONE IN YOUR FAMILY WILL USE THESE SERVICES
IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS?

Service	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Vocational or educational guidance and aptitude testing	93	10.2	731	80.1	87	9.5
Family counseling and care	98	10.7	705	77.2	110	12.0
Housing for the elderly	169	18.6	645	70.8	97	10.6
Transportation for the elderly	149	16.3	678	74.3	85	9.3
Youth activities	188	20.6	659	72.2	66	7.2
Youth camps	153	16.8	697	76.3	63	6.9
Child adoption services for Jewish households	40	4.4	798	87.4	75	8.2
Cultural programs	350	38.4	491	53.9	70	7.7
Marital parent-child or individual counseling	77	8.5	720	79.0	114	12.5
Nursing homes	99	10.8	692	75.8	120	13.1
Programs for the handicapped	58	6.4	764	83.7	91	10.0
Educational programs	339	37.2	485	53.2	87	9.5
Programs that help combat anti-Semitism	229	25.2	572	62.9	109	12.0
General recreational facilities	341	37.3	498	54.5	74	8.1
Scholarships for youths to visit Israel	82	9.0	756	83.0	73	8.0
Day care for preschool children	82	9.0	759	83.2	71	7.8
Nursery schools	103	11.3	746	81.7	64	7.0
Help finding a job	91	10.0	720	78.9	102	11.2
Financial assistance if you had a financial problem	74	8.1	752	82.4	87	9.5
Day care for the elderly	91	10.0	731	80.1	91	10.0
Jewish Family & Children's Service	87	9.5	732	80.2	94	10.3
Jewish Employment & Vocational Service	77	8.4	745	81.6	91	10.0
A loan fund for higher education	68	7.4	772	84.6	73	8.0
A Reform day school	34	3.7	815	89.3	64	7.0
A Conservative day school	37	4.1	812	88.9	64	7.0
Assistance for individuals or families with drug abuse problems	22	2.4	816	89.4	75	8.2
Assistance for individuals or families with alcohol abuse problems	19	2.1	818	89.6	76	8.3
Other	19	2.1	622	71.4	230	26.4

TABLE C15 - IN1

NOW TELL ME IF YOU BELIEVE THAT YOU OR SOMEONE IN YOUR FAMILY WILL LIKELY USE EACH
OF THESE SERVICES SOMETIME IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS.
(by income)

Will Use Service		0-\$19,999		\$20,000-39,999		\$40,000-59,999		\$60,000 or More	
		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Vocational or educational guidance and aptitude testing	YES	17	12.3	15	11.5	13	13.7	6	5.5
	NO	120	87.0	115	88.5	81	85.3	103	94.5
Family counseling and care	YES	22	16.7	16	13.0	14	15.4	7	6.6
	NO	110	83.3	107	87.0	77	84.6	99	93.4
Housing for the elderly	YES	44	34.9	28	21.1	17	17.7	13	11.8
	NO	82	65.1	105	79.0	79	82.3	97	88.2
Transportation for the elderly	YES	45	34.9	21	15.7	14	14.6	11	9.9
	NO	84	65.1	113	84.3	82	85.4	100	90.1
Youth activities	YES	16	11.7	44	32.8	36	36.7	25	22.1
	NO	121	88.3	90	67.2	62	63.3	88	77.9
Youth camps	YES	17	12.3	38	27.5	25	26.6	20	17.7
	NO	121	87.7	100	72.5	69	73.4	93	82.3
Child adoption services for Jewish households	YES	6	4.4	9	6.7	4	4.3	3	2.7
	NO	129	95.6	125	93.3	90	95.7	109	97.3
Cultural programs	YES	58	42.7	65	48.9	50	51.6	48	42.9
	NO	78	57.4	68	51.1	47	48.5	64	57.1
Marital, parent-child or individual counseling	YES	12	9.2	15	12.3	14	16.1	9	8.4
	NO	119	90.8	107	87.7	73	83.9	98	91.6
Nursing homes	YES	11	9.5	21	16.3	13	13.8	15	13.5
	NO	105	90.5	107	83.0	81	86.2	96	86.5
Programs for the handicapped	YES	14	10.5	7	5.3	7	7.6	5	4.5
	NO	119	89.5	126	94.7	85	92.4	107	95.5
Educational programs	YES	55	40.4	67	50.8	49	51.0	43	40.2
	NO	81	59.6	65	49.2	47	49.0	63	58.9
Programs that help combat anti-Semitism	YES	41	31.3	45	35.4	35	39.3	26	24.3
	NO	90	68.7	82	64.6	54	60.7	81	75.7
General recreational facilities	YES	63	46.3	73	52.9	54	56.3	40	36.0
	NO	73	53.7	65	47.1	42	43.8	71	64.0
Scholarships for youths to visit Israel	YES	13	9.3	17	12.8	7	7.3	10	9.3
	NO	127	90.7	116	87.2	89	92.7	98	90.7
Day care for preschool children	YES	7	5.1	18	13.3	19	20.0	13	11.6
	NO	130	94.9	117	86.7	76	80.0	99	88.4
Nursery schools	YES	8	5.8	27	19.7	22	22.9	15	13.2
	NO	129	94.2	110	80.3	74	77.1	99	86.8

TABLE C15 - IN1
(continued)

Will Use Service		0-\$20,000		\$20,000-39,999		\$40,000-59,999		\$60,000 or More	
		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Help finding a job	YES	20	15.5	18	14.1	11	12.4	9	8.2
	NO	109	84.5	110	85.9	78	87.6	101	91.8
Financial assistance if you had a financial problem	YES	24	18.2	17	12.8	6	6.3	2	1.8
	NO	108	81.8	116	87.2	90	93.8	108	98.2
Day care for the elderly	YES	20	15.8	20	14.5	7	7.8	6	5.5
	NO	107	84.3	118	85.5	83	92.2	104	94.6
Jewish Family & Children's Service	YES	16	12.1	22	16.5	12	13.0	5	4.6
	NO	116	87.9	111	83.5	80	87.0	105	95.5
Jewish Employment & Vocational Service	YES	22	16.3	16	12.3	10	10.9	5	4.5
	NO	113	83.7	114	87.7	82	89.1	106	95.5
A loan fund for higher education	YES	21	14.9	18	13.1	8	8.3	1	0.9
	NO	120	85.1	119	86.9	88	91.7	109	99.1
A Reform day school	YES	4	2.9	5	3.7	4	4.1	5	4.4
	NO	135	97.1	131	96.3	94	95.9	110	95.7
A Conservative day school	YES	5	3.6	10	7.1	5	5.3	5	4.4
	NO	134	96.4	130	92.9	90	94.7	109	95.6
Assistance for individuals or families with drug abuse problems	YES	2	1.4	4	3.0	1	1.1	3	2.7
	NO	139	98.6	129	97.0	94	99.0	108	97.3
Assistance for individuals or families with alcohol abuse problems	YES	2	1.4	4	3.0	1	1.1	2	1.8
	NO	139	98.6	128	97.0	94	99.0	109	98.2

TABLE F1

DO YOU FEEL THAT A JEW HAS A GREATER OBLIGATION TO JEWISH
PHILANTHROPIES THAN TO GENERAL COMMUNITY PHILANTHROPIES?

<u>Obligation</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes, greater obligation to Jewish philanthropies	565	61.8
No, not a greater obligation to Jewish philanthropies	116	12.7
Equal obligation	206	22.5
Don't know	27	3.0

TABLE F2

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES WOULD YOU SAY ARE CURRENTLY PART
OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS' ONGOING FUNCTIONS?

<u>Jewish Federation Functions</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>Don't Know</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall community planning for the St. Louis area	580	63.8	247	27.2
Raising and allocating funds for service uses of St. Louis Jews	743	81.6	149	16.4
Raising and allocating funds for service uses of the American Jewish community	676	74.4	185	20.4
Raising and allocating funds for Israel	759	83.5	131	14.4
Raising and allocating funds for Russian Jews and Jewish communities worldwide other than Israel	682	74.9	190	20.9
Training Jewish community leaders	611	67.2	234	25.7
Sponsoring lectures and seminars on public affairs issues of Jewish interest	684	75.1	186	20.4
Other	153	18.7	571	69.9

TABLE F3

HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU BELIEVE EACH OF THESE FUNCTIONS SHOULD BE?

Function	Very Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important		Don't Know	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Overall community planning for the St. Louis area	526	58.3	222	24.6	58	6.4	97	10.7
Raising and allocating funds for service uses of St. Louis Jews	708	78.2	117	12.9	13	1.4	67	7.4
Raising and allocating funds for service uses of the American Jewish community	505	56.0	277	30.7	40	4.4	79	8.8
Raising and allocating funds for Israel	618	68.4	179	19.8	36	4.0	71	7.9
Raising and allocating funds for Russian Jews and Jewish communities worldwide other than Israel	502	55.6	267	29.6	60	6.6	74	8.2
Training Jewish community leaders	508	56.6	222	24.7	79	8.8	89	9.9
Sponsoring lectures and seminars on public affairs issues of Jewish interest	493	55.0	261	30.2	60	6.7	74	8.2
Other	150	19.6	32	4.2	14	1.8	571	74.4

TABLE F4

WHICH OF THESE DO YOU BELIEVE SHOULD BE THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT
FUNCTION OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS?

<u>Function</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Overall community planning for the St. Louis area	100	11.1
Raising and allocating funds for service uses of St. Louis Jews	382	42.4
Raising and allocating funds for service uses of the American Jewish community	68	7.6
Raising and allocating funds for Israel	105	11.7
Raising and allocating funds for Russian Jews and Jewish communities worldwide other than Israel	37	4.1
Training Jewish community leaders	30	3.3
Sponsoring lectures and seminars on public affairs issues of Jewish interest	28	3.1
Other	14	1.6
Don't know	136	15.1

TABLE F5-6

HOW MUCH PER YEAR DOES YOUR HOUSEHOLD CONTRIBUTE TO JEWISH
AND TO NON-JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES?

<u>Contribution</u>	<u>Jewish Philanthropies</u>		<u>Non-Jewish Philanthropies</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
\$0	71	9.2	71	9.2
\$50 or less	88	11.3	166	21.2
\$51-100	67	8.6	123	15.7
\$101-500	210	26.9	222	28.3
\$501-1,000	120	15.3	62	7.9
\$1,001-5,000	124	15.9	50	6.4
\$5,001-10,000	15	1.9	5	0.6
More than \$10,000	9	1.2	4	0.5
Don't know	76	9.7	80	10.2

TABLE F7

HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE PROGRAMS
OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS?

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Excellent	118	12.9
Good	317	34.8
Fair	66	7.2
Poor	10	1.1
Very poor	9	1.0
Don't know enough about it	270	29.6
Don't care	1	0.1
Don't know	118	12.9

TABLE F8-10

HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK (ON AN AVERAGE) DO YOU CURRENTLY SPEND
ON VOLUNTEER WORK WITH JEWISH AND
NON-JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS?

<u>Number of Hours</u>	<u>Jewish Organizations</u>		<u>Non-Jewish Organizations</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
None	656	71.9	737	80.6
Less than one hour	67	7.3	62	6.8
One-five hours	123	13.5	94	10.3
Six-10 hours	34	3.7	11	1.2
11-20 hours	11	1.2	5	0.5
More than 20 hours	15	1.6	5	0.5

TABLE F9

FOR WHICH ORGANIZATION(S) DO YOU SPEND YOUR VOLUNTEER TIME?
(if more than one hour)

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Temple or synagogue (including men's clubs and sisterhoods)	62	31.6
Jewish Federation of St. Louis	36	18.3
Jewish Community Centers Association	27	13.6
Women's group	60	30.3
Men's group	10	5.1
Other	76	38.6

TABLE F11

HAVE YOU MADE A CONTRIBUTION TO THE JEWISH FEDERATION
OF ST. LOUIS IN THE LAST TWO YEARS?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	684	76.0
No	193	21.4
Don't know	22	2.4

TABLE F12

WHAT ARE YOUR SOURCES OF INFORMATION CONCERNING
THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS?

<u>Source</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
St. Louis Jewish Light	690	78.4
Congregational or other organizational bulletins	193	22.0
Word of mouth	429	48.8
Direct Federation solicitation	326	37.1
No source	53	6.0
Other	86	9.8

TABLE F13

WHAT IS YOUR SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT SOURCE OF INFORMATION
CONCERNING THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS?

<u>Source of Information</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
St. Louis Jewish Light	514	56.6
Congregational or other organizational bulletins	26	2.9
Word of mouth	140	15.4
Direct Federation solicitation	87	9.6
No source	39	4.3
Other	51	5.6
Don't know	51	5.6

TABLE M1

HAVE YOU EVER VISTED ISRAEL?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	249	27.3
No	664	72.7

TABLE M2

DO YOU INTEND TO VISIT
ISRAEL?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	258	36.9
Maybe	175	25.0
No	232	33.2
Don't know	34	4.9

TABLE M3

DO YOU BELIEVE AMERICAN JEWS HAVE A
RESPONSIBILITY TO AID ISRAEL?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	726	79.6
Depends on type of aid	126	13.8
No	30	3.3
Don't know	30	3.3

TABLE M4

DO YOU APPROVE OF THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF AID
BY AMERICAN JEWS FOR THE JEWS OF ISRAEL?

Aid to Israel	Strongly Approve		Moderately Approve		Moderately Disapprove		Strongly Disapprove		Don't Know	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Raising money to be sent to Israel	656	71.9	186	20.4	33	3.6	13	1.4	24	2.6
Buying Israel Bonds	522	57.2	298	32.7	38	4.2	12	1.3	42	4.6
Belonging to Zionist organizations	294	32.4	283	31.2	121	13.3	77	8.5	133	14.6
Visiting Israel	576	63.2	250	27.4	25	2.7	9	1.0	51	5.6
Political lobbying on behalf of Israeli interests	521	57.1	218	23.9	67	7.3	36	3.9	70	7.7
Sending military supplies	619	68.1	178	19.6	35	3.9	29	3.2	48	5.3
Sending U.S. military personnel if Israel's security is threatened	440	48.3	177	19.4	85	9.3	120	13.2	89	9.8

TABLE M5

HOW MUCH ANTI-SEMITISM DO YOU THINK THERE IS IN THIS COMMUNITY?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Great deal	160	17.5
Moderate	359	39.3
Little	269	29.4
None	67	7.3
Don't know	59	6.5

TABLE M6

IN WHAT WAYS DOES THE ANTI-SEMITISM WHICH YOU HAVE
PERCEIVED MANIFEST ITSELF?

<u>Category</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>Don't Know</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Business	472	53.8	143	16.3
Employment	429	48.9	143	16.3
Housing	279	31.8	143	16.3
Politics	365	41.6	143	16.3
Schools	382	43.6	144	16.4
Social clubs	529	60.3	143	16.3
Informal relations	452	51.5	144	16.4
Other	51	5.8	143	16.3

TABLE M7

HAVE YOU PERSONALLY EXPERIENCED ANTI-SEMITISM
IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	230	25.2
No	662	72.5
Don't know	21	2.3

TABLE M8

HOW MUCH EXPERIENCE HAVE YOU HAD WITH ANTI-SEMITISM
IN YOUR LIFETIME?

<u>Amount Experienced</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Great deal	137	15.0
Moderate	262	28.6
Little	414	45.2
None	94	10.3
Don't know	8	0.9

TABLE M9

HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU BELIEVE THE FOLLOWING ARE TO THE JEWISH PEOPLE?

Importance to Jewish People	Very Important		Moderately Important		Moderately Unimportant		Totally Unimportant		Don't Know	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Neighborhoods where Jews can be among Jews	421	46.1	323	35.4	100	11.0	55	6.0	14	1.5
Businesses and shops which serve Jewish needs and tastes	413	45.3	345	37.9	107	11.7	36	4.0	10	1.1
Societies and associations which represent Jewish interests	618	67.7	248	27.2	26	2.8	9	1.0	12	1.3
The State of Israel	776	84.9	101	11.1	19	2.1	5	0.5	13	1.4
Institutions and agencies which provide services to the Jewish community	738	80.8	149	16.3	10	1.1	1	0.1	15	1.6
Social justice for all racial and ethnic groups	786	86.0	94	10.3	14	1.5	6	0.7	14	1.5
Attending services on the High Holidays	572	62.6	226	24.7	61	6.7	35	3.8	20	2.2

TABLE M10

WHAT IS YOUR POLITICAL AFFILIATION?

<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Democratic	353	40.3
Republican	110	12.6
Independent	372	42.5
Other	14	1.6
Don't know	27	3.1

TABLE M11

DO YOU USUALLY VOTE FOR THE DEMOCRATIC OR REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE?

<u>Political Party</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Democratic	244	42.0
Republican	85	14.6
Neither	205	35.3
Don't know	46	7.9

TABLE M12

DID YOU VOTE IN THE 1980 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	799	90.4
No	83	9.4

TABLE M13

WHO DID YOU VOTE FOR IN THE 1980 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION?

<u>Presidential Choice</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Reagan	339	44.3
Carter	359	46.9
Other	65	8.5
Didn't vote	3	0.4

TABLE M14

DID YOU VOTE IN THE 1976 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION?

<u>Response</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	800	90.4
No	84	9.5

TABLE M15

WHO DID YOU VOTE FOR IN THE 1976 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION?

<u>Presidential Choice</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Ford	302	39.5
Carter	444	58.1
Other	10	1.3

TABLE IN1

INCOME OF JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

<u>Income</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than \$5,000	27	5.2
5,000-9,999	42	8.0
10,000-14,999	41	7.8
15,000-19,999	44	8.4
20,000-24,999	31	5.9
25,000-29,999	38	7.3
30,000-39,999	78	14.9
40,000-49,999	58	11.1
50,000-59,999	47	9.0
60,000-69,999	33	6.3
70,000-79,999	25	4.8
80,000-89,999	11	2.1
90,000-99,999	11	2.1
100,000-149,999	20	3.8
150,000-199,999	7	1.3
200,000 or more	11	2.1

TABLE PCH3a

AGE OF CHILDREN
(total number of children in household)

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0	24	3.4	20	35	5.0
1	15	2.0	21	29	4.1
2	27	3.9	22	29	4.1
3	20	2.9	23	15	2.1
4	21	3.0	24	10	1.4
5	25	3.6	25	11	1.6
6	25	3.6	26	6	0.9
7	24	3.4	27	9	1.3
8	12	1.7	28	2	0.3
9	21	3.0	29	4	0.6
10	37	5.3	30	2	0.3
11	46	6.6	31	3	0.4
12	28	4.0	32	1	0.1
13	30	4.3	33	0	0.0
14	28	4.0	34	0	0.0
15	25	3.6	35	1	0.1
16	36	5.1	36	0	0.0
17	34	4.9	37	1	0.1
18	30	4.3	38	0	0.0
19	34	4.9	39	1	0.1

TABLE PCH4

MARITAL STATUS - CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Now married	3	0.4
Widowed	1	0.1
Divorced	3	1.0
Separated	4	0.1
Never married	570	98.3
Living with partner of opposite sex	0	0.0

TABLE PCH6

TYPE OF SCHOOL - CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD

<u>Type of School</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Public elementary or secondary school	321	57.4
Public college, junior college or university	79	14.1
Private college or university	53	9.5
Private Christian elementary or secondary school	1	0.2
Private Jewish elementary or secondary school	19	3.4
Private elementary or secondary school - no religious affiliation	24	4.3
Other	61	10.9

TABLE PCH7

DISABILITY - CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD

<u>Any Disability</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No	559	97.2
Yes, wheelchair	1	0.2
Yes, other	15	2.6

PCH14

CHILDREN'S JEWISH EDUCATION

<u>Category</u>	<u>Children's Completed Jewish Education</u>		<u>Current Education</u>		<u>Future Education</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Sunday	252	84.3	220	83.5	121	78.1
Afternoon Hebrew school	138	46.2	80	32.3	53	34.2
All-day Jewish school	13	4.3	19	7.7	17	11.0
Private tutor	7	2.3	8	3.2	4	2.6
Yeshiva high school	4	1.0	2	1.0	8	5.2
Yeshiva college	1	0.3	3	1.2	1	1.0
Person will be raised as Christian	6	2.0	11	4.4	4	2.6
Person will be raised as other religion	3	1.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
Other	15	5.0	15	6.0	18	11.6
None	18	6.0	14	5.6	9	6.2

TABLE PCH15

INFORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION - CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD

<u>Informal Jewish Education Type</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No, or child too young	462	86.5
Synagogue youth groups	32	6.0
Social groups	16	3.0
Service organizations	4	0.7
Zionist youth groups	2	0.4
Other	18	3.4

TABLE MD1

LISTS USED TO CONSTRUCT SAMPLE FRAME

<u>TEMPLES AND SYNAGOGUES</u>	
01 TEMPLE ISRAEL	17 MISHKAN ISRAEL-SHEREI THILIM CONGREGATION
02 UNITED HEBREW CONGREGATION	18 AGUDATH ISRAEL
03 SHAARE EMETH TEMPLE	19 TRADITIONAL CONGREGATION OF CREVE COEUR
04 TEMPLE EMANUEL	20 <u>ST. LOUIS JEWISH LIGHT</u>
05 B'NAI EL TEMPLE	<u>AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS</u>
06 GENESIS	21 JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION
07 KOL AM CONGREGATION	22 HOME START PROGRAM
08 B'NAI AMODNA CONGREGATION	23 AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
09 SHAARE ZEDEK SYNAGOGUE	24 AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS
10 BRITH SHOLOM KNESETH ISRAEL CONGREGATION	25 AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TECHNION
11 BAIS ABRAHAM CONGREGATION	26 B'NAI B'RITH YOUTH ORGANIZATION
12 BETH HAMEDROSH HAGODOL CONGREGATION	27 H. F. EPSTEIN HEBREW ACADEMY F.H.A.
13 CHESED SHEL EMETH CONGREGATION	28 HABONIM SOCIETY OF ST. LOUIS
14 NUSACH HARI-B'NAI ZIION CONGREGATION	29 JEWISH CENTER FOR AGED AUXILIARY
15 TPHERIS ISRAEL CHEVRA KADISHA CONGREGATION	30 JCCAIDS
16 YOUNG ISRAEL SYNAGOGUE	31 JEWISH EDUCATORS COUNCIL

TABLE MD1
(continued)

32 JFCEES	48 HADASSAH-SAMPTER MACCABEAN GROUP
33 JEWISH HOSPITAL AUXILIARY	49 HADASSAH-EMMA LAZARUS GROUP
34 MIRIAM NO. 17, U.O.T.S.	50 HADASSAH-ELEANOR ROOSEVELT GROUP
35 NADAH WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION	51 HADASSAH-HANNAH SENESCH GROUP
36 NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, ST. LOUIS SECTION	52 HADASSAH-GOLDA MEIR GROUP
37 STATE OF ISRAEL BONDS-ST. LOUIS	53 ORT-CANDLELIGHT CHAPTER
38 CITY OF HOPE	54 ORT-WOODSMILL CHAPTER
39 CENTRAL AGENCY FOR JEWISH EDUCATION (nonaffiliates)	55 ORT-JOY POGER CHAPTER
40 B'NAI B'RITH HILLEL FOUNDATION	56 ORT-CENTRAL CHAPTER
	57 ORT-CHAVEROT CHAPTER
	58 ORT-GATEWAY CHAPTER
<u>ORGANIZATION CHAPTERS</u>	59 ORT-GOLDENRUD CHAPTER
41 B'NAI B'RITH WOMEN ST. LOUIS COUNCIL	60 ORT-DOGWOOD CHAPTER
42 AMERICAN CANCER RESEARCH CENTER	61 ORT-HAWTHORNE CHAPTER
43 HADASSAH-BUSINESS & PROFESSIONAL GROUP	62 ORT-NORTHWIND CHAPTER
44 HADASSAH-HENRIETTA SZOLD GROUP	63 ORT-SHOREWOOD CHAPTER
45 HADASSAH-RACHEL LANDY GROUP	64 PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #1
46 HADASSAH-MATILDE SCHECHTER GROUP	65 PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #2
47 HADASSAH-ALICE SELIGSBURG GROUP	66 PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #3

TABLE MD1
(continued)

67 PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #4	84 JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS COUNCIL/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
68 PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #5	85 JEWISH EMPLOYMENT & VOCATIONAL SERVICE/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
69 PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #6	86 JEWISH NATIONAL FUND/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
70 PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #7	87 STATE OF ISRAEL BONDS/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
71 PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #8	88 JEWISH CENTER FOR AGED/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
72 PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #9	89 ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH/ BOARD OF DIRECTORS
73 B'NAI B'RITH-DAVID BERGER	90 CENTRAL AGENCY FOR JEWISH EDUCATION/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
74 B'NAI B'RITH-HARRISON EGEL	91 B'NAI B'RITH HILLEL FOUNDATION/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
75 B'NAI B'RITH-YACHAD	92 JCCA TRUSTEES
76 B'NAI B'RITH-ARCHWAY	93 AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
77 B'NAI B'RITH-MISSOURI	94 JEWISH FEDERATION WOMEN'S DIVISION/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
78 B'NAI B'RITH-YOUNG SINGLES	95 H. F. EPSTEIN HEBREW ACADEMY/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
79 B'NAI B'RITH-BRANDEIS	96 LIFE SKILLS FOUNDATION FOR THE RETARDED/ BOARD OF DIRECTORS
80 B'NAI B'RITH-ST. LOUIS UNIT	97 VAAD HOEIR/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
81 B'NAI B'RITH-AKIBA	
82 B'NAI B'RITH-NORTH VALLEY	
<u>BOARDS OF DIRECTORS</u>	
83 JEWISH FAMILY & CHILDREN'S SERVICE/ BOARD OF DIRECTORS	

TABLE MD1
(continued)

98 JEWISH HOSPITAL/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
99 JCCA/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
100 JEWISH FEDERATION/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
101 THE DELCREST/BOARD OF DIRECTORS
102 DISTINCTIVE JEWISH SURNAMES

MISCELLANEOUS

103 FEDERATION SENIORS
104 "SNOWBALL LIST"
105 MULTI-SERVICE SENIOR
CENTER (JCCA)
106 CONSERVATIVE DAY SCHOOL
WAITING LIST
107 JFCS NEW AMERICANS
108 H. F. EPSTEIN HEBREW ACADEMY
109 TEMPLE ISRAEL SINGLES

ELDERLY HOUSING

110 CHAI HOUSE
111 COVENANT HOUSE
112 DELMAR GARDENS EAST

113 DELMAR GARDENS WEST
114 CLAYTON ON THE GREEN
115 JEWISH CENTER FOR AGED
116 PARKVIEW TOWERS
117 THE DELCREST

OLD LISTS

118 JCCA RESIGNATIONS 1974-1975
119 JCCA RESIGNATIONS 1976
120 JCCA RESIGNATIONS 1977
121 JCCA RESIGNATIONS 1978
122 JCCA RESIGNATIONS 1979
123 JCCA RESIGNATIONS 1980
124 JEWISH LIGHT ENGAGEMENTS 1976-1981
125 NUSACH HARI-B'NAI ZION CONGREGATION (confirmations)
126 TEMPLE ISRAEL (confirmations)
127 TEMPLE EMANUEL (confirmations)
128 SHAARE EMETH TEMPLE (confirmations)
129 B'NAI EL TEMPLE (confirmations)

TABLE MD1
(continued)

- 130 UNITED HEBREW CONGREGATION (confirmations)
 - 131 B'NAI AMOONA CONGREGATION (confirmations)
 - 132 SHAARE EMETH TEMPLE (confirmands' parents)
 - 133 B'NAI AMOONA CONGREGATION (confirmands' parents)
 - 134 UNITED HEBREW CONGREGATION (confirmands' parents)
 - 135 B'NAI AMOONA CONGREGATION (marriages)
 - 136 UNITED HEBREW CONGREGATION (marriages)
 - 137 TEMPLE ISRAEL (marriages)
 - 138 SHAARE EMETH TEMPLE (marriages)
 - 139 JEWISH LIGHT (marriages 1976-1981)
 - 140 B'NAI EL TEMPLE (marriages)
 - 141 NUSACH HARI-B'NAI ZION CONGREGATION (marriages)
 - 142 JEWISH LIGHT (births 1976-1981)
 - 143 SHAARE ZEDEK SYNAGOGUE (nonaffiliates)
 - 144 B'NAI EL TEMPLE (former members)
 - 145 SHAARE ZEDEK SYNAGOGUE (former members)
 - 146 TRADITIONAL CONGREGATION OF CREVE COEUR
(former members)
 - 147 TIPHERIS ISRAEL CHEVRA KADISHA CONGREGATION (former members)
 - 148 NUSACH HARI-B'NAI ZION CONGREGATION (former members)
-

TABLE MD2

PROCESSING NONCURRENT LISTS OF JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS
AND MISCELLANEOUS LISTS OF JEWISH POPULATION

<u>LISTS</u>	<u>TOTAL ENTRIES ON LIST</u>	<u>TOTAL JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS</u>	<u>TOTAL JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS LISTED IN METRO AREA</u>	<u>PERCENT OF TOTAL ENTRIES LOCATED IN METRO AREA</u>	<u>PERCENT OF JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS LOCATED IN METRO AREA</u>
<u>JCCA RESIGNATIONS</u>					
1975 Resignations	1735	794	492	28.4	62.0
1976 Resignations	1901	902	437	23.0	48.4
1977 Resignations	1645	846	492	29.9	58.2
1978 Resignations	1795	889	561	31.3	63.1
1979 Resignations	1838	897	520	28.3	58.0
1980 Resignations	1892	867	803	42.4	92.6
TOTAL	<u>10,806</u>	<u>5,195</u>	<u>3,305</u>	<u>30.6</u>	<u>63.6</u>
<u>JCCA SINGLES</u>	258	258	248	96.1	96.1
<u>"SNOWBALL LIST"</u>	252	252	229	90.9	90.9
<u>ENGAGEMENTS</u>					
Jewish Light Engagements	700	700	284	40.6	40.6
<u>CONFIRMANDS</u>					
Nusach Hari-B'nai Zion Congregation	180	180	10	5.6	5.6
Temple Israel	1209	1209	188	15.6	15.6
Temple Emanuel	293	293	47	16.0	16.0
Shaare Emeth Temple	692	692	198	28.6	28.6
B'nai El Temple	191	191	34	17.8	17.8
United Hebrew Congregation	1401	1401	331	23.6	23.6
B'nai Amoona Congregation	788	788	205	26.0	26.0
TOTAL	<u>4,754</u>	<u>4,754</u>	<u>1,013</u>	<u>21.3</u>	<u>21.3</u>

TABLE MD2
(continued)

<u>LISTS</u>	<u>TOTAL ENTRIES ON LIST</u>	<u>TOTAL JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS</u>	<u>TOTAL JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS LISTED IN METRO AREA</u>	<u>PERCENT OF TOTAL ENTRIES LOCATED IN METRO AREA</u>	<u>PERCENT OF JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS LOCATED IN METRO AREA</u>
<u>CONFIRMATIONS (Parents)</u>					
Shaare Emeth Temple	25	25	24	96.0	96.0
B'nai Amoona Congregation	<u>788</u>	<u>788</u>	<u>327</u>	<u>41.5</u>	<u>41.5</u>
TOTAL	<u>813</u>	<u>813</u>	<u>351</u>	<u>43.2</u>	<u>43.2</u>
<u>MARRIAGES</u>					
B'nai Amoona Congregation	541	541	233	43.1	43.1
United Hebrew Congregation	379	379	183	48.3	48.3
Temple Israel	434	434	189	43.5	43.5
Shaare Emeth Temple	71	71	38	53.5	53.5
Jewish Light	268	268	138	51.5	51.5
B'nai El Temple	12	12	7	58.3	58.3
Nusach Hari- B'nai Zion Congregation	<u>45</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>48.9</u>	<u>48.9</u>
TOTAL	<u>1,750</u>	<u>1,750</u>	<u>810</u>	<u>46.3</u>	<u>46.3</u>
<u>BIRTHS</u>					
Jewish Light Births	948	948	599	63.2	63.2
<u>HIGH HOLY DAY GUESTS</u>					
B'nai El Temple	130	130	27	20.8	20.8
Shaare Zedek Synagogue	<u>23</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>87.0</u>	<u>87.0</u>
TOTAL	<u>153</u>	<u>153</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>30.7</u>	<u>30.7</u>

TABLE MD2
(continued)

<u>LISTS</u>	<u>TOTAL ENTRIES ON LIST</u>	<u>TOTAL JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS</u>	<u>TOTAL JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS LISTED IN METRO AREA</u>	<u>PERCENT OF TOTAL ENTRIES LOCATED IN METRO AREA</u>	<u>PERCENT OF JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS LOCATED IN METRO AREA</u>
<u>FORMER MEMBERS</u>					
B'nai El Temple Shaare Zedek Synagogue	275	275	161	62.6	62.6
Traditional Congregation of Creve Couer	16	16	10	62.5	62.5
Tpheris Israel Chevra Kadisha Congregation	44	44	29	65.9	65.9
Nusach Hari- B'nai Zion Congregation	108	108	14	13.8	13.8
	<u>142</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>129</u>	<u>90.8</u>	<u>90.8</u>
TOTAL	<u>585</u>	<u>585</u>	<u>343</u>	<u>58.6</u>	<u>58.6</u>
TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS	<u>21,019</u>	<u>15,408</u>	<u>7,229</u>	<u>34.4</u>	<u>46.9</u>

TABLE MD3

RECORDS OF LIST PROCESSING - PERCENT OF SINGLE ENTRIES BY LIST

<u>NAME OF ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>NUMBER OF ORIGINAL ENTRIES BEFORE DUPLICATION-REMOVAL PROCESS</u> COLUMN 1	<u>NUMBER OF SINGLE ENTRIES AFTER MERGE PROCESS</u> COLUMN 2	<u>PERCENT OF SINGLE ENTRY</u> COLUMN 3
<u>TEMPLES AND SYNAGOGUES</u>			
TEMPLE ISRAEL	1484	297	20.0
UNITED HEBREW CONGREGATION	1455	161	11.2
SHAARE EMETH TEMPLE	1474	111	7.5
TEMPLE EMANUEL	328	16	4.9
B'NAI EL TEMPLE	464	37	8.0
GENESIS	33	7	21.2
KOL AM CONGREGATION	104	19	18.3
B'NAI AMUONA CONGREGATION	968	32	3.3
SHAARE ZEDEK SYNAGOGUE	708	33	4.7
BRITH SHOLUM KNESETH ISRAEL CONGREGATION	477	28	5.9
BAIS ABRAHAM CONGREGATION	170	34	20.1
BETH HAMEDROSH HAGODOL CONGREGATION	571	98	17.2
CHESED SHEL EMETH CONGREGATION	103	20	19.4
NUSACH HARI-B'NAI ZION CONGREGATION	360	38	10.6
TPHERIS ISRAEL CHEVRA KADISHA CONGREGATION	100	8	8.0
YOUNG ISRAEL SYNAGOGUE	94	6	6.4
MISHKAN ISRAEL-SHEREI THILIM CONGREGATION	35	4	11.4
AGUDATH ISRAEL	6	1	16.7
TRADITIONAL CONGREGATION OF CREVE COEUR	170	14	8.2
SUBTOTAL	9,104	966	10.6

TABLE MD3
(continued)

<u>NAME OF ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>NUMBER OF ORIGINAL ENTRIES BEFORE DUPLICATION-REMOVAL PROCESS</u> COLUMN 1	<u>NUMBER OF SINGLE ENTRIES AFTER MERGE PROCES</u> COLUMN 2	<u>PERCENT OF SINGLE ENTRY</u> COLUMN 3
<u>ST. LOUIS JEWISH LIGHT</u>	13,283	2,829	21.3
<u>AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS</u>			
JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTERS ASSOCIATION	5069	692	13.3
HOME START PROGRAM	86	11	12.8
AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE	67	3	4.5
AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS	269	14	5.2
AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TECHNION	44	7	15.9
B'NAI B'RITH YOUTH ORGANIZATION	590	148	25.1
H. F. EPSTEIN HEBREW ACADEMY F.H.A	25	1	4.0
HABONIM SOCIETY OF ST. LOUIS	79	17	21.5
JEWISH CENTER FOR AGED AUXILIARY	1122	62	5.5
JCCAIDS	230	3	1.3
JEWISH EDUCATORS COUNCIL	23	3	13.0
JFCEES	70	4	5.7
JEWISH HOSPITAL AUXILIARY	2406	80	3.3
MIRIAM NO. 17, U.O.T.S.	1235	30	2.4
NADAH WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION	154	17	11.0
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, ST. LOUIS SECTION	2422	129	5.3
STATE OF ISRAEL BONDS-ST. LOUIS	1925	257	13.4
CITY OF HOPE	205	11	5.4
CENTRAL AGENCY FOR JEWISH EDUCATION (nonaffiliates)	32	4	12.5
B'NAI B'RITH HILLEL FOUNDATION	597	278	46.6
JEWISH SPECIAL NEEDS SOCIETY	409	31	7.6
LABOR ZIONIST ALLIANCE BRANCH 127	50	10	19.6
LIFE SKILLS FOUNDATION FOR THE RETARDED	596	93	15.6
NEW MT. SINAI CEMETERY ASSOCIATION	15	3	20.0
FERN WALDMAN MEMORIAL FUND FOR CANCER RESEARCH	41	5	12.2
FEDERATION YOUNG PROFESSIONALS DIVISION	755	221	29.3
SUBTOTAL	18,516	2,134	11.4

TABLE MD3
(continued)

<u>NAME OF ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>NUMBER OF ORIGINAL ENTRIES BEFORE DUPLICATION-REMOVAL PROCESS COLUMN 1</u>	<u>NUMBER OF SINGLE ENTRIES AFTER MERGE PROCESS COLUMN 2</u>	<u>PERCENT OF SINGLE ENTRY COLUMN 3</u>
<u>ORGANIZATION CHAPTERS</u>			
B'NAI B'RITH WOMEN ST. LOUIS COUNCIL	1492	108	7.2
AMERICAN CANCER RESEARCH CENTER	1194	68	5.8
HADASSAH-BUSINESS & PROFESSIONAL GROUP	144	15	10.4
HADASSAH-HENRIETTA SZOLD GROUP	463	16	3.5
HADASSAH-RACHEL LANDY GROUP	381	19	5.0
HADASSAH-MATILDE SCHECHTER GROUP	488	19	3.9
HADASSAH-ALICE SELIGSBURG GROUP	320	10	3.1
HADASSAH-SAMPTER MACCABEAN GROUP	365	19	5.2
HADASSAH-EMMA LAZARUS GROUP	386	9	2.3
HADASSAH-ELEANOR ROOSEVELT GROUP	375	14	3.7
HADASSAH-HANNAH SENESCH GROUP	100	3	3.0
HADASSAH-GOLDA MEIR GROUP	20	0	0.0
ORT-CANDLELIGHT CHAPTER	227	7	3.1
ORT-CENTRAL CHAPTER	103	3	2.9
ORT-CHAVEROY CHAPTER	113	16	14.2
ORT-GATEWAY CHAPTER	116	6	5.2
ORT-GOLDENROD CHAPTER	61	16	26.2
ORT-WOODSMILL CHAPTER	70	7	10.0
ORT-JOY POGER CHAPTER	67	3	4.5
ORT-DOGWOOD CHAPTER	45	0	0.0
ORT-HAWTHORNE CHAPTER	52	2	3.9
ORT-NORTHWIND CHAPTER	123	18	14.6
ORT-SHOREWOOD CHAPTER	60	0	0.0
PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #1	136	19	14.0
PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #2	86	7	8.1
PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #3	53	4	7.6
PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #4	46	4	8.5
PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #5	53	4	7.6
PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #6	141	5	3.6
PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #7	29	1	3.5
PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #8	47	4	8.5
PIONEER WOMEN-CHAPTER #9	41	2	4.9

TABLE MD3
(continued)

NAME OF ORGANIZATION	NUMBER OF		PERCENT OF SINGLE ENTRY COLUMN 3
	ORIGINAL ENTRIES BEFORE DUPLICATION-REMOVAL PROCESS COLUMN 1	SINGLE ENTRIES AFTER MERGE PROCESS COLUMN 2	
<u>ORGANIZATION CHAPTERS</u>			
B'NAI B'RITH-DAVID BERGER	75	22	31.0
B'NAI B'RITH-HARRISON EGEL	91	8	8.8
B'NAI B'RITH-YACHAD	47	1	2.1
B'NAI B'RITH-ARCHWAY	284	27	9.6
B'NAI B'RITH-MISSOURI	990	91	9.2
B'NAI B'RITH-YOUNG SINGLES	148	44	29.7
B'NAI B'RITH-BRANDEIS	209	28	13.4
B'NAI B'RITH-ST. LOUIS UNIT	68	5	7.5
B'NAI B'RITH-AKIBA	55	3	5.6
B'NAI B'RITH-NORTH VALLEY	74	8	10.8
		667	7.1
<u>BOARDS OF DIRECTORS</u>			
	SUBTOTAL	9,438	
<u>JEWISH FAMILY & CHILDREN'S SERVICE/</u>			
BOARD OF DIRECTORS	47	2	4.3
<u>JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS</u>			
COUNCIL/BOARD OF DIRECTORS	53	9	17.0
<u>JEWISH EMPLOYMENT & VOCATIONAL</u>			
SERVICE/BOARD OF DIRECTORS	55	18	32.7
<u>JEWISH NATIONAL FUND/BOARD OF DIRECTORS</u>			
STATE OF ISRAEL BONDS/BOARD OF DIRECTORS	44	4	9.1
<u>JEWISH CENTER FOR AGED/BOARD OF DIRECTORS</u>			
ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH/	22	1	4.6
BOARD OF DIRECTORS	62	0	0.0
<u>CENTRAL AGENCY FOR JEWISH</u>			
EDUCATION/BOARD OF DIRECTORS	52	11	21.2
<u>B'NAI B'RITH HILLEL FOUNDATION/BOARD OF DIRECTORS</u>			
JCCA TRUSTEES	41	5	12.2
<u>AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE/BOARD OF DIRECTORS</u>			
JEWISH FEDERATION WOMEN'S	42	6	14.3
DIVISION/BOARD OF DIRECTORS	60	1	1.7
<u>H. F. EPSTEIN HEBREW ACADEMY/BOARD OF DIRECTORS</u>			
LIFE SKILLS FOUNDATION FOR THE RETARDED/	14	0	0.0
BOARD OF DIRECTORS	55	2	3.6
	37	3	8.1
	31	6	19.4

TABLE MD3
(continued)

<u>NAME OF ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>NUMBER OF ORIGINAL ENTRIES BEFORE DUPLICATION-REMOVAL PROCESS COLUMN 1</u>	<u>NUMBER OF SINGLE ENTRIES AFTER MERGE PROCESS COLUMN 2</u>	<u>PERCENT OF SINGLE ENTRY COLUMN 3</u>
<u>BOARDS OF DIRECTORS</u>			
VAAD HOEIR/BOARD OF DIRECTORS	108	3	2.8
JEWISH HOSPITAL/BOARD OF DIRECTORS	52	3	5.8
JCCA/BOARD OF DIRECTORS	44	0	0.0
JEWISH FEDERATION/BOARD OF DIRECTORS	72	4	5.6
THE DELCREST/BOARD OF DIRECTORS	36	1	2.8
SUBTOTAL	927	79	8.5
<u>DISTINCTIVE JEWISH SURNAMES</u>	3277	1093	50.1
<u>MISCELLANEOUS</u>			
FEDERATION SENIORS	61	10	16.4
"SNOWBALL LIST"	229	106	46.3
MULTI-SERVICE SENIOR CENTER (JCCA)	416	114	27.2
CONSERVATIVE DAY SCHOOL WAITING LIST	223	19	8.5
JFCS NEW AMERICANS	320	37	11.6
H. F. EPSTEIN HEBREW ACADEMY	172	19	11.1
JCCA SINGLES	248	67	27.0
TEMPLE ISRAEL SINGLES	116	25	21.6
SUBTOTAL	1,784	397	22.2

TABLE MD3
(continued)

<u>NAME OF ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>NUMBER OF ORIGINAL ENTRIES BEFORE DUPLICATION-REMOVAL PROCESS COLUMN 1</u>	<u>NUMBER OF SINGLE ENTRIES AFTER MERGE PROCESS COLUMN 2</u>	<u>PERCENT OF SINGLE ENTRY COLUMN 3</u>	
<u>ELDERLY HOUSING</u>				
CHAI HOUSE	137	27	19.7	
COVENANT HOUSE	283	26	9.2	
DELMAR GARDENS EAST	57	46	80.7	
DELMAR GARDENS WEST	143	95	66.4	
CLAYTON ON THE GREEN	14	12	85.7	
JEWISH CENTER FOR AGED	230	168	73.0	
PARKVIEW TOWERS	197	58	29.4	
THE DELCREST	142	13	9.2	
	SUBTOTAL	1,203	445	37.0
<u>OLD LISTS</u>				
JCCA RESIGNATIONS 1974-1975	493	65	13.2	
JCCA RESIGNATIONS 1976	437	56	12.8	
JCCA RESIGNATIONS 1977	492	57	11.6	
JCCA RESIGNATIONS 1978	562	51	9.1	
JCCA RESIGNATIONS 1979	520	72	13.9	
JCCA RESIGNATIONS 1980	804	176	21.9	
JEWISH LIGHT ENGAGEMENTS 1976-1981	284	58	20.4	
NUSACH HARI-B'NAI ZION CONGREGATION (confirmations)	10	4	40.0	
TEMPLE ISRAEL (confirmations)	188	83	44.2	
TEMPLE EMANUEL (confirmations)	47	12	25.5	
SHAARE EMETH TEMPLE (confirmations)	198	60	30.3	
B'NAI EL TEMPLE (confirmations)	34	16	47.1	
UNITED HEBREW CONGREGATION (confirmations)	331	117	35.4	
B'NAI AMOONA CONGREGATION (confirmations)	206	58	28.3	
SHAARE EMETH TEMPLE (confirmands' parents)	24	0	0.0	
B'NAI AMOONA CONGREGATION (confirmands' parents)	327	21	6.4	
UNITED HEBREW CONGREGATION (confirmands' parents)	464	30	6.5	
B'NAI AMOONA CONGREGATION (marriages)	234	29	12.5	
UNITED HEBREW CONGREGATION (marriages)	183	40	21.9	
TEMPLE ISRAEL (marriages)	189	62	32.8	

TABLE MD3
(continued)

<u>NAME OF ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>NUMBER OF ORIGINAL ENTRIES BEFORE DUPLICATION-REMOVAL PROCESS COLUMN 1</u>	<u>NUMBER OF SINGLE ENTRIES AFTER MERGE PROCESS COLUMN 2</u>	<u>PERCENT OF SINGLE ENTRY COLUMN 3</u>
<u>OLD LISTS</u>			
SHAARE EMETH TEMPLE (marriages)	38	7	18.4
JEWISH LIGHT (marriages 1976-1981)	138	20	14.5
B'NAI EL TEMPLE (marriages)	7	1	14.3
NUSACH HARI-B'NAI ZION CONGREGATION (marriages)	22	6	27.3
JEWISH LIGHT BIRTHS 1976-1981	599	58	9.7
SHAARE ZEDEK SYNAGOGUE (nonaffiliates)	20	1	5.0
B'NAI EL TEMPLE (former members)	161	31	19.3
B'NAI EL TEMPLE (High Holy Day guests)	130	0	0.0
SHAARE ZEDEK SYNAGOGUE (former members)	10	1	10.0
TRADITIONAL CONGREGATION OF CREVE COEUR (former members)	29	2	6.9
TPHERIS ISRAEL CHEVKA KADISHA CONGREGATION (former members)	14	1	7.1
NUSACH HARI-B'NAI ZION CONGREGATION (former members)	129	11	8.5
SUBTOTAL	7,189	1,206	16.8
TOTAL	<u>61,414</u>	8,706	14.2
TOTAL INCLUDING DISTINCTIVE JEWISH SURNAMES	<u>64,691</u>	9,799	15.1

TABLE MD4

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF SINGLE ENTRIES BY LIST TYPE
(adjusted to exclude non-Jews)

<u>List Type</u>	<u>Number of Single Entries</u>
Temples and Synagogues	964
Jewish Light	1951
Agencies and Organizations	1513
Organization Chapters	665
Boards of Directors	79
Distinctive Jewish Surnames	665
Miscellaneous	392
Elderly Housing	455
Old Lists	<u>1003</u>
TOTAL	<u>7,687</u>

TABLE MD5

FREQUENCY OF CURRENT AFFILIATION WITH
JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

0	5502	26.3
1	5565	26.6
2	3368	16.1
3	2427	11.6
4	1360	6.5
5	1109	5.3
6	377	1.8
7	460	2.2
8	292	1.4
9	188	0.9
10	125	0.6
11	46	0.2
12	37	0.1
13	25	0.1
14	15	0.1
15	6	0.0
16	4	0.0
17	4	0.0
18	3	0.0
19	4	0.0
20	2	0.0
21	0	0.0
22	1	0.0
TOTAL	<u>20,920</u>	

TABLE MD6

NUMBER OF CONTACTS MADE

<u>Contacts</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1	633	69.0
2	134	14.7
3	72	7.8
4	36	3.9
5	21	2.3
6	10	1.1
7	5	0.5
8	3	0.3
9	3	0.3

TABLE MD7

FIELD WORK RESULTS:
ZIP CODE DISTRIBUTION BY CATEGORY

Zip Code	Whole Sample		Completions		Conversions		Completions and Conversions		Refusals	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
63011	56	3.6	34	4.1	46	4.0	39	4.2	7	2.9
63017	114	7.4	78	9.3	98	8.4	85	9.2	13	5.5
63043	26	1.7	17	2.0	18	1.6	18	2.0	0	0.0
63105	126	8.1	76	9.1	97	8.4	80	8.7	17	7.1
63108	39	2.5	19	2.3	25	2.2	19	2.1	6	2.5
63110	6	0.4	2	0.2	3	0.3	3	0.3	0	0.0
63112	15	0.9	6	0.7	9	0.8	6	0.7	3	1.3
63114	16	1.0	6	0.7	8	0.7	6	0.7	2	0.8
63117	22	1.4	12	1.4	16	1.4	13	1.4	3	1.3
63119	14	0.9	3	0.4	5	0.4	3	0.3	2	0.8
63122	10	0.6	2	0.2	3	0.3	2	0.2	1	0.4
63124	114	7.4	76	9.1	99	8.5	82	8.9	17	7.1
63130	217	14.0	99	11.8	150	12.9	113	12.3	37	15.5
63131	34	2.2	26	3.1	30	2.6	26	2.8	4	1.7
63132	175	11.3	109	13.0	147	12.7	118	12.8	29	12.2
63141	442	28.5	249	29.7	360	31.0	282	30.6	78	32.8
63144	12	0.8	3	0.4	5	0.4	3	0.3	2	0.8
Other	112	7.2	21	2.5	41	3.5	24	2.6	17	7.1

TABLE MD7
(continued)

Zip Code	Completions, Conversions and Refusals		Non-Jews		"Moved Out-of-Towns"		"Can't Locate"	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
63011	46	4.0	5	3.4	1	1.9	4	2.7
63017	98	8.4	6	4.0	3	5.8	3	2.0
63040	18	1.6	3	2.0	0	0.0	4	2.7
63095	97	8.4	7	4.7	7	13.4	11	7.3
63108	25	2.2	2	1.3	1	1.9	10	6.7
63110	3	0.3	1	0.7	2	3.8	0	0.0
63112	9	0.8	4	2.7	1	1.9	1	0.7
63114	8	0.7	5	3.4	0	0.0	3	2.0
63117	16	1.4	1	0.7	4	7.7	1	0.7
63119	5	0.4	7	4.7	0	0.0	2	1.3
63122	3	0.3	6	4.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
63124	99	8.5	5	3.4	0	0.0	4	2.7
63130	150	12.9	7	4.7	14	26.9	35	23.3
63131	30	2.6	1	0.7	2	3.8	1	0.7
63132	147	12.7	8	5.4	3	5.8	15	10.0
63141	360	31.0	29	19.5	9	17.3	38	25.3
63144	5	0.4	1	0.7	1	1.9	2	2.0
Other	41	3.5	51	34.2	4	7.7	14	9.3

TABLE MD8

NUMBER OF CURRENT AFFILIATIONS WITH
JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS FOR SAMPLE CATEGORIES

	<u>Whole Sample</u>		<u>Completions</u>		<u>Conversions</u>		<u>Completions and Conversions</u>		<u>Refusals</u>	
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0	458	29.5	205	24.5	28	33.3	233	25.3	72	30.3
1	502	32.4	218	26.0	16	19.0	234	25.4	75	31.5
2	213	13.7	135	16.1	13	15.5	148	16.1	39	16.4
3	141	9.1	108	12.9	8	9.5	116	12.6	18	7.6
4	81	5.2	57	6.8	6	7.1	63	6.8	12	5.0
5	65	4.2	46	5.5	6	7.1	52	5.6	10	4.2
6	23	1.5	15	1.8	2	2.4	17	1.8	4	1.7
7	25	1.6	19	2.3	2	2.4	21	2.3	4	1.7
8	16	1.0	16	1.9	0	0.0	16	1.7	0	0.0
9	10	0.6	6	0.7	0	1.2	7	0.8	3	1.3
10	7	0.5	5	0.6	1	1.2	6	0.7	3	0.4
11	2	0.1	2	0.2	0	0.0	2	0.2	1	0.0
12	2	0.1	2	0.2	0	0.0	2	0.2	0	0.0
13	3	0.2	2	0.2	1	1.2	3	0.3	0	0.0
17	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0
20	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0

TABLE MD8
(continued)

	Completions, Conversions and Refusals		Non-Jews		"Moved Out-of-Towns"		"Can't Locate"	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
0	305	26.3	78	52.3	14	26.9	48	32.0
1	309	26.7	67	45.0	30	57.7	79	52.7
2	187	16.1	3	2.0	4	7.7	14	9.3
3	134	11.6	0	0.0	3	5.8	2	1.3
4	75	6.5	0	0.0	1	1.9	4	2.7
5	62	5.3	1	0.7	0	0.0	2	1.3
6	21	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
7	25	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
8	16	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
9	10	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
10	7	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
11	2	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
12	2	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
13	3	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
17	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
20	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

TABLE P2-P1

NUMBER OF PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD, BY ZIP CODE

Zip Code	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven
63105/63117	25 2.74 27.17 12.38	35 3.83 38.04 10.51	10 1.09 10.87 6.58	11 1.20 11.96 7.91	7 0.77 7.61 10.00	4 0.44 4.35 23.53	0 0.00 0.00 0.00
63131/63141	49 5.36 15.96 24.26	99 10.83 32.25 29.73	57 6.24 18.57 37.50	63 6.89 20.52 45.32	32 3.50 10.42 45.71	7 0.77 2.28 41.18	0 0.00 0.00 0.00
63011	6 0.66 15.38 2.97	16 1.73 41.03 4.80	9 0.98 23.08 5.92	6 0.66 15.38 4.32	1 0.11 2.56 1.43	1 0.11 2.56 5.88	0 0.00 0.00 0.00
63017	18 1.97 21.18 8.91	25 2.74 29.41 7.51	18 1.97 21.18 11.84	15 1.64 17.65 10.79	8 0.88 9.41 11.43	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.11 1.18 100.00
63124	19 2.08 23.17 9.41	36 3.94 43.90 10.81	13 1.42 15.85 8.55	11 1.20 13.41 7.91	2 0.22 2.44 2.86	1 0.11 0.89 5.88	0 0.00 0.00 0.00
63130	26 2.84 23.21 12.87	56 6.13 50.00 16.82	13 1.42 11.61 8.55	6 0.66 5.36 4.32	10 1.09 8.93 14.29	1 0.11 0.89 5.88	0 0.00 0.00 0.00
63132	32 3.50 27.59 15.84	37 4.05 31.90 11.11	17 1.86 14.66 11.18	21 2.30 18.10 15.11	7 0.77 6.03 10.00	2 0.22 1.72 11.76	0 0.00 0.00 0.00
63108/63110/ 63112	13 1.42 46.43 6.44	9 0.98 32.14 2.70	1 0.33 10.71 2.16	3 0.33 10.71 2.16	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00

TABLE P2-CH1

HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN, BY ZIP CODE

Zip Code	0-5		6-18		18 or older		No children	
Other	15	11.2	13	3.5	2	1.0	32	6.1
63105/63117	14	10.5	35	9.3	22	11.4	59	11.2
63131/63141	42	31.3	170	45.2	88	45.6	147	27.8
63011	4	3.0	13	3.5	11	5.7	22	4.2
63017	16	11.9	53	14.1	14	7.3	41	7.8
63124	5	3.7	18	4.8	19	9.8	57	10.8
63130	19	14.2	27	7.2	13	6.7	79	14.9
63132	17	12.7	44	11.7	23	11.9	69	13.0
63108/63110/ 63112	2	1.5	3	0.8	1	0.5	23	4.4

TABLE P2-IN1

INCOME BY SEX FOR RESPONDENT WHO IN 1980 WORKED 40 WEEKS OR MORE PER
YEAR AND 35 HOURS OR MORE PER WEEK

Amount	Men		Women	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-\$9,999	1	0.6	5	5.6
10,000-19,999	11	6.3	25	28.1
20,000-29,999	30	17.1	17	19.1
30,000-49,999	48	27.3	26	29.2
50,000-99,999	66	37.5	12	13.5
100,000 or more	20	11.4	4	4.5

TABLE P8-25

RELIGIOUS IDENTITY BY AGE

Age	Orthodox		Conservative		Reform		More Than One Religion		Traditional	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	4	1.9	49	23.7	106	51.2	0	0.0	5	2.4
36-50	11	4.8	54	23.7	128	56.1	2	0.9	4	1.8
51-65	13	5.8	56	24.9	140	62.2	0	0.0	1	0.4
Over 65	51	21.3	73	30.4	95	39.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL %		<u>8.8</u>		<u>25.7</u>		<u>52.0</u>		<u>0.2</u>		<u>1.2</u>

Age	Just Jewish		Other	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	33	15.9	7	3.4
36-50	23	10.1	6	2.6
51-65	12	5.3	3	1.3
Over 65	20	8.3	0	0.0
TOTAL %		<u>9.9</u>		<u>1.8</u>

TABLE P8-26

INTERMARRIAGE ATTITUDES BY AGE

Age	A Jew should never marry a non-Jew under any circumstances		A Jew should marry a non-Jew only if the spouse agrees to a formal conversion to Judaism		A Jew should marry a non-Jew only if no children are planned	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	23	11.6	23	11.6	2	1.0
36-50	46	21.6	37	17.4	6	2.8
51-65	40	19.7	34	16.8	4	2.0
Over 65	86	38.1	25	11.1	6	2.7
TOTAL %		<u>23.3</u>		<u>14.1</u>		<u>2.1</u>

Age	A Jew should marry a non-Jew only if the spouse agrees to raise the children as Jews; formal conversion is not necessary		A Jew should marry a non-Jew as long as the two people care about each other; religion should not be a concern		Don't Care		Other	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	37	18.6	106	53.3	6	3.0	2	1.0
36-50	28	13.2	94	44.1	1	0.5	1	0.5
51-65	26	12.8	86	42.4	11	5.4	2	1.0
Over 65	13	5.8	88	38.9	8	3.5	0	0.0
TOTAL %		<u>12.3</u>		<u>44.5</u>		<u>3.1</u>		<u>0.6</u>

TABLE P8-30

NEIGHBORHOOD COMPOSITION PREFERENCE BY AGE

Age	100% Jewish		75% Jewish		50-75% Jewish		More Than 25% Jewish but Less Than 50% Jewish		Less Than 25% Jewish	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	6	3.0	33	16.4	88	43.8	28	13.9	9	4.5
36-50	9	4.3	24	11.3	101	47.6	36	17.0	8	3.8
51-65	8	3.8	32	15.3	96	45.9	18	8.6	12	5.7
Over 65	36	16.3	47	21.3	68	30.8	6	2.7	7	3.2
TOTAL %		<u>7.0</u>		<u>16.1</u>		<u>41.8</u>		<u>10.4</u>		<u>4.3</u>
Age	It Depends		Don't Care		No Other Jews					
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent				
21-35	4	2.0	33	16.4	0	0.0				
36-50	6	2.8	28	13.2	0	0.0				
51-65	8	3.8	35	16.8	0	0.0				
Over 65	4	1.2	53	24.0	0	0.0				
TOTAL %		<u>2.7</u>		<u>17.8</u>		<u>0.0</u>				

TABLE P8-45

EDUCATION BY AGE
(respondents and spouses)

Age	Less Than High School		High School		Some College		Finished College		Advanced Degree	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	2	0.4	20	4.2	73	15.4	190	40.2	188	39.8
36-50	9	2.2	62	15.0	85	20.5	129	31.2	129	31.2
51-65	29	7.1	131	32.0	108	26.4	84	20.5	57	13.9
Over 65	120	35.0	113	32.9	58	16.9	30	8.8	22	6.4
TOTAL %		<u>22.7</u>		<u>16.8</u>		<u>16.8</u>		<u>24.8</u>		<u>18.9</u>

TABLE P8-P65

OCCUPATION BY AGE

Age	Executive, Administrative, Managerial		Professional		Technicians		Sales		Administrative Support	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	44	21.1	74	35.4	4	1.9	34	16.3	15	7.2
36-50	41	18.1	73	32.2	1	0.4	49	21.6	22	9.7
51-65	40	17.8	33	14.7	0	0.0	62	27.6	34	15.1
Over 65	24	10.0	19	7.9	4	1.7	72	30.0	29	12.1
TOTAL %		<u>16.5</u>		<u>22.0</u>		<u>1.0</u>		<u>24.0</u>		<u>11.1</u>
Age	Service		Farming, Forestry, Fishing		Mechanics, Repairers		Precision, Production		Operators, Fabricators, Laborers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	2	1.0	0	0.0	2	1.0	1	0.5	0	0.0
36-50	3	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	2.2	0	0.0
51-65	2	0.9	0	0.0	3	1.3	2	0.9	2	0.9
Over 65	1	0.4	1	0.4	3	1.3	9	3.8	6	2.5
TOTAL %		<u>1.0</u>		<u>0.1</u>		<u>0.9</u>		<u>1.9</u>		<u>0.9</u>
Age	Transportation		Homemakers		Other					
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent				
21-35	2	1.0	20	9.6	11	5.3				
36-50	2	0.9	27	11.9	4	1.8				
51-65	1	0.4	38	16.9	8	3.6				
Over 65	0	0.0	56	23.3	16	6.7				
TOTAL %		<u>0.6</u>		<u>15.6</u>		<u>4.4</u>				

TABLE P8-P65-PCH1

WOMEN WHO WORK 40 WEEKS OR MORE PER YEAR AND WHO WORK 35 HOURS OR MORE
PER WEEK AND WHO HAVE CHILDREN

<u>Age of Children</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-5	26	13.6
5-18	98	51.3
19 or older	67	35.0

TABLE P8-Z

ZIP CODE BY AGE

Age	Other		63105/63117		63131/63141		63011		63017	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-20	28	4.8	55	9.5	248	42.8	20	3.5	75	12.9
21-35	54	10.8	57	11.4	156	31.2	37	7.4	46	9.2
36-50	18	4.3	34	8.0	185	43.7	18	4.3	47	11.1
51-65	13	3.0	29	6.8	169	39.5	15	3.5	37	8.6
Over 65	17	4.4	52	13.5	101	26.3	8	2.1	23	6.0
TOTAL %		<u>5.6</u>		<u>9.8</u>		<u>37.1</u>		<u>4.2</u>		<u>9.9</u>

Age	63124		63130		63132		63106/63108/63112	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
0-20	29	5.0	52	9.0	67	11.6	6	1.0
21-35	30	6.0	46	9.2	52	10.4	22	4.4
36-50	26	6.2	30	7.1	57	13.5	8	1.9
51-65	51	11.9	54	12.6	54	12.6	6	1.4
Over 65	52	13.5	71	18.5	52	13.5	8	2.1
TOTAL %		<u>8.1</u>		<u>10.9</u>		<u>12.2</u>		<u>2.2</u>

TABLE P8-R1

TEMPLE AND SYNAGOGUE AFFILIATION BY AGE

Age	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	96	45.9	113	54.1
36-50	176	77.2	52	22.8
51-65	167	74.9	56	25.1
Over 65	153	63.8	87	36.3
TOTAL %		<u>65.7</u>		<u>34.3</u>

TABLE P8-R10a

RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE (LIGHTING CANDLES ON FRIDAY NIGHT) BY AGE

Age	Always		Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	22	10.5	14	6.7	40	19.1	134	63.8
36-50	34	15.0	27	11.9	56	24.7	110	48.5
51-65	48	21.3	18	8.0	50	22.2	109	48.4
Over 65	76	32.6	10	4.3	22	9.4	125	53.7
TOTAL %		<u>20.1</u>		<u>7.8</u>		<u>18.7</u>		<u>53.4</u>

TABLE P8-R10i

RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE (HAVING A CHRISTMAS TREE) BY AGE

Age	Always		Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	28	13.3	4	1.9	11	5.2	167	79.5
36-50	24	10.5	4	1.8	11	4.8	189	82.9
51-65	14	6.2	5	2.2	13	5.8	193	85.8
Over 65	5	2.2	3	1.3	9	3.9	216	92.7
TOTAL %		<u>7.9</u>		<u>1.8</u>		<u>4.9</u>		<u>85.4</u>

TABLE P8-R10j

RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE (STAYING HOME ON HIGH HOLIDAYS) BY AGE

Age	Always		Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	121	58.2	25	12.0	20	9.6	42	20.2
36-50	175	76.8	14	6.1	15	6.6	24	10.5
51-65	177	78.7	15	6.7	14	6.2	19	8.4
Over 65	182	78.8	11	4.8	7	3.0	31	13.4
TOTAL %		<u>73.5</u>		<u>7.3</u>		<u>6.3</u>		<u>13.0</u>

TABLE P8-R11

SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE AT LEAST ONCE A YEAR BY AGE
(respondents)

<u>Age</u>	<u>Attend</u>		<u>Never Attend</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
21-35	173	84.0	33	16.0
36-50	201	88.9	25	11.1
51-65	199	91.3	19	8.7
Over 65	196	83.8	38	16.2
TOTAL %		<u>87.0</u>		<u>13.0</u>

TABLE P8-R1102

SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE ON HIGH HOLIDAYS BY AGE

<u>Age</u>	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
21-35	48	23.3	158	76.7
36-50	39	17.3	187	82.7
51-65	37	16.9	182	83.1
Over 65	66	28.2	168	71.8
TOTAL %		<u>21.5</u>		<u>78.5</u>

TABLE P8-R15

CHOICE OF MOST IMPORTANT SUBJECT IN JEWISH EDUCATION BY AGE

Age	Bible		Postbiblical Jewish History		Israel		The Meanings of the Jewish Festivals		Jewish Observances	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	28	15.0	18	9.6	9	4.8	11	5.9	13	7.0
36-50	23	11.3	12	5.9	6	2.9	11	5.4	25	12.3
51-65	26	12.8	14	6.9	4	2.0	9	4.4	22	10.8
Over 65	57	29.1	10	5.1	7	3.6	10	5.1	19	9.7
TOTAL %		<u>16.9</u>		<u>6.8</u>		<u>3.3</u>		<u>5.2</u>		<u>10.0</u>

Age	Jewish Philosophy and Ethics		Talmud		Hebrew		Holocaust		Other	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	78	41.7	1	0.5	2	1.1	21	11.2	6	3.2
36-50	94	46.1	7	3.4	5	2.5	12	5.9	9	4.4
51-65	83	40.9	4	2.0	3	1.5	21	10.3	17	8.4
Over 65	54	27.6	7	3.6	10	5.1	13	6.6	9	4.6
TOTAL %		<u>39.1</u>		<u>2.4</u>		<u>2.7</u>		<u>8.5</u>		<u>5.2</u>

TABLE P8-H15

NUMBER OF AUTOMOBILES IN HOUSEHOLD BY AGE

Age	None		One		Two		Three or More	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	4	1.9	63	30.0	126	60.0	17	8.1
36-50	1	0.4	42	18.4	117	51.3	68	29.8
51-65	8	3.6	52	23.2	120	53.6	44	19.6
Over 65	67	29.0	110	47.6	51	22.1	3	1.3
TOTAL %		<u>8.9</u>		<u>29.8</u>		<u>46.4</u>		<u>14.9</u>

TABLE P8-HP3

CHOICE OF HOSPITAL BY AGE

Age	Barnes		Jewish		St. John's		Missouri Baptist		St. Luke's East	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	25	21.4	37	31.6	17	14.5	3	2.6	0	0.0
36-50	22	20.0	47	42.7	15	13.6	7	6.4	1	0.9
51-65	23	19.0	65	53.7	11	9.1	6	5.0	0	0.0
Over 65	29	18.1	104	65.0	7	4.4	6	3.8	1	0.6
TOTAL %		<u>19.5</u>		<u>49.9</u>		<u>9.8</u>		<u>4.3</u>		<u>0.4</u>

Age	St. Luke's West		St. Mary's		Other	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	13	11.1	0	0.0	20	17.1
36-50	3	2.7	0	0.0	13	11.8
51-65	4	3.3	1	0.8	9	7.4
Over 65	3	1.9	0	0.0	7	4.4
TOTAL %		<u>4.5</u>		<u>0.2</u>		<u>9.6</u>

TABLE P8-C10

IMPORTANCE OF PROXIMITY TO JEWISH INSTITUTIONS BY AGE

Age	Very Important		Somewhat Important		Not Important	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	59	28.4	87	41.8	62	29.8
36-50	71	31.1	69	30.3	88	38.6
51-65	62	27.7	69	30.8	93	41.5
Over 65	86	36.6	61	26.0	88	37.5
TOTAL %		<u>31.1</u>		<u>31.9</u>		<u>37.0</u>

TABLE P8-F9-1

TEMPLE AND SYNAGOGUE VOLUNTEERISM BY AGE

Age	Does Not Volunteer		Does Volunteer	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	21	65.6	11	34.4
36-50	34	69.4	15	30.6
51-65	41	69.5	18	30.5
Over 65	36	67.9	17	32.1
TOTAL %		<u>68.6</u>		<u>31.4</u>

TABLE P8-M4a

OPINION ON WHETHER JEWS SHOULD SEND MONEY TO ISRAEL BY AGE

Age	Strongly Approve		Moderately Approve		Moderately Disapprove		Strongly Disapprove	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	141	68.8	48	23.4	11	5.4	5	2.4
36-50	170	76.6	42	18.9	9	4.1	1	0.5
51-65	151	68.6	62	28.2	5	2.3	2	0.9
Over 65	186	81.6	32	14.0	7	3.1	3	1.3
TOTAL %		<u>73.9</u>		<u>21.1</u>		<u>3.8</u>		<u>1.3</u>

TABLE P8-M4e

OPINION ON WHETHER JEWS SHOULD LOBBY FOR ISRAEL BY AGE

Age	Strongly Approve		Moderately Approve		Moderately Disapprove	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	120	60.3	61	30.7	14	7.0
36-50	136	63.0	56	25.9	13	6.0
51-65	125	59.2	58	27.5	18	8.5
Over 65	132	64.7	41	20.1	21	10.3
TOTAL %		<u>61.7</u>		<u>26.1</u>		<u>8.1</u>

Age	Strongly Disapprove	
	Number	Percent
21-35	4	2.0
36-50	11	5.1
51-65	10	4.7
Over 65	10	4.9
TOTAL %		<u>4.2</u>

TABLE P8-M4g

OPINION ON WHETHER JEWS SHOULD SUPPORT U.S. ARMY IN ISRAEL BY AGE

Age	Approve		Moderately Approve		Moderately Disapprove		Disapprove	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	106	54.4	48	24.6	22	11.3	19	9.7
36-50	101	48.8	60	29.0	17	8.2	29	14.0
51-65	106	53.5	30	15.2	24	12.1	38	19.2
Over 65	120	57.1	37	17.6	22	10.5	31	14.8
TOTAL %		<u>53.6</u>		<u>21.6</u>		<u>10.5</u>		<u>14.4</u>

TABLE P8-M7

ANTI-SEMITISM EXPERIENCED IN PAST 12 MONTHS BY AGE

Age	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	81	39.7	123	60.3
36-50	71	32.1	150	67.9
51-65	59	26.7	162	73.3
Over 65	16	6.9	216	93.1
TOTAL %		<u>25.8</u>		<u>74.2</u>

TABLE P8-M8

ANTI-SEMITISM EXPERIENCED IN OWN LIFETIME BY AGE

Age	Great Deal		Moderate Amount		Little		None	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	14	6.7	51	24.3	127	60.5	18	8.6
36-50	23	10.1	64	28.2	113	49.8	27	11.9
51-65	51	22.8	81	36.2	73	32.6	19	8.5
Over 65	46	19.7	61	26.2	98	42.1	28	12.0
TOTAL %		<u>15.0</u>		<u>28.8</u>		<u>46.0</u>		<u>10.3</u>

TABLE P8-M10

POLITICAL AFFILIATION BY AGE
(respondents)

Age	Democratic		Republican		Independent		Other	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	86	43.9	29	14.8	76	38.8	5	2.6
36-50	69	32.6	30	14.2	109	51.4	4	1.9
51-65	82	38.1	18	8.4	112	52.1	3	1.4
Over 65	109	50.9	33	15.4	71	33.2	1	0.5
TOTAL %		<u>41.3</u>		<u>13.1</u>		<u>44.0</u>		<u>1.6</u>

TABLE P8-IN1

END OF LINE

INCOME BY AGE										
Age	0-\$9,999		\$10,000-19,999		\$20,000-29,999		\$30,000-49,999		\$50,000-99,999	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-35	15	9.7	29	18.8	21	13.6	49	31.8	36	23.4
36-50	4	3.0	11	8.3	22	16.5	38	28.6	46	34.6
51-65	6	4.8	14	11.1	18	14.3	32	25.4	39	31.0
Over 65	42	39.6	28	26.4	8	7.6	17	16.0	6	5.7
TOTAL %		<u>13.1</u>		<u>15.9</u>		<u>13.2</u>		<u>26.1</u>		<u>24.4</u>

<u>Age</u>	<u>\$100,000 or More</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
21-35	4	2.6
36-50	12	9.0
51-65	17	13.5
Over 65	5	4.7
TOTAL %		<u>7.3</u>

TABLE P16S BY MA1

RELIGION OF SPOUSE BY YEAR OF MARRIAGE
(prior to conversion to Judaism included)

Religion of Spouse	Pre-1930		1930-1949		1950-1964	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Jewish	23	100.00	175	99.43	160	94.12
Protestant	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	2.94
Catholic	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	1.18
No Religion	0	0.00	1	0.57	3	1.76
Other	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

Religion of Spouse	1965-1974		1975 or After	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Jewish	107	81.06	80	75.47
Protestant	9	6.82	7	6.60
Catholic	7	5.30	12	11.32
No Religion	6	4.55	3	2.83
Other	3	2.27	4	3.77

TABLE RI-IN1

INCOME BY AFFILIATION WITH SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE

Response	0-\$9,999		\$10,000-19,999		\$20,000-29,999		\$30,000-49,999		\$50,000-99,999	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	30	43.5	49	58.3	38	55.1	85	62.5	96	76.8
No	39	56.5	35	41.7	31	44.9	51	37.5	29	23.2
TOTAL %		<u>13.2</u>		<u>16.1</u>		<u>13.2</u>		<u>26.1</u>		<u>24.0</u>

Response	\$100,000 or More	
	Number	Percent
Yes	29	76.3
No	9	23.7
TOTAL %		<u>7.3</u>

TABLE C15-P8

NOW TELL ME IF YOU BELIEVE THAT YOU OR SOMEONE IN YOUR FAMILY WILL LIKELY USE EACH
OF THESE SERVICES SOMETIME IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS.
(by age)

<u>Will Use Service</u>		59 or Younger		60 or Older	
		Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Vocational or educational guidance	YES	72	13.4	21	7.6
and aptitude testing	NO	465	86.4	256	92.1
Family counseling and care	YES	73	14.1	24	8.7
	NO	445	85.9	252	91.3
Housing for the elderly	YES	74	13.6	89	34.5
	NO	471	86.4	169	65.5
Transportation for the elderly	YES	66	12.0	78	29.4
	NO	484	88.0	187	70.6
Youth activities	YES	171	31.0	16	5.6
	NO	381	69.0	268	94.4
Youth camps	YES	139	25.1	14	4.9
	NO	416	75.0	270	95.1
Child adoption services for	YES	30	5.5	10	3.6
Jewish households	NO	516	94.5	270	96.4
Cultural programs	YES	266	48.5	80	28.4
	NO	282	51.5	202	71.6
Marital, parent-child or individual	YES	61	12.0	15	5.4
counseling	NO	449	88.0	261	94.6
Nursing homes	YES	55	10.2	41	16.7
	NO	481	89.6	203	82.9
Programs for the handicapped	YES	30	5.6	27	9.9
	NO	507	94.4	247	90.2
Educational programs	YES	263	49.3	72	25.6
	NO	269	50.5	209	74.4
Programs that help combat	YES	161	31.6	64	22.9
anti-Semitism	NO	349	68.4	216	77.1
General recreational facilities	YES	274	50.1	65	23.2
	NO	273	49.9	215	76.8
Scholarships for youths to visit	YES	64	11.7	16	5.7
Israel	NO	482	88.3	264	94.3
Day care for preschool children	YES	69	12.7	13	4.6
	NO	476	87.3	271	95.4

TABLE M11 BY XIN1

DO YOU USUALLY VOTE DEMOCRATIC OR REPUBLICAN?
(by income)

Affiliation	0-\$9,999		\$10,000-19,999		\$20,000-29,999	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Democratic	21	55.3	30	65.2	18	51.4
Republican	3	7.9	6	13.0	6	17.1
Neither	14	36.8	10	21.7	11	31.4
TOTAL	<u>38</u>	<u>12.3</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>15.0</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>11.4</u>

Affiliation	\$30,000-49,999		\$50,000-99,999		\$100,000 or More	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Democratic	43	48.3	35	46.7	6	24.0
Republican	16	18.0	11	14.7	8	32.0
Neither	30	33.7	29	38.7	11	44.0
TOTAL	<u>89</u>	<u>29.0</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>24.4</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>8.1</u>

TABLE M13 BY XIN1

WHO DID YOU VOTE FOR IN THE 1980 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION?
(by income)

Candidate	0-\$9,999		\$10,000-19,999		\$20,000-29,999	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Reagan	8	18.6	20	28.2	22	37.9
Carter	32	74.4	45	63.4	33	56.9
Other	3	7.0	6	8.5	3	5.2
TOTAL	<u>43</u>	<u>9.5</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>15.7</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>12.8</u>

Candidate	\$30,000-49,999		\$50,000-99,999		\$100,000 or More	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Reagan	60	48.0	63	52.1	24	68.6
Carter	54	43.2	48	39.7	7	20.0
Other	11	8.8	10	8.3	4	11.4
TOTAL	<u>125</u>	<u>27.6</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>26.7</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>7.7</u>

TABLE XZP8A BY MF21

PARENTS OF RESPONDENT AND SPOUSE IF PRESENT BY AGE

Parents' Jewish Identity

Age	Orthodox Jew		Conservative Jew		Reform Jew		Converted Conservative		Converted Reform		Other	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-40	192	36.23	141	26.60	192	36.23	3	0.57	2	0.38	0	0.00
41-60	501	60.43	145	17.49	164	19.78	0	0.00	11	1.33	8	0.97
Over 60	392	71.14	61	11.07	98	17.79	3	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

Education

Age	Less Than High School		High School		Some College		Finished College		Advanced Degree	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
21-40	1993	54.60	664	18.19	337	9.23	318	8.71	338	9.26
41-60	4045	72.36	953	17.05	179	3.20	187	3.35	226	4.04
Over 60	3212	90.12	220	11.98	2	0.06	34	0.95	96	2.69

PART VII

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I
DISTINCTIVE JEWISH SURNAMES
COMPLETE LIST

201 Abraham	109 Ginsberg	243 Margolin	133 Weinberg
202 Abrahams	225 Ginsburg	244 Margolis	134 Weiner
203 Abrahamson	110 Gold	245 Markowitz	135 Weinstein
204 Abramovitz	111 Goldberg	246 Moskowitz	267 Weintraub
205 Abrams	226 Goldfarb		268 Wexler
206 Abramson	112 Goldman	247 Nathan	
207 Adelman	113 Goldstein	248 Nathanson	269 Zeitlin
208 Aronson	227 Gottlieb		270 Zuckerman
	228 Greenbaum	249 Perlman	
209 Bercovitz	114 Greenberg	250 Pincus	999 N.A.
210 Berkowitz	229 Greenwald		000 On neither
101 Berman	115 Grossman	251 Rabinowitz	list
102 Bernstein		252 Rappaport	
211 Birnbaum	230 Halperin	123 Rosen	
212 Blumberg	231 Halpern	124 Rosenbaum	
213 Blumenthal	232 Halprin	253 Rosenberg	
214 Bornstein	116 Horowitz	254 Rosenblatt	
215 Brodsky	233 Horwitz	125 Rosenbloom	
216 Brody	234 Hurwitz	255 Rosenblum	
	235 Hyman	256 Rosenstein	
217 Cahn		126 Rosenthal	
103 Caplan	236 Isenberg	127 Rothman	
104 Cohen		257 Rothschild	
105 Cohn	117 Kahn	258 Rothstein	
	118 Kaplan	259 Ruben	
218 Eisenberg	119 Katz	260 Rubenstein	
219 Eisner	237 Katzman	128 Rubin	
106 Epstein	238 Kohn		
220 Feinberg	239 Lefkowitz	129 Samuels	
221 Feingold	240 Lerner	261 Schulman	
222 Feinstein	241 Levi	262 Segal	
107 Feldman	120 Levin	130 Shapiro	
223 Finkelstein	121 Levine	263 Shulman	
224 Freedman	122 Levinson	131 Siegel	
108 Friedman	242 Levitt	132 Silverman	
		264 Silverstein	
		265 Strauss	
		266 Sugarman	

SHORT LIST OF DISTINCTIVE JEWISH SURNAMES

Berman	Kahn
Bernstein	Kaplan
	Katz
Caplan	
Cohen	Levin
Cohn	Levine
	Levinson
Epstein	
	Rosen
Feldman	Rosenbaum
Friedman	Rosenbloom
	Rosenthal
	Rothman
Ginsberg (burg)	Rubin
Gold	
Goldberg	Samuels
Goldman	Shapiro
Goldstein	Siegel
Greenberg	Silverman
Grossman	
	Weinberg
Horwitz	Weiner
	Weinstein

APPENDIX II
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

LET'S TALK ABOUT WHO LIVES IN THIS HOUSE.

P1.

HOW MANY PEOPLE LIVE IN THIS HOUSEHOLD? ____

NOTE: DO LIST IN QUESTION P1.

- >FAMILY MEMBERS LIVING HERE, INCLUDING BABIES STILL IN THE HOSPITAL.
- >RELATIVES LIVING HERE.
- >LODGERS OR BOARDERS LIVING HERE.
- >OTHER PERSONS LIVING HERE.
- >COLLEGE STUDENTS WHO STAY HERE WHILE ATTENDING COLLEGE, EVEN IF THEIR PARENTS LIVE ELSEWHERE.
- >PERSONS WHO USUALLY LIVE HERE BUT ARE TEMPORARILY AWAY (INCLUDING CHILDREN IN BOARDING SCHOOL BELOW THE COLLEGE LEVEL).
- >PERSONS WITH A HOME ELSEWHERE BUT WHO STAY HERE MOST OF THE WEEK WHILE WORKING.
- >ANY COLLEGE STUDENT WHO STAYS SOMEWHERE ELSE WHILE ATTENDING COLLEGE, BUT RETURNS FOR SUMMER.

NOTE: DO NOT LIST IN QUESTION P1.

- >ANY PERSON AWAY FROM HERE IN THE ARMED FORCES.
- >ANY PERSON WHO USUALLY STAYS SOMEWHERE ELSE MOST OF THE WEEK WHILE WORKING THERE.
- >ANY PERSON AWAY FROM HERE IN AN INSTITUTION SUCH AS A HOME FOR THE AGED OR MENTAL HOSPITAL.
- >ANY PERSON STAYING OR VISITING HERE WHO HAS A USUAL HOME ELSEWHERE.

RESPONDENT

P2.

SEX: 1 Male 2 Female

SPOUSE

P2s.

SEX: 1 Male 2 Female 7 Not applicable

P3.

RACE

- 1 White
- 2 Black
- 3 Other

P3s.

RACE

- 1 White 7 Not applicable
- 2 Black
- 3 Other NOW SKIP TO P5. FOR RESPONDENT

FIRST, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT MARRIAGE AND CHILD RAISING.

P4.

WHAT IS YOUR MARITAL STATUS?

- 1 Now married 4 Separated 9 Refused to answer
- 2 Widowed 5 Never married
- 3 Divorced 6 Living with partner of opposite sex

IF 1, MARK P2s AND P3s FOR SPOUSE.

IF 5, SKIP TO P8.

RESPONDENT

P5.

HAVE YOU BEEN MARRIED MORE THAN ONCE?

- 1 yes 7 Not applicable
- 2 no 9 Refused to answer

SPOUSE

P5s.

HAVE YOU BEEN MARRIED MORE THAN ONCE?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P5. ____

IF NO, SKIP TO P7 FOR RESPONDENT.

IF NO, SKIP TO P7 FOR RESPONDENT.

P6.
HOW MANY MORE TIMES HAVE YOU BEEN MARRIED,
IN ADDITION TO YOUR FIRST MARRIAGE?

1 One 3 Three 7 Not applicable
2 Two 4 Four or more 9 Refused to answer

P6s.
HOW MANY MORE TIMES HAVE YOU BEEN MARRIED,
IN ADDITION TO YOUR FIRST MARRIAGE?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P6. ____

NOTE: P7 IS ADDENDUM 1, MARRIAGE ADDENDUM.
ONE MARRIAGE ADDENDUM SHOULD BE FILLED
OUT FOR EACH MARRIAGE FOR RESPONDENT AND SPOUSE.
MARK ID CODE ON EACH MARRIAGE ADDENDUM

P8.
WHAT IS YOUR AGE, MONTH AND YEAR OF BIRTH?

AGE AT LAST BIRTHDAY ____
MONTH OF BIRTH ____
YEAR OF BIRTH ____

P8s.
WHAT IS YOUR AGE, MONTH AND YEAR OF BIRTH?

AGE AT LAST BIRTHDAY ____
MONTH OF BIRTH ____
YEAR OF BIRTH ____

P9.
HOW MANY BABIES HAVE YOU EVER HAD,
OR FATHERED, NOT COUNTING STILLBIRTHS?
(DO NOT COUNT YOUR STEPCHILDREN OR
CHILDREN YOU HAVE ADOPTED.)

01 One 06 Six 11 Eleven
02 Two 07 Seven 12 Twelve
03 Three 08 Eight 13 Thirteen or more
04 Four 09 Nine 77 None
05 Five 10 Ten 99 Refused to answer

P9s.
HOW MANY BABIES HAVE YOU EVER HAD,
OR FATHERED, NOT COUNTING STILLBIRTHS?
(DO NOT COUNT YOUR STEPCHILDREN OR
CHILDREN YOU HAVE ADOPTED.)

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P9. ____

P10.
HOW MANY CHILDREN LIVING IN THIS HOUSEHOLD HAVE BEEN ADOPTED?

0 None 2 Two 4 Four or more
1 One 3 Three 9 Refused to answer

RESPONDENT

SPOUSE

P11.
WHAT WAS YOUR AGE WHEN YOU HAD
OR FATHERED YOUR FIRST CHILD?

7 Not applicable
8 Don't know Age: ____

P11s.
WHAT WAS YOUR AGE WHEN YOU HAD
OR FATHERED YOUR FIRST CHILD?

7 Not applicable
8 Don't know Age: ____

ASK P12 FOR WOMEN BORN AFTER MAY 1936.
IF BORN BEFORE MAY 1936, SKIP TO P16.
ASK FOR MEN OF ANY AGE.

ASK P12s FOR WOMEN BORN AFTER MAY 1936.
IF BORN BEFORE MAY 1936, SKIP TO P16.
ASK FOR MEN OF ANY AGE.

P12.
DO YOU EXPECT TO HAVE ANY (MORE) CHILDREN?

1 Yes 2 No 8 Don't know

P12s.
DO YOU EXPECT TO HAVE ANY (MORE) CHILDREN?

1 Yes 2 No 8 Don't know

IF NO, SKIP TO P16.

P13.
HOW MANY MORE CHILDREN DO YOU PLAN
TO HAVE?

- 0 None 3 Three
- 1 One 4 Four or more
- 2 Two 7 Not applicable
- 8 Don't know

P14.
WHEN DO YOU THINK YOU WILL PROBABLY
HAVE YOUR NEXT CHILD--IN HOW MANY YEARS?

- 1 Will have no more children
- 2 Within a year
- 3 Within 2 years
- 4 Within 3-5 years
- 5 Within 6-10 years
- 6 Sometime, but more than 10 years away
- 7 Not applicable
- 8 Don't know

P15.
HOW MANY YEARS DO YOU THINK IT WILL
BE BEFORE YOU FINISH HAVING ALL YOUR
CHILDREN?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P14. ____

P13s.
HOW MANY MORE CHILDREN DO YOU PLAN
TO HAVE?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P13. ____

P14s.
WHEN DO YOU THINK YOU WILL PROBABLY
HAVE YOUR NEXT CHILD--IN HOW MANY YEARS?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P14. ____

P15s.
HOW MANY YEARS DO YOU THINK IT WILL
BE BEFORE YOU FINISH HAVING ALL YOUR
CHILDREN?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P14. ____

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND.

P16.
ARE YOU CURRENTLY--

- 1 Jewish 4 No Religion
- 2 Protestant 5 More than one religion
- 3 Catholic 6 Other _____
- 7 Not applicable
- 8 Don't know

IF 4, ASK P17. IF ANY OTHER CATEGORY, SKIP TO P18.

P17.
INTO WHAT RELIGION WERE YOU
BORN OR RAISED?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P16. ____

P18.
SOME PEOPLE CHANGE FROM ONE RELIGION
TO ANOTHER. DID YOU EVER HOLD ANOTHER
FAITH?

- 1 No
- 2 Yes, Protestant
- 3 Yes, Catholic
- 4 Yes, More than one religion
- 5 Yes, Other
- 7 Not applicable

P16s.
ARE YOU CURRENTLY--

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P16. ____

P17s.
INTO WHAT RELIGION TRAINING WERE YOU
BORN OR RAISED?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P16. ____

P18s.
SOME PEOPLE CHANGE FROM ONE RELIGION
TO ANOTHER. DID YOU EVER HOLD ANOTHER
FAITH?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P18. ____

IF NO SKIP TO P20.

P19.
DID YOU FORMALLY CONVERT TO JUDAISM?

- 1 No
- 2 Yes, Orthodox
- 3 Yes, Conservative
- 4 Yes, Reform
- 5 Other _____
- 7 Not applicable

P20.
WHAT IS/WAS YOUR MOTHER'S RELIGION?

- 1 Jewish
- 2 Protestant
- 3 Catholic
- 4 No religion
- 5 More than one religion
- 6 Other _____
- 8 Don't know

P19s.
DID YOU FORMALLY CONVERT TO JUDAISM?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P19. ____

P20s.
WHAT IS/WAS YOUR MOTHER'S RELIGION?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P20. ____

IF MOTHER IS JEWISH, ASK P21. IF NOT, SKIP TO P22.

RESPONDENT

P21.
IF MOTHER IS JEWISH IS/WAS SHE--

- 1 Born or raised Orthodox Jew
- 2 Born or raised Conservative Jew
- 3 Born or raised Reform Jew
- 4 Converted Orthodox Jew
- 5 Converted Conservative Jew
- 6 Converted Reform Jew
- 8 Don't know

P22.
WHAT IS/WAS YOUR FATHER'S RELIGION?

- 1 Jewish
- 2 Protestant
- 3 Catholic
- 4 No religion
- 5 More than one religion
- 6 Other _____
- 8 Don't know

IF FATHER IS/WAS JEWISH, ASK P23. IF NOT, SKIP TO P24.

P23.
IF FATHER IS JEWISH IS/WAS HE--

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P21. ____

SPOUSE

P21s.
IF MOTHER IS JEWISH IS/WAS SHE--

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P21. ____

P22s.
WHAT IS/WAS YOUR FATHER'S RELIGION?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P22. ____

P23s.
IF FATHER IS JEWISH IS/WAS HE--

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P21. ____

USE FOLLOWING NUMBER CODE FOR QUESTION P24 & 24s.

01 Born or raised Orthodox Jew
02 Born or raised Conservative Jew
03 Born or raised Reform Jew
04 Converted Orthodox Jew
05 Converted Conservative Jew
06 Converted Reform Jew

07 Protestant
08 Catholic
09 No religion
10 More than one religion
11 Other _____
88 Don't know

P24.
WHAT ARE/WERE YOUR GRANDPARENT'S
RELIGIOUS BACKGROUNDS?

Mother's mother _____

father _____

Father's mother _____

father _____

RESPONDENT

P25.
DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF (PLEASE
ANSWER EVEN IF YOU DO NOT BELONG TO
A TEMPLE OR SYNAGOGUE)

0 Not Jewish 4 More than one religion
1 Orthodox 5 Traditional
2 Conservative 6 Just Jewish
3 Reform 7 Other _____
8 Don't know

P26.
LET'S TALK ABOUT INTERMARRIAGE OF JEWS TO
NON-JEWS. DO YOU FEEL THAT:

1 A Jew should never marry a non-Jew
under any circumstances.

2 A Jew should marry a non-Jew only if
the spouse agrees to a formal conversion to Judaism.

3 A Jew should marry a non-Jew only if no children are planned.

4 A Jew should marry a non-Jew only if the spouse agrees to
raise the children as Jews, formal conversion not necessary.

5 A Jew should marry a non-Jew as long as the two people care
about each other. Religion should not be a concern.

6 Don't care

8 Don't know

9 Refused to answer

P24s.
WHAT ARE/WERE YOUR GRANDPARENT'S
RELIGIOUS BACKGROUNDS?

Mother's mother _____

father _____

Father's mother _____

father _____

SPOUSE

P25s.
DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF (PLEASE
ANSWER EVEN IF YOU DO NOT BELONG TO
A TEMPLE OR SYNAGOGUE)

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P25. ---

P26s.
LET'S TALK ABOUT INTERMARRIAGE OF JEWS TO
NON-JEWS. DO YOU FEEL THAT:

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P26. ---

NOW WE ARE GOING TO TALK ABOUT YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD AND WHERE YOU HAVE LIVED IN THE PAST.

P27.

ARE YOU PLANNING TO MOVE DURING THE NEXT 3 YEARS?

01 Yes, within same general area	05 Yes, out of the metropolitan
02 Yes, to the City of St. Louis	area, where _____
03 Yes, to a suburb further from the	06 Perhaps, not sure
City of St. Louis than the current address	07 No, not moving
04 Yes, to a suburb closer to the City	08 Other _____
than the current address	88 Don't know

P28.

IS ANYONE IN THE HOUSEHOLD PLANNING TO MOVE DURING THE NEXT THREE YEARS, EVEN IF THE HOUSEHOLD DOES NOT?

- 1 No
- 2 Yes, one of the children will get own residence in St. Louis area
- 3 Yes, one of the children will move out of the area
- 4 Yes, some adult member of the household will move into another residence in St. Louis area
- 5 Yes, some adult member will move out of the area
- 8 Don't know

P29.

DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN WHO HAVE PERMANENTLY MOVED OUT OF THE ST. LOUIS AREA?

1 No, all children live in the area	3 Yes, all of my children have moved out of the area
2 Yes, some of my children have moved out of the area	7 Have no children, not applicable

P30.

JEWS HAVE DIFFERING VIEWS ABOUT LIVING IN JEWISH OR NON-JEWISH NEIGHBORHOODS--SOME PREFERRING ONE, SOME THE OTHER. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING COMES CLOSEST TO YOUR VIEW AT THE PRESENT TIME ABOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD COMPOSITION THAT YOU WOULD PREFER?

01 100% Jewish	<u>SHOW CARD</u>
02 75% Jewish	
03 50% Jewish, 50% non-Jewish	
04 More than 25% Jewish but less than 50% Jewish	
05 Less than 25% Jewish	
06 No other Jews	
07 It depends (Specify) _____	
08 Don't care	
88 Don't know	
99 Refused to answer	

P31.

IS THIS A PARTICULARLY JEWISH NEIGHBORHOOD? WOULD YOU SAY THAT IT IS:

1 About 100% Jewish	5 Less than 25% Jewish
2 At least 75% Jewish	6 There are no other Jews in this neighborhood
3 About 50% Jewish and 50% non-Jewish	8 Don't know
4 Between 25% Jewish and 50% Jewish	

SHOW CARD

P32.

WHEN DID YOU MOVE INTO THIS RESIDENCE?

01 1981	05 1960 to 1969	88 Don't know
02 1979 to 1980	06 1950 to 1959	
03 1975 to 1978	07 1949 or earlier	
04 1970 to 1974	08 Never lived elsewhere	<u>IF NEVER LIVED ELSEWHERE, SKIP TO P35s.</u>

NOTE: FOR QUESTIONS P33, P34, P35s, P37, P37s, HAVE RESPONDENT ANSWER QUESTION EVEN IF ALL THE INFORMATION CANNOT BE REMEMBERED. RECORD EVEN PARTIAL ANSWERS

P33.

WHAT WAS YOUR ADDRESS IN 1961?

7 Not applicable	State/Country	City	Street	Zipcode
8 Don't know				

P34.

WHAT WAS YOUR ADDRESS IN 1941?

7 Not applicable	State/Country	City	Street	Zipcode
8 Don't know				

P35.

WHERE DID YOU LIVE JUST BEFORE YOU MOVED INTO THIS RESIDENCE?

P35s.

WHERE DID YOU LIVE JUST BEFORE YOU MOVED INTO THIS RESIDENCE?

1 State: _____

1 State: _____

2 Country: _____

2 Country: _____

3 City, town, village, etc.

3 City, town, village, etc.

_____, (zipcode) _____

_____, (zipcode) _____

P36.

WHEN DID YOU MOVE INTO THE ST. LOUIS AREA?

P36s.

WHEN DID YOU MOVE INTO THE ST. LOUIS AREA?

1 1981	5 1960 to 1969	USE NUMBER CODE FROM <u>P36.</u> ____
2 1979 to 1980	6 1950 to 1959	
3 1975 to 1978	7 1949 or earlier	
4 1970 to 1974	8 Always lived in St. Louis area	<u>IF 8, SKIP TO P39.</u>

P37.
WHERE DID YOU LIVE BEFORE YOU MOVED INTO
THE ST. LOUIS AREA?

0 Always lived in St. Louis area

1 State: _____

2 Country: _____

3 City, town, village, etc.

_____, (zipcode) _____

P38.
IN WHAT STATE OR FOREIGN COUNTRY
WERE YOU BORN?

1 Born in the St. Louis area

2 Elsewhere in the United

States (List state _____)

3 Eastern Europe

4 Germany-Austria

5 Israel

6 Other

8 Don't know

P37s.
WHERE DID YOU LIVE BEFORE YOU MOVED INTO
THE ST. LOUIS AREA?

0 Always lived in St. Louis area

1 State: _____

2 Country: _____

3 City, town, village, etc.

_____, (zipcode) _____

P38s.
IN WHAT STATE OR FOREIGN COUNTRY
WERE YOU BORN?

1 Born in the St. Louis area

2 Elsewhere in the United

States (List state _____)

3 Eastern Europe

4 Germany-Austria

5 Israel

6 Other

8 Don't know

IF 1, ASK P39. IF 3, 4, 5, OR 6, SKIP TO P40. IF 2, SKIP TO P42.

RESPONDENT

P39.
DO YOU KNOW WHAT STREET YOUR PARENTS
WERE LIVING ON WHEN YOU WERE BORN?

City _____ Street _____ zipcode _____

SPOUSE

P39s.
DO YOU KNOW WHAT STREET YOUR PARENTS
WERE LIVING ON WHEN YOU WERE BORN?

City _____ Street _____ zipcode _____

NOW SKIP TO P42

P40.
ARE YOU A NATURALIZED CITIZEN OF THE U.S.?

1 Yes, a naturalized citizen

2 No, not a citizen

3 Born abroad of American parents

7 Not born in a foreign country

P41.
WHEN DID YOU COME TO THE U.S. TO STAY?

0 Not applicable

5 1940-49

1 Before 1900

6 1950-59

2 1900-1919

7 1960-1969

3 1920-29

8 1970-1975

4 1930-39

9 Since 1975

P40s.
ARE YOU A NATURALIZED CITIZEN OF THE U.S.?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P40. ____

P41s.
WHEN DID YOU COME TO THE U.S. TO STAY?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P41. ____

P42.
DID YOU PRIMARILY SPEAK A LANGUAGE OTHER
THAN ENGLISH WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?

- 1 Yes, Yiddish
- 2 Yes, Hebrew
- 3 Yes, other
- 4 No, spoke primarily
English

P43.
PARENT'S BIRTHPLACE (CITY AND STATE
OR NAME OF FOREIGN COUNTRY):

Mother _____

Father _____

P44.
GRANDPARENT'S BIRTHPLACE (CITY AND STATE
OR NAME OF FOREIGN COUNTRY):

Mother's mother _____

father _____

Father's mother _____

father _____

P42s.
DID YOU PRIMARILY SPEAK A LANGUAGE OTHER
THAN ENGLISH WHEN YOU WERE GROWING UP?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P42. ____

P43s.
PARENT'S BIRTHPLACE (CITY AND STATE
OR NAME OF FOREIGN COUNTRY):

Mother _____

Father _____

P44s.
GRANDPARENT'S BIRTHPLACE (CITY AND STATE
OR NAME OF FOREIGN COUNTRY):

Mother's mother _____

father _____

Father's mother _____

father _____

LET'S TALK NOW ABOUT EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND TRAINING
USE THESE CODES FOR P45, P45s, P47, P47s, P48, P48s, P49, P49s, P50, P50s.

01 1st or less	13 Some College
02 2nd	14 Finished College Degree
03 3rd	15 Some work on Master's degree
04 4th	16 Completed Master's
05 5th	17 Some Ph.D. work
06 6th	18 Finished Ph.D.
07 7th	19 M.D.
08 8th	20 Law degree
09 9th	21 Other _____ (please specify)
10 10th	22 No formal education
11 11th	88 Don't know
12 12th	

RESPONDENT

P45.
WHAT IS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR
YEAR OF SCHOOLING YOU HAVE EVER
COMPLETED? _____

P46.
ARE YOU CURRENTLY ATTENDING SCHOOL?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

IF NO, SKIP TO P48.

SPOUSE

P45s.
WHAT IS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR
YEAR OF SCHOOLING YOU HAVE EVER
COMPLETED? _____

P46s.
ARE YOU CURRENTLY ATTENDING SCHOOL?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

IF NO, SKIP TO P48s.

P47.
IF YES, AT WHAT LEVEL ARE YOU
CURRENTLY ATTENDING? _____

P48.
WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR
YEAR OF SCHOOL YOUR FATHER
COMPLETED? _____

P49.
WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR
YEAR OF SCHOOL YOUR MOTHER
COMPLETED? _____

P50.
WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR YEAR OF
SCHOOL COMPLETED BY YOUR GRANDPARENTS?

Mother's mother _____

father _____

Father's mother _____

father _____

P47s.
IF YES, AT WHAT LEVEL ARE YOU
CURRENTLY ATTENDING? _____

P48s.
WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR
YEAR OF SCHOOL YOUR FATHER
COMPLETED? _____

P49s.
WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR
YEAR OF SCHOOL YOUR MOTHER
COMPLETED? _____

P50s.
WHAT WAS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR YEAR OF
SCHOOL COMPLETED BY YOUR GRANDPARENTS?

Mother's mother _____

father _____

Father's mother _____

father _____

NOW LET'S TALK ABOUT YOUR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND YOUR FAMILY'S RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

RESPONDENT

P51.
DID YOUR FAMILY CONSIDER ITSELF:
(ASK EVEN IF FAMILY DID NOT BELONG
TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE).

1 Orthodox	4 More than one religion
2 Conservative	5 Traditional
3 Reform	6 Other _____
	7 Family not Jewish

P52.
HOW MANY YEARS OF FORMAL JEWISH
EDUCATION HAVE YOU RECEIVED?

1 None	4 6-10 years
2 Less than 1 year	5 11 years & more
3 1-5 years	7 Not applicable
	8 Don't know

SPOUSE

P51s.
DID YOUR FAMILY CONSIDER ITSELF:
(ASK EVEN IF FAMILY DID NOT BELONG
TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE).

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P51. _____

P52s.
HOW MANY YEARS OF FORMAL JEWISH
EDUCATION HAVE YOU RECEIVED?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P52. _____

USE NUMBER CODES BELOW FOR P54, P54s, P55, P55s, P56, P56s, P57, P57s.
CIRCLE ALL THOSE THAT APPLY.

01 No Schooling	05 Private tutor	09 Yeshiva College
02 Sunday	06 Yiddish school	10 Other _____
03 Afternoon Hebrew School	07 Adult classes	77 Parent or person not Jewish
04 All-day school	08 Yeshiva High School	88 Don't know

P53.
 ARE YOU CURRENTLY RECEIVING ANY
 KIND OF FORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION?

1 Yes 2 No

IF NO, SKIP TO P55.

P54.
 IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY RECEIVING ANY
 KIND OF FORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION,
 WHAT KIND IS IT?

01	07
02	08
03	09
04	10 Other _____
05	77
06	88

P55.
 IF YOUR JEWISH EDUCATION IS COMPLETED,
 WHAT KIND WAS IT?

01	07
02	08
03	09
04	10 Other _____
05	77
06	88

P56.
 WHAT WAS YOUR FATHER'S RELIGIOUS TRAINING?

01	07
02	08
03	09
04	10 Other _____
05	77
06	88

P57.
 WHAT WAS YOUR MOTHER'S RELIGIOUS TRAINING?

01	07
02	08
03	09
04	10 Other _____
05	77
06	88

P53s.
 ARE YOU CURRENTLY RECEIVING ANY
 KIND OF FORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION?

1 Yes 2 No 7 Person not Jewish

IF NO, SKIP TO P55s. IF PERSON NOT JEWISH
SKIP TO P60.

P54s.
 IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY RECEIVING ANY
 KIND OF FORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION,
 WHAT KIND IS IT?

01	07
02	08
03	09
04	10 Other _____
05	77
06	88

P55s.
 IF YOUR JEWISH EDUCATION IS COMPLETED,
 WHAT KIND WAS IT?

01	07
02	08
03	09
04	10 Other _____
05	77
06	88

P56s.
 WHAT WAS YOUR FATHER'S RELIGIOUS TRAINING?

01	07
02	08
03	09
04	10 Other _____
05	77
06	88

P57s.
 WHAT WAS YOUR MOTHER'S RELIGIOUS TRAINING?

01	07
02	08
03	09
04	10 Other _____
05	77
06	88

RESPONDENT

P58.
WERE YOU BAR/BAT MITVAH?

1 Yes 2 No

P59.
WERE YOU CONFIRMED?

1 Yes 2 No

P60.
DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN, WHETHER THEY LIVE AT HOME OR NOT, WHO BELONG TO SUCH GROUPS AS THE HARE KRISHNA, CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY, JEWS FOR JESUS, OR OTHER SUCH ORGANIZATIONS?

1 No children in any such organization 4 Yes, Jews for Jesus
2 Yes, Hare Krishna 5 Yes, Other
3 Yes, Church of Scientology 7 No Children, not applicable

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT THE WORK YOU DO.

P61.
DO YOU HAVE A PHYSICAL, MENTAL OR OTHER HEALTH CONDITION WHICH HAS LASTED FOR 6 MONTHS OR MORE AND WHICH:

1 Limits the kind or amount of work you can do at the job
2 Prevents you from working at a job
3 Limits or prevents you from using public transportation
4 No such disabling condition

P62a.
LAST YEAR (1980), DID YOU WORK, EVEN FOR A FEW DAYS, AT A PAID JOB OR IN A BUSINESS OF ANY KIND?

1 Yes 2 No

SPOUSE

P58s.
WERE YOU BAR/BAT MITVAH?

1 Yes 2 No 7 Not applicable

P59s.
WERE YOU CONFIRMED?

1 Yes 2 No 7 Not applicable

P60.
DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN, WHETHER THEY LIVE AT HOME OR NOT, WHO BELONG TO SUCH GROUPS AS THE HARE KRISHNA, CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY, JEWS FOR JESUS, OR OTHER SUCH ORGANIZATIONS?

4 Yes, Jews for Jesus
5 Yes, Other
7 No Children, not applicable

P61s.
DO YOU HAVE A PHYSICAL, MENTAL OR OTHER HEALTH CONDITION WHICH HAS LASTED FOR 6 MONTHS OR MORE AND WHICH:

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P61. ____

P62as.
LAST YEAR (1980), DID YOU WORK, EVEN FOR A FEW DAYS, AT A PAID JOB OR IN A BUSINESS OF ANY KIND?

1 Yes 2 No

IF NO, SKIP TO 62D.

P62b.
HOW MANY WEEKS DID YOU WORK IN 1980?
____ weeks

P62c.
DURING THE WEEKS WORKED IN 1980, HOW MANY HOURS DID YOU USUALLY WORK EACH WEEK?
____ hours

P62bs.
HOW MANY WEEKS DID YOU WORK IN 1980?
____ weeks

P62bs.
DURING THE WEEKS WORKED IN 1980, HOW MANY HOURS DID YOU USUALLY WORK EACH WEEK?
____ hours

RESPONDENT

SPOUSE

P62d.

OF THE WEEKS NOT WORKED IN 1980, (IF ANY) HOW MANY WEEKS WERE YOU LOOKING FOR WORK OR ON LAYOFF FROM A JOB?

_____ weeks

P62ds.

OF THE WEEKS NOT WORKED IN 1980, (IF ANY) HOW MANY WEEKS WERE YOU LOOKING FOR WORK OR ON LAYOFF FROM A JOB?

_____ weeks

P63.

AT WHAT LOCATION DID YOU WORK LAST WEEK? LIST PRIMARY JOB LOCATION IF MORE THAN ONE JOB.

City _____, zipcode _____

7 Not applicable, did not work

P63s.

AT WHAT LOCATION DID YOU WORK LAST WEEK? LIST PRIMARY JOB LOCATION IF MORE THAN ONE JOB.

City _____, zipcode _____

7 Not applicable, did not work

P64.

WHEN DID YOU LAST WORK, EVEN FOR A FEW DAYS?

1 1981	6 1970-74
2 1980	7 1969 or earlier
3 1979	8 Never worked
4 1978	
5 1975-77	

P64s.

WHEN DID YOU LAST WORK, EVEN FOR A FEW DAYS?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P64. _____

P65.

WHAT IS YOUR MAIN OCCUPATION?

P65s.

WHAT IS YOUR MAIN OCCUPATION?

P66.

WHAT ARE/WERE YOUR MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES OR DUTIES?

P66s.

WHAT ARE/WERE YOUR MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES OR DUTIES?

P67.

DO YOU HAVE ANOTHER OCCUPATION, BESIDES YOUR MAIN WORK, FOR WHICH YOU ARE PAID OR EARNED AN INCOME?

1 Yes 2 No

P67s.

DO YOU HAVE ANOTHER OCCUPATION, BESIDES YOUR MAIN WORK, FOR WHICH YOU ARE PAID OR EARNED AN INCOME?

1 Yes 2 No

IF NO SKIP TO P70.

P68.

IF YES, WHAT IS THIS OCCUPATION?

P68s.

IF YES, WHAT IS THIS OCCUPATION?

RESPONDENT

P69.

WHAT WERE YOUR MOST IMPORTANT
ACTIVITIES OR DUTIES IN THIS
OTHER JOB?

P70.

DO YOU WORK FOR YOURSELF, FOR SOMEBODY
ELSE, OR IN A FAMILY BUSINESS?

- 1 Work for somebody else as
employee of private company,
business of individual, for wages
salary, or commissions.
- 2 Self-employed in own
business, professional
practice, or other that
is incorporated
- 3 Self-employed in own business,
professional practice, or other
that is not incorporated
- 4 Working without pay in
family business
- 5 Working with pay in family
business
- 6 Other
- 7 Do not work

P71.

WHAT IS/WAS YOUR FATHER'S OCCUPATION,
THE ONE IN WHICH HE WORKED FOR MOST
OF HIS LIFE?

P72.

DOES/DID YOUR FATHER WORK FOR HIMSELF,
FOR SOMEBODY ELSE, OR IN A FAMILY
BUSINESS?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P70. ____

P73.

WHAT IS/WAS YOUR MOTHER'S OCCUPATION, THE
ONE IN WHICH SHE WORKED FOR MOST OF HER
LIFE?

SPOUSE

P69s.

WHAT WERE YOUR MOST IMPORTANT
ACTIVITIES OR DUTIES IN THIS
OTHER JOB?

P70s.

DO YOU WORK FOR YOURSELF, FOR SOMEBODY
ELSE, OR IN A FAMILY BUSINESS?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P70. ____

P71s.

WHAT IS/WAS YOUR FATHER'S OCCUPATION,
THE ONE IN WHICH HE WORKED FOR MOST
OF HIS LIFE?

P72s.

DOES/DID YOUR FATHER WORK FOR HIMSELF,
FOR SOMEBODY ELSE, OR IN A FAMILY
BUSINESS?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM P70. ____

P73s.

WHAT IS/WAS YOUR MOTHER'S OCCUPATION, THE
ONE IN WHICH SHE WORKED FOR MOST OF HER
LIFE?

RESPONDENT

P74.
WHAT WERE THE OCCUPATIONS OF EACH OF
OUR GRANDPARENTS, THE ONES IN WHICH
THEY WORKED FOR MOST OF THEIR LIVES?

Mother's mother _____
 father _____
Father's mother _____
 father _____

SPOUSE

P74s.
WHAT WERE THE OCCUPATIONS OF EACH OF
YOUR GRANDPARENTS, THE ONES IN WHICH
THEY WORKED FOR MOST OF THEIR LIVES?

Mother's mother _____
 father _____
Father's mother _____
 father _____

USE THE FOLLOWING NUMBER CODES FOR P75, P75s, P76, P76s, P77, P77s.

1 Yes, full-time 2 Yes, part-time 3 Children still at home 4 No 8 Don't know

P75.
DID YOUR MOTHER EVER WORK BEFORE SHE WAS
MARRIED? ____

P75s.
DID YOUR MOTHER EVER WORK BEFORE SHE WAS
MARRIED? ____

P76.
DID YOUR MOTHER EVER WORK AFTER SHE WAS
MARRIED, AND BEFORE ALL THE CHILDREN
HAD LEFT THE HOUSEHOLD? ____

P76s.
DID YOUR MOTHER EVER WORK AFTER SHE WAS
MARRIED, AND BEFORE ALL THE CHILDREN
HAD LEFT THE HOUSEHOLD? ____

P77.
DID YOUR MOTHER EVER WORK AFTER ALL
THE CHILDREN HAD LEFT THE HOUSEHOLD? ____

P77s.
DID YOUR MOTHER EVER WORK AFTER ALL
THE CHILDREN HAD LEFT THE HOUSEHOLD? ____

P78. ARE THERE ANY OTHER ADULTS CURRENTLY LIVING IN THE HOUSEHOLD BESIDES YOU AND YOUR
SPOUSE? 1 Yes 2 No

IF YES, FILL OUT AN ADDENDUM FOR EACH OTHER ADULT IN THE HOUSEHOLD. MARK ID CODE ON EACH
ADDENDUM.

NOW FILL OUT AN ADDENDUM FOR EACH CHILD WHO IS CURRENTLY LIVING IN THE HOUSEHOLD.
MARK ID CODE ON EACH CHILD ADDENDUM.

QUESTIONS E SERIES FOR RESPONDENTS 60 AND OVER ONLY.
IF UNDER 60 YEARS OF AGE SKIP TO R1.

E1.
IF YOU ARE GOING TO STAY IN THE ST. LOUIS AREA, DO YOU EXPECT THAT YOU WILL HAVE
ANY CHANGES IN YOUR HOUSING NEEDS IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS?

01 Not going to stay in the St. Louis area.	06 Yes, will need institutional care
02 No, will have no change in housing needs.	07 Yes, apt is being changed to condo
03 Yes, smaller house	08 Yes, need a safer neighborhood
04 Yes, lower rental	09 Other _____
05 Yes, a unit without stairs	88 Don't know

E2.
IF CURRENTLY WORKING, WHEN DO YOU EXPECT TO RETIRE?

1 Within the next year	4 Beyond 10 years	8 Don't know
2 Within the next 2-5 years	5 Don't plan to retire	
3 6 to 10 Years	7 Not Currently working	

E3.

HOW SAFE WOULD YOU SAY YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD IS? WOULD YOU SAY IT IS:

- 1 Very safe 3 Pretty unsafe 8 Don't know
2 Pretty safe 4 Not safe at all

E4.

HAVE YOU USED ANY OF THESE COMMUNITY SERVICES IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS?

SHOW CARD

	Yes	No
a. Library	1	2
b. Public transportation	1	2
c. Jewish Community Center	1	2
d. Home maker services	1	2
e. Meals-on wheels to residence	1	2
f. Meals at a nutrition center	1	2
g. Home health care	1	2
h. Day care service	1	2
i. Legal aid	1	2
j. Temple or Synagogue	1	2
k. Police Department	1	2
l. Fire Department	1	2
m. Telephone information service	1	2
n. Social worker	1	2
o. Multi-Service Senior Center	1	2
p. Alcohol-abuse treatment organization	1	2
q. Other (Specify)	1	2

E5.

DO YOU HAVE PROBLEMS OBTAINING THE SERVICES YOU WOULD LIKE TO USE?

- 1 No problems 4 Yes, don't know what 6 Yes, other _____
2 Yes, can't get to them services are available 8 Don't know
3 Yes, costs too much 5 Yes, health problems

E6.

HOW DO YOU USUALLY GET YOUR FOOD SHOPPING DONE?

- 1 Walk 4 Own car 7 Food delivery
2 Bus 5 Get driven by relative 8 Other _____
3 Taxi 6 Get driven by friend

E7.

IS THE LOCATION OF YOUR PRESENT RESIDENCE: SHOW CARD

	Yes	No	D.K.
a. Convenient for shopping	1	2	8
b. Convenient to transportation	1	2	8
c. Convenient to residences of family	1	2	8
c. Convenient to residences of friends	1	2	8
d. Convenient to the JCCA	1	2	8
e. Convenient to medical services	1	2	8
f. Convenient to temple or Synagogue	1	2	8

E8.
HOW MANY HOSPITALIZATIONS HAVE YOU HAD IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS?

1 None	2 Two	4 Four	6 Six or more
1 One	3 Three	5 Five	8 Don't know

E9.
DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN WHO LIVE IN THE ST. LOUIS AREA?

1 Yes 2 No

E10.
HOW MANY TIMES PER MONTH ON THE AVERAGE, WOULD YOU SAY THAT YOU AND MEMBERS OF YOUR FAMILY SEE EACH OTHER?

1 One time	3 Three times	5 Five or more times	7 No visits
2 Two times	4 Four times	6 No family in St. Louis	8 Don't know

LET'S TALK NOW ABOUT RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES.

R1.
DO YOU CURRENTLY BELONG TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE?

1 Yes 2 No 8 Don't know

IF NO, SKIP TO R3.

R2.
IF YOU CURRENTLY BELONG TO A TEMPLE OR SYNAGOGUE, IS IT:

1 Orthodox	3 Reform	5 Other _____
2 Conservative	4 Traditional	7 Do not currently belong, not applicable
		8 Don't know

R3.
IF YOU DO NOT CURRENTLY BELONG TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE, DID YOU EVER BELONG TO ONE, AFTER YOU WERE GROWN UP?

1 Yes 2 No 7 Currently belong

IF NO, SKIP TO R5.

R4.
IF YOU DID BELONG WHAT KIND OF SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE, WAS IT?

0 Never belonged	3 Conservative	6 Other _____
1 Currently belong	4 Reform	8 Don't know
2 Orthodox	5 Traditional	

R5.
 IF YOU DO NOT CURRENTLY BELONG OR HAVE NEVER BELONGED TO A SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE, IS IT
 BECAUSE: CIRCLE ALL THOSE THAT APPLY.

- 01 Never have been and just not interested
- 02 Used to belong but no longer interested
- 03 Costs too much
- 04 Went mainly for educational training for children which is now completed
- 05 Moved too far away from a synagogue or temple
- 06 Bad experience in Sunday School or Hebrew School
- 07 Don't have the time
- 08 Went mainly for my own educational training which is now completed
- 09 Other _____
- 77 Currently affiliated, not applicable
- 88 Don't know

R6.
 WHICH OF THESE IS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT REASON?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM R5. ____

RESPONDENT

SPOUSE

R7.
 DID YOUR PARENTS BELONG TO A
 SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE WHEN YOU
 WERE GROWING UP?
 1 No 2 Yes 8 Don't know

R7s.
 DID YOUR PARENTS BELONG TO A
 SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE WHEN YOU
 WERE GROWING UP?
 1 No 2 Yes 8 Don't know

IF NO, SKIP TO R9.

R8.
 IF YES, WAS IT:

R8s.
 IF YES, WAS IT:

- 0 Never belonged
- 1 Orthodox
- 2 Conservative
- 3 Reform
- 4 Traditional
- 5 Other
- 8 Don't know

USE NUMBER CODE FROM R8. ____

R9.
 WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING JEWISH CEREMONIAL OBJECTS DO YOU HAVE IN YOUR HOME?

	Yes	No
a. Mezuzah	1	2
b. Menorah	1	2
c. Kiddush Cup	1	2

R10.

HOW OFTEN WOULD YOU SAY EACH OF THE FOLLOWING PRACTICES IS OBSERVED BY YOUR HOUSEHOLD? SHOW CARD

	Always	Usually	Some- times	Never
a. Light candles Friday night	1	2	3	4
b. Have a Passover Seder in my home	1	2	3	4
c. Attend Passover Seder outside my home	1	2	3	4
d. Buy kosher meat for home	1	2	3	4
e. Eat non-kosher meat outside my home	1	2	3	4
f. Use two sets of dishes in my home	1	2	3	4
g. Walk to synagogue or temple	1	2	3	4
h. Light Chanukah candles	1	2	3	4
i. Have a Christmas tree	1	2	3	4
j. Stay home from work or school on High Holidays	1	2	3	4
k. Have Easter egg hunt in my house	1	2	3	4
l. Use a Mikvah	1	2	3	4

R11.

EVEN IF YOU DON'T CURRENTLY BELONG TO A TEMPLE OR SYNAGOGUE, HOW OFTEN (ON A YEARLY AVERAGE) DO YOU ATTEND SYNAGOGUE OR TEMPLE SERVICES? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

01 Never	06 An occasional Saturday or Friday night
02 High Holidays	07 Most Saturdays
03 Occasional Bar/Bat Mitzvah	08 Daily, or almost daily
04 Festivals like Purim, Succoth	09 Other _____
05 Most Friday Nights	88 Don't know

R12.

HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE QUALITY OF THE JEWISH EDUCATION YOUR CHILDREN ARE RECEIVING OR HAVE RECEIVED?

1 Excellent	4 Poor	7 No Children
2 Good	5 Very poor	8 Don't know
3 Fair	6 No Jewish education for children	

R13.

HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE QUALITY OF THE JEWISH EDUCATION THAT YOU RECEIVED?

1 Excellent	4 Poor	6 No Jewish education
2 Good	5 Very poor	8 Don't know
3 Fair		

R14.
I AM GOING TO READ A LIST OF SUBJECTS THAT ARE OFTEN TAUGHT IN JEWISH SCHOOLS. I WOULD LIKE YOU TO TELL ME HOW IMPORTANT YOU FEEL IT IS FOR EACH OF THESE TO BE INCLUDED IN A JEWISH EDUCATIONAL CURRICULUM. SHOW CARD

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Very Important	Don't Know
01. Bible	1	2	3	8
02. Post-biblical Jewish history	1	2	3	8
03. Israel	1	2	3	8
04. The meanings of the Jewish festivals	1	2	3	8
05. Jewish observances	1	2	3	8
06. Jewish philosophy and ethics	1	2	3	8
07. Talmud	1	2	3	8
08. Hebrew	1	2	3	8
09. Holocaust	1	2	3	8
10. Other (SPECIFY)	1	2	3	8

R15.
WHICH OF THESE DO YOU FEEL IS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT SUBJECT TO BE TAUGHT IN A JEWISH SCHOOL?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM R14. _____ (USE CODE 88 FOR DON'T KNOW)

I AM GOING TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR LIVING QUARTERS

H1.
HOW MANY ROOMS DO YOU HAVE IN YOUR LIVING QUARTERS? (DO NOT COUNT BATHROOMS, PORCHES, BALCONIES, FOYERS, HALLS, GARAGES, OR HALF-ROOMS)

1 one room 4 four rooms 7 seven rooms
2 two rooms 5 five rooms 8 eight rooms
3 three rooms 6 six rooms 9 nine or more rooms

H2.
ARE YOUR LIVING QUARTERS:

1 owned or being bought by you or by someone else in this household?
2 rented for cash rent?
3 occupied without payment or cash rent?

IF 2 OR 3 SKIP TO H4.

H3.
IF OWNED OR BEING BOUGHT BY YOU, WHAT IS YOUR TOTAL MONTHLY MORTGAGE PAYMENT? PLEASE INCLUDE REAL ESTATE TAXES AND MONTHLY PREMIUM FOR FIRE AND HAZARD INSURANCE.

TOTAL MONTHLY MORTGAGE AMOUNT \$ _____ .00 NOW SKIP TO H6.

H4.

IF YOU PAY CASH RENT, WHAT IS YOUR MONTHLY RENT?

1 Less than \$50	15 \$180-189
2 \$50-59	16 \$190-199
3 \$60-69	17 \$200-224
4 \$70-79	18 \$225-249
5 \$80-89	19 \$250-274
6 \$90-99	20 \$275-299
7 \$100-109	21 \$300-349
8 \$110-119	22 \$350-399
9 \$120-129	23 \$400-499
10 \$130-139	24 \$500 or more
11 \$140-149	77 Do not pay rent
12 \$150-159	88 Don't know
13 \$160-169	99 Refused to answer
14 \$170-179	

H5.

DOES THIS MONTHLY PAYMENT INCLUDE UTILITIES?

- 1 Yes 2 No IF YES, SKIP TO H7.

H6.

IF NO, WHAT ARE YOUR AVERAGE MONTHLY UTILITY COSTS (GAS, ELECTRIC, WATER)?

1 Less than \$50	13 \$160-169
2 \$50-59	14 \$170-179
3 \$60-69	15 \$180-189
4 \$70-79	16 \$190-199
5 \$80-89	17 \$200-224
6 \$90-99	18 \$225-249
7 \$100-109	19 \$250-274
8 \$110-119	20 \$275-299
9 \$120-129	21 \$300-349
10 \$130-139	22 \$350-399
11 \$140-149	23 \$400-499
12 \$150-159	24 \$500 or more
	77 Not applicable, do not pay rent
	88 Don't know
	99 Refused to answer

H7.

IS THIS APARTMENT (HOUSE) PART OF A CONDOMINIUM?

- 1 Yes 2 No

H7a.

IS THIS APARTMENT (HOUSE) PART OF A CO-OP?

- 1 Yes 2 No

IF NOT A ONE-FAMILY HOUSE OR CONDOMINIUM, CIRCLE NOT APPLICABLE AND SKIP TO H9.

H8.

IF YOU LIVE IN A ONE-FAMILY HOUSE OR A CONDOMINIUM UNIT WHICH YOU OWN OR ARE BUYING, WHAT IS THE VALUE OF THIS PROPERTY, THAT IS, HOW MUCH DO YOU THINK THIS PROPERTY (HOUSE AND LOT OR CONDOMINIUM UNIT) WOULD SELL FOR IF IT WERE FOR SALE? (DO NOT ASK THIS QUESTION IF THIS IS A MOBILE HOME OR TRAILER, A HOUSE ON 10 OR MORE ACRES, A HOUSE WITH A COMMERCIAL ESTABLISHMENT OR MEDICAL OFFICE ON THE PROPERTY.)

01 Less than \$10,000	13 \$50,000 - 54,999	88 Don't know
02 \$10,000 -14,999	14 \$55,000 - 59,999	99 Refused to answer
03 \$15,000 -17,499	15 \$60,000 - 64,999	
04 \$17,500 -19,999	16 \$65,000 - 69,999	
05 \$20,000 -22,499	17 \$70,000 - 74,999	
06 \$22,500 -24,999	18 \$75,000 - 79,999	
07 \$25,000 - 27,499	19 \$80,000 - 89,999	
08 \$27,500 - 29,999	20 \$90,000 - 99,999	
09 \$30,000 - 34,999	21 \$100,000- 124,999	
10 \$35,000 - 39,999	22 \$125,000- 149,999	
11 \$40,000 - 44,999	23 \$150,000- 199,999	
12 \$45,000 - 49,999	24 \$200,000 or more	
	77 Not applicable	

H9.

ABOUT WHEN WAS THIS BUILDING ORIGINALLY BUILT? (MARK WHEN THE BUILDING WAS FIRST CONSTRUCTED, NOT WHEN IT WAS REMODELED, ADDED TO, OR CONVERTED.)

1 1979 or 1980	5 1950-1959
2 1975 to 1978	6 1949 or earlier
3 1970 to 1974	8 Don't know
4 1960 to 1969	

H10.

WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THIS BUILDING YOU LIVE IN? (INCLUDE ALL APARTMENTS, FLATS, ETC., EVEN IF VACANT.)

1 A mobile home or trailer	5 A building 3 or 4 families
2 A one-family house detached from any other house	6 A building 5 to 9 families
3 A one-family house attached to one or more houses	7 A building 10 to 19 families
4 A building for 2 families	8 A building 20 to 49 families
	9 A building 50 or more families
	10 other _____

H11.

HOW MANY STORIES (FLOORS) ARE IN THIS BUILDING? (COUNT AN ATTIC OR BASEMENT AS A STORY IF IT HAS ANY FINISHED ROOMS FOR LIVING PURPOSES.)

1 one	3 three	5 seven to twelve
2 two	4 four to six	6 thirteen or more

H12.

IS THERE A PASSENGER ELEVATOR IN THIS BUILDING? 1 yes 2 no

H13.

DO YOU HAVE A TELEPHONE IN YOUR LIVING QUARTERS? 1 yes 2 no

H14.

IS YOUR PHONE NUMBER LISTED IN THE TELEPHONE DIRECTORY? 1 yes 2 no

H15a.

HOW MANY AUTOMOBILES, EXCLUDING TRUCKS OR VANS,
ARE KEPT AT HOME FOR USE BY MEMBERS OF YOUR
HOUSEHOLD?

0 none 2 two
1 one 3 three or more

H15b.

HOW MANY TRUCKS OR VANS, ARE KEPT AT HOME FOR
USE BY MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD?

0 none 2 two
1 one 3 three or more

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT GENERAL HEALTH CONDITIONS.

RESPONDENT

SPOUSE

HP1.

DOES YOUR FAMILY HAVE A PRIVATE
PHYSICIAN?

1 Yes 2 No

HP2.

HAVE YOU USED A HOSPITAL IN THE LAST
FIVE YEARS?

1 Yes 2 No

IF NO, SKIP TO HP5.

HP2s.

HAVE YOU USED A HOSPITAL IN THE LAST
FIVE YEARS?

1 Yes 2 No

IF NO, SKIP TO HP5.

HP3.

IN WHICH HOSPITAL: (FOR LAST
HOSPITALIZATION ONLY, IF IN HOSPITAL
MORE THAN ONCE)

1 Barnes 3 Other _____
2 Jewish 8 Don't know

HP4.

WAS THIS HOSPITAL CARE: (FOR
LAST HOSPITALIZATION ONLY, IF
IN HOSPITAL MORE THAN ONCE):

1 Emergency Room only 4 Clinic
2 Out-patient 5 Other
3 In-patient

HP3s.

IN WHICH HOSPITAL: (FOR LAST
HOSPITALIZATION ONLY IF, IN HOSPITAL MORE
THAN ONCE)

1 Barnes 3 Other _____
2 Jewish 8 Don't know

HP4s.

WAS THIS HOSPITAL CARE: (FOR
LAST HOSPITALIZATION ONLY, IF
IN HOSPITAL MORE THAN ONCE):

1 Emergency Room only 4 Clinic
2 Out-patient 5 Other
3 In-patient

RESPONDENT

HP5.

ARE YOU CONFINED TO A
WHEELCHAIR, OR OTHERWISE DISABLED?

- 1 No
- 2 Yes, wheelchair
- 3 Other _____

IF NO, SKIP TO HP7.

HP6.

WOULD YOU SAY THIS DISABILITY:

- 1 Severely limits access to
receiving services
- 2 Somewhat limits access
- 3 Does not limit access to
services at all
- 7 No disability
- 8 Don't know

HP7.

IS THERE ANYONE IN THE HOUSEHOLD WHO NEEDS ANY ASSISTANCE IN PERFORMING EVERYDAY
FUNCTIONS?

1 Yes, all the time	3 Yes, occasionally	8 Don't know
2 Yes, most of the time	4 No, not at all	

HP8.

HAVE YOU SEEN A PHYSICIAN, FOR ANY
REASON, IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS?

- 1 Yes 2 No
- IF YES, SPECIFY REASON _____

SPOUSE

HP5s.

ARE YOU CONFINED TO
A WHEELCHAIR, OR OTHERWISE DISABLED?

- 1 No
- 2 Yes, wheelchair
- 3 Other _____

IF NO, SKIP TO HP7.

HP6s.

WOULD YOU SAY THIS DISABILITY:

USE NUMBER CODE FROM HP6. ____

HP8s.

HAVE YOU SEEN A PHYSICIAN, FOR ANY
REASON, IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS?

- 1 Yes 2 No
- IF YES, SPECIFY REASON _____

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER.

C1.

HAVE YOU EVER BELONGED TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER?

- 1 yes 2 no, never a member

C2.

IF NOT CURRENTLY A MEMBER OR HAVE NEVER BEEN A MEMBER, WHAT IS THE MAIN REASON YOU
DON'T CURRENTLY BELONG TO THE JCCA?

01 Financial reasons	06 Don't like to belong to Jewish organizations
02 Too busy	07 Used a service that is no longer needed
03 Not interested in the services	08 Problems with staff
04 Poor scheduling of services	09 Poor quality of services
05 Inconvenient to get there	10 Other
	88 Don't know

IF NEVER A MEMBER, SKIP TO C8.

C3.
DO YOU OR YOUR FAMILY CURRENTLY BELONG TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER?

1 Yes 2 No

C4.
WHAT ARE THE REASONS THAT YOU USE OR HAVE USED THE CENTER?
CIRCLE ALL THOSE THAT APPLY.

- 01 Convenient to my residence
02 Convenient to my work
03 Cultural and educational activities
04 Like to be part of Jewish social environment
05 Provides a number of services for me and/or family
06 Want to have or my children to have Jewish social contacts
07 Other _____
77 Don't belong
88 Don't know

C5.
WHICH OF THESE IS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT REASON?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM C4. _____

C6.
HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE PROGRAMS THAT YOU HAVE USED AT OF THE JCCA?

- 1 Excellent 3 Fair 5 Very poor
2 Good 4 Poor 7 Not applicable
8 Don't know

C7.
HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE QUALITY OF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMS THAT YOU HAVE USED AT THE JCCA? SHOW CARD.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	Have not used Service	D.K.
a. Day care	1	2	3	4	5	7	8
b. Pre-School	1	2	3	4	5	7	8
c. Health & Physical Education	1	2	3	4	5	7	8
d. Senior Adults Programs	1	2	3	4	5	7	8
e. Family Programming/Group Services	1	2	3	4	5	7	8
f. Cultural Arts	1	2	3	4	5	7	8
g. Volunteer Programs	1	2	3	4	5	7	8
h. Camps	1	2	3	4	5	7	8

C8.
DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THE JCCA SHOULD PERMIT NON-JEWS TO BECOME MEMBERS?

- 1 Yes 8 Don't know
2 No
3 Depends on how many

IF NO, CIRCLE NO ON C8 AND NONE ON C9.

C9.

WHAT PROPORTION OF THE JCCA MEMBERSHIP DO YOU BELIEVE SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO BE NON-JEWISH?

0 None, non-Jewish members should
not be admitted

1 10 % non-Jewish

2 20 % non-Jewish

3 30 % non-Jewish

4 40% non-Jewish

5 50% non-Jewish

6 60 % non-Jewish

7 more than 60 % non-Jewish

8 Don't care

9 Don't know

LET'S TALK ABOUT JEWISH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS IN ST. LOUIS.

C10.

GENERALLY, IS BEING NEAR TO JEWISH INSTITUTIONS IMPORTANT TO YOU?

1 Very important

2 Somewhat important

3 Not important

C11.

IS TRANSPORTATION A PROBLEM IN USING JEWISH INSTITUTIONS?

1 Always

2 Sometimes

3 Never

8 Don't know

C12.

DO YOU RECEIVE THE ST. LOUIS JEWISH LIGHT? 1 Yes 2 No

IF NO, SKIP TO C14.

C13.

WHICH OF THESE NEWS CATEGORIES IN THE ST. LOUIS JEWISH LIGHT DO YOU USUALLY READ?

SHOW CARD

	Yes	No
a. News about Israel	1	2
b. Birth, marriage, engagement, obituary sections	1	2
c. News about Jews in other foreign countries	1	2
d. News about Jewish life throughout the United States	1	2
e. News about Jewish life in St. Louis	1	2
f. News about the St. Louis Jewish Federation	1	2
g. Reviews of plays, books, movies & TV shows	1	2
h. Other	1	2

C14.
 NOW LET'S TALK SPECIFICALLY ABOUT SOME AGENCIES AND SERVICES WHICH ARE SOMETIMES OFFERED IN A COMMUNITY. (GIVE CARD.) LOOK AT THE LIST OF SERVICES THAT MIGHT BE OFFERED TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY BY JEWISH AGENCIES. NOW TELL ME WHICH THREE OF THESE YOU BELIEVE WOULD BE MOST IMPORTANT IN TERMS OF THE PRIORITIES OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY. TELL ME WHICH YOU THINK IS THE MOST IMPORTANT, THE SECOND MOST IMPORTANT AND THE THIRD MOST IMPORTANT. LOOK AT THE LIST CAREFULLY FOR A MOMENT BEFORE YOU ANSWER.

USE NUMBER CODE FROM C15.

1st: ___ 2nd: ___ 3rd: ___ USE NUMBER CODE 88 FOR DON'T KNOW.

C15.
 NOW TELL ME IF YOU BELIEVE THAT YOU OR SOMEONE IN YOUR FAMILY WILL LIKELY USE EACH OF THESE SERVICES SOMETIME IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS. LET'S TALK ABOUT THEM ONE AT A TIME.

	YES	NO	D.K.
01. Vocational or educational guidance and aptitude testing	1	2	8
02. Family counseling and care	1	2	8
03. Housing for the elderly	1	2	8
04. Transportation for the elderly	1	2	8
05. Youth activities	1	2	8
06. Youth camps	1	2	8
07. Child adoption services for Jewish households	1	2	8
08. Cultural programs	1	2	8
09. Marital, parent-child, or individual counseling	1	2	8
10. Nursing homes	1	2	8
11. Programs for the handicapped	1	2	8
12. Educational programs	1	2	8
13. Programs that help combat anti-semitism	1	2	8
14. General recreational facilities	1	2	8
15. Scholarships for youths to visit Israel	1	2	8
16. Day care for pre-school children	1	2	8
17. Nursery schools	1	2	8
18. Help if you needed finding a job	1	2	8
19. Financial assistance if you had a financial problem	1	2	8
20. Day care for the elderly	1	2	8
21. Jewish Family and Childrens' Service	1	2	8
22. Jewish Employment and Vocational Service	1	2	8
23. A loan fund for higher education	1	2	8
24. A Reform day school	1	2	8
25. A Conservative day school	1	2	8
26. Assistance for individuals or families with drug abuse problems	1	2	8
27. Assistance for individuals or families with alcohol abuse problems	1	2	8
28. Other	1	2	8

LET'S TALK ABOUT JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES IN GENERAL AND THE JEWISH FEDERATION SPECIFICALLY.

F1.
 DO YOU FEEL THAT A JEW HAS A GREATER OBLIGATION TO JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES THAN TO GENERAL COMMUNITY PHILANTHROPIES?

1 Yes 2 No 3 Equal obligation 8 Don't Know

F2.
WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES WOULD YOU SAY
ARE CURRENTLY PART OF THE ST. LOUIS JEWISH
FEDERATION'S ONGOING FUNCTIONS?. SHOW CARD.

F3.
HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU BELIEVE EACH
OF THESE FUNCTIONS SHOULD BE?
SHOW CARD.

	F2			F3			
	Yes	No	D.K.	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important at all	Don't Know
1. Overall community planning for St. Louis area	1	2	8	1	2	3	8
2. Raising and allocating funds for service uses of St. Louis Jews	1	2	8	1	2	3	8
3. Raising and allocating funds for service uses for the American Jewish community	1	2	8	1	2	3	8
4. Raising and allocating funds for Israel	1	2	8	1	2	3	8
5. Raising and allocating funds for Russian Jews and Jewish communities world-wide other than Israel	1	2	8	1	2	3	8
6. Training Jewish Community leaders	1	2	8	1	2	3	8
7. Sponsoring lectures and seminars on public affairs issues of Jewish interest	1	2	8	1	2	3	8
8. Other	1	2	8	1	2	3	8

F4.
WHICH OF THESE DO YOU BELIEVE SHOULD BE THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT FUNCTION OF THE ST. LOUIS JEWISH FEDERATION?

USE NUMBER CODE FROM F2. USE CODE 9 FOR DON'T KNOW.

F5.
HOW MUCH PER YEAR DOES YOUR HOUSEHOLD CONTRIBUTE TO ALL JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES? THIS INCLUDES SYNAGOGUES, TEMPLES, FEDERATION AND ALL OTHERS. DO NOT INCLUDE JCCA DUES OR OTHER SUCH ORGANIZATIONAL FEES. DO COUNT SYNAGOGUE DUES.

0 Nothing 2 \$51-100 4 \$501-1000 6 \$5001-10,000 8 Don't know
1 \$50 or less 3 \$101-500 5 \$1001-5000 7 More than \$10,000 9 Refused to answer

F6.
HOW MUCH PER YEAR DOES YOUR HOUSEHOLD CONTRIBUTE TO NON-JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES?
SHOW CARD.

0 Nothing 5 \$1001-5000
1 \$50 or less 6 \$5001-10,000
2 \$51-100 7 More than \$10,000
3 \$101-500 8 Don't know
4 \$501-1000 9 Refused to answer

F7.
HOW WOULD YOU RANK THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE PROGRAMS OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION?

1 Excellent	4 Poor	
2 Good	5 Very poor	8 Don't know
3 Fair	6 Don't know enough about it	
	7 Don't care	

F8.
HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK (ON AVERAGE) DO YOU CURRENTLY SPEND ON VOLUNTEER WORK WITH JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS?

IF LESS THAN ONE HOUR, SKIP TO F10.

0 None	3 6-10 hours
1 Less than 1 hour	4 11-20 hours
2 1-5 hours	5 More than 20 hours
	8 Don't know

F9.
IF MORE THAN 1 HOUR, FOR WHICH ORGANIZATION OR ORGANIZATIONS DO YOU SPEND YOUR VOLUNTEER TIME? (CIRCLE ALL THOSE THAT APPLY.)

- 1 Synagogue or temple (including men's clubs and sisterhoods)
- 2 Jewish Federation
- 3 JCCA
- 4 Women's group
- 5 Men's group
- 6 Other _____
- 7 Not applicable

F10.
HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK DO YOU CURRENTLY SPEND ON VOLUNTEER WORK WITH NON-JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS?

0 None	3 6-10 hours
1 Less than 1 hour	4 11-20 hours
2 1-5 hours	5 More than 20 hours

F11.
HAVE YOU MADE A CONTRIBUTION TO THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS IN THE LAST TWO YEARS?

- 1 yes 2 no 8 Don't know 9 Refused to answer

F12.
WHAT ARE YOUR SOURCES OF INFORMATION CONCERNING THE ST. LOUIS JEWISH FEDERATION? (CIRCLE ALL THOSE THAT APPLY.)

1 St. Louis Jewish Light	4 Direct Federation solicitation
2 Congregational or other organizational bulletins	5 Don't have any source of information
3 Word of mouth	6 Other _____
	8 Don't know

F13.
WHAT IS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT SOURCE? _____ USE NUMBER CODE FROM F12.

I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT MATTERS RELATING TO ISRAEL, AND SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT ANTI-SEMITISM.

M1.
HAVE YOU EVER VISITED ISRAEL? 1 Yes 2 No IF YES, SKIP TO M3.

M2.
DO YOU INTEND TO VISIT ISRAEL?

1 Yes 2 Maybe 3 No 8 Don't Know

M3.
DO YOU BELIEVE AMERICAN JEWS HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO AID ISRAEL?

1 Yes 2 Depends on the type of aid 3 No 8 Don't Know

SHOW CARD.

M4. Do you approve of the following types of aid by American Jews for the Jews of Israel?	Strongly Approve	Moderately Approve	Moderately Disapprove	Strongly Disapprove	Don't Know
a. Raising money to be sent to Israel	1	2	3	4	8
b. Buying Israel bonds	1	2	3	4	8
c. Belonging to Zionist organizations	1	2	3	4	8
d. Visiting Israel	1	2	3	4	8
e. Political lobbying on behalf of Israeli interests	1	2	3	4	8
f. Military supplies	1	2	3	4	8
g. Sending U.S. military personnel if Israel's security is threatened	1	2	3	4	8

M5.
HOW MUCH ANTI-SEMITISM DO YOU THINK THERE IS IN THIS COMMUNITY? WOULD YOU SAY THAT, ON THE WHOLE, THERE IS A GREAT DEAL OF ANTI-SEMITISM, A MODERATE AMOUNT, A LITTLE, OR NO ANTI-SEMITISM IN THIS COMMUNITY?

1 Great deal 2 Moderate 3 Little 4 None 8 Don't know

IF NONE, SKIP TO M7.

M6.
IN WHAT WAYS DOES THE ANTI-SEMITISM MANIFEST ITSELF? CIRCLE ALL THOSE THAT APPLY.

01 in business 04 in politics 07 informal relations
02 in employment 05 in the schools 08 other (Describe) _____
03 in housing 06 in social clubs 88 don't know

M7.
HAVE YOU PERSONALLY, IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, EXPERIENCED ANTI-SEMITISM?

1 Yes 2 No 8 Don't know

M8.
HOW MUCH ANTI-SEMITISM HAVE YOU PERSONALLY EXPERIENCED IN YOUR LIFETIME?

1 Great deal 2 Moderate 3 Little 4 None 8 Don't know

M9.
HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU BELIEVE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ARE TO THE JEWISH PEOPLE?

<u>SHOW CARD.</u>	Very Important	Moderately Important	Moderately Unimportant	Totally Unimportant	Don't Know
a. Neighborhoods where Jews can be among Jews	1	2	3	4	8
b. Businesses and shops which serve Jewish needs and tastes	1	2	3	4	8
c. Societies and associa- tions which represent Jewish interests	1	2	3	4	8
d. The State of Israel	1	2	3	4	8
e. Institutions and agencies which provide service to the Jewish community	1	2	3	4	8
f. Social justice for all racial and ethnic groups	1	2	3	4	8
g. Attending services on the High Holidays	1	2	3	4	8

M10.
IN TERMS OF POLITICAL AFFILIATION, DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF:

1 Democrat 3 Independent 8 Don't know
2 Republican 4 Other 9 Refused to answer

IF 1 OR 2 SKIP TO M12.

M11.
DO YOU, AS A RULE, VOTE FOR THE DEMOCRATIC OR REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE?

1 Democratic 2 Republican 3 Neither 8 Don't know

M12.
DID YOU VOTE IN THE 1980 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION? 1 Yes 2 No IF NO, SKIP TO M14.

M13.
DID YOU VOTE FOR: 1 Reagan 2 Carter 3 Other 7 Didn't vote 9 Refused to answer

M14.
DID YOU VOTE IN THE 1976 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION?

1 Yes 2 No IF NO, SKIP TO M16.

M15.
DID YOU VOTE FOR: 1 Ford 2 Carter 3 Other 7 Didn't vote 9 Refused to answer

RESPONDENT

IN1.

WHAT WAS YOUR TOTAL INCOME IN 1980?

SHOW CARD. JUST INDICATE YOUR INCOME BY GIVING ME THE TWO DIGIT CODE OF THE
APPROPRIATE CATEGORY FOR YOUR INCOME. INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

- a. Interest, including tax exempt
income, dividends, royalties,
or net rental income
- b. Social Security
- c. Supplemental Security (SSI) or
other public assistance or public
welfare payments
- d. Unemployment compensation,
veteran's payments, pensions,
alimony or child support, or any
other sources of income received
regularly

USE NUMBER CODE FROM CARD. USE NUMBER CODE 88 FOR DON'T KNOW.
USE NUMBER CODE 99 FOR REFUSED.

____ TOTAL INCOME

____ TOTAL INCOME

ADDENDUM FOR ALL CHILDREN LIVING IN THE HOUSEHOLD
(FILL OUT ONE FOR EACH CHILD IN THE HOUSEHOLD) START WITH OLDEST CHILD

ID CODE _____

CH1.

SEX: 1 Male 2 Female

CH2.

RACE: 1 White 2 Black 3 Other

CH3.

WHAT IS AGE, MONTH AND YEAR OF BIRTH?

Age at last birthday _____

Month of birth _____

Year of birth _____

CH4.

MARITAL STATUS:

- 1 Now married 4 Separated
2 Widowed 5 Never married
3 Divorced 6 Living with partner
of opposite sex

CH5.

WHAT IS THE HIGHEST GRADE OR YEAR
OF SCHOOLING COMPLETED?

01 Nursery School	12 10th
02 Kindergarten	13 11th
03 1st	14 12th
04 2nd	15 Some College
05 3rd	16 Finished College
06 4th	17 College Plus
07 5th	18 Other _____
08 6th	77 Child not yet
09 7th	started school
10 8th	
11 9th	

CH6.

WHAT KIND OF SCHOOL DOES THIS CHILD
ATTEND?

01 Public elementary or secondary school	
02 Public college, Jr. college, or university	07 Other _____
03 Private college or university	77 Child not currently in school
04 Private Christian elementary or secondary school	88 Don't know
05 Private Jewish elementary or secondary school	
06 Private elementary or secondary school- no religious affiliation	

CH7.

IS CHILD CONFINED TO
A WHEELCHAIR, OR OTHERWISE DISABLED?

- 1 No
2 Yes, wheelchair
3 Yes, Other _____
7 No disability

IF NO SKIP TO CH9.

CH8.

IF YES, WOULD YOU SAY THIS DISABILITY:

- 1 Severely limits access to
receiving services
2 Somewhat limits access
3 Does not limit access to
services at all
7 No disability, not applicable
8 Don't know

ADDENDUM FOR ALL CHILDREN LIVING IN HOUSEHOLD (con't)

CH9.

- a. LAST YEAR (1980), DID CHILD WORK, EVEN FOR A FEW DAYS, AT A PAID JOB OR IN A BUSINESS OF ANY KIND? c. DURING THE WEEKS WORKED IN 1980, HOW MANY HOURS DID CHILD USUALLY WORK EACH WEEK?

1 Yes 2 No IF NO, SKIP TO CH9d. _____ Hours

- b. HOW MANY WEEKS DID CHILD WORK IN 1980?

_____ Weeks

- d. OF THE WEEKS NOT WORKED IN 1980, (IF ANY) HOW MANY WEEKS WAS CHILD LOOKING FOR WORK OR ON LAYOFF FROM JOB? _____ Weeks

CH10.

WHAT IS CHILD'S MAIN OCCUPATION? _____

CH11.

WHAT WAS CHILD'S MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITIES OR DUTIES? _____

USE FOLLOWING NUMBER CODES FOR CH12, CH13, AND CH14.

01 Sunday	09 Person will be raised a Christian
02 Afternoon Hebrew School	10 Person will be raised a religion other than Jewish or Christian
03 All-day school	11 Other _____
04 Private tutor	12 Child not currently enrolled
05 Yiddish school	77 Person not Jewish
06 Adult classes	88 Don't know
07 Yeshiva High School	
08 Yeshiva College	

CH12.

IN WHAT KIND OF FORMAL JEWISH EDUCATIONAL TRAINING IS THIS CHILD CURRENTLY ENROLLED? LIST ALL THOSE THAT APPLY.

a. _____ b. _____ c. _____ If 11, specify: _____

CH13.

IF THIS CHILD HAS NOT YET BEGUN FORMAL JEWISH EDUCATIONAL TRAINING, WHAT KIND WILL IT BE?

a. _____ b. _____ c. _____ If 11, specify: _____

CH14.

IF CHILD'S RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IS COMPLETED, WHAT KIND WAS IT?

a. _____ b. _____ c. _____ If 11, specify: _____

CH15.

DOES THIS CHILD CURRENTLY RECEIVE ANY INFORMAL JEWISH EDUCATIONAL TRAINING?

1 No	5 Zionist youth groups
2 Synagogue youth groups	6 Child under 5
3 Social groups	7 Other _____
4 Service organizations	

ADDENDUM FOR OTHER ADULTS IN THE HOUSEHOLD
(FILL OUT FOR EACH ADULT IN THE HOUSEHOLD)

ID CODE _ _ _ _ _

A1.
HOW IS THIS PERSON RELATED TO RESPONDENT?

01 Brother 05 Grandparent
02 Sister 06 Other _____
03 Father 77 Not applicable
04 Mother

A2.
IF NOT RELATED TO PERSON, THEN SPECIFY:

07 Roomer 10 Partner
08 Boarder 11 Paid employee
09 Roommate 12 Other _____

A3.
SEX: 1 Male 2 Female

A4.
RACE: 1 White 2 Black 3 Other

5.
WHAT IS AGE, MONTH AND YEAR OF BIRTH?

Age at last birthday _ _ _ _ _

Month of birth _ _ _ _ _

Year of birth _ _ _ _ _

A6.
MARITAL STATUS:

1 Now married 4 Separated
2 Widowed 5 Never married
3 Divorced 6 Living with partner
 of opposite sex

A7.
ARE THEY CONFINED TO A WHEELCHAIR, OR
OTHERWISE, DISABLED?

1 No
2 Yes, wheelchair
3 Yes, Other _____
7 No disability

IF NO, SKIP TO A9.

A8.
IF YES, WOULD YOU SAY THAT THIS
DISABILITY:

1 Severely limits access to
receiving services
2 Somewhat limits access
3 Does not limit access
to services at all
4 Don't know
7 No disability

A9.
DOES THIS PERSON HAVE A PHYSICAL, MENTAL
OR OTHER HEALTH CONDITION WHICH HAS
LASTED FOR 6 MONTHS OR MORE WHICH . . .

1 Limits the kind or amount of work
they can do at the job
2 Prevents them from working at a job
3 Limits or prevents them from using
public transportation
4 No disability

ADDENDUM FOR OTHER ADULTS IN THE HOUSEHOLD (con't)

A10.

LAST YEAR (1980), DID THIS PERSON WORK
EVEN FOR A FEW DAYS, AT A JOB WHERE
THEY WERE PAID?

1 Yes 2 No IF NO SKIP TO A10d.

b. HOW MANY WEEKS DID THIS PERSON WORK IN
1980?

____ Weeks

c. DURING THE WEEKS WORKED IN 1980, HOW
MANY HOURS DID THEY USUALLY WORK EACH
WEEK?

____ Hours

d. OF THE WEEKS NOT WORKED IN 1980,
(IF ANY) HOW MANY WEEKS WERE THEY
LOOKING FOR WORK OR ON LAYOFF FROM
JOB?

____ Weeks

A11.

WHAT IS THIS PERSON'S
OCCUPATION? _____

A12.

WHEN DID THIS PERSON MOVE
INTO THIS RESIDENCE?

1 1981

2 1979 to 1980

3 1975 to 1978

4 1970 to 1974

5 1960 to 1969

6 1950 to 1959

7 1949 or earlier

8 Always lived here

MARRIAGE ADDENDUM

ID CODE _____

A. CIRCLE ONE - 1 RESPONDENT 2 SPOUSE

- B. 1 CURRENT MARRIAGE
2 FIRST PRIOR MARRIAGE
3 SECOND PRIOR MARRIAGE
4 THIRD PRIOR MARRIAGE
5 FOURTH PRIOR MARRIAGE

C. LET'S TALK ABOUT YOUR CURRENT OR MOST RECENT MARRIAGE. (OR THE NEXT PRIOR MARRIAGE)

DATE OF MARRIAGE: _____
month year

D. DID THIS MARRIAGE END BECAUSE OF DEATH OF SPOUSE OR SOME OTHER REASON?

- 1 Yes, death of spouse 4 No, Currently married
2 Yes, divorced
3 Yes, separated IF NO, SKIP TO EITHER P8 OR NEXT MARRIAGE ADDENDUM.

E. WHAT WAS THE RELIGION OF SPOUSE IN THIS MARRIAGE WHEN SPOUSE WAS GROWING UP?

- 1 Jewish when growing up 4 Catholic
2 Converted to Judaism 5 Other _____
3 Protestant 8 Don't know

F. WERE THERE ANY CHILDREN IN THIS MARRIAGE?

- 1 Yes 2 No IF NO, SKIP TO EITHER P8 OR NEXT MARRIAGE ADDENDUM.

G. WHO IS RAISING OR RAISED THESE CHILDREN AFTER THE MARRIAGE ENDED?

- 1 Respondent 4 Other family member
2 Respondent's ex-spouse 5 Other _____
3 Grandparent 8 Don't know

H. INTO WHAT RELIGION ARE THESE CHILDREN BEING RAISED OR EDUCATED?

- 1 Jewish 4 Mixed religions
2 Christian 5 Other _____
3 No religion 8 Don't know

IF EITHER RESPONDENT OR SPOUSE HAS BEEN MARRIED MORE THAN ONCE, CONTINUE TO FILL OUT A SEPARATE MARRIAGE ADDENDUM FOR EACH MARRIAGE FOR BOTH RESPONDENT AND SPOUSE.

MARRIAGE ADDENDUM (con't)

CIRCLE ONE - 1 RESPONDENT 2 SPOUSE

P8. LET'S TALK ABOUT YOUR MARRIAGE IMMEDIATELY
PRIOR TO THIS ONE.

Month and Year
of Marriage
[][] [][] [][]
month year
9 not applicable

(b) Did this marriage end because of death of spouse?

1 yes 2 no
9 not applicable

(c) WHAT WAS THE RELIGION OF SPOUSE IN THIS
MARRIAGE WHEN SPOUSE WAS GROWING UP?

1 Jewish when
growing up
2 Converted to
Judaism
3 Protestant
4 Catholic
5 Other _____

(D) WERE THERE ANY CHILDREN IN THIS MARRIAGE

1 Yes 2 No

(E) WHO IS RAISING OR RAISED THESE CHILDREN AFTER THE MARRIAGE ENDED?

1 Respondent 2 Respondent's ex-spouse
3 Grandparent 4 Other family member
5 Other 6 Don't know

(F) INTO WHAT RELIGION ARE THESE CHILDREN BEING RAISED OR EDUCATED?

1 Jewish 2 Christian 3 No Religion
4 Mixed Religion 5 Other 6 Don't know

APPENDIX III

SAMPLE LETTERS MAILED TO RESPONDENTS

APPENDIX III

A STUDY OF THE JEWISH POPULATION OF ST. LOUIS

My name is Gary Tobin, a professor of urban studies at Washington University. I am presently engaged in research funded by a grant to me from the Endowment Fund of the Jewish Federation of St. Louis. This study focuses on population trends and characteristics of the St. Louis Jewish community. This letter has been sent to your household requesting an interview with a Jewish adult member of the residence. You have been selected at random from about 24,000 Jewish households in the St. Louis area for a personal interview in your home.

Up-to-date information on the Jewish population is extremely important for sound planning on the part of social agencies, congregations, and other Jewish institutions. The results of this study will vitally affect the services that you and your family will receive in the years to come. We are asking for the cooperation of each and every selected household. Of course, responses to the interview are completely voluntary.

All interview materials will be handled in the strictest confidence and all responses will be completely anonymous. Extensive safeguards have been taken to assure confidentiality of responses and no individual will ever be identified.

Interviews will be conducted beginning June 1. A professional interviewer from the firm of Survey Research Service will either call you to set up an appointment or will visit your home sometime during that period. It would be helpful if more than one adult member of the household were present for the interview, but this is not necessary.

I thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. I think you will enjoy participating in the survey. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 889-5883 or 889-5868.

Sincerely,

Gary A. Tobin, Ph.D.
Urban Studies Program/Urban
Administration Program

A STUDY OF THE JEWISH POPULATION OF ST. LOUIS

A PROFESSIONAL INTERVIEWER FROM THE FIRM OF SURVEY RESEARCH SERVICE HAS BEEN BY TO CONDUCT YOUR INTERVIEW FOR A STUDY OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY. PLEASE CALL ME AT _____ OR SURVEY RESEARCH SERVICE AT 432-8683 TO SET UP YOUR APPOINTMENT.

THANK YOU.

INTERVIEWER

The interviews for the Demographic Study of the St. Louis Jewish Community are now being conducted. An interviewer from Survey Research Service has been unable to contact you for your personal interview. Please call _____ at _____ to schedule an appointment. Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gary A. Tobin, Ph.D.
Urban Studies
Washington University