

Demographic

Recent Jewish Community Population Studies: A Roundup

IT HAS BEEN WELL over a decade since the 1970 National Jewish Population Study (NJPS) was completed. While the NJPS provides baseline data for comparing current population trends and characteristics, no new national data have been collected in the intervening years. Indeed, it is unlikely that a national survey of American Jews will again be undertaken before 1990.

While the NJPS has not been replicated, a large number of local Jewish community population studies have been carried out in recent years. In the absence of a national survey, a comparison of the data contained in the various community studies provides an alternative means of developing a profile of the American Jewish community in 1984. Hence this article, which updates the material appearing in Gary Tobin's and Julie Lipsman's "A Compendium of Jewish Demographic Studies: Data Summary," which is scheduled to appear in *Perspectives in Jewish Population Research*, prepared by the center for modern Jewish studies at Brandeis University. Taken as a whole, the data presented here offer considerable insight into the changes that have taken place in American Jewish life since 1970.

Note: All the data cited in this article are drawn from the following sources: James McCann and Debra Friedman, *A Study of the Jewish Community in the Greater Seattle Area* (Seattle, 1979); Bruce A. Phillips, *Los Angeles Jewish Community Survey Overview for Regional Planning* (Los Angeles, 1980); Allied Jewish Federation of Denver, *The Denver Jewish Population Study* (Denver, 1981); Lois Geer, *1981 Population Study of the St. Paul Jewish Community* (St. Paul, 1981); Lois Geer, *The Jewish Community of Greater Minneapolis 1981 Population Study* (Minneapolis, 1981); Population Research Committee, *Survey of Cleveland's Jewish Population, 1981* (Cleveland, 1981); Peter Regenstreif, *The Jewish Population of Rochester, New York* (Rochester, 1981); Paul Ritterband and Steven M. Cohen, *The 1981 Greater New York Jewish Population Survey* (New York, 1981); Nancy Hendrix, *A Demographic Study of the Jewish Community of Nashville and Middle Tennessee* (Nashville, 1982); Policy Research Corporation, *Chicago Jewish Population Study* (Chicago, 1982); Ira M. Sheskin, *Population Study of the Greater Miami Jewish Community* (Miami, 1982); Gary A. Tobin, *A Demographic and Attitudinal Study of the Jewish Community of St. Louis* (St. Louis, 1982); Bruce A. Phillips and William S. Aron, *The Greater Phoenix Jewish Population Study* (Phoenix, 1983-1984); Jewish Community Federation of Richmond, *Demographic Survey of the Jewish Community of Richmond* (Richmond, 1984); Bruce A. Phillips, *The Milwaukee Jewish Population Study* (Milwaukee, 1984); and Gary A. Tobin, Joseph Waksberg, and Janet Greenblatt, *A Demographic Study of the Jewish Community of Greater Washington* (Washington, D.C., 1984).

Comparing local community studies is no simple matter, since they employ a variety of sampling techniques, interviewing methods, and sets of questions. Moreover, the findings are reported in different formats. It should be understood, then, that the tables presented in this article are a distillation and reconstruction of very different originals.

Data are scarce for small communities and communities in the South and Southwest. Phoenix, Nashville, and Miami enter into the picture, for example, but Houston, Dallas, and Palm Beach do not. Still, this article takes account of both large and intermediate-sized communities covering a broad geographic spread.

A major caution is needed in reviewing the data which follow. A national "datum" cannot be constructed by merely adding together the data contained in the individual community studies. These studies, after all, do not represent a sample of the national Jewish population.

While many more surveys were examined than are presented here, they were not included for a variety of reasons: some methodologies were considered inadequate to insure reliable data; some communities did not report most of their data; still other communities presented the data in such a way that they could not be synthesized for comparative purposes. The tables presented in this article represent the best possible compromise between comprehensiveness and accuracy. All the studies chosen were completed between 1979 and 1983, allowing for maximum comparability.

Sampling Methodologies

A wide variety of sampling methodologies have been used in Jewish demographic research: federation lists; list merging; random-digit dialing; etc. It is clear that there is no single best method; it depends on city size, location, and the nature of the Jewish population. What is crucial is that the chosen method be appropriate to the particular community, be employed properly and rigorously, and be reported accurately. A summary of the sampling and research methods used in the various studies included in this article is provided in Tables 1 and 2.

In theory the end result of the differing methodologies should be the same—a sample drawn from a universe of Jewish households providing a profile of the community as a whole. (Excluded from consideration here are differences in the scope and detail of the questions posed.) In practice, however, differences are to be anticipated—even if they cannot be quantified—depending on the study procedure employed.

Virtually all communities seek to include non-affiliated Jewish households in their study samples. The various methodologies, however, differ in their ability to tap these "unknowns." Since available data indicate differences between "list" and "non-list" households—particularly for such characteristics as intermarriage and organizational affiliation—it can be assumed that procedures which differ in their success in bringing "unknowns" into the sample frame also produce results which differ.

TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF SAMPLING METHODOLOGY, PART ONE

City	Year	Random Selection		Random	Distinctive	Other
		List Merging	One-Two Lists	Digit Dialing	Jewish Surnames	
Chicago	1982			X		
Cleveland	1981	X		X	X	
Denver	1981			X		
Los Angeles	1979			X		
Miami	1982	X			X	
Milwaukee	1983			X	X	
Minneapolis	1981	X				
Nashville	1982		Fed. List		X	
New York	1981			X	X	X
Phoenix	1983			X	X	
Richmond	1983		X		X	
Rochester	1980	X			X	
St. Louis	1982	X			X	
St. Paul	1981		UJFC List			
Seattle	1979		Fed. List		X	X
Washington, D.C.	1983			X	X	

TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF SAMPLING METHODOLOGY, PART TWO

City	Year	Interview Procedure			Interviewers	
		Mail Interview	Phone Interview	Personal Interview	Volunteers ^a	Professionals
Chicago	1982		X			X
Cleveland	1981		X		X	
Denver	1981		X		X	
Los Angeles	1979		X			X
Miami	1982	X	X		X	
Milwaukee	1983		X			X
Minneapolis	1981			X	X	
Nashville	1982		X			X
New York	1981	X	X			X
Phoenix	1983		X			X
Richmond	1983		X			X
Rochester	1980			X	X	
St. Louis	1982			X		X
St. Paul	1981			X	X	
Seattle	1979	X	X			X
Washington, D.C.	1983		X			X

^aMay include paid volunteers.

The use of mail questionnaires may produce some differences in response compared to phone surveys. This factor is selective, affecting some questions but not others.

LIST MERGING

In many communities the primary source for drawing a sample is a master list of known Jewish households in the area. This list is usually obtained from the local Jewish federation, and tends to include the names of contributors to Jewish causes, as well as members of synagogues. Using such a list in isolation can introduce a serious bias into the sample frame, since it tends to exclude the young, the old, the formerly affiliated, and many individuals who consider themselves somewhat marginal to the organized Jewish community.

The St. Louis community study used a list-merging process that took nearly a year to complete. Lists were obtained from synagogues, the Jewish newspaper, Jewish organizations, and elderly housing units. In addition, various lists were assembled: people with distinctive Jewish surnames, old lists (marriages, confirmations, ex-members, etc.), and miscellaneous lists (a "snowball" list, JCCA singles, etc.). In all, 148 lists were compiled. Approximately 40,000 names from these lists were keypunched and merged by a computer, bringing the total down to 22,000 by eliminating duplicate entries. From this comprehensive sample frame a sample of 1,500 households was selected, eventually resulting in 922 interviews.

Obviously, the list-merging process that took place in St. Louis was costly, placing it beyond the means of most communities. Still, similar surveys, on a scaled-down level, have been conducted with some success in several communities. A 1980 study of Rochester, New York, for example, employed the following procedure:

The master list for the study was constructed from the unduplicated mailing list of the Jewish community federation and the membership lists of the congregations and Jewish organizations. However, unlike 1961, we went beyond these groups. Also used was the membership listing of the new large Jewish community center, selected as far as possible for Jewish households. This listing included participants in its extensive senior adult programs and single adults. In addition, the lists of Jewish households in two large senior adult housing projects and the membership lists of two Knights of Pythias groups with primarily Jewish memberships were made available. To be noted, also, is the fact that, again unlike 1961, all the Orthodox congregations now had membership lists and were able to make available lists of non-member, high holy day seat holders.¹

List merging is only appropriate in moderate-sized, relatively stable communities. It would not be suitable for use in new, growing communities such as Phoenix or Denver.

¹Regenstrief, *The Jewish Population of Rochester, New York*, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-57.

RANDOM-DIGIT DIALING

Random-digit dialing is one of the newer and more popular methods for conducting Jewish demographic research, particularly where budget limitations are involved and telephone interviews will be used in lieu of personal interviews. The Cleveland Jewish community, which utilized this method in 1982, reported the following:

Random-digit dialing is a painstaking undertaking, which can be used only where there is a significant concentration of target samples. Even in the case of heavily concentrated Jewish areas, we figured a "hit" (Jewish household) took an average of 20 to 30 dialings (because of busy signals, no answers, and phone numbers being unassigned). In the areas outside the Jewish core communities, where scoring a "hit" would have been much more time-consuming, a combination of other methods was used.

The RDD work sheet uses lists of four-digit random numbers attached to phone exchanges of the area to be surveyed. These lists have columns with disposition headings. Every number must be called and the disposition recorded—not a working number, business, disconnected, non-Jewish household, etc. When the random number does lead to a Jewish household (or Jewish member of the household), the interviewer solicits the interview.

We had some apprehension that this extensive dialing might cause animosity in the non-Jewish community toward the Jewish community federation. Happily, this fear proved to be unfounded. The interviewers reported no unpleasant exchanges. In fact, the contrary happened. A number of non-Jews were concerned that the caller might be from a hate organization misrepresenting herself and asked questions to satisfy themselves that it was not so. One even called the federation to make sure.²

To better appreciate the enormous volume of calls that are required to construct an adequate sample frame by means of random-digit dialing, reference can be made to the experience in Denver, Colorado:

The RDD sample was based on some 41,000 phone numbers generated at random by computer so as to include both listed and non-listed phone numbers (in fact, over half of all the respondents had unlisted phone numbers). Of these original 41,000 phone numbers, over 22,000 turned out to be residential phone numbers. Of these residential phone numbers, 932 turned out to be Jewish households. Calls to these 932 households resulted in 802 interviews.³

The fact that over half the phone numbers called in Denver via random-digit dialing were unlisted points up an important feature of this procedure. Los Angeles reports a similar experience: "The wisdom of this technique was borne out by the fact that over forty per cent of our respondents have unlisted phone numbers, and thus would not otherwise have been included in the survey."⁴

²Population Research Committee, *Survey of Cleveland's Jewish Population, 1981*, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

³Allied Jewish Federation of Denver, *The Denver Jewish Population Study*, *op. cit.*, p. vii.

⁴Phillips, *Los Angeles Jewish Community Survey Overview for Regional Planning*, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

Since random-digit dialing is expensive, methods are often employed to eliminate certain geographical areas. Thus, it is possible that "geographic" bias is introduced into the study. Careful attention must also be paid to call-back techniques, screening mechanisms, and other such things.

DISTINCTIVE JEWISH SURNAMES

At least six of the communities reported on in this article made some use of a list of distinctive Jewish surnames in drawing their sample frames; in most instances, a standard list of 35 names—e.g., Cohen, Levine, Rubin, Shapiro, etc.—was employed. The following example of usage, drawn from the Dallas community study, points up the fact that this method most often serves as a means of checking sample frames derived from other sources:

For the purposes of this study, the master list was tested for completeness by a process known as the "distinctive Jewish names method" . . . using 35 distinctively Jewish names. A list of each of these Jewish surnames in the telephone directories of every municipality in Dallas County was made and the total number determined. The ratio of these surnames which appear on both the federation master list and the telephone list to the total of the distinctive Jewish names gives an approximation of the completeness of the master list.³

Since definitive studies of the validity of the distinctive Jewish surnames procedure are lacking, great care must be shown in using this methodology.

TWO-PHASE STUDIES

The Jewish communities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minnesota conducted demographic surveys of their respective populations in 1981. While the two studies were locally sponsored, they were directed by the same researcher, Lois Geer. Geer used a two-phase methodology as follows:

In the first phase an attempt was made to reach 25 per cent of the known Jewish households in the area. The intent was to gather as much "non-sensitive" data as possible on the largest number of households. Data to be gathered in this phase included such things as: current and prior residences; length of time at current residence; moving intentions; characteristics of the individuals in the households (age, sex, marital status, education, etc.); household synagogue affiliation; educational intentions for children; community problems and priorities; knowledge of any unaffiliated Jews.

The purpose of the second phase of the population study was two-fold. First, data of a more sensitive nature, such as income, previous marital history, etc., needed to be gathered. The second purpose of this phase was to allow for more in-depth study of specific groups within the Jewish community: the elderly, single persons, dual-working and intermarried households; also, the "unaffiliated" in

³Betty Maynard, *The Dallas Jewish Community Study* (Dallas, 1974), pp. 3-4. The data in Maynard's study are not cited in this article because they are outdated.

Minneapolis. Separate questionnaires were developed, each with questions specific to the group interviewed, as well as questions asked of all phase-two respondents.⁶

The sample for phase one was drawn from a master list of all known Jewish households in the country. In St. Paul, 2,818 households were listed; in Minneapolis, 8,886. The sample for phase two was drawn from those who were interviewed in phase one. In St. Paul, this involved reinterviewing almost all the respondents (95 per cent). In Minneapolis, approximately 45 per cent of the respondents were given a second interview.

Data Analysis

HOUSEHOLD SIZE

Tables 3 and 4 show mean household size and the distribution of households by the number of persons in them. The means range from a low of 2.2 in Los Angeles, Denver, and Miami, to a high of 2.8 in Cleveland. The bulk of the communities have means between 2.4 and 2.6.

TABLE 3. MEAN HOUSEHOLD SIZE

City	Year	Members of Jewish Households
Chicago	1982	2.6
Cleveland	1981	2.8
Denver	1981	2.2
Los Angeles	1979	2.2
Miami	1982	2.2
Milwaukee	1983	2.5
Minneapolis	1981	2.6
Nashville	1982	2.6
New York	1981	2.4
Phoenix	1983	2.4
Richmond	1983	2.4
Rochester	1980	2.5
St. Louis	1982	2.6
St. Paul	1981	2.3
Washington, D.C.	1983	2.3 ^a
Washington, D.C.	1983	2.7 ^b
NJPS	1970	2.8

^aJewish persons only.

^bAll persons.

⁶Geer, *1981 Population Study of the St. Paul Jewish Community*, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

TABLE 4. HOUSEHOLD SIZE, BY PER CENT

City	Year	1 Person	2 Persons	3 Persons	4 Persons	5 Persons	6+ Persons
Chicago	1982	21	36	21	12	8	2
Cleveland	1981	19	34	16	17	9	5
Denver	1981	30	37	16	13	3	1
Los Angeles	1979	33	36	12	13	5	1
Milwaukee	1983	30	37	—	—	—	—
Minneapolis	1981	22	37	16	15	8	2
Nashville	1982	24	34	16	16	8	2
Richmond	1983	29	35	12	17	6	1
Rochester	1980	24	37	15	16	7	1
St. Louis	1982	22	37	17	15	7	2
St. Paul	1981	27	39	15	12	5	2
Washington, D.C.	1983	23	31	16	20	7	3
NJPS	1970	18	31	14	21	10	4

With the exception of Cleveland, all the communities report a smaller mean household size than the 2.8 figure recorded by the NJPS in 1970. Certain variations in definition and methodology may account for some of the differences in the community figures. Thus, it would be important to know whether non-Jewish household members or students attending college were included in the computations. Community samples containing large numbers of the non-affiliated would be likely to produce lower figures for household size, since non-affiliated households are generally smaller than affiliated ones.

If it is in fact the case that mean household size has declined significantly since 1970, this could be explained by a variety of factors: a lower birth rate, leading to a smaller number of children per household; a growing proportion of households with children no longer living at home; a growing divorce rate, creating two households; an aging population, with more widows and widowers living singly; and a later marrying age, with more singles living in their own housing units before marriage.

Table 3 shows the distribution of households by the number of individuals comprising them. Without exception, one-person households constitute a larger proportion of the whole in the community studies than in the NJPS; this is also true of two- and three-person households. Correspondingly, larger households, i.e., those with four or more persons, are a smaller proportion of the whole in the community studies than in the NJPS.

The particular factor exerting the greatest influence on household size can vary between communities, e.g., age (the elderly) in Miami, singles in Denver, etc. However, if there has been an across-the-board drop in household size since 1970, it is almost certainly due to a decline in the Jewish birth rate, with a smaller number of children per household in all the communities.

AGE

Age distribution (see Table 5) is one of the most important factors shaping population trends. While the published reports of the community studies show a degree of variation in the age spans covered, certain basic trends can be noted. Virtually all the communities have smaller proportions of the population under 20 years of age than the 32 per cent figure reported by the NJPS. At the other end of the scale, nearly all the communities have significantly larger proportions of people over 60 years of age than the 16 per cent NJPS figure. Quite strikingly, all the communities outside the Sunbelt have larger proportions of people over 70 years of age than the seven per cent figure reported by the NJPS.

Differences between the communities, particularly in patterns of in-out migration, account for some of the variation in the age distribution. In Denver, for example, nearly a third of the Jewish population is in the 30-49 years age category. Only eight per cent of the Washington, D.C. Jewish population is over age 65.

TABLE 5. AGE, BY PER CENT

City	Year	0-9	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70+
Chicago	1982		21		35		30		14
Cleveland	1981		22	11		33		20	14
Denver ^a	1981	12	9	22	21	11	10	8	7
Los Angeles	1979	16	13	19	13	14	13	8	4
Miami	1982	9	11	8	11	7	10	18	26
Milwaukee	1983	11	16	13	15	12	10	12	11
Minneapolis	1981	12	15	12	15	12	12	11	10
Nashville	1982	21	7	11		41		20	
New York	1981	9	12	16	13	12	14	13	10
Phoenix ^a	1983	13	11	17	19	10	10	12	7
Richmond	1983	15	9	15	22	8	11	13	8
Rochester	1980	12	8	14	17		29		20
St. Louis ^a	1982	11	14	14	14	12	13	11	11
St. Paul	1981	10	12	11	13	8	16	16	14
Seattle	1979		20	12	23	10	22		13
Washington, D.C.	1983		23		18	20	19		8
NJPS	1970	12	20	14	11	13	13	9	7
U.S. Census ^{a,b}	1980	14	17	18	14	10	11	5	12

^aOne or more age categories will vary 1-2 years from the designated range.

For Denver and Phoenix, the categories are: 0-9; 10-17; 18-29; 30-39; 40-49; 50-59; 60-69; 70-94.

For St. Louis, the categories are: 0-10; 11-20; 21-30; 31-40; 41-50; 51-60; 61-70; 71+.

For Washington, D.C., the categories are: 0-17; 18-35; 36-45; 46-65; 66+.

For U.S. Census, the categories are: 0-9; 10-19; 20-29; 30-39; 40-49; 50-59; 60-64; 65+.

^bU.S. bureau of the census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1981*, Washington, D.C., 1981.

SEX

The proportion of females to males in the community studies (see Table 6) is linked to the increased aging of the Jewish population, since Jewish females enjoy greater longevity than Jewish males. While the proportion of females in the NJPS was just above 50 per cent, most communities register larger proportions. Washington, D.C. is the only community with a larger proportion of males than females (52 per cent to 48 per cent).

MARITAL STATUS

Marital status, as reported on in the various community studies (see Table 7), is affected by age distribution, as well as in-migration patterns. Thus Denver, with a relatively large proportion of Jews in the 30-49 years age category, and a relatively small proportion in the 60 and over age category, has a large proportion of singles (23 per cent). Denver also has a relatively large proportion of divorced and separated

TABLE 6. SEX, BY PER CENT

City	Year	Male	Female
Cleveland	1981	47	53
Los Angeles	1979	48	52
Miami	1982	44	56
Milwaukee	1983	49	51
Minneapolis	1981	49	51
Nashville	1982	49	51
Richmond	1983	49	51
Rochester	1980	49	51
St. Louis	1982	47	53
St. Paul	1981	47	53
Washington, D.C.	1983	52	48
NJPS	1970	48	51

TABLE 7. MARITAL STATUS, BY PER CENT

City	Year	Married	Single	Widowed	Divorced/ Separated
Chicago ^b	1982	65	23	6	6
Cleveland	1981	69	11	13	8
Denver ^a	1981	64	23	4	9
Los Angeles ^a	1979	57	17	12	14
Miami	1982	61	7	23	8
Milwaukee	1983	67	14	9	10
Minneapolis	1981	66	22	7	5
Nashville	1982	70	17	8	5
New York	1981	65	15	11	9
Phoenix	1983	63	18	9	10
Richmond ^c	1983	67	14	12	7
Rochester	1980	71	18	8	3
St. Louis	1982	68	9	17	6
St. Paul	1981	66	20	11	3
Washington, D.C.	1983	61	27	4	7
NJPS ^d	1970	78	6	10	5
U.S. Census	1980	67	19	8	6

^aTables reconstituted. Figures are approximate. The statistics on marital status were given only as a cross-tabulation with age groups. For Los Angeles, the figures shown were calculated using a weighted average from the sample sizes in each age group. For Denver, the same process was employed, but with percentages used in place of sample sizes (which were unavailable).

^bData for marital status of adults, 18 and over.

^cHeads of household; in the case of married couples, both husband and wife were defined as heads of household.

^dHeads of household only.

people, and a very low proportion of the widowed. Washington, D.C. has the largest proportion of singles—27 per cent. Despite some differences between the communities, however, the general trend since 1970 appears to be in the direction of a smaller proportion married, a larger proportion single, a larger proportion widowed, and a larger proportion divorced or separated. All of this is consistent with the data on age distribution and household size.

In every community, the majority of households—some two out of three—consist of married couples; the proportions range from a high of 71 per cent in Rochester to a low of 57 per cent in Los Angeles. The overall pattern, however, would appear to have shifted dramatically since 1970, when the NJPS reported that nearly four of five households were married (78 per cent).

The greatest change in the marital status configuration since 1970 would appear to be in the proportion of singles. In most cities—Miami and St. Louis are exceptions—that proportion is at least twice the NJPS figure of 6 per cent: 15 per cent in New York, 18 per cent in Phoenix, 23 per cent in Chicago, and 18 per cent in Rochester.

The data also show (not reported in the table) that many of the married households are without children, either because couples have no children as yet, or because older children have already left home. In most communities, households consisting of adults and children are no longer typical; in many communities, they are a dwindling minority.

GENERAL EDUCATION

Compared to the NJPS, the data in the community studies (see Table 8) reveal smaller proportions of Jews with education at the high school level or below, and larger proportions with a college education or advanced degrees. Even the proportion reporting “some college” is larger than in 1970. Where there are exceptions to this, as in Rochester and Seattle, it would appear that the decrease in “some college” masks an increase at the higher education level.

The data indicate that Jews are remarkably well educated. While the NJPS found that 34 per cent of the Jewish population had at least a college degree, most communities show figures in the 40–50 per cent range; in Washington, D.C. the figure is a remarkable 72 per cent. When the data are separated by age cohort (not shown in the table), it becomes clear that as many as 90 per cent of those in the 25–40 years age category have at least a college degree; in Washington, about 80 per cent have an advanced degree.

Data from the community studies (not shown in the table) make it clear that increased proportions of Jewish females have college and advanced degrees. However, females have yet to attain the same educational level as Jewish males.

OCCUPATION

Occupation, together with secular education, is a prime determinant of socioeconomic status. Virtually all the community studies that inquired about occupation

TABLE 8. GENERAL EDUCATION, BY PER CENT

City	Year	High School or Less	Some College	College Degree ^a	Advanced Degree
Chicago ^c	1982	22	27	25	26
Los Angeles	1979	32	25	26	18
Miami	1982	41	23	24	12
Milwaukee	1983	22	20	32	26
Minneapolis	1981	25	29	28	19
Nashville	1982		← 52 →	28	22
New York	1981	31	18	31	20
Phoenix	1983	24	25	33	17
Rochester	1980	36	15	24	25
St. Louis ^b	1982	33	22	27	18
St. Paul	1981	43	23	20	15
Seattle	1979	29	18	26	27
Washington, D.C.	1983	15	16	24	48
NJPS ^d	1970	46	20	15	19
U.S. Census	1980	67	15	10	8

^a"College degree" includes completed bachelors degrees and uncompleted advanced degrees.

^b"Other education" excluded, and percentages recomputed.

^cRespondent and spouse only.

^dBased on individual's age, 25 and over.

(see Table 9) found that half or more of employed Jews are in the professional or manager/proprietor categories; in five communities, the proportions approximate two-thirds of the whole. Approximately half the community studies report larger proportions in these categories than the NJPS figure of 62 per cent; the remainder report smaller proportions. The differences between the NJPS and the community studies are to be explained by reference to the sales and clerical categories, since the proportions in the blue-collar category are virtually the same.

Communities as diverse as Chicago (10 per cent), Phoenix (14 per cent), Los Angeles (11 per cent), Cleveland (10 per cent), and Rochester (10 per cent) have significant proportions of blue-collar workers. In most communities about 15 per cent of the work force holds clerical positions—the same proportion as reported by the NJPS. The bulk of the communities have larger proportions of workers in the sales category than the 12 per cent figure reported by the NJPS: 21 per cent in Chicago; 17 per cent in Cleveland; 24 per cent in Phoenix; 20 per cent in Los Angeles; and 33 per cent in St. Louis. In most communities, at least 50 per cent of employed persons are in sales, clerical, or blue-collar positions.

The proportions of managers/proprietors in most communities are smaller than the NJPS figure of 34 per cent: 21 per cent in Chicago; 22 per cent in Cleveland;

TABLE 9. OCCUPATION,^a BY PER CENT

City	Year	Managers/ Proprietors					Blue Collar
		Professional	Sales	Clerical			
Chicago ^b	1982	33	21	15		10	
Cleveland	1981	39	22	12		10	
Los Angeles	1979	34	16	19		11	
Miami	1982	31	27	17		9	
Milwaukee	1983	46	20	8		8	
Minneapolis	1981	23	42	← 25 →		10	
Nashville	1982	43	34	9	10	4	
Phoenix	1983	28	23	24	11	14	
Richmond ^c	1983	45	23	14	15	3	
Rochester	1980	45	19	← 26 →		10	
St. Louis	1982	29	20	33	12	6	
St. Paul	1981	27	38	← 26 →		9	
Seattle	1979	40	29	20	← 11 →		
Washington, D.C.	1983	48	24	← 23 →		4	
NJPS ^d	1970	28	34	12	16	10	
U.S. Census	1980	17	12	7	19	46	

^aHousewives, students, retired, unemployed, and unknown excluded from figures; percentages recomputed to include only those employed for wages.

^bRespondent and spouse only.

^cMales and females combined, all ages.

^dBased on individual's age, 25 and over.

24 per cent in Washington, D.C.; and 16 per cent in Los Angeles. On the other hand, some communities have significantly larger proportions of professionals than the 28 per cent figure reported by the NJPS, e.g., 45 per cent in Richmond and 46 per cent in Milwaukee.

The data on occupation in the community studies show significant variation by age, sex, and city size. Thus, there are heavy concentrations of young people in the professions, women in clerical positions, and blue-collar workers in larger cities. Taken as a whole, the data reveal significant occupational diversity among American Jews.

INCOME

Information on annual household income in the community studies (see Table 10) cannot be compared with the NJPS because of the inflationary trend since 1970. This factor also hinders comparisons between the community studies themselves. Still another complicating element is the various ways in which "income" is defined in the community studies. Other characteristics shaping differences in income distribution are the proportions of households at the age extremes (65 and over, and under 30), the size of particular communities, and regional differences in the cost of living.

Keeping all of these qualifications in mind, it can yet be said that the data reveal two divergent trends. As might be expected of a group with high educational/occupational status, income is also high for a significant portion of the Jewish population. In all the community studies at least 25 per cent of the households report incomes of more than \$40,000. On the other hand, in every community except Washington D.C. at least ten per cent of the population have household incomes under \$10,000; many households report incomes under \$5,000.

As with occupation, the figures on income in the community studies reveal significant diversity.

NATIVITY

The proportions of the foreign-born in the community studies (see Table 11) range from a low of six per cent in Richmond to a high of 27 per cent in Miami. Most communities show proportions in the area of 11–18 per cent, contrasting sharply with the NJPS figure of 23 per cent.

While an influx of Russian and Israeli immigrants has added to the foreign-born element of American Jewry since 1970, it is clear that the foreign-born component is decreasing over time.

MOVING PLANS

The largest proportions of households in the community studies (see Table 12) indicate that they have no plans to move, ranging from a low of 45 per cent in

TABLE 10. ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME^{a,b}

City	Year	0-\$9,999	\$10,000-\$19,999	\$20,000-\$29,999	\$30,000-\$39,999	\$40,000+
Chicago	1982	13	19	25	14	29
Denver	1981	16	21	16	19	28
Los Angeles	1979	21	21	20	12	27
Miami	1982		36	19	15	31
Milwaukee	1983	12	18	21		← 49 →
Minneapolis	1981	13	20	23	13	31
Nashville	1982	10	16	20		54
New York	1981	12	16	21	18	33
Phoenix	1983	10	26	25	(See Below) ^c	(See Below) ^c
Rochester	1980	14	26	22	13	25
St. Louis	1982	13	16	13	15	43
St. Paul	1981	20	18	23	14	25
Washington, D.C.	1983	5	8	← 16 →		59
NJPS	1970	33	35		← 32 →	

^aRefusals excluded from figures.

^bDoes not accurately reflect comparisons due to changes in cost of living over four-year period and because of variance in cost of living between metropolitan areas.

^cFor Phoenix, the ranges and percentages are: \$30,000-\$50,000—25 per cent; \$50,000+—12 per cent.

TABLE 11. NATIVITY, BY PER CENT

City	Year	Locally Born	U.S. Born ^a	Foreign Born
Chicago ^c	1982	66	22	12
Cleveland	1981	58	27 ^b	15
Denver	1981	22	67	11
Los Angeles	1979	16	60	24
Miami	1982	4	69	27
Milwaukee	1983	← 89 →		11
Minneapolis	1981	47	40	13
New York	1981	← 83 →		17
Richmond ^d	1983	22	72	6
Rochester	1980	← 85 →		15
St. Louis	1982	50	34	16
St. Paul	1981	46	36	18
Seattle	1979	← 77 →		23
Washington, D.C.	1983	36	56	8
NJPS ^d	1970	← 77 →		23

^aOther than locally born.^bU.S. = U.S. and Canada.^cRespondent and spouse only.^dHeads of household.

TABLE 12. MOVING PLANS, BY PER CENT

City	Year	Moving Within		Moving Out of		No Plans to Move
		Metro Area	Metro Area	Don't Know		
Chicago ^a	1982	16	8	16	60	
Cleveland	1981	9	7	0	84	
Los Angeles	1979	26	12	5	56	
Miami	1982	7	5	18	70	
Milwaukee	1983	13	10	17	60	
Minneapolis	1981	11	5	0	84	
Phoenix	1983	26	11	3	60	
Richmond	1983	11	7	5	78	
Rochester	1980	10	5	15	70	
St. Louis	1982	11	5	5	80	
St. Paul	1981	7	7	0	86	
Washington, D.C.	1983	19	8	27	45	
NJPS	1970	5 ^b	10	2	83	

^aMoving within next 3 years.^bMoving within same city.

Washington, D.C. to a high of 86 per cent in St. Paul. Those in the "don't know" category range from zero per cent in several communities to 27 per cent in Washington, D.C. These figures generally conform to those reported by the NJPS—83 per cent with no plans to move, and two per cent in the "don't know" category.

Among those who are planning to move, it is a local move that is most often contemplated. Los Angeles (26 per cent) and Phoenix (26 per cent) report the largest proportions of planned local moves, while St. Paul (7 per cent) and Miami (7 per cent) report the lowest. Los Angeles (12 per cent), Phoenix (11 per cent), and Milwaukee (12 per cent) have the largest proportions of households planning to leave the community; all other communities range between 5–8 per cent.

Plans to move are cited most often in Sunbelt communities (e.g., Phoenix and Los Angeles), growing communities (e.g., Washington, D.C.), and large communities (e.g., Chicago). The fewest contemplated moves were in Miami, where retirees have gone to settle, and in stable communities, such as Rochester and Cleveland.

RELIGIOUS IDENTIFICATION

Religious identification, as distinct from congregational membership, is reported in 13 of the community studies (see Table 13). Identification with Orthodoxy is consistently low in all these communities, ranging from five per cent in Los Angeles and Minneapolis to 15 per cent in Seattle. Eight communities report proportions of Conservative Jews ranging from 30–39 per cent. The proportions of Reform Jews are more varied: in five communities they constitute 32–39 per cent of the whole; in five communities, over 40 per cent; and in three communities, less than 30 per cent.

TABLE 13. RELIGIOUS IDENTIFICATION, BY PER CENT

City	Year	Orthodox	Conservative	Reform	No Preference/ Other
Chicago	1982	6	35	39	20
Cleveland	1981	9	39	47	5
Los Angeles	1979	5	33	35	28
Miami	1982	11	35	24	30
Milwaukee	1983	7	27	52	14
Minneapolis	1981	5	53	32	10
New York	1981	13	36	28	23
Richmond	1983	8	42	36	14
Rochester	1980	12	36	42	10
St. Louis	1982	8	26	52	14
St. Paul	1981	7	55	27	11
Seattle	1979	15	30	46	9
Washington, D.C.	1983	3	35	38	22
NJPS	1970	11	40	30	15

The greatest variations occur in the no preference/other category, ranging from a low of five per cent in Cleveland to a high of 30 per cent in Miami.

New York (13 per cent) and Miami (11 per cent) are centers of Orthodoxy, with Rochester (12 per cent) and Seattle (15 per cent) also showing high proportions. St. Louis (52 per cent), Milwaukee (52 per cent), and Cleveland (47 per cent) have large concentrations of Reform Jews. Minneapolis (53 per cent) and St. Paul (55 per cent) have the largest proportions of Conservative Jews.

In 1970 the NJPS reported the following proportions for household heads: 11 per cent Orthodox; 40 per cent Conservative; 30 per cent Reform; and 15 per cent "other." When these figures are compared with those in the community studies, there appears to be a shift from the Conservative grouping to the Reform and "other" categories. In many communities about one-fourth of the Jewish population identifies as "other" or "just Jewish"; among the younger age cohorts, the proportions are even higher. There are few signs that young people are increasingly identifying as Orthodox.

SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP

The extent of synagogue membership as reported in the community studies (see Table 14) varies widely, ranging from a low of 26 per cent in Los Angeles to a high of 84 per cent in St. Paul. Age and mobility patterns help to account for the differences, but community size also plays a part in that synagogue membership is inversely related to city size. The four communities with the smallest proportions

TABLE 14. SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP, BY PER CENT

City	Year	Yes	No
Chicago	1982	44	56
Cleveland	1981	61	39
Los Angeles	1979	26	74
Miami	1982	38	62
Milwaukee	1983	56	44
Minneapolis	1981	79	21
Nashville	1982	78	22
New York	1981	41	59
Phoenix	1983	33	67
Richmond	1983	67	33
Rochester	1980	68	32
St. Louis	1982	66	34
St. Paul	1981	84	16
Seattle	1979	75	25
Washington, D.C.	1983	39	61
NJPS	1970	47	53

of synagogue members are the largest in population; the four communities with the largest proportions of synagogue members are among the smallest in population. Sunbelt communities have low rates of affiliation—Los Angeles, 26 per cent; Phoenix, 33 per cent; Miami, 38 per cent—because they contain large concentrations of the elderly, who tend to affiliate less. More generally, the data indicate that both the old and the young, as well as lower-income households, have lesser rates of synagogue membership. Overall, the proportion of households in the community studies who are affiliated with synagogues does not exceed the NJPS figure of 47 per cent.

It is important to note that the figures on synagogue membership in the community studies are limited to currently affiliated households; they do not cover former synagogue members or those who might intend to join a synagogue in the future. In addition, data indicate that synagogue attendance occurs independently of membership.

RELIGIOUS SERVICE ATTENDANCE

Information on religious service attendance was elicited in only a small number of the community studies (see Table 15). Because of differences in definition, it is best to employ three broad categories: those who never attend, those who attend often, and the in-between group. Those never attending range from 16–30 per cent, while those attending often range from 9–21 per cent. The in-between group (attending only on the high holy days and “occasionally”) ranges from 49–75 per cent.

TABLE 15. RELIGIOUS SERVICE ATTENDANCE,^a BY PER CENT

City	Year	High Holy Days			
		Never	Only	Occasionally	Often
Miami	1982	24	30	29	17
New York	1981	30	27	22	21
Rochester	1980	29	45	9	17
St. Louis ^b	1982	18	30	38	14
Seattle ^c	1979	20	30	30	20
Washington, D.C.	1983	16	14	61	9
NJPS	1970	27	28	25	18

^aCategories as designated, except as follows:

For Miami, occasionally = several times per year; often = more than once per month or more.

For New York, often = more than once per month.

For Rochester, occasionally = less than once per month, but more than high holy days; often = more than once per month.

For NJPS, high holy days = 1–4 times per year; occasionally = 5–19 times per year; often = 20+ times per year.

^bFigures approximate; multiple answers were given to nine different response choices and have been roughly divided into the four categories as shown.

^cFigures approximate; taken from general statements in text.

Comparable data from the NJPS—limited, however, to household heads—are 27 per cent, 18 per cent, and 53 per cent, respectively.

RITUAL OBSERVANCE

The data on ritual observance, reported in a small number of the community studies (see Table 16), follow the expected pattern. The proportions participating in a Passover seder range from 81–95 per cent, while those lighting Hanukkah candles range from 75–86 per cent. *Kashrut* is observed by much smaller proportions of households; in five communities that inquired about the use of two sets of dishes, the range of positive responses was between nine per cent and 26 per cent. Significant proportions of households do not have a mezuzah: 39 per cent in Chicago, 34 per cent in New York, and 24 per cent in St. Louis.

TABLE 16. RITUAL OBSERVANCE, PER CENT YES

City	Year	<i>Kashrut</i>					Mezuzah
		Sabbath Candles	Passover Seder	Two Sets of Dishes	Kosher Meats	Hanukkah Candles	
Chicago ^b	1982	—	85	11	—	75	61
Miami	1982	51	89	24	45	77	81
New York	1981	39	87	26	36	78	66
Phoenix	1983	33	81	9	—	78	57
Rochester	1980	64	95	34	—	86	79
St. Louis	1982	47	58/79 ^a	17	—	75	76
Seattle	1979	63	90	21	—	86	—
NJPS ^c	1970	—	—	28	—	—	—

^aSeder in home/seder outside home.

^bAnyone in household.

^cNJPS report on Jewish identity refers to adults (either 18 and over or 21 and over). Those who observe the Sabbath were 36.7 per cent. This was purely self-defined and referred to any observance which differentiated the Sabbath from the rest of the week. For Passover, 83.4 per cent reported participation; for Hanukkah, 75.2 per cent. *Kashrut* was reported by 25.9 per cent; again, this was self-defined.

Data available from the community studies generally show declining patterns of ritual observance by generation.

ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION

Nine communities gathered information on current affiliation with Jewish organizations (see Table 17). The proportions holding some sort of membership vary widely, ranging from 27 per cent in Los Angeles to 82 per cent in Rochester. While definitional issues can account for some of the differences, the impact of community

size is clear. The larger communities have smaller proportions of households with organizational affiliations. Sunbelt communities, such as Phoenix (36 per cent), also have small proportions of members of organizations. In contrast, older, more stable communities, such as Cleveland (62 per cent), St. Louis (75 per cent), and Rochester (82 per cent), have high rates of organizational affiliation.

TABLE 17. MEMBERSHIP IN JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS, BY PER CENT

City	Year	Yes	No
Chicago ^b	1982	37	63
Cleveland	1981	62	38
Los Angeles	1979	27	73
Miami	1982	61	39
Milwaukee	1983	53	47
Phoenix	1983	36	64
Richmond	1983	44	56
Rochester	1980	82	18
St. Louis ^a	1982	75	25

^aIncludes synagogue membership.

^bRespondent and spouse only.

Memberships in local Jewish community centers show similar patterns (see Table 18), ranging from 23–31 per cent in five communities; in New York the figure is 12 per cent, reflecting the influence of population size on organizational membership. Richmond, in contrast, has a 47 per cent membership rate in the Jewish community center. The data from St. Louis indicate that large numbers of families either add or drop Jewish community center memberships over a five-year period, depending on service and programmatic needs at particular times.

TABLE 18. MEMBERSHIP IN JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER, BY PER CENT

City	Year	Yes	No
Miami ^a	1982	23	77
Milwaukee	1983	28	72
Minneapolis	1981	23	77
New York	1981	12	88
Phoenix	1983	19	81
Richmond ^b	1983	47	53
Rochester	1980	31	69
St. Louis	1982	30	70

^aResponse based on participation/non-participation, rather than membership/non-membership.

^bHouseholds.

TRAVEL TO ISRAEL

The NJPS reported that 16 per cent of Jewish households had visited Israel. As against this, the proportions reported in nine community studies (see Table 19) range from a low of 27 per cent in St. Louis to a high of 45 per cent in Miami. There is no discernible pattern for travel to Israel in terms of city size, region, or demographic make-up.

TABLE 19. TRAVEL TO ISRAEL, BY PER CENT

City	Year	Yes
Chicago	1982	30
Cleveland	1981	38
Miami	1982	45
Nashville	1980	41
New York	1981	37
Richmond ^a	1983	33
Rochester	1980	28
St. Louis	1982	27
Washington, D.C.	1983	35
NJPS	1970	16

^aAnyone in family.

JEWISH CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

Nine community studies (see Table 20) report some form of giving to a Jewish organization or cause by no less than 63 per cent of all households, increasing to

TABLE 20. JEWISH CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS,^a BY PER CENT

City	Year	Yes	No	Dollar Amounts			
				\$0-\$99	\$100-\$499	\$500-\$1,000	\$1,000+
Chicago ^c	1982	69	31	56	23	8	13
Los Angeles	1979	65	35	—	—	—	—
Miami ^b	1982	63	27	34	30	16	20
Milwaukee	1983	74	26	—	—	—	—
Minneapolis	1981	73	27	49	26	10	15
Phoenix	1983	53	47	—	—	—	—
Rochester	1980	79	21	—	—	—	—
St. Louis	1982	78	22	32	30	17	21
St. Paul	1981	75	25	51	24	8	17
Washington, D.C.	1983	66	34	31	44	10	15

^aRefusals and "don't knows" excluded from figures.

^bDollar amounts refer to all charitable contributions.

^cWithout any corrections after validating JUF givers.

79 per cent in Rochester. Older and more stable communities, such as St. Louis, St. Paul, Minneapolis, and Milwaukee have particularly large proportions of contributing households.

Where data regarding the size of gifts are available, it is evident that from one-third to slightly more than one-half of all contributions were under \$100. Combining the gift categories, the proportion of households giving under \$500 ranged from three-fifths to three-quarters of all contributing households. Households reporting gifts of \$1,000 or more ranged from 13 per cent to 21 per cent of contributing households.

Making a contribution to a Jewish organization or cause breaks the pattern of lower affiliation rates, religious observance, etc., that is observable in the larger communities. Thus, about seven out of ten households in Chicago and two-thirds of those in Los Angeles and Washington made some contribution. Even where the dollar amounts are small, they serve to establish some formal attachment to the Jewish community.

A number of points have to be kept in mind when considering the data on Jewish charitable contributors. The extent to which the various community studies reached out to the unaffiliated has special importance here. Moreover, differing proportions of older and younger households, as well as lower-income elements, would clearly affect charitable contributions. Finally, the proportions of reported contributors are probably ceiling figures, masking some respondents who do not give, but claimed that they had.

Conclusion

Judging from the data appearing in the community studies—which in aggregate cover over 50 per cent of the American Jewish population—there have been both sweeping change and significant continuity in American Jewish life since 1970. It is clear that the American Jewish community is far from monolithic in character, composition, or behavior. Indeed, the Jewish “community” is a composite of sub-groups differentiated by region, religiosity, generation, and class. There is no “typical” Jewish family, Jewish institution, etc. At the same time, American Jews share a number of characteristics which serve to distinguish them from the general population. As a group they have higher educational, occupational, and income status. They also have a lower birth rate and a higher average age.

There are major differences between communities depending on size and region. Larger communities have greater concentrations of blue-collar workers, lower-income groups, and Jews who are unaffiliated with synagogues. Rapidly growing communities have greater concentrations of singles and Jews who are unaffiliated with organizations.

Families consisting of two parents and children have become a distinct minority, being outnumbered in total by the following: single adult households who have not yet married; divorced or separated households; married households where the

children have already left home; widowed households with children; and widowed adults living alone, with a relative, or with other older adults.

Religious life is characterized by great diversity. Sabbath restrictions on work, the maintenance of two sets of dishes, etc. are clearly rituals of the past for the vast majority of American Jews, although they are observed by the Orthodox. On the other hand, the lighting of Hannukah candles and participation in a Passover seder are widely observed. Most American Jews attend synagogue on the high holy days.

GARY A. TOBIN
ALVIN CHENKIN