

The Conference of Jewish Communal Service: A Professional Profile

JONATHAN S. WOOCHEER*

*Associate Professor of Jewish Communal Service, Benjamin S. Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service,
Brandeis University, Waltham*

The Conference of Jewish Communal Service is the largest professional Jewish organization in North America dealing with issues of social welfare, communal well-being, and professional concerns relative to the entire field of Jewish communal service. Since its inception as the National Conference of Jewish Charities in 1899, the Conference—then an organization of both volunteers and professionals—has played a leadership role in both defining and addressing the evolving agenda of the North American Jewish community. Today, the over-3000 members of the Conference play the major part in developing and delivering the broad range of programs and services which have made that community a model in the Jewish world and in American and Canadian life.

In order to maintain its leadership, the Conference of Jewish Communal Service has, over the years, undertaken a number of pioneering studies—of issues in Jewish social welfare, of priorities for communal life, and of its own membership and activities—designed to enable it to respond more acutely to the evolving needs of the Jewish community. The most recent of these initiatives was the establishment of a Commission on Scope and Function in 1980 to examine the fundamental purposes and programs of the Conference and its relationship both to the workers in Jewish communal service (Conference members and non-members) and to the Jewish community as a whole. The Commission, under the chairmanship of Daniel Mann, and with the strong support of Bernard Olshansky and Gerald Bubis, Presidents of the Conference during this period, undertook a comprehensive examination of these areas and delivered a report and recommendations to the Conference membership in the Spring of 1982.

As part of its work, the Commission, working through an Advisory Committee chaired by Donald Feldstein, conducted a survey of the membership of the Conference dealing with a wide variety of issues relating to the activities of the Conference and to other professional concerns. The survey questionnaire, designed largely by Daniel Mann and then-Conference Executive Director Matthew Penn was mailed in January 1982. Approximately 750 completed questionnaires were received by mid-March. These were transmitted to the Benjamin S. Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service at Brandeis University, which was engaged by the Conference to conduct the data analysis and prepare a preliminary report on the findings. The author served as the principal investigator. This preliminary report was presented to Conference members at the 1982 Annual Meeting of the Conference.

Subsequently, additional funding became available to prepare a more comprehensive analysis of the data collected in the survey. No such analysis, and certainly no report, can hope to be truly comprehensive. The 1982 survey provides a wealth of information about the members of the Conference, their concerns, ideas concerning the Conference, and their backgrounds. This report attempts to present some of the most important of that information as a guide to the Conference in its ongoing efforts to implement the recommendations of the Commission on Scope and Function and its continuing endeavor to provide leadership to the North American Jewish community.

* With assistance from Lauren Salzenstein, M.A. in Jewish Communal Service, Benjamin S. Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service, Brandeis University.

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the members of the Advisory Committee to the Commission on Scope and Function of the Conference of Jewish Communal Service, and especially its Chairman Donald Feldstein, of Daniel Mann and Ferne Katleman, Presidents of the Conference, and of its Executive Director Joel Ollander, in the preparation of this report.

Respondent Profile

A total of 756 members of the Conference of Jewish Communal Service responded to the survey questionnaire, representing close to a quarter of the total membership of the Conference. Tables 1-7 provide a profile of the respondents in terms of seven key variables which will be used extensively in the analysis below: sex, age, professional position, the Affiliated Professional Association (APA) to which they belong, the region in which they live, their educational degree, and their highest level of Jewish education.

Several aspects of these responses merit comment:

1. The survey did evidently reach a diverse segment of Conference members. All regions, age groups, APAs, and professional positions are represented among the respondents. This should not, however, be taken as implying that the respondents constitute a represen-

Table 1: Sex of Respondents (N = 756)

Male	59.7%
Female	38.5%
NA*	1.9%

* NA = No answer, Not available, Not applicable.

Table 2: Age of Respondents

Under 25	3.0%
25-29	14.6%
30-34	14.7%
35-39	10.8%
40-44	9.8%
45-54	17.2%
55-64	16.7%
65 and over	7.4%
NA	5.8%

Table 3: Positions Held by Respondents

Agency Director	31.1%
Assistant Director	13.1%
Supervisor/Division Head	28.2%*
Direct Practice/Line Workers	11.0%*
Consultant	3.6%
Retired	4.4%
Unemployed	0.1%
NA	8.6%

* The distinction between the categories of Supervisor/Division Head and Direct Practice/Line Worker should be viewed with some caution. In the community center field, e.g., the position of supervisor or division head is often the basic line job.

tative sample of all Jewish communal service workers. First, the membership of the Conference itself is neither all-embracing nor necessarily representative of all those working in the field. Second, it is not certain that the respon-

Table 4: Membership of Respondents in Affiliated Professional Association (APA)*

Association of Jewish Center Workers (AJCW)	31.6%
Association of Jewish Community Organization Personnel (AJCOP)	25.5%
Association of Jewish Community Relations Workers (AJCRW)	4.9%
Association of Jewish Vocational Service Professionals (AJVSP)	5.6%
Council for Jewish Education (CJE)	8.7%
National Association of Jewish Family, Children's, and Health Professionals (NAJFCHP)	10.2%
North American Association of Jewish Homes and Housing for the Aged (NAJHHA)	2.5%
National Association of Synagogue Administrators (NASA)	2.2%
Members-at-large** and No Answer	8.7%

* APA—Affiliated Professional Associations represent distinct and separate fields of service to which most CJCS members belong.

** Members-at-Large—In those instances where a worker does not fit into an existing APA, he or she may join CJCS directly.

Table 5: Regional Residence of Respondents

New York City area	18.3%
Northeast	16.7%
Middle Atlantic	13.0%
South	11.8%
Midwest	17.3%
West and Rocky Mts.	1.1%
Pacific Coast	9.8%
Canada	4.2%
Overseas	0.0%
NA	7.9%

dents constitute a true sample of Conference members. Where it is possible to compare the profile of survey respondents with the total membership of the Conference, however, the results are generally reassuring. The ratio of male to female respondents is consistent with the CJCS membership as a whole. Further, based on Conference membership figures, the response rate for all of the APAs ranged between 22% and 32%. Thus no professional group is either grossly over- or under-represented in the total respondent pool.

With these caveats in mind, it is possible to view the respondents as a broadly representative group, though one which is apparently skewed somewhat toward the more senior members of the profession. This in itself is not necessarily a major disability, since it is the more active and professionally self-conscious Jewish communal service workers who are likely to set the tone for the field as a whole.

2. The respondents constitute a professional cadre which is apparently defined by appropriate specialized training and background. The vast majority

Table 6: Educational Degrees of Respondents

Doctorate	10.3%
MSW	43.9%
MA	27.5%
BA	11.8%
Associate	0.7%
High School	0.9%
NA	4.9%

Table 7: Jewish Education of Respondents

None	5.0%
Sunday School	11.0%
Afternoon elementary Hebrew School, Heder, Talmud Torah, or folkshul	24.3%
Day School or Yeshiva (elementary or junior high level)	1.9%
Hebrew or Jewish high school (afternoon or evening)	11.4%
Day School or Yeshiva (high school)	2.4%
College of Jewish Studies, teachers college, or college-level Yeshiva	11.4%
Graduate school, rabbinical seminary or equivalent	23.7%*
Other or NA	9.0%

* This category is, unfortunately, somewhat ambiguous, since it lumps together individuals who may have had an extensive Jewish education with those who have a very limited background, but may have taken a course or two in Judaic studies as part of a graduate Jewish communal service training program.

of respondents have an advanced degree (although the survey instrument does not permit us to identify the field in all instances). The vast majority also have some Jewish education, with more than a third reporting Jewish studies at the college or post-graduate level. As we shall see below, the respondents manifest stronger than average Jewish backgrounds and levels of identification in other ways as well.

In addition to the general overview which Tables 1-7 provide, it is important as well to note several relationships among these key background variables. One issue which the Conference continues to address is the status of women within the profession. The survey indicates clearly that among the respondents women were concentrated in lower level positions. Table 8 summarizes this relationship.

Male and female respondents dif-

Table 8: Position by Percentage Female

Director	14.1%
Assistant Director	32.3%
Supervisor	54.0%
Line Worker	75.9%

ferred in other ways as well. Nearly 30% of the women responding were under 30 years of age compared with only 11% of the male respondents. Women were correspondingly under-represented in the 35-44 age bracket. (It should be noted that the different age distribution of men and women does not in itself account for the disproportionate percentage of women in lower level positions. Even controlling for age, women are less likely to be directors and assistant directors.)

Women were also more likely than men to have no or only a Sunday School level Jewish education. They were, on the other hand, just as likely as men to report a college or graduate-level Jewish educational experience. In terms of general education, women were much less likely than men to hold a doctorate (3.4% vs. 15.1%) and much more likely to list a B.A. as their highest degree (18.6% vs. 7.5%).

In assessing these figures, it should be recognized that many of the inter-relationships among variables are complex and difficult to disentangle. Women are, e.g., somewhat over-represented among respondents who are members of AJCW and NAJFCHP and thus are more likely to be working in agencies which often have a higher proportion of line workers than other settings. What emerges from the data is a clear pattern, but not a causal explanation.

Age provides a second set of interesting relationships. As a whole, it might be noted, the respondents to this survey are somewhat younger than the six hundred or so Conference members who responded to a comparable survey in the early 1970's (45% under 40 years of age in 1982 vs. 32% forty and under in the earlier survey). Among the current group, younger respondents are, as might be anticipated, less likely to occupy senior level positions, although

over the age of 35, the percentage of respondents who are agency directors is relatively constant. More interesting is the finding that 40% of those between 25 and 34 years of age have had a graduate level Jewish education. This may well indicate the growing impact of Jewish communal service programs on the field. The APAs also have somewhat different age profiles. Younger respondents are "over-represented" in AJCW and AJCOP and "under-represented" in NAJFCHP and CJE.

Background data gathered in the Conference membership survey was not limited to the seven variables listed above. Indeed, the survey provides us with a rich store of information from which to draw a fuller portrait of Jewish communal service professionals today.

We noted above the relatively high levels of Jewish identification among the respondents. Nearly four-fifths, e.g., are affiliated with a congregation (12% Orthodox, 36% Conservative, 22% Reform, and 3%, each, Traditional and Reconstructionist). This high level of current involvement may well reflect the fact that over 70% of the respondents were members of Jewish youth or student organizations at some point, and over half attended a Jewish sponsored summer camp. Involvement with Israel was similarly high. 82.7% report having visited Israel at least once. Over two-fifths have participated in an organized program in Israel, which includes three-fifths of those under age 35. Based on this data, one could conclude that the respondents indeed represent a pool of active and committed Jews who work for the Jewish community, not merely a group of communal workers who happen to be Jewish.

As the age profile of the respondents suggests, many are relative newcomers to the field (26.8% having been in it less than five years), while others are veterans (nearly 30% having worked fifteen

or more years). A slight majority have worked at some point for a non-Jewish organization or agency (over 40% have not). Finally, most of those surveyed report that they belong to at least one other professional organization and a majority also belongs to at least one other Jewish organization.

This profile of the respondents to the 1982 survey can be compared with that of the respondents to the survey of 1973. It must be remembered that neither group of respondents constitutes a random or statistical sample of Conference members, but in each case the percentage of those replying to the survey was approximately 30% of the CJCS membership, and appeared to be reasonably representative of the membership as a whole at the time. The most notable differences between the two respondent groups are to be found with respect to age distribution, professional positions held, and field of practice. More than two-fifths of those completing the 1982 survey are under 40 years of age, compared with only a third of the 1973 respondents. This age differential is reflected in the fact that the current respondent group also includes a significantly greater number of those who identified themselves as supervisor/division heads or direct practice-line workers, and a smaller percentage of agency directors. The 1982 respondents also include proportionally more Federation workers and fewer Center workers. In most other respects, the profiles of the two groups are quite similar. Whether the difference in the age profile of the respondents to the two surveys reflects a Conference membership which is younger overall today is difficult to say, but it certainly offers no call for discouragement and may be seen as boding well for the Conference as it seeks to represent the entire field and not merely its senior professionals.

The broad picture which emerges

from the background data gathered in this survey presents few surprises. The respondents are clearly diverse in many respects, and in this sense at least, certainly representative of the field. Only in terms of generally sharing high levels of Jewish involvement (something which, in effect, "comes with the territory"), could one characterize the entire respondent group as falling into a particular mold. Even here, there are substantial differences in background and denominational self-definition among the respondents. The diversity in age, position, professional field, and education makes it possible for us to raise the question of whether and how these differences express themselves in the respondents' answers to the series of attitudinal questions which constituted the major focus of the survey. To these questions we now turn.

Issues of Concern

The survey asked respondents to list the "single most crucial issue that concerns you today as a professional Jewish communal worker," and invited two additional responses if desired. The answers given were coded into five categories:

1. Issues of Jewish survival, continuity, and community
2. Issues of general welfare and society at large
3. Service or program issues related to carrying out the above objectives
4. Issues of professional development (e.g., professional standards and ethics, training, education, commitment)
5. Issues of personnel practices and standards affecting the field of Jewish communal service

Table 9 summarizes the respondents' choices for the "single most crucial issue of concern."

As the Table indicates, no single issue

Table 9: Most Crucial Issue of Concern (Category)

Jewish survival, continuity or community	34.4%
General welfare and society-at-large	5.6%
Service/program (related to carrying out above objectives)	22.6%
Professional development	12.7%
Personnel practices and standards	16.0%
NA	8.8%

dominated the concerns of the respondents, although issues of Jewish survival and community, and service/program issues (presumably) related to these concerns, were the most often cited. When the issues listed as additional concerns are included, this picture is reinforced (indeed, service/program issues are listed slightly more often than survival/community issues as additional choices). It is also clear that general social and welfare issues are least often regarded as of primary concern. Though one should not overemphasize this finding, it does seem to coincide with the "turning inward" which has become characteristic of the Jewish communal system in recent decades. (It may also reflect some ambiguity in the question itself, which might be interpreted as asking for the most important personal concern of the respondent [who is a professional] or the concern (s)he perceives as paramount within the profession (s)he is identified with.)

Do the concerns of the respondents differ with differences in sex, age, professional position, APA affiliation, region, and general and Jewish education?

Men were slightly more likely than women (37% vs. 31%) to list a Jewish survival/community issue as their greatest concern, but otherwise differences by sex are insignificant. Age seems to bear no consistent relationship to issues of concern (i.e., no pattern could be observed in the differences which did exist). Directors were more likely to list a survival/community issue and less likely to list a personnel practice issue than were other respondents. Line workers for their part were least likely to list an issue of professional development as their most crucial concern. All such differences, however, should be interpreted with great caution; indeed, it is often unclear whether they have any substantive significance at all. (Such significance often lies in the eye of the beholder, since there are no formal tests for it. Statistical tests of significance reveal only the extent to which a given difference in responses between groups is or is not likely to be the result of random variation due to sampling. These tests are not applicable to a survey of this type, nor do they indicate how "important" a difference is. In general, we have tried to report here only those differences between groups which were at least five percent.)

The same might be said about differences by APA for these questions. Table 10 summarizes the responses to the "single most crucial issue" question by APA.

At first glance there appear to be substantial differences among the members

Table 10: Single Most Crucial Issue by APA (Percentage)

APA	AJCW	AJCOP	AJCRW	AJVSP	CJE	NAJFCHP	NAJHHA	NASA	At-Large
SURVIVAL	31.0	38.9	27.0	14.3	47.0	27.3	26.3	47.1	50.0
WELFARE	3.3	3.6	0.0	16.7	0.0	14.3	10.5	5.9	7.4
SERVICE	19.2	18.7	16.2	45.2	18.2	32.5	47.4	29.4	18.5
PROF DEV	15.9	13.5	18.9	7.1	15.2	5.2	5.3	0.0	9.3
PERSONNEL	23.0	16.6	21.6	11.9	9.1	9.1	5.3	5.9	11.1
NA	7.5	8.8	16.2	4.8	10.6	11.7	5.3	11.8	3.7
(N)	(239)	(193)	(37)	(42)	(66)	(77)	(19)	(17)	(54)

of the various APAs. CJE, NASA, AJCOP, AJCW, and AJCRW members, as well as members-at-large, most often list a Jewish survival or community issue as their greatest concern; NAJHHA, AJVSP, and NAJFCHP members are most likely to list a service or program issue. Yet, this pattern is probably less a reflection of differences in substantive philosophy than of the varying professional responsibilities of members of the different APAs. We must recall that the differentiation between an issue "primarily of Jewish survival, continuity and community" and a "service/program issue to carry out objectives" related to Jewish survival or general welfare concerns is one established in the coding of open-ended responses. Whether a particular respondent framed his/her answer in broad terms or in terms of a specific programmatic issue may well reflect nothing more than the different type of work done in different types of communal agencies. Further, if we look at those respondents who cited a second and third issue of concern, we find that differences between members of the various APAs are reduced or in some instances even reversed. We should also note that in many instances the numbers of APA members responding were small, dictating caution in any interpretations. Thus, it may be more important to recognize that there was a broad distribution of responses among members of all of the APAs, than to focus on specific percentage differences.

The Annual Meeting

The Annual Meeting of the Conference of Jewish Communal Service is the oldest Jewish gathering in North America devoted to a consideration of communal welfare issues and professional concerns of the field. It has also evolved into a major gathering for the

full range of professionals working in and for Jewish agencies. Of all the elements of the program of the Conference, it is perhaps the most ambitious in its goals of providing opportunities for training, fellowship, discussion of important issues, and sharing of ideas and experiences.

The membership survey sought extensive information concerning the Annual Meeting—who has attended, how they evaluate the experience, what are their goals for the Meeting, where and when should it be held? The responses received indicate that a large portion of those who completed the survey (nearly 70%) have attended at least one Annual Meeting in the past ten years. Of these attendees, a majority have attended more than one Meeting. Table 11 summarizes the respondents' reported participation in the Conference's Annual Meeting.

As might be expected, older and more senior professionals are more likely to have attended an Annual Meeting than are younger respondents and those who categorize themselves as line workers. Given these findings, it is also not surprising that women and those holding a BA or MA degree are less likely to have attended than men and those with an MSW or doctorate. Finally, in light of the pattern of holding the Annual meeting in the East every other year and at various sites in the alternate year, we could also anticipate the finding that respondents from the South, Midwest, and West are less likely to have attended a Meeting than those working in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic regions.

Table 11: Number of Annual Meetings Attended, 1972-81

0	30.0%
1	17.5%
2-5	36.4%
6 or more	16.1%

When we turn to patterns of Annual Meeting attendance characteristic of members of the different APAs, we find some, but rarely dramatic differences. A majority of the respondents from every APA except NASA indicated that they had attended at least one Annual Meeting during the past ten years. For members of NAJFCHP and AJCW the percentage of attendees was extremely high: 81.8% and 76.2% respectively. Nearly 70% of AJCOP, CJE, and NAJHHA members reported attending at least one Meeting, while for AJCRW and AJVSP members, approximately 55% indicated participation. When we examine frequency of attendance, the patterns are similar. Among both NAJFCHP and AJCW (as well as the small number of NAJHHA) members, well over 20% of all the respondents had attended six or more Annual Meetings. For all of the APAs (excepting NASA), a substantial majority of those who had attended any Meetings had in fact attended more than one.

The success (or failure) of the Annual Meeting can be judged in several different ways. One is how the respondents feel about the current structure of the Meeting (length, number of sessions, etc.). By this criterion there is general, but not universal, satisfaction with the Annual Meeting. The vast majority of those responding (89.6%) are satisfied with the length of the Meeting, but more than a third (35.6%) feel that there are too many sessions. (NAJHHA, AJVSP, and AJCRW members are most inclined to feel this way.) A more important criterion, probably, is the qualitative evaluation of the usefulness of the Annual Meeting provided by the respondents. The picture here is roughly similar: substantial positive sentiment, with room for improvement. Table 12 summarizes respondent evaluations of the Meeting.

As these figures clearly indicate, well

Table 12: Evaluation of Annual Meeting by Respondents

	(all respondents)	(adjusted for no response)
Invaluable	4.9%	6.9%
Generally useful	37.6%	53.0%
Occasionally useful or valuable	24.6%	34.7%
Insignificant	3.4%	4.8%
Useless	0.4%	0.6%
NA	29.1%	—

over half of those in a position to respond have found the Annual Meeting to be valuable as a general rule. Only a tiny proportion evaluate the Meeting as almost entirely without value. Still, more than a third can be regarded as expressing some level of dissatisfaction in that they find the Meeting only occasionally useful. In this respect, it is appropriate that the Meeting's organizers continue to look for ways of making the experience more consistently helpful to those attending. What can be taken as somewhat reassuring is that no group or groups of respondents express unusually high levels of dissatisfaction. Those between the ages of 35 and 44 and those who have attended Jewish day schools are somewhat more likely than others to find the Annual Meeting "insignificant," but even among these respondents, a substantial majority do find the Meeting at least occasionally useful.

Several other questions were raised in the survey concerning the most desirable location, frequency, and time period for the Annual Meeting. With respect to the time of year, there was little dissatisfaction with the current late May-early June date. Fifty-six percent approve of that period, and only 16.5% disapprove. None of the alternative times suggested has any significant support. A plurality of respondents also prefers to continue the current practice of holding the Meeting on an annual basis, and alternating its site between the

East Coast and other parts of the country. In all, more than 55% rate this as their first, second, or third preference. No other option presented secured nearly as much support, although the preferences were fairly widely distributed. It is interesting to note the substantial support, but also significant opposition to holding the national Meeting bi-annually, with regional conferences during the alternate years. Support for this concept comes primarily from older respondents, while support for the concept of an Annual Meeting plus annual regional conferences is greatest among younger (and line) workers, and opposition greatest among those in senior level positions. Table 13 summarizes the responses of the entire group to this question.

With regard to location, it is not surprising that the current practice of alternating East coast and other sites has the widest support, since 35% of the respondents are from the Northeast and New York City areas. Also to be expected is the fact that respondents working on the Pacific coast are most likely to favor an East coast-West coast alternation, and that those from the Midwest and South are more likely than others to support rotating the Annual Meeting throughout the continent.

In seeking the maximum value of the Annual Meeting for those attending, one of the key questions planners must

ask is what purposes the Meeting should seek to achieve. Do Conference members want primarily to hear from experts, to discuss issues in the field, to undertake practical training, to enhance their Judaic knowledge, to seek new positions? The survey questionnaire provided respondents with an extensive opportunity to indicate which purposes were most important to them personally. Table 14 summarizes the respondents' ratings of these various purposes.

As this table indicates, there is a widespread sense among the respondents that the Annual Meeting should indeed serve a variety of purposes. Each one of the areas suggested is regarded by more than three-quarters of those surveyed as being at least somewhat important. In terms of priority of importance, there is one which clearly stands out: sharing knowledge and experience. Together with the high importance attached to exchanging ideas, this result would appear to argue for a strong emphasis at the Annual Meeting on sessions in which the professional practitioners have an opportunity to report on and discuss their work experience and the insights gained therein. In essence, the respondents strongly desire a participatory Meeting. However, there is certainly also strong support for using expert speakers on professional, Jewish, and general issues, and for ongoing efforts to highlight the Jewish dimensions of communal service.

Table 13: Preferences for Annual Meeting Site and Schedule

Preference	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	Against	NA
Option							
Annual Meeting, alternate East coast and other regions	28.6	18.9	8.1	5.3	1.7	8.1	29.4
Annual Meeting, alternate East and West coasts	6.2	11.6	11.8	6.2	2.6	18.4	41.1
Annual Meeting, rotate around North America	13.5	16.7	11.5	6.9	3.2	11.1	37.2
Annual Meeting in various locations + annual regional conferences	14.8	14.7	7.9	5.3	4.0	18.4	34.9
Meeting in alternate years, regional conferences in the "off-year"	24.1	9.1	4.4	4.6	4.9	24.1	28.2

Table 14: Importance of Annual Meeting

Degree of Importance	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not particularly important	Not At All	Not Sure/NA
PURPOSE						
Sharing knowledge	67.1%	25.9%	3.3%	0.4%	0.1%	3.2%
Learning practice skills	32.0%	32.1%	22.0%	7.0%	2.5%	4.4%
Understanding Jewish dimension	39.0%	37.2%	14.9%	4.4%	0.9%	3.6%
Exchange ideas about contemporary issues	43.9%	40.1%	9.8%	2.8%	0.0%	3.4%
Meet other professionals	35.7%	37.8%	17.9%	3.6%	0.9%	4.1%
See friends	15.1%	27.9%	30.0%	16.3%	5.3%	5.4%
Hear from experts on professional issues	33.6%	45.0%	14.7%	2.1%	0.8%	3.9%
Hear from experts on Jewish or general issues	34.4%	41.7%	15.6%	3.8%	0.7%	3.8%
Discuss personnel issues	16.3%	31.7%	29.1%	12.4%	5.7%	4.8%
Discuss opportunities for women in JCS	19.0%	23.9%	27.9%	14.7%	7.0%	7.4%
Employment clearing house	21.8%	32.4%	23.4%	10.4%	5.3%	6.7%

Thus, what emerges is a very broad programmatic mandate, ranging from providing chances to learn practical skills to discussing major issues in the field.

By comparison (and only by comparison), what might be regarded as the social and career advancement purposes of the Annual Meeting are viewed as somewhat less important by the respondent group as a whole. Though meeting other professionals is a high priority purpose, seeing friends definitely is not. Similarly, discussing personnel issues and holding job interviews are seen as important or very important purposes by only about half the respondents, in contrast to most of the other aims listed above. In light of the recent focus on this issue, special note should be taken of the relatively low priority given to discussion of opportunities for women in Jewish communal service. Here, as might be expected, female respondents held a dramatically different view than did men. While only 6.5% of the men surveyed see such discussion as a "very important" Meeting purpose, 38.5% of the women so rated it. The difference on this item is perhaps the most dramatic one in the entire survey and would seem

to indicate that considerable discussion concerning the priority of this issue remains appropriate.

Aside from this striking instance, there are a number of other areas where differences in age, sex, level of position, and educational background do appear to be reflected in somewhat different priorities with respect to the Annual Meeting. Younger professionals are more concerned than their older colleagues with using the Meeting to learn new skills and as a clearinghouse for employment opportunities. Given the larger percentage of women in their ranks, it is not surprising that they are also somewhat more likely to rate discussion of opportunities for women an important priority than older respondents. Women, in turn, are as a group more likely than men to view learning skills and employment-related activities as important purposes.

Again, in light of the strong associations between age, sex, and position, we should not be surprised to find some differences in assigning priorities to the various proposed Annual Meeting purposes among those at various levels of professional responsibility. Indeed, in some areas, e.g., the importance as-

signed to hearing experts, as well as the expected areas of seeking employment and discussing women's opportunities, those in line worker positions do accord the proposed purposes greater importance. Yet, in terms of the overall ranking of purposes for the Annual Meeting, there is considerable comparability at all levels. Table 15 illustrates this, using a rank order computed from a score reflecting the mean level of importance assigned to a particular item.

The similarities in rank ordering are striking. Clearly, there is no dramatic gap between what those at different professional levels are seeking from the Annual Meeting.

The same finding generally holds true with respect to the priorities of members of the different APAs, as illustrated in Table 16.

The differences here are somewhat greater than those by position, but, again, rarely seem to indicate broad disagreements about Meeting goals. No APA is shown to have dramatically different priorities than the other affiliates of the Conference. For all, the collegial and learning dimensions of the Annual Meeting seem to be of prime importance, with other goals generally occupying a lower position of priority.

Educational background too seems to make little difference in shaping the priorities of respondents for the Annual Meeting. The sole significant difference discovered is the much lower emphasis which those holding a Ph.D. give to learning new practice skills. Otherwise, we again find a substantial degree of consensus among respondents regardless of their highest level of general or Jewish education.

In sum, the planners of the Conference of Jewish Communal Service's Annual Meeting can with considerable assurance view the priorities of the respondents to this survey as widely shared across the entire field. The members of the Conference value the Annual Meeting as a forum for sharing knowledge and for educating themselves and their colleagues. The major challenge is to ensure that the Meeting is effective in fulfilling these purposes and to try to broaden the participation of workers at every level, from every region, and from every element of the field.

Conference Publications

Perhaps the single most visible aspect of the work of the Conference of Jewish Communal Service is its publication of

Table 15: Ranking of Annual Meeting Purposes by Position

Position	Director	Asst. Director	Supervisor	Line Worker
PURPOSE				
Sharing knowledge	1	1	1	1
Learning skills	7	7	6	5
Understanding Jewish dimension	3	4	4	5
Exchange ideas	2	2	2	2
Meet other professionals	6	3	3	7
See friends	10	8	11	11
Hear from experts on professional issues	4	4	4	2
Hear from experts on Jewish or general issues	4	6	6	4
Discuss personnel issues	8	10	10	10
Discuss opportunities for women	11	10	9	9
Employment clearing house	8	8	8	8

JOURNAL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

Table 16: Ranking of Annual Meeting Purposes by APA

APA	AJCW	AJCOP	AJCRW	AJVSP	CJE	NAJFCHP	NAJHHA	NASA
PURPOSE								
Sharing knowledge	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Learning skills	7	7	8	4	7	6	6	5
Understanding Jewish dimension	6	3	5	7	2	3	2	6
Exchange ideas	2	2	2	2	5	2	3	4
Meet other professionals	3	5	3	6	6	7	7	7
See friends	10	10	11	11	10	9	10	11
Hear from experts on professional issues	4	4	6	3	4	5	4	2
Hear from experts on Jewish or general issues	5	6	7	5	3	4	5	2
Discuss personnel issues	9	9	10	9	8	11	8	8
Discuss opportunities for women	11	11	9	10	11	8	11	10
Employment clearing house	8	8	4	8	9	10	9	9

the *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*. Over 96% of the survey respondents report receiving the *Journal*. What is more important, the vast majority of members appear to read at least a substantial portion of the *Journal*. The survey also attempted to determine what *type* of articles were most frequently read.

These figures indicate a not surprising tendency on the part of many respondents to be most interested in articles which deal with their own field of practice, but they also reveal a broad interest among those answering in those issues which touch the field and the Jewish community as a whole. It should be noted that there are some differences in these patterns of readership among the members of the various APAs. With the caution that the numbers responding for some APAs are small, we can, e.g., find some evidence that AJCRW members tend to read less of the *Journal* than members of other APAs. They are also least likely to read articles dealing with

fields of practice other than their own. On the other hand, as might be anticipated, AJCRW members are the most likely to read articles dealing with public affairs and Jewish community issues, which constitute, in effect, their field of practice. In general, differences among the members of the various APAs in their patterns of reading the *Journal* are rarely dramatic, and may reflect the typical content of *Journal* issues more than any intrinsic differences in the degree of identification with the publication as a professional resource.

The same might be said with respect to the evaluations which members of the various APAs give to the *Journal*. Overall, about a third of the respondents rate the quality of the *Journal* as much or somewhat higher than that of other journals in their field. Another two-fifths view the *Journal* as "about the same" in quality. Only about 12% feel that the *Journal* is lower in quality than other

Table 17: Portion of Journal Read by Respondents

All	8.3%
Most	37.6%
Some	38.1%
Little	11.8%
None	0.7%
NA	3.6%

Table 18: Percentage of Respondents Reading Various Types of Articles

Articles dealing with own field of practice	86.1%
Articles dealing with other fields	34.4%
Articles on public affairs and/or Jewish community issues	72.1%
Articles about trends within Jewish communal services	70.9%

professional journals (14% are not sure or did not respond). The most positive assessments of the *Journal* were given by the members of NASA, AJVSP, and NAJHHA. Since a comparative assessment was asked for, it is not clear how these results should be interpreted. What is perhaps more significant is that for no APA was the percentage of respondents rating the *Journal* as lower in quality than others in the field greater than 16%. (Members at large did tend to be somewhat more negative in their evaluation, with more than 20% giving the *Journal* a "lower quality" rating; on the other hand, even among this group of respondents, 37% regarded the *Journal* as of "higher quality" than other professional journals.) On what is, in effect, the "bottom line" question—how important is the publication of the *Journal* for the Conference—there was also substantial agreement of response among the members of the different APAs: Overall, three-fifths of the respondents regarded publication of the *Journal* as "essential" and another 35% as "desirable." Only among the small number of NASA members responding (17), did fewer than half the members of any APA view publication as "essential," with virtually all the rest regarding such publication as desirable.

The variations in reading patterns and evaluations of the *Journal* may, however, reflect other differences among the respondents. Line workers, e.g., are somewhat less likely to read larger portions of the *Journal* than are those occupying other positions. They also tend to be less prepared to evaluate the quality of the *Journal* in a comparative context. Both findings likely reflect the relative inexperience of these workers. They are, however, just as likely as other workers to regard continued publication of the *Journal* as essential for the Conference, and indeed, nearly a fifth indicated that they would like to see the

Journal published on a monthly basis. (Overall, more than three-quarters of those responding want the *Journal* to continue to be published quarterly, with 9% opting each for monthly and semi-annual publication.)

Age, per se, seems to have relatively little consistent relationship to reading patterns and evaluation of the *Journal*, except that here too, the youngest respondents were most likely to want the *Journal* published on a monthly basis. Likewise, there is no distinction between women and men in their patterns of response (though more than twice as many women were unsure in their evaluation of the quality of the *Journal*). Respondents with a BA were consistently less likely than others to read the various categories of articles listed, had a higher percentage reporting that they read little of the *Journal*, and a lower percentage (46%) who viewed publication of the *Journal* as essential for the Conference. Those with a doctorate, on the other hand, were generally more likely than others to be somewhat critical in their evaluation of the quality of the *Journal*, but, together with those holding an MSW, most likely to regard publication of the *Journal* as essential. The only findings of note when respondents are broken down by level of Jewish education are a slight tendency for those with no Jewish education to read less of the *Journal* than others and the fact that a smaller than average percentage among this group (45%) and a larger than average percentage among those with an afternoon high school, college, or graduate level Jewish education (approximately two-thirds) view publication of the *Journal* as essential for the Conference.

These data can be interpreted as a general endorsement of the *Journal* by a large segment of the respondents (broad readership, positive evaluation, support for continued publication).

Judging by the survey, the Conference has met with somewhat less success in its publication of a sizable reader—*The Turbulent Decades*—containing articles culled from the *Journal* written over the past twenty-five years. About half of the respondents have the two volume set of books, but fewer than 10% of these have read all or most of them, and more than a fifth, none at all. This degree of utilization may not in itself indicate that the books are without value, since many of the purchasers likely regard them as reference tools, not as “straight reading.”

No question was asked calling for an evaluation of the volumes, so it is not possible to determine how well they have been received. When respondents are broken down by the various background variables used for analytic purposes, several relationships can be noted. Whereas three-fifths of the directors and assistant directors surveyed reported owning *The Turbulent Decades*, only 35% of supervisors and 29% of line workers had the volumes. Since position is related, as we have seen, both to age and sex, it is also true that women and younger respondents were less likely than men and those above the age of 35 to have the books. In addition, those with a doctorate or an MSW are about 20 percentage points more likely to have *The Turbulent Decades* than those with an MA or BA (57% vs. 37%). Finally, respondents who have no Jewish education are much less likely than those with some Jewish education to own the volumes.

While these findings do not seem difficult to explain (especially since many of the background variables are themselves related), their significance can really only be determined in reference to the Conference’s goals in publishing this collection of articles. If the books were to serve a “continuing education” function for those at less advanced levels in the field, they do not yet seem to have

had a major impact. On the other hand, with more senior workers, the volumes appear to have received relatively broad acceptance, as a resource for one’s professional library, if not as required reading (or re-reading as the case may be).

The third Conference publication addressed in the survey is the newsletter *Concurrents*, which is published three times a year. Just over three-quarters of those surveyed indicated that they receive *Concurrents*, about 13% claimed they did not, and 10% were unsure or did not respond. Clearly, a relatively substantial portion of the Conference membership may not be fully aware of this publication. Among those who do receive it, however, it is evidently popular: More than half of these respondents “always” read it, and about another third read it “fairly often.” Of the total pool of respondents, more than a quarter would like to see *Concurrents* published at least five times a year, and fewer than 10% want its frequency of publication reduced. While only a fifth of all those surveyed would characterize the continuation of *Concurrents* as “essential,” another 47% regarded it as “desirable,” and less than 4% viewed its continuation as “undesirable.”

This pattern holds true in broad terms for members of all of the APAs. There are some differences in the degree of support for continued publication, but these are minor. And, while the percentage of those who indicate that they always read *Concurrents* ranges from well over 50% for members of NAJHHA, AJCOP, and AJCRW to under 40% for members of AJVSP, NAJFCHP, NASA, and CJE, these differences seem in several instances to reflect primarily differences in the proportion of each group which receives the newsletter. A similar pattern can be observed with respect to position. Here, directors and assistant directors are

more likely to report receiving *Concurrents* than supervisors or line workers, and also are more likely "always" to read it. But among those with an opinion, respondents are nearly equally likely to endorse continued publication of the newsletter regardless of position. When those responding to the survey are broken down by sex and educational degree, the pattern is again essentially the same: men and those with doctorates or an MSW are more likely to receive *Concurrents* and to always read it, but all groups support its continued publication at roughly equivalent levels. Finally, while region of employment has no apparent relationship to readership or general support for *Concurrents*, it is interesting to note that respondents in the Midwest, West, and Pacific Coast areas are more likely than those from other regions to want to see the newsletter published at least five times a year.

Local Frameworks and Educational Programs

One of the most important concerns of the Conference and of the field of Jewish communal service in general in recent years has been the development of frameworks for professional exchange and continuing education for workers within local communities. These frameworks are typically either local chapters of the CJCS or *ad hoc* groupings across APA lines which come together to listen to speakers, discuss issues of Jewish or professional concern, or engage in some form of Jewish study. The membership survey indicated that such groups and programs are now fairly common, although many members still either do not have access to such activities, do not participate, or are unaware whether such opportunities exist in their own communities.

Forty-three percent of all those responding reported that a local community-wide "forum" or "chapter"

of Jewish communal workers exists in their community. Slightly over a third of the respondents reported that such a framework does not currently exist, and a bit more than a quarter were either unsure or did not respond. In those places where a local framework exists, the most common pattern seems to be for it to meet several times a year, with some groups meeting on a monthly basis, and a number infrequently. These frameworks appear to be most active in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic regions, and least common in the West, South, and Midwest (where the "density" of Jewish communal professionals is lower). It should be noted that although some individual APAs conduct programs for their members working in New York City, there is no overall local framework for CJCS members in New York. This probably helps to account for the fact that workers in the New York City metropolitan area were the least likely to know whether professional frameworks existed in their locality, with nearly half responding "not sure" to the question.

Survey respondents were also asked whether their local community had ever offered a program of courses in continuing Jewish education for professionals. Here, 50.3% responded affirmatively, 23.4% negatively, and 26.3% either did not know or did not respond. For the year 1981-82 (when the survey was undertaken), 35.1% indicated that a continuing education program was available, 33.6% that none was being held that year, and 31.3% not sure or not responding. In all of these figures (including those relating to the existence of local frameworks), perhaps the most significant question relates to those respondents (generally about 20%) who answered "not sure." Whether this lack of awareness concerning the availability of such activities in their community indicates a lower degree of identification

with the field, with the goals of such programs, or simply (as the figure for New York City cited above might suggest) a greater difficulty in getting information due to community size, is difficult to say. What does seem apparent is that more intensive efforts may be needed to promote awareness of such programs among workers where they do exist if participation is to be maximized.

The assumption that local continuing education or chapter activities would be favorably received by most professionals (assuming access to and awareness of these programs) is borne out by the responses to the two final questions in this section. The survey asked how frequently respondents participate in meetings or educational programs of this kind. Leaving aside the approximately 30% who either did not respond or indicated that no such programs were currently available to them, more than two-fifths of the remaining respondents reported that they "almost always" or "often" attend such programs. An additional 48.5% attend "sometimes" or "infrequently," while only a bit over 10% indicated that they never attend. While these are by no means overwhelming figures, they do suggest that such programs have a reasonably broad base of participation, even if that participation is somewhat inconsistent.

The broad support for local frameworks and continuing education activities (at least in the abstract) is confirmed by the responses to the final question posed in this area. Over half the respondents (50.5%) indicated that they viewed having such activities in their local community as "essential," and another 38.2% regarded them as "desirable but not essential." Clearly, a mandate exists for the continuation of efforts to promote these activities; the challenge is to ensure that they are fully utilized.

Current patterns of participation in and support for local frameworks and continuing education are not entirely uniform across the several background variables employed in the analysis of the survey. In part, differences in the extent of participation probably reflect differences in the availability of such programs. Agency directors, e.g., were much more likely than those occupying other professional positions to indicate that no local chapter or educational program was available in their community (quite possibly because many come from smaller communities where the percentage of workers who are directors is higher). Thus, the figures which indicate that they were less likely to participate in such activities on a regular or occasional basis than were assistant directors or supervisors must be viewed with some caution. Line workers had the highest level of uncertainty as to whether these programs were available (as well as a large percentage indicated that they were not), and this lack of awareness may account at least in part for their relatively low reported level of participation. The survey results do indicate, however, that line workers and supervisors are in general somewhat more supportive of the need for local frameworks and educational programs than are directors and assistant directors (approximately 55% calling such activities "essential" vs. 45% of directors and assistant directors).

Regional factors may also play a role in shaping patterns of participation and support. Workers in the New York City area (understandably, in light of the absence of an overall CJCS local framework) were by far the least frequent participants in such programs. (As we have seen above, there was also a high degree of uncertainty among New York metropolitan area workers about even the availability of these activities.) This, plus other unique characteristics of the

region (high proportion of older workers, consultants and retirees), make the low levels of participation predictable. Having said this, it should also be noted that workers in the NYC area were on average only slightly less supportive of such programs than their colleagues (44.2% viewing them as "essential" vs. a mean for all respondents of 50.5%). The New York metropolitan area would, then, seem to be a prime target region for the initiation and expansion of local Conference programming and educational activities.

Differences in patterns of participation by members of the various APAs are also somewhat complex. AJCW and AJCOP members were most likely to indicate that there are no local frameworks or educational programs in their communities. (Again, in smaller communities, a Federation and/or a Center may well be the only agencies.) However, the reported frequency of participation in such activities by AJCW and AJCOP members is actually higher (albeit slightly) than that for members of most other APAs (AJVSP members were most likely overall to indicate that they "almost always" or "often" participate). In general, the differences in frequency of participation among the members of the different APAs were not substantial, although AJCRW and NAJHHA members were the most likely to indicate that they "never" participate. This picture of minimal variation is reinforced when we look at the extent of support for local frameworks and continuing education among the members of the several APAs. Here we find almost no differences of any significance, with between 46% and 53% of the members of each APA viewing such programs as "essential." It is safe to conclude that support for local professional frameworks and activities is thus not only broad, but consistent across the field of Jewish communal service.

Two other variables are worth examining in relationship to participation in and support for local frameworks and continuing education programs: age and sex. With respect to both frequency of participation and extent of support for such activities, there is a slight distinction between respondents under and over 45 years of age, with those under that age somewhat more likely to take part in such programs and to view their availability as "essential." Women are also more likely to participate "almost always" or "often" than men (33% vs. 25%), and to regard these activities as "essential" (57.4% vs. 46.3%). Given the interrelationships among the various background variables which we have seen earlier, these findings are not surprising. Taken together with all of the other data reported here, however, they appear to confirm the impression that, if anything, the "market" for local professional activities for Jewish communal workers will be expanding, and that this is indeed an area for the Conference to promote vigorously.

Social Action by Jewish Communal Workers

Since its inception, the Conference of Jewish Communal Service has constituted a vehicle through which professional Jewish communal workers have been able to speak out on vital issues affecting the welfare of the Jewish and general communities. Do current members continue to regard such action as appropriate, and if so for what types of issues?

The membership survey posed several questions in this area. The first was a broad one: "In general do you feel that it is appropriate for professionals as a group to speak out on public affairs or Jewish communal issues by such means as issuing statements to the media or sponsoring public forums?" A large majority (59.9%) of those answering re-

sponded affirmatively. Most of the remainder (31.1%) gave a qualified response: "it depends." Only 3.8% felt such action was inappropriate, and the remainder of the respondents either were unsure or did not answer. On this question there was some variation among members of the several APAs, with NAJFCHP, CJE, and members-at-large having the largest percentage of affirmative responses (70%+) and AJCOP and AJCRW members the lowest (48.6%). Only among AJCRW members, however, was there a substantial portion of respondents who opposed speaking out in all instances (16.2% vs. no more than 6.7% for any other APA.) The relative reluctance of these respondents to approve of such action may well reflect a caution bred of experience in having to deal as the "community's spokesperson" with often difficult public issues. Even here, however, it is important to note that nearly half of the AJCRW members approved of professionals speaking out as a group on these issues.

Differences on other background variables also appear to have some correlation with responses on this question. Line workers are somewhat less likely to approve speaking out as a general rule than workers in other positions (49.4% vs. 59.9% for all respondents), and retired workers and consultants (each less than 5% of the total number of respondents) somewhat more likely (69.7% and 77.8% respectively). Respondents from the New York City area were more likely to regard such action as appropriate and those from the South, the West, and Canada less likely than the respondent pool as a whole. Men were slightly more likely to respond affirmatively than women (61.9% vs. 56.0%), and those 45 years of age and older more likely than those under 45. Again, however, it must be noted that most of these differences were small, and reflect deviations from a

broad consensus, rather than clear and sharp divisions among the respondents.

The survey did not limit itself to asking about the appropriateness of professionals speaking out on public issues in general terms. It also asked about the appropriateness of social action by groups of professional Jewish communal workers or organizations representing them in a variety of specific issue areas: a) general social, economic, or political issues; b) public issues of identifiably Jewish concern; c) general foreign affairs issues; d) international issues affecting Israel or World Jewry; e) Jewish community issues; f) professional issues in social work, education, or other fields of practice; and g) professional issues in Jewish communal service. Table 19 summarizes the responses to these questions.

The pattern of responses is both consistent and revealing. The members surveyed are clearly supportive of organized social action by Jewish communal service professionals in those areas where they can claim special competence and/or concern. Logically, the most important of these issues areas is that of Jewish communal service itself. Here, an overwhelming majority of respondents (nearly four out of five) believe that organized social action is almost always appropriate. More than two thirds of the respondents feel similarly concerning Jewish community issues and public issues of Jewish concern. Somewhat fewer, but still almost three-fifths, of the respondents approve of social action with respect to international issues affecting Israel or world Jewry and issues in the general fields of practice with which Jewish communal service professionals often identify. Only minorities of the respondents would countenance group social action under nearly all circumstances on general social, political, economic and foreign affairs issues.

Table 19: *Appropriateness of Social Action by Jewish Communal Workers on Various Issues*

ISSUE	Almost Always Appropriate	Sometimes Appropriate	Rarely Appropriate	Never Appropriate	Not Sure/NA
General social, economic, or political issues	35.1%	47.1%	10.2%	2.2%	5.5%
Public issues of Jewish concern	69.7%	23.0%	2.9%	0.7%	3.7%
General foreign affairs issues	15.5%	47.0%	25.4%	6.3%	5.8%
International issues affecting Israel or world Jewry	59.3%	29.4%	6.6%	0.9%	3.8%
Jewish community issues	69.6%	23.9%	2.8%	0.5%	3.1%
Professional social work or education issues	58.2%	35.8%	2.5%	0.4%	3.1%
Professional Jewish Communal Service issues	79.6%	15.5%	1.3%	0.1%	3.4%

The broad support for an activist posture which we noted above in the question on "speaking out" on public issues is obviously reaffirmed here for all of those areas which touch directly on the respondents' Jewish and professional identities. Even with respect to those general issues where there is some reluctance to view social action as always appropriate, a substantial majority agrees that such activity is appropriate at least some of the time. Only in regard to general foreign affairs issues is there a sizeable minority which declines to approve of group action under nearly all circumstances.

Differences among respondents which might be correlated with the several background variables examined are even less substantial here than with respect to the general question on the appropriateness of speaking out discussed above. AJCRW members are in general somewhat more reluctant than members of the other APAs to endorse social action as "always appropriate," but the differences are not usually dramatic. Professional position seems to have little correlation with willingness to endorse social action, nor is there a consistent pattern of relationships with respect to age and sex. Respondents with a doc-

torate are somewhat more likely than other workers to view social action as "always appropriate" with respect to most of the issue areas listed, but no other distinctions based on educational background are consistently significant. Thus, we are again looking at a situation in which the data point to idiosyncratic and individual characteristics as the basis for differences in viewpoint among the respondents, rather than the consistent impact of background factors such as APA affiliation, position, age, or education. The overall import of the survey results is a clear endorsement of the appropriateness of "social action" (that term, unfortunately, being itself somewhat vague) on those issues which bear directly on the welfare of the Jewish community and on the professional activities of Conference members.

Areas of Professional Concern

Perhaps no area of the membership survey is more significant for the future directions of the Conference and the field of Jewish communal service than that which asked respondents to identify their major areas of concern as professionals. The survey listed sixteen such areas and asked those responding to

rank the significance of each for him/herself as a Jewish communal worker. Table 20 presents the results of this section of the survey.

The initial impression one receives in examining this data is one of broad and serious concern with a wide range of issues affecting both individual practitioners and Jewish communal service as a whole. Only two areas of concern out of the sixteen listed are not regarded as either "very important" or "important" by at least half the respondents: professional or "white-collar" unions and professional organizations in the general community. (The latter finding may be a revealing indication of the extent to which Jewish communal service, rather than a "general" professional identity, has become the primary focus of professional self-identification for many of the survey respondents.) For all of the other issues there are sizable, and sometimes enormous, majorities who regard them as at least

"important" areas of concern. (In saying this, it should be acknowledged that questions of the sort used on the survey tend to produce highly positive evaluations of the significance of the items listed. When a respondent indicates that a particular issue is "very important," that does not, of course, tell us what degree of effort he or she is prepared to put into dealing with it personally and certainly does not reveal what course of action he or she would like to see undertaken. Thus, while absolute levels of concern should not be ignored, it is the comparative ranking of different areas which is probably the most revealing aspect of the data.)

The issue which stands out as "very important" to the largest percentage of respondents (64.6%) is "professional standards and practices." The two other areas rated as "very important" by an absolute majority of respondents are "standards for personnel practices and benefits" and a "code of ethics for pro-

Table 20: Areas of Professional Concern by Degree of Importance

ISSUE:	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not particularly Important	Not important At All	Not Sure/NA
Professional standards and practices	64.6%	27.1%	3.3%	1.2%	0.3%	3.5%
Entrance qualifications	48.4%	32.4%	12.0%	3.3%	0.4%	3.4%
Accreditation standards	32.7%	34.3%	19.0%	7.7%	1.5%	4.9%
Personnel practice and benefits standards	55.4%	30.2%	9.5%	1.1%	0.1%	3.7%
Benefit programs	43.3%	34.3%	15.1%	3.7%	0.5%	3.2%
Professional code of ethics	51.1%	30.3%	10.8%	3.0%	1.1%	3.7%
Job security	44.4%	32.8%	14.2%	3.3%	0.8%	4.5%
Professional rights	44.2%	34.5%	13.5%	2.1%	0.7%	5.0%
Continuing professional education	47.9%	35.1%	11.2%	2.1%	0.1%	3.6%
Continuing Jewish education for professionals	46.2%	32.0%	15.1%	2.6%	0.5%	3.6%
Opportunities for interdisciplinary exchange	30.7%	27.7%	21.3%	5.0%	1.1%	4.2%
Professional training	41.3%	39.0%	13.1%	1.7%	0.5%	4.4%
Schools of JCS	33.1%	30.7%	22.0%	6.5%	2.0%	5.8%
Lay-professional relations	39.3%	37.4%	14.6%	3.0%	0.9%	4.8%
Professional unions	13.8%	22.9%	23.0%	20.6%	10.4%	9.3%
Professional organizations in general community	14.3%	28.6%	29.6%	13.4%	3.4%	10.7%

professionals." A number of additional issues were ranked as "very important" by more than two-fifths of those responding: qualifications and standards for entering the field, continuing professional education, continuing Jewish education for professionals, job security, rights of professionals, benefit programs (such as tax shelters, long-term disability insurance, life insurance, etc.), and professional training. All of these issues appear to relate to two fundamental concerns: establishing norms and expectations for workers in the field and providing those rewards and benefits which those who are recognized as professionals in turn have the right to expect from their employers. Without attempting to read too much into the data, it might be said that "professionalization" of the field of Jewish communal service appears to be a dominant concern of many respondents at this time. This does not necessarily mean that Jewish communal service per se is being treated as a single profession; but it does mean that many in the field appear to be eager to impose upon themselves the responsibilities and claim the rights which are generally associated with the status of being members of a recognized profession.

A key question in this regard is the extent to which the attributions of significance to the several issue areas are generally similar among the various segments of the respondent pool. Among the members of the different APAs there is substantial, although not total, commonality. Members of the CJE, NAJFCHP, and NAJHHA were more likely than other respondents to view professional standards, standards for entrance, and accreditation standards as "very important" issues. CJE members were also more likely than other workers to view a professional code of ethics, job security, continuing Jewish education, and rights of profes-

sionals as "very important." AJVSP and NAJHHA members were less likely than others to rank schools of Jewish communal service and continuing Jewish education as "very important" concerns. (AJVSP members were also most likely to so rank professional organizations in the general community.) AJCOP, and to a lesser extent AJCW and NASA, members were the most likely to view lay-professional relations as a "very important" professional issue.

As we have noted earlier in this report, differences of this sort are by and large explicable in terms of the nature of the work which different members of the field engage in and the organizational and professional environments to which they must relate. The extent of commonality and the differences in professional concerns which prevail among the members of the various APAs can be visualized in another way by comparing the rank ordering of the sixteen issues in terms of importance (calculated as a mean score) for each of the APAs. This is done in Table 21.

On more than a few issues, there is broad agreement with regard to priority of significance among the members of many, if not all, of the APAs. (Because of "ties" in the rank ordering of individual items among the members of each APA, there may be even closer agreement than a quick comparison of the numbers would appear to indicate. An item ranked "9" for one APA and "5" for another might actually be only one rank order apart depending upon the configuration of "ties" in each listing.) In comparative terms, members of each APA do tend to have a small number of special concerns or non-concerns of their own (e.g., continuing Jewish education for CJE members, lay-professional relations for AJCOP and AJCRW members, professional training for members of AJVSP), but they also tend to share their evaluations of the

JOURNAL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

Table 21: Ranking of Professional Issues by APA

	AJCW	AJCOP	ACJRW	AJVSP	CJE	NAJFCHP	NAJHHA	NASA
Professional standards and practices	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
Entrance qualifications	5	6	3	8	4	2	2	10
Accreditation standards	12	14	14	13	6	5	4	13
Personnel practice and benefits standards	1	2	1	2	4	3	4	3
Benefit programs	5	6	3	10	6	12	9	2
Professional code of ethics	3	6	9	2	1	5	3	3
Job security	3	11	9	5	6	8	9	6
Professional rights	5	6	3	5	6	8	9	6
Continuing professional education	5	2	3	8	6	3	4	10
Continuing Jewish education for professionals	10	5	3	11	1	8	13	9
Opportunities for interdisciplinary exchange	12	13	13	5	12	13	9	13
Professional training	5	6	9	2	11	5	7	3
Schools of JCS	12	12	12	15	12	14	14	10
Lay-professional relations	10	2	3	11	14	8	7	6
Professional unions	16	16	15	16	15	16	16	16
Professional organizations in general community	15	15	15	13	16	15	15	15

significance of a large number of the issues listed. Thus, the survey clearly indicates that there are field-wide concerns which many professional Jewish communal workers may well be prepared to address as such.

APA membership is not, of course, the only variable to be examined in relationship to the ranking of professional concerns. The survey data do reveal other patterns of interest. With respect to several issues, e.g., there is an inverse correlation between seniority of position and the importance attributed to that concern (i.e., line workers are most likely to rate the concern "very important," supervisors next, then assistant directors, and directors least likely). This pattern holds for rights of professionals, continuing professional education, continuing Jewish education, opportunities for interdisciplinary exchange, professional training, schools of Jewish communal service, and professional unions. Here again, though, it

should be noted that the differences are slight. Regional, age, and sex variations were also found. Respondents from the South and those between the ages of 35-39 were less likely to regard a number of the listed issues as "very important" than other workers. On the other hand, women and respondents 25-29 years of age were more likely to rate many of the areas of concern as "very important" to them personally. Not unexpectedly, perhaps, respondents with a BA degree only tended to be less likely to view entrance standards into the field, schools of Jewish communal service, and standards for accreditation as "very important." Level of Jewish education appears to relate to degree of concern for the several issues listed in a number of respects, not all easily explicable. Respondents with no Jewish education were, understandably if regrettably, least likely to regard continuing Jewish education as "very important," and those with a day high

school, college, or graduate level education were the most likely. So too, those who had college or graduate level Judaic studies were most likely to view schools of Jewish communal service as "very important." Less understandable is the finding that those respondents who reported having an afternoon high school level Jewish education were somewhat less likely than others to regard a series of professional concerns as "very important."

It is not clear what to make of these patterns of difference. Collectively, they may point to a somewhat greater expressed concern for addressing a number of professional issues on the part of those currently at the "entrances" to the field—i.e., women, those in lower level positions, very young workers—but apparently committed to making their careers in it. Once more, however, we should conclude by recalling the starting point for all of these breakdowns: a deep concern on the part of the large majority of those surveyed with a range of issues which bespeaks their commitment to high professional standards of training and conduct and a corresponding interest in securing the rights and benefits to which they feel entitled as professionals.

Inclusion of Other Professionals within the Conference

The Conference of Jewish Communal Service includes in its membership only a portion of all those whose professional work relates directly to the Jewish community and its welfare. Some groups—e.g., Jewish educators—are partially affiliated with the Conference through an existing APA, the Council for Jewish Education, to which many senior level educators belong, but which includes relatively few rank and file teachers and in general has enrolled only a small percentage of all those individuals profes-

sionally involved in Jewish education. Others, e.g., rabbis or Jewish academics, have not historically been part of the Conference as a group, although individual rabbis and academics may be members. In charting its future directions, one of the decisions which the leadership of the Conference must make is whether to intensify efforts to reach out to groups of professional Jewish communal workers who are unaffiliated or only partly affiliated with the Conference and its APAs. Linked to this decision is the question of which groups to target as priorities for outreach endeavors. The membership survey addressed these issues in a series of questions in which respondents were asked to indicate how important they felt it was to have various professional groups organized within the Conference of Jewish Communal Service (either directly or through the APAs).

Table 22 reports the results on these questions.

In broad terms, these results would appear to provide a clear mandate for outreach efforts to nearly all of the groups cited. For eight out of the eleven groups, a majority of the survey respondents regard inclusion within the Conference as either "crucial" or "important." For only two of the professional categories—rabbis and synagogue administrators—did as many as 10% of the respondents view inclusion as "not desirable."

Three professional groups stand out as priority targets for outreach efforts: workers in Jewish housing for the aged, professionals in Jewish youth organizations, and professionals serving Jewish college students. For each of these groups, approximately three-quarters of the respondents indicated that they felt that inclusion within the Conference was "essential" or "important." In a sense, this strong endorsement of inclusion of these workers is

JOURNAL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

Table 22: Importance of Including Groups of Professionals within CJCS

	Crucial	Important	Desirable but not Essential	Not Desirable	Not Sure	NA
PROFESSIONAL GROUP						
Professionals serving						
Jewish college students	26.3%	48.4%	15.1%	1.7%	0.9%	7.5%
Professors of Jewish studies	11.1%	39.2%	32.9%	7.0%	2.2%	7.6%
Rabbis	14.4%	28.4%	31.7%	14.9%	2.4%	8.1%
Synagogue administrators	11.6%	31.3%	35.2%	10.4%	3.0%	8.4%
Jewish housing for						
the aged workers	27.8%	50.1%	13.2%	1.1%	1.1%	6.7%
Jewish hospital workers	20.0%	43.8%	22.8%	3.7%	1.6%	8.2%
Hebrew, religious and day school educators	16.9%	37.6%	27.1%	8.2%	2.2%	7.9%
Professionals in Zionist and Israel related agencies	15.9%	39.0%	27.1%	6.7%	2.8%	8.5%
Professionals in applied research	17.7%	42.2%	25.7%	4.0%	2.2%	8.2%
Professionals in adult membership organizations	13.4%	34.4%	32.4%	9.1%	2.6%	7.9%
Professionals in Jewish youth organizations	27.8%	45.4%	15.6%	2.4%	0.8%	8.0%

unsurprising. Of all the professional categories listed, they are the ones which come closest to the traditional emphases of the field (i.e., they clearly "fit the mold" of the professional Jewish communal worker), and the groups with which they work are high priority groups on the Jewish communal agenda.

Some of the other professional categories listed may be seen as introducing more problematic elements, either in terms of the focus of their professional work (teaching of Judaica) or its locus (the synagogue or other "sub-communal" agencies). (Interestingly, the inclusion of applied researchers in the Jewish community was regarded as "crucial" or "important" by nearly three-fifths of the respondents. It is, therefore, not only direct service workers who are seen as especially appropriate targets for outreach.)

Once again, we must recall that we are speaking of differences in the degree of priority accorded the various professional categories, not major substantive disagreements as to the appropriateness of their incorporation into the Conference. Even with respect to the groups

commanding the least support for inclusion—rabbis and synagogue administrators—there is a substantial majority who view their involvement within the Conference as at least desirable. From this perspective, what the survey results endorse is a wall-to-wall Conference, one which embraces virtually every category of professional involved in serving the Jewish community.

(Some note should perhaps be taken of one additional element of the findings reported above. Two groups which were not ranked especially high as priority targets for expanded inclusion—Jewish educators and synagogue administrators—are already represented in the Conference through APAs. These APAs, the CJE and NASA, do not by any means include all those who fall into the categories of educator and synagogue administrator. It would appear, however, that some interpretive work within the Conference by these APAs, reaffirming their place within the universe of Jewish communal service, might be important.)

As we have previously, we should also look briefly at the relationships between

several of the background variables probed in the survey and the respondents' attitudes concerning inclusion of the various professional groups listed. Once more, a comparison among members of the different APAs is most revealing because of the relative absence of sharp differences. In a few instances there are particular priorities which might well be expected. Members of CJE, e.g., are much more likely than those of other APAs to view inclusion of Jewish educators as "crucial" or "important." They are also somewhat more supportive of outreach to professors of Jewish studies and college campus professionals. As might be anticipated, NASA members are by far the most likely to regard inclusion of synagogue administrators as important for the Conference. Similarly, members of NAJHHA and, to a slightly lesser extent, AJVSP are the most eager to include workers in Jewish homes for the aged. NAJHHA and NAJFCHP members are in general less likely than other respondents to regard inclusion of campus workers and workers in Jewish adult organizations as vital. In addition to these specific priorities, there is a general tendency for members of CJE to view the incorporation of the listed professional groups as more important than do members of the other APAs.

Having said all this, we can return to the central finding: a substantial commonality of attitudes among the members of the several APAs. Table 23, which displays the rank order of priorities for inclusion of the various professional groups for each APA, again serves to illustrate this point.

With the very few understandable exceptions noted above, the members of the different APAs are strikingly similar in their priorities. Should the Conference decide to move ahead in an effort to recruit additional members from among the professional groups listed, it

can do so in the security of knowing that its current members are substantially united in whom they would most like to see become part of the organization.

The pattern of correlations between support for inclusion of under- or unaffiliated professionals and several of the other background variables is not unlike that which we have seen with respect to other questions in the survey. Supervisors and line workers are somewhat more likely than their senior level colleagues to view inclusion of most of the listed groups as "crucial." The same finding holds true for the youngest groups of respondents (those under 30) as compared with their older counterparts, and for women as compared with men. Respondents with a BA are less likely to regard the inclusion of most of the groups as "crucial" than are those with an advanced degree. Level of Jewish education seemed to make a significant difference in only one area: respondents with college or graduate level Judaic studies were more likely to view inclusion of Jewish educators as crucial. What these results mean is not obvious, but they would seem to support the general impression derived from an examination of the survey as a whole: identification with the Conference as the "central address" for the field of Jewish communal service and support for an activist professional posture on its part is, if anything, likely to increase in coming years.

Conclusion

It is impossible to summarize and little less difficult to assess the significance of a study of this scope. The Conference of Jewish Communal Service now has a wealth of information about itself and its members to sift through, to discuss, and to evaluate. This is properly the task of the elected leadership of the Confer-

JOURNAL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

Table 23: Rank Ordering of Priorities for Professional Group Inclusion

PROFESSIONAL GROUP	AJCW	AJCOP	AJCRW	AJVSP	CJE	NAJFCHP	NAJHHA	NASA
Professionals serving Jewish college students	3	1	1	3	1	3	7	4
Professors of Jewish studies	7	8	9	6	8	7	5	7
Rabbis	10	10	9	8	11	7	10	9
Synagogue administrators	10	10	9	11	10	9	10	2
Jewish housing for the aged workers	1	2	1	1	3	2	1	2
Jewish hospital workers	4	4	6	2	6	1	2	4
Hebrew, religious and day school educators	7	7	4	7	1	6	4	9
Professionals in Zionist and Israel related agencies	6	4	6	8	7	10	7	9
Professionals in applied research	4	6	4	3	3	5	5	6
Professionals in adult membership organizations	7	8	8	8	9	10	9	7
Professionals in Jewish youth organizations	1	2	3	5	3	3	2	1

ence and of the respective APAs which largely comprise it. As this process takes place, questions beyond those addressed in this summary report will undoubtedly arise, and the data now exists to answer many of these questions. Other questions may go beyond the scope of this membership survey altogether; and the Conference will need to find other means to grapple with them.

If one were, despite all, to venture two broad conclusions from the data analyzed for this report, they would be the following:

1. The field of Jewish communal service has developed a mature sense of itself as a domain of professional practice. Whether or not one accepts the concept of Jewish communal service as a profession in its own right, the evidence of this study is that the level of professional concern among the members of the Conference is high. The answers to the many questions posed bespeak a responsible Jewish professionalism—a commitment to standards, to education, to outreach, to participation in Jewish

and general communal discussion of vital issues. For the Conference itself, there is a mandate to grow and to improve as a vehicle for professional self-definition and self-expression. By and large, the survey respondents approve of what the Conference has set out to do, in its Annual Meeting and its publications. They want these programs to continue and to be more effective.

2. There is a substantial consensus among the survey respondents on a broad range of issues. By the evidence of this study, Jewish communal service is a field more united than divided. Professional affiliation, age, sex, education, position, region of employment are not without their impact and importance. But the differences which exist among the members of the Conference do not coincide with these lines of distinction in anything approaching clear terms. In examining the survey data one repeatedly finds differences in emphasis and in nuance. Almost nowhere does one find substantial disagreements on significant issues. Where the Confer-

ence chooses to act, it can do so with confidence that its constituents share common values, common concerns, common aspirations, and common opinions.

At the same time, the leadership of the Conference must be attentive to the special concerns which do exist among particular groups, especially newer and younger workers and women. The great challenge here is to make sure that those not yet in positions of visibility and influence—indeed, those who are perhaps under-represented among the respondents to the survey itself—develop a strong identification with the field, with the Conference, and with

their fellow professionals. The data from this study indicate that they are in many ways eager to strengthen these connections. That the Conference help them to do so, even possibly where more senior members feel less pressing needs, may be a key to its own success and survival.

A study is at best a very sketchy map of the territory in which the Conference and the field of Jewish communal service today journey. What roads to take cannot be determined by the map. That, as always, is the task of leadership. If their choices are helped by having this map in their hands, then the study itself will have served its purpose.