
JEWISH PHILANTHROPIC GIVING IN DETROIT

The Detroit Area Jewish Population Study
Interim Report #3

Co-Principal Investigators:

Steven M. Cohen
Professor of Sociology, Queens College, CUNY

Jacob B. Ukeles
President, Ukeles Associates, Inc.
Adjunct Professor, Columbia University

Ukeles Associates Inc.

New York, NY

December 1990

PREFACE

This is one of a series of reports on the Jewish population of the Detroit area drawn from the findings of the Detroit Area Jewish Population Study. The analysis is based on data collected in the geographic core of the Jewish community, which includes 75,000 Jews living in 12 Oakland County suburbs. The total Jewish population within the tri-county area is an estimated 96,000. This report was prepared by Ukeles Associates Inc.

The Study, commissioned by the Jewish Welfare Federation of Detroit, was co-directed by Dr. Steven M. Cohen, Professor of Sociology at Queens College and Dr. Jacob B. Ukeles, President of Ukeles Associates, Inc. and Adjunct Professor of Public Affairs at Columbia University. The random sample survey of 1,100 interviews was conducted by the Market Opinion Research Corporation in late 1989.

The Demographic Study Committee of the Detroit Jewish Welfare Federation is chaired by Stuart E. Hertzberg. Lawrence M. Ziffer, Director of Planning and Agency Relations, and Patricia C. Becker, Technical Consultant, are the Federation professional staff.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
PHILANTHROPIC GIVING -- SIZE AND TYPE OF GIFTS	2
THE IMPACT OF AGE UPON CHARITABLE GIVING	8
THE IMPACT OF JEWISH COMMUNAL AFFILIATION AND DENOMINATION	12
THE IMPACT OF WEAKER ATTACHMENT TO ISRAEL AMONG YOUNGER JEWS	16

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1:	Giving to the Campaign, Other Jewish Causes, and Non-Sectarian Causes, and Total Giving . .	4
Exhibit 2:	Distribution of Giving to the Campaign as a Percentage of income	7
Exhibit 3:	Giving to Non-Sectarian Causes by Age	9
Exhibit 4:	Giving to Other Jewish Causes by Age	10
Exhibit 5:	Giving to the Campaign by Age	11
Exhibit 6:	Mean Gift to the Campaign by Level of Jewish Communal Affiliation and Age	13
Exhibit 7:	Mean Gift to the Campaign by Denomination and Age	15
Exhibit 8:	Measures of Israel Attachment by Age	18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Most Jews in Detroit are contributors to charity. The survey indicated that only one in four made no contribution in 1988. Almost two of three contributed to non-sectarian causes, half gave to Jewish charities other than the Allied Jewish Campaign, and four of ten were donors to the Campaign itself.

A number of factors affect the structure of contributions. As might be expected, the affluent give more in absolute terms, and a higher proportion of their income, to charitable causes. Younger adults, defined here as those under 50, are just as likely to contribute as those 50 and over. Fewer of them are donors to the Campaign; more give to other Jewish causes.

Those who participate more widely in Jewish organizational activities contribute more at a higher rate, and with more money, to the Campaign and other Jewish causes than those whose affiliation is weaker. Members of Conservative synagogues donate more to the Campaign than members of Reform synagogues. Finally, Jews under 50 in Detroit are less attached to Israel than those 50 and over. This weaker attachment may account for some of the difference in the amount contributed to the Campaign.

PHILANTHROPIC GIVING -- SIZE AND TYPE OF GIFTS

Respondents to this survey of a sample of the Jewish population in Metropolitan Detroit were asked a number of questions relating to the nature and size of their charitable contributions. Exhibit 1 reports the distribution of amounts given to all charities, to the Allied Jewish Campaign of the Jewish Welfare Federation (the Campaign), to other Jewish causes, and to non-sectarian causes.¹ The first page of the Exhibit reports on giving by all households, the second page refers only to "affluent" households.²

Among all households (affluent or not), 3 out of 4 made some charitable contribution. More than 4 in 10 gave to the Campaign,

¹The interviewers asked respondents how much they (and, if married, their spouses) contributed to "All Jewish causes in 1988, including synagogues, temples, or the Allied Jewish campaign." Those who contributed to Jewish causes were in turn asked, "How much, if anything, did you contribute to the Allied Jewish Campaign of the Detroit Jewish Welfare Federation in 1988?" Interviewers asked all respondents how much they had contributed "to non-Jewish or general charities and causes in 1988, such as United Way, universities, hospitals, museums, and social activist causes."

Respondents answered in numerical categories (e.g. \$100-\$499). For purposes of the analysis of amounts contributed, we re-coded answers to the categories' means. For example, we regarded those who contributed \$100-499 to the Campaign as having contributed \$300 each.

The analysis distinguishes between contributions to the Campaign and contributions to other Jewish causes. We derived the latter figure by subtracting the estimated Campaign contribution from the amount provided for all Jewish causes, including the Campaign.

²Since so much charitable giving relies heavily on more affluent households, the analysis often distinguishes between the general sample (all households) and the affluent. Our operational definition of the "affluent" includes those households reporting annual income in 1988 of \$100,000 or more. The definition of "affluent" also include households that met any of the following criteria: belonging to a country club; owning a home worth \$200,000 or more; owning assets other than a home in the amount of \$500,000 or more. Of those 30-69 years old, about a quarter of the households qualify as "affluent." Of those age 70 and over, fewer than one in ten qualify as affluent.

5 in 10 made donations to other Jewish causes, and 2 of 3 gave to non-sectarian causes. Of those who made some contribution, 9 in 10 gave more than \$100, and more than 2 out of 3 gave over \$500. Looking at the Campaign by itself, 43 percent made some donation; of those who gave, 56 percent contributed more than \$100. (The distributions of size of gifts actually received by the Campaign and that reported by the respondents highly resemble one another. This similarity lends credibility to the respondents' reports of their giving behavior to the Campaign, and, by extension, to the other causes as well.)

On average, households contributed a total of \$2500 to all charities. Of this figure, about a quarter (\$600) went to the Campaign, about a half (\$1200) to other Jewish charities, and the last quarter (\$700) to non-sectarian causes.

Among the affluent, as might be expected, both the proportion of people making donations and the size of the contribution was higher than for the entire sample. Almost 9 in 10 made some contribution, and more than 60 percent gave to the Campaign. The mean gift for all contributions was \$6,200; for contributions to the Campaign, the mean was \$1,700. One of 3 of the affluent households gave at least \$1,000 to all causes combined. Over 7 in 10 gave that much to the campaign.

Exhibit 1: Giving to the Campaign, Other Jewish Causes, and Non-Sectarian Causes, and Total Giving*

ALL HOUSEHOLDS				
	CAMPAIGN	OTHER JEWISH	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL GIVING
\$10,000 +	1%	3%	1%	6%
5,000 - 9,999	1%	1%	1%	7%
1,000 - 4,999	7%	18%	11%	25%
500 - 999	4%	6%	10%	14%
100 - 499	13%	16%	26%	16%
1 - 99	19%	7%	16%	8%
0	57%	49%	35%	24%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
MEAN GIVING	\$600	\$1200	\$700	\$2500

Exhibit 1 (cont).

AFFLUENT HOUSEHOLDS ONLY				
	CAMPAIGN	OTHER JEWISH	NON-SECTARIAN	TOTAL GIVING
\$10,000 +	3%	8%	3%	21%
5,000 - 9,999	5%	3%	3%	18%
1,000 - 4,999	21%	31%	31%	33%
500 - 999	8%	7%	17%	8%
100 - 499	18%	8%	20%	7%
1 - 99	9%	2%	4%	2%
0	37%	41%	22%	12%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%
MEAN GIVING	\$1700	\$2600	\$1900	\$6200

Note: Totals may not equal to 100% due to rounding.

"Total Giving" is the sum of giving to all three sub-categories of charitable causes. Thus, as the first row, last column of the lower panel indicates, 21% of affluent households made total charitable contributions of \$10,000 or more. Included here are all those who contributed at least \$10,000 to the Campaign (3%), to other Jewish causes (8%), and to non-sectarian charities (3%). These three figures amount to 14%, leaving 7% unaccounted for. But the 21% who gave \$10,000 to all charities combined also includes those who may have given, say, \$4,000 to each of these three categories of causes, for a total of \$12,000 in all charitable giving.

Exhibit 2 reports the distribution of giving to the Campaign as a fraction of income. The first column reports on all households, including those who make no contributions. The second column is restricted to those who make some contribution to the Campaign. Among Campaign contributors alone, 30 percent give 1% or more of their income to the Campaign, or more than \$10 per \$1,000 of income. One in eight give as much as 3% of their income, which is \$30 for every \$1,000 in income.

The affluent give a higher fraction of their income to the Campaign. Of those affluent households who make a contribution, over a fifth donate 3% or more and almost half give 1% or more.

Exhibit 2: Distribution of Giving to the Campaign as a Percentage of income

ALL HOUSEHOLDS		
	ALL (INCLUDING NON-DONORS)	DONORS ONLY
3% OR MORE	6%	13%
1 - 3%	8%	17%
0.5 - 1%	6%	13%
UNDER 0.5%	24%	56%
0	57%	--
TOTAL	100%	100%

AFFLUENT HOUSEHOLDS ONLY		
	ALL (INCLUDING NON-DONORS)	DONORS ONLY
3% OR MORE	13%	21%
1 - 3%	17%	26%
0.5 - 1%	7%	11%
UNDER 0.5%	27%	42%
0	37%	--
TOTAL	100%	100%

Note: Totals may not equal to 100% due to rounding

THE IMPACT OF AGE UPON CHARITABLE GIVING

The pattern of giving for younger Jews differs from that of middle aged Jews. Those under 50 are just as likely to contribute to non-sectarian causes, and slightly more likely to give to Jewish causes other than the Campaign (see Exhibits 3 and 4). But as Exhibit 5 indicates, the middle-aged population contributes about twice as much per household to the Campaign as does the younger adult segment of the population.

The difference is not due to income. Whether we examine the whole population, or just those who are Campaign donors, the middle-aged respondents are contributing more than twice as much per \$1000 of income as are the younger respondents.

Exhibit 3: Giving to Non-Sectarian Causes by Age

AGE	30 - 49	50 - 69	70+	TOTAL
% DONORS	66%	66%	58%	65%

MEAN GIFT

ALL	\$800	\$800	\$300	\$700
DONORS ONLY	\$1200	\$1300	\$600	\$1100

GIFTS PER \$1000 INCOME

ALL	\$8	\$12	\$7	\$9
DONORS ONLY	\$12	\$19	\$12	\$14

CHARITABLE AFFLUENT

AGE	30 - 49	50 - 69	70+	TOTAL
% DONORS	88%	76%	75%	78%

MEAN GIFT

ALL	\$2200	\$2200	\$1600	\$2200
DONORS ONLY	\$2500	\$2400	\$1900	\$2400

GIFT PER \$1000 INCOME

ALL	\$16	\$16	\$14	\$16
DONORS ONLY	\$18	\$17	\$17	\$18

Note: The "donors" referred to within the table refer to those who are donors specifically to non-sectarian philanthropic causes.

Exhibit 4: Giving to Other Jewish Causes by Age

AGE	30 - 49	50 - 69	70+	TOTAL
% DONORS	50%	45%	47%	48%

MEAN GIFT

ALL	\$1400	\$1200	\$900	\$1200
DONORS ONLY	\$2700	\$2500	\$1700	\$2400

GIFT PER \$1000 INCOME

ALL	\$15	\$18	\$24	\$18
DONORS ONLY	\$30	\$38	\$45	\$36

CHARITABLE AFFLUENT

AGE	30 - 49	50 - 69	70+	TOTAL
% DONORS	50%	45%	47%	48%

MEAN GIFT

ALL	\$3000	\$3000	\$2900	\$3000
DONORS ONLY	\$4200	\$5000	----	\$4500

GIFT PER \$1000 INCOME

ALL	\$20	\$26	\$39	\$23
DONORS ONLY	\$27	\$43	--	\$35

Note: The "donors" referred to within the table refer to those who are donors specifically to Jewish causes other than the Campaign.

Exhibit 5:

Giving to the Campaign by Age

AGE	30 - 49	50 - 69	70+	TOTAL
% DONORS	49%	50%	50%	50%

MEAN GIFT

ALL	\$400	\$800	\$600	\$600
DONORS ONLY	\$1000	\$1700	\$1200	\$1300

GIFT PER \$1000 INCOME

ALL	\$3	\$8	\$10	\$6
DONORS ONLY	\$7	\$17	\$20	\$14

CHARITABLE AFFLUENT

AGE	30 - 49	50 - 69	70+	TOTAL
% DONORS	64%	85%	86%	73%

MEAN GIFT

ALL	\$1200	\$2800	\$4200	\$2000
DONORS ONLY	\$1800	\$3300	\$4900	\$2700

GIFT PER \$1000 INCOME

ALL	\$7	\$19	\$37	\$13
DONORS ONLY	\$11	\$22	\$43	\$18

Note: The "donors" referred to within the table refer to those who are donors specifically to the Campaign.

THE IMPACT OF JEWISH COMMUNAL AFFILIATION AND DENOMINATION

Prior research elsewhere and the current research in Detroit have demonstrated what activists everywhere have long known: Those who participate more widely in Jewish organizational activities are also more generous to the Campaign and to other Jewish causes.

Exhibit 6 demonstrates the predictably strong association between communal affiliation³ and philanthropic giving. Among affluent households, the average donation to the Campaign of those who score high on communal affiliation is more than double that among those with a moderate score; those with a moderate score, in turn, report average Campaign gifts of more than three times that among those with a low score. Clearly, Campaign giving increases quite dramatically with every increase in communal activity.

Exhibit 6 also demonstrates that the influence of age on giving to the Campaign persists across all levels of communal activity.

³To describe communal affiliation, we developed an index that measures involvement in Jewish communal life in ways other than philanthropic contributions. The index counts six items: belonging to a congregation; belonging to or utilizing the Jewish Community Center; belonging to another Jewish organization; reading the Jewish News weekly; volunteering at least monthly for a Jewish organization; serving on a board or committee of a Jewish organization or congregation. Those reporting five or more of these items were classified as "high;" those reporting two, three, or four items are labeled "moderate;" and others, scoring zero or one on the index, are classified as "low."

Exhibit 6: Mean Gift to the Campaign by Level of Jewish Communal Affiliation and Age (Charitable Affluent Only)

AFFILIATION INDEX		
AGE:	30 - 49	50 - 69
HIGH	\$2300*	\$3800*
MODERATE	\$800	\$1800
LOW	\$200	\$800

*These two figures are based on fewer than 20 cases, and hence need to be interpreted with greater caution than other findings.

Exhibit 7 presents average Campaign gifts by age for affluent members of Conservative and Reform congregations, offering a second way of examining the impact of Jewish affiliation patterns upon philanthropic giving. Of people in the same age category, affluent Conservative Jews give about 50% more than their Reform counterparts. Not surprisingly, but still very noteworthy, middle-aged Jews give about twice as much as younger Jews of the same denomination, be it Conservative or Reform. In other words, whatever their age, Conservative Jews are more Campaign-oriented than Reform Jews; and, whatever their denomination, Jews age 50 and over are far more Campaign-oriented than Jews under 50.

The large difference in Campaign support between Conservative and Reform congregations is quite understandable. Reform leaders pride themselves on reaching out to less involved Jewish families generally and to the mixed married in particular. To the extent that Reform temples do so, they also will tend to reach larger numbers who are not particularly sympathetic to the Campaign.

The relative under-involvement of Reform Jews in the Campaign may come as a surprise to some. After all, in the early twentieth century, Reform Jews were leaders of the Federation movement in most of the major American Jewish communities. It seems that the character of Federation leadership around the country underwent a fundamental change in the early 1970's, when more traditionally minded Jews came to play a more prominent role than they had before. Federations adopted a more survivalist agenda, one that emphasized service to Jewish clients and Jewish continuity (e.g., Jewish education). At the same time, those with more universalist charitable inclinations (including many Reform Jews) found that non-sectarian charities had lowered historic barriers to Jewish participation and leadership.

**Exhibit 7: Mean Gift to the Campaign by Denomination and Age
(Charitable Affluent Only)**

DENOMINATION		
AGE:	30 - 49	50 - 69
CONSERVATIVE MEMBER	\$1500	\$3000
REFORM MEMBER	\$1000	\$2000

THE IMPACT OF WEAKER ATTACHMENT TO ISRAEL AMONG YOUNGER JEWS

For several decades, and especially since 1967, the cause of supporting the beleaguered and besieged Jewish State has been the major theme in the marketing of centralized Jewish philanthropies. For the most part, in the promotion of most Federation campaigns around the country, local needs have taken a back seat to Israel.

Since 1982, developments connected to the State of Israel have had a negative impact on some American Jews. The most controversial events start with the War in Lebanon, highlighted by the Sabra and Shatila massacre, in which Israeli leaders bore "indirect responsibility" (1982). They continue with the 1984 election to the Knesset of Meir Kahane, an event that provoked the Israeli Education Ministry to institute new courses on democracy and group tolerance. The mid-1980's also saw bitter, often violent clashes between religious and secular militants in Israel. In 1987, the American Jew Jonathan Pollard was arrested and subsequently convicting of spying for the government of Israel. The end of 1987 marked the beginning of the intifada and the highly controversial initial responses by Israeli troops to Palestinian violence. In 1988 the controversy over "Who is a Jew" emerged. In both 1988 and 1990, Israeli politicians engaged in what seemed to many as unseemly and unprincipled coalition bargaining.

These events make it plausible to assume that the younger generation will be more resistant to philanthropic appeals that emphasize Israel. Indeed, as our report on Jewish identity makes clear, attachment to Israel is one of the few areas where the Jewish commitment of younger Jews in Detroit is weaker than that of older Jews. Exhibit 8 reports the significant discrepancies between younger and older affluent respondents on Israel. Among the middle-aged, just 7 percent score low on the index, as compared with five times as many (35 percent) among the younger group. Of those under 50, just 17 percent score high, as opposed to more than twice as many among the middle-aged (38 percent).

Twice as many of those 30-49 as those 50-69 have never been to Israel. Of those 30-49, under a third feel "very close" to Israel, compared with more than twice as many of the middle-aged respondents. When asked about the problems confronting Detroit Jewry, less than a quarter of the younger respondents first mentioned Israel, as contrasted with over a third of those 50-69. When asked whether they would give more to the Campaign if a proportion of the charitable funds were kept in Detroit rather

than given to Israel, more than twice as many younger as middle-aged respondents answered affirmatively. By any measure, the older affluent households are far more Israel-oriented than are the younger households.

Exhibit 8: Measures of Israel Attachment by Age (Charitable Affluent Only)

AGE	30 - 49	50 - 69
VISITED ISRAEL		
TWICE OR MORE	20%	36%
ONCE	23%	40%
NEVER	57%	24%
TOTAL	100%	100%

HOW CLOSE DO YOU FEEL TO ISRAEL?

VERY CLOSE	29%	68%
SOMEWHAT CLOSE	41%	21%
SOMEWHAT OR VERY DISTANT	21%	11%
TOTAL	100%	100%

"ISRAEL" MENTIONED AS IMPORTANT ISSUE	23%	34%
---------------------------------------	-----	-----

WOULD YOU GIVE MORE TO CAMPAIGN IF MORE MONEY WENT TO DETROIT AND LESS TO ISRAEL?

NO	61%	77%
MAYBE	17%	13%
YES	23%	10%
TOTAL	100%	100%

COMPOSITE INDEX OF ISRAEL ATTACHMENT

HIGH	17%	38%
MODERATE	48%	55%
LOW	35%	7%
TOTAL	100%	100%

Note: "Charitable Affluent" donors are affluent and make donations to any Philanthropic cause