

JEWISH FEDERATION COUNCIL OF GREATER LOS ANGELES

Osias Goren, President

Ted Kanner, Executive Vice President

Merv Lemmerman, Executive Director

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Benjamin Dvoskin, Chairperson

Lewis Blumberg

Dr. Elliot N. Dorff

Dr. Howard Freeman

Dr. Lilli Friedland

Dr. Michael Goldstein

Abner Goldstine

Marcie Greenberg, ex officio

Dr. Maurice Hamovitch

Ira Moskatel

Rabbi Daniel Polish

Dr. Madeleine Stoner

Dr. Martin I. Taft

האגודה הלאומית היהודית
בני ישראל

916.93(73)
J49

11214

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables	vii
Acknowledgements	ix
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	xiii
INTRODUCTION	3
CHAPTER 1 - Social Problems and Needs	13
CHAPTER 2 - Communal Problems and Needs	35
CHAPTER 3 - Social and Communal Problems Combined	65
CHAPTER 4 - Issues of Interest	83
APPENDICES	
A - Initial Memoranda to JFC Regional Directors and Checklist	95
B - Map of JFC Regions and Community Listing	105
C - Computation of Weighted Rank Scores	111
D - Additional Tables	117

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 1	
1-1 Do These Social Problems Exist In Your Region?	14
1-2 What Are the Most Serious Social Problems In Your Region?	19
1-3 Are the Serious Social Problems Getting Worse In Your Region?	25
1-4 Do You Know of Programs That Address Each of These Social Problems? How Adequate Are They?	28
CHAPTER 2	
2-1 Do These Communal Problems Exist in Your Region?	36
2-2 What Are the Most Serious Communal Problems In Your Region?	43
2-3 Are the Serious Communal Problems Getting Worse In Your Region?	51
2-4 Do You Know of Programs That Address Each of These Communal Problems? How Adequate Are They?	55
2-5 Which Groups Are Most Affected By the Communal Problems?	60
CHAPTER 3	
3-1 What Are the Most Serious Problems In Your Region? (Social and Communal Problems Combined)	66
3-2 What Is the Rank-order of the Most Serious Problems In Your Region? (Social and Communal Problems Combined)	70
3-3 Which Jewish Population Groups Are Most In Need of Additional Resource Allocations?	78

Acknowledgements

Conducting a major community needs assessment, such as the Regional Needs Survey, is a cooperative effort involving many participants in all stages of the process. We wish to thank those individuals who were instrumental in helping us carry out this project. In the acknowledgements that follow we have made an attempt to be exhaustive in recognizing the contributions of all who participated in this major work; we apologize for any oversight or omission.

Eve Fielder and her staff at the Survey Research Center of the Institute for Social Science Research at UCLA were there at the beginning. They assisted us in the conceptualization of the project and in the design of the initial questionnaire. Dr. Allan Shoff was also very helpful in this formative stage of questionnaire design. Eve and her colleagues at the Center supervised the collection, coding, editing, and key punching of the data.

A unique feature of this project was the involvement of close to twenty volunteer interviewers who took on a major time-commitment and augmented the professional interviewer staff provided by the Survey Research Center. The volunteers were carefully and intensively trained by Vi Dorfman, Field Supervisor at the Center, and they handled their assignments with great thoroughness.

Suzanne Tannenbaum, now residing in Israel, served as the supervisor of data collection. She carried out her responsibilities with competence and efficiency, bringing that phase of the project to a successful completion.

Marum Rieger assisted in all stages of the organization of the project, preparing early drafts of the questionnaire, assisting with the supervision of the data collection, and preparing the support materials for inclusion in the final report.

Our thanks go to each of the JFC Regional Directors for their important contributions in selecting the survey respondents and volunteer interviewers.

JFC Agency directors reviewed drafts of the preliminary questionnaires and assisted in the development of the lists of Jewish communal and social problems.

Bill Korn of UCLA was outstanding in directing the data preparation, computerization, and statistical analysis.

Dr. Robert Wenkert of the UCLA Graduate School of Education, and Dr. Adrienne Bank, of the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation, Graduate School of Education, took the initial responsibility for producing the manuscript. Dr. Wenkert organized the data, prepared many of the tables, and presented a fine working draft. Dr. Bank incorporated the open-ended data into the report, helped write several of the sections and cooperated with us in editing the final version. She was a constant source of encouragement and good humor.

The manuscript was typed in numerous drafts and redrafts by Katharine Fry who exhibited much patience and diligence.

A special Review Committee read the initial manuscript draft and made many valuable suggestions. We are grateful to Rabbi Elliot Dorff, Benjamin Dwoskin, Marcie Greenberg, Dr. Maurice Hamovitch, Merv Lemmerman, Jack Ostrow, Arnold Saltzman, Esther Shapiro, and Dr. Louis Yuster for their reading of the manuscript and constructive comments.

We also offer special thanks to Jewish Federation Council's Executive Vice President, Ted Kanner; Executive Director, Merv Lemmerman; Chairpersons of the Planning & Budgeting Committee and Research Committee, respectively, Marcie Greenberg and Benjamin Dwoskin, for their commitment to the production of action-oriented research.

The entire professional and support staff of Planning and Budgeting Department were exemplary in their individual contributions to the project. We thank them all for being a constant source of encouragement and supportiveness.

Barbara Kamilar was instrumental in the design, layout and publication of the final report.

This project was made possible by a grant from the Jewish Community Foundation of Greater Los Angeles; we are grateful for their financial backing. The report is part of the overall Community Priorities System. The central lay group in this process is the Community Priorities Committee, co-chaired by Jack Ostrow and Dr. Louis Yuster. We wish to thank them for their support and encouragement.

Lastly, we wish to express our sincere gratitude to the 237 respondents from whom we learned much about the nature of the Jewish community and who gave us a deeper insight into the needs of its population. We are indebted to them for sharing with us their experience and knowledge, their frank opinions, and thoughtful responses. To them and to all who participated in this project, we say thank you.

- Saul Andron and Steven Huberman

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles conducted a Regional Needs Survey in order to develop a valid and current information base to assist JFC leaders in determining overall community priorities. 237 knowledgeable individuals were interviewed from the five JFC regions. These priorities will provide one input to determine how best to allocate scarce resources among programs and agencies in the community.

EXISTENCE OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

- Social problems relate to individual and social functioning. Respondents were asked about the existence of 22 social problems in their regions. Each of these problems was reported in all JFC regions by at least some respondents. These social problems, therefore, seem to be widespread.
- In general, the number and variety of problems tend to be greater in those regions having the larger Jewish populations.
- Family problems and problems of the elderly are among the most frequently cited problems in all regions. Permanent poverty and other poverty-related problems tend to be more prevalent in regions with larger Jewish populations.

MOST SERIOUS SOCIAL PROBLEMS

- When all the JFC regions are considered together four social problems are noted as the most serious: divorce/marital conflict, lack of affordable housing for the elderly, social isolation of the elderly, and emotional or psychological problems of children and adolescents. These four social problems include the three most serious as reported by all five regions. These are "first tier" problems.
- There is a "second tier" of five problems, considered to be among the more serious social problems in only some regions: emotional or psychological problems of adults, lack of home care for the elderly, lack of transportation for the elderly, lack of institutional facilities for the elderly, and Jews living in permanent poverty.
- The remaining 13 social problems comprise a "third tier," thought by only a small number of respondents to be among the three most serious social problems.
- The reasons given by respondents for social problems being considered most serious can be grouped into four broad categories:

1. Individual Impact

The problem is serious because individuals are at risk.

2. Large Numbers
The problem is serious because many individuals are now or will soon be affected.
3. Jewish Survival
The problem is serious because Jewish survival is threatened.
4. Jewish Responsibility
The problem is serious because the Jewish community has responsibility for dealing with it.

CHANGING STATUS OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

- Almost all of the nine most serious social problems in the five regions are judged to have gotten worse in recent years. In all regions and for all of the nine social problems, the respondents who said that conditions had gotten worse outnumbered those who said they had gotten better.
- There is near consensus that three problems, listed in descending order, have gotten particularly worse: lack of affordable housing for the elderly, Jews living in a condition of permanent poverty, and divorce and marital conflict.

AWARENESS AND ADEQUACY OF PROGRAMS ADDRESSING SOCIAL PROBLEMS

- When asked about services available to address the nine most serious social problems, respondents were more apt to name Jewish than general programs. The one exception was in meeting the transportation needs of the elderly where twice as many respondents cited general rather than Jewish programs.
- Respondents appear to be relatively unfamiliar with services in relation to two "second tier" problems of the elderly -- transportation in the case of the Jewish services, and home help in the case of the general services.
- In general, only small minorities of respondents consider existing services to be adequate for any of the nine most serious social problems, and especially for the following three problems of the elderly: lack of transportation, lack of home care, and lack of affordable housing.
- Taken as a whole, the perceived adequacy of the services provided by Jewish and general agencies appears to be about the same.

EXISTENCE OF COMMUNAL PROBLEMS

- Jewish communal problems relate to areas of need specific to Jews and the Jewish community. Respondents were asked whether each of 25 Jewish communal problems existed in their regions. Each of these

problems was reported in all JFC regions by at least some respondents. Jewish communal problems are seen as numerous and pervasive.

- The regions are similar to one another with respect to the number and variety of communal problems they experience, but they differ in their particular combination of problems. The influence of cults, the cost of Jewish education, anti-Israel propaganda, and especially the isolation of immigrants from the mainstream of Jewish life are more frequently mentioned in those regions with larger Jewish populations, whereas the lack of Jewish recreational facilities and social and cultural activities are more frequently cited in those with smaller Jewish populations.
- In all JFC regions, intermarriage, anti-semitism, low levels of affiliation with synagogues and Jewish groups, and the small number of UJWF contributors are frequently reported communal problems.

MOST SERIOUS COMMUNAL PROBLEMS

- When the regions are considered together, two communal problems are included among the three most serious in all JFC regions: intermarriage, and the large numbers of Jews unaffiliated with any Jewish groups or organizations. Four other problems also are regarded as among the three most serious in some regions: small numbers of UJWF contributors, anti-semitic activity, low synagogue affiliation, and few children receiving a Jewish education. Taken as a whole, these six communal problems account for the three most serious ones named in all regions. These are "first-tier" problems. For four of the six problems, however, there is substantial regional variation.
- The reasons given by respondents for "first-tier" communal problems being considered most serious were almost exclusively linked to Jewish community survival. These problems were regarded as evidence of an eroding Jewish community or as contributing to that erosion.
- There is a "second tier" of three problems, only considered serious in some regions and by relatively small percentages of respondents: the quality of Jewish education, anti-Israel propaganda and lack of Jewish recreational facilities.
- The remaining 17 communal problems comprise a "third tier," because they were named as among the three most serious problems either by small minorities or, in some regions, by no respondents at all.

CHANGING STATUS OF COMMUNAL PROBLEMS

- Of the nine most serious communal problems identified by respondents, three were judged to have particularly worsened during the past three years: anti-Israel propaganda, anti-semitic activity, and intermarriage.

- Except for some improvement in the quality of Jewish education, more respondents thought that the problems had gotten worse than thought they had gotten better. Majorities in all regions thought that the lack of Jewish recreational and social activities had stayed about the same.
- The Metropolitan region appears to have been slightly more affected by negative trends than the other regions.
- Trends in relation to communal problems are less pessimistic than trends in relation to social problems.

AWARENESS AND ADEQUACY OF PROGRAMS ADDRESSING COMMUNAL PROBLEMS

- Survey results suggest that two of the nine most serious communal problems, anti-semitic activity and anti-Israel propaganda are receiving the most programmatic attention. Receiving the least attention are low levels of synagogue affiliation, low levels of Jewish group affiliation, and intermarriage.
- On average, respondents are more aware of program efforts directed to "second tier" than "first tier" communal problems.
- Of the programmatic activities directed to the nine areas under review, those aimed at anti-semitism and anti-Israel propaganda are deemed most adequate. Those judged least adequate address the problems of synagogue affiliation, intermarriage, and the quality of Jewish education.
- Assessments of programmatic adequacy are on average somewhat more favorable for Jewish communal than for social problems. For seven of the nine communal problems, however, few respondents consider existing programs to be adequate.

POPULATION GROUP AFFECTED BY COMMUNAL PROBLEMS

- Of the nine most serious communal problems, two were reported as affecting almost everyone in the Jewish community: the small number of UJWF contributors, and the prevalence of anti-semitic activity.
- Although the remaining seven serious problems affect specific groups, e.g., the general adult population, young adults, teenagers and children rather than preschoolers, single adults, single parents, the elderly, and immigrants, most communal problems appear to affect everyone in the Jewish community either directly or indirectly.

RANK ORDERING OF SOCIAL AND COMMUNAL PROBLEMS

- Social and communal problems are intermingled among the most serious problems confronting the Federation regions. Both types of problems are equally represented among the ten most serious problems in every JFC region.
- When weighted rank scores are used to order problems, five are among the ten most serious in most regions: intermarriage, divorce/marital conflict, the emotional or psychological problems of children and adolescents, the low number of Jews affiliated with Jewish groups or organizations, and the lack of affordable housing for the elderly.
- Although problem rankings tend to vary by region, the following types of problems rank among the most serious in all regions: family problems, problems of low levels of organizational affiliation, problems of the elderly, and Jewish educational problems.
- In general, the survey findings indicate considerable diversity about the particular combination of problems respondents in each region considered the most serious; judgments are dispersed over many problems.

POPULATION GROUPS MOST IN NEED OF ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

- When respondents were asked about groups in their regions most in need of additional resource allocations, the two groups most often cited in all regions were the elderly and teenagers.
- The reasons respondents gave for nominating the elderly as most in need were related primarily to characteristics of the elderly, especially their physical vulnerability.
- Respondents who identified teenagers as most in need were concerned with teenagers' alienation from Jewish life and their cultural vulnerability. Their eroding Jewish identity was of particular concern.
- The groups least often cited as having such needs were preschoolers and immigrants, although the latter ranked somewhat higher in the Metropolitan region than in the others.
- Children, young adults, the general adult population, single parents and single adults tend to fall into middle positions in terms of need. Although children were thought to have a greater need for additional allocations than single adults in all regions, the other relative rankings of the groups in the middle vary noticeably from one region to another.

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the findings from the 1982 Jewish Federation Council Regional Needs Survey. The survey, conducted within the framework of the Federation's Community Priorities System, is one means of generating a valid and current information base to assist JFC leaders in determining overall community program priorities. The results of the survey, however, do not constitute final JFC community priorities; rather the data represent the aggregated judgments and perceptions of a knowledgeable cross section of individuals from the JFC regions regarding the problems and needs facing Jews in Los Angeles. This document coupled with the results of the 1979 Los Angeles Jewish Population Study, therefore, provides information essential to an informed priority setting process.

We want to emphasize the distinction between needs assessment and priority setting. Needs assessment is essentially a measurement process. It is a tool for collecting and analyzing accurate, timely data to assist decision-makers in planning programs, identifying resources to meet problems, and, ultimately, allocating funds. Priority setting, on the other hand, is essentially a political process. It strives to sort out and choose among competing values and judgments; only one of these values is related to need. A needs assessment makes a contribution to an informed priority setting process; it is not the total process.

Formal needs assessments, while not yet common among human service agencies, appear to be on the increase. More and more, they are seen by such agencies not only as a useful part of the budgetary process but also as a means of promoting awareness about the needs of particular target groups, ascertaining the seriousness of specific problems, and obtaining general judgments about the adequacy of services.

How the Survey was Conducted

The findings presented in this report are based on information collected through what is commonly referred to in the needs assessment literature as the "key informant" approach. The primary emphasis of this approach is to gather information about client needs and perceptions of service utilization from persons who are designated as familiar with the community, its people, their particular needs, and the availability and use of services.

As noted earlier, this Regional Needs Survey was conducted primarily to develop an information base to assist lay decision-makers in establishing community priorities so as to best allocate scarce resources among programs and agencies in the community. In order to achieve that goal, we wanted to approach people involved with and knowledgeable about Jewish community life. Further, we recognized the other advantages of this approach: its relatively simple design, low cost, and short time frame. Considering the specific purpose we had in mind for undertaking this needs assessment, as well as the practicality of this approach, we judged the "key informant" method to be the most appropriate strategy.

The usefulness of the information obtained from the "key informant" approach is based to a large degree on the effectiveness of the procedures for identifying respondents who are best qualified to provide the requested information.

Respondent Selection Process

The five regional directors of the Jewish Federation Council were contacted by the Planning and Budgeting Department and asked to identify key individuals in their regions whom they regarded as knowledgeable about the

region, its Jewish residents, their problems and need for services, and the patterns of service received. We asked for a balanced set of nominees, as representative as possible of the entire region, and collectively familiar with the diverse population groups and human needs in the region. We devised a checklist to ensure that balance was achieved, and that a broadly representative group had been selected in each region. It should be noted that respondents selected by the key informant approach are not intended to be representative of a community's population in a statistical sense. Respondents were in approximately equal numbers, male and female. However, they were more likely to be opinion leaders, to be more involved in Jewish and community affairs, and to be older than the population of any region as a whole. These factors should be kept in mind in interpreting their responses. The initial memoranda to regional directors, and a copy of the checklist, are in Appendix A.

Description of Questionnaire

Concurrently, we designed a questionnaire to be used as the basis of structured interviews conducted by trained interviewers. This systematically elicited the pertinent information about regional problems, needs and target groups from the identified individuals. With the promise of confidentiality, a total of 33 questions were asked of all respondents, including questions about their own affiliations and participation in Jewish affairs. The questionnaire was designed to elicit problem identification and diagnosis information as well as priority choices among problems and needs facing Jews in the JFC regions. Its specific content revolves around two extensive lists of problems divided into social and communal areas. Social problems relate to individual and social functioning. Jewish

communal problems relate to areas of need specific to Jews and the Jewish community. These two problem lists were formulated by the researchers in consultation with JFC agency executives, regional directors, the Planning & Budgeting Research Committee, and outside consultants. The final lists are extensive and cover a broad range of problem and need areas.

Both closed and open-ended questions were included in the questionnaire. For each social problem item, respondents were asked:

1. whether the problem exists in the region
2. its degree of seriousness
3. the specific geographic focus
4. changing conditions surrounding the problem

Respondents were then asked to select the three most serious social problems and give a rationale for these selections. Further problem diagnosis was solicited through questions asking about respondent awareness of Jewish and community programs dealing with these problems and the adequacy of these programs. Finally, respondents had the opportunity to offer suggestions to JFC and its agencies for dealing with these problems.

These same questions, following the same sequence, were asked in regard to the Jewish communal problems.

Respondents were finally asked to consider social and Jewish communal service problems together. The three most serious social and Jewish communal problems were rank ordered by degree of seriousness. Lastly, Jewish population groups were ranked in terms of their need for additional resource allocations.

A draft of the questionnaire was reviewed by all JFC agency executive directors, JFC regional directors, Planning & Budgeting Committee

Budget Review chairpersons, members of the Planning & Budgeting Research Committee, members of the JFC Administrative staff, and the chairperson of the Committee on Regions. The questionnaire was then revised and pretested with a small sample of respondents selected from all five JFC regions. Following this pretest, further modifications were made and the questionnaire was finalized. A copy of the full questionnaire is available upon request.

Data Collection and Analysis

Altogether, 237 key individuals were interviewed. The respondent sample, approximately proportional to the population size of each region,* was as follows:

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

<u>Region</u>	<u>Number</u>
Metropolitan	60
San Fernando Valley	75
Western	37
Eastern	34
Southern	31
Total	237

All findings reported here are based on the responses of these 237 individuals.

After the interviews were completed, the data were coded and checked for errors. Statistical analyses were performed by the Institute of Social Science Research at UCLA. A detailed description of the methods used to compute the weighted rank scores appears in Appendix C.

An analysis of possible biases was then undertaken to ensure that the judgments expressed by the respondents had not been unduly influenced by the affiliations or positions they held or by their particular areas of

*A map of the JFC Regions and the communities included in each region can be found in Appendix B.

expertise. No serious biases were found. The respondents had displayed a high level of objectivity, open-mindedness and communal spirit in their responses.

An earlier draft of this report was circulated to a special Review Committee for review and comments. The small committee was composed of some members of the JFC Planning & Budgeting Committee, the Planning & Budgeting Research Committee, the Planning & Budgeting Community Priorities Committee, and the JFC agencies' executive directors. This final document incorporates their thoughts and recommendations.

Organization of Report

The following chapters are organized in approximately the same sequence as the questions in the original questionnaire. In each chapter we begin with a broad review of problems, followed by a progressively narrower focus on the problems deemed by respondents as the most serious in their region.

Chapter 1 deals with the variety of social problems identified by respondents as existing in their region and judged by them as the most serious for Jews residing in the region. The chapter then discusses respondents' views as to whether conditions surrounding the most serious problems have gotten better, worse, or stayed the same during the preceding three years. Finally, analysis of respondent awareness of Jewish and general community-sponsored programs is presented.

Chapter 2 follows the same format but focuses on Jewish communal problems in the five JFC regions. This chapter also reports the respondents' judgments about Jewish population groups most affected by these particular communal problems.

Chapter 3 considers social problems and Jewish communal problems together. The main focus is on the types of social and communal problems judged by the respondents as the most serious of all the problems facing Jews in the JFC regions. Weighted rank scores have been computed to help further distinguish among the most serious social and communal problems confronting Jews in the individual regions. Regional variations and similarities are also highlighted.

The chapter concludes with an examination of the population groups within the Jewish community most in need of additional resource allocations. The analysis points out the relative high level of consensus existing both within and across regions around the target groups most in need of additional Jewish community resources.

The last chapter, Chapter 4, analyzes the meaning of the findings and their function in stimulating new ways of thinking about problems affecting the Jewish community.

Each chapter includes a boldface boxed summary of the findings, followed by detailed text which accompanies the tables in which findings are displayed. These tables tend to be long and, in some instances, complex. Because of this, we have described what each table contains, and how it can be usefully read.

We want to make one additional comment about the tables here, even though it will be repeated later on. Almost all of the tables have a "Total" column, in which the reported findings for all regions and for all respondents are combined. These aggregated findings can be taken as a convenient point of reference but should not be given any more emphasis than that, because respondents in the Needs Survey were asked questions about

their own particular region, and not about the greater Los Angeles Jewish community. The combined responses from the five JFC regions, while convenient for assessing overall patterns and trends, are nonetheless artificial and, therefore, require cautious interpretation.

We turn now to the Survey findings. We begin the presentation with an analysis of the most serious social problems and needs facing Jews in the five JFC regions.

CHAPTER 1

Social Problems and Needs

1-1

Social problems relate to individual and social functioning. Respondents were asked about the existence of 22 social problems in their regions. Each of these problems was reported in all JFC regions by at least some respondents. These social problems, therefore, seem to be widespread.

In general, the number and variety of problems tend to be greater in those regions having the larger Jewish populations.

Family problems and problems of the elderly are among the most frequently cited problems in all regions. Permanent poverty and other poverty-related problems tend to be more prevalent in regions with larger Jewish populations.

Respondents were asked whether the problems listed in the left-hand column of Table 1-1 exist in their region. The table indicates the proportions who said "yes." Each row shows the extent of regional variation. The first five columns order the problems for the different JFC regions. The "Total" column on the right-hand side of the table displays the data for all respondents and regions combined. The problems are listed so that the ones cited by more respondents appear near the top, the ones cited by fewer near the bottom.

Prevalence of social problems. The data clearly indicate that all problems were seen as existing in all regions. The 22 social problems studied thus appear to be widespread, numerous, and diverse. However, the percentages shown in the table vary, depending on the particular region and the specific problem to which the respondents referred when they answered the question. When only those problems thought to exist in their region by at least 50% of the respondents are considered, the tabulations show 20 such problems in the Metropolitan and San Fernando

1-1. Do These Social Problems Exist In Your Region?

<u>PROBLEM†</u>	<u>METRO</u>	<u>SF VALLEY</u>	<u>WESTERN</u>	<u>EASTERN</u>	<u>SOUTHERN</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Divorce/marital conflict	93%	97%	95%	85%	94%	94%
No afford. elderly housing	95	92	100	82	68	90
Isolation of elderly	90	80	97	91	87	88
Child/teen emotional probs.	83	89	92	82	77	86
No elderly transportation	85	85	81	79	77	83
Adult emotional problems	83	80	73	79	77	79
Drug abuse	75	79	70	59	68	72
No elderly home help	70	72	76	71	68	71
No elderly institut'l care	72	69	78	65	74	71
Permanent poverty	83	65	84	47	23	65
Adult unemployment	77	75	43	62	45	65
Elderly nutritional needs	75	63	78	59	39	65
No poor legal services	78	60	73	50	29	61
No emergency money	62	68	60	59	42	60
Immigrant adjustment	78	63	46	44	52	60
No disabled opportunities	67	65	57	41	48	59
Teen unemployment	60	65	43	56	52	57
No immigrant jobs	68	59	46	35	48	54
Juvenile delinquency	57	63	43	26	36	49
Child abuse/neglect	55	49	40	38	26	45
Alcohol abuse	45	52	43	15	39	42
No child institutional care	37	44	49	41	23	40
Totals	*	*	*	*	*	*
Number of Respondents	(60)	(75)	(37)	(34)	(31)	(237)

†For the actual survey wording of each problem, see List D-I in Appendix D.

*Respondents were asked whether each problem existed in their region. Since most said yes to more than one problem, the column totals exceed 100%.

Valley regions, 14 in the Western and Eastern regions, and 11 in the Southern region. The number of different problems existing in each region roughly parallels the variation in the size of its Jewish population.* Those regions with the largest Jewish populations have the greatest number and variety of problems. Perhaps this finding is not surprising, since the composition of the Jewish population in the heavily settled regions of Greater Los Angeles generally tends to be heterogeneous; thus, people's problems are likely to be more diverse.

Regional variations among problems. The regions do appear similar to one another with respect to some problems. For example, divorce/marital conflict is reported as a problem by about the same proportion of respondents in all five regions. The same holds true for some of the problems faced by the elderly.

In contrast, the regions differ quite substantially with respect to other problems. For example, Jews in a condition of permanent poverty is a problem noted much more frequently in the Metropolitan and Western regions than in the Southern region where it is mentioned by fewer than a fifth of the respondents. The San Fernando Valley and Eastern regions occupy an intermediate position on this problem. The findings for permanent poverty in the Metropolitan and Western regions can be attributed to the large number of elderly and immigrant Jewish residents, the latter particularly the case in the Metropolitan region. Other social problems often linked with poverty -- the lack of legal services for the

*Similar results are obtained even when different cut-off points are used. Thus, if only the problems cited by at least 80 percent of the respondents are considered, the data indicate that the Metropolitan region has 7 such problems, the San Fernando Valley and Western regions have 6 each, the Eastern region has 4, and the Southern region has 2.

poor, child abuse/neglect, or lack of institutional care for children -- are also less frequently mentioned in the Southern and Eastern regions than in these other regions.

The problems which seem to be known by nearly all respondents (90 percent and above) in their region are as follows:

For Metropolitan:	No affordable elderly housing Divorce/marital conflict Isolation of elderly
For San Fernando Valley:	Divorce/marital conflict No affordable elderly housing
For Western:	No affordable elderly housing Isolation of elderly Divorce/marital conflict Child/teen emotional problems
For Eastern:	Isolation of elderly
For Southern:	Divorce/marital conflict

Regional variations among perceived problems thus form a complex pattern which will be clarified somewhat by subsequent tables and discussion.

Patterns among problems. An examination of variations among the problems reveals a few distinct patterns. For instance, drug abuse is a more frequently mentioned problem than is alcohol abuse in all regions. Similarly, lack of appropriate institutional care for the elderly is more frequently cited in all regions than lack of institutional and foster care for children and adolescents. Drug abuse, permanent poverty, adult unemployment, lack of legal services for the poor, lack of emergency money for the poor, and the problems of immigrants are frequently cited but they are not perceived as existing equally in all regions.

It is not clear whether these problems do not in fact exist equally in all regions or whether the particular sample of respondents is unaware of them. For example, respondents may not be aware of problems which are not visible to them, e.g., drug abuse, permanent poverty.

The cluster of problems faced by the elderly -- lack of affordable housing, social isolation, lack of transportation, inability to obtain home care or housekeeping assistance, lack of institutional care facilities, and unsatisfied nutritional needs -- are among the most frequently mentioned problems. This pattern is consistent even though specifics vary regionally, for example, as to whether unaffordable elderly housing or social isolation is the greater problem. Unaffordable elderly housing ranges from a low 68 percent recognition factor in the Southern region to unanimous concern among Western region respondents.

Another cluster of frequently cited problems could loosely be designated as family-related, namely, divorce/marital conflict, and the emotional or psychological difficulties of children, adolescents, and adults. Here too, there are variations. While divorce/marital conflict is clearly of great concern to respondents in all five regions, in the Western region in particular, the emotional problems of youngsters seem more visible to respondents than do the emotional problems of adults. Less frequently cited but still noticeably high in the Metropolitan and San Fernando Valley regions is child abuse/neglect with these two regions also perceiving problems in juvenile delinquency and teen unemployment. The other three regions identify these particular problems to a lesser degree.

1-2

When all the JFC regions are considered together four social problems are noted as the most serious: divorce/marital conflict, lack of affordable housing for the elderly, social isolation of the elderly, and emotional or psychological problems of children and adolescents. These four problems include the three most serious as reported by all five regions. These are "first tier" problems.

There is a "second tier" of five problems, considered to be among the more serious in only some regions: emotional or psychological problems of adults, lack of home care for the elderly, lack of transportation for the elderly, lack of institutional facilities for the elderly, and Jews living in permanent poverty.

The remaining 13 social problems comprise a "third tier," thought by only a small number of respondents to be among the three most serious problems.

The reasons given by respondents for social problems being considered most serious can be grouped into four broad categories:

1. Individual Impact

The problem is serious because individuals are at risk.

2. Large Numbers

The problem is serious because many individuals are now or will soon be affected.

3. Jewish Survival

The problem is serious because Jewish survival is threatened.

4. Jewish Responsibility

The problem is serious because the Jewish community has responsibility for dealing with it.

In the Needs Survey, respondents were asked to designate from the list of 22 problems the three they considered to be the most serious in their region. The results are displayed in Table 1-2, and serve to clarify and simplify the complicated patterns found in the preceding table.

Social problems seen as most serious. The most noteworthy finding is that the four problems that respondents identified as most serious

1-2. What Are the Most Serious Social Problems In Your Region?

<u>PROBLEM</u>	<u>METRO</u>	<u>SF VALLEY</u>	<u>WESTERN</u>	<u>EASTERN</u>	<u>SOUTHERN</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Divorce/marital conflict	43% [2]	61% [1]	51% [2]	59% [1]	77% [1]	57%
No afford. elderly housing	65 [1]	36 [2]	76 [1]	35 [3]	19	47
Isolation of elderly	32 [3]	28	22	44 [2]	48 [2]	33
Child/teen emotional probs.	23	29 [3]	27 [3]	21	39 [3]	27
Adult emotional problems	12	24	11	21	23	18
No elderly home help	10	17	22	21	7	15
No elderly transportation	12	13	8	21	13	13
No elderly institut'l care	5	15	14	9	26	13
Permanent poverty	23	8	22	6	3	13
Drug abuse	8	13	11	12	7	10
Adult unemployment	12	5	3	12	7	8
No disabled opportunities	12	11	5	0	0	7
No poor legal services	10	3	11	3	0	6
No emergency money	3	11	5	6	3	6
No child institutional care	5	7	5	6	7	6
Teen unemployment	3	1	3	12	7	4
Immigrant adjustment	8	4	0	0	3	4
Elderly nutritional needs	5	0	5	3	7	3
Child abuse/neglect	3	3	0	6	0	3
Alcohol abuse	2	3	0	3	3	2
No immigrant jobs	2	4	0	0	3	2
Juvenile delinquency	2	3	0	0	0	1
Totals	*	*	*	*	*	*
Number of Respondents	(60)	(75)	(37)	(34)	(31)	(237)

[1][2][3] These symbols signify that the problems so designated rank as the most serious, second most serious, and third most serious in the region, respectively. These ranks were assigned to the problems chosen by the highest percentages in each region.

* Respondents were asked to select from the full list of 22 social problems the three most serious ones facing Jews in their individual region. The totals for each column therefore exceed 100%.

are the same ones that have already appeared as the four most frequently identified in the preceding table. That is, for these four problems -- 1) divorce/marital conflict, 2) lack of affordable housing for the elderly, 3) social isolation of the elderly and 4) emotional and psychological problems of children and adolescents -- most respondents saw them as both present and most serious in their region. Their importance is thus corroborated. Although each problem is not seen as equally serious in each region, jointly the four include the three most serious problems in all five regions. They will therefore be called "first tier" problems and will receive the most analytic attention.

FIRST TIER PROBLEMS

Divorce/marital conflict: ranks as the most serious problem in the San Fernando Valley, Eastern, and Southern regions; and as the second most serious problem in the Metropolitan and Western regions.

No affordable elderly housing: ranks as the most serious problem in the Metropolitan and Western regions, as the second most serious problem in the San Fernando Valley region, and as the third most serious problem in the Eastern region; it does not rank among the top three (or even the top five) in the Southern region.

Isolation of the elderly: ranks as the second most serious problem in the Eastern and Southern regions, and as the third most serious problem in the Metropolitan region; it barely misses being ranked in the top three in the San Fernando Valley and Western regions.

Child/teen emotional problems: ranks as the third most serious problem in the San Fernando Valley, Western, and Southern regions; it does not rank among the top three in the Metropolitan and Eastern regions, but is tied for fourth in both.

In sum, divorce/marital conflict ranks among the top three problems in all five regions; lack of affordable housing for the elderly ranks among the top three problems in four of the five regions; and social isolation

of the elderly, as well as child/teen emotional problems, rank among the top three problems in three of the five regions. To repeat, these four are therefore designated as "first tier."

Table 1-2 also shows the existence of a "second tier" of problems -- those named as among the three most serious by at least 20% of the respondents in at least one region. These five problems, and the regions in which they were thus ranked, are the following:

SECOND TIER PROBLEMS

Adult emotional problems -- in the San Fernando Valley, Eastern, and Southern regions.

No elderly home help -- in the Western and Eastern regions.

No elderly transportation -- in the Eastern region.

No elderly institutional care -- in the Southern region.

Permanent poverty -- in the Metropolitan and Western regions.

These five problems thus comprise a "second tier," being selected by substantial minorities in at least some regions for inclusion among the three most serious problems in those regions.

Finally, the remaining 13 problems on the list presented to respondents were said to be "most serious" by 10% or fewer of the respondents overall, and by 13% or fewer of the respondents in any single region. They comprise a "third tier" of problems, having been selected by relatively small minorities or, in some regions, by no respondents at all.

The intent so far has been to identify the most serious social problems in the five regions, and thus to direct attention to them. Of the original list of 22 problems, nine -- four in the first tier and

five in the second tier -- deserve further examination and are analyzed in tables that follow as to whether or not conditions are worsening; and as to the services available to deal with them.

Reasons for problems being considered serious. It is interesting to explore the criteria which respondents used in order to make distinctions between serious and less serious problems. For each problem they designated as "most serious," respondents were asked why they considered it so serious. A variety of answers were given, but they can be grouped into four broad categories.

1. Individual impact. The problem is serious because individuals are at risk. For example, respondents saw the problems of the elderly in terms of immediate personal hardship: "People have to have shelter, they can't live in the street." "They are unable to solve the problem themselves or even help themselves." For children and young people, they were likely to note the long-term effects of having individuals continue at risk. "If we can't help children, we are jeopardizing their adjustment to later life." "If they don't get help, they will never be any good." And, "We are raising a group of children who are not able to assume the responsibilities of adulthood and who have no respect for others."

2. Large numbers affected. The problem is serious because many individuals are now or will soon be affected. Some respondents noted the present extensiveness of the problem: "I know a lot of kids in big trouble, seriously disturbed." Others emphasized the likelihood that the problem will become even more widespread in the near future because

of social conditions: "Stress is higher," "People don't have extended families," "We live in complicated times with changing values," "Inflation and high interest rates make it difficult for people on fixed incomes to survive." Others thought of the ripple effect which occurs when families break up: "The children are the sufferers as well as the parents." Still others saw that large numbers of people could be affected by the problems in the future: "It costs more later and for longer. People become problems in the community, have bad marriages."

3. Jewish survival. The problem is serious because Jewish survival is threatened. For example, "[Divorce and marital conflict] eats away at the basic fabric of the family which is the backbone of Jewish society," and "When a family has dissolved, it is extremely difficult to recreate that joyful Jewish experience." The problems of the elderly are also seen as problems for Jewish survival: "We are losing their value to the community."

4. Jewish responsibility. The problem is serious because the Jewish community has responsibility for dealing with it. Respondents suggested that there were some basic human rights to which people were entitled and that the Jewish community should ensure that people had them. This came out most strongly in relation to the elderly: "Food is a basic human need," "[Services] are life-sustaining to them." "Their lack is very detrimental." "[The elderly] have a right to a choice. We should not force people to be institutionalized."

1-3

Almost all of the nine most serious social problems in the five regions are judged to have gotten worse in recent years. In all regions and for all of the nine social problems, the respondents who said that conditions had gotten worse outnumbered those who said they had gotten better.

There is near consensus that three problems, listed in descending order, have gotten particularly worse: lack of affordable housing for the elderly, Jews living in a condition of permanent poverty, and divorce and marital conflict.

The respondents in the Needs Survey, after identifying the problems in their regions, were asked whether the conditions surrounding these problems had gotten better, worse, or stayed the same during the preceding three years. The most common response was that they had gotten worse as Table 1-3 illustrates.

Problem trends seen as getting worse. The percentages in the table represent those who said that the specified problem had gotten worse. For example, the figures in the upper left-hand corner of the table indicate that 69% of the 49 respondents in the Metropolitan region considered the problem of divorce/marital conflict to have worsened in that region over the preceding three years. The figures immediately to the right indicate that 71% of the 69 respondents in the San Fernando Valley think the same for that region. The remaining figures in the body of the table represent the other problem-region combinations. The "Total" column displays the figures for all regions and respondents combined, albeit separately for each problem.

When examined as a whole, the data in Table 1-3 show that for most problems and in most regions, majorities among the respondents believe that conditions have worsened during the past three years. Thus, in 34

1-3. Are the Serious Social Problems Getting Worse In Your Region?†

	<u>METRO</u>	<u>SF VALLEY</u>	<u>WESTERN</u>	<u>EASTERN</u>	<u>SOUTHERN</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>FIRST TIER PROBLEMS</u>						
Divorce/marital conflict	69% (49)	71% (69)	87% (30)	54% (26)	74% (23)	71% (197)
No afford. elderly housing	93% (57)	96% (67)	88% (33)	92% (26)	90%* (20)	93% (203)
Isolation of elderly	44% (50)	55% (58)	53% (34)	44% (27)	35% (26)	48% (195)
Child/teen emotional probs.	44% (41)	53% (62)	59% (29)	32% (25)	55% (20)	49% (177)
<u>SECOND TIER PROBLEMS</u>						
Adult emotional problems	49%* (43)	55% (55)	52%* (25)	68% (25)	57% (21)	55% (169)
No elderly home help	53%* (38)	65%* (52)	65% (23)	65% (20)	30%* (20)	58% (153)
No elderly transportation	53%* (49)	48%* (64)	41%* (29)	68% (25)	38%* (24)	50% (191)
No elderly institut'l care	54%* (37)	59%* (49)	50%* (26)	55%* (20)	41% (22)	53% (154)
Permanent poverty	74% (47)	77%* (47)	77% (30)	62%* (13)	80%* (5)	75% (142)

† Respondents include only those who thought the problem existed in their region and who expressed an opinion about its severity.

* Fewer than 20% of the respondents thoughts these problems were among the three most serious in their region (see Table 1-2). Nonetheless, data about the worsening of the problem are included here for purposes of comparison.

of the 45 problem-region combinations, 50% or more of the respondents state such a belief. In the remaining 11 combinations, only four fall below 40%. These somewhat less pessimistic results are mostly attributable to larger percentages of respondents who say that conditions have remained about the same.

In all regions and for all problems, respondents who thought that conditions had improved were outnumbered by those who said that they had gotten worse. Although these results are not displayed in the table, this was the case without exception.

Finally, the table indicates a high level of respondent agreement that lack of affordable housing for the elderly is a worsening condition in all five regions. Divorce/marital conflict, and Jews living in permanent poverty, were also identified as worsening problems by substantial majorities in four of the five regions.

According to respondents, the three year trend, especially for family problems, for problems faced by the elderly, and for economic problems, has been bleak. The prevailing perception, therefore, among the respondents in all the regions is that these particular problems have become more serious and debilitating over the past few years. These findings are not surprising in light of a combination of factors. The worsening economy, high unemployment levels, government cutbacks in social services, have adversely impacted Jews along with the general population. In addition, the aging of the Jewish population and the growing divorce rate among Jews have had serious repercussions upon family stability and functioning.

1-4

When asked about services available to address the nine most serious social problems, respondents were more apt to name Jewish than general programs. The one exception was in meeting the transportation needs of the elderly where twice as many respondents cited general rather than Jewish programs.

Respondents appear to be relatively unfamiliar with services in relation to two "second tier" problems of the elderly -- transportation in the case of the Jewish services, and home help in the case of the general services.

In general, only small minorities of respondents consider existing services to be adequate for any of the nine most serious social problems, and especially for the following three problems of the elderly: lack of transportation, lack of home care, and lack of affordable housing.

Taken as a whole, the perceived adequacy of the services provided by Jewish and general agencies appear to be about the same as judged by respondents.

As part of the Needs Survey, respondents were asked whether they knew of any programs or services in their region which addressed the problems they had designated as the most serious. They were asked to identify both Jewish and general programs, as well as the agencies that sponsored them. After they had named the programs and agencies, they were then asked to assess the adequacy of services in terms of staffing, money, and other resources allocated to them. The results are summarized in Table 1-4.

Awareness of problem-related services: Jewish and general. As the table indicates, at least some respondents were able to identify services for each of the "first tier" and "second tier" problems. Awareness differs, depending on program sponsor and on the problem being considered. The results, as a whole, show that respondents were more

1-4. Do You Know of Programs that Address Each of These Social Problems?
How Adequate Are They?

	AWARENESS [†]		ADEQUACY [*]	
	Jewish Programs	General Programs	Jewish Programs	General Programs
<u>FIRST TIER PROBLEMS</u>				
Divorce/marital conflict	92% (135)	53% (135)	28% (124)	30% (71)
No afford. elderly housing	70% (112)	62% (112)	18% (79)	13% (69)
Isolation of elderly	86% (78)	59% (78)	33% (67)	44% (46)
Child/teen emotional probs.	88% (65)	55% (65)	26% (57)	30% (36)
<u>SECOND TIER PROBLEMS</u>				
Adult emotional problems	81% (43)	56% (43)	26% (34)	25% (24)
No elderly home help	56% (36)	39% (36)	10% (20)	14% (14)
No elderly transportation	32% (31)	64% (31)	10% (10)	15% (20)
No elderly institut'l care	60% (30)	47% (30)	33% (18)	29% (14)
Permanent poverty	61% (31)	55% (31)	32% (19)	18% (17)

[†] Respondents who selected a problem among the three most serious in their region were asked whether they knew of any Jewish or general community programs dealing with the problem. The percentages represent the proportions of respondents who said they did.

^{*} The respondents who said they know of one or more programs dealing with the problem were asked to assess how adequate those programs or services were: "very adequate," "adequate," "less than adequate," "not at all adequate," or "don't know." The percentages represent the proportions of respondents who said "very adequate" or "adequate."

aware of Jewish than general programs or agencies. This is understandable given the criteria by which the respondents were initially selected -- they were to be knowledgeable, after all, about the Jewish population and its needs in their region, and could thus be expected to be more aware of the existing network of Jewish communal agencies than those in the general sectors. Many respondents are lay leaders or professionally employed by Jewish communal agencies. The sole exception to this pattern of awareness is in meeting the transportation needs of the elderly. Twice as many of the respondents for whom this was a serious problem were aware of general rather than Jewish services. Based on this divergence from the prevailing pattern, one could assume that meeting the transportation needs of the elderly is in fact dealt with more by general than by Jewish agencies. This is indeed the case as evidenced by the existence and popularity of local city and community senior transportation and escort services and other elderly transportation arrangements. It is not surprising, then, that awareness of Jewish programs dealing with transportation for the elderly appears to be low, while, in contrast, with respect to the other eight problems, higher percentages of respondents named Jewish than general programs or agencies. These perceptions are confirmed by an examination of Jewish communal agency services currently provided.

Respondent awareness of Jewish services varied according to problem. Questioned about their knowledge of Jewish programs, many individuals named services or agencies that dealt with the "first-tier" problems of divorce/marital conflict, the isolation of elderly and child/teen emotional problems; somewhat fewer could identify services or agencies providing affordable elderly housing.

The table indicates that for "second tier" problems -- the inability of the elderly to obtain home care, the needs of the elderly for appropriate institutional care, and conditions of permanent poverty among Jews -- Jewish services are less well-known.

Among general services, home help programs for the elderly appear not to be well known; neither are programs dealing with proper institutional care for the elderly.

Judgments of service adequacy. With regard to the adequacy of the services actually provided, the findings indicate that only minorities of respondents deemed themselves satisfied. As the two right-hand columns of Table 1-4 show, less than 50 percent of the respondents designated existing programs as "very adequate" or "adequate" regardless of the problems they addressed. Indeed, for most of the problems the percentages are substantially below 50 percent. Even though many of these percentages are based on relatively small numbers of respondents and must therefore be treated with caution, the pattern is consistent throughout, and can thus be relied upon as useful information. Taken as a whole, only minorities of respondents consider existing services to be adequate for the "first tier" and "second tier" problems.

Beyond that general finding, the data warrant two additional comments, although they must be offered with more caution. First, the adequacy of the services provided by Jewish and general agencies appear to be judged about equal by the respondents. In the main, the percentages for the two sets of services are quite similar and, where they are not, percentage differences in one direction for one service are offset by comparable differences in the opposite direction for another service.

Second, the problems for which the existing services are judged by respondents to be least adequate pertain exclusively to the elderly: lack of transportation, lack of home care, and lack of affordable housing. Services for these three problems are judged least adequate in both the Jewish and general service sectors. Because of this consistency the findings deserve attention, despite the small number of respondents on whom some of the percentages are based. In general, it appears that inadequate levels of resources are targeted to certain problems of the elderly. In this respect, the elderly stand out as a distinctive group of service recipients. They are perceived to be facing serious social problems with currently inadequate service responses, both from the Jewish and general service sectors.

In spite of the heavy involvement of Jewish communal agencies in services for the elderly, the problems facing this group are still perceived as outdistancing existing efforts.

The reasons given by respondents for judging services or programs as adequate or inadequate were not analyzed problem-by-problem. However, an impressionistic overview of respondent explanations indicates that most people justify their responses based on inputs rather than outcomes. For example, in describing inadequate services, people cite: insufficient funds, too few staff, inadequately trained staff, program too small, "It is not speaking to the people and therefore not reaching their problems," "There is a need for new programs." In describing adequate services, respondents said, "There are a lot of dedicated people handling the situation," "They are well publicized but could be publicized better," "They are making a big effort; they are doing their best."

Only a very few noted that the outcomes of programs were effective. As evidence of ineffective outcomes, people said, "They are not meeting needs; they do not produce results," "They don't do outreach," "Problems are too overwhelming."

It is interesting to speculate on why most respondents' judgments do not focus on outcomes. Perhaps because the problems are so complex people cannot easily see the direct relationship between attempts to deal with them and their amelioration. Staffing, funding, facilities are things that can be immediately and visibly increased or changed, while results are harder to assess. Perhaps, in addition, respondents did not have access to information about general outcomes but did have personal contact with or knowledge of the service providers. Whatever the reasons, their evaluation of adequacy of services seems to have been made less in terms of service effectiveness and more in terms of levels of effort.

CHAPTER 2

Communal Problems and Needs

2-1

Jewish communal problems relate to areas of need specific to Jews and the Jewish community. Respondents were asked whether each of 25 Jewish communal problems existed in their regions. Each of these problems was reported in all JFC regions by at least some respondents. Jewish communal problems are seen as numerous and pervasive.

The regions are similar to one another with respect to the number and variety of communal problems they experience, but they differ in their particular combination of problems. The influence of cults, the cost of Jewish education, anti-Israel propaganda, and especially the isolation of immigrants from the mainstream of Jewish life are more frequently mentioned in those regions with larger Jewish populations, whereas the lack of Jewish recreational facilities and social and cultural activities are more frequently cited in those with smaller Jewish populations.

In all JFC regions, intermarriage, anti-semitism, low levels of affiliation with synagogues and Jewish groups, and the small number of UJWF contributors are frequently reported communal problems.

In the Needs Survey, respondents were asked about the social problems which were discussed in the preceding chapter, and also about communal problems distinctive to Jewish communities. The latter are listed in the left-hand column of Table 2-1, and the body of the table reports the percentages of respondents who said that the problems existed in their region.

Table 2-1 follows the same format as Table 1-1. Each row shows regional variations on particular problems. The first five columns order the problems for the different JFC regions. The "Total" column on the right-hand side displays the combined data for all respondents and regions. The problems enumerated in the table have been arranged so that the ones cited by more respondents appear towards the top, the ones cited by fewer appear near the bottom.

2-1. Do These Communal Problems Exist In Your Region?

<u>PROBLEM†</u>	<u>METRO</u>	<u>SF VALLEY</u>	<u>WESTERN</u>	<u>EASTERN</u>	<u>SOUTHERN</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Intermarriage	95%	93%	89%	91%	97%	93%
Low synagogue affil.	90	92	84	100	97	91
Low Jewish group affil.	92	91	89	97	84	91
Anti-semitic activity	92	91	81	100	81	91
Few UJWF contributors	92	89	81	85	97	88
No Jewish child educ.	88	80	89	82	84	85
Influence of cults	90	91	70	74	74	81
Synagogue member costs	77	84	76	79	74	78
Jewish educ. costs	82	88	70	62	61	77
Anti-Israel propaganda	83	76	81	62	64	77
Less religious observance	80	69	70	71	74	74
No Jewish adult educ.	63	71	62	74	74	68
No young org. leaders	72	61	57	71	64	65
No singles social opport.	67	57	65	71	71	66
Jewish summer camp costs	62	68	46	59	55	58
No Jewish recreat'l facil.	47	48	73	85	64	59
No Jewish child care	67	57	62	59	42	57
Quality of Jewish educ.	53	57	54	59	71	59
No Jewish social activ.	50	55	46	79	61	56
No outsider interactions	58	56	46	41	36	50
No disabled Jewish activ.	55	61	46	29	36	43
No political/legis. activ.	58	43	51	38	42	47
Immigrant isolation	73	52	35	12	29	41
Jewish chaplaincy needs	40	37	32	35	42	38
No Jewish campus activ.	42	33	27	35	45	35
Other	30	32	19	26	32	28
Totals	*	*	*	*	*	
Number of Respondents	(60)	(75)	(37)	(34)	(31)	(233)

†For the actual survey wording of each problem, see List D-II in Appendix D.

*Respondents were asked whether each problem existed in their region. Since most said yes to more than one problem, the column totals exceed 100%.

Prevalence of communal problems. As the figures in Table 2-1 clearly indicate, all 25 communal problems studied are reported to exist in all regions by some respondents. Like social problems, then, communal problems are reported as pervasive.

Regional variations among problems. Nevertheless, the percentage of respondents reporting problems by region varies, so further analyses can be made. As Table 2-1 indicates, overwhelming majorities in practically all JFC regions say that intermarriage is a problem, that low synagogue affiliation and low Jewish group affiliation are problems, that there are too few contributors to the United Jewish Welfare Fund (UJWF), and that too few Jewish children are receiving a Jewish education. In addition, large majorities cite as a problem the prevalence of anti-semitic activity (vandalism, discriminatory literature, etc.). While the regions differ to some degree, these problems are mentioned by at least four-fifths of the respondents in all regions. All respondents from the Eastern region agreed that low synagogue affiliation and anti-semitic activities are problems.

The regions also appear to be quite similar with respect to other, less frequently mentioned problems. For example, the cost of synagogue membership, declining levels of religious observance, the small number of Jewish adults receiving a Jewish education, the lack of young leadership for Jewish organizations and synagogues, and a lack of organized opportunities for single Jewish men and women to meet and socialize were cited as problems by similar sized majorities in all regions.

Other problems appear concentrated in particular regions. The influence of cults and missionaries is mentioned more frequently in the

Metropolitan and San Fernando Valley regions than in the Western, Eastern, and Southern regions. The same is true with respect to the cost of Jewish education, which is cited more frequently in the Metropolitan, San Fernando Valley, and Western regions than in the Eastern and Southern regions. This may be attributed to the fact that most Jewish schools and Jewish children are located in the Metropolitan, San Fernando Valley, and Western regions and that tuition costs have greatly increased over the past several years. A similar regional pattern holds regarding the reported lack of cultural and Jewish educational programs for individuals with disabilities and handicaps.

The regions differ most noticeably about the degree to which the isolation of immigrant groups from the mainstream of Jewish communal life is a problem. This problem is noted by three-fourths of the respondents in the Metropolitan region, about half of the respondents in the San Fernando Valley region, only about a third of the respondents in the Western region, and is the least frequently mentioned of all the communal problems in both the Southern and the Eastern regions. The heavy concentration of new immigrant Jewish populations, e.g., Soviets, Iranians, Israelis, primarily in the Metropolitan region, with large and growing numbers in the San Fernando Valley region contributes to regional variations in the responses on this item.

In the Eastern, Western, and Southern regions, the lack of recreational facilities and leisure-time activities carried on in Jewish settings is mentioned as a problem far more frequently than in the Metropolitan and San Fernando Valley regions. Similarly, respondents in the Eastern and Southern regions cite a lack of Jewish social and cultural

activities more frequently than their counterparts in the other regions. The variations here may not be surprising. There are, in fact, no Jewish community center facilities in both the Southern and Eastern regions, while the Western region has one small center and a senior adult facility. In the communal system, Jewish social and cultural programming are most closely associated with Jewish centers. Thus, it follows that both the absence of local facilities and the inadequate level of Jewish cultural programming are perceived most acutely by the respondents in the Southern and Eastern regions.

In Chapter 1 it was pointed out that regions with larger Jewish populations also tend to have a greater number of social problems when compared with regions with smaller Jewish populations. Partly because of the countervailing pattern noted above, however, the regions do not appear to differ very much with respect to the total number or range of communal problems reported. Respondents in all five regions agree about the existence of the most frequently cited problems and they also agree about the existence of many of the less frequently cited problems. In sum, the regions do not greatly differ from one another in terms of the number and variety of communal problems, but diverge around the severity of certain particular problems.*

*Using a similar analysis to that in Chapter 1, one gets the following results. When only the communal problems cited by at least 50% of the respondents are considered, the data indicate that the Metropolitan region has 22 such problems, the San Fernando Valley has 21, the Western region has 18, the Eastern region has 19, and the Southern region has 18. There is thus a slight tendency for the regions with the largest Jewish populations to have a greater number, and therefore

The problems which seem to be known by practically all respondents (90 percent and above) in their region are as follows:

For Metropolitan:	Intermarriage Low Jewish group affiliation Anti-semitic activity Few UJWF contributors Low synagogue affiliation Influence of cults
For San Fernando Valley:	Intermarriage Low synagogue affiliation Low Jewish group affiliation Anti-semitic activity Influence of cults
For Western:	None
For Eastern:	Low synagogue affiliation Anti-semitic activity Low Jewish group affiliation Intermarriage
For Southern:	Intermarriage Low synagogue affiliation Few UJWF contributors

Patterns among problems. An examination of the variations among perceived problems reveals distinct patterns. The low level of synagogue affiliation and of association with Jewish communal groups and organizations are cited much more frequently as problems in all five regions than is the lack of specific social, cultural, or other activities. The lack of organizational affiliation thus appears to be judged

(cont.) a greater variety of communal problems, but the regional differences for communal problems are not as large as they are for social problems. Similar results are obtained when only the communal problems cited by at least 80 percent of the respondents are considered; the corresponding numbers are 10, 9, 9, 7, and 6 respectively. These regional differences for communal problems are also not as large as for the social problems. It is legitimate to say that the regions do not differ a great deal in terms of respondents' perception of the number and variety of communal problems.

as more critical to sustaining communal life than is a lack of direct participation in specific activities. Respondents seem to believe that belonging to the formal institutions of Jewish life is essential. Communal membership is seen as basic to a personal Jewish life style.

The lack of a Jewish education for children is cited more frequently in all five regions than is the same lack for adults. Persons interviewed recognized that meaningful Jewish education must begin while children are relatively young.

The high costs of synagogue membership and of Jewish education are identified more frequently as problems in all regions than is the cost of summer camps. One possible interpretation is that respondents regard formal Jewish schooling as basic while participation in summer camps is supplementary. Although both forms of Jewish experience are important, respondents may believe that the formal school represents the primary setting for Jewish education in the Jewish community. An alternative explanation is that respondents see parents more affected by the costs of many years of school education than by one-time or short-term camp experiences.

The small number of children receiving a Jewish education is cited more frequently as a problem in all regions than is the low quality of the education provided. Although Jewish education may vary in quality, respondents appear to believe that efforts must be made to expose as many children as possible to some form of religious education. The data in Table 2-1 allow distinctions to be made among problems. These patterns will be explored further in the tables that follow.

2-2

When the regions are considered together, two communal problems are included among the three most serious in all JFC regions: intermarriage, and the large numbers of Jews unaffiliated with any Jewish groups or organizations. Four other problems also are regarded as among the three most serious in some regions: small numbers of UJWF contributors, anti-semitic activity, low synagogue affiliation, and few children receiving a Jewish education. Taken as a whole, these six communal problems account for the three most serious ones named in all regions. These are "first-tier" problems. For four of the six problems, however, there is substantial regional variation.

The reasons given by respondents for "first-tier" communal problems being considered most serious were almost exclusively linked to Jewish community survival. These problems were regarded as evidence of an eroding Jewish community or as contributing to that erosion.

There is a "second tier" of three problems, only considered serious in some regions and by relatively small percentages of respondents: the quality of Jewish education, anti-Israel propaganda and lack of Jewish recreational facilities.

The remaining 17 communal problems comprise a "third tier," because they were named as among the three most serious problems either by small minorities or, in some regions, by no respondents at all.

In addition to specifying the Jewish communal problems in their region, the Needs Survey respondents were asked to indicate the three problems they considered to be the most serious. The results, displayed in Table 2-2, reveal substantial regional variation.

Communal problems seen as most serious. It is worth comment that two top problems which most respondents said existed in their region -- intermarriage and the low level of Jewish group affiliation -- also head the list of problems selected by respondents as most serious in all five regions. But the next four problems appearing in Table 2-2 are among the most serious only in some regions. Further, problems now appear in

2-2. What Are the Most Serious Communal Problems In Your Region?

<u>PROBLEM</u>	<u>METRO</u>	<u>SF VALLEY</u>	<u>WESTERN</u>	<u>EASTERN</u>	<u>SOUTHERN</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Intermarriage	40% [1]	32% [1]	38% [3]	44% [2]	58% [1]	40%
Low Jewish group affil.	35 [2]	27 [2]	43 [1]	38 [3]	29 [2]	34
Few UJWF contributors	28	23	41 [2]	12	26 [3]	26
Anti-semitic activity	30 [3]	26 [3]	14	35	10	24
Low synagogue affil.	8	26 [3]	11	53 [1]	26 [3]	23
No Jewish child educ.	23	23	19	9	26 [3]	21
Quality of Jewish educ.	13	8	16	21	16	14
Anti-Israel propaganda	17	10	22	9	10	13
No Jewish recreat'l facil.	5	4	24	17	20	11
Synagogue member costs	5	18	5	12	13	11
No singles social opport.	15	12	3	9	13	11
Jewish educ. costs	13	15	5	3	3	10
No Jewish child care	15	11	8	3	3	9
Influence of cults	12	11	3	3	7	8
Other	5	8	5	9	7	7
No young org. leaders	3	7	5	6	13	6
No Jewish adult educ.	2	5	11	6	0	5
No outsider interactions	7	5	5	3	3	5
No political/legis. activ.	7	4	11	0	3	5
Jewish summer camp costs	5	8	0	0	3	4
Less religious observance	3	3	5	0	3	3
No Jewish social activ.	2	3	0	6	7	3
No disabled Jewish activ.	2	4	3	0	0	2
Jewish chaplaincy needs	0	4	0	0	3	2
No Jewish campus activ.	5	1	0	3	0	2
Immigrant isolation	0	3	3	0	0	1
Totals	*	*	*	*	*	*
Number of Respondents	(60)	(75)	(37)	(34)	(31)	(237)

[1][2][3] These symbols signify that the problems so designated rank as the most serious, second most serious, and third most serious in the region, respectively. These ranks were assigned to the problems chosen by the highest percentages in each region.

Respondents were asked to select from the full list of 25 communal problems the three most serious ones facing Jews in their individual region. The totals for each column therefore exceed 100%.

a different order than they did in Table 2-1. The low level of synagogue affiliation has moved down since few respondents in the Metropolitan and Western regions saw it as among their most serious problems, although Eastern region respondents judge it as the most serious; and it is third in the San Fernando Valley and Southern regions. The quality of Jewish education has moved up from its middle position in Table 2-1 while the problem of declining religious observance has moved down. Finally, the isolation of Jewish immigrants from the mainstream of communal life -- a problem prominently mentioned in the Metropolitan region and, to a lesser extent, in the San Fernando Valley region -- drops to the bottom of the most serious problems list. In short, the pattern of problems shown in Table 2-1 is different from that in Table 2-2.

When social problems were discussed in Chapter 1, it was noted that four "first tier" problems constituted the pool for the three most serious problems in all regions. By contrast, Table 2-2 indicates that, for the most serious communal problems, respondents' judgments vary across and within regions. Thus, in order to encompass all those problems included among the three most serious in all regions, six communal problems have to be placed in the "first tier":

FIRST TIER PROBLEMS

Intermarriage: ranks as the most serious problem in the Metropolitan, San Fernando Valley, and Southern regions; as the second most serious problem in the Eastern region; and as the third most serious problem in the Western region.

Low Jewish group affiliation: ranks as the most serious problem in the Western region; as the second most serious

problem in the Metropolitan, San Fernando Valley, and Southern regions; and as the third most serious problem in the Eastern region.

Few UJWF contributors: ranks as the second most serious problem in the Western region, and is tied for third in the Southern region; it barely misses being ranked in the top three in the Metropolitan and San Fernando Valley regions, but is ranked quite low in the Eastern region.

Anti-semitic activity: ranks as the third most serious problem in the Metropolitan region, and is tied for third in the San Fernando Valley region; it barely misses being ranked in the top three in the Eastern region, but is ranked quite low in the Western and Southern regions.

Low synagogue affiliation: ranks as the most serious problem in the Eastern region, and is tied for third in the San Fernando Valley and Southern regions; it is ranked very low in the Metropolitan and Western regions.

No Jewish child education: is tied for third in the Southern region; does not rank among the top three in any other region, and is ranked very low in the Eastern region.

In summary, two problems -- intermarriage and low levels of Jewish group affiliation -- rank among the top three most serious communal problems in all five regions; low levels of synagogue affiliation is ranked similarly in three of the five regions; the small number of UJWF contributors and anti-semitic activities are comparably ranked in two of five regions; and the small numbers of children receiving a Jewish education ranks among the top three in only one of the five regions. These rankings of serious problems are more dispersed than were the parallel rankings of social problems. Further, even though these six communal problems rank among the three most serious in some regions, four of the six have low percentages in a few regions. These regional variations

should not be overlooked when the "first tier" problems are discussed later on.*

Table 2-2 also shows a small set of "second tier" problems, composed of those named most serious by at least 20 percent of the respondents in one or more regions. These problems and the regions in which they were thus ranked are the following:

SECOND TIER PROBLEMS

Quality of Jewish education -- in the Eastern region.

Anti-Israel propaganda -- in the Western region.

No Jewish recreational facilities -- in the Western and Southern regions.

The remaining 17 problems on the list were said to be most serious by fewer than 11 percent of all respondents, and by fewer than 18 percent of the respondents in any single region. Unlike the pattern among social problems, there is no sharp percentage decline between "second tier" and "third tier" communal problems, and the demarcation between the two tiers is thus relatively arbitrary. Between 15 and 18 percent of the respondents in selected regions perceived the following four problems as among the most serious in their regions: synagogue costs (San Fernando Valley region), lack of organized opportunities for Jewish singles to meet (Metropolitan region), Jewish education costs (San Fernando Valley region), and lack of Jewish-sponsored facilities for child care (Metropolitan region).

*One example is for the Metropolitan region. The low level of synagogue affiliation is included in the "first tier" list because it ranks among the three most serious problems in three regions. However, in the Metropolitan region it is superseded in seriousness by 11 other problems.

In the earlier discussion of the data in Table 2-1, it was pointed out that the low level of affiliation with either synagogues, communal groups or organizations was a more frequently cited problem in all regions than was the lack of specific social, cultural, or other activities. Table 2-2 corroborates this finding.

It was also pointed out that the lack of a Jewish education for children was a more frequently cited problem than was such a lack for adults. Table 2-2 reveals that this finding holds even when considering only the most serious problems. The Eastern region is the only one where nearly similar judgments are made about participation of children and adults in Jewish educational programs, perhaps because so few respondents thought that the small number of adults and of children receiving a Jewish education were among the most serious problems for that region.

It has already been pointed out that in all regions synagogue membership costs and Jewish education were more frequently regarded as problems than were summer camp costs. Since relatively few respondents ranked the three "cost" problems as among the most serious in their region, the pattern is not as clear in Table 2-2 as in Table 2-1. In the Metropolitan region, however, the high cost of Jewish education is ranked as a more serious problem than are the other costs. Respondents in the San Fernando Valley consider the three cost problems as more serious than do respondents in the other regions.

Finally, it should be pointed out that, in all regions, more respondents saw low enrollment in Jewish education as a problem; fewer

cited low quality of education as a problem. Table 2-2 indicates that, in terms of seriousness, this remains the case for the San Fernando Valley, Metropolitan, and Southern regions. In the Western region, however, low enrollment and low quality are considered as equally serious problems, and in the Eastern region low quality is considered by far the more serious problem. Since both these problems fall into the first and second tiers, more information will be provided about them shortly.

Reasons for problems being considered serious. The six "first-tier" communal problems appear somewhat disparate at first glance. However, the reasons that respondents gave for choosing each problem were remarkably similar across problems. For example, the seriousness of the intermarriage problem was justified by statements such as, "It breaks up Jewish family life," "It speeds up assimilation," and "Traditionally, the Jewish family is the basis of the survival of the Jewish culture. Continually diminishing this is endangering the continuation of the culture."

The low levels of affiliation with Jewish groups or organizations was seen as a serious problem because "If we cannot get Jews in this [Eastern] region to affiliate with anything, they eventually will disappear as Jews entirely," and "Jews with no affiliations are the ones that become non-Jews."

In the minds of respondents, it appears that intermarriage and non-affiliation of Jews with Jewish groups or organizations are both serious issues, not because individuals are at risk, nor because individuals are leading non-fulfilling or unrewarding lives, but because collective Jewish identity is endangered. Respondents express the fear

that Jews may disappear into the general society. The survival and continuity of the Jewish community are thus threatened by these problems.

This same sense of foreboding about the future is evident from the reasons given for the four remaining "first-tier" problems. Some respondents said that the seriousness of the small number of contributors to the UJWF is due to the lack of sufficient money to run programs. But many did note that "the UJWF fails to involve Jews in communal life" and "[non-participating Jews] are not of value to the community. They don't accept the fate and responsibility of being Jewish."

Anti-semitic activity is a serious problem in the view of some respondents because it is on the increase due to social and economic pressures and "This is a foretaste of what happened in Germany."

Low level of synagogue affiliation, like the low level of affiliation with Jewish groups, is specified as a serious problem by respondents because it is an indication of a potential loss of Jewishness. "Without the synagogue, I don't think we have a chance to survive." Respondents who chose this as a serious problem regarded the synagogue as a cohesive bond for Jews. Their fear that this bond was loosening was synonymous with their fear that the community was being weakened.

The same rationale was used by respondents who saw the large number of Jewish children not receiving a Jewish education as a serious problem. Their comments can be captured by two quotes. "Jewish education insures Jewish survival. We need some way to reach the unaffiliated and pull them into Jewish education." "The fewer Jewish children to receive a Jewish education, the fewer Jewish adults in the next generation to

support the Jewish community. Without Jewish education, there will soon be no need at all for the Jewish Federation Council."

Respondents, then, regarded these six problems as serious either because they saw them as evidence of an eroding Jewish community or as contributing to that erosion. Unlike in the social arena, where the suffering of growing numbers of people, or Jewish attitudes about human rights were used to justify the seriousness of particular concerns, the serious problems in the communal arena were almost exclusively linked to Jewish community survival.

2-3

Of the nine most serious communal problems identified by respondents, three were judged to have particularly worsened during the past three years: anti-Israel propaganda, anti-semitic activity, and intermarriage.

Except for some improvement in the quality of Jewish education, more respondents thought that the problems had gotten worse than thought they had gotten better. Majorities in all regions thought that the lack of Jewish recreational and social activities had stayed about the same.

The Metropolitan region appears to have been slightly more affected by negative trends than the other regions.

Trends in relation to communal problems are less pessimistic than trends in relation to social problems.

Respondents, after identifying serious communal problems in their region, were asked whether these conditions had gotten better, worse, or stayed the same during the preceding three years. The results are presented in Table 2-3 in terms of the percentage of respondents who said that the specified conditions had worsened.

2-3. Are the Serious Communal Problems Getting Worse In Your Region?†

	<u>METRO</u>	<u>SF VALLEY</u>	<u>WESTERN</u>	<u>EASTERN</u>	<u>SOUTHERN</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>FIRST TIER PROBLEMS</u>						
Intermarriage	81% (53)	66% (68)	71% (31)	71% (31)	60% (30)	70% (213)
Low Jewish group affil.	69% (51)	48% (65)	61% (31)	50% (32)	39% (23)	54% (202)
Few UJWF contributors	52% (54)	52% (63)	58% (24)	33%* (27)	43% (28)	49% (196)
Anti-semitic activity	89% (53)	76% (67)	72%* (29)	82% (34)	76%* (25)	80% (208)
Low synagogue affil.	60%* (48)	45% (64)	40%* (25)	52% (31)	46% (28)	49% (196)
No Jewish child educ.	59% (49)	50% (58)	37%* (27)	46%* (28)	39% (23)	49% (185)
<u>SECOND TIER PROBLEMS</u>						
Quality of Jewish educ.	39%* (28)	17%* (41)	17%* (18)	25% (20)	14%* (21)	23% (128)
Anti-Israel propaganda	82%* (49)	86%* (57)	80% (30)	90%* (21)	74%* (19)	83% (176)
No Jewish recreat'l facil.	29%* (24)	14%* (35)	28% (25)	22%* (27)	10% (20)	21% (131)

† Respondents include only those who thought the problem existed in their region and who expressed an opinion about its severity.

* These problems were classed by fewer than 20% of the respondents among the three most serious in this region (see Table 2-2). Nonetheless, data about the worsening of the problem are included here for purposes of comparison.

Problem trends seen as mixed. As indicated in the table, substantial majorities said that three problems had gotten worse in all regions: anti-Israel propaganda, anti-semitic activity, and inter-marriage.

In contrast, only small minorities said that the lack of Jewish recreational and social facilities, and the quality of Jewish education had worsened. Majorities in all regions said that the problem of Jewish recreational and social facilities had remained much the same.

The second problem cited in the preceding paragraph -- the quality of Jewish education -- evoked a different pattern of responses. In all regions, the majority of respondents said that the problem had changed during the past three years. Of these, more said it had improved rather than worsened. This was true in all except the Metropolitan region, where respondents who thought the problem had worsened outnumbered those who said it had improved. Despite this lack of unanimity, respondents viewed the trend in the quality of Jewish education more favorably than they did the trends for other communal problems.

Four problems remain to be discussed: low Jewish group affiliation, the small number of UJWF contributors, low synagogue affiliation, and the small number of children receiving a Jewish education. For all regions combined, about half of the respondents considered each of these problems to have worsened. In spite of some regional variation, there is no region in which respondents seeing improvement outnumbered those reporting deterioration. Where the figures are below 50 percent, the remaining respondents thought that the problem had remained about the same.

In conclusion, when the findings are considered as a whole, the trend for communal problems appears somewhat less negative than the corresponding trend for social problems described earlier. Of the nine most serious communal problems, one appears to be somewhat improved, and one has stayed the same. Although overall, tendencies were reported as negative, they were not as negative as those for major social problems.

One more observation from the findings presented in Table 2-3 is warranted. For seven of the nine problems, the highest percentages of respondents indicating that conditions have worsened are in the Metropolitan region. Conversely, for five of the nine problems the lowest respondent percentages indicating deteriorating conditions are in the Southern region. These two regions clearly differ from one another on this matter. This may be attributable to the fact that in the Metropolitan region Jews tend to reside in neighborhood clusters and problems may be more readily visible. In contrast, Jews in the Southern region are not as densely populated and therefore people may not be as aware of changing trends. The survey results suggest that trends over the past three years in the Metropolitan region may be more negative than in other regions.

2-4

Survey results suggest that two of the nine most serious communal problems, anti-semitic activity and anti-Israel propaganda are receiving the most programmatic attention. Receiving the least attention are low levels of synagogue affiliation, low levels of Jewish group affiliation, and intermarriage.

On average, respondents are more aware of program efforts directed to "second tier" than "first tier" communal problems.

Of the programmatic activities directed to the nine areas under review, those aimed at anti-semitism and anti-Israel propaganda are deemed most adequate. Those judged least adequate address the problems of synagogue affiliation, intermarriage, and the quality of Jewish education.

Assessments of programmatic adequacy are on average somewhat more favorable for Jewish communal than for social problems. For seven of the nine communal problems, however, few respondents consider existing programs to be adequate.

As part of the Needs Survey, respondents were asked whether they knew of any programs or services in their region addressing the communal problems they had designated as most serious. If they identified programs or sponsoring agencies, they were then asked to assess the adequacy of the services in terms of staffing, money, and other resources. Since these questions were specifically directed to Jewish communal problems, respondent judgments pertain exclusively to programs and agencies under Jewish auspices and sponsorship. The results for "first tier" and "second tier" communal problems are in Table 2-4.

Awareness of problem-related services. The table indicates that at least some respondents were able to identify existing programs for each of the problems listed. Respondent awareness varied, however, depending on the particular problem being considered.

2-4. Do You Know of Programs that Address Each of These Communal Problems?
How Adequate Are They?

<u>FIRST TIER PROBLEMS</u>	<u>AWARENESS</u> [†]	<u>ADEQUACY</u> [*]
Intermarriage	54% (95)	18% (54)
Low Jewish group affil.	54% (79)	28% (43)
Few UJWF contributors	79% (61)	27% (48)
Anti-semitic activity	95% (57)	63% (54)
Low synagogue affil.	43% (54)	13% (23)
No Jewish child educ.	69% (49)	29% (34)
<u>SECOND TIER PROBLEMS</u>		
Quality of Jewish educ.	84% (32)	18% (27)
Anti-Israel propaganda	94% (31)	52% (29)
No Jewish recreat'l facil.	70% (27)	26% (19)

[†] Respondents who classed a problem among the three most serious in their region were asked whether they knew of any Jewish community programs dealing with the problem. The percentages represent the proportions of respondents who said they did.

^{*} The respondents who said they knew of one or more programs dealing with the problem were asked to assess how adequate those programs were: "very adequate," "adequate," "less than adequate," "not at all adequate," or "don't know." The percentages represent the proportions of respondents who said "very adequate" or "adequate."

Awareness was highest for programs dealing with anti-semitic activity and anti-Israel propaganda. Next in level of awareness were programs or services dealing with the quality of Jewish education, the number of UJWF contributors, the availability of Jewish recreational and social facilities, and the number of children receiving a Jewish education.

Somewhat more than half of those for whom intermarriage and low levels of Jewish group affiliation represented serious problems thought that there were existing programs addressing them. Fewer than half of the respondents for whom the low level of synagogue affiliation was a serious problem could identify agencies or programs seeking to solve it. All these problems are "first tier." The pattern of responses could be interpreted to mean that more effort and attention are currently devoted to "second tier" than "first tier" communal problems. An alternative explanation is that the nature of some of the first tier problems, especially the affiliation problems, do not lend themselves directly to specific programs and services. They can be seen as conditions of Jewish life or symptoms of other more basic problems rather than as concrete, specific problems which are amenable to direct programmatic solutions.

Judgments of service adequacy. Estimates of programmatic adequacy vary substantially. Small majorities consider programs dealing with anti-semitic activity and anti-Israel propaganda to be adequate or better than adequate. For the remaining seven problems few respondents consider existing programs either "very adequate" or "adequate." For the problem of low synagogue affiliation, only a few of those respondents who know of efforts to deal with this problem think that they are

adequate. Also rated inadequate are programs dealing with intermarriage and the quality of Jewish education. Programmatic efforts regarding levels of Jewish group affiliation, numbers of UJWF contributors, numbers of children receiving a Jewish education, and provision of Jewish recreational and social facilities also are not seen as adequate.

To summarize, the problems of anti-semitism and anti-Israel propaganda seem to have stimulated program responses of which people are aware and which they perceive as adequate. At the other end of the scale, specific programs to address the problems of low synagogue affiliation and high rate of intermarriage are not widely known, nor are they deemed adequate by those who do know about them. Respondent answers suggest that for these two problems, efforts either do not exist, or have not been well publicized. Whatever the cause, existing efforts are not regarded as adequate. In fact, there have been few effective programs to increase levels of synagogue participation. The growing problem of intermarriage is seen as something that in the short run we can do little about.

The remaining programs occupy intermediate positions of various sorts. Programs dealing with the quality of education rank fairly high on recognition, but quite low on adequacy. The problems of inadequate numbers of properly trained Jewish teachers, and the perception that some aspects of Jewish education have only limited positive impact may contribute to the feeling that Jewish education is in serious trouble.

Programs dealing with low levels of Jewish group affiliation rank quite low on recognition, but average on adequacy. Programs designed to deal with the small number of UJWF contributors, the small number of

children receiving a Jewish education, and the lack of Jewish recreational and social facilities rank about average on both dimensions.

With the exception of the relatively favorable judgments expressed about programs aimed at anti-semitic activity and anti-Israel propaganda, respondent assessments of the communal and social programs are remarkably similar and relatively low.*

Nevertheless, the intensity of effort and resource deployment that characterize existing programs to combat anti-semitism and anti-Israel propaganda can potentially serve as models for other programs designed to deal with other important communal issues. According to the judgments expressed by the survey respondents, there is nothing else even remotely comparable in terms of "success rate" in the realm of the Jewish communal services.

*On average, 24 percent of survey respondents judged the social programs under Jewish auspices reviewed in Table 1-4 to be adequate. The corresponding average for the Jewish communal programs reviewed in Table 2-4 is 31 percent. Thus, the adequacy of the latter is judged somewhat more favorably on average. However, when the assessments of the programs dealing with anti-semitism and anti-Israel propaganda are not included in the computation, the average for the communal programs drops to 23 percent, which is practically the same as for the social programs. With the exception of the two most "successful" program areas, then, only an average of one person in four considers either communal or social programs to be adequate.

2-5

Of the nine most serious communal problems, two were reported as affecting almost everyone in the Jewish community: the small number of UJWF contributors, and the prevalence of anti-semitic activity.

Although the remaining seven serious problems affect specific groups, e.g., the general adult population, young adults, teenagers and children rather than preschoolers, single adults, single parents, the elderly, and immigrants, most communal problems appear to affect everyone in the Jewish community either directly or indirectly.

For the communal problems chosen by respondents as the most serious in their regions, an additional question was asked in the Needs Survey: "Which groups are most affected by the problem?" The results for the nine most serious problems, and the groups to which respondents were asked to refer, are presented in Table 2-5.

Groups affected by communal problems. As the table highlights, at least two communal problems -- the small number of UJWF contributors, and the prevalence of anti-semitic activity -- were held to affect Jewish groups across the board. Both of these are "first tier" problems, and majorities of respondents indicated that all groups were adversely affected. This pattern provides a clue to the reason for these problems being judged among the most serious in the majority of the regions: Anti-semitism and UJWF contributions are thought to affect almost everyone in one way or another.

For the remaining seven problems, respondents paired specific groups with specific problems. The highest percentages chose the general adult population as the group most affected by anti-Israel propaganda and low levels of affiliation with Jewish groups and synagogues.

2-5. Which Groups Are Most Affected By the Communal Problems?

	FIRST TIER PROBLEMS					SECOND TIER PROBLEMS			
	Inter-marriage	Low Jewish Group Affil.	Few WJMF Contrib.	Anti-Semitic Activity	Low Synagogue Affil.	No Jewish Child Ed.	Quality of Jewish Ed.	Anti-Israel Propaganda	No Jewish Re-creat'l Facil.
Preschool age	33%	38%	63%	61%	36%	26%	41%	43%	33%
Children (5-12)	52	48	72	66	43	84	94	57	48
Teenagers (13-18)	45	57	72	88	49	80	91	60	93
Young adults (18-25)	74	65	70	84	51	26	53	73	74
Adults, general (26-64)	54	80	78	86	76	6	50	90	52
Single adults (all ages)	28	48	70	66	40	2	34	50	52
Single parents	24	46	72	64	34	4	31	47	44
Elderly (65+)	10	37	77	75	32	2	25	53	52
Immigrants	8	24	60	55	24	8	25	37	33
Other	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	0
Totals	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Number of Respondents	(95)	(79)	(60)	(56)	(53)	(49)	(32)	(30)	(27)

*Since respondents designated more than one group as most affected by a particular problem, the percentages in each column total more than 100%.

Young adults were identified as most affected by intermarriage. Teenagers were disproportionately chosen as the group most affected by the lack of Jewish recreational and social facilities. Finally, the highest percentages of respondents chose both teenagers and younger children as most affected by the quality of Jewish education and the small numbers receiving such an education.

However, the main implication of the response pattern seen in Table 2-5 is that the linkage between problems and groups tends to be diffuse. Specific groups may be directly affected by particular problems, but respondents' common perception is that communal problems have a diffuse and broader indirect impact, affecting multiple groups or, indeed, the community as a whole. Almost by definition, communal problems have an impact community-wide -- they affect the health and well-being of the total community and its future viability.

CHAPTER 3

Social and Communal Problems Combined

3-1

Social and communal problems are intermingled among the most serious problems confronting the Federation regions. Both types of problems are equally represented among the ten most serious problems in every JFC region.

Five problems are among the ten most serious ones in every region. Three are mainly family problems: intermarriage, divorce/marital conflict, and emotional or psychological problems of children and adolescents. The other two are low levels of Jewish group affiliation, and isolation of the elderly.

Aside from these commonalities, the regions differ in their combinations and ordering of problems.

In earlier chapters the survey findings for social and communal problems were treated separately. In this section the two sets of problems will be considered together, so as to understand the major problems facing Jews in the JFC regions.* The main focus will be on the social and communal problems judged by respondents as the most serious confronting Jews in the JFC regions.

Table 3-1, derived from already reported survey results, lists the 10 most serious problems in each region and in all regions combined.

The most serious problems. Social and communal problems are intermingled among the top 10 problems with half of the 10 most serious problems in each region social, the other half communal; this despite

*Two additional sets of tables have been placed in Appendix D. One set combines the results from Tables 1-1 and 2-1, referring to the reported existence of social and Jewish communal problems, and are labeled Tables D-1 through D-6. The second set, labeled D-7 through D-12, displays the combined data from Tables 1-2 and 2-2, referring to the social and communal problems considered by the respondents as the most serious in their region. All these tables include findings on the 47 problems presented in the interviews.

3-1. What Are the Most Serious Problems In Your Region?
(Social and Communal Problems Combined)

<u>JFC Region</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>JFC Region</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>Metro</u>		<u>SF Valley</u>	
No afford. elderly housing	65%	Divorce/marital conflict	61%
Divorce/marital conflict	43	No afford. elderly housing	36
Intermarriage	40	Intermarriage	32
Low Jewish group affil.	35	Child/teen emotional probs.	29
Isolation of elderly	32	Isolation of elderly	28
Anti-semitic activity	30	Low Jewish group affil.	27
Few UJWF contributors	28	Anti-semitic activity	26
No Jewish child educ.	23	Low synagogue affil.	26
Child/teen emotional probs.	23	Adult emotional problems	24
Permanent poverty	23	Few UJWF contributors	23
Number of Respondents (60)		Number of Respondents (75)	
<u>Western</u>		<u>Eastern</u>	
No afford. elderly housing	76%	Divorce/marital conflict	59%
Divorce/marital conflict	51	Low synagogue affil.	53
Low Jewish group affil.	43	Intermarriage	44
Few UJWF contributors	41	Isolation of elderly	44
Intermarriage	38	Low Jewish group affil.	38
Child/teen emotional probs.	27	No afford. elderly housing	35
No Jewish recreat'l. facil.	24	Anti-semitic activity	35
Anti-Israel propaganda	22	Quality of Jewish educ.	21
Isolation of elderly	22	Child/teen emotional probs.	21
No elderly home help	22	Adult emotional problems	21
Number of Respondents (37)		Number of Respondents (34)	
<u>Southern</u>		<u>Totals</u>	
Divorce/marital conflict	77%	Divorce/marital conflict	57%
Intermarriage	58	No afford. elderly housing	47
Isolation of elderly	48	Intermarriage	40
Child/teen emotional probs.	39	Low Jewish group affil.	34
Low Jewish group affil.	29	Isolation of elderly	33
Few UJWF contributors	26	Child/teen emotional probs.	27
Low synagogue affil.	26	Few UJWF contributors	26
No Jewish child educ.	26	Anti-semitic activity	24
No elderly institut'l care	26	Low synagogue affil.	23
Adult emotional problems	23	No Jewish child educ.	21
Number of Respondents (31)		Number of Respondents (237)	

differing regional problems and variations in the order of problems. Both social and communal problems thus rate equally as among the most serious in all JFC regions.

The problems in Table 3-1 are already familiar as "first tier" and "second tier" problems presented earlier. Among the five problems included as the 10 most serious in every region, three are family related: intermarriage, divorce/marital conflict, and emotional or psychological problems of children and adolescents. The other two on every regional list are: large numbers of Jews unaffiliated with any Jewish (non-synagogue) group or organization, and isolation of the elderly. These five problems, although ranked differently in each region, are judged as among the 10 most serious problems everywhere.

3-2

When weighted rank scores are used to order problems, five are among the ten most serious in most regions: intermarriage, divorce/marital conflict, the emotional or psychological problems of children and adolescents, the low number of Jews affiliated with Jewish groups or organizations, and the lack of affordable housing for the elderly.

Although problem rankings tend to vary by region, the following types of problems rank among the most serious in all regions: family problems, problems of low levels of organizational affiliation, problems of the elderly, and Jewish educational problems.

In general, the survey findings indicate considerable diversity about the particular combination of problems respondents in each region considered the most serious; judgments are dispersed over many problems.

Near the end of the interviews with respondents, after they had selected the three most serious social problems, and the three most serious communal problems in their region, they were asked to consider together and rank all six problems, from one to six, in terms of their seriousness. On the basis of this commingled ranking of social and communal problems, rank scores were computed for each problem in each region, and for all regions combined. These scores were weighted and standardized so as to make them comparable across regions.*

Weighted rank scores as an indication of seriousness. There is one major advantage in the use of such weighted standardized rank scores rather than percentages for ordering the most serious problems. Percentages reflect the proportion of respondents who choose a problem as serious, but do not reflect the intensity of respondent feeling about that particular problem in relation to others also selected as most serious. Table 3-2 orders problems using weighted standardized rank scores. Such scores take into account not only the number of respondents who choose a particular problem as one the six most serious social and communal problems (3 from each list), but also the priority rating they assign that problem relative to the other five problems they have designated to the most serious category. Thus, a problem chosen by fewer respondents to whom it is the most serious among the six in their region

*Rank scores were calculated by a mathematical formula based on two factors: (a) the number of respondents who identified the problem as one of the most serious in their region, and (b) the rank they assigned to the problem (1-6) among the six most serious ones they had chosen. A weighting factor was included in the calculations, and the raw scores were standardized to promote comparability. Under the method used, rank scores can range from 0 to 200. For a more detailed description of the methodology, see Appendix C.

can obtain a rank score as high as a problem chosen by more respondents who have designated it as the least serious of the six. The higher rank scores are assigned, of course, to those problems designated by many respondents as most serious of their six, and the lower rank scores characterize problems chosen by only a few respondents who designate them as least serious. Table 3-2 lists the ten problems in each region receiving the highest rank scores in that region.

Family problems are ranked as serious across regions. As the table indicates, even when all problems are considered together, family problems still rank high in all the regions. Divorce/marital conflict is ranked as the most serious problem in the San Fernando Valley, Eastern, and Southern regions; as the second most serious problem in the Western region; and as the third most serious problem in the Metropolitan region. Intermarriage ranks second in the Metropolitan, San Fernando Valley, and Southern regions; third in the Eastern region; and fifth in the Western region. Both of these family problems are among the top five ranked problems in all regions. A third family-related problem -- emotional or psychological problems of children and adolescents -- is found in all regions although with somewhat lower rankings -- sixth in the San Fernando Valley, eighth in the Metropolitan and Southern regions, and tenth in the Western and Eastern regions. Emotional or psychological problems of adults is tenth in the San Fernando Valley but not among the top 10 of any other region.

Lack of affiliation also ranked as serious across regions. The lack of organizational affiliation, like the major family problems, also ranks high in all regions. The large numbers of Jews unaffiliated with

3-2. What is the Rank-order of the Most Serious Problems In Your Region?
(Social and Communal Problems Combined)

<u>JFC Region</u>	<u>Rank Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>JFC Region</u>	<u>Rank Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>
<u>Metro</u>			<u>SF Valley</u>		
No afford. elderly housing	78	1	Divorce/marital conflict	82	1
Intermarriage	63	2	Intermarriage	51	2
Divorce/marital conflict	45	3	No afford. elderly housing	42	3
Low Jewish group affil.	42	4	Low Jewish group affil.	35	4
No Jewish child educ.	39	5	Anti-semitic activity	32	5
Few UJWF contributors	38	6	Child/teen emotional probs.	32	6
Anti-semitic activity	37	7	Few UJWF contributors	30	7
Child/teen emotional probs.	31	8	No Jewish child educ.	29	8
Isolation of elderly	31	9	Low synagogue affil.	29	9
Permanent poverty	22	10	Adult emotional problems	29	10
Number of Respondents (60)			Number of Respondents (75)		
<u>Western</u>			<u>Eastern</u>		
No afford. elderly housing	94	1	Divorce/marital conflict	76	1
Divorce/marital conflict	66	2	Low synagogue affil.	70	2
Few UJWF contributors	54	3	Intermarriage	65	3
Low Jewish group affil.	50	4	Anti-semitic activity	57	4
Intermarriage	47	5	Low Jewish group affil.	50	5
No Jewish recreat'l. facil.	29	6	Isolation of elderly	43	6
No Jewish child educ.	22	7	No afford. elderly housing	32	7
Anti-Israel propaganda	22	8	Quality of Jewish educ.	31	8
Isolation of elderly	22	9	No elderly home help	26	9
Child/teen emotional probs.	22	10	Child/teen emotional probs.	22	10
Number of Respondents (37)			Number of Respondents (34)		
<u>Southern</u>			<u>Totals</u>		
Divorce/marital conflict	89	1	Divorce/marital conflict	70	1
Intermarriage	87	2	Intermarriage	60	2
Low Jewish group affil.	54	3	No afford. elderly housing	55	3
Isolation of elderly	44	4	Low Jewish group affil.	44	4
Few UJWF contributors	38	5	Few UJWF contributors	35	5
Low synagogue affil.	38	6	Isolation of elderly	32	6
No Jewish child educ.	37	7	Anti-semitic activity	32	7
Child/teen emotional probs.	30	8	No Jewish child educ.	29	8
No Jewish recreat'l. facil.	25	9	Child/teen emotional probs.	28	9
Quality of Jewish educ.	24	10	Low synagogue affil.	28	10
Number of Respondents (31)			Number of Respondents (237)		

Jewish groups or organizations ranks as the third most serious problem in the Southern region; fourth in the Metropolitan, San Fernando Valley, and Western regions; and fifth in the Eastern region. It is one of the top five problems in all regions. Low levels of synagogue affiliation ranks as a lower overall problem except in one region. It ranks as the second most serious problem in the Eastern region, sixth in the Southern region, and ninth in the San Fernando Valley; but not among the top 10 problems in either the Metropolitan or Western regions. In the Eastern region it ranks as a more serious problem than the lack of affiliation with non-synagogue groups or organizations.

Problems of the elderly regionally concentrated. Turning to problems of the elderly, one also finds a mixed picture. Lack of affordable housing for the elderly ranks as the most serious problem in the Metropolitan and Western regions, third in the San Fernando Valley region; seventh in the Eastern region, and not among the top 10 in the Southern region. Isolation of the elderly, among the top 10 problems in all regions in Table 3-1, looks different in Table 3-2 where rank scores are used. A comparison of the two tables shows that the problem has dropped from fifth to ninth in the Metropolitan region; from fifth to out of the top 10 altogether in the San Fernando Valley region; from fourth to sixth in the Eastern region; and from third to fourth in the Southern region. It retains the same ninth ranking only in the Western region. This means that when respondents were asked to rank their six most serious problems, they tended to assign higher rankings to problems other than the isolation of the elderly. Nevertheless, the problem remains highly ranked in the Southern and Eastern regions. Further, the

Eastern region ranks the inability of the elderly to obtain home care or housekeeping assistance as among its top 10 problems. Problems of the elderly are present in all regions, but particulars vary in seriousness from one region to another.

It is interesting to note that although lack of affordable elderly housing is highly ranked in the Metropolitan, Western, and San Fernando Valley regions, as noted above, the disparity in their rank scores reveals differing perceptions of the seriousness of this particular problem relative to others in each region. Thus, this problem is regarded as more than twice as serious in the Western region as in the San Fernando Valley region. Similarly, the Western region sample is more united in its belief than the Metropolitan sample that affordable elderly housing is the most serious problem, even though the problem achieves the number one ranking in both regions. Similar rank score comparisons can be made with other problems on the lists in Table 3-2.

Other communal problems vary regionally. The small number of UJWF contributors, and the prevalence of anti-semitic activity, both appear to be considered as serious problems although not equally so in all regions. The lack of UJWF contributors ranks among the top ten problems in all but the Eastern region. Anti-semitic activity is among the top 10 problems in the Eastern, San Fernando Valley, and Metropolitan regions but not in either the Western or Southern regions.

Anti-Israel propaganda ranks eighth in the Western region but is not among the top 10 problems in any other region. Like many of the earlier problem listings, the weighted standardized rankings of problems shows differences from one region to another.

Jewish education: problems of enrollment and quality. Table 3-2 shows two Jewish educational problems: the small number of children receiving a Jewish education, and the quality of the education provided. The small number of Jewish-educated children is considered to be a more serious problem than the quality of the education in all regions except the Eastern, where the low quality of education is seen as more serious.

Other serious problems. Two problems appear in Table 3-2 which are among the 10 most serious in only one or two regions. Jews living in a condition of permanent poverty is tenth-ranked in the Metropolitan region, but not among the top 10 in any other region. Lack of Jewish recreational and social facilities ranks as the sixth most serious problem in the Western region and as the ninth in the Southern region, but does not appear among the top 10 anywhere else.

Problems summary. All problems in Table 3-2 have now been discussed but summing up is difficult, because most are not ranked among the top 10 in all regions.

Once again, then, regional variations are significant. Only four of the 16 problems included on each of the five regional lists, are on all the lists. Three of the four are family problems -- divorce/marital conflict, intermarriage, and the emotional or psychological problems of children and adolescents -- and the fourth is the low number of Jews affiliated with Jewish groups or organizations. The remaining 12 problems appear on only some of the regional lists. For example, no affordable housing for the elderly is ranked first in the Metropolitan and Western regions but does not appear as a serious problem in the Southern

region. Further, even the problems that appear on every list tend to be ranked differently within each region. The widely held view that there are marked and important differences among the JFC regions in terms of the existence and intensity of social and communal problems is substantiated by this analysis.

When categories of problems are discussed, some broad generalizations can be attempted. Family problems are important in every region. Problems of lack of organizational affiliation -- either with Jewish groups, or synagogues, or both -- rank high in every region. Problems of the elderly, while varying in particulars, seem serious in every region. Communal problems that affect all population groups, e.g., the small number of UJWF contributors, and the prevalence of anti-semitic activity, also rank among the top 10 in every region. Jewish educational problems of one sort or another are also found among the 10 most serious problems in every region. The remaining two particular problems -- conditions of permanent poverty, and lack of Jewish recreational and social facilities -- rank among the 10 most serious problems in one or two regions, respectively. Altogether, these four problem categories account for 14 of the 16 individual problems on the regional lists in the table.

It is important to reiterate the point made earlier: the lack of consensus among respondents from a particular region is true for all regions. No problem on any of the lists has a rank score above 100, even though the highest possible score is 200. The relatively low scores mean that there is no unanimity among regional respondents, either with respect to the problems chosen from the two lists as most serious in

their region, or with regard to the ranks assigned the six problems selected as most serious. Respondents' judgments in each region were dispersed over many problems rather than being concentrated on a few. This dispersion is most noticeable in the San Fernando Valley, where the top problem is ranked less than three times higher than the tenth-ranked problem, and is least pronounced in the Western region where the top-ranked problem has a score more than four times higher than the tenth-ranked problem. Western region respondents demonstrate the greatest consensus around the problem of lack of affordable housing for the elderly (rank score - 94). Table 3-3, which deals with groups considered most in need of additional resource allocations, shows that the judgments of respondents are considerably more concentrated on a few groups, and the pattern is clearer.

3-3

When respondents were asked about groups in their regions most in need of additional resource allocations, the two groups most often cited in all regions were the elderly and teenagers.

The reasons respondents gave for nominating the elderly as most in need were related primarily to characteristics of the elderly, especially their physical vulnerability.

Respondents who identified teenagers as most in need were concerned with teenagers' alienation from Jewish life and their cultural vulnerability. Their eroding Jewish identity was of particular concern.

The groups least often cited as having such needs were preschoolers and immigrants, although the latter ranked somewhat higher in the Metropolitan region than in the others.

Children, young adults, the general adult population, single parents and single adults tend to fall into middle positions in terms of need. Although children were thought to have a greater need for additional allocations than single adults in all regions, the other relative rankings of the groups in the middle vary noticeably from one region to another.

After respondents had ranked the most serious problems in their region, they were presented with a list of nine population groups currently served by the JFC and its agencies, and were asked to select the three groups which, in their opinion, were most in need of additional resource allocations such as money, personnel, or programs. After the respondents had chosen the three groups, they were asked to rank them, from one to three, in order of need. Rank scores were subsequently calculated for all groups in all regions, utilizing the method already described. Table 3-3 lists the groups and presents the results in the form of scores and ranks for each region, and for all regions combined, revealing a fairly consistent pattern across regions.

Groups most in need of additional resources. The elderly and teenagers are considered the two groups most in need in all regions. The elderly rank first in the Metropolitan, San Fernando Valley, and Western regions; and, in all three, teenagers rank second. Conversely, teenagers rank first in the Eastern and Southern regions; and in both, the elderly rank second. These two groups are either first or second in all regions. When the weighted standardized ranks are examined, it is clear that the elderly get a particularly high score in the Western region, signifying consensus in that region that they are the group most in need of additional resources. Similarly, respondents in the Southern and Eastern regions emphasize teenagers as most in need of additional resources. For each region there is greater consensus concerning the population group perceived to be most in need of additional resources than there is agreement on the most serious problem.

At the low end of the scale there is a fairly consistent pattern of rankings. Immigrants and pre-school children tend to be considered least in need of additional resources in most regions. These low rankings may be attributed to the relatively low visibility, and few numbers of these groups in relation to other groups in the Jewish community.

Within the middle ranks, the table indicates some consistent relative positions; for example, children rank from third to fifth and single adults from sixth to eighth. The two rankings do not overlap; single adults do not outrank children in any region. Other patterns in the middle groups do vary among regions. In summary, one can say that the groups judged to be the most and the least in need of additional resources tend to be similar in the five regions, but that the regions differ noticeably with respect to the judgments offered about the middle-ranked groups.

Justifications Given for Groups In Need of Additional Resources

Respondents were asked why they felt the groups they had selected as most in need of additional resources were so needy.

Those who nominated the elderly as most in need justified their choice primarily on the characteristics of the elderly, especially their physical vulnerability: They are the "most neglected," "least able to care for themselves," "live in fear." They also "have concrete survival needs which are not being met," "have multiple problems -- lack of funds, lack of mobility, lack of health." Others emphasized the community's obligation -- we should help the elderly "for theological reasons." "One can judge a society on how the elderly are treated."

3-3. Which Jewish Population Groups Are Most
In Need of Additional Resource Allocations?

<u>JFC Region</u>	<u>Rank Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>JFC Region</u>	<u>Rank Score</u>	<u>Rank</u>
<u>Metro</u>			<u>SF Valley</u>		
Elderly (65+)	89	1	Elderly (65+)	99	1
Teenagers (13-18)	80	2	Teenagers (13-18)	75	2
Young adults (19-25)	64	3	Children (5-12)	59	3
Children (5-12)	48	4	Adults (26-64)	48	4
Adults (26-64)	44	5	Young adults (19-25)	41	5
Single parents	34	6	Single parents	36	6
Immigrants	17	7	Single adults (all ages)	18	7
Single adults (all ages)	10	8	Immigrants	13	8
Preschool age	7	9	Preschool age	12	9
Number of Respondents (60)			Number of Respondents (75)		
<u>Western</u>			<u>Eastern</u>		
Elderly (65+)	132	1	Teenagers (13-18)	100	1
Teenagers (13-18)	70	2	Elderly (65+)	80	2
Young adults (19-25)	43	3	Children (5-12)	57	3
Single parents	40	4	Adults (26-64)	47	4
Children (5-12)	36	5	Single parents	41	5
Adults (26-64)	31	6	Young adults (19-25)	41	6
Single adults (all ages)	23	7	Single adults (all ages)	22	7
Preschool age	16	8	Preschool age	12	8
Immigrants	5	9	Immigrants	0	9
Number of Respondents (37)			Number of Respondents (34)		
<u>Southern</u>			<u>Totals</u>		
Teenagers (13-18)	110	1	Elderly (65+)	96	1
Elderly (65+)	82	2	Teenagers (13-18)	84	2
Young adults (19-25)	56	3	Children (5-12)	50	3
Children (5-12)	39	4	Young adults (18-25)	49	4
Single parents	39	5	Adults (26-64)	42	5
Single adults (all ages)	34	6	Single parents	37	6
Adults (26-64)	28	7	Single adults (all ages)	19	7
Preschool age	9	8	Preschool age	11	8
Immigrants	4	9	Immigrants	10	9
Number of Respondents (31)			Number of Respondents (237)		

By contrast, those who identified teenagers as most in need of additional community resources did so for collective rather than individual reasons. Some stated their concerns in personal terms: "It is a most problematic and difficult age," or "They are most vulnerable and need contact right now." But most were concerned with teenagers' alienation from Jewish life and cultural vulnerability. Their eroding Jewish identity was of particular concern.

"The community is looking at a big assimilation problem. So if you are going to educate people with Jewish studies and traditions, you will have your best chance with youth."

"Not enough services to keep them Jewishly oriented -- [they have] primarily a non-Jewish development."

"They have no place to meet in a predominantly Christian community."

"Post Bar and Bat Mitzvah is the period in which we are losing all our youth."

"[If we attended to teenagers] I think a lot of problems would be solved -- non-affiliation would be less [as well as] problems of intermarriage."

Differences in respondent perceptions among regions of the most serious problems are not surprising, since each region is confronted by different combinations of problems and each has a different set of demographic characteristics. Given these regional differences it is significant that the respondents in each region are very similar to one another in their assessment of the two groups most in need of additional resource allocations, namely, the elderly and teenagers. The relationship between perceived problems and those groups identified as being in need of additional resources will be discussed further in the final chapter of this Report.

CHAPTER 4

Issues of Interest

This concluding chapter highlights issues which have been stated, suggested, or implied in the preceding sections of the report. We have sought to identify certain issues which, in our judgment, merit additional consideration and discussion. The chapter highlights both consensus and variations in the findings and several policy implications.

The findings in this report are significant in their meaning and implications. They represent the collective judgments of 237 highly knowledgeable and diverse individuals, including Jewish communal professionals, key agency and federation leadership, rabbis, and users of Jewish communal services. Upon analyzing the data, it was clear that these individuals took a broad perspective on Jewish communal problems and needs and were not merely responding in terms of their own professional or volunteer interests and biases. While not the sole determinant of community priorities, the findings in this report constitute information central to informed and responsible priorities-setting and planning.

Consensus Across Regions

There is substantial agreement across regions as to the most serious types of problems confronting the individual regions in greater Los Angeles. The most serious problems can be broadly classified as (a) family problems, (b) elderly problems, and (c) affiliation problems.

Among the family problems ranked very serious throughout greater Los Angeles are divorce and marital conflict, intermarriage, and the emotional and psychological problems of children and adolescents. Elderly problems also appear and cluster across regions. They consist primarily of the lack of affordable housing and social isolation. Declining affiliation with Jewish communal institutions consists of various elements, including lack

of organizational, synagogue and Jewish educational participation. In short, problems facing Jews and the Jewish community are multi-faceted and consist of a variety of related elements. There is value in thinking in terms of broad problem categories with specific problem manifestations when conceptualizing and designing alternative programmatic responses.

It should also be underscored that there is a high level of consensus among the respondents as to the two target groups most in need of additional Jewish communal attention, namely, elderly and teenagers. As indicated earlier in this report, these are the two population groups which are most vulnerable. That is to say, the elderly are physically at risk; more resources need to be allocated to them to ensure their physical survival and comfort. The vulnerability of teenagers was analyzed in terms of Jewish identity and cultural alienation. Their future connectedness with Jewish life and community was perceived as being endangered. The teenage group is also most in need of increased resource investments.

It is interesting to relate respondent perceptions of the most serious problems in the regions and the population groups facing the greatest need for additional resource assistance. For the elderly the case is rather clear cut. A number of specific elderly-related problems rank very high in seriousness in all five JFC regions. These problem-focused findings are consistent with and reinforced by the high level of consensus among regions that the Jewish elderly population is in greatest need of additional resources to deal with their problems.

For Jewish teenagers, the relation with the most serious problem listings is less direct and apparent, at least at first observation. Besides emotional problems of children and teens, no problems directly affecting

the teenage population are ranked on any region's most serious problem listings. Juvenile delinquency, drug abuse, teen unemployment, rank very low on "seriousness" across all regions.

A closer analysis of respondent comments explaining their selection of teenagers as a high priority group in the community sheds light on this apparent discrepancy. The justification for this population group requiring additional resources seems to deal primarily with the prevention of future problems which threaten the community's survival in physical, communal, and cultural terms.

Greatest concern is expressed for those problems which await Jewish teenagers as they grow into adulthood, including divorce and marital conflict, intermarriage, and emotional and family breakdown -- problems which have proved extremely threatening and harmful to Jewish family and community integrity, stability and vitality. Put another way, teenagers are the most visible group who will shortly inherit many of the major problems cited in the survey. The relationship, therefore, between teenagers as a target group and the most serious problems, is based on future projection and concern that insufficient resources are being targeted to this group during its most vulnerable years.

Variations Across Regions

Although the regions were in agreement in terms of identifying the same broad categories of most serious problems, there are important differences which ought to be underscored. The problems are ordered and ranked somewhat differently in each of the regions' most serious listings. For example, only four of the sixteen problems ranked on the five regional lists as one of the ten most serious social and communal problems, are

included on each regional list. Three of these four items relate to family difficulties -- divorce and marital conflict, intermarriage, and the emotional and psychological problems of children and youth.

The fourth problem relates to the small number of Jews affiliated with Jewish communal groups and organizations. However, even these problems, which appear on every list, tend to be rank ordered somewhat differently by the five regions. Their corresponding rank scores clearly vary across regions, further highlighting variations in respondent perceptions regarding the seriousness of these particular problem items. Divorce and marital conflict is a good example of this spread in rank scores across regions.

Among the remaining twelve problems there is significant disparity in the regional rankings. For example, lack of affordable housing for the elderly is ranked first in the Metropolitan and Western regions but is not viewed as a serious problem in the Southern region and is ranked only seventh in the Eastern. These problems appear selectively on the regions' top ten most serious problem listings. This pattern of variation substantiates the view that important differences exist among the Federation regions regarding the seriousness and urgency of specific problems.

There is another distinction worth noting. The findings reveal greater consensus among the regions with regard to the most serious social problems than with regard to Jewish communal problems. This trend emerges from a comparison of the responses displayed in Tables 1-2 and 2-2.

One explanation for this different response pattern may have to do with the nature of Jewish identification. There are diverse opinions among Jews about the components which are necessary for one to be considered a "good Jew." Various behaviors and attitudes have different levels of

salience and importance to members of the Jewish community. Thus, for example, items relating to religious, cultural, or organizational involvements may be scored high by some Jews and low by other Jews. This disparity among Jews with regard to the nature of Jewishness is reflected in the disagreement among respondents as to the importance of various Jewish communal problems. As Table 2-2 indicates, there is only limited consensus about the three most serious Jewish communal problems facing the Federation regions.

Policy Implications

1. The nature of social and Jewish communal problems: Avoiding the "quick-fix" solution. Both social and Jewish communal problems are diverse and, in many cases, getting worse. According to respondents, many of the problems analyzed in this study have intensified over the last few years. Social problems were seen as worsening at a more rapid pace than communal problems. Among the reasons cited for social problems being serious and getting worse are the following: individuals are at risk; large numbers of individuals are now or will soon be affected; Jewish continuity is undermined; and the Jewish community has the unique responsibility for ameliorating these situations. In regard to specific Jewish communal problems, respondents time and again indicated that collective Jewish identity is endangered through assimilation. Respondents expressed their fears that Jews may disappear into the general society. Therefore, individual and collective peril are being underscored in explaining the seriousness of problems.

The survey uncovered a high level of awareness about services dealing with the most serious social and Jewish communal problems. Persons are

aware of programs geared to divorce and marital conflict, elderly problems, and are even more aware of Jewish programs dealing with communal threats as anti-Semitism, anti-Israel propaganda and the quality of Jewish education. Our respondents score high on awareness but rate Jewish and general community responses to these problems as woefully inadequate. The highest adequacy rating, where 44 percent of the respondents said that the program was adequate, was for general programs dealing with the isolation of the elderly. The highest ratings for adequacy for Jewish programming related to programs to combat anti-Semitic activity, where 63 percent of the respondents asserted the programs were adequate. However, on the whole, only an average of one person in four perceived either communal or general programs to be adequate.

When one places the list of problems and the judgment of adequacy side by side, there is a natural inclination to conclude that the problems can be ameliorated simply by "more" and "better" services of the kind already in existence. While this may turn out to be a correct interpretation for some problems, e.g., lack of affordable housing for the elderly does beckon a direct and concrete response, it does not fully take into account the complexity of social and Jewish communal problems. Indeed, the existence of a problem does not prove the existence of an effective solution. It may be desirable to solve all the 47 problems noted in the survey, but solutions are not necessarily easily attainable.

Problem solutions might not necessarily be achieved by investing more money in existing programs directed toward the worsening conditions. Problems are caused by a variety of factors, only some of which can be controlled by particular Jewish communal interventions. For example, the problem

of Jewish intermarriage has worsened over the past decade. It is, however, doubtful that by investing more funds in current programming we can reverse this trend significantly. Jewish intermarriage may be caused by a multiplicity of family, educational, peer group, or other life experience factors. It is difficult, if not impossible, to isolate a specific cause and to propose a specific solution and thereby solve the overall problem. Such "quick-fixes" only deal with a single manifestation of a highly complex social phenomenon.

The implication of this analysis is the need to take a more systemic approach to the definition and solution of social and Jewish communal problems. Many problems do not fall neatly within strict organizational boundaries. Given the broadness and complexity of problems, it may be necessary to consider responses across agencies and across Jewish communal functions. Innovative linkages between agencies and other institutions, such as synagogues and other Jewish communal organizations, have great potential in this regard.

It may also be necessary to begin reconceptualizing our approach to some problems. For instance, Jewish communal leaders have noted with growing alarm the disconnectedness of significant numbers of persons from organized Jewish life. The problem is often seen as lack of affiliation and this sometimes tends to be the end of the diagnosis. Thus, lack of affiliation with Jewish organizations, groups, or educational institutions is most frequently handled by encouraging membership drives or outreach campaigns. However, our data indicate that given the complexity of such problems, other more innovative approaches may be warranted. We might begin focusing on trying to ascertain why large numbers of Jews are unaffiliated. Are

there some lacks in our current infrastructure that discourage their participation? Rather than simply claiming that the unaffiliated are "mis-directed," it might be more productive for Jewish organizations to undergo self-scrutiny to determine the extent to which they are in harmony with the needs of the unaffiliated. Flexibility and receptivity to new service approaches and to new constituencies are required. To sum up, in many cases, there is no one-to-one correspondence between particular problems, especially Jewish communal problems, and solutions. Problems are multi-dimensional and complex and so should be the approaches to their solution.

2. Inputs to priorities setting. In applying these data to the priorities setting process, it is important to make two points. First, the Los Angeles Jewish community is not monolithic in its demographic characteristics and needs. Greater Los Angeles covers a tremendous geographic spread, incorporating over half a million Jews with diverse problems and needs. Therefore, the stress of this report has been both upon the commonalities and specific differences within the community and its various regions.

This report encompasses the views of a highly knowledgeable group of individuals affiliated in diverse ways with the organized Jewish community. In order to determine community priorities in the most informed manner possible, these views should be augmented by other information sources, such as the Los Angeles Jewish Population Study, census data, agency budgetary material, user statistics and other expert opinion. In addition, similar needs surveys should be conducted in the future, polling other Jewish groups in the community, including the huge non-affiliated population, users of agency services, and specific target groups.

In conclusion, the Los Angeles Jewish community faces a number of major challenges. The community has exhibited, particularly over the last decade, a tremendous amount of program innovation and experimentation. The Jewish Federation Council and its network of agencies have been at the forefront of this movement. We therefore are confident that the problems and challenges delineated in this report can be successfully addressed. To paraphrase Pirke Avot, "It is not our duty to complete the task, but neither are we free to desist from it."

APPENDIX A

Initial Memoranda to JFC Regional Directors
and Checklist



TO: REGIONAL DIRECTORS: MYKE BARASH, HERMAN GILLMAN,
JACK GOLDOWITZ, ALAN KASSIN, LEE WIEDER

FROM: SAUL ANDRON

SUBJECT: KEY INFORMANT NEEDS ANALYSIS (KINA)

DATE AUGUST 17, 1981

Background

As you are aware, the Planning & Budgeting Department has been asked by the JFC Officers to design and implement a Community Priorities System for JFC allocations purposes. Although the final decisions about allocations are a central P&B responsibility, regional input regarding the relative importance of programs and services is indispensable to a more effective and participatory decision-making process. Most importantly, knowledgeable persons in the regions are among the people closest to the human conditions underlying programs and services. We need the input of such persons to make the allocating process more reflective of human need - and we are asking you to help in this process by selecting "key informants" in each of the regions for the upcoming Key Informant Needs Analysis.

What it is

The Key Informant Needs Analysis (KINA) is a simple and inexpensive way of estimating relative needs for Jewish communal services in each region. Essentially it involves:

1. Identifying persons knowledgeable about needs for services ("Key Informants"), and
2. Asking them what those needs are, and how important they are.

We expect the KINA to provide one of the information bases for the subsequent rating of program needs within the region. The KINA will generate the best information and opinion that is available about human needs of Jews in the different regions.

Advantages of KINA

1. It is simple, fast, and inexpensive.
2. It can give information about relative needs and severity of problems.
3. It permits wide participation in planning and priority setting.
4. It can generate enthusiasm about problem solving.
5. It can open lines of communication among agencies.
6. It can often develop community support for program continuation or change.

Limitations of KINA

1. It cannot develop quantitative estimates of need for services.
2. Unserved or "invisible" populations may be overlooked (especially those without effective advocates).
3. It reflects the existing organizational perspectives regarding needs and priorities. (We hope that by involving users and potential users of services, this limitation can be minimized).

Implementation of KINA

There will be six phases to the KINA:

1. Design - This phase is now underway and is largely completed. P&B staff has met with regional directors, agency directors, JFC lay leaders in this task, and has arrived at an overall study plan. A consultant has been retained to assist in the overall management of the study, and a survey research agency has been contacted regarding assistance in the design of the KINA instrument and in data analysis.
2. Selection of Key Informants - Key Informants will be selected by regional directors. Guidelines for this are given later in this memorandum. Technical assistance from P&B staff will be available on request. We expect that this process will be completed by October 2, 1981.
3. Data Collection - A questionnaire will be designed, pre-tested, and administered to the Key Informants in each region. Interviewers will include volunteers from each region and a few professional interviewers. Training will be provided. Our expectations are that the questionnaire will be completed by the end of October. All completed interviews are expected by December 15, 1981.
4. Data Analysis - The data will be analyzed and a preliminary report of findings prepared for each region over the winter months.
5. Feedback Meetings - Copies of the preliminary reports will be sent to Key Informants for their review and comment, and a feedback meeting will be held in each region to discuss the findings, receive further input, and arrive at interpretations and program implications.
6. Report - A final report to each region will be prepared by P&B staff. These reports will also be made available to the central Planning & Budgeting Committee.

Regional Directors
August 17, 1981
Page 3

Selecting Key Informants (KIs)

The most important criterion for selecting KIs is their knowledge of the region, its people, needs for services, and patterns of service being received. (Political power, position, or influence, while important in their own right, are not necessarily mandatory selection criteria for KIs). Key Informants should also have an understanding of the region, or of a significant part of it, which results from:

- providing professional services, i.e., in both Jewish and non-Jewish agency settings
- providing volunteer services
- involvement in Jewish affairs and community activities
- status as a consumer or consumer advocate
- long-term residence or conduct of business

We expect the KINA to be advisory to the regional P&B Committees and Boards in their task of rating program needs within their own regions. To broaden the base of participation, members of the following groups should not be selected as key informants in your regions: regional P&B Committee members; regional board members; central P&B Committee members. In addition, try to avoid selecting KIs who are members of the central JFC Board of Directors.

It would be inappropriate for these groups to advise themselves through this process. We recognize that these conditions might restrict your ability to select a list of knowledgeable key informants within your particular region. However, please make every effort to involve others in this process.

We suggest the following strategy for developing the most knowledgeable and balanced panel of KIs. Identify an initial list of 8-12 knowledgeable persons, and ask them who else should be part of the panel. Board and committee members might prove helpful in this task - they probably have this knowledge. Explain the KINA process to this initial panel and share the criteria listed below with them. Try to get as many names as possible, covering all categories that are relevant to your region. Back-up names may prove useful, if first choices are on vacation or otherwise unavailable.

Criteria for selection include:

1. Persons knowledgeable about the region and its needs (see above).
2. In selecting KIs, the ultimate list should be as balanced as possible, so that it is as representative of the entire region as it can be. Obviously, there will be differences in each

region, but as you select KIs, consider the following categories. There may be cases where one person can reasonably represent more than one interest. In the interest of achieving broader participation, try to minimize those situations.

a. Representatives of Different Characteristics of Service Users

- 1) Age: Children and adolescents, adults, elderly
- 2) Type of service needed: Jewish education, recreation, cultural activities, family services, nutrition, employment, health, etc.
- 3) Ethnic Subgroups: Russian immigrants, Israelis, Iranians, etc.

b. Regional Jewish Communal Agency Personnel (including Jewish Communal Workers located in Regions, such as JFS, JBB)

- 1) Administrators
- 2) Professionals and program staff (including "frontline workers")
- 3) Volunteers
- 4) Board members (not serving on regional P&B Committee and Board)

c. Community Leaders

- 1) Organizations: community centers, synagogues, day schools, B'nai B'rith, AJC, etc. - include lay leaders, rabbis, etc.
- 2) Unaffiliated persons who are knowledgeable about regional needs: long-time residents with a "sophisticated" view of Jewish services and needs.

d. Consumers of Services

- 1) May be found in b.3 and 4 or c. above
- 2) May be recommended by other KIs
- 3) May be "potential users" (i.e. someone who would use a service "if...")

Regional Directors
August 17, 1981
Page 5

- e. Geographic Balance
 - 1) KIs should represent all parts of the region
 - 2) Where one location has been extremely vocal, a separate representative for that community might be considered
- f. Experts and university types who might be knowledgeable about your region, its people, and their needs for Jewish communal services
- g. Representatives of general community agencies (including police, public school personnel, political leaders, hospital workers)
- h. Any other knowledgeable persons in your region that you feel can be helpful in this process

Number of KIs

Because of resource limitations at both regional and central levels, we have limited the overall number of KIs to 175. We have allocated these to the regions based upon the size of their Jewish populations. The projected allocations are:

Eastern	25	Metropolitan	40
Southern	25	San Fernando Valley	60
Western	25		

We would like you to try and keep the number of key informants in your regions within these numbers. If you really cannot develop a representative panel of key informants, we are ready to adjust the numbers.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation. If you have any questions or need for assistance please contact either Saul Andron or Dr. Allan Shoff, a consultant to the project (396-3413).

SA:sws



TO: Myke Barash, Herman Gillman, Jack Goldowitz, Alan Kassin,
Peter Braun
FROM: Saul Andron
SUBJECT: Regional Needs Survey

DATE October 6, 1981

Based on your input at the Regional Planning Seminar, we have rethought a number of aspects relating to the upcoming needs survey in the regions. I hope that the proposed changes described below meet your concerns.

1. The name of the project has been changed from the Key Informants Needs Analysis to the Regional Needs Survey. "Key Informants" will henceforth be referred to as "Respondents."
2. We recognize that a certain number of the respondents from your lists will decline being interviewed. Therefore, to ensure that we maintain the regional sample sizes as specified in the original KINA memo, dated August 17, 1981, we request that you include an additional ten names on the respondent rosters you are currently preparing.

Following is the revised number of respondents we request to be included on your regional rosters as well as the number of interviews we project for each region.

<u>REGION</u>	<u>NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS REQUESTED</u>	<u>NUMBER OF PROJECTED INTERVIEWS</u>
1. San Fernando Valley	70	60
2. Metro	55	45
3. Southern	35	25
4. Eastern	35	25
5. Western	35	25

3. The success of the proposed Regional Needs Survey depends on our carefully generating a knowledgeable and diverse group of respondents from each of the regions. I urge you to consider very carefully your choice of respondents so that they will reflect the diversity and complexity of needs facing Jews in your regions.

In response to your request, the deadline for submitting the respondent rosters is extended to Friday, October 23rd. This will ensure that you have adequate time to complete the selection process.

4. I have attached the roster form to be used in listing the names of the respondents and some basic information about them. Please submit the original copy to me and keep copies for your use.

We will review the respondent rosters centrally and then schedule meetings with you to review your choices and make any necessary revisions, additions, etc.

5. In conducting the Regional Needs Survey, we are committed to a process of maximizing the involvement of individual Jews from the community in generating a valid profile of needs in the regions. Utilizing volunteer interviewers is part of this goal. We recognize the practical difficulties involved in recruiting volunteers and insuring that they follow through on their designated assignments. Nevertheless, we believe the regions will derive important benefits by promoting lay participation in this planning activity.

In response to your concerns, we have attempted to devise an interview process whereby the bulk of the actual interviewing is handled by paid professionals.

Following is the proposed allocation of interviewing responsibilities between the paid personnel and the volunteers from the region:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

<u>REGION</u>	<u>TOTAL NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS</u>	<u>DISTRIBUTION</u>	
		<u>PAID PERSONNEL</u>	<u>REGIONS</u>
San Fernando Valley	60	35	25
Metro	45	30	15
Southern	25	15	10
Eastern	25	15	10
Western	25	15	10
<u>TOTALS</u>	180	110	70

If this proposed division of labor creates hardships for any particular region, please notify me and we will consider alternative arrangements. I will contact you at a later date regarding the timetable for submitting the names of volunteer interviewers and the date of the interview training session.

However, please begin giving thought now to those individuals from your regions who might be called upon to participate as interviewers in this project. In selecting your region's interviewers, it is desirable for each interviewer to conduct two or three interviews.

We look forward to working with you on this exciting planning project. We sincerely intend not to overburden the regions with unmanageable and unrealistic work expectations. It is our responsibility to remain in close contact with each other as we proceed in this collaborative venture.

SA/st

cc: Stanley Weinstein, Larry Rauch, Vivian Barnert, Leo Hirsch, Frank Maas

Regional Needs Survey - Addendum

October 6, 1981

In response to your request we have reconsidered the guideline in the August 17th KINA memo excluding regional P&B committee and board members from participating as respondents in the upcoming Regional Needs Survey. In compiling your respondent rosters, up to one fifth the size of your regional samples can now be composed of regional board members.

Following is a breakdown per region of the number of regional board members you may include in your samples:

<u>REGION</u>	<u>TOTAL NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS</u>	<u>NUMBER OF REGIONAL BOARD MEMBER PERMITTED FOR SAMPLES</u>
1. San Fernando Valley	60	12
2. Metro	45	9
3. Southern	25	5
4. Eastern	25	5
5. Western	25	5

Please apply the same selection criteria to your choice of regional board members as for the rest of your respondent sample, i.e., a knowledgeable group reflecting the diversity of needs in your region.

We hope this change will assist you in the process of selecting your respondent samples.

REGIONAL NEEDS SURVEY

RESPONDENT ROSTERS

VALIDATION CHECKLIST

REGION _____

<u>Respondent Category</u>	<u>Checklist</u>		
	<u>Represented</u>	<u>Over-Represented</u>	<u>Under or Not Represented</u>
1. Knowledgeable about Fields of Communal Activity			
Jewish Education	_____	_____	_____
Community Relations/Social Action	_____	_____	_____
Fundraising/Campaign	_____	_____	_____
Health and Social Welfare	_____	_____	_____
Cultural and Recreational Activities	_____	_____	_____
Religious/Synagogue Activities	_____	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____	_____
2. Knowledgeable about Population Target Groups			
Pre-School Children (0-5)	_____	_____	_____
Pre-Teens (6-12)	_____	_____	_____
Teenage Youth (13-18)	_____	_____	_____
Young Adults/College Age (18-25)	_____	_____	_____
Adults (26-64)	_____	_____	_____
Singles	_____	_____	_____
Single Parents	_____	_____	_____
Elderly (65+)	_____	_____	_____
Immigrants	_____	_____	_____
All ages, family	_____	_____	_____
3. Jewish Communal Agency Professionals			
Jewish Family Service	_____	_____	_____
Jewish Vocational Service	_____	_____	_____
Jewish Centers Association	_____	_____	_____
Jewish Big Brothers	_____	_____	_____
Community Relations Committee	_____	_____	_____
Bureau of Jewish Education	_____	_____	_____
Jewish Day and Supplementary Schools	_____	_____	_____
Professionals in non-JFC Sponsored	_____	_____	_____
Jewish Organizations (e.g. Young Israel)	_____	_____	_____
Hillel	_____	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____	_____

continued...

Checklist

	<u>Represented</u>	<u>Over- Represented</u>	<u>Under or No Represented</u>
4. Community Lay Leaders			
Rabbis	_____	_____	_____
Synagogue Involvement	_____	_____	_____
JFC Agency Involvement	_____	_____	_____
JFC Region Involvement	_____	_____	_____
Interfaith Work	_____	_____	_____
Other Jewish Organization Involvement (e.g. AJC, B'nai B'rith)	_____	_____	_____
Women's Organizations	_____	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____	_____
5. Consumers of Service	_____	_____	_____
6. Geographic Diversity			
Representatives of Different Subareas within Region	_____	_____	_____
7. Representatives of General Human Service Agencies (including police, public schools, political leaders, United Way)	_____	_____	_____
8. Outside Experts			
Researchers	_____	_____	_____
Academics	_____	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____	_____

COMMENTS

APPENDIX B

Map of JFC Regions and Community Listing

COMMUNITIES BY REGION

EASTERN REGION

Alhambra
Altadena
Alta Loma
Arcadia
Azusa
Brea (part)
Claremont
Covina
Cucamonga
Downey
Duarte
Eagle Rock
Glendora
La Canada
La Habra (part)
La Mirada
La Verne
Monrovia
Montclair
Montebello
Monterey Park
Norwalk
Ontario
Pasadena
Pico Rivera
Pomona
Rosemead
San Dimas
San Gabriel
San Marino
Santa Fe Springs
Sierra Madre
South Pasadena
Temple City
Upland
Walnut
West Covina
Whittier

METROPOLITAN REGION

Bel Air
Beverly Hills
Beverlywood
Century City
Culver City
Hollywood
Inglewood
Ladera Heights
Los Angeles
Westchester
Westwood

SAN FERNANDO VALLEY REGION

Agoura
Burbank
Canoga Park
Canyon Country
Chatsworth
Encino
Glendale
Granada Hills
Moorpark
Newhall
North Hollywood
Northridge
Pacoima
Reseda
San Fernando
Sepulveda
Sherman Oaks
Studio City
Sun Valley
Sunland
Sylmar
Tarzana
Thousand Oaks
Tujunga
Valencia
Van Nuys
Verdugo City
Westlake
Woodland Hills

SOUTHERN REGION

Bell
Compton
El Segundo
Gardena
Harbor City
Hawthorne
Hermosa Beach
Huntington Park
Lawndale
Lomita
Lynwood
Manhattan Beach
Palos Verdes
Redondo Beach
San Pedro
South Gate
Torrance
Wilmington

WESTERN REGION

Brentwood
Los Angeles (part)
Malibu
Mar Vista
Marina del Rey
Ocean Park
Pacific Palisades
Playa del Rey
Santa Monica
Venice

APPENDIX C

Computation of Weighted Rank Scores

METHODOLOGICAL APPENDIX

Standardized Rank Scores

The Regional Needs Survey requested detailed information about 26 Jewish Communal and 22 Social Service problems. In order to determine the perceived relative importance and priority of these problems, the respondents were asked to:

- a) indicate whether or not each of the 48 problems existed in their Regions,
- b) select the three most serious problems in each category, and
- c) rank in priority order the six problems selected in (b) by their seriousness.

Evaluating the data collected by steps (a) and (b) involved no more than counting the number of times each problem was mentioned. The ranking process presented more difficulty. In one analysis, for instance, we found that the group of respondents affiliated with synagogues ("Affiliated") gave the following sets of ranks to the problems "social isolation of the elderly" ("isolation") and "small number of Jewish children receiving a Jewish education" ("Education"):

<u>Rank Assigned</u>	<u>"Isolation"</u> <u># Mentions</u>	<u>"Education"</u> <u># Mentions</u>
1	2	14
2	4	9
3	7	8
4	17	7
5	12	2
6	13	5
Total	55	45

Which problem was perceived to be more serious? "Isolation" has more mentions but "Education" seems to have more mentions at higher ranks.

To provide a less awkward and more meaningful measure of comparison, a formula was developed to provide a single rank score for each problem. This score took into account both the number of times a problem was mentioned as one of the 6 most serious and the ranks assigned by the respondents. The formula involves three steps:

- 1) A weight is assigned to each given rank. The total number of mentions at each given rank for each problem is multiplied by its corresponding weight. These individual computations are then summed to produce a raw rank score for each problem. The assigned weights were as follows:

<u>Rank Assigned</u>	<u>Weight</u>
1	6
2	5
3	4
4	3
5	2
6	1

Referring back to the example above, the following raw rank scores were derived for the "Affiliated."

<u>Rank Assigned</u>	<u>"Isolation"</u>		<u>"Education"</u>	
	<u># of Mentions</u>	<u>X Weight</u>	<u># of Mentions</u>	<u>X Weight</u>
1	2	6 = 12	14	6 = 84
2	4	5 = 20	9	5 = 45
3	7	4 = 28	8	4 = 32
4	17	3 = 51	7	3 = 21
5	12	2 = 24	2	2 = 4
6	13	1 = 13	5	1 = 5
	Raw Rank Scores 148		191	

On the basis of the raw rank scores, we can say that the "Education" problem is perceived as being more serious than the "Isolation" problem. By performing this calculation for each problem, we can order them reliably on the basis of their raw rank score.

- 2) The raw rank score, however, does not allow us to compare the perceived relative seriousness of a given problem among different groups of respondents. A group such as the synagogue-affiliated, with 183 respondents, would almost always yield a higher raw rank score than the group not affiliated with synagogues (Unaffiliated), with 54 respondents, simply because there are more chances for the problem to be mentioned.

To eliminate the effect of group size, we simply divide the raw rank score for each problem by the highest possible score obtainable in that group (that is, the score obtained when all members of the group choose the same problem as rank 1). For our sample groups, these scores are (183x6)=1098, and (54x6)=324, respectively.

Performing this calculation results in the following standardized scores:

<u>Respondent Group</u>	<u>"Isolation"</u>	<u>"Education"</u>
Affiliated	$\frac{148}{1098} = .135$	$\frac{191}{1098} = .174$
Unaffiliated	$\frac{80}{324} = .247$	$\frac{12}{327} = .037$

Thus, we can see that although the raw rank score for the Affiliated was much higher than the Unaffiliated for the "Isolation" problem (148 vs. 80), the standardized rank score was considerably lower (.135 vs. .247).

- 3) To make the standardized scores more readable, we multiply them by 200. This results in a set of standard scores with a range of 0 (if no one in the group selected the problem as one of the 6 most serious) to 200 (if everyone in the group selected the same problem as most serious). The standard scores for our sample would then be:

<u>Respondent Group</u>	<u>"Isolation"</u>	<u>"Education"</u>
Affiliated	27.2	35.2
Unaffiliated	49.4	7.4

We can now conclude that those respondents affiliated with synagogues consider "Education" to be a far more serious problem than do the unaffiliated. On the other hand, the unaffiliated group regards "Isolation" as a more serious problem than does the group affiliated with synagogues.

The same procedure, yielding the same type of standard scores, was applied to the priority ranking of the top three population groups most in need of additional resource allocations.

Average Ranks

In the discussion of Standardized Rank Scores, we were addressing the problem of overall perceived seriousness of a problem. It is also of interest to look at the relative intensity of the respondents' feelings about a problem. In this instance, the focus is on how high a rank is assigned to a problem by those who consider it a serious problem.

We can estimate intensity by computing the average rank assigned to the problem, ignoring those respondents who did not select it as one of the 6 most serious. For the sample data for health and welfare experts described above, the average ranks are:

$$\text{"Isolation"} = \frac{(2 \times 1) + (4 \times 2) + (7 \times 3) + (17 \times 4) + (12 \times 5) + (13 \times 6)}{55} = 4.3$$

$$\text{"Education"} = \frac{(14 \times 1) + (9 \times 2) + (8 \times 3) + (7 \times 4) + (2 \times 5) + (5 \times 6)}{45} = 2.8$$

On the basis of these results, we can say that the synagogue-affiliated who reported that "Education" was a serious problem felt more strongly about it than those who felt that "Isolation" was a serious problem.

As with the Standardized Rank Scores, Average Ranks can be (and have been) computed for the population group ranking analysis.

APPENDIX D

Additional Tables

D-I. LIST OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS USED IN NEEDS SURVEY

<u>Problems as Worded in Questionnaire</u>	<u>Table Designations</u>
a. Alcohol abuse.	(Alcohol abuse)
b. Divorce and marital conflict.	(Divorce/marital conflict)
c. Emotional or psychological problems of children and adolescents.	(Child/teen emotional probs.)
d. Emotional or psychological problems of adult-age individuals.	(Adult emotional problems)
e. Juvenile delinquency.	(Juvenile delinquency)
f. Adult unemployment.	(Adult unemployment)
g. Inability of teenagers to obtain part-time or summer employment.	(Teen unemployment)
h. Drug abuse.	(Drug abuse)
i. Lack of institutional and foster care for children and adolescents.	(No child institutional care)
j. Child abuse/neglect.	(Child abuse/neglect)
k. Lack of affordable legal services for the poor.	(No poor legal services)
l. Jews in permanent poverty conditions.	(Permanent poverty)
m. Social isolation of the elderly.	(Isolation of elderly)
n. Inability of elderly to obtain in-home care or housekeeping assistance.	(No elderly home help)
o. Lack of affordable housing for the elderly.	(No afford. elderly housing)
p. Lack of appropriate institutional care for the elderly when necessary.	(No elderly institut'l care)
q. Nutritional needs of the elderly.	(Elderly nutritional needs)
r. Lack of transportation for the elderly.	(No elderly transportation)

- s. Lack of opportunities for the disabled, i.e., deaf, blind or developmentally disabled to obtain socialization and community living skills. **(No disabled opportunities)**
- t. Emergency financial needs of Jews caught in life crisis situations. **(No emergency money)**
- u. Inability of immigrants to obtain jobs. **(No immigrant jobs)**
- v. Difficulty of immigrants to adjust to American society and life styles. **(Immigrant adjustment)**

- r. Isolation of immigrant groups from mainstream of Jewish community life. (Immigrant isolation)
- s. Large number of Jews not affiliated with any Jewish (non-synagogue) groups or organizations. (Low Jewish group affil.)
- t. Declining levels of religious observance by Jews. (Less religious observance)
- u. Lack of Jewish-sponsored child-care facilities. (No Jewish child care)
- v. Lack of young leadership for Jewish organizations/synagogues. (No young org. leaders)
- w. Small number of contributors to United Jewish Welfare Fund. (Few UJWF contributors)
- x. Insufficient community relations activity, e.g., lobbying, information programs related to current political and legislative issues. (No political/legis. activ.)
- y. Lack of organized opportunities for single Jewish men and women to meet and socialize. (No singles social opport.)

D-1. Do These Problems Exist in Your Region?
 (Social and Communal Problems Combined, All Regions Combined)

Divorce/marital conflict	94%	Elderly nutritional needs	65
Intermarriage	93	No poor legal services	61
Low synagogue affil.	92	No emergency money	60
Low Jewish group affil.	91	Jewish summer camp costs	60
Anti-semitic activity	90	Immigrant adjustment	60
No afford. elderly housing	90	No Jewish recreat'l facil.	59
Few UJWF contributors	89	No disabled opportunities	59
Isolation of elderly	88	No Jewish child care	59
Child/teen emotional probs.	86	Quality of Jewish educ.	58
No Jewish child educ.	84	Teen unemployment	57
No elderly transportation	83	No Jewish social activ.	56
Influence of cults	83	No immigrant jobs	54
Adult emotional problems	79	No outsider interactions	50
Synagogue member costs	79	No disabled Jewish activ.	49
Jewish educ. costs	76	Juvenile delinquency	49
Anti-Israel propaganda	75	No political/legis. activ.	47
Less religious observance	73	Immigrant isolation	46
Drug abuse	72	Child abuse/neglect	45
No elderly home help	71	Alcohol abuse	42
No elderly institut'l care	71	No child institutional care	40
No Jewish adult educ.	68	Jewish chaplaincy needs	38
Permanent poverty	65	No Jewish campus activ.	36
No young org. leaders	65	Other communal problems	29
Adult unemployment	65	Total	*
No singles social opport.	65	Number of Respondents	(237)

*Since respondents mentioned more than one problem, the total exceeds 100%.

D-2. Do These Problems Exist in Your Region?
 (Social and Communal Problems Combined, Metropolitan Region Only)

<i>No afford. elderly housing</i>	95%	<i>No young org. leaders</i>	72
Intermarriage	95	No elderly home help	70
Divorce/marital conflict	93	No immigrant jobs	68
Low Jewish group affil.	92	No disabled opportunities	67
Anti-semitic activity	92	No singles social opport.	67
Few UJWF contributors	92	No Jewish child care	67
Isolation of elderly	90	No Jewish adult educ.	63
Low synagogue affil.	90	No emergency money	62
Influence of cults	90	Jewish summer camp costs	62
No Jewish child educ.	88	Teen unemployment	60
No elderly transportation	85	No outsider interactions	58
Anti-Israel propaganda	83	No political/legis. activ.	58
Child/teen emotional probs.	83	Juvenile delinquency	57
Adult emotional problems	83	No disabled Jewish activ.	55
Permanent poverty	83	Child abuse/neglect	55
Jewish educ. costs	82	Quality of Jewish educ.	53
Less religious observance	80	No Jewish social activ.	50
No poor legal services	78	No Jewish recreat'l facil.	47
Immigrant adjustment	78	Alcohol abuse	45
Adult unemployment	77	No Jewish campus activ.	42
Synagogue member costs	77	Jewish chaplaincy needs	40
Drug abuse	75	No child institutional care	37
Elderly nutritional needs	75	Other communal problems	30
Immigrant isolation	73	Total	*
No elderly institut'l care	72	Number of Respondents	(60)

*Since respondents mentioned more than one problem, the total exceeds 100%.

D-3. Do These Problems Exist in Your Region?
 (Social and Communal Problems Combined, San Fernando Valley Only)

Divorce/marital conflict	97%	No disabled opportunities	65
Intermarriage	93	Teen unemployment	65
No afford. elderly housing	92	Elderly nutritional needs	63
Low synagogue affil.	92	Immigrant adjustment	63
Low Jewish group affil.	91	Juvenile delinquency	63
Anti-semitic activity	91	No young org. leaders	61
Influence of cults	91	No disabled Jewish activ.	61
Child/teen emotional probs.	89	No poor legal services	60
Few UJWF contributors	89	No immigrant jobs	59
Jewish educ. costs	88	No singles social opport.	57
No elderly transportation	85	No Jewish child care	57
Synagogue member costs	84	Quality of Jewish educ.	57
Adult emotional problems	80	No outsider interactions	56
Isolation of elderly	80	No Jewish social activ.	55
No Jewish child educ.	80	Immigrant isolation	52
Drug abuse	79	Alcohol abuse	52
Anti-Israel propaganda	76	Child abuse/neglect	49
Adult unemployment	75	No Jewish recreat'l facil.	48
No elderly home help	72	No child institutional care	44
No Jewish adult educ.	71	No political/legis. activ.	43
No elderly institut'l care	69	Jewish chaplaincy needs	37
Less religious observance	69	No Jewish campus activ.	33
Jewish summer camp costs	68	Other communal problems	32
No emergency money	68	Total	*
Permanent poverty	65	Number of Respondents	(75)

*Since respondents mentioned more than one problem, the total exceeds 100%.

D-4. Do These Problems Exist in Your Region?
 (Social and Communal Problems Combined, Western Region Only)

No afford. elderly housing	100%	No Jewish adult educ.	62
Isolation of elderly	97	No Jewish child care	62
Divorce/marital conflict	95	No emergency money	60
Child/teen emotional probs.	92	No young org. leaders	57
Intermarriage	89	No disabled opportunities	57
Low Jewish group affil.	89	Quality of Jewish educ.	54
No Jewish child educ.	89	No political/legis. activ.	51
Low synagogue affil.	84	No child institutional care	49
Permanent poverty	84	Immigrant adjustment	46
No elderly transportation	81	No immigrant jobs	46
Few UJWF contributors	81	Jewish summer camp costs	46
Anti-Israel propaganda	81	No Jewish social activ.	46
Anti-semitic activity	81	No outsider interactions	46
No elderly institut'l care	78	No disabled Jewish activ.	46
Elderly nutritional needs	78	Adult unemployment	43
Synagogue member costs	76	Teen unemployment	43
No elderly home help	76	Juvenile delinquency	43
Adult emotional problems	73	Alcohol abuse	43
No Jewish recreat'l facil.	73	Child abuse/neglect	40
No poor legal services	73	Immigrant isolation	35
Influence of cults	70	Jewish chaplaincy needs	32
Drug abuse	70	No Jewish campus activ.	27
Less religious observance	70	Other communal problems	19
Jewish educ. costs	70	Total	*
No singles social opport.	65	Number of Respondents	(37)

*Since respondents mentioned more than one problem, the total exceeds 100%.

D-5. Do These Problems Exist in Your Region?
 (Social and Communal Problems Combined, Eastern Region Only)

Low synagogue affil.	100%	Drug abuse	59
Anti-semitic activity	100	Elderly nutritional needs	59
Low Jewish group affil.	97	No emergency money	59
Intermarriage	91	Jewish summer camp costs	59
Isolation of elderly	91	No Jewish child care	59
Divorce/marital conflict	85	Quality of Jewish educ.	59
Few UJWF contributors	85	Teen unemployment	56
No Jewish recreat'l facil.	85	No poor legal services	50
No afford. elderly housing	82	Permanent poverty	47
Child/teen emotional probs.	82	Immigrant adjustment	44
No Jewish child educ.	82	No outsider interactions	41
No elderly transportation	79	No disabled opportunities	41
Adult emotional problems	79	No child institutional care	41
Synagogue member costs	79	Child abuse/neglect	38
No Jewish social activ.	79	No political/legis. activ.	38
Influence of cults	74	No immigrant jobs	35
No Jewish adult educ.	74	Jewish chaplaincy needs	35
No elderly home help	71	No Jewish campus activ.	35
Less religious observance	71	No disabled Jewish activ.	29
No young org. leaders	71	Other communal problems	26
No singles social opport.	71	Juvenile delinquency	26
No elderly institut'l care	65	Alcohol abuse	15
Adult unemployment	62	Immigrant isolation	12
Jewish educ. costs	62	Total	*
Anti-Israel propaganda	62	Number of Respondents	(34)

*Since respondents mentioned more than one problem, the total exceeds 100%.

D-5. Do These Problems Exist in Your Region?
 (Social and Communal Problems Combined, Eastern Region Only)

Low synagogue affil.	100%	Drug abuse	59
Anti-semitic activity	100	Elderly nutritional needs	59
Low Jewish group affil.	97	No emergency money	59
Intermarriage	91	Jewish summer camp costs	59
Isolation of elderly	91	No Jewish child care	59
Divorce/marital conflict	85	Quality of Jewish educ.	59
Few UJWF contributors	85	Teen unemployment	56
No Jewish recreat'l facil.	85	No poor legal services	50
No afford. elderly housing	82	Permanent poverty	47
Child/teen emotional probs.	82	Immigrant adjustment	44
No Jewish child educ.	82	No outsider interactions	41
No elderly transportation.	79	No disabled opportunities	41
Adult emotional problems	79	No child institutional care	41
Synagogue member costs	79	Child abuse/neglect	38
No Jewish social activ.	79	No political/legis. activ.	38
Influence of cults	74	No immigrant jobs	35
No Jewish adult educ.	74	Jewish chaplaincy needs	35
No elderly home help	71	No Jewish campus activ.	35
Less religious observance	71	No disabled Jewish activ.	29
No young org. leaders	71	Other communal problems	26
No singles social opport.	71	Juvenile delinquency	26
No elderly institut'l care	65	Alcohol abuse	15
Adult unemployment	62	Immigrant isolation	12
Jewish educ. costs	62	Total	*
Anti-Israel propaganda	62	Number of Respondents	(34)

*Since respondents mentioned more than one problem, the total exceeds 100%.

D-6. Do These Problems Exist in Your Region?
 (Social and Communal Problems Combined, Southern Region Only)

Intermarriage	97%	No Jewish social activ.	61
Low synagogue affil.	97	Jewish summer camp costs	55
Few UJWF contributors	97	Immigrant adjustment	52
Divorce/marital conflict	94	Teen unemployment	52
Isolation of elderly	87	No disabled opportunities	48
Low Jewish group affil.	84	No immigrant jobs	48
No Jewish child educ.	84	Adult unemployment	45
Anti-semitic activity	81	No Jewish campus activ.	45
Child/teen emotional probs.	77	No emergency money	42
No elderly transportation	77	No Jewish child care	42
Adult emotional problems	77	No political/legis. activ.	42
No elderly institut'l care	74	Jewish chaplaincy needs	42
Influence of cults	74	Elderly nutritional needs	39
Synagogue member costs	74	Alcohol abuse	39
Less religious observance	74	No outsider interactions	36
No Jewish adult educ.	74	Juvenile delinquency	36
No singles social oport.	71	No disabled Jewish activ.	36
Quality of Jewish educ.	71	Other communal problems	32
No afford. elderly housing	68	No poor legal services	29
Drug abuse	68	Immigrant isolation	29
No elderly home help	68	Child abuse/neglect	26
Anti-Israel propaganda	64	Permanent poverty	23
No young org. leaders	64	No child institutional care	23
No Jewish recreat'l facil.	64	Total	*
Jewish educ. costs	61	Number of Respondents	(31)

*Since respondents mentioned more than one problem, the total exceeds 100%:

D-7. What Are the Three Most Serious Problems in Your Region?
(Social and Communal Problems Combined, All Regions Combined)

FIRST TIER PROBLEMS

Divorce/marital conflict	57%
No afford. elderly housing	47
Intermarriage	40
Low Jewish group affil.	34
Isolation of elderly	33
Child/teen emotional probs.	27
Few UJWF contributors	26
Anti-semitic activity	24
Low synagogue affil.	23
No Jewish child educ.	21

SECOND TIER PROBLEMS

Adult emotional problems	18
No elderly home help	15
Quality of Jewish educ.	14
Anti-Israel propaganda	13
No elderly transportation	13
No elderly institut'l care	13
Permanent poverty	13
No Jewish recreat'l facil.	11

THIRD TIER PROBLEMS

Synagogue member costs	11	No political/legis. activ.	5
No singles social opport.	11	Teen unemployment	4
Jewish educ. costs	10	Jewish summer camp costs	4
Drug abuse	10	Immigrant adjustment	4
No Jewish child care	9	Elderly nutritional needs	3
Adult unemployment	8	Less religious observance	3
Influence of cults	8	Child abuse/neglect	3
No disabled opportunities	7	No Jewish social activ.	3
Other communal problems	7	No disabled Jewish activ.	2
No young org. leaders	6	Alcohol abuse	2
No poor legal services	6	Jewish chaplaincy needs	2
No emergency money	6	No immigrant jobs	2
No child institutional care	6	No Jewish campus activ.	2
No Jewish adult educ.	5	Immigrant isolation	1
No outsider interactions	5	Juvenile delinquency	1

D-8. What Are the Three Most Serious Problems in Your Region?
 (Social and Communal Problems Combined, Metropolitan Region Only)

FIRST TIER PROBLEMS

No afford. elderly housing	65%
Divorce/marital conflict	43
Intermarriage	40
Low Jewish group affil.	35
Isolation of elderly	32
Anti-semitic activity	30

SECOND TIER PROBLEMS

Few UJWF contributors	28
No Jewish child educ.	23
Child/teen emotional probs.	23
Permanent poverty	23

THIRD TIER PROBLEMS

Anti-Israel propaganda	17	No child institutional care	5
No singles social opport.	15	No Jewish recreat'l facil.	5
No Jewish child care	15	Synagogue member costs	5
Quality of Jewish educ.	13	Jewish summer camp costs	5
Jewish educ. costs	13	No Jewish campus activ.	5
Adult emotional problems	12	Other communal problems	5
No elderly transportation	12	No young org. leaders	3
Adult unemployment	12	Less religious observance	3
Influence of cults	12	No emergency money	3
No disabled opportunities	12	Teen unemployment	3
No elderly home help	10	Child abuse/neglect	3
No poor legal services	10	No Jewish adult educ.	2
Low synagogue affil.	8	No Jewish social activ.	2
Drug abuse	8	No disabled Jewish activ.	2
Immigrant adjustment	8	Alcohol abuse	2
No outsider interactions	7	No immigrant jobs	2
No political/legis. activ.	7	Juvenile delinquency	2
No elderly institut'l care	5	Jewish chaplaincy needs	0
Elderly nutritional needs	5	Immigrant isolation	0

D-9. What Are the Three Most Serious Problems in Your Region?
(Social and Communal Problems Combined, San Fernando Valley Only)

FIRST TIER PROBLEMS

Divorce/marital conflict	61%
No afford. elderly housing	36
Intermarriage	32
Child/teen emotional probs.	29
Low Jewish group affil.	27
Anti-semitic activity	26
Low synagogue affil.	26

SECOND TIER PROBLEMS

Isolation of elderly	28
Adult emotional problems	24
Few UJWF contributors	23
No Jewish child educ.	23

THIRD TIER PROBLEMS

Synagogue member costs	18	No Jewish adult educ.	5
No elderly home help	17	No outsider interactions	5
No elderly institut'l care	15	Immigrant adjustment	4
Jewish educ. costs	15	No immigrant jobs	4
No elderly transportation	13	No Jewish recreat'l facil.	4
Drug abuse	13	No political/legis. activ.	4
No singles social opport.	12	No disabled Jewish activ.	4
No disabled opportunities	11	Jewish chaplaincy needs	4
No emergency money	11	Less religious observance	3
No Jewish child care	11	No Jewish social activ.	3
Influence of cults	11	Immigrant isolation	3
Anti-Israel propaganda	10	No poor legal services	3
Quality of Jewish educ.	8	Child abuse/neglect	3
Jewish summer camp costs	8	Alcohol abuse	3
Other communal problems	8	Juvenile delinquency	3
Permanent poverty	8	No Jewish campus activ.	1
No child institutional care	7	Teen unemployment	1
No young org. leaders	7	Elderly nutritional needs	0
Adult unemployment	5		

D-10. What Are the Three Most Serious Problems in Your Region?
(Social and Communal Problems Combined, Western Region Only)

FIRST TIER PROBLEMS

No afford. elderly housing	76%
Divorce/marital conflict	51
Low Jewish group affil.	43
Few UJWF contributors	41
Intermarriage	38
Child/teen emotional probs.	27

SECOND TIER PROBLEMS

No Jewish recreat'l facil.	24
Anti-Israel propaganda	22
Isolation of elderly	22
No elderly home help	22
Permanent poverty	22

THIRD TIER PROBLEMS

No Jewish child educ.	19	No young org. leaders	5
Quality of Jewish educ.	16	Less religious observance	5
Anti-semitic activity	14	Other communal problems	5
No elderly institut'l care	14	Adult unemployment	3
Low synagogue affil.	11	Teen unemployment	3
No Jewish adult educ.	11	No singles social opport.	3
No political/legis. activ.	11	Influence of cults	3
Adult emotional problems	11	No disabled Jewish activ.	3
Drug abuse	11	Immigrant isolation	3
No poor legal services	11	Immigrant adjustment	0
No Jewish child care	8	No immigrant jobs	0
No elderly transportation	8	Child abuse/neglect	0
No disabled opportunities	5	Alcohol abuse	0
No emergency money	5	Juvenile delinquency	0
No child institutional care	5	Jewish summer camp costs	0
Elderly nutritional needs	5	No Jewish social activ.	0
Synagogue member costs	5	Jewish chaplaincy needs	0
Jewish educ. costs	5	No Jewish campus activ.	0
No outsider interactions	5		

D-11. What Are the Three Most Serious Problems in Your Region?
(Social and Communal Problems Combined, Eastern Region Only)

FIRST TIER PROBLEMS

Divorce/marital conflict	59%
Low synagogue affil.	53
Intermarriage	44
Isolation of elderly	44
Low Jewish group affil.	38
No afford. elderly housing	35

SECOND TIER PROBLEMS

Anti-semitic activity	35
Quality of Jewish educ.	21
Child/teen emotional probs.	21
Adult emotional problems	21
No elderly home help	21
No elderly transportation	21

THIRD TIER PROBLEMS

No Jewish recreat'l facil.	17
Few UJWF contributors	12
Synagogue member costs	12
Drug abuse	12
Adult unemployment	12
Teen unemployment	12
No Jewish child educ.	9
Anti-Israel propaganda	9
No singles social opport.	9
Other communal problems	9
No elderly institut'l care	9
Permanent poverty	6
No emergency money	6
No child institutional care	6
Child abuse/neglect	6
No Jewish adult educ.	6
No young org. leaders	6
No Jewish social activ.	6

Jewish educ. costs	3
No Jewish child care	3
Influence of cults	3
No poor legal services	3
Elderly nutritional needs	3
No outsider interactions	3
No Jewish campus activ.	3
Alcohol abuse	3
No disabled opportunities	0
Immigrant adjustment	0
No immigrant jobs	0
Immigrant isolation	0
No political/legis. activ.	0
Jewish summer camp costs	0
Less religious observance	0
No disabled Jewish activ.	0
Jewish chaplaincy needs	0
Juvenile delinquency	0

D-12. What Are the Three Most Serious Problems in Your Region?
(Social and Communal Problems Combined, Southern Region Only)

FIRST TIER PROBLEMS

Divorce/marital conflict	77%
Intermarriage	58
Isolation of elderly	48
Child/teen emotional probs.	39
Low Jewish group affil.	29
Few UJWF contributors	26
Low synagogue affil.	26
No Jewish child educ.	26

SECOND TIER PROBLEMS

No elderly institut'l care	26
Adult emotional problems	23
No Jewish recreat'l facil.	20

THIRD TIER PROBLEMS

No afford. elderly housing	19	Immigrant adjustment	3
Quality of Jewish educ.	16	No immigrant jobs	3
No elderly transportation	13	Jewish educ. costs	3
Synagogue member costs.	13	No Jewish child care	3
No singles social opport.	13	Jewish summer camp costs	3
No young org. leaders	13	Less religious observance	3
Anti-semitic activity	10	No outsider interactions	3
Anti-Israel propaganda	10	No political/legis. activ.	3
Influence of cults	7	Jewish chaplaincy needs	3
No Jewish social activ.	7	Alcohol abuse	3
Other communal problems	7	No Jewish adult educ.	0
No elderly home help	7	No disabled Jewish activ.	0
Drug abuse	7	No Jewish campus activ.	0
Adult unemployment	7	Immigrant isolation	0
No child institutional care	7	No disabled opportunities	0
Teen unemployment	7	No poor legal services	0
Elderly nutritional needs	7	Child abuse/neglect	0
Permanent poverty	3	Juvenile delinquency	0
No emergency money	3		