

Orientations Toward Jewish Charitable Giving

ARNOLD DASHEFSKY
University of Connecticut

Traditional Jewish religion has set forth certain standards and expectations for its followers. To be sure, Judaism provides a wealth of information on the norms governing Jewish charitable behavior, *tsedakah*, as found in the Tanach, the Talmud, and the Midrash.¹ In years past *tsedakah* was well-integrated into the daily life of the Jews. Institutions were developed to provide for the social and welfare needs of the various communities. *Tsedakah* was expected from all Jews— even the poor.

It is not within the scope of this article to discuss the details of *tsedakah* in America. Milton Goldin, in his book, *Why They Give* (1976), has documented this rich and sometimes colorful segment of history. To be noted, however, is the fact that institutions did evolve to cope with the immigrant experience, dealing with a myriad of social, educational, and health problems associated with an uprooted generation.

In addition to local needs, Jews felt a responsibility to coreligionists in other lands. News of pogroms in the Russian Pale, the aftermath of World War I, the unprecedented Holocaust, and the birth of the State of Israel have moved Jews to contribute their time, energy, and dollars in the name of *tsedakah*.

Any discussion of *tsedakah*, of course, must take into account the United Jewish Appeal (UJA). Although Jews represent less than 3% of the total population in America they give about \$500 million a year to UJA. This is in contrast to over 32 million Americans of all faiths including Jews who give about \$1.5 billion annually to United Way. These figures are impressive because it means a community representing *less than 3% of the total* U.S. population raises for UJA 33% of the dollars that Americans generally contribute to the United Fund.

The need to reach out to the younger members of the Jewish community is evident when one assesses current trends in Jewish philanthropy that were noted by Steven Cohen (1979) in an article based on data gathered in 1965 and 1975 in the Jewish community of Boston. Cohen's study suggests that there was a change in behavior and attitude toward Jewish philanthropy from 1965 to 1975. Important to note was the difference in the age group 30–39. In 1965 those making contributions rose sharply after the 20–29 age group and the rate of giving also increased and remained high until age 50. In contrast, ten years later the giving rate

for those entering the 30–39 age group did not increase as dramatically as in 1965 with contributions gradually rising in each succeeding cohort, peaking in the 50's age group.

Another trend noted was that those who frequently gave were also more inclined to public and private Jewish behavior such as synagogue attendance, lighting Shabbat candles, attending a seder, and keeping a Kosher home. A third change from 1965 to 1975 was found in patterns of employment. Self-employed professionals, a growing segment of the donor population, have begun to out-give the traditional generous entrepreneurs. Finally, Cohen takes into account a shift in life-style, i.e., a gradual moving away from the traditional household unit, indicating that Jewish philanthropy must now address the single, one-parent, and non-parent households in order to effectively reach all potential donors.

Studies like Cohen's as well as other literature (Heilman, 1975; Rabinowitz and Shapiro, 1981) emphasize the importance of preexisting positive Jewish identification with regard to Jewish philanthropy. This is further supported by data from the National Jewish Population Survey, which is based on 5,790 interviews completed in the early 1970's. This study found that 64% of respondents claimed giving to the last local UJA/Federation campaign and that those who were most likely to give had a greater degree of Jewish identification, e.g., synagogue attendance, Jewish educational background (Dashefsky and Lazerwitz, 1983).²

Perhaps the single most important conclusion indicated by these data is that giving to and being involved with both the UJA and the general charity drive are clearly manifestations of Jewish identification. The UJA, like all major Jewish institutions, has a vital stake in the extent and quality of American Jewish commitment. As that commitment level decreases with Americans Jews becoming more multi-generational American, less religiously and organizationally involved, the ability of the UJA to raise funds is bound to decrease.

However, the data of the NJPS and other surveys do not tell us why less affiliated Jews and some synagogue members also do not give to the UJA. Such a "why" question is the focus of the research into the attitudes of American Jews toward their Jewish identification, affiliation, and charitable giving, and it is the basis of this article.³

Method

The usefulness of the survey research strategy is that it affords the investigators a way to analyze the response of hundreds or even thousands of individuals in a systematic way that allows them to draw inferences

about the population or community studied from the sample, which in turn may prove useful for local or national planning purposes. This type of survey efficiently provides a wide range of information about respondents, from either telephone, mail, or in-person interviews. However, such studies do not typically permit respondents to provide detailed clarifications or explanations for their attitudes or their self-reported behavior. As a result, survey data lend themselves to statistical tests of association, but the relationships that are observed can be very difficult to interpret; that is, with survey data it can be difficult to explain *why* people feel the way that they do, and how their particular attitudes relate to their broader world-view.

Obviously, this quantitative approach is not satisfactory if one is interested in probing a limited set of issues to penetrate beneath the level of quick, surface responses. Thus, this study is based upon intensive interviews with a purposive sample of 72 persons.⁴ Unlike a random sample, in which every person in a population is assigned an equal probability of inclusion, a purposive sample intentionally includes categories of persons who represent the social types that are of maximum interest to a research project. In this study the types of individuals selected (described below) were drawn from different regions of the country as well as from varying concentrations of city/suburban residence. This selection process was designed to focus on areas and individuals where it is assumed that the greatest opportunities for reaching new givers exists. They include two in the "sun-belt," Texas and Florida, which have received large numbers of Jewish migrants in recent years. In addition, two areas in the "frost-belt" were studied, New York and southern New England, both of which have populations living in the central cities as well as a growing suburban dispersion of population.

Of the 72 respondents that were interviewed 42 came from New York, and the other 30 were roughly evenly divided among Texas, Florida, and New England. The New York and non-New York groups were divided into three categories based on the assumption supported by the National Jewish Population Survey that Jewish identification and organizational involvement were directly related to contributing to the campaign. These categories included:

1. *Affiliated*: givers to UJA (preferably \$500 or more) and synagogue members and/or members of two or more Jewish organizations;
2. *Underaffiliated*: non-givers to UJA but synagogue members and/or members of two or more Jewish organizations; and
3. *Unaffiliated*: non-givers to UJA and non-members of a synagogue or

two or more Jewish organizations.

Interviews were sought primarily with individuals who were a) approximately between 35–50 years of age; b) native-born parents; and c) possessing a B.A. degree. The interview consisted of over 100 questions and covered a variety of standard demographic and social characteristics (e.g., age, sex, marital status, employment, generation, number of children, residence, income, necessary expenditures, etc.). In addition, a wide range of Jewish background characteristics was studied (e.g., synagogue membership, synagogue attendance, denominational preference, organizational involvement, Jewish education, etc.). The major portion of the interview probed actual behavior and attitudes with respect to charitable giving (e.g., how much given, to whom given, decision-making in giving, degree of satisfaction and giving) as well as orientations toward UJA/Federation (e.g., motivations, inhibitions, preferred method of solicitation, involvement with UJA/Federation, possible stimuli to giving, etc.). The interview concluded with a series of questions dealing with the respondents' knowledge and experience of Israel and anti-Semitism.⁵

Group Portraits in Three Dimensions

The data reported derived from a larger study relying on both quantitative and qualitative analysis. The quantitative findings revealed that those who had children, were self-employed, had more Jewish education, frequent synagogue attendance, and more Jewish and general organizational involvement, were more likely to contribute to the UJA. By contrast, the findings reported in this article focus on the qualitative examinations of the characteristics that distinguish the three groups (Affiliated, Underaffiliated, and Unaffiliated) with respect to their orientation toward Jewish charitable giving and the reasons for it. While the individuals specially interviewed for this study are not statistically representative of the entire American Jewish community, they are illustrative of the major patterns of affiliation with UJA and Jewish organizational life—or the lack of it.

Portraits of the Affiliated

We have defined the minimum criteria of membership in the *Affiliated Group* as contributing to the UJA Campaign (preferably \$500 or more) and being a member of a synagogue and/or two or more Jewish organizations. Consider the case of Mrs. S. She is 35 years old, married, with two school-age children. While she was raised in a small Jewish community in upstate New York, she has lived in southern New England for 12 years,

currently in a town identified as having the largest number of Jews in the metropolitan area. Having earned a M.A. degree, she is working part-time away from home. While Mrs. S. grew up in a Conservative Jewish home, she now considers herself Reform, belongs to a Reform temple, and attends synagogue services less than monthly. Nevertheless, she is very involved in community Jewish organizations such as the local Community Center, Family Service, Women's Division of Federation as well as its Leadership Development Program. In addition, she is a member of the P.T.A. and supports artistic and health groups in the community. Moreover, she reports that all or nearly all of her friends are Jewish. Finally, she had an average amount of Jewish education attending five years of Sunday and Hebrew School.

In the case of Mrs. S., the key to her commitment to UJA, she believes, stems from her childhood socialization, in particular, discussions at the dinner table. While only her grandfather was born abroad, the fact that HIAS helped him upon his arrival at Ellis Island is very important to her. Since she mentioned it twice in the interview, it appears likely to be significant in understanding her commitment to UJA. This same grandfather helped organize the first Conservative synagogue in her hometown, and her father was president of the local Jewish Community Center. Mrs. S. comes with Jewish socialization experiences rooted in activity and commitment to organized Jewish life. As she said, "It's family tradition that has a lot to do with it." In fact, she and her husband spent their honeymoon in Israel—for six weeks!

Mrs. S. feels, however, that her family does not contribute enough to the local campaign although they gave \$5,000 over each of the past two years based on a family salary of over \$100,000. She alone makes the decision as to how much to give. Mrs. S. is, perhaps, the epitome of the Federation executive's dream of a Young Leader. Her involvement stems from her socialization in the family committed to Jewish community involvement, and her level of giving is a function of her very high family income.

Consider the case of Mr. K. He is 41 years old and married, with three school-age children. While he grew up in Brooklyn, he now lives in Long Island. He is a C.P.A. and is self-employed. He considers himself to be a Conservative Jew and is a member of a Conservative Congregation, where he attends services several times a month. He had a typical Jewish education through Bar Mitzvah, attending Sundays and afternoons. While he is not highly involved in Jewish organizations, he suggests 80-90% of his close friends are Jewish. As he put it, "I have to have my people around me."

In discussing the reasons for his being committed to the local campaign, to which he gave over \$500 on a salary in five figures, Mr. K. stated:

If you were looking at what made me a contributor, I would say that somehow my father didn't have a lot of money; but it was his nature that if someone put their hand out and they needed, he may not have had, but they got. And it doesn't have to be verbalized that some people are givers, and others are takers. If there had to be any distinction between givers and non-givers, it would be to see what the parents did.

Then there is the case of Mrs. C. She is thirty-one years old, married with one pre-school child and expecting another. While she grew up in a small town in the northwestern United States, she now lives in a large metropolitan area in Texas. Mrs. C. has a master's degree and is trained as a psychiatric social worker, but she has been working primarily as a homemaker. She considers herself Conservative but belongs to an Orthodox congregation and attends services several times a month. In her Jewish community where she grew up she had a Sunday School Jewish education, which lasted for nine years (more than the norm). Currently she plans to send her children to a dayschool. Mrs. C. belongs to a variety of local Jewish organizations, such as the Community Center, Hadassah, and has held a leadership position. She is also a member of several general community organizations. Finally, her close friends are nearly all Jewish.

Mrs. C.'s family gift to the local campaign was over \$2,500 on an estimated income in the upper five figures. She is deeply committed to Jewish life as well as to personal practice in the home. The origins of her commitment to Jewish life and the UJA are rooted in her family experiences. She was very close to her grandparents, who escaped from Nazi Germany. Mrs. C. recounted her grandparents' flight from Germany:

They were in Germany; and they were very, very wealthy people. They had a big store, and they lived behind the store; and this was before Krystallnacht. One morning she woke up and found the store was totally defaced; and she had already lived through pogroms; and she said to my grandfather, "We are getting out;" and he said: "Don't be silly. This can't happen here." That whole scene from Holocaust . . . "Oh, that's silly. It can't happen here. Don't believe it." And she said, "Fine, you stay; and I'm taking the children, and I'm going. And if you want to come you can come, but I'm not going to stay here."

Mrs. C. went on to explain her close ties to her small town Jewish community and to her father, who died in middle-age:

I was brought up feeling very special because I was Jewish. Positively so! Oh yes, I mean being Jewish was very important to my family—not that Federation was a part of my life—but my fondest memories were of sitting in *shul*

playing with the strings of my father's *tallis*—just real positive memories.

But there were also negative experiences that shaped her Jewish identification:

My first was in first grade, and one of my closest friends called me a “dirty Jew.” And I can close my eyes and tell you what we were both wearing. I’ll never forget that. So I had experiences like that. Being Jewish was just a big part of my life.

What do these portraits have in common? They represent individuals who had Jewish socialization experiences rooted in the family and community involvement and/or the giving of charity. Now they are enmeshed in the Jewish community through organizational involvement, synagogue membership, and/or almost exclusively, a Jewish friendship network. Add to this that they all have substantial family incomes, over \$60,000, which makes it possible for them to implement the commitments they developed. As Cohen concluded: “Putting things crudely, it appears that deciding whether to give is a Jewish decision; deciding what to give is an economic one” (1979:50).

Portraits of the Unaffiliated

Turning now to the Unaffiliated Group, we remember that they were selected on the basis of their not being contributors to the UJA campaign and nonmembers of a synagogue or two or more Jewish organizations. Some individuals did belong to one Jewish organization such as a community center, Hadassah, or some Jewish fellowship group.

Take the case of Mr. G. He is 37 years old, divorced father of one child, who spends part of the time with his father. Mr. G. grew up in Cleveland and has lived in a metropolitan area of southern New England for 14 years. He is a college graduate who works as a research engineer for a corporation, and he earns over \$40,000 per year.

Mr. G. had primarily a Sunday School education as a child for five years with some mid-week instruction. He does not accept any conventional Jewish denominational preference such as Orthodox, Conservative, or Reform. While Mr. G., of course, does not belong to a synagogue, he is a member of a Havurah group and also does attend religious services several times a year. Even though he does not belong to any other Jewish organizations, he does belong to several general professional and community associations. In addition, more than half his friends are Jewish.

The best way to summarize Mr. G.’s attitude toward his lack of affiliation with UJA and his general low level of Jewish involvement is to use his

own statement about himself, "I am a child of the sixties," By that he meant he had a distrust of anyone who told him he should do something: "If someone says, 'he should do this;' I say, 'don't want to do this;' before I even know what *this* (italics mine) is."

And yet, this is misleading. It is more appropriate to say that he is aware of the need to give charity and does so, but not within the realm of the establishment. Evidence of this is found in his decision to stop giving to United Fund. He does contribute to two causes: Health and Amnesty International, which he sought out.

His Jewish identity also takes an anti-establishment form in that he has joined a Havurah group, but he again shows self-motivation by attending the Jewish Awareness Seminar sponsored by the local Federation. He felt they were informative and was not "turned off" by going into the posh homes (a different one for each lecture) as some of those who attended had been.

He has traveled to Israel and from this became more aware of its precarious "geography." And yet, he does not contribute to UJA. When asked if he could direct his dollars to a specific social program in Israel, i.e., Project Renewal, he still resisted, saying that he preferred direct contributions. He enjoyed writing a check to a particular charity and knowing that every penny went directly there. He had a sense of giving only in that manner. He also disliked solicitation of all kinds and spoke in terms of time wasted by such activity.

Dr. and Mrs. N. are two other members of the Unaffiliated Group. He is 44, and she is 40. They have two school-age children. While Dr. N. has lived all his life in New York City, Mrs. N. was raised in a metropolitan area of upstate New York and has lived in the City for the past 18 years. He holds a doctorate and works for the Board of Education; she is a college graduate who is self-employed in crafts. Their family income is over \$30,000.

Mrs. N. had no Jewish education, and Dr. N. attended a community afternoon school for three years. They do not accept any conventional Jewish denominational preference. They think of themselves as "ethnically Jewish" and did not attend religious services at all during the twelve months preceding the interview. They do, however, belong to the local Jewish Y and are members of several professional and community associations. Most of their friends are intermarried, and so they estimate that only half their friends are Jewish. Finally, in regard to their Jewish identification they believe that the Jewish education of their children is the children's own choice.

This is how they responded to the question:

Interviewer (I): Which kind of Jewish education is, was or will be given your children?

Mrs. N.: Not now they're not (receiving any).

I.: Did they ever? . . .

Mr. N.: Well, it's their choice.

Mr. N.: Literally their choice . . . She (daughter) doesn't lean towards it. She doesn't want to.

Mr. N.: As a matter of fact, she's made her decision.

Mrs. N.: She goes back and forth. There was a time when she would go to Temple with her friends, and then (was) turned off again. Right now she's off.

Mr. N.: She's been off for quite awhile, and she's made her decisions by saying she doesn't believe.

Mrs. N.: Yeh.

Mr. N.: That's what I mean by that.

Mrs. N.: . . . But she's changeable, and she's going into puberty and adolescence; and a lot of her opinions are going to change back and forth for the next few years.

I.: And everything is up for grabs as far as your son goes?

Mrs. N.: Right now, nothing. I guess we'll kind of wait and see what he decides later.

I.: Do you think he'll want to be Bar Mitzvahed?

Mrs. N.: (He the son) will probably say no.

Mr. N.: I will say no . . .

Mrs. N.: I would see what he'd want to do.

The best way to summarize Dr. and Mrs. N.'s virtual lack of Jewish affiliation and involvement is their lack of Jewish socialization and Dr. N.'s political involvement. As he put it:

Dr. N.: I was extremely political by the time I was ten years old. I was politicized.

I.: By whom? How?

Dr. N.: My grandfather was an old time socialist—an old time radical socialist, and I was very close with him. What happened was that he . . . my father and his brothers disagreed with him in his being unrealistic, etc., and so forth; and I didn't particularly like what they were saying; and I let them have it with both barrels; and I've been doing it ever since; and my grandfather likes to take them on; and so I evened up the sides a little. That's what really happened.

Nevertheless, Dr. N. has some measure of Jewish identification. When asked what type of activity outside the synagogue could UJA sponsor, he replied:

Dr. N.: I'll tell you something. Personally, if they had something like I went to - those *folkshuls*, those cultural programs . . . I'd encourage my own kids to

go. Whether they would or not is another story. We often try to find something like that . . .

I.: You like things in Yiddish?

Dr. N.: I think the Yiddish culture in some ways is far richer . . . It's a secular sense to it that (I like) . . . what I call the Jewish experience, and a sense of historical perspective, their background, and that's something I would like my own children to have, although they don't. It's always impossible to find such a thing around.

Moreover, when the N.'s were interested in disposing of some used clothing, they decided to donate it to a *Jewish* thrift shop and training center. In their minds, giving money is not as important as being involved—especially politically:

Dr. N.: No. I'll tell you something about that. For me, I have to speak for myself, if I have been involved in something, I feel a hell of a lot better than when I've given anything. It's almost meaningless to me to give some money to a cause. I don't have an emotional response; but if I have actively participated in some way in some cause, that has meaning.

I.: Can you think of any such instances that were particularly meaningful to you?

Dr. N.: Yeh, I can give a number. When I was involved in the ban the bomb movement in the early 60's. That was before we were married. And I was in Washington when Kennedy made the big speech.

I.: Was there any financial contribution involved along with participation? Or just participation?

Dr. N.: It was just participation. I was active, doing . . . That I found very satisfying—Even now when I've been able to help get something done, even in the neighborhood . . .

Another example of the Unaffiliated type of person is Mr. L. He is 39 years old, married a second time and living with Mrs. L's high school age daughter. Mr. L. was raised in Brooklyn, New York and has lived in his metropolitan South Florida community for seven years. He has a master's degree, works in educational administration, and has a family income of over \$30,000 per year.

Mr. L. had a somewhat typical Jewish education, attending afternoon school for about five years. He considers himself Reform; and, of course, he does not belong to a synagogue nor to any Jewish organizations. Mr. L., however, indicated that he did attend religious services occasionally. While he does not belong to any Jewish organizations, he does belong to several general community professional, service and recreational organizations and has served as an officer in some civic organizations. Although Mr. L. reported that nearly all his friends were Jewish, his wife is not and his daughter receives no Jewish education. The time of the interview was

December; and in the living room where the interview took place was a large, decorated Christmas tree, and nearby was a Hanukkah Menorah.

According to Mr. L., his lack of involvement in the local UJA campaign is the result of his lack of funds. As he put it, "I've lived on a month-to-month basis." His lack of other Jewish commitments seem to be rooted in his alienation from religion and synagogue life. As he explained it:

(Mrs. L.) and I have both been married for a second time. When I first went to the Temple to inquire about marriage, I was handed a card asking for my occupation, my annual salary—exactly what my contributions should be based on my earnings. It shook the foundations of my ideology and scared me away, and I didn't get married in that Temple.

Mr. L. seemed to be looking for non-synagogue types of Jewish cultural activity and even religious celebrations. When asked whether there were any activities outside of the synagogue that would interest him, he replied: "Something of a holiday nature would be very appealing. The fondest remembrance of childhood was the family holidays." Perhaps Mr. L.'s relationship to the Jewish Community could be described as ambivalent. He has some fond childhood Jewish memories and would be interested in family-oriented Jewish activities outside the synagogue, but his wife is Christian and obviously has some ties to the Christian experience (e.g., the Christmas tree in their home). Nevertheless, Mr. L. made a pledge to the local UJA campaign about the time of the interview.

What do these portraits have in common? They represent individuals who had very little Jewish socialization experiences in the family, community involvement, and the giving of charity. This led them to be less involved as adults in the formally organized Jewish community, to have far less informal friendship ties to Jews or more likely to have intermarried than members of the Affiliated Group. Nevertheless, they still claimed at least half their friends to be Jewish and did not disavow their Jewish identity.

They were, moreover, responsive to pursuing *tsedakah* (in the sense of justice), such as the redemption of captives (as in the case of supporting Amnesty International) or the quest for peace (as in the ban the bomb movement). They may have even developed these concerns through their socialization in a highly secularized Jewish version of traditional *tsedakah*. In other words, these individuals may very well be pursuing *tsedakah*, but they do not even know it. Nor does the community seem to have a role for them to play consistent with their identities.

Thus, it seems that even among these Unaffiliated there remains *dos pinteleyid*, the jot of Jewishness, possessed with *menshlichkeit*, a compassionate concern and sensitivity for others. The question remains whether these people can mobilize themselves or be mobilized by others to affirm

their identities and activities as Jews.

Portraits of the Underaffiliated

We have defined the criteria of membership in the Underaffiliated Group as membership in a synagogue and/or two or more Jewish organizations but not having contributed to the UJA campaign. Thus, the Underaffiliated resemble the Affiliated by virtue of their synagogue (or Jewish organizational) membership, but they resemble the Unaffiliated in their not contributing to the campaign. Whom do they really most resemble?

Let us take a look at the situation of Mr. and Mrs. O. He is 36 and she is 33. They have three children, two in school and one pre-schooler. They both grew up in major northern metropolitan areas—he in New York and she in Chicago—and have lived for the past one and one-half years in a metropolitan South Florida community. They both attended college. He works in real estate, and she works as a homemaker. They have an income of over \$75,000.

While Mr. O. grew up attending afternoon Hebrew school, studying Hebrew in the public high school, and belonging to Jewish youth groups, Mrs. O. grew up as a Christian. She has, however, pursued a substantial amount of adult Jewish education courses, had a private tutor, and recently became a Bat Mitzvah. Now Mr. and Mrs. O. consider themselves to be Reform and belong to a Reform congregation. They attend religious services on a weekly basis. While Mr. O. is a member of the Temple Brotherhood, Mrs. O. is very active in several Jewish community organizations and has held a position as an officer. Moreover, they are both involved in general community organizations. Mr. O. is active in a humanitarian cause aimed at ending world hunger about which he spoke with great conviction and spiritual fervor. Mrs. O. has been active in local school and political causes, and they also belong to a local country club.

While Mr. and Mrs. O. are connected to Jewish organizational life—she, a convert, more than he—they do not give to the local campaign. Their Temple involvement gives them much pleasure, and they recently raised their contribution, increasing their charitable giving to over \$2,500. Why does it give them so much satisfaction?

Mr. O. explained:

Because I'm there all the time, and I could see what is needed; so if I could see that we contributed to something they didn't have, I get pleasure out of seeing when I'm at services or whatever—or knowing that we've created a building. My highest amount of satisfaction is the money I give to the (humanitarian) project. I always experience reluctance in making contributions, yet I know that is what I want to do regardless of what I'm contributing

to. I know that is what I really want to do, and the reluctance that I have is the comfortableness that I want to give as much as I sometimes do. I just feel that I'm philanthropic by nature, generally, and sometimes I am concerned whether I have the ability to give as much as I would like; so when I do give, it's very rewarding that I've made a commitment to do that. Once I've committed myself it's just a wonderful feeling and that's the way I feel with the contributions I've made to the (humanitarian) project; and I'll go on to say as far as the contributions we've made to our Temple, I feel equally rewarded that I have done that.

Why does their generosity and humanitarian concern not extend to the Federation?

I would say for us and close friends, which we are talking about right now, I would say there is no feeling of Federation involvement in the community. ZERO! There is an awakening that is going on, but unfortunately, I don't know if it is too late. It's like "where-were-you-when-we-needed-you" type of attitude right now. It's a community of young people who need the services, and they just didn't have the manpower, or they just didn't have something to be here in the last few years. There's a definite resentment about Federation. It comes from knowing *Federation here like sucks you in and drains you until you're dry* (italics mine). It's that or nothing. So when you're interested in a few different things such as the Temple, different organizations, it's not okay to be just a small contributor to UJA—like total commitment tie; I think people fear that. That needs to be overcome educationally.

Thus, for the O.'s the Temple is "there" providing "comfort," close friends, family activities, and a place for the children. While the Temple appears psychologically close, the Federation appears remote.

Another example of the Underaffiliated is the case of Mr. R., who is 40 years old and married for the second time with no children. He grew up in New York City and continues to live there. Mr. R. went to Law School and now has a private legal practice. His family income is in excess of \$75,000. As to his Jewish background Mr. R. reported he had a very limited Jewish education lasting two or three years and did not participate in any Jewish youth organizations. He thinks of himself as culturally Jewish and belongs to a Reform temple, where he attends religious services several times a month. He is active in Jewish organizations such as Bnai Brith and serves on the Board of Directors of his Temple. In addition, he is active in general fraternal and political organizations. Although Mr. R.'s wife is a convert to Judaism prior to their marriage, he reports nearly all their friends to be Jewish.

While Mr. R. is active and contributive to his Temple as well as other Jewish and general organizations, he did not contribute to the local UJA Campaign. Why is he positively disposed to his synagogue and not to

UJA? Mr. R. explains:

The synagogue came to me in the time of my life when I needed to have a stronger Jewish identity. It provided that in a very warm, familiar atmosphere, something which was absent from most of my life (the warm, familiar atmosphere); and, therefore, I felt very much at home. I did go to services and enjoyed them, and I became very involved. It was very familiar; that is the point. When a member of the family says they need some money, you say you will be happy. It's a very personal, direct contact kind of thing, and I know what the finances of the synagogue are like better than the average congregant because of my involvement on the board.

Not only is Mr. R. attracted to his Temple to support it, but he is repelled by UJA and its method of solicitation as he sees it.

I can't set aside my personal offense at UJA methodology. I find it extraordinarily offensive. It is effective. It works. A lot of people give but not (me). I really believe it to be offensive. They don't do it in my synagogue because a number of people find it offensive . . . standing up and saying how much people have given is an extraordinary, insensitive thing to do. But I think what one gives is between himself and their Maker and not a matter of public consumption. The fact that there are IBM lists that indicate what I gave last year, the year before that, the year before that, and there is always this pressure to update it each year is extraordinarily offensive to me. I feel it's like a business. I don't owe UJA anything; and, therefore, I would find it extraordinarily offensive to have them call me up and say, "Hey, you gave this much last year;" and it is done that way because I have been involved with it.

As Mr. R. explained later, he had been a solicitor for Israel Bonds which he felt used the same solicitation technique. As with the O.'s, Mr. R. finds his synagogue attractive because it offers him the psychic support he needs to express himself as a Jew. Whereas UJA offers none of this, Mr. R. finds it repellent because of the solicitation techniques he perceives relying on public pledging. Moreover, his perceptions of UJA include that it is an impersonal, "computerized business," "high pressure," and also engenders "a feeling that no amount is really enough." As he concluded, "I must feel that I have given to a *need* not to a big organization."

Summary and Conclusion

Jewish charitable giving, *Tsedakah*, has taken on some new dimensions within the context of the American Jewish community. This article sought to delineate some of the differences in orientations that have emerged with respect to such charitable giving. A purposive sample of 72 individuals was interviewed as part of a larger study. The respondents were equally divided into three groups:

1. *Affiliated*: gives to UJA (preferably \$500 or more) and synagogue

-
-
- members and/or members of two or more Jewish organizations;
2. *Underaffiliated*: non-givers to UJA but synagogue members and/or members of two or more Jewish organizations; and
 3. *Unaffiliated*: non-givers to UJA and non-members of a synagogue or two or more Jewish organizations.

The results of the analysis of the data obtained through in-depth interviews were presented as three separate portraits, defining the different orientations of the respondents toward Jewish charitable giving and the reasons for it. Individuals in the *Affiliated Group* had Jewish socialization experiences rooted in the family and community involvement, and/or the giving of charity and were currently enmeshed in the community through organizational involvement, synagogue membership, and/or almost an exclusive Jewish friendship network. The *Unaffiliated Group*, by contrast, consisted of individuals who had very little Jewish socialization experience in the family, community involvement, or the giving of charity. This led them to be less involved as adults in the formally organized Jewish community, to have far less informal Jewish friendship ties, or more likely to be intermarried even though they did not disavow their Jewish identification. The third group, the *Underaffiliated* (with respect to UJA), resembled the *Affiliated*, in that they had Jewish roots and interconnections (e.g., synagogue membership and/or organizational involvement) but, like the *Unaffiliated*, did not give because they did not possess a positive image and personal understanding of what the UJA or the local Jewish Federation does.

While the *Underaffiliated* do not give like the *Unaffiliated*, the former are largely different from the latter. The *Underaffiliated* have Jewish roots and interconnections like the *Affiliated Group*. What they lack compared to the *Affiliated* is a positive image and personal understanding of what UJA does. In part, this may be the result of not being adequately informed, as these individuals may be much newer to the community, or this may be the result of crude or negative solicitation techniques, or this may result from the lack of tangible needs that the UJA fulfills for these people.

*This article is derived from a research report prepared for and funded by the United Jewish Appeal (directed by Arnold Dashefsky and Bernard Lazerwitz with the assistance of Dana Kline) and originally produced by The Center For Judaic Studies and Contemporary Jewish Life at The University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut. Thanks are due to the Department of Developmental Services and New Gifts of the United Jewish Appeal, National Director, Barry Judelman, and National Program Director, Neal Hurwitz, for permission to use these data. Special thanks are owed to Mark Abrahamson, Steven M. Cohen, Dana Kline, Bernard Lazerwitz, and Egon Mayer for their advice and aid during the course of the research as well as to Celeste Machado, Rachele Rosenberg, and David

Zeligson, who served as student research assistants. Last but not least, special appreciation is extended to Linda Snyder for setting up the interviews and typing the manuscript.

NOTES

1. For a discussion of the classical and contemporary applications of *tsedakah*, see Kimmelman (1982), Neusner (1982) and Siegel (1982).
2. Philadelphia ranked second out of eleven geographical areas of American Jewry in giving to the UJA. See Lazerwitz (1977) for more details.
3. See Dashevsky and Shapiro (1974) for a detailed discussion of the determinants and consequences of Jewish identification.
4. Actually, interviews were carried out with 79 individuals, but seven cases were excluded because they did not fit the general criteria established.
5. The interview schedule underwent a series of several different versions, five in all, which were developed during the period from November, 1981 until March, 1982. The great majority of the interviews, those from New York and New England, were gathered using Version 5 of the schedule; and the others utilized the slightly different Version 4. A small group of individuals were interviewed using Version 6 for a focus-group approach, in which the closed-ended questions were filled out in a questionnaire, and the open-ended questions were asked in the interview.

REFERENCES

- Cohen, Steven M.
 1979 "Trends in Jewish philanthropy." *American Jewish Yearbook*, 80:29-51.
- Dashevsky, A. and Howard M. Shapiro
 1974 . *Ethnic Identification Among American Jews*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Dashevsky, A. and B. Lazerwitz
 1983 *Why Don't They Give? Determinants of Jewish Charitable Giving*. Storrs, CT: Center For Judaic Studies and Contemporary Jewish Life.
- Goldin, Milton
 1976 *Why They Give*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Heilman, Samuel C.
 1975 "The gift of alms: Face to face giving among Orthodox Jews." *Urban Life and Culture*, 3(4):371-395.
- Kimelman, Reuven
 1982 *Tsedakah and Us*. New York: National Jewish Resource Center.
- Lazerwitz, Bernard
 1977 "The community variable in Jewish identification." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 16 (December): 361-369.
- Neusner, Jacob
 1982 *Tsedakah: Can Jewish Philanthropy Buy Jewish Survival?* Chappaqua, NY: Russel Books.
- Rabinowitz, Dayle Friedman and Judith Tychman Shapiro
 1981 *Among Friends: A Qualitative Analysis of Informal Jewish Friendship Networks*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Hebrew Union College.
- Siegel, Danny
 1982 *Gym Shoes and Irises*. Spring Valley, NY: Townhouse Press.