

questions which identify respondents and their spouses as either born Jews, converts (i.e. "Jews by choice"), or non-Jews. The reports published in Denver, Phoenix, and Milwaukee demonstrate that intermarriage is related to many areas of planning and organized community life from Jewish schooling and service usage to fertility and residential mobility.

Residential Mobility:

Residential mobility is the second most requested content area (after basic demographic items). Information about patterns of Jewish movement helps planners to anticipate the emergence of Jewish areas and estimate the prospects

for stability in older neighborhoods. In the Sunbelt, questions about residential mobility have provided information about the scope and impact of recent growth.

Conclusion

While often maligned, the population study is nevertheless widely recognized as the single most important source of information about social change in the Jewish community. Linking the process of planning a population study more closely to the structure and style of Federation life is an important step that leads to increased utilization and makes it a more integrated component of Federation planning.

Twenty-Five Years Ago in this *Journal*

The romantic concept of grace coming down from above implies that man is not free to decide in favor of the good. Neither is he the person who originates evil. Sin overcomes him and compels him; it is original. Man is not the one that seeks and strives, wins or succumbs. He merely reacts to the contest between the devil and the savior. This dogma removes the very ground from under man's rights as a moral and ethical individual. Moral freedom to achieve that which is good is negated. Predestination and predeterminism are instead emphasized. The logical conclusion is the anarchical principle of Gnosti-

cism, "everything is permitted," notwithstanding the moral demands made by those who were still rooted in the Old Testament and in traditional Judaism.

Nothing could be more opposed to the aspirations of a social conscience than romantic piety which only seeks itself and its salvation. Romantic passivity is the reason for the alliance between ruler and believer wherever romantic religion has held sway; every reaction has been consecrated and every forward drive damned.

MELECH SCHACHTER, Ph.D.
Summer, 1960

Understanding Synagogue Affiliation*

STEVEN HUBERMAN, Ph.D.

Co-Director, Planning & Budgeting Department, Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles

... people who are involved in one aspect of communal life "spill over" to other areas of involvement. Members of Jewish organizations are likely also to belong to synagogues and to give to Jewish philanthropy. Organizations frequently see themselves in competition for the same members and same donors. Although this is an organizational reality, there needs to be greater recognition of "the more, the more."

AFFILIATION with the Jewish community can take a variety of forms. It may involve contributing to the Jewish Federation, belonging to Jewish organizations, participating in the activities of Jewish agencies, or joining a synagogue. The focus of this article is congregational affiliation—formally belonging to a synagogue. This type of affiliation reveals a great deal about the intensity of Jewish life in a community.¹

Although there has been an enormous increase in demographic research on Jews in the past decade, we know very little about who are the "unaffiliated." A major goal of this article is to identify the factors associated with affiliation and non-affiliation. By expanding our understanding of these population groups, we can more effectively plan strategies to attract the unaffiliated into the organized Jewish community.

*The following persons reviewed this article and were extremely helpful in this project: Ted Kanner, Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles, Executive Vice President; Merv Lemmerman, Executive Director; and Ilene Olansky, Vice-President.

¹ Formal Jewish communal affiliation may occur in at least five different spheres: religious-congregational, educational-cultural, community relations, Israel-overseas, or social welfare. Recent patterns of activity in these five affiliation spheres are elucidated in Daniel Elazar, *Participation and Accountability in the Jewish Community*. New York: Council of Jewish Federations, 1980. The thrust of our study is the religious-congregational sphere.

The findings in this report are based on the Los Angeles Jewish Population Study, a random telephone survey which included 823 completed interviews with Jewish households in 1979, a population survey updating, and recent literature on affiliation. The major focus of the research was demographic—measuring the size, composition, and distribution of the more than 500,000 Jewish residents of Greater Los Angeles. Synagogue, organizational, and philanthropic participation were also studied. At approximately the same time this research was being carried out, the University of Judaism conducted a study on Jewish identification among 413 randomly selected respondents. Since there was considerable similarity between these two research studies, several of the findings from the University of Judaism inquiry are included in our analysis.²

The findings from these various inquiries shed light on the dynamics of being Jewish in Greater Los Angeles, the second largest Jewish community in the United States. In addition, our data illuminate changing patterns of Jewish-

² The University of Judaism study was directed by Dr. Neil Sandberg and Dr. Gene Levine. The 1979 Federation study was designed and directed by Dr. Bruce Phillips. This article also incorporates material derived from a 1981 data update and a 1983 reanalysis. Although the observations in this essay relate to these specific dates, we believe the patterns described hold true today.

ness which are becoming prevalent in all areas of the country.

Overall Patterns

In our study we asked the respondents, "Do you, or does anyone else in your household, belong to a synagogue?" If the answer was "yes" we defined the person(s) as "affiliated" with a synagogue. Using this definition, there is a very low rate of congregational affiliation. Only 26% of Jewish adults presently belong to a synagogue. There has also been a significant erosion in synagogue membership. A full 40% of past members no longer affiliate. One in three Jews has never been affiliated with a congregation.

It is instructive to chart changes in Jewish observance over a period of time. In 1968, 27% of the Jews in Los Angeles were affiliated. Thus, there are approximately the same number of Jews affiliated today as compared to fifteen years ago.³ Whereas synagogue affiliation seems to have stabilized at about 1 in 4 Jews, other forms of Jewish religious practice have declined to even lower levels. For example, in the University of Judaism sample, today only 7% of Jews report keeping kosher, only 12% attend Shabbat services, and only 18% regularly light Shabbat candles. In contrast, religious practices which require less frequency are more widely observed: 50% of Jews fast on Yom Kippur, 66% attend a Passover seder, and a majority possess prayer books, *mezuzot*, and *chanukah menorot*. Most Jews own religious symbols, but many do not engage in active religious observance.⁴

³ Fred Massarik, *A Report on the Jewish Population of Los Angeles, 1968*. Los Angeles: Jewish Federation Council, 1968.

⁴ Neil Sandberg and Gene Levine, *The Changing Character of the Los Angeles Jewish Community*. Los Angeles: University of Judaism, 1981.

Los Angeles has a variegated network of synagogues. There are synagogues of every ideology—ranking from large, old, well-established temples to traditional Chassidic *Shtetlach*. There are independent *minyanim*, which serve as alternatives for those seeking religious expression outside of conventional institutions. The independent California lifestyle has led some congregations to experiment in liturgy. In contrast, one can walk into some synagogues in the city and see bearded, caftaned young rabbis engaged in kabbalistic meditation. This wide diversity in synagogue style is paralleled by varying levels of community affiliation. Affiliation is at its highest in Beverly Hills with a 54% rate, and lowest in the Venice beach community with a 10% affiliation rate.⁵

Branch of Judaism

Religiosity involves a number of components. Social scientists have isolated four dimensions of religious identification—ideological, ritualistic, organizational, and cultural.⁶ Our study focused on the ideological dimension—self-identification with a particular branch of Judaism—and the organizational dimension—affiliation with a particular synagogue. We measured identification with the religious ideologies by asking persons with what branch of Judaism they were aligned. The overwhelming majority (70%) of

⁵ Portraits of Los Angeles synagogue life are contained in Sharon and Michael Strassfeld, (eds), *The Third Jewish Catalog: Creating Community*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1980, pp. 223–232 and *Jewish Los Angeles—A Guide*. Los Angeles: Jewish Federation Council, 1982.

⁶ The four facets of religiosity are treated in Sidney Goldstein and Calvin Goldscheider, *Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1968, pp. 171–231.

the adult Jewish population align with Reform, Conservative, or Orthodox Judaism. Within this breakdown, the most widespread identification is today with Reform (34%) and Conservative Judaism (30%), followed by Orthodoxy (6%). It is useful to contrast this pattern with data collected among the Jews of Los Angeles in 1968.

Preference for Branch of Judaism
for All Jewish Adults

Year	Orthodox	Conservative	Reform	Other	No Preference
Today	6%	30%	34%	7%	23%
1968	6%	32%	22%	2%	38%

The fact that so many Jews continue to identify with one of the three main religious branches confirms the strength of the three movements. Some Jews, albeit a distinct minority, choose other ideologies within Judaism such as Reconstructionist or Sephardic Judaism. Important shifts are taking place. Whereas adherents to Orthodox and Conservative Judaism have maintained almost the same proportion over the years studied, Reform Judaism has grown. Generational and age-related shifts are taking place. The proportion of Jews today identifying as Orthodox is 16% among persons 65 or older and 6% among persons aged 20 to 29. Conservative adherence ranges from 32% among persons aged 65 and over to 22% among the 20 to 29 age category. Reform Jews represent 33% of the 20–29 age group and 28% of the group over age 65.

Although ideological identification is significant, the second component of religiosity—actual synagogue membership—more accurately reflects the strength of one's commitment to one's ideology. Our data indicate that

self-identified Orthodox and Conservative Jews are more likely than Reform adherents to affiliate. Almost 50% of Orthodox and Conservative Jews join a synagogue; approximately 1 in 4 Reform Jews do so.

During the past 15 years, there has been an increase in those who express denominational preference. In 1968, 62% of Jews indicated a self-identification with one of the branches of Judaism; today, 77% express a branch preference. Although more people are aligning themselves with a particular branch, a full 23% continue to identify themselves as "just Jewish" and have no ideological preference. It is these persons who are least likely to join a synagogue. Ninety-two percent of those who consider themselves "just Jewish" do not affiliate with a synagogue.

Age, Sex, Marital Status

We now turn to those demographic factors which are associated with affiliation. Very few Jews in their twenties become involved in congregations (16%). Until the age of at least 30, young adults are completing their education, starting a career, and establishing roots in some locality. During this transitional phase, it is unlikely that one will make a more permanent institutional commitment such as affiliating with a synagogue. This general lack of communal involvement holds for both males and females.

Marriage and the presence of children are major catalysts to communal affiliation. Among single, never married, and divorced persons, approximately 15% are affiliated. Intact married couples report an affiliation rate of 31%. While 20% of Jews with no children are affiliated, 64% of families with three or more children are synagogue members.

Family life cycle is an important determinant of affiliation. Most couples wait until their children are of school age before they affiliate with a synagogue. During the pre-school phase, the low rate of affiliation is generally not due to economic problems. Other studies confirm that less affluent families at this stage are as unaffiliated as more affluent families. At this juncture, only the more religiously observant are likely to affiliate. It appears that the main reason for delay is that children are not old enough to be enrolled in religious school.⁷

The peak affiliation phase occurs when children approach Bar/Bat Mitzvah and Confirmation. By that time parents are generally aged 40 or over and have a 46% affiliation rate. Synagogue affiliation at this point symbolizes an intensified interest in Jewish life. Families wish to expose their children to Jewish education and provide them with a Jewish identity. The child is, therefore, seen as a major link to the religious institution. As a consequence, many parents base their evaluation of the synagogue on the quality of the school and its youth activities.

During the post-school phase, there is a decline in membership. For example, only 27-28% of Jews over the age of 65 maintain their synagogue affiliation. They no longer have a child-oriented interest in membership. Sustained affiliation is now a reflection of the synagogue serving not only religious but social and cultural needs.

There is an important variation in the influence of marital status on ideology and affiliation. The variation is affected by the religion of the spouse. In our analysis, we make a distinction among

three types of marriages—in-marriage, conversionary marriage, and intermarriage. An "in-marriage" is between two persons born Jewish; a "conversionary marriage" is between a born Jew and a convert to Judaism; and an "intermarriage" is between a born Jew and a born non-Jew who has not converted to Judaism. *Among Jews currently married, 76% are married to born Jews (in-marriage); 5% are married to converts to Judaism (conversionary married); and 19% are married to non-Jews (intermarriage).* In 1968, only 5% of married Jews were intermarried.

In a recent national study coordinated by the American Jewish Committee, it was found that on virtually every index of Jewish attitude and practice, intermarried couples scored low. Intermarried couples may affirm some tie to Jewishness but generally do not act on that affirmation.⁸ Our study substantiated that observation. Jews married to born Jews and to converts to Judaism have a synagogue affiliation rate of 38%. In contrast, hardly any intermarried Jews in Los Angeles (4%) belong to synagogues. This is a significant finding since participation in synagogue life exerts a profound influence on the religio-ethnic identity of young children and their parents. Intermarried couples and their children are not taking advantage of this important identity-shaping institution. We should, however, note that intermarried couples are not always welcomed with open arms into congregations.

Socio-economics

The impact of geographic mobility on Jewish community participation was a subject of our research. This issue is of interest since one in five Jews has lived

⁷ The classic study of affiliation and the life cycle is Marshall Sklare and Joseph Greenblum, *Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

⁸ Egon Mayer and Carl Sheingold, *Intermarriage and the Jewish Future*. New York: American Jewish Committee, 1979.

in Los Angeles nine years or less. Jewish newcomers to the city seem to have a low level of voluntary organizational membership. Only 15% of the Jewish newcomers express their community ties through membership in synagogues and temples. Movement to a new city disrupts Jewish communal loyalties. New families and individuals generally fail to identify with the religio-ethnic life of the community. Our research suggests that recent migrants to Los Angeles are less active in formal Jewish structures than are long-time residents.

Sociological studies have shown that community participation increases in time. *It usually takes at least five years for persons to become fully integrated into the socio-economic and religious life of the new community.* However, recent newcomers to a city may not be as willing as migrants of the previous generation to participate in community affairs. In today's society, people are more inclined to relocate, especially due to economic circumstances and vocational factors. People also feel less anchored to their families and kin. Consequently, migrants may feel that Los Angeles is not likely to be their permanent place of residence. Such persons may identify with Judaism, but may feel that they will not remain in their new place of residence long enough to justify the financial and emotional investment of affiliating with a synagogue.⁹

Repeated geographic movement erodes one's ties to Judaism and the Jewish community. However, there appears to be an exception to this rule. Research has found that *those persons who were strongly involved in Jewish life in their former community continue their involvement in their new location.* Although there are

invariably distractions and disruptions to life style, those who are committed seek out and maintain their community activity. Informal Jewish socializing, religious devotion, and activity involvement persist for this group. On the other hand, the majority—those who were unaffiliated in their previous community—are even less likely to affiliate when moving to a new city.¹⁰

Our data enabled correlations between education, occupation, income and affiliation. Researchers have noted in the past a relationship between socio-economic status and synagogue affiliation. Their conclusion is that Jews with post-college education and in professional positions tend to be less involved with the synagogue than Jews in other categories. Our study, however, does not support this hypothesis. We found that the *level of synagogue affiliation is virtually the same for persons of all levels of education and occupation.*

The income factor plays an important role in synagogue involvement. As income rises so does the extent of participation. Families earning under \$30,000 have an affiliation rate between 18-24%; families earning \$60,000 or more have an affiliation rate of 49%. The data are significant since many Jews have incomes of under \$30,000. Indeed, 57% of the persons interviewed in the University of Judaism study reported that the cost of belonging to a synagogue is too high, as compared to 19% who indicated that it was reasonable.¹¹

An economic barrier seems to be discouraging synagogue participation of working class and poor Jews. Those with low incomes are unlikely to become in-

⁹ Sidney Goldstein, "Jews in the United States: Perspectives from Demography," *American Jewish Year Book*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1980, pp. 3-59.

¹⁰ Charles Jaret, "The Impact of Geographic Mobility on Jewish Community Participation: Disruptive or Supportive?" *Contemporary Jewry*, Vol. 4 No. 2 (Spring/Summer 1978), pp. 9-21.

¹¹ Sandberg and Levine, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

volved in a temple. Even though most synagogues offer reduced membership rates, many Jews appear reluctant to seek special financial arrangements.

Jewish Communal Involvement

Does Jewish education matter? Are students with intensive Judaic training heavily affiliated with Jewish communal activities as adults? We sought answers to these questions by subjecting the University of Judaism data to a series of statistical analyses. Our first observation is that the *type* of Jewish education does not have a serious impact on the extent of adult affiliation. Adults who had a day school education report a 35% affiliation rate, but this is not significantly greater than former afternoon or Sunday school students who both report 32% rates.

The key differential is *years* of Jewish schooling. Six years or less of Jewish schooling does not seem to make a difference in adult synagogue participation. Those with six years or less of Jewish schooling are no more involved than those who have had no religious education. *Jewish education makes an impact among those with seven or more years of schooling.* Adults who had less than seven years of Jewish education have a synagogue affiliation rate of 25% or less. Among adults with seven or more years of Jewish education, the participation rate ranges from 37% to 50%.

Is the higher rate of affiliation due to the effects of Jewish schooling or Jewish family background? Other research has confirmed that all other factors being equal, adults who have had *longer* Jewish educations are more religiously observant than those with minimal Jewish schooling. The impact of coming from a Jewishly identified home is comparable to the effects of hours of school instruction. The Jewish family and the Jewish school are the two primary Jewish so-

cializing influences. One learns the norms of Jewish religious practice from both Jewish educational and home life experiences.¹² Persons raised in identifiably Jewish families who have had seven or more years of Jewish education are the most likely to affiliate.

"God, Israel, and the Torah are one." This classic formulation, attributed to the *Zohar*, emphasizes the *organic* nature of Judaism. Religion, peoplehood, and culture are inextricably intertwined. There are a variety of elements in Jewish life including religious observance, education, civil defense, social welfare, support of Israel and world Jewry, and so on. Mordecai Kaplan and other religious authorities have argued that these elements of Jewish life are organically connected. They derive strength and reinforce each other; they blend into each other and are penetrated by each other.¹³

Our study supports the organic theory of Jewish life. We see the *spill-over effect* in operation. Jewish involvement in one area spills over to other areas of community participation. For example, those who belong to Jewish organizations also tend to belong to a synagogue. Forty-eight percent of persons who are involved in Jewish organizational activity also become active in synagogues. The phenomenon goes both ways. Synagogue participation leads to other forms of Jewish activity; Jewish organizational participation also leads to other channels to express one's Jewishness. In short, the synagogue and organization reinforce each other.

Furthermore, 72% of those who be-

¹² Geoffrey E. Bock, *Does Jewish Education Matter?* New York: Council of Jewish Federations, 1975.

¹³ Judaism as an organic civilization composed of intertwined elements is discussed in "Mordecai M. Kaplan on His Hundredth Year: The Man, His Thought, His Influence in Judaism, No. 117, Volume 30, Number 1 (Winter, 1981), pp. 3-103.

long to synagogues report making donations to the United Jewish Fund, the central fund of the Jewish Federation and the United Jewish Appeal. Synagogue members seem willing to pay their Jewish communal dues in a very literal fashion by supporting the central philanthropic fund.¹⁴

Summary and Implications

Regression Analysis

In this study we assessed the impact of various factors on synagogue affiliation. These background factors included denomination, age, sex, marital status, socio-economics, and residence. In order to determine which of these factors most significantly affects affiliation, we used the special statistical technique of "regression" to test the differential impact of the background or independent variables—age and sex—on the dependent variable, synagogue affiliation.

Using this technique, we located the major determinants or predictors of affiliation. The following list contains the positive factors listed in order of their influence on synagogue membership.¹⁵

¹⁴ A closer inspection of the giving data reveals an important caveat. Many of those who report donating to the United Jewish Fund do not actually do so. There are two explanations. Giving to the Jewish community is a "respectable" activity. People who were interviewed may want to look good and, therefore, over-report the extent of their philanthropy. In addition, respondents may be confusing their giving to the United Jewish Fund with giving to other Jewish charities, such as Israel Bonds, B'nai B'rith, etc. We suspect that both explanations are valid.

¹⁵ It should be recalled that this study collected data primarily on demographic factors. Since Jewish educational and family variables were included in the University of Judaism study, these issues were not explored in our survey or included in the regression analysis. A fuller description of the regression model is contained in Hubert Blalock, *Social Statistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Factors Associated with Affiliation, in Rank Order

Rank	Influence
1	Respondent belongs to one or more Jewish organizations
2	Respondent is of Conservative denomination
3	Respondent and spouse are Jewish
4	Respondent is of Orthodox denomination
5	Household contains one or more children
6	Length of residence in community
7	Household income

The factor most strongly connected with synagogue membership is that of belonging to another type of Jewish organization. Those persons who join Jewish educational, cultural, community relations, social welfare, Israel or overseas Jewry organizations, will also most likely belong to a synagogue. Participation in the American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League, American Jewish Congress, Jewish Community Relations Council, Federation, United Jewish Appeal, Israel Bonds, Jewish National Fund, or any other formal organizational structure, is the most powerful correlate of synagogue affiliation among those factors which we assessed. A full 48% of those persons who belong to a Jewish organization also affiliate with a synagogue. Among those persons who do not belong to a Jewish organization, only 19% affiliate. As pointed out earlier, synagogue and organizational activity are mutually reinforcing.

Another powerful affiliation predictor is that of an in-marriage—both husband and wife are Jewish. Thirty-eight percent of Jews married to a born Jew or who convert to Judaism affiliate. A mere 4% of intermarried couples join a synagogue. Although mixed marriage does not automatically imply a couple's lack of commitment to the Jewish com-

munity, it does pose a serious threat to Jewish continuity. Our data and the American Jewish Committee study previously cited substantiate the low level of Jewish identification among mixed married couples (marriage with no conversion to Judaism). Only one in three Jews who are married to non-Jews view their children as Jewish and very few of them expose their children to Jewish culture or religion. In contrast, when Jews marry converts to Judaism (conversionary marriage), Jewishness is affirmed and translated into Jewish practice, particularly in terms of religious observance and affiliation. There is reason for considerable optimism about Jewish perpetuation when the born non-Jewish spouse converts to Judaism.¹⁶

Other groups most likely to affiliate with a synagogue are persons who self-identify as Conservative or Orthodox Jews. Jews who label themselves "just Jewish," or Reform, are not as likely to join a synagogue. Between 42-44% of Orthodox and Conservative Jews belong, whereas 24% of Reform and 7% of no-preference Jews do so. Persons may call themselves particular types of Jews, and Judaism may matter to them, but many are vastly unsure about what calling oneself a particular type of Jew means or is supposed to mean. At the very minimum, each of the branches of Judaism encourages affiliation. The majority of persons who identify with each of the three major branches of Judaism are, despite this dictum, unaffiliated. Variations exist, but research confirms the general uncertainty of Jews regarding the "requirements" or even the desiderata of

Judaism. The attitude of most Jews is that affiliation is not a "requirement."¹⁷

Another positive influence for synagogue affiliation is the presence of children in the household. When we combine age, marital status, and children, we identify the factors that contribute to the highest affiliation rate—married couples in their forties or fifties who have minor children living at home with them. During these child-raising years, the Jewish family continues to have a great deal of child-centeredness. American Jews are still heard saying, "Anything for the children." It is almost axiomatic that being Jewish implies "family." Parents still frequently affirm their responsibility to transmit Jewish identity to their offspring. The degree to which a child identifies with Judaism later in life is primarily shaped by family, school, peer, and synagogue experiences. Although there has been a diminution in affiliation in recent years, almost half of all parents affiliate with a temple—a conscious investment in Jewish identity development.¹⁸

Length of residence in the metropolitan area and household income are also positive influences. Long-time residents and persons at the middle and upper ends of the income spectrum form a large portion of the affiliated. Besides the aforementioned positive influences, there are several negative factors which militate *against* belonging to a synagogue. In addition to the negative influences previously highlighted, single-never married, divorced, and widowed Jews are less likely than mar-

¹⁷ A classic research report on Jewish beliefs and practices is Leonard Fein, Bernard Reisman, et al., *Reform Is A Verb*. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1972.

¹⁸ Influences on Jewish group identification are empirically treated in Arnold Dashefsky and Howard Shapiro, *Ethnic Identification Among American Jews*. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1974.

¹⁶ Steven Huberman, "From Christianity to Judaism: Religious Changers in American Society," *Conservative Judaism* (Fall, 1982), pp. 10-28. Also, David Singer, "Living With Intermarriage," *Commentary* (July, 1979), pp. 48-53.

ried persons to become involved in a synagogue.

Dropouts

One final subject was explored in this study—why people drop their synagogue membership. We found that the highest ranking reasons were that the family had moved out of the community, no longer had children of school age, and consequently saw no need to make a financial investment in a new congregation (37%). Others stated that membership dues are too high—their current financial situation did not allow enough discretionary income to pay the cost of membership.

Our data indicate that for some the synagogue is not an institution for significant emotional investment. Only rarely did respondents express anger toward the synagogue. Dissatisfaction does not seem to be the cause of dropping out. *The norm for the dropouts is apathy.* The apathetic allowed their membership to lapse because they were either not interested, too busy, or maintained the synagogue was too far away. More dissatisfied persons (13%) would make negative statements, such as "I didn't like temple politics or how the temple was run."

A distinct minority attributed dropping out to a change in family life-style, such as divorce, death of spouse, personal illness, or marriage to a non-Jew. Even fewer (2%) said they left the synagogue because they did not like the rabbi or cantor.

Policy considerations

There are four policy implications which can be drawn from this study—the importance of the spillover effect; the need for special outreach to particular groups; welcoming newcomers;

and dealing with household income barriers.

First, our study substantiates the fact that people who are involved in one aspect of communal life "spill over" to other areas of involvement. Members of Jewish organizations are likely also to belong to synagogues and to give to Jewish philanthropy. Organizations frequently see themselves in competition for the same members and same donors. Although this is an organizational reality, there needs to be greater recognition of "the more, the more." *The more Jews become involved in any positive Jewish activity, the more likely it is that they will become involved in other facets of Jewish life.* Synagogues and Jewish organizations together are the mechanism to maintain Jewish identity.

Second, the groups which are least likely to affiliate are the (1) intermarried, (2) never-married, (3) divorced, (4) widowed. Innovative strategies will have to be developed to entice these persons to join. One possibility to effectively touch the lives of these detached groups is to *promote greater diversity within synagogues.* Given the multifarious needs and orientations of these four groups, synagogues are giving greater attention to more program diversity. These range from traditional to the experimental, *minyanim* for people just learning how to follow services, informal gatherings of people in private homes for Shabbat services, services led by lay congregants, or more structured conventional services.

Persons turn to synagogues to reap the benefits from these religious options plus to satisfy spiritual, personal, interpersonal, or social needs. A multi-purpose synagogue with a diversity of programs would seem most likely to attract individuals who differ in terms of their Jewish identification and needs.

Third, residential relocation is frequent and disruptive. Mobility lowers

ethnic participation among most of the groups we studied. Except for "hard-core" Jews, for whom Jewishness is the central theme of their lives, newcomers to a community tend to see synagogue affiliation as low priority. Given the increased prevalence of relocation, efforts to identify and integrate newcomers are to be encouraged.

Fourth, membership dues are a problem. Many of the people interviewed said dues are too high. High membership fees are usually necessitated by building funds and the high cost of maintaining a religious school. High fees discourage younger couples, singles, the divorced and widowed from joining, unless they have children of school age. Many synagogues are encouraging young people and other new members to experience synagogue life before being asked to carry a full financial burden. Some have suggested that young couples only be charged a nominal sum during their first years of membership or until they have children to

enroll in the religious school. The objective of such a policy is to build synagogue commitment of young couples from the beginning of their marriage.

In conclusion, synagogues perform three vital community functions. They act as the *bet hatefillah*, the House of Prayer; the *bet hamidrash*, the House of Study; and the *bet ha kneset*, the House of Assembly. In Los Angeles and throughout the United States, the synagogue is a regular assembly point for thousands of Jews. Week after week substantial numbers of Jews gather there. Without this institution, many would assimilate. Synagogues give meaning to the statement, "I'm Jewish."

A famous rabbinic saying is, "Do not separate yourself from the community." The rabbis were apparently aware that Jewishness is cultivated within organized religious institutions. By promoting synagogue affiliation, the Jewish community is in keeping with this traditional outlook.

Public Education and the Jewish School*

DR. ALVIN I. SCHIFF

Executive Vice President, the Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York.

... the most important challenges facing the Jewish community [re. Jewish education] are creating a sense of urgency about the critical needs of Jewish education; responding quickly and effectively to the critical personnel problems; finding ways to provide greater parental and communal support to Jewish schooling; establishing clear curricular objectives that will yield needed results; providing the time to achieve these purposes; and providing the financial wherewithal to make improvements possible.

It is here like never before! The great stir about education. As one educator recently noted in a Harvard University symposium, "The rapid fire dissemination of reports has created a sense of urgency within the educational community. There is an eagerness to act ..."¹ Indeed, by all the accounts, the great stir has had national, statewide and local impact. The States are busily involved in finding the most effective ways to bring about dramatic improvements in education.

From my own experience in New York State, as a member of several of the Education Commissioner's Advisory Councils and the Governor's Committee on Education, I can attest to the eagerness of New York's Board of Regents and legislature to act decisively and quickly. Unquestionably, a strong sense of urgency undergirds the new efforts being launched in the name of educational improvement.

How does all the fuss being made about education during the last two years relate to Jewish education? How can the Jewish community most benefit from the spate of reports and the new

rush of activity for education? What lessons can we learn from the manifold recommendations regarding public education?

At the Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York we were interested in obtaining answers to questions like these. Consequently, we thought it would be important to determine the extent to which the various segments of the Jewish educational community felt that the recommendations of the reports and studies being issued were relevant to Jewish schools.

To accomplish this, we developed a 32 item instrument which summarized the key recommendations of five of the major national studies and administered it in Greater New York and nine other communities.² Forty-seven percent of the 1076 respondents to the questionnaire are professional Jewish educators. Fifty-three percent are parents and lay leaders.

Seven of the 32 recommendations were singled out as having utmost relevance to Jewish schooling. I will refer to these in my discussion.

Essentially, there are four imperatives to be adduced regarding Jewish education from the current developments in general education.

* Presented at the annual meeting of the National Executive Council of the American Jewish Committee, Chicago, November 2, 1984.

¹ John Barranco, "Accountable After the Politicians Have Moved On ..." in "Symposium on the Year of the Reports: Responses from the Educational Community," *Harvard Education Review*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (February 1984), p. 6.

² A. I. Schiff and C. Botwinick, "The Relevance of the Recommendations of Major National Studies on Education to Jewish Schooling," *Jewish Education*, Vol. 52, No. 2 (Summer 1984), p. 7.