

# **A TALE OF FOUR CITIES: LEARNING ABOUT JEWISH COMMUNITY**

**Jacob B. Ukeles, Ph.D.**



**Presentation has been revised minimally from the version originally given at the November, 2012 General Assembly in Baltimore, MD.**

# CONTENTS

- About the Four Jewish Community Studies
- Some Basics
- Jewish Engagement
- Economic & Social Vulnerability
- Some Interesting Specifics
- Concluding Comments

# Four major community studies in the same period using similar methods creates an unusual opportunity

3

## □ Baltimore (2010)

- Field: March 1 - June 20
- 1,213 interviews, including 116 cell phones

## □ Chicago (2010)

- Field: March 24 - June 20
- 1,993 interviews, including 364 cell phones

## □ Cleveland (2011)

- Field: March 28 - June 30
- 1,044 interviews, including 65 cell phones

## □ New York (2011)

- Field: Feb. 8 - July 10
- 5,993 interviews, including 1,302 cell phones

# But keep in mind:

4

- “Sample” is not representative of US Jewry
  - No small or medium size communities
  - No Western or Southern communities
- There are modest differences in the criteria used to define a Jewish person
  - Chicago published data does not count an individual who self-defines as “partially Jewish” as Jewish

# SOME BASICS

# Communities range from 38,000 Jewish households in Cleveland to 694,000 in New York

6

## □ Baltimore

- 42,000 Jewish HH
- 93,000 Jewish persons
- 108,000 PPL in Jewish HH

## □ Chicago

- 148,000 Jewish HH
- 292,000 Jewish persons
- 382,000 PPL in Jewish HH

## □ Cleveland

- 38,000 Jewish HH
- 81,000 Jewish persons
- 98,000 PPL in Jewish HH

## □ New York

- 694,000 Jewish HH
- 1,538,400 Jewish persons
- 1,769,000 PPL in Jewish HH

All four of these older, established Jewish communities have grown since their previous study

7

□ Baltimore (since 1999)

- HH: +16%
- Jews: +2%
- PPL in JHH: +8%

□ Chicago (since 2000)

- HH: + 8%
- Jews: + 8%
- PPL in JHH: +17%

□ Cleveland (since 1996 )

- HH: +14%
- Jews: No change
- PPL in JHH: + 11%

□ New York (since 2002 )

- HH: +8%
- Jews +9%
- PPL in JHH: +6%

# The age distribution of Jewish persons in the four communities is remarkably similar

8

## □ Baltimore

- Children <18: 23%
- Adults 18-64: 56%
- Seniors, 65+: 21%

## □ Chicago

- Children <18: 21%
- Adults 18-64: 58%
- Seniors, 65+: 21%

## □ Cleveland

- Children <18: 23%
- Adults 18-64: 58%
- Seniors, 65+: 19%

## □ New York

- Children <18: 22%
- Adults 18-64: 56%
- Seniors, 65+: 22%



In all four communities most respondents were born where they live; Baltimore, Chicago & Cleveland are “magnets” for rest of USA; NY is a magnet for FSU & rest of the world

9

### □ Baltimore (All Adults)

- Born in Baltimore: 52%
- **Other USA:** 38%
- FSU & EE 4%
- Other non-USA 6%

### □ Chicago (All Adults)

- Born in Chicago: 54%
- **Other USA:** 33%
- FSU & EE 7%
- Other non-USA 6%

### □ Cleveland (Rs)

- Born in Cleveland: 56%
- **Other USA** 35%
- FSU & EE 4%
- Other non-USA 4%

### □ New York (Rs+ Sp)

- Born in New York: 56%
- Other USA: 15%
- **FSU & EE** 17%
- **Other non-USA** 13%

In all four communities, around 80% of respondents are long-time residents or natives; in Chicago, 15% are newcomers

□ Baltimore (Rs)

- Last ten years: 9%
- 11 to 19 years: 8%
- 20+ years+: 30%
- Born in Baltimore: 52%

□ Chicago (Rs)

- **Last ten years** 15%
- 11 to 19 years 8%
- 20+ years: 23%
- Born in Chicago: 54%

□ Cleveland (Rs)

- Last ten years 8%
- 11 to 19 years 8%
- 20+ years: 28%
- Born in Cleveland: 56%

□ New York (R's)

- Last ten years 6%
- 11 to 19 years 13%
- 20+ years: 25%
- Born in New York: 56%

# BIG STORIES : JEWISH ENGAGEMENT

# In each of the four communities:

12

1. Relatively high overall levels of engagement compared with last available national data [NJPS 2000-01] and other communities.
2. But a significant minority is not highly engaged:
  - Young adults (non-Orthodox)
  - Intermarrieds
  - Jews with no religion
3. Cost inhibits participation in Jewish life

# All four communities have high overall levels of engagement (relative to other communities)

13

Measures of Jewish Engagement	Baltimore	Chicago	Cleveland	New York
Very important to be Jewish	74%	74%	75%	57%
Very important to be part of Jewish Community	48%	40%	50%	44
Very attached to Israel	46%	41%	44%	44
In <u>intermarried</u> HH: % children raised Jewish-only (plus additional % raised Jewish & Something Else)	30% (18%)	49% (26%)	33% (22%)	31% 11%)
Affiliation	58%	48%	52%	50
% HH giving to Jewish Causes	63%	67%	65%	59%

# A significant minority of the Jewish community is not highly engaged in Jewish life

Key Groups	Percent who say it is very important to be Jewish			
	Baltimore	Chicago	Cleveland	New York
Young Jews 18-34 (non-Orthodox)	54%	71%	67%	34%
Intermarried Jewish respondents	50%	37%	47%	21%
Jews with no religion (“secular” Jews)	34%	47%	40%	18%
All Jewish Respondents	74%	74%	75%	57%

# Cost inhibits participation in Jewish life

15

Report cost is a barrier		Baltimore	Chicago	Cleveland	New York
Synagogue Membership					
	Income <\$50,000	36%	33%	30%	NA
	All Jewish HH	18%	19%	19%	NA
Jewish Summer Camp					
	Income <\$50,000	64%	44%	57%	NA
	All Jewish HH	26%	15%	30%	NA

Orthodox cohort is large (& growing) & is highly engaged.  
Differences in life style may affect community cohesion.

16

## Baltimore

- **21% of Jewish Respondents identify as Orthodox Jews**
- **32% of all Jewish Persons in are in Orthodox Households**
- **Four-of-Ten Children Live in Orthodox Households**
- **87% of Orthodox Respondents Under Age 35 Are Married Compared to 15% of All Other Jewish Respondents**

## New York

- **20% of Jewish Respondents identify as Orthodox Jews**
- **32% of all Jewish Persons in are in Orthodox Households**
- **Six-of-Ten Children Live in Orthodox Households**
- **65% of Orthodox Respondents Under Age 35 Are Married Compared to 25% of All Other Jewish Respondents**



# BIG STORIES: ECONOMIC & SOCIAL VULNERABILITY

# In each of the four communities:

- Many Jews are just managing and/or living in or near poverty
- Growing number of seniors, 75+; aging boomers portend much larger future needs
- A significant percentage of respondents find it difficult to access some services
- The community has been affected by the “Great Recession” (data collected in Baltimore, Chicago and Cleveland)

# Many Jews are just managing and/or are living in poverty or near poverty

<b>Measures of Economic Vulnerability</b>	<b>Baltimore</b>	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Cleveland</b>	<b>New York</b>
Income below \$50,000	37%	39%	44%	42%
Household not making ends meet or just managing	33%	35%	41%	42%
Poor Jewish households (Below 150% of federal poverty line)	5%	7%	12%	19%
Near-Poor Jewish households	7%*	4%*	7%*	10%**

\*Baltimore, Chicago, Cleveland: between 150% and 200% of federal poverty line

\*\*New York: Between 150% and 250% of the federal poverty line

# Growing number of Jewish seniors, 75+ - aging boomers portend much larger future needs.

<b>Seniors and Boomers</b>	<b>Baltimore</b>	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Cleveland</b>	<b>New York</b>
Seniors 75+, current study	12%	10%	10%	13%
Seniors 75+, previous study	9%	8%	8%	11%
Boomers, 50 to 64, current study	22%	24%	29%	21%
Boomers, 50 to 64, previous study	18%	19%	19%	18%

# A significant percentage of respondents find it difficult to access some services

21

Services	Baltimore	Chicago	Cleveland	New York
Sought help with personal issues (e.g., depression)	23%	24%	NA	NA
Very difficult to access help with personal issues	7%	5%	NA	NA
Sought job help	12%	18%	11%	14%
Very difficult to access job help	28%	28%	37%	43%
Sought help for person with a disability	8%	9%	NA	15%*
Very difficult to access help for person with a disability	9%	15%	NA	20%*

\*Adult only, separate question for child

# The “Great Recession” had a significant impact in Baltimore, Chicago and Cleveland

22

<b>Impacts of Recession</b>	<b>Baltimore</b>	<b>Chicago</b>	<b>Cleveland</b>
Negatively Impacted by Economic Downturn	43%	56%	57%
Serious impact	18%*	21%**	26%**
Groups hit hardest	Boomers and young adults	Boomers and Single parents	Boomers

\*Two or more impacts

\*\*"Strong negative impact"

**SOME INTERESTING  
SPECIFICS**

# “Borderland” Jews are 14% of respondents in New York

24

Considers Self:	Religion:	Number	Percent
Partially Jewish	Various Religions	79,200	11%
Jewish	Another religion	13,200	2%
Jewish	Judaism & another religion	1,000	0.1%
Not Jewish	Judaism	4,100	0.6%
Not Sure	Judaism or none	1,600	0.2%
Total "Borderland" Respondents		99,100	14%
Total Survey Respondents		694,200	100%



# “Borderland” Jews in New York (cont’d)

25

- Borderland respondents disproportionately report having been raised by intermarried parents
- If raised by one Jewish parent or two, they were often raised as Jewish and something else.
- They are disproportionately younger, less well-educated, and reside in areas of low Jewish density, that is, where few other Jews live.
- Not surprisingly, they score far lower on measures of Jewish engagement than other (so-called “Conventional”) Jews.

# Only in Chicago are younger respondents as likely as older respondents to identify Reform or Conservative

26

Denomination	18-39	40-64	65 & Over
Orthodox	12%	5%	4%
Traditional	6%	11%	7%
Conservative	22%	17%	28%
Reform	46%	46%	42%
Reconstructionist	1%	5%	4%
No Denomination	7%	10%	10%
No Religion	5%	7%	6%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%

# Concluding comments

- Remarkable stability of these older, established large Jewish communities
- Strong overall Jewish engagement with important exceptions: intermarried, Jews with no religion, non-Orthodox young adults (except Chicago!)
- Demographic strength of the Orthodox community
- Increasing numbers of self-identified Jews whose attachment to being Jewish is in some way tenuous
- Increasing diversity (e.g., non-white Jews)
- Significant Jewish poverty & the high cost of being Jewish

# WEBSITE REPORTS FROM THE FOUR CITIES

# Websites: Reports from the Four Cities

- Published reports, questionnaires, etc., for each of the four Jewish community studies are available at the Berman Jewish DataBank @ The Jewish Federations of North America: [www.jewishdatabank.org/us-local-communities.cfm](http://www.jewishdatabank.org/us-local-communities.cfm)
- Reports are also available through the Federation websites in each of the four cities:
  - Baltimore: [www.associated.org](http://www.associated.org)
  - Chicago: [www.juf.org/pdf/ealert/pop\\_study.pdf](http://www.juf.org/pdf/ealert/pop_study.pdf)
  - Cleveland: <http://www.jewishcleveland.org/popstudy.aspx>
  - New York: [www.ujafedny.org/jewish-community-study-of-new-york-2011/](http://www.ujafedny.org/jewish-community-study-of-new-york-2011/)

# Research Teams and Sponsors: Baltimore

- The 2010 Greater Baltimore Jewish Community was commissioned by The ASSOCIATED: Jewish Community Federation of Baltimore; the study chair was Michael Saxon, the study director was Michael Hoffman.
- The research team consisted of Dr. Jacob B. Ukeles and Dr. Ron Miller of Ukeles Associates, Inc. (UAI); survey research was conducted for UAI by SSRS (Social Science Research Solutions): Dr. David Dutwin and Robyn Rapoport.

# Research Teams and Sponsors: Chicago

- The 2010 Metropolitan Chicago Jewish Community was commissioned by Jewish United Fund [JUF]/Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago; the study director was Dr. Peter Friedman.
- The study was conducted by JPAR (Jewish Policy & Action Research), a strategic alliance of Ukeles Associates and SSRS. The principal investigators for the JPAR research team were Dr. Jacob B. Ukeles and Dr. Ron Miller of Ukeles Associates, Inc. The Chief Methodologist for the study was Dr. David Dutwin of SSRS.

# Research Teams and Sponsors: Cleveland

- The 2011 Greater Cleveland Jewish Community was commissioned by the Jewish Federation of Cleveland; the study chair was Enid Rosenberg and the Study Director was Erika Rudin-Luria.
- The study was conducted by JPAR (Jewish Policy & Action Research). The principal investigators for the JPAR research team were Dr. Jacob B. Ukeles, Dr. Pearl Beck and Dr. Ron Miller of Ukeles Associates, Inc. The Chief Methodologist for the study was Dr. David Dutwin of SSRS.



# Research Teams and Sponsors: New York

- The Jewish Community Study of New York 2011 was commissioned by UJA-Federation of New York. The study chair was Scott A. Shay; the Study Director was Jennifer Rosenberg.
- The study was conducted by JPAR (Jewish Policy & Action Research). The research team leader for JPAR was Professor Steven M. Cohen. Other members of the research team included Dr. Jacob B. Ukeles, Dr. Ron Miller & Dr. Pearl Beck of Ukeles Associates, Inc. The Chief Methodologist for the study was Dr. David Dutwin of SSRS.