

For Library Use Only
DO NOT CIRCULATE

DRAFT - INTERNAL DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

PATTERNS AND TRENDS IN THE JEWISH COMMUNITY
OF THE GREATER TRENTON AREA

PREPARED FOR THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF GREATER TRENTON

BY MALLACH HINDIN & ASSOCIATES
PENNINGTON, NEW JERSEY

MAY 1975

J296

T795

1001

PATTERNS AND TRENDS IN THE JEWISH COMMUNITY
OF THE GREATER TRENTON AREA

This report is based on a survey conducted of the Jewish population of the greater Trenton area between December 1974 and March 1975. The report is a draft presented for discussion and review by the Long-Range Planning Committee and the Board of the Jewish Federation of Greater Trenton, on behalf of whom this study was conducted.

Although the report is a draft, the data presented in the report is final and complete. It should be noted that a section on survey and research methodology, to be Appendix 1, has not be included in this draft.

Alan Mallach
Study Director

Edward Hindin
Assistant Study Director

Mallach Hindin & Associates
53 North Main Street
Pennington, New Jersey 08534

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study, and the survey that represented its core effort, was in many ways a collaborative effort between the Jewish Federation of Greater Trenton and the firm of Mallach Hindin & Associates, which performed the study under contract with the Federation.

Within the Federation we particularly want to thank Mr. Richard Glazer, President of the Federation for his support and assistance in kicking off the survey, and Ms. Rose Movitch and Mr. Ronald Berman of the Long-Range Planning Committee of the Federation provided constant support and constructive criticism. Ms. Willie Turner of the Federation office was of invaluable assistance throughout the survey on innumerable matters of detail. George Blacker and Howard Henschel of Greenwood House; Marty Kaplan and Carl Shipper of the Jewish Community Center; Lee Kalik and Col. Hal Hoenig of Jewish Family Service; and Rabbi David Schlucker of the Trenton Hebrew Academy were all of assistance in framing the study design, as were also the members of the Long-Range Planning Committee, and the various representatives of organizations, synagogues, and others who participated in the planning meetings for the study.

For Mallach Hindin & Associates Alan Mallach acted as study director and Edward Hindin as assistant study director. Field supervisors were Charles Barranco and Gloria Adlerman. Charles Barranco was also coding supervisor. Guy Sikora was computer programmer, with the assistance of William Dolphin of the Rutgers Center for Computing & Informational Services. Interviewers and Coders were Arthur Buchanan, Rita Chase, Mary Epp, Lynn Friedman, Deborah J. Fudge, Eleanor Hasson, Patricia Hindin, Marion Jacobson, Jeanette Koffler, Patricia Martin, Susan Mars, Machael Rosenthal, Harvey Samachson, Sylvia Sarnoff, Berenice Schmalzbach, and Donna Serridge.

Among others not formally connected with the study we would like to cite Eugene Schneider, long-time resident of the Trenton area, who acted as a ongoing sounding board for approaches, ideas, and directions during the course of the study.

The report was written by Alan Mallach.

INTRODUCTION

The survey of the Jewish community of the greater Trenton area, the report on which you have before you, was commissioned by the Jewish Federation of greater Trenton in the Fall of 1974, on the basis of discussions and plans taking place during the greater part of that year. Unlike most surveys of Jewish communities, such as the one conducted by the Federation in 1961, this survey went beyond the geographical area served at present by the Federation, and into an area that has until recently been a terra incognita for the organized Jewish community - in particular the recent developments in East Windsor, notably Twin Rivers.

The survey was conducted in two overlapping phases.* Initially, an effort was made to contact every identified Jewish household in the total survey area** by telephone, and to obtain over the phone a basic demographic profile of the household -- the age and sex of all family members, and the length of the family's residence in the area. On the basis of the telephone calls, appointments were then made with a sample of respondents for an in-depth personal interview, generally taking place at the respondent's home. It was

*A more detailed discussion of the survey, the methodology used, and the statistical standards applied, will be found in Appendix 1: Methodology, at the end of the report.

**The survey area included (in New Jersey) Trenton, Ewing, Hamilton, Lawrence, Bordentown, Princeton, East & West Windsor, Washington, the Hopewell Valley, Hightstown, Roosevelt, and Perrineville; and (in Pennsylvania) Yardley, Morrisville, and Lower Makefield.

through the means of this in-depth interview that detailed information about social characteristics, use of and need for services, etc., etc. was obtained. In the end, we were able to complete over 2,500 telephone interviews, and nearly 600 in-depth interviews, a body of information unparalleled, with regard to both reliability and the comprehensive nature of the information, in the history of the Trenton Federation.

The following report is divided into five sections, each one touching on a major area of concern, or areas of concern, to the Federation and its subventions:

(1) THE JEWISH POPULATION IN THE TRENTON AREA deals with the demographic picture of the present Federation service area, as well as the additional areas surveyed. In addition to presenting current population data, we have attempted to present a picture of major population trends affecting the Jewish community of the area.

(2) SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE JEWISH POPULATION covers the major social and economic features -- origin, educational level, occupation, income, and housing. In essence, if the first chapter answers the question "how many of us are there"; the second answers the question "who are we?"

(3) JEWISH LIFE IN THE TRENTON AREA discusses the many aspects of Jewish values, attitudes, and practices characterizing the local community - in addition to assessing the state of Jewish beliefs and values, the chapter also looks at their manifestations, in terms

of synagogue and organization membership, attendance, etc.

(4) THE JEWISH FEDERATION AND ITS SUBVENTIONS deals explicitly with the need and demand for, as well as the current use of, the services provided by the Federation and the four major subventions: the Jewish Community Center; the Trenton Hebrew Academy; Jewish Family Service; and Greenwood House. Each is discussed individually, and an assessment of each is attempted.

(5) PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE is the concluding chapter, in which we attempt to tie together the information presented to this point, and ask the classic question, "what does it mean?"

The last chapter, indeed the survey as a whole, cannot tell the board of the Federation or of any of the subventions what to do in the future. It does not provide answers to the questions that occupy these bodies; all it can do is provide the information, through which it should be possible to frame the right questions, and arrive at reasonable answers. It goes without saying that each decision that has to be made by the Federation and the subventions must by necessity be the result of the interplay of a range of factors, of which the findings of this survey are only one.

It may be that this survey will make the task of boards and planning committees harder rather than easier. Many of the facts presented herein are unpleasant, and many will have the effect of narrowing the realistic options available. Others will be perceived as providing ammunition for particular points of views or factions.

Many people reading this report will be reminded of the American slogan during World War II, "information is ammunition in the war of ideas"; hopefully, few will attempt to treat it as such. As with all such surveys, there are three levels on which it must be judged, or approached. With regard to the first, the statistical validity of the data, we are confident that it meets the most stringent available tests; the second, the interpretation placed on the data, we have followed the most informed judgement of ourselves and of such experts in the field as we have indirectly consulted through their written works. The third, the use that is made of the data, is in the hands of the readers of this report, the leadership and membership of the Jewish community of the greater Trenton area. We are confident that that too will meet the highest standards of the art.

CHAPTER 1: THE JEWISH POPULATION IN THE TRENTON AREA:
demographic characteristics and trends

For many the most important aspect of a survey, such as the one being discussed in these pages, is the opportunity it provides to count the population, and take stock of changes since the last count. Since, as is well known, the U.S. Census does not tally households by religion, surveys of this nature are the sole opportunity through which the Jewish community can measure itself in this way. This chapter presents what are termed the 'demographic' characteristics of the population -- total numbers, age distribution, and the like. The following chapter presents its counterpart: the 'socioeconomic' characteristics such as education, income, and occupation of Jewish households in the survey area.

In this and subsequent chapters, a distinction is made between the Federation Area and the New Area. The Federation area is that area served at present by the Jewish Federation of Greater Trenton, and its various subventions*, while the so-called new area (a term we have adopted for simplicity, although the area is in no real sense 'new') is the nearby area in which the Jewish population has been sharply increasing in recent years.**

*Federation area: City of Trenton, Ewing, Lawrence, Hamilton, Bordentown, Hopewell, Pennington in New Jersey; Morrisville, Lower Makefield, and Yardley in Pennsylvania.

**New area: Princeton, East Windsor, West Windsor, Hightstown, Roosevelt, Perrineville, and Washington Township.

The Federation area, sometimes called the Greater Trenton area, is identical to the area surveyed by the Jewish Federation in 1949, and again in 1961. As a result, it is possible to make direct comparisons, and identify clear trends in the features of the Jewish community.

A. Population and Age Distribution

As illustrated in Table 1-1, on the following page, the total Jewish population of the Federation area has dropped precipitously since 1961, showing a decline of 1,353 people, representing 16.1% of the 1961 Jewish population. We have placed the total Jewish population of the Federation area today (1/75) at 7,059 individuals. As will be discussed in detail later, there are now more Jewish individuals living in the new area - principally in East Windsor Township - than in the traditional center of Jewish population in this region.

The decline in population is attributable, it would appear, to a straightforward series of reasons: the gradual aging of a population which is receiving no significant replacement, either from new household formation, or from in-migration. During the past 3 to five years, at least, it would appear that there has been no significant net in-migration of Jewish families into the area. In fact, as will also be discussed below, it would appear that on balance there has been a net out-migration of Jewish families from the area in recent years.

TABLE 1-1: JEWISH POPULATION DISTRIBUTION BY AGE IN FEDERATION AREA - 1949, 1961, and 1975

	1975		1961		1949	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
0-4	185	2.6%	492	5.8%	736	8.9%
5-9	414	5.9	792	9.4	576	7.0
10-14	520	7.4	1056	12.6	422	5.1
15-19	686	9.7	656	7.8	461	5.6
20-24	447	6.3	320	3.8	569	6.9
25-34	492	7.0	568	6.8	1415	17.2
35-44	725	10.3	1536	18.3	1551	18.8
45-54	1081	15.3	1516	18.0	1186	14.4
55-64	1203	17.0	696	8.3	813	9.9
65+	1207	17.1	760	9.0	469	5.7
unknown	99		20		35	
total	7059	100.0%	8412	100.0%	8233	100.0%

note: data for 1961 and 1949 from "A Demographic Study of the Jewish Population of Trenton, New Jersey and Vicinity: 1961", Table 2, page 13.

The demographic shifts are considerable; the share of the population made up of individuals 65 and over, for example, has gone from 5.7% to 17.1%, while the share of individuals 9 and under has declined from 15.9% to 8.5%. Table 1-1(a) on the following page compares the distribution by age in the Federation area with the national age distribution of the Jewish population; the Federation

area population is significantly older:

 TABLE 1-1(a): JEWISH POPULATION DISTRIBUTION BY AGE - FEDERATION AREA
 AND NATIONAL JEWISH SAMPLE

	Federation Area	National Sample	difference*
0-4	2.6%	5.7%	-3.1%
5-9	5.9	6.7	-0.8
10-14	7.4	10.1	-2.7
15-19	9.7	9.4	+0.3
20-24	6.3	8.7	-2.4
25-34	7.0	10.4	-3.4
35-44	10.3	11.8	-1.5
45-54	15.3	13.8	+1.5
55-64	17.0	11.4	+5.6
65+	17.1	11.1	+6.0

*difference (-) refers to area in which Federation is underrepresented
 (+) area or group in which Federation is overrepresented.

note: national population data in this table and in any subsequent
 use is from the National Jewish Population Study of the Council
 of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (1971)

 area is substantially lower in two significant areas: (1) children of
 elementary and preschool age groups; and (2) adults in the early years
 of family formation and child rearing.

It would appear that the small number of households in this crucial
 middle group is the result of substantial loss through out-migration.

Referring back to Table 1-1, it will be noted that in 1961 there were
 1056 individuals aged 10-14 in the community. fourteen years later,

there were only 209 individuals in the comparable 25-29 age group!

Even if one assumes that many left, perhaps during their teenage years

as a result of family mobility, or other reasons, this is still a

drastic decline. Furthermore, of these 209 individuals, 89, or 42.6%,

are not independent household heads; rather, they are still living with parents or relatives. As such, they are still highly mobile, and as likely as not to leave the area as stay in the future.*

Another dimension of the age distribution picture, one useful for planning purposes, is that of individual cohort size. A cohort is the number of people of a given age; i.e., the number of people born within the same one-year period. The cohorts in the 0-4 age group, for example, will determine the number of children reaching school age each year for the next five years. The following table gives the average size of each cohort for the Jewish population in the Federation area:

 TABLE 1-1(b): COHORT SIZE FOR JEWISH POPULATION IN FEDERATION AREA

0-4	37	45-49	97
5-9	82.8	50-54	119.2
10-14	104	55-59	111.4
15-19	137.2	60-64	129.2
20-24	89.4	65-69	104
25-29	41.8	70-74	67
30-34	56.6	75-79	42.8
35-39	54.6	80-89	13.4
40-44	90.4		

In addition to the relative absence of preschool children, which has been noted above, another interesting point is that the largest cohorts are among those people likely to retire within the coming decade, in particular the 60-64 age group.

B. Geographic Distribution & Variation by Subarea

The population within the Federation area has moved considerably since 1961, largely away from Trenton. If the principal movement

*this pattern is even more pronounced among the 20-24 age group, in which only 35 of 447 individuals are in independent households

between 1949 and 1961 was from the central & eastern parts of Trenton to the Western Section of Trenton, the movement from 1961 to 1975 was away from the city entirely. While the 1961 study could, reasonably in view of the information that was true at the time, write "the future Jewish community is in the Western Section and the suburbs", trends since then have largely eliminated the Western Section of Trenton as a center of Jewish life:

 TABLE 1-2: DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH POPULATION WITHIN FEDERATION AREA BY SUBAREA - 1961 and 1975 - HOUSEHOLDS

	1975		1961	
	n	%	n	%
Trenton	1002	38.7%	1720	69.2%
Suburbs -				
New Jersey	1150	44.4	620	25.0
Pennsylvania	398	15.4	144	5.8

Today, as noted in the table, 38.7% of the Jewish households in the area live in Trenton. These households, however, represent only 29.4% of the Jewish population of the area; the Trenton Jewish community is made up disproportionately of senior citizens, living as individuals or couples, largely in a limited number of large apartment buildings.

The table on the following page illustrates some of the principal characteristics of the Jewish population in each of the major municipalities making up the Federation area. A number of significant differences are noticeable.

TABLE 1-3: COMPARATIVE DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURES OF SUB-POPULATIONS
WITHIN FEDERATION AREA

	Trenton	Ewing	Lawrence	Hamilton/ Bordentown	Yardley/ Makefield*
Households:					
n	1002	653	247	226	398
%	38.7%	25.2%	9.5%	8.7%	15.4%
Population:					
n	2072	1728	919	622	1506
%	29.4%	24.5%	13.0%	8.8%	21.3%
average household size	2.07	2.65	3.72	2.75	3.78
Population aged 0-9:					
n	55	128	122	35	235
% sub-pop.	2.6%	7.4%	13.3%	5.6%	15.6%
% 0-9 total	9.2%	21.4%	20.4%	5.8%	39.2%
Population aged 65 and over:					
n	747	289	19	73	58
% sub-pop.	36.1%	16.7%	2.1%	11.7%	3.9%
% total 65+	61.9%	23.9%	1.6%	6.0%	4.8%
median age:	60.7 years	48.2 years	22.5 years	45.9 years	29.1 years
median age of head of house:	63.4 years	57.9 years	46.7 years	55.1 years	48.0 years

*including Morrisville

note: disparity between percentages and 100.0% represents Hopewell area (too small to distribute) and undistributed total.

% sub-pop: percentage of municipal sub-population; e.g., 36.1% of Trenton Jewish residents are over 65

% total: percentage of total area population (e.g., 65+) living in that city; e.g., 61.9% of all area residents 65+ live in Trenton.

The five communities, or sub-populations, fall into three distinct groupings:

- Trenton is a community of the old. three quarters of the city's Jewish population is over 50, and the number of families with small children living in the city is insignificant.
- Ewing and Hamilton are moving in the same direction; in both communities the number of senior citizens is high, and likely to increase in view of a bulge in the 50-64 age group. In both communities there are far fewer children in the 0-9 group than in the 15-19 age group.
- Lawrence and Yardley/Makefield are the two communities in which substantial numbers of child-raising families are still located. Most of the families in these communities are child raising, and contain 3 to 6 members. Still, of all the under 20 cohorts in these communities, those in the 15-19 age group are the largest, although proportionately smaller than in Ewing and Hamilton. Lawrence and Yardley/Makefield, therefore, have already well passed the peak child-rearing and child-bearing years.

The sharp differences result in demographic imbalances:

- 62% of the area's senior citizens live in the City of Trenton.
- 60% of the area's children aged 9 or less live in Lawrence and in Yardley/Makefield

Thus the different patterns of change within the area, particularly the depletion of the younger population from Trenton, has resulted in a region which is demographically bifurcated -- certain areas are dominated by child-rearing families and contain only a handful of senior citizens, while others are dominated by senior citizens, and contain few younger people.* It should be stressed, however, that

*in this context it should be noted that the traditional Jewish practice of having elderly parents live with their children has all but disappeared in this area.

the Jewish communities of Lawrence and Yardley/Makefield are not young communities in any real sense; they are merely young relative to the rest of the area. To find the young Jewish families, we must look outside the area.

C. Where The Young People Are - the New Area

The second area in which the survey took place is the area outside the current Federation service area - in essence, the Windsors, including Twin Rivers*, Roosevelt, and Princeton. While the absence of precise lists made it impossible to arrive at an exact population count, we have been able to arrive at a highly reliable estimate. Table 1-4 presents the distribution of population by age in the new area, as we estimate it, and by comparison with that of the Federation area presented earlier:

 TABLE 1-4: JEWISH POPULATION DISTRIBUTION BY AGE - COMPARISON OF
 NEW AREA AND FEDERATION AREA

	NEW AREA		FEDERATION AREA		% OF TOTAL IN NEW AREA
	n	%	n	%	
0-4	939	12.5%	185	-2.6%	83.5%
5-9	1187	15.8	414	5.9	74.1
10-14	765	10.2	520	7.4	59.5
15-19	451	6.0	686	9.7	39.7
20-24	248	3.3	447	6.3	35.7
25-34	1802	23.9	492	7.0	78.6
35-44	1115	14.8	725	10.3	60.6
45-54	692	9.2	1081	15.3	39.0
55-64	327	4.3	1203	17.0	21.4
65+	180	2.4	1207	17.1	13.0
unknown	16		99		
total	7532	100.0%	7059	100.0%	51.6%

*Although Twin Rivers is part of East Windsor Township, since it is widely perceived as a distinct community, it has been treated as such

The information presented in Table 1-4 is remarkable: the new area is as far removed from a 'normal' distribution as the Federation area, but in the opposite direction! It is overwhelmingly dominated by young families with small children; children under 9 are proportionately twice as large a part of the new area population as of the national Jewish population. This area, in particular the sub-areas of the Windsors and Twin Rivers, is an area in the process of becoming - it has only just come into being, with the construction of the Twin Rivers Planned Unit Development (as well as other smaller developments in the area, both subdivisions and garden apartments), and is made up principally of families that have just moved to the area, and are beginning the process of child-rearing in their first home.

Within the area there are disparities as notable as those in the Federation area, which are presented on the following page. In essence, Princeton is a middle-aged community, not substantially different from Lawrence or Yardley/Makefield in its demographic composition. Roosevelt, although too small to have a statistical impact on the area as a whole, is demographically unique - a mix of young families and senior citizens, with relatively few people in the middle -- as a result of its unusual atmosphere and history. Finally, it is in the Windsors and Twin Rivers where the child explosion is taking place.

TABLE 1-5: COMPARATIVE DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURES OF SUB-POPULATIONS
WITHIN NEW AREA

	Windsors*	Roosevelt**	Princeton	Twin Rivers
households (estimate):				
n	600	120	600	800
%	28.3%	5.7%	28.3%	37.7%
population (estimate):				
n	2252	382	1924	2974
%	29.9%	5.1%	25.5%	39.5%
average HH size:	3.75	3.18	3.21	3.72
population aged 0-9:				
n	667	58	306	1095
% sub-pop.	29.6%	15.2%	15.9%	36.8%
% 0-9 total	31.4%	2.7%	14.4%	51.5%
population aged 65 and over:				
n	31	49	81	19
% sub-pop.	1.4%	12.8%	4.2%	0.7%
% 65+ total	17.2%	27.2%	54.0%	10.6%
median age:	26.2	35.1	27.5	25.8
	years	years	years	years
median age of head of-house:	37.4	50.6	46.9	34.1
	years	years	years	years

*area includes East Windsor (less Twin Rivers) West Windsor, Hightstown, and Washington Township. 75% to 80% of the total, however, is in East Windsor Township.

**area contains Roosevelt and Perrineville (Upper Millstone Twp.)

Over half of the children aged 9 and under in the new area live in the Twin Rivers development; conversely, over half of the (small)

number of senior citizens in the area live in Princeton.

In short, then, a new population has largely come into being in this area that is comparable in size, or slightly larger, than the Jewish population of the Federation area. The speed with which this population has come into being, and the degree to which its size is a recent phenomenon is illustrated by the following data on length of residence:

TABLE 1-6: LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN AREA OF POPULATION - NEW AREA
(households)

under 1 year	67	3.2%
1 year	245	11.6
2 years	425	20.0
3 or 4 years	501	23.6
5 to 9 years	380	17.9
10 to 19 years	272	12.8
20 or more years	262	12.4
lifetime resident	63	3.0
subtotal under 5 years		58.4%

Nearly 3 out of 5 households in the new area have moved to the area since 1970! Again, the pattern varies widely from community to community within the new area:

- Twin Rivers has been populated only since 1969-1970, when the first dwelling units were constructed. Only an insignificant handful of Twin Rivers residents were previously residents of the survey area.
- The Windsors were populated principally during the period from 1965-1972. This coincides with the period of greatest subdivision and apartment development in the area; development after that time has been concentrated in Twin Rivers.

- The largest group of Princeton residents moved to Princeton between 1955 and 1965 (roughly one-third of the community). The remainder of the population is widely distributed; although hardly any are lifetime residents of the area, many have lived here over 20 years.
- The Roosevelt population contains a concentration of older families who moved to Roosevelt at the time of its initial development in the 30's, and a steady, slow, turnover since that time. Nearly half the families in Roosevelt are still either lifetime residents or pre-World War II migrants.

It is doubtful that prior to 1965 there were more than 150-200 Jewish families in the area, leaving aside Princeton.

D. Migration and Population Trends in the Federation Area

The above discussion of in-migration to the new area prompts a look at the same question with regard to the Federation area; this is particularly important in terms of our ability to assess future population trends in the Federation area. The following table presents data on length of residence of Jewish households in the Federation

TABLE 1-6(a): LENGTH OF RESIDENCE - FEDERATION AREA (households)

under 1 year	21	0.8%
1 year	53	2.0
2 years	31	1.2
3 or 4 years	76	2.9
5 to 9 years	202	7.8
10 to 19 years	346	13.4
20 or more years	1043	40.3
lifetime resident	818	31.6
subtotal under 5 years		6.9%

The table presents a picture of population stasis, or the absence of meaningful replenishment; the gross in-migration during the past fi

years - the number entering, unadjusted for the number leaving - is in the area of 1% to 2% per year. Since normal movement of any population in this country is on the order of 10% to 20% per year, of which 6% to 8% is inter-regional (between states or substate regions), this would suggest:

- there is considerable out-migration from the Federation areas, and has been during the past decade.
- the net migratory balance is negative; i.e., out-migration exceeds in-migration, most probably by a considerable amount.

This is supported, although only roughly, by a peripheral finding of the survey: during the three months of telephone interviewing, the interviewers in the Federation area identified 37 telephones that were operative as of 1/1/75, but were disconnected between then and the end of March. Of these, the interviewers determined that 10 were the result of deaths, 11 verified out-migration, and 16 undetermined. At the same time, since it would appear that a major part of out-migration is that of young people, who never establish households in the area, it is likely that the above is a mere fraction of the total out-migration.

A further indication of the degree of out-migration comes from a calculation of birth and death rates. Such calculations show clearly that the excess of deaths over births in the Federation area does not account for more than a small part of the net loss in population between 1961 and 1975. The table on the following page illustrates this point.

TABLE 1-7: RELATIONSHIP OF NATURAL DECREASE IN POPULATION TO TOTAL POPULATION LOSS 1961-1975 - FEDERATION AREA

	ASSUMPTION A*	ASSUMPTION B*
natural increase (+) or decline (-) 1961	+ 19.3/year	- 11.5/year
natural increase or decline 1975	- 48.3/year	- 63.4/year
change resulting from natural decline	- 210	- 561
actual change	- 1353	- 1353
remainder (net migration)	- 1143	- 792

Assumption A: Jewish birth rate largely comparable to national average for same period, adjusted by number of women in 5-year age categories.

Assumption B: Jewish birth rate 2/3 that arrived at for Assumption A; adjusted similarly.

The above table indicates that there is a net out-migration of 55 to 80 individuals annually from the Federation area. The number of households is not declining; indeed, there was a slight increase from 1961 -- from 2484 to 2590. Again, the reason for the decline would appear to be principally found in the erosion of the young adult population. As noted above, a comparison of age groups in 1961 and 1974 suggests strongly that the greatest loss has been in those individuals reaching maturity in the late 1960's and early 1970's, a group that has largely disappeared from the area's Jewish population. If this is the case, it would suggest that the out-migration has been more significant during the past five to eight years than

during the preceding period; furthermore, a glance at Table 1-1 will show that a substantial pool still exists for continued out-migration during the late 1970's and early 1980's in the form of a large body of today's 15 to 19 year olds. Since only a handful of the 20-24 group has formed their own households, they too are a potential body of out-migrants.

The existence of this strong out-migration potential, which is impossible to quantify for the future, makes it difficult to project trends with precision. Nonetheless, a general outline of future trends can be discerned:

- at present the actuarial death rate within the Jewish population of the Federation area is 13.43 per thousand individuals*. This can be expected to lead to 100-120 deaths per year in the community during the coming years.
- If assumption B (table 1-7) is accepted, the birth rate within the Jewish population of the Federation area is 4.3 per thousand. This is likely to yield only 20-30 births per year during the coming years.*
- Finally, net migration out of the area can only be estimated in the crudest terms. If we adopt assumption B, and further assume that the out-migration rate has roughly doubled over the 14-year period under study**, a level of out-migration between 80 and 100 people is likely during coming years.

The adoption of these three assumptions leads directly to the

*The most recent available national rates were as follows: birth rate 14.9/thousand (1973); death rate 9.4/thousand (1972). The differences are, of course, largely attributable to the unusual age distribution of the Jewish population, and the shortage of women in the child-bearing years.

**This follows logically from the hypothesis that the group of people aged 10-14 in 1961 is the largest component of out-migration.

following:

- net excess of deaths over births = 70 to 100 per year
- net out migration = 80 to 100 per year
- total population loss = 150 to 200 per year
- total population loss 1975-1980 = 750 to 1000

This assumes, of course, that nothing will take place during this period that will drastically change the pattern of the last few years. We believe that that is an inescapable assumption; the only likely events that would change the pattern would be a major increase in residential construction in the area, coupled with a major employment increase*. Given the largely developed nature of the area, neither is a likely eventuality.

It is impossible to project the population of the new area, since there are too many variables the future of which is too uncertain -- in particular, the future of residential development in the area, and the plans of still-young households for additional children. Both are highly uncertain. Nonetheless, it is apparent that at least for the next decade the population is bound to increase, since the area will not have either a major pool of potential out-migrants, or a major pool of elderly citizens, until the mid-1980's. Thus, this population will grow, although at a rate we cannot anticipate. At present the total Jewish population in the combined area is divided almost evenly between the two areas. It is not out of the question

*For whatever reasons, the Trenton area (unlike Princeton & East Windsor) is not generally considered to be within commuting distance of New York and North Jersey.

that by the late 1980's the ratio will be 2:1 -- a population of 9000 to 10000 in the new area, and a population of 5000 or less in the present Federation service area.

CHAPTER 2: SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE JEWISH POPULATION

If the previous chapter was devoted to counting the Jewish population, this one is devoted to describing them in social and economic terms; educational levels, occupations, incomes, and so on. In this and subsequent chapters a 5-part geographic classification of the population will be used, in addition to the distinction between the Federation area and the new area. The five categories are (1) the city of Trenton; (2) the suburbs within the Federation area (Ewing, Lawrence, etc.); (3) the Windsors, including Roosevelt but excluding Twin Rivers; (4) Princeton; and (5) Twin Rivers.

A. Origin of the Population

The origin of the population is in reality two separate features - first, the area from which the individuals moved to the survey area, and second, the birthplace of the individuals surveyed. In order to make generational comparisons, we also asked individuals for the birthplace of their parents. The tables on the following page present some of the more interesting aspects of the question on respondents' origins. One point not included on the table, but of interest, is that 64% of all of the present residents of the suburban part of the Federation area moved to their present homes from the city of Trenton. This is one manifestation of a trend that has been going on since the 1940's.

TABLE 2-1: ORIGIN OF THE JEWISH POPULATION

a. Where did respondents live prior to moving to the survey area?

	Trenton	Suburbs	Windsors	Princeton	Twin Rivers
New York City	25.3%	29.5%	37.9%	25.9%	63.8%
North Jersey	22.7	17.3	23.4	24.1	22.0
Philadelphia & S. Jersey	20.0	18.7	6.5	13.8	3.1
New York State	2.7	5.8	16.1	6.9	5.5
Other U.S.	17.3	25.2	15.3	22.4	3.9
Outside U.S.	12.0	3.6	0.8	8.6	1.6

b. Where were respondents born? (actual interview respondents and their spouse, if any)

Central N.J.*	34.9%	25.4%	5.9%	3.8%	0.6%
Other N.J. area	8.6	11.0	11.2	9.5	8.1
New York City	20.7	28.5	53.2	44.8	74.4
Northeast U.S.	8.2	17.5	14.1	12.4	6.9
Other U.S.	3.9	4.7	6.3	12.4	2.5
Eastern Europe	17.2	9.9	5.9	14.3	3.8
Western Europe	6.5	2.6	1.5	1.9	0.6
Middle East	0	0.3	0.5	0	2.5
Other	0	0	0	1.0	0.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

c. Where were respondents' parents born?

Central N.J.	5.4%	6.6%	1.7%	0.9%	1.0%
Other N.J.	2.5	3.9	4.2	3.3	5.1
New York City	5.4	11.0	20.2	23.3	43.7
Northeast U.S.	3.6	8.7	7.5	6.7	5.1
Other U.S.	3.4	8.2	8.7	6.7	5.1
Eastern Europe	64.7	47.8	51.9	55.2	34.6
Western Europe	13.9	12.7	5.0	2.9	2.4
Middle East	0	0.9	0.2	1.0	1.4
Other	1.1	0.3	0.5	0	1.7
Outside U.S.	79.7%	61.7%	57.6%	59.1%	40.1%

*Central N.J. defined as survey area and immediate vicinity

The table, of course, reaffirms the conventional wisdom about the wellsprings of American Jews; initially from Eastern Europe (in particular Russia & Poland), from there to New York City, and from there to dispersal around the country. It is clear that most of the Jewish population of the survey area followed this pattern; those who did not, either coming from elsewhere than Eastern Europe, or moving directly from Europe to the Central New Jersey or the Philadelphia areas, are a minority. It is interesting to note that the parents of the Twin Rivers residents are the only group of respondent parents in which a majority were born within the United States. It should also be noted that, although no parents to speak of are native to the survey area, a substantial minority of the residents of the Federation area are.

B. Education, Occupation, and Income

The survey area as a whole showed exceptional attainments in all three basic economic categories; the Jewish population of the Greater Trenton area is well educated, largely employed in professional categories, and affluent. It is so by comparison both to the population at large, and to the national Jewish population.

With regard to education, the majority of respondents, male and female, have a college degree, and in many cases, a graduate degree.* Although the educational level of women is still somewhat

*Again, responses to this and similar questions are based on the actual respondent and his/her spouse, rather than all adults. The class of respondents, however, represents about 90% of population over 25.

lower than that of men in the area, it has increased more rapidly since 1961:

TABLE 2-2: HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED - FEDERATION AREA

	1975			1961		
	M	F	TOTAL	M	F	TOTAL
less than a HS diploma	10.1%	8.2%	9.1%	21.9%	21.4%	21.6%
HS diploma	19.4	29.7	24.8	24.1	39.9	32.0
some college	13.9	21.4	17.9	16.7	21.8	19.2
BA degree*	22.6	29.3	26.1			
MA degree*	21.5	11.4	16.2			
Ph.D*	12.5	0	6.0			
BA or more	56.6	40.7	48.3	36.9	16.6	26.7

*or the equivalent

The percentage of women with a college degree or better has more than doubled since 1961. These educational levels are considerably higher than those reported for the national Jewish population in 1971; the educational level of the population in the new area, however, is still higher.

TABLE 2-2(a): HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED - COMPARISON

	Federation	New area	National
HS diploma or less	33.9%	21.6%	46.4%
Some college	17.9	16.2	19.9
college graduate (BA)	26.1	30.5	14.7
Post-graduate or professional degree	22.2	31.7	19.0

TABLE 2-2(b): HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED/BY AGE OF RESPONDENT - FEDERATION AREA (male heads only)

	20-39	40-59	60+
HS diploma or less	0	25.0%	45.2%
Some college	7.1%	14.4	15.1
College graduate (BA)	35.7	22.7	17.2
Post-graduate or professional degree	57.1	37.9	22.6

of the respondents under 40 years of age, over half have a graduate or professional degree, and 93% have graduated from college. The only community, as would be expected, in which educational status is significantly greater is Princeton - within the Princeton Jewish community 85% of the respondents had college degrees, and 57% had graduate degrees; 79% of the male heads of household had graduate degrees.

Consistent with the high level of educational attainment, a very high percentage of the employed members of the Jewish community in the survey area are employed in professional positions. In the total Jewish community, 54% of the male workers and 44% of the female workers are professionals - teachers, doctors, lawyers, research personnel, etc. Another point of interest is the large number of women in the labor force - nearly half (48.4%) of the women in the survey area are presently employed, and, as has been noted, almost half of this group are professionals.

TABLE 2-3: OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY OF EMPLOYED WORKERS

	Trenton	Suburbs	Windsors	Princeton	Twin Rivers
(a) male employed workers					
Professional	44.9%	48.1%	53.8%	90.2%	51.6%
managerial	19.1	30.2	21.5	9.8	20.5
technical	9.0	4.9	7.5	0	14.1
clerical					
& sales	16.9	13.0	12.9	0	9.0
other	11.2	3.7	4.3	0	3.8
(b) female employed workers					
professional	29.2%	38.8%	43.8%	80.6%	52.2%
managerial	9.2	12.2	8.3	8.3	0
technical	7.7	7.1	12.5	5.6	21.7
clerical					
& sales	46.2	35.7	29.2	2.8	13.0
other	7.7	6.1	6.3	2.8	13.0
% in labor force	53.7%	49.7%	46.2%	64.3%	28.8%

(c) comparison with national Jewish sample

	MALE		FEMALE	
	TRENTON*	NATIONAL	TRENTON*	NATIONAL
professional & technical	61.1%	29.3%	53.4%	23.8%
managerial	22.6	40.7	9.3	15.5
clerical & sales	11.6	17.4	30.7	50.0
other	4.9	11.0	6.7	7.6

*entire survey area, NOT city of Trenton

The occupational status of the residents of the new area (all sub-areas) is even more heavily skewed toward the professional category than is that of the Federation area residents. 62% of all employed men, and 58% of all employed women, living in the new area are professionals. In both areas, not only are there large numbers of professionals, but there are unusually few in all other categories, including the managerial (including small business proprietorships) which nationally is the principal area of Jewish employment.

One further point on employment category should be mentioned: it was noted that a majority of employed women in the area are employed in professional & technical positions. A sharp contrast emerges between that, and the jobs women who are at present homemakers held previously.

 TABLE 2-3(a): OCCUPATIONS OF EMPLOYED WOMEN AND PAST OCCUPATIONS OF WOMEN WHO ARE NOW HOMEMAKERS

	Employed at present	once employed now homemakers
professional & technical	53.4%	40.9%
managerial	9.3	0.9
clerical & sales	30.7	47.8
other	6.7	4.7

The women who left their jobs for marriage and motherhood, as distinct from those women who combined them, tend to have been much more likely to hold clerical or other low-level positions.

The connection to the city of Trenton, which residents of the Federation share with regard to their origin, is also shared with regard to their employment. Residents of the new area, on the other hand, are largely untied to Trenton, and work in a variety of areas often far removed. The image of Twin Rivers residents, however, as overwhelmingly made up of New York City commuters is not true. Although it may have been true at one time, at present only 28% of the Twin Rivers respondents work in New York City; that, of course, is still a higher percentage than that of any other area studied.

TABLE 2-4: PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT FOR EMPLOYED WORKERS IN SURVEY AREA

	Trenton	Mercer County*	South NJ & Penna.	New York City**	Central & North NJ
Trenton	88.6%	6.3%	2.5%	0	2.5%
Suburbs	66.8	21.7	4.0	2.4	5.1
Windsors	15.3	29.2	5.6	16.0	34.0
Princeton	7.1	72.6	3.6	3.6	13.1
Twin Rivers	5.9	23.8	17.8	27.7	24.8
Total	46.4%	25.9	5.8	8.1	13.8

*excluding city of Trenton

**including suburbs in New York State (one mention)

It is interesting to note that of those groups that are recent immigrants to the area, particularly the residents of the Windsors and Twin Rivers, and who have most likely sought and in many cases obtained employment in the area since moving here, very few have

found work in Trenton; far more work in the immediate surrounding suburbs of the city. This, one can assume, is a reflection of Trenton's declining function in the regional labor market generally; it is likely that many of the residents of the Federation area who work in Trenton (a) have done so for a very long time; and (b) have given at least some consideration, particularly if they are free professionals or independent proprietors, to the idea of a move to the suburbs.

The third area of concern here is household income; here, too, as can be expected, the Jewish community has achieved high levels. The following table presents distributions for each of the sub-areas, as well as median income data:

TABLE 2-5: HOUSEHOLD INCOME DISTRIBUTION AND MEDIAN INCOME

	0-\$9999	\$10000-\$19999	\$20000+	Median
Trenton	40.7%	25.3%	34.0%	\$13,462
Suburbs	9.7	34.0	56.3	\$21,696
Windsors	8.2	17.6	74.1	\$23,182
Princeton	4.4	13.3	82.2	\$30,000
Twin Rivers	4.5	34.3	61.2	\$22,000
National Jewish sample (1971)	32.9%	34.7	32.4	\$12,630

The median household income for the national Jewish sample, which was drawn in 1971, is undoubtedly considerably higher today; still, if it has risen consistent with general national trends, it is not likely to be more than \$16,000 to \$17,000 -- lower than any group in the local survey with the exception of the city of Trenton. The lower income in the city of Trenton is, clearly, more than anything else a problem of the elderly. 48% of the respondents over the age

of 65 in Trenton were earning under \$5,000/year, with an additional 23% earning between \$5,000 and \$10,000. Clearly, in the midst of an exceptionally affluent population there is a considerable number supporting themselves on meager fixed incomes.

Although the median income in Princeton is the highest, it is closely approached by some of the suburban communities in the Federation area, when looked at individually:

TABLE 2-5(a): MEDIAN INCOME BY MUNICIPALITY IN SURVEY AREA

Trenton	\$13,462	Windsor	\$24,342
Ewing	\$18,889	Roosevelt	\$21,786
Lawrence	\$27,917	Princeton	\$30,000
Hamilton	\$17,188	Twin Rivers	\$22,000
Yardley/Mkfld	\$23,333		
Total survey area		\$21,894	

The last aspect of family income, which is of particular interest, is that dealing with respondents' income expectations; i.e., how large a household income they expected to have five years from today. We expect that the answers an individual provides to a question of this sort are a mixture of realism and mental set; on the one hand, many people have a clear idea (assuming certain constants about the society and the economy) of their economic prospects. On the other, people's fears, tensions, whether economic or not, tend to cloud their perceptions of their economic position, particularly their economic future. The following table compares actual incomes with

TABLE 2-5(b): INCOME DISTRIBUTION AND MEDIAN - PRESENT HOUSEHOLD INCOME AND ANTICIPATED INCOME (IN FIVE YEARS)

		\$0-\$9999	\$10000-\$19999	\$20000-\$34999	\$35000+	MEDIAN	5 YEAR CHANGE
Trenton	NOW	40.7%	25.3%	23.1%	11.0%	\$13462	
	5 YRS	45.5	22.1	16.9	15.6	\$12857	- 4.5%
Suburbs	NOW	9.7%	34.0%	41.0%	15.3%	\$21696	
	5 YRS	11.3	27.8	35.3	25.6	\$25,000	+ 15.2%
Windsors	NOW	8.2%	17.6%	63.5%	10.6%	\$23182	
	5 YRS	7.0	7.0	54.9	31.0	\$29,615	+ 27.7%
Prince- ton	NOW	4.4%	13.3%	46.7%	35.6%	\$30,000	
	5 YRS	2.6	2.6	41.0	53.8	\$37,500	+ 25.0%
Twin Rivers	NOW	4.5%	34.3%	56.7%	1.5%	\$22,000	
	5 YRS	1.6	9.4	51.6	37.5	\$32,045	+ 45.7%

the income respondents anticipate having five years from today. Clearly, many if not most of the respondents in Twin Rivers and (to a slightly lesser degree) the Windsors see themselves moving upward quickly from an economic standpoint, as do the already affluent Princetonians; many of the residents of the Federation area, on the other hand, see their income stabilized or (most probably in the case of older people) declining. Given the age distribution of the two groups, this may be realistic; at the same time, one cannot help note that this may relate as well to the contrast of growth and decline in the two areas.

C. Housing of the Population

A brief note on housing should be adequate, since the survey identified little of significance in this area; in essence, the principal findings included:

- the great majority of respondents are home owners, particularly in the new areas. In the Federation area, 27.6% of the households are renters, primarily elderly residents of a limited number of apartment developments. Only 5.4% of the residents of the new area are renters.*
- The great majority of households are satisfied with their housing; only 9.4% indicated any desire to move within the area from their present house or apartment, for any reason.
- Although very few families indicated a desire to move, a somewhat larger number indicated that they had either too much or too little space -- 23% of the Trenton respondents felt that they had too much

*We do not believe that this finding is biased, in the sense that one can argue that it is more difficult to obtain interviews with apartment residents, etc. A careful canvass was done of a number of garden apartment developments in the new areas, including the identification of 'Jewish names', and very few were found.

space, while 34% of the Twin Rivers respondents felt they had too little space. Most respondents, however, did not expect to move for this reason.

- among those respondents who did expect to move, the reasons cited most often were (a) to move to a larger house; and (b) to have more land around the house, more open space. It should be stressed that neither of these was voiced by more than a handful of respondents.

Finally, the question of housing costs should be looked at in somewhat more detail. Although the housing cost data does not precisely match the income data, it suggests that at least some of the lower income Jewish households - in Trenton in particular, but elsewhere as well -- are paying disproportionate amounts for shelter:

 TABLE 2-6: LOW INCOME POPULATION AND LOW-RENT SHARE OF HOUSING

	% families under \$5,000	% rentals under \$100/mo.*
Trenton	27.5%	16.4%
Suburbs	4.9	1.7
Windsors	5.9	1.4
Princeton	0	2.7
Twin Rivers	4.5	0

Although the percentages are small, outside Trenton, the numbers are not entirely negligible - the 10% or so of Trenton families that may be paying more than a reasonable amount for shelter can add up to as many as 100 households; 3% more in the suburban part of the Federation area could represent another 40-50 families. Thus this is a problem that the Federation could justifiably look into.

D. Social Patterns and Attachment to the Area

We noted earlier that the majority of the Jewish population in the survey area are not native to the area; in particular, the new area is made up largely of recent in-migrants. As a result, a major concern was to assess the degree to which these households had developed an attachment to the Central New Jersey area, and could be considered likely present and future participants in the social and civic life of the community. In order to do so, a series of questions around friendship patterns, anticipated length of stay, and the like, were framed and directed at respondents.

The last, unfortunately, did not yield meaningful results; nearly every response of individuals asked how long they expected to live in the area was 'indefinite', or the equivalent (total of lifetime/indefinite/don't know was 90.7% of all responses). As mentioned in the discussion of housing, either people are generally satisfied with their present situation, or, influenced by the many uncertainties of the day, are reluctant to commit themselves as far as any future plans are concerned. In any case, the consensus in both areas is that families will stay where they are for the foreseeable future. One must question this finding with respect to one sub-group, the Twin Rivers townhouse residents. The majority of Twin Rivers residents live in townhouses, and previous studies (including one conducted by the author in the summer of 1973) of townhouse residents, including this group, suggests that they are substantially more likely to move, given the opportunity, than residen

of detached single family houses. Still, there is not way to apply these findings from the past to the question at hand.

More significant than this is the degree to which recent migrants have developed friendship patterns within the area, and as that takes place, allowed friendships based on neighboring in their previous place of residence to decline. It should be noted that few people, if any, maintain a friendship pattern that is exclusively local; among in-migrants to the Federation area, most of whom arrived fifteen to thirty years ago, if not long, over half still maintain some social contact with the area from which they moved.

The following table illustrates the division of friendships between local and outside the area:

 TABLE 2-7: PERCENTAGE OF FRIENDS WHO LIVE IN THIS AREA (5 of respondents citing each level, and mean for each area)

	0-49%	50-74%	75-99%	100%	mean
Trenton	11.9%	15.1%	66.7%	12.7%	75.7%
Suburbs	15.8	18.3	55.4	10.4	72.5
Windsors	19.2	31.3	44.4	5.1	65.3
Princeton	19.6	32.1	41.1	7.1	64.7
Twin Rivers	37.5	27.5	30.0	5.0	54.1

Although locally-based friendships are fewest at Twin Rivers, the average Twin Rivers resident still has over 50% of his friends in the area; this is so despite the short period since migration to the area. The figure of 75% or so, which the residents of Trenton show, is most probably the practical upper limit for locally-based friendship patterns.

Evidence for the proposition that in-migrants quickly develop ties in their new community, but never completely abandon the old one, is provided further by responses to "Do you still return to (old area) for ALL, SOME, or NONE of the following?" Few people, in any group, continued to regard their old community as relevant to their organizational, communal, or religious activities; that was not true, however, of friendship patterns:

 TABLE 2-7(a): PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS RETURNING TO OLD AREA FOR ALL, SOME, OR NONE OF THEIR SOCIAL LIFE

	ALL*	SOME*	NONE*	NOT APPLICABLE
Trenton	11.3%	42.3%	46.5%	45.8%
Suburbs	6.1	48.1	45.8	35.8
Windsors	0	41.2	58.8	5.8
Princeton	1.9	39.6	58.5	5.4
Twin Rivers	0	59.3	40.7	1.2

*percentage of those for whom question was applicable

 The responses are remarkably similar; Twin Rivers, as can be expected, has a higher percentage of people returning for social life to their old neighborhood, but not a substantially higher percentage. In view of their newness in New Jersey, and the fact that they generally came from (presumably) fairly cohesive New York neighborhoods, it is surprising that the gap is not greater than it is. The weight of the evidence suggests that most of the Twin Rivers Jewish community has decided to make, for whatever reasons, its break with New York City,* and establish itself in

*A decision it would appear that many present residents of the Federation area, or their parents, made as far back as the 1920's.

Central New Jersey. Whether they will establish themselves in Twin Rivers, specifically, is another matter; we suspect that, their economic position permitting, there will be a fair amount of movement away from Twin Rivers to available single family homes and subdivisions in the general area - East & West Windsor, Princeton, Cranbury, etc. The cost of making such a move, however, if no other reason, will probably keep many families in their Twin Rivers townhouses longer than they would otherwise choose.

E. A Note on the Aging

It has been noted previously that the elderly represent a particularly large part of the Jewish population in the Federation area, a point which is of particular significance for future planning. There are, as has been mentioned 1208 individuals aged 65 and over in the Federation area. They are divided as follows:

TABLE 2-8: DISTRIBUTION OF SENIOR CITIZENS BY AGE,SEX, AND AREA

	TRENTON		SUBURBS		TOTAL		TOTAL
	M	F	M	F	M	F	
65-69	107	182	128	103	235	285	520
70-74	89	119	61	66	150	185	335
75-79	57	78	38	41	95	119	214
80+	65	50	17	7	82	57	139
TOTAL	318	429	244	217	562	646	1208

This distribution is generally consistent with the national Jewish sample, as regards age/sex breakdown within the senior citizen group. It is worth noting Trenton/Suburban differences; (a) the Trenton elderly are more likely to be women, independently of age; and (b) the Trenton group is older, with 33.5% over 75, compared to 22.3% in the

suburbs.

Some of the other points regarding the elderly should be restated briefly:

- the aging are often of low income; in the City of Trenton 48% live on \$5,000/year or less, and 71% on less than \$10,000/year. In the suburban part of the Federation area the comparable figures are 20% and 33%.
- 54% of the Trenton aging have a high school diploma or less; 32% are college graduates. The comparable figures for the suburban area are 45% and 45%.
- Most of the aging are native-born; 44% of those in Trenton, but 55% of those in the suburban area, were born overseas. Of the foreign-born, 79% were born in Eastern Europe.
- Hardly any senior citizens live in households with their grown children; to the degree that they do, they tend to be concentrated in Trenton, and to a lesser degree in Ewing. There are 92 senior citizens in the Federation area living with children or relatives; of these 51, or 55%, are in the city of Trenton.

As noted earlier the largest group of senior citizens by far is that in Trenton. The Jewish communities in Ewing and Hamilton also have large numbers of senior citizen members; perhaps more important for planning, the largest cohorts in these two communities are in the 55-64 age groups - the senior citizens of the next decade.

This concludes the overview of social and economic characteristics of the Jewish population of the survey area. The next chapter enters into the more complex issues of Jewish life - religious practices, organizational involvement, values, attitudes and identity.

CHAPTER 3: JEWISH LIFE IN THE TRENTON AREA values attitudes and practices

This chapter is devoted to the Jewish background, values and practices of the members of the Jewish community in the survey area. As such, it should be of interest and value to the community for two distinct reasons; first, as a means of broadly and objectively assessing where the community stands with regard to the continuity of religious and cultural traditions, and second, as an indication of the underlying values and attitudes which in turn strongly influence people's behavior -- their potential interest in services provided by the Jewish community, their likelihood of participating or supporting Jewish activities and functions, and so on.

The chapter is divided into five sections: (1) a discussion of the Jewish background and orientation of the population; (2) Jewish attitudes and values held by the members of the population; (3) their involvement with religious life, including synagogogue membership; their social and organizational involvement; and (5) an attempt to identify trends and patterns from the body of information presented.

A. Jewish Background and Orientation

The most pronounced feature of the Trenton area Jewish community, with regard to the relationship between past background and present orientation, is what could be termed 'slippage', in the sense of a generational movement away from more traditional to less traditional branches or perceptions of Judaism. Although roughly

a third of the households in our sample had been raised in Orthodox Jewish homes, only a handful of families consider themselves today to be Orthodox (2.5% outside Trenton). The only center of Orthodox Judaism in the area is among older individuals and couples within the city of Trenton; elsewhere, adherents are few and far between.

TABLE 3-1: RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION OF JEWISH POPULATION (self-assessment

	TRENTON	SUBURBS	WINDSORS	PRINCETON	TWIN RIVERS
Orthodox	13.1%	3.0%	4.0%	1.8%	0
Conservative	44.6	53.2	54.0	44.6	43.2
Reform	35.4	35.0	19.0	28.6	45.7
Other*	6.9	8.9	23.0	25.0	11.1

*secular, cultural, non-observant (with scattered exceptions)

The dominant orientation, at least with regard to respondents' self assessment, is the Conservative; in all areas except Twin Rivers and Trent they represent a substantial majority of all adherents to an organized branch of Judaism, and they are a plurality in Trenton as well. In Twin Rivers the community is fairly evenly divided in their self-assessment between the Conservative and Reform branches. As will be shown later, however, the terms 'Conservative' and 'Reform' do not by any means mean the same things to all people.

The upbringing of these individuals was substantially different from the above pattern; as illustrated in the table on the following page, it shows that 40%-50% of the adults in the Federation area were raised as Orthodox Jews, and approximately a quarter of the

TABLE 3-1(a): RELIGIOUS UPBRINGING OF JEWISH POPULATION

	TRENTON	SUBURBS	WINDSORS	PRINCETON	TWIN RIVERS
Orthodox	48.4%	41.0%	30.3%	25.2%	20.4%
Conservative	28.4	33.9	39.9	35.5	38.9
Reform	18.2	13.5	12.1	16.8	28.0
Non-Observant	4.9	11.6	17.7	22.4	12.7

adults in the new area. Two other patterns in the above table are worth noting:

- the relative scarcity of Reform households in the previous generation, an accurate reflection of the recent spread (post World War II) of that branch of Judaism beyond its traditional adherents.
- the relatively high percentage of adults who were raised in non-observant households; this is a reminder that widespread non-observance of Jewish religious practices is far from being a recent phenomenon in Jewish society.

A comparison of family religious orientation today, with the Jewish upbringing of the husband and wife of the home, as presented on the following page, shows that by and large the generational shift in religious practices is a gradual one -- for example, of those people raised as Orthodox Jews, and who are no longer Orthodox, far more are Conservative than Reform. Further, the tables suggest that it is the upbringing of the wife that is more significant in determining the family's religious orientation than that of the husband. Note that 50.2% of the wives, by comparison with 40.0% of the husbands, live today in a household of the same orientation as that of their own upbringing.

TABLE 3-1(b): COMPARISON OF RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION AND UPBRINGING

(a) family religious orientation by husband's upbringing - Fed. Ar

		UPBRINGING			
		ORTHODOX	CONSERVATIVE	REFORM	SECULAR
ORIENTATION	ORTHODOX	18	0	0	1
	CONSERVATIVE	75	58	6	8
	REFORM	35	31	24	9
	SECULAR	9	3	1	9

(b) orientation by husband's upbringing - new area*

ORIENTATION	ORTHODOX	4	0	0	0
	CONSERVATIVE	26	39	10	9
	REFORM	12	20	16	5
	SECULAR	6	4	4	15

(c) orientation by wife's upbringing - Federation area

ORIENTATION	ORTHODOX	20	1	0	0
	CONSERVATIVE	67	72	13	8
	REFORM	24	23	43	10
	SECULAR	7	4	3	5

(d) orientation by wife's upbringing - new area*

ORIENTATION	ORTHODOX	4	0	0	0
	CONSERVATIVE	26	52	6	4
	REFORM	9	20	23	2
	SECULAR	1	2	7	20

*area in above tables does not include Princeton

The tables on the previous page are straightforward; the households in the central area created by the 'steps' are those whose present religious orientation is the same as the upbringing of the spouse in question; households to the left of the steps have 'slipped', in the sense of having adopted a less traditional approach to Judaism than that in which they were raised. Households to the right of the steps have done the reverse, and adopted a more traditional approach.

- for example, in the top table there are 58 men who were raised as Conservative Jews and who today maintain that religious orientation. This group represents 39% of the Conservative households in the Federation area; it also represents 63% of the men who were raised as Conservative Jews.

By and large, among both Conservative and Reform Jews, a substantial majority stay in the branch of Judaism in which they were raised; for example, in the Federation area, 63% of the men and 72% of the women who were raised as Conservative Jews still consider themselves oriented to that branch. It is most notably the dropping away of people raised as Orthodox Jews from that branch that has generated the most shifting in religious orientation.

 TABLE 3-1(c): PATTERNS OF CHANGE IN ORIENTATION/UPBRINGING

	to less traditional: single*	double*	Same	to more traditional: single*	double*
<u>Federation</u>					
husband	37.3%	16.4%	38.0%	5.2%	3.1%
wife	31.0	11.7	46.7	8.0	2.7
<u>Windsor/Twin Rivers</u>					
husband	29.4	12.9%	43.5%	8.8%	5.3%
wife	30.1	6.8	56.3	4.5	2.3

*single - change of one degree; e.g., orthodox to conservative;
 double - change of two degree; e.g., orthodox to reform

Although some of the difference between the relative stability of the husband's and the wife's religious background can be attributed to the fact that the wives in the sample, on the average, claim less religious upbringings than the husbands, some difference remains; it is, after all, not implausible, in view of Jewish tradition on the matter, that wives do tend to have more influence on the religious direction taken by the household.*

One question that comes to mind in the context of the Jewish upbringing of the survey respondents is the number and location of respondents in which either husband or wife has had no Jewish upbringing; i.e., is not Jewish. The survey identified a total of 36 households in which one partner was not Jewish by origin (we did not attempt to determine whether the partner had since converted to Judaism); these households represent 7.1% of all households survey in which both a husband and wife were present. This is slightly below the national average reported by the Jewish Population Study, which estimated that 9.2% of all Jewish households nationally are intermarried. Although the number of intermarriages is too small to justify exhaustive analysis, some points of interest can be made:

- the sex distribution of intermarriage is consistent with the national picture: in 2/3 of the couples the wife was originally not Jewish, and in 1/3 the husband was originally not Jewish.
- The volume of intermarriage was higher in the Federation area than in the new area, despite the greater age of the

residents of the former. 8.7% of the marriages in the Federation area were intermarriages, compared to 5.2% in the new area. Also, the sex ratio among inter-married couples was even in the new area, but 3:1 in the Federation area (females:males not Jewish).

- the volume of intermarriage is somewhat higher among individuals who were raised either in reform or non-observant households. 43% of the intermarried families came from such households (the Jewish partners), compared to 27% of the non-intermarried couples.

As the table below illustrates, intermarried couples tend to have a less traditional religious orientation at present as well:

TABLE 3-2: RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION - INTERMARRIED AND NON-INTERMARRIED COUPLES

	INTERMARRIED	NOT INTERMARRIED
ORTHODOX	2.9%	5.0%
CONSERVATIVE	31.4	50.3
REFORM	40.0	32.7
OTHER	25.7	12.0
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%

Just under 2/3 of the intermarried couples identify themselves with the less traditional branches of Judaism (or with none), compared with 45% of the non-intermarried couples.

Two further background items are worthy of some discussion: (1) Jewish education, and (2) knowledge of Hebrew and/or Yiddish. The overwhelming majority of men, and a substantial although smaller majority of women, in the survey area have received some Jewish education. As Table 3-3 on the following page shows; first, there are no significant differences between areas in the percentage of adults with Jewish education in their backgrounds, or in the mode

of Jewish education followed:

TABLE 3-3: JEWISH EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

	% some Jewish education		median years of Jewish education*	
	MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
Trenton	80.4%	66.9%	6.8	5.9
Suburbs	87.8	66.1	6.1	5.1
Windsors	82.0	69.6	6.4	4.9
Princeton	86.5	64.2	6.1	5.2
Twin Rivers	91.3	60.5	5.7	5.0

*only those respondents with some Jewish education

(b) mode of Jewish education

	MEN	WOMEN
hebrew school	74.2%	76.7%
day school*	12.9	11.3
Jewish college or seminary	2.7	1.0
Other**	10.1	11.0
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%

*including Hebrew high school

**principally private lessons, tutoring, etc.

of education. Although the respondents in many ways represent different generations, it would appear that there has been little fundamental change in the practices of Jewish education over that time, or, as we will see subsequently, in the current practice of Jewish education as it affects the respondents' children.

Roughly half of the adults in the area claim some knowledge of Hebrew and Yiddish; perhaps three quarters have some knowledge of one or the other. As may be expected, the ability to speak

or read Yiddish is greatest in Trenton, and next in the suburbs of the Federation area; Hebrew knowledge is distributed fairly evenly across the entire survey area, with its peak in Princeton.

TABLE 3-4: KNOWLEDGE OF HEBREW AND YIDDISH

	YIDDISH			read only	HEBREW	
	speak only	read & speak	none		read & speak	none
Trenton	25.8%	28.8%	41.0%	33.9%	13.3%	51.5%
Suburbs	28.8	11.6	49.6	42.2	10.1	45.8
Windsors	27.1	16.7	52.5	29.1	15.3	55.2
Princeton	21.3	14.8	63.0	30.8	26.2	42.1
Twin Rivers	18.2	7.1	68.8	30.1	17.9	49.4

difference between reported totals and 100% is made up of miscellaneous responses.

(b) comparison with 1961 - Federation area

	1961	1975
speak only	32.7%	27.6%
speak & read	28.9	26.1
no knowledge	38.6	46.3

note: data from 1961 for all adults aged 18 and over

The comparison with 1961 shows a decline in the share of the population speaking Yiddish, but a decline in actuality quite small. This is a tribute of sorts to the stability of the population. It is interesting to note, however, that while Yiddish is slowly declining, although by no means dying out, the knowledge of spoken Hebrew, and presumably knowledge of Hebrew generally beyond the prayer book, is apparently greater in the new areas among the younger populations.

It is desirable to add a caveat to this last point; many people are prone to claim an ability to speak or read Hebrew or Yiddish on the basis of only a minimal grasp of the language. We suspect, therefore, that the figures presented above are a somewhat inflated picture of reality.

B. Attitudes, Perceptions and Values

It is our contention that the attitudes people hold about the concerns underlying specific activities and services are as likely to influence their behavior as are their direct assessments or impressions of the service or program in question. The underlying Jewish attitudes toward such basic questions as the place the respondent perceives for himself in the community, the stress he places on relationships within as distinct from without the Jewish community, and many similar areas are likely to influence, if not determine, the individual's interest in and demand for services, his willingness to participate in the affairs of the community (and support them financially).

A number of different approaches were taken to identify and assess the various dimensions of the community's attitudes. The first was a series of six assertions, to which respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed.* Each of the assertions was designed to probe either a current question of controversy, or an underlying communal value. The questions, and the basic direction of the response

to each were as follows:

(1) most of a Jewish family's friends should be other Jewish families: this statement yielded a mixed response; the majority disagreed, but a sizeable minority, in particular in the Federation area, agreed (34%).

This statement deals with the question of social exclusivity. A comparison of responses to this statement, with information on actual social interaction patterns of the respondents, suggests that the responses may be questionable; there may be some feeling, particularly on the part of younger respondents oriented toward less traditional Jewish practices, that it is socially unacceptable to agree with the above statement. That position is not held by orthodox respondents, 58% of whom agreed with the statement.

TABLE 3-5: ATTITUDE TOWARD SOCIAL EXCLUSIVITY AND ACTUAL FRIENDSHIP PATTERNS

	TRENTON	SUBURBS	WINDSORS	PRINCETON	T.R.
% agreeing with exclusivity statement	33.3%	33.8%	19.6%	25.9%	25.9%
% stating that 75% or more of their friends are Jewish	70.6%	56.5%	60.6%	39.3%	74.1%

Of all five areas, only in Princeton is the reality not widely at variance with the expressed value, suggesting that there is some doubt about the expressed value.*

(2) Israel's survival is not only important, but crucial, to American Jewry: This statement, designed to assess identification with Israel, was framed strongly in order to provide, as it were, an 'out' for respondents who did

*The percentage of Jewish families in the general population in the survey area, with the exception of East Windsor Township (Twin Rivers) is too low for the interaction patterns above to have come about except consciously.

not feel reasonably strongly on the subject. Despite this, the positive consensus on this point was strong and consistent. Only 5% of the respondents disagreed, and 46% agreed strongly.

Although the overall pattern was not notably different in different areas, it should be noted that the intensity of support was somewhat lower in the Windsors and Twin Rivers. This is a recurrent pattern.

(3) A Jew should care more about the good opinion of other Jews than about that of other people in general.

This, as was expected, was the subject of general negative consensus; the only non-negligible support for the proposition was in Trenton (23% agree).

(4) All Jews have a duty to support Jewish communal activities and services: This question identified considerable difference of opinion between different areas, and between people of different religious orientation.

In essence, the above statement is a consensus value in the Federation area, but is subject to disagreement in the New area, particularly in Twin Rivers. 85% of the respondents in the Federation area agreed, but only 58% in Twin Rivers; although this is a majority, it is not a large one. As the table below illustrates, support for the idea of a communal obligation is limited in the new area to adherents of traditional branches of Judaism:

TABLE 3-5(a): SUPPORT FOR COMMUNAL OBLIGATION IN WINDSORS/TWIN RIVERS BY RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

	ORTHODOX	CONSERVATIVE	REFORM	OTHER
agree (%)	75.0%	80.5%	46.3%	41.9%
disagree	25.0	19.5	53.7	58.1

Thus, among Orthodox and Conservative respondents in the area, support

TABLE 3-5(b): ATTITUDE STATEMENTS - SUMMARY TABLE

	TRENTON	SUBURBS	WINDSORS	PRINCETON	TWIN RIVERS	TOTAL
1. most of a Jewish family's friends should be other Jewish families						
% agree	33.3%	33.8%	19.6%	25.9%	25.9%	29.2%
score*	2.64	2.70	2.90	2.93	2.86	
2. Israel's survival is not only important, but crucial, to American Jewry						
% agree	95.2%	96.9%	93.9%	94.5%	92.3%	95.1%
score*	1.54	1.52	1.71	1.56	1.71	
3. A Jew should care more about the good opinion of other Jews than about that of other people in general						
% agree	23.4%	17.3%	5.1%	11.5%	9.8%	14.8%
score*	2.85	3.01	3.21	3.10	3.05	
4. All Jews have a duty to support Jewish communal activities and services						
% agree	87.4%	84.3%	66.7%	78.8%	57.7%	77.5%
score*	1.77	1.90	2.22	2.04	2.33	
5. Too much fuss has been made by some people about assimilation and intermarriage						
% agree	39.5%	43.5%	44.3%	46.2%	53.4%	44.4%
score*	2.65	2.64	2.64	2.56	2.42	
6. If it were possible, ideally all Jews ought to settle in Israel						
% agree	15.0%	7.7%	6.9%	11.3%	6.2	9.3%
score*	3.02	3.09	3.21	3.16	3.09	

*score is a rating from 1 to 4 reflecting the relative weight of 'strong' and 'moderate' agree/disagree responses. The range is 'strongly agree' = 1 to 'strongly disagree' = 4. 2.50 would reflect a perfect 50:50 split on an issue; roughly speaking 1.0 - 2.2 would be a positive consensus, and 2.8 - 3.2 a negative one.

for the idea of a communal obligation is close to that in the Federation area. Among Reform and other respondents, the majority (although a slender one) is opposed to the idea. This may have potential negative implications for future planning in that area, with regard to the potential level of support for Jewish communal services.

(5) Too much fuss has been made by some people about assimilation and intermarriage: this statement yielded the most evenly divided group of responses. Not only was there a substantial group on both sides in each area, but this statement also generated the largest body of 'don't know' responses (49).

It is clearly an issue in which religious orientation is a significant factor; as the table below shows, Orthodox & Conservative respondents are far more likely to consider intermarriage a serious problem than are Reform and other respondents:

TABLE 3-5: RESPONSE TO INTERMARRIAGE STATEMENT (above) AND RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

	FEDERATION AREA		WINDSOR/TWIN RIVERS	
	AGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE
Orthodox	10.0%	90.0%	25.0%	75.0%
Conservative	33.3	66.7	33.7	66.3
Reform	55.4	44.5	61.5	38.5
other	68.0	32.0	61.5	61.5

In any case, it is clearly an issue in which there is a significant split within the community.

(6) If it were possible, ideally all Jews ought to settle in Israel: this statement generated a near-total negative consensus, which was somewhat surprising - not because there is any reason to believe that

any appreciable number of area residents desire to make aliyah, but because the statement was carefully hedged - 'if it were possible', 'ideally', to allow a respondent to answer affirmatively without as a result feeling guilty. Nonetheless, under 10% of the respondents answered affirmatively.

In summary, the responses to the attitude statements tend to show a consistent picture, that of a 'liberal' Jewish community that tends to oppose, at least ideologically, the strands of Jewish exclusivity that were a part of traditional Jewish society in many ways. At the same time support for Israel, and to a lesser degree, support for Jewish communal services and activities, are seen as positive values. The distinction is seen in the widely divergent responses to question 2 (support for Israel) and question 6 (aliyah); the first is not only acceptable, but actively desirable, in the framework and context of American life -- the second requires a repudiation, to some degree, of what was once called 'the promise of American life'. This may be why so few respondents were ready to answer affirmatively to statement 1 (Jewish friends); although many of the respondents may prefer the company of other Jewish families, may find it more comfortable, or more emotionally or intellectually rewarding, and may consciously or unconsciously seek such people for their friends, they draw the line at voicing explicit agreement with the value that they unconsciously practice.

The second series of attitude questions were organized around the themes of what it means to be a 'good Jew', in respondents' eyes, and to be a part of the Jewish community. The first set of questions were first, 'do you feel that you are part of the Jewish community?',

and if not, 'would you like to be?' subsequently we asked respondents to define how they interpreted that idea. Interestingly, the great majority of respondents, both in the relatively close-knit Federation area, and in the new area, felt they were a part of the Jewish community; one important difference was that those respondents in the Federation area who did not feel part of the community did not want to, while those in the new area often did:

TABLE 3-6: FEELING PART OF JEWISH COMMUNITY, AND DESIRE TO BE PART OF COMMUNITY

	FEEL PART OF JEWISH COMMUNITY		IF NOT, DESIRE TO BE PART	
	yes	no	yes	no
Federation area	81.1%	18.9%	41.0%	59.0%
Windsor/ Twin Rivers	75.6	24.4	61.4	38.6

It is unlikely, given the intensity of organized Jewish life in the Federation area, that many individuals would remain outside the Jewish community except by choice. In the new area, particularly in Twin Rivers, there are fair numbers of people who do not feel themselves part of the community, perhaps because of their newness to the area, and would like to become part.

The question arises, of course, what does 'part of the Jewish community' mean? The interpretations that people provided fall into three distinct categories, one or another of which is generally clearly uppermost in an individual's mind. The three categories are

as follows:

(1) Identification: being part of the Jewish community is a matter more of state of mind than actual behavior or activity. Being aware of Jewish concerns, considering oneself Jewish, and similar values, are what these respondents consider being 'part of the Jewish community'.

(2) Joining: a second group of respondents defines being part of the community in formal terms; if you are a member of a synagogue or temple, and/or a member of Jewish organizations, you are part of the community.

(3) Participation: the third area is related to the second but involves a major difference - instead of membership in formal terms, the touchstone is felt to be the active role, the involvement, of the individual in the concerns and needs of the community, over and above (or separate from) organizational membership.

The stress placed on each one varied somewhat from area to area:

TABLE 3-6(a) DEFINITION OF 'BEING PART OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY'

	IDENTIFICATION	JOINING	PARTICIPATION
Trenton	10.9%	33.6%	55.5%
Suburbs	13.8	39.5	46.7
Windsors	20.0	51.1	28.9
Princeton	23.1	46.2	30.8
Twin Rivers	15.7	61.4	22.9
Federation area	12.7%	37.3%	50.0%
Windsors/ Twin Rivers	18.1	55.6	26.3

At the admittedly real risk of over-analyzing this table, it occurs to us that this, too, ties in to some of the points made earlier, contrasting the Federation area with Twin Rivers with regard to the idea of a communal obligation, and with regard to religious orientation and values. The importance of participation, or active involvement, in the affairs of the Jewish community, is part of a traditional

definition, a traditional image of the Jewish community as a highly interactive and supportive environment; that image may be losing much of its strength among the younger Jews, who tend to see the idea of being part of the community either in internal (I feel therefore I am), or in relatively mechanistic, and formal, terms. This dichotomy persists in the question that follows the above; namely, "do you believe that being part of the Jewish community, in that sense, is important in being a good Jew?" In Trenton, the most traditional community in the area, the response was overwhelmingly positive - 77% felt that it was important. In Twin Rivers, the response was the opposite - only 48% felt it was important. The other communities ranged between 60% and 70%.

Here we have the full measure of the disparity between the two groups; in Trenton, not only is being part of the Jewish community perceived as an active, participatory, matter, but it is further considered generally to be central to being a good Jew, to one's Jewishness or Yiddishkeit. In Twin Rivers, on the other hand, being part of the community is perceived either as an internal affair of the individual, or as a relatively mechanical act; in either case, the Twin Rivers respondent is far less likely to consider it important in whether the individual is or is not a good Jewish person. The question then arises: what practices, or values, do make up the good Jew?

Respondents were asked to assess the importance of five distinct attitude/behavior areas in Jewishness. The five areas were

as follows:

- (1) carrying out traditional religious practices
- (2) fulfilling family obligations and responsibilities
- (3) being actively involved in Jewish communal and civic matters
- (4) living according to strong ethical and moral principles
- (5) being committed to Israel and her survival

In each case, respondents were asked to state whether they considered the value VERY important, MODERATELY important, or NOT important.*

TABLE 3-7: IMPORTANCE OF VALUES IN JEWISHNESS (rank score)

	TRENTON	SUBURBS	WINDSORS	PRINCETON	TW.RIVERS
traditional religion	1.82	1.94	1.93	2.05	1.99
family responsibility	1.15	1.20	1.19	1.16	1.17
Communal & civic involvement	1.54	1.83	1.95	1.82	2.04
ethical & moral principles	1.13	1.12	1.15	1.09	1.40
Committment to Israel	1.29	1.45	1.62	1.36	1.68

note: scoring as follows: a response of 1.00 would mean that every respondent considered the issue VERY important; 3.00 would mean that all considered it NOT important. A score in the area of 1.3 or 1.4 and below is a VERY important consensus.

There are a number of points about this table, which tend to reinforce conclusions drawn earlier from previous questions.

- Trenton respondents were the only group in which a clear majority considered communal involvement to be VERY important (56%); only 22% of the Twin Rivers respondents considered this area to be VERY important, while 26% considered it to be not at all important.
- There was near unanimity that fulfillment of family obligations, and living according to strong ethical principles, were central to Jewishness. Both of these areas, of course, are both internal as well as being reflected in practices and behavior not of an overtly sectarian character.
- Only in Trenton did as many as 30% of the respondents consider traditional religious practices to be central to Jewishness; this area was consistently felt to be of only Moderate importance.
- The importance of the commitment to Israel also varied, being greatest in Trenton, and least in Twin Rivers and the Windsors. As will be shown below, this is also related to the associations with traditional religion.

Two of the value areas were studied in greater detail, because of their direct relevance to the questions of communal services in general, and the Federation specifically; we refer to the values of (a) communal involvement; and (b) commitment to Israel. Generally, we found that the factors that tended to influence people to feel a given way in the Federation area, did not necessarily affect people in the Windsors, and vice versa. For example, age was strongly linked to belief in the importance of communal involvement in the Federation area, but not in any other area -- in Trenton, 68% of respondents over 65 felt that communal involvement was VERY important, compared to only 45% of respondents under that age. Indeed, in the Federation area as a whole, only 29% of respondents under 49

felt that communal involvement was VERY important in the picture of what it meant to be a good Jew.*

In addition to age, the following factors were significant in affecting the value people placed on communal involvement:

- the degree to which one limited one's friends to other Jewish families; this was particularly pronounced in the Windsors, where 76% of the families who considered communal involvement VERY important also had over 75% of their friendships with Jewish families.
- self evidently, the degree to which one was a member of at least one Jewish organization; 81% of those considering communal involvement VERY important in the Windsor/Twin Rivers area were also organization members, compared to 57% of the others.
- In the Federation area, length of residence strongly influenced this value: 71% of those considering communal involvement VERY important had lived in the Federation area 20 or more years (this applies only to the suburban parts, since there are no appreciable number of recent in-migrants (under 20 years) in the city of Trenton.
- Finally, religious orientation strongly influences this value: in the Federation area, 73% of Orthodox and 45% of Conservative adherents considered it VERY important, compared to 35% of Reform adherents. In the Windsor/Twin Rivers area the comparable figures were 35% for Conservative, and 12.5% for Reform.

The composite picture painted by these relationships suggests that the strong association of communal involvement with Jewishness, as a basic and important value, is disappearing. It is a value that is apparently most strongly associated with a traditional approach to religion and Jewish life, and to a degree, with traditional patterns of social exclusivity. Younger Jewish families appear to treat

* only 19% of those respondents aged 21-29 in the survey area considered communal involvement VERY important. The number of such respondents was too small to break down meaningfully by area.

Jewishness as much more of a matter internal to them, rather than manifest through organized Jewish life.

The value placed on commitment to Israel did not vary as sharply as the above on the basis of social and demographic factors. The factor most strongly influencing commitment to Israel was religious orientation:

TABLE 3-7(a): IMPORTANCE OF COMMITMENT TO ISRAEL AND RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

	VERY IMPORTANT	MODERATELY IMPORTANT	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	SCORE*
Federation area:				
Orthodox	90.5%	9.5%	0	1.10
Conservative	68.7	28.9	2.4%	1.34
Reform	61.1	32.7	6.2	1.45
Other	43.5	43.5	13.0	1.70
Windsor/Twin Rivers area:				
Conservative	53.9%	36.0%	10.1%	1.56
Reform	35.7	50.0	14.3	1.79
Other	46.9	37.5	15.6	1.69

*see note at bottom of Page 3-19; Table 3-7

Two points emerge from this table:

- the commitment to Israel is considered more important, and more central to the idea of Jewishness, among adherents of more traditional branches of Judaism.
- holding religious orientation constant, commitment to Israel is still substantially less strong in the Windsor/Twin Rivers area than in the Federation area.

It should be stressed that in all cases only a small percentage of respondents feel that commitment to Israel is not at all important to their idea of Jewishness; nonetheless, it is our experience that the distinction between VERY important and MODERATELY important

a powerful one, particularly when there is a question of getting people to act on the basis of their professed beliefs and values.

 TABLE 3-7(b): SUMMARY OF FACTORS INFLUENCING COMMUNAL INVOLVEMENT VALUE

(a) age of respondent - Federation area only:

	20-49	50-64	65+
% VERY important	29.2%	43.6%	58.6%
score	1.88	1.72	1.50

(b) length of residence - Federation area only:

	0-9 years	10-19 years	20+ years
% VERY important	21.6%	27.9%	41.4%
score	2.00	1.98	1.72

(c) religious orientation - Federation area:

	ORTHODOX	CONSERVATIVE	REFORM	OTHER
% VERY important	72.7%	44.8%	35.4%	*
score	1.27	1.66	1.83	

(d) religious orientation - Windsor/Twin Rivers area

% VERY important	*	35.4%	12.5%	9.4%
score		1.73	2.20	2.34

(3) organization membership - Windsor/Twin Rivers area only:

	Yes	No
% VERY important	32.5%	13.2%
score	1.85	2.22

*sample too small

 C. Religious Practices and Synagogue Membership

The third area of discussion here, following after the discussion of first orientation, and then, values and attitudes, is

that of the actual religious practices followed, and the level of synagogue (or temple) membership. The table below compares the Federation area and the Windsor/Twin Rivers area with regard to the level of various religious practices:

TABLE 3-8: LEVEL OF RELIGIOUS PRACTICES BY AREA

	REGULARLY	OCCASIONALLY	NOT AT ALL
(a) light Hanukah candles			
Federation area	82.0%	5.7%	12.3%
Windsor/TR area	91.9	5.4	2.7
(b) Hold a Pesach seder			
Federation area	67.6%	14.4%	18.0%
Windsor/TR area	79.5	9.7	10.8
(c) Attend services on High Holy Days			
Federation area	81.9%	8.7%	9.9%
Windsor/TR area	54.6	18.9	26.5
(d) fast on Yom Kippur			
Federation area	63.3%	12.3%	24.4%
Windsor/TR area	57.8	8.6	33.5
(e) attend Friday night services			
Federation area	17.7%	50.5%	31.8%
Windsor/TR area	9.2	27.0	63.8
(f) attend services during the day on Saturday (Shabbos)			
Federation area	8.5%	27.2%	64.4%
Windsor/TR area	5.4	17.8	76.8

The contrast between the two areas is striking: the residents of the Windsor/Twin Rivers area are much more consistent with regard to

USE THIS PAGE FOR YOUR NOTES

USE THIS PAGE FOR YOUR NOTES'.....

home and family observances - Hanukah and Pesach - while the residents of the Federation area are much more likely to participate in group activities - High Holy Days and Friday night services. This is consistent, of course, with the distinction drawn earlier between the underlying Jewish attitudes and values of the two groups of people. This disparity persists after controlling for religious orientation:

TABLE 3-8(a): LEVEL OF RELIGIOUS PRACTICES/BY ORIENTATION/BY AREA

REGULARLY OCCASIONALLY NOT AT ALL

(a) attend services on High Holy Days/Conservative orientation:

Federation area	92.8%	4.2%	3.0%
Windsor/TR area	76.4	13.5	10.1

Reform orientation:

Federation area	75.2%	14.5%	10.3%
Windsor/TR area	41.1	26.8	32.1

(b) attend services on Friday nights/Conservative orientation:

Federation area	24.2%	55.2%	20.6%
Windsor/TR area	16.5	32.9	50.6

Reform orientation:

Federation area	10.3%	57.3%	32.5%
Windsor/TR area	5.4	19.6	75.0

One could almost argue that the entire frame of reference, with regard to religious orientation and observance, is different in the two areas. The level of organized religious observance outside the home, among those calling themselves Conservative / Jews in the Windsor/Twin Rivers area is less than that among Reform Jews in the Federation area. We will see a similar pattern with regard to membership in

synagogues.

Two other patterns of religious observance of interest have to do with Bar-Mitzvah and Kashrut. Briefly, it was noted that 85% of the men in the community have been Bar-Mitzvah, a percentage matching closely the percentage who have had some Jewish education. Nearly every respondent with young children indicated, further, that they planned to have their children Bar-Mitzvah; interestingly, however, the number of parents with older children who actually had their child Bar-Mitzvah varies quite widely. The percentage of families keeping a Kosher kitchen also varies, with, as expected, the highest percentage among Trenton households.

TABLE 3-9: BAR-MITZVAH (children 13 and over) AND KASHRUT

	% that have had Bar-Mitzvah	% keeping Kashrut
Trenton	74.2%	34.4%
Suburbs	76.0	20.4
Windsors	72.2	23.1
Princeton	62.9	25.0
Twin Rivers	53.8	13.4
TOTAL	72.5%	23.5%

It is difficult to compare these findings with those of the 1961 Survey, since the manner of framing the questions was somewhat different. In 1961, however, the total of two categories roughly comparable to the Kashrut category above* was 33.5%, so that it would appear that there has been considerable decline in the number of families keeping Kashrut.

* categories (a) strictly Kosher home; and (b) observant in home, but not always when out.

The third area of interest in this section is synagogue membership. The great majority of respondents in the Federation area and in Princeton are members of a synagogue or temple; about half are members in the Windsor and Twin Rivers areas, more in the former than the latter:

TABLE 3-10: SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP BY AREA (% members)

Trenton	Suburbs	Windsors	Princeton	Twin Rivers	TOTAL
74.8%	76.5%	56.3%	80.4%	27.5%	66.0%

Although in the Federation area (and in Princeton) synagogue membership does not vary significantly by religious orientation (with, of course the exception of those who are secular, or non-observant), it varies substantially in the Windsor/Twin Rivers area. On the basis of the table below, one can almost assert that many Windsor/Twin Rivers residents consider the term 'Reform' almost a synonym for non-religious or non-observant, a position that the Reform leadership would almost certainly dispute.

TABLE 3-10(a): SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP/BY ORIENTATION/BY AREA (% members)

	Federation area	Windsor/TR area
Orthodox	78.3%	
Conservative	84.3	59.6%
Reform	75.2	29.6
Other	25.9	18.8

The percentage of 'Reform' Jews in the Windsors who are members of a congregation is roughly comparable to the percentage of 'other' Jews who are synagogue members in the Federation area.

Membership in synagogues is relatively little affected by age or length of residence. There is a modest trend for synagogue membership to be greatest in the middle years (40's primarily), as well as for synagogue membership to increase slightly with increasing length of residence. Both 'trends', however are only nominal. The absence of such trends is consistent with a parallel finding; specifically, that there is little strong interest in synagogue membership among those not presently members. Only in Twin Rivers, where 32% of the non-members indicate an interest in joining a synagogue, does there appear to be any appreciable unmet demand for synagogue membership

 TABLE 3-10(b): INTEREST IN SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP BY NON-MEMBERS

	STRONG	MODERATE	NONE
Trenton	3.0%	27.3%	69.7%
Suburbs	18.0	26.0	56.0
Windsors	19.0	40.5	40.5
Princeton	0	40.0	60.0
Twin Rivers	31.7	46.7	21.7

We tend to discount largely the expressions of MODERATE interest; in most such cases this amounts to little more than an expression analogous to 'it would be nice to', and such. This point is discussed in greater detail in the following chapter. Of those expressing an interest in future synagogue membership, the great majority indicated that their preference would be for relatively less traditional services and facilities; as the table on the top of the following page illustrates, there may be a potential demand in certain areas here.

TABLE 3-10(c): PREFERENCE IN TYPE OF SYANGOGUE/TEMPLE BY INDIVIDUALS NOT MEMBERS AND INTERESTED IN JOINING

	Traditional*	Middle*	Non-Traditional*
Trenton	0	55.0%	45.0%
Suburbs	18.8%	43.8	37.5
Windsors	0	55.2	44.8
Princeton	16.7	16.7	66.7
Twin Rivers	7.4	40.7	51.9
TOTAL	7.8%	45.4%	46.8%

Generally speaking, the most important considerations for most people in choosing a synagogue, or considering membership, were the rabbi; the atmosphere of the religious services; and the availability & quality of a childrens' education program, in that order. The other alternatives proposed; e.g., social & communal activities, and the type of people who are members, were considered very much secondary matters. It should be noted as well that childrens' education programs were considered of much less import in the Federation area, than in the Windsors and Twin Rivers.

About a third of the respondents in the Federation area have left at least one synagogue or temple that they were previously members of (the number in the new area is, of course, much smaller). No particular patterns were noted, with regard to reasons for leaving, period in which most departures took place, etc. Reasons were evenly divided between 'practical' reasons - travel time, cost, etc.; and 'personal' or 'religious' reasons, such as conflicts over programs, policies, or personalities. One can assume that in an area like the Trenton area, with a high level of synagogue membership, and a variety of synagogues and temples to choose from, there

will be a consistent ebb and flow of memberships over time. It is notable that, with one exception, the ratio of current members to members lost is very similar for all of the synagogues in the area.

D. Organizational and Social Activity

As has become apparent through the information presented to this point, the survey area, in particular the Federation area, is made up largely of highly active, involved individuals. The contrasts that have been noted between the Federation area and Twin Rivers, it should be noted, are perhaps more the result of the high levels of involvement in most of the area, than because of particularly low levels in Twin Rivers. The same patterns hold true for organization membership and social activity. In a nutshell - the majority of Jewish families are members of Jewish organizations, and the majority of Jewish families socialize principally, and in many cases almost exclusively, with other Jewish families.

84% of the households in the Federation area, and 66% of the households in the new area, contain at least one member who is a member of a Jewish organization. (the smallest percentage is in Twin Rivers - 56%) The average household, in this 84%, is a member of two organizations. In Twin Rivers, on the other hand, the average household is a member of under 1.2 organizations, and only 20% are members of two or more groups. In contrast, 23% of the Trenton households are members of 4 groups!

A comparison of group membership, however, with the 1961 survey suggests that organizational involvement at that time was even greater than it is today; nearly every organization that existed both in 1961 and in 1975 has declined in the percentage of the community that are members:

 TABLE 3-11: PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL FAMILIES HAVING AT LEAST ONE MEMBER
 IN FOLLOWING ORGANIZATIONS - FEDERATION AREA 1961 & 1975

	1975	1961
Hadassah	41.7%	50.0%
Service with Federation & subventions*	24.3	21.6
Sisterhoods	21.0	60.0
Bnai Brith	17.1	20.0
Council of Jewish Women	11.2	15.8
ORT	8.4	11.9
Jewish War Veterans	6.3	26.4
Zionist Organizations	6.3	14.5
Synagogue Mens' Clubs	1.8	45.1
American Jewish Committee	1.2	1.5
Workmens' Circle	0.6	3.5
American Jewish Congress	0	5.5

note: groups with small percentages can be under or over-represented by sampling procedure.

*including board memberships, volunteer groups, auxiliaries, etc.

We have not attempted to verify whether there is a particular reason for the massive discrepancy between membership in synagogues on the one hand, and membership in mens' clubs at those synagogues on the other (and to a lesser degree, membership in sisterhoods). Leaving this problem aside, the variation appears reasonably consistent for most groups; in many cases, such as Bnai Brith, the 1961-1975 change noted on the table is within the range of possible sampling error.

As was noted, the number of organizations that the typical respondent is a member of varies widely from area to area; within the various areas, variation is more limited. There is a mild relationship with length of residence, but although length of residence may influence people to join the first organization, it has no effect on multiple joining. Age of household head has no effect on joining; religious orientation, however, in the Windsor and Twin Rivers areas, has a strong effect on organization joining - almost all the Conservative adherents in those areas are group members, compared to little over half the Reform Jews, and less than a third of those considering themselves unaffiliated.

TABLE 3-11(a) FEATURES OF ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP

(a) median years of residence - members and non-members

WINDSOR		PRINCETON		TWIN RIVERS	
mem	non	mem	non	mem	non
9.1	6.0	12.9	9.0	3.4	2.7

(b) membership by religious orientation - Windsor/Twin Rivers are

	CONSERVATIVE	REFORM	OTHER
% members	78.7%	61.8%	32.2%

(c) average number of organizations/member (number of organization members X total number of organizations cited)

TRENTON	SUBURBS	WINDSOR	PRINCETON	TWIN RIVERS
1.96	2.09	1.45	1.88	1.17

Finally, the distribution of organization membership among the various areas is presented on the following table. Different organizations, would appear, follow different geographic patterns -- Hadassah, for

TABLE 3-11(b): CONCENTRATION OF ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP BY AREA - percentages represent the percentage of households in each area that have at least one member in that organization

	TRENTON	SUBURBS	WINDSORS	PRINCETON	TWIN RIVER
Hadassah	40.0%	43.1%	20.2%	67.9%	8.6%
B'nai Brith	13.8	19.2	31.7	42.9	23.5
Sisterhoods	22.3	20.2	13.5	12.5	6.2
ORT	2.3	12.3	10.6	0	21.0
Pioneer Women	1.5	1.5	14.4	0	0
Subventions*	26.9	22.7	0	0	1.2

*see note on previous page

example, has nearly saturated the Princeton Jewish community, yet has no membership to speak of in Twin Rivers. B'nai Brith, also, has a proportionately stronger membership base both in Princeton and in the Windsors than in the Federation area. In many ways, the greater organizational activity in the Federation area is the result of the proliferation of smaller, more narrowly-focused organizations, meeting particular needs. The table above represents nearly all the organization membership in the new area, yet leaves out a major share of the Federation area - Zionist groups, womens' groups, lodges, veterans' groups, etc., etc.

To conclude this section, a slightly more detailed presentation of the patterns of friendship, to which reference has been made earlier (see table 3-5), should be done. The distribution of households on the basis of the percentage of their total friends who are Jewish is presented on the following page. In all communities with the exception of Princeton, over half of the respondents stated

that more than three quarters of their friends are Jewish:

 TABLE 3-12: PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS' FRIENDS WHO ARE JEWISH
 (percent responding in each category)

	0-49%	50-74%	75-100%
Trenton	8.7%	20.6%	70.6%
Suburbs	14.7	28.8	56.5
Windsors	14.4	25.0	60.6
Princeton	17.9	42.9	39.3
Twin Rivers	12.3	13.6	74.1
TOTAL	13.2	25.4	61.3

 Only one Jewish family out of eight does less than half, roughly speaking, of its social activity with other Jewish families. At present, Jews make up approximately 2% of the population of Trenton, perhaps 2.5% of the population of the suburbs in the Federation area, and perhaps 7% to 8% of the population of Princeton. It is only in East Windsor, Roosevelt, and Twin Rivers where the Jewish share of the population is such that random selection would result in Jewish families having more than a token number of Jewish acquaintances.

E. Overview - Trends in Jewish Life

Despite the wide range of materials presented in this chapter, their implications are all generally in the same direction; namely, a significant shift in attitudes and behavior, clearly geographic, and perhaps generational as well. It is a shift that has great significance for the future role and functioning of the organized Jewish community.

The most significant pattern is the attenuation of the communal commitment, be it religious or civic, in the new area generally* and in Twin Rivers, the youngest and newest community, in particular. The level of support, commitment, or participation in all aspects of organized Jewish life is substantially lower in this area; the weight of the evidence, furthermore, is that this decline is not a function of a short length of residence, or any other social or economic difference -- rather, it is a basic shift in attitude. This attitude manifests itself in a number of different ways:

- a reduced sense of communal obligation; i.e., a reduced feeling that civic involvement, or support of communal services, is either a personal responsibility, or generally a significant part of Jewishness.
- a reduced level of association with formal Jewish religious life; lower levels of synagogue membership, attendance, and participation.

difference in the

An important aspect of the above is the/manner in which the term 'Reform' is used in Twin Rivers and in the Federation area. Among residents of the Federation area, to be a Reform Jew is, in essence, to be an observant, synagogue-attending, Jew of the Reform branch, by which is meant certain religious practices, values, and the like. Many, if not most, of the Twin Rivers respondents consider 'Reform' to be a euphemistic synonym for 'non-observant'-- self-defined Reform Jews in that area are not synagogue members, as a rule, and do not participate in religious

*Princeton being something of a special case, it is not really included in the discussion below.

observances more than minimally.

Thus, although there are many Jews in the Windsors and in Twin Rivers who do hold similar values about participation and commitment to the Jews of the Federation area, the overwhelming consensus on these matters that characterizes the Federation area is absent. This, in turn, suggests that the level of support or participation in Jewish affairs in the area is likely to be substantially lower, in proportion to the number of people or families, than in the Federation area. As will be noted in the following chapter, readiness to participate in, or to join, certain activities and services -- for example, a Jewish Community Center -- may not be any less, since many people are interested in services of that nature for reasons unrelated to Jewish values, practices, or commitment. In that case, of course, a different problem arises -- the fact that many such people will choose to join or not to join a Center solely on its competitive secular merits, without regard to the fact that it is or is not a Jewish Center.

One can but speculate on the reasons for this change in values and attitudes; some have suggested that it is, at least in part, a 'New York' attitude -- the idea being that residents of New York, with its huge size and impersonality, are less inclined to feel a personal commitment or obligation than the residents of the much smaller, much more closely-knit, Trenton community. On the other hand, the reasons may be more closely connected to the broad

generational shift in the attitudes of the Jewish community.

Although such a change is hard to quantify, there is evidence that it does exist, and that it is generally in the direction of reduced communal and civic commitment and participation, particularly with regard to Jewish versus secular pursuits.

CHAPTER 4: THE JEWISH FEDERATION AND ITS SUBVENTIONS
awareness, utilization, needs & prospects

Of all the areas investigated in the survey of Jewish families, the area of most immediate and practical concern to the Jewish Federation is that dealing with the Federation directly and with the four agencies which it supports (in whole or in part), generally known as the subventions. These four agencies, specifically (1) the Jewish Community Center; (2) the Trenton Hebrew Academy; (3) Greenwood House; and (4) Jewish Family Service were the subject of a series of specific questions directed toward eliciting peoples' response to the agencies, and the relationship of the agencies to the Jewish Community in the survey area.

After a short section dealing with the Jewish community's awareness of the Federation and the four subventions, four separate sections are presented dealing with the particular concerns and issues associated with each subvention.

A. Community Awareness

As could be expected, residents of the current service area of the Federation were generally aware of the existence and role of the Federation and its subventions, while those respondents living in the 'new' area were less so; nonetheless, some interesting inconsistencies appeared.

Table 4-1 presents the degree to which residents of the various areas were able to identify the Jewish Federation and its role in

Jewish life in the area:

TABLE 4-1: AWARENESS OF JEWISH FEDERATION AND ITS FUNCTIONS

	full under- standing of Federation	partial understand- ing of Fed.	name ident- ification only	never heard of Federation
Trenton	22.0%	55.3%	19.5%	3.3%
Suburbs	25.3	61.1	11.6	2.0
Windsors	7.7	16.3	16.3	59.6
Princeton	5.4	14.3	10.7	69.6
Twin Rivers	6.1	6.1	4.9	82.9

An individual who was aware that the Federation had both fund-raising and administrative/planning or similar functions was held to have a 'full understanding' on the above table. Of those respondents who had a partial understanding of Federation, nearly all associated it exclusively with fund-raising. Thus, two points that can be drawn from this table are:

- Although most residents of the Federation area are aware of Federation, many have only a limited awareness of its functions, or have a name-identification only.
- Outside the Federation area even name-identification of Federation, even among stable communities (Princeton or Roosevelt) is limited.

Thus it would appear that the Federation is not as 'visible' as might be expected; whether or not this is a positive virtue, in that Federation visibility could conceivably detract from that of its subventions, is an issue that could perhaps be addressed.

Awareness of the four major subventions also varies widely, as is presented in Table 4-2:

 TABLE 4-2: NAME IDENTIFICATION OF FEDERATION SUBVENTIONS (percentage of respondents that have heard of each subvention)

	Jewish Family Service	Green- wood House	Jewish Community Center	Trenton Hebrew Academy
Trenton	93.1%	99.2%	100.0%	90.7%
Suburbs	96.6	97.0	99.0	92.1
Windsors	75.0	39.4	68.3	58.7
Princeton	71.4	44.6	71.4	53.6
Twin Rivers	65.4	16.5	42.7	71.8

Within the Federation area nearly everyone has at least heard of all four subventions - outside the area it varies widely; the majority in all parts of the new area have heard of Jewish Family Service and (a smaller majority) the Trenton Hebrew Academy. Awareness of the Jewish Community Center is uneven (less in Twin Rivers), and few people in the new area have heard of Greenwood House.* Although we have some reservations about the accuracy of this information (it may be inflated), it suggests, at very least, in view of the interest many respondents have in the kinds of services involved, that some public relations effort may be in order. It should also be noted, in view of the visibility point made earlier, that identification of the

*The question, of course, is: how many respondents were 'faking it' on those questions where they could make an educated guess, even if they had not actually heard of the specific agency? Greenwood House, clearly, is the only one of the four in which the function is not largely apparent from the name.

four subventions is consistently higher than identification of the Federation itself. Since it is the subventions that are direct providers of services to members of the Jewish community, we suggest that this is preferable to the converse situation.

The following sections discuss our findings with regard to the individual subventions.

B. The Jewish Community Center

The Jewish Community Center in Ewing Township is in many ways the most visible of the four subventions; certainly it represents the most substantial physical plant, and conceivably the widest variety and range of activities and programs. The survey attempted to elicit information about three major issues or questions relevant to the present and future of the Jewish Community Center:

- Who are its members, and what distinguishes them from individuals and families who are not members?
- Why do people leave the Jewish Community Center; i.e., fail to renew their membership?
- What interest exists in a Jewish Community Center in the non-Federation areas, under what circumstances, and for what kinds of activities?

Each of these questions will be addressed in turn.

Table 4-3 on the following page presents data on membership in the Jewish Community Center. 42% of the households living in the Federation area in our survey were members of the JCC, a slightly higher level than in the universe of households in the Federation area. The highest membership percentages were found in

Trenton and in Lawrence, the lowest in Hamilton & Bordentown.

TABLE 4-3: MEMBERSHIP IN JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER

a. Percentage of respondents who are members

TRENTON	EWING	LAWRENCE	HAMILTON	YARD-MOR	NEW AREA	TOTAL
46.1%	39.2%	53.7%	23.5%	38.8%	0.8%	NA

b. percentage of total members of JCC from each community

41.8%	22.0%	15.6%	5.7%	13.5%	1.4%	100%
-------	-------	-------	------	-------	------	------

The JCC draws nearly its entire membership from the current Federation area, although the distance between the JCC and Princeton for example, is really no greater than that between the JCC and some parts of the service area.

There are a number of significant differences between JCC members and non-members, within the Federation area:

- families with children are more likely to be JCC members. 53% of families with children are JCC members, compared to only 34% of non-member families.
- similarly, larger families are more likely to be members of the JCC. 53% of families with 4 or more members are JCC members, compared to 29% of families of 1 to 3 members.
- long-term residents (20 years or more in the area) are less likely to be JCC members than shorter-term residents. 51% of families resident 20 years or less in the area are members of the JCC, but only 39% of long-term (over 20 years) residents.

We did not discover much attitudinal difference between JCC members and non-members; the two groups were largely similar with regard to such matters as religious orientation, social patterns, etc. There was one exception: JCC members were more likely to be concerned about intermarriage than non-members. (67% of members disagreed with the

opinion statement "too much fuss has been made about intermarriage and assimilation" compared to 52% of non-members) The difference, however, was modest.

The relative absence of association between JCC membership and values and attitudes (notwithstanding the very limited exception noted above) suggests that JCC membership is not widely considered to be a religious or culturally linked status, but rather one associated with an interest in social and recreational goals. This, in turn, suggests with regard to the residents of the Windsors and Twin Rivers, who express a desire to belong to a Jewish Community Center that they could well be satisfied with a non-sectarian center providing the same facilities and programming. This point will be discussed in greater detail below.

Turning to those families who have been members of the JCC in the past, but are no longer members today, a number of interesting differences appear. We distinguished between three groups of people - those who are members; those who have been, but have left; and those who have never been members of the JCC. When these groups are divided into demographic categories, the following differences emerge:

(1) the group with the largest percentage of ex-members is not the senior citizen group: it is the non-senior citizen group without children; e.g., 'empty nesters' in their 40's and 50's.

(2) families with children, as would be expected, have the highest membership percentage. Even there, however, 28%

of all families with children 18 and under were once JCC members and have left.

(3) overall, 36% of the households in the Federation area were once members of the JCC, but are no longer members. This is nearly as many as the current membership level (41%).

(4) the greatest membership percentage is among families who have lived in the area 10-19 years. Beyond that point, the percentage of members drops sharply among suburban families, while continuing to rise (but slowly) among residents of Trenton.

The last point can be elaborated: suburban residents of the Federation area are much more likely to drop out of the JCC membership rolls as they get older, or as they become more established in their towns and neighborhoods. Trenton residents, on the other hand, appear to depend more heavily on the JCC for social and recreational activities including senior citizens' activities, than do the suburban families

TABLE 4-3(a) JCC MEMBERSHIP AND EX-MEMBERSHIP BY DEMOGRAPHIC FEATURES
FEDERATION AREA ONLY

(a) by stratum*		% members	% ex-members
SENIOR	Trenton	42.7%	32.0%
CITIZENS	Suburbs	28.8	38.5
HH WITH	Trenton	58.8%	29.4
CHILDREN	Suburbs	50.4	27.8
ADULTS/NO	Trenton	37.5	54.2
CHILDREN	Suburbs	18.9	59.5
(b) by length of residence			
1-19	Trenton	47.1%	35.3
YEARS	Suburbs	47.6	20.2
20+	Trenton	50.8%	27.9%
YEARS	Suburbs	22.2	49.2

*stratum from initial telephone interview - Households with children include those with both children & senior citizens; adult households include no members 60 or over.

4-65

It would appear that many residents of the area, particularly suburbanites, tend to join the JCC either for a specific facility or service, or as a means of becoming involved in social and organizational life. Over time, the initial need, whether age-linked or a function of newness in the community, dissipates; at that point, it would appear that many residents no longer see any function being served for them by the Center, and leave.

Since the Jewish population of Trenton is shrinking, as well as the population with young children generally in the Federation area, it would appear that the demographic base of the JCC is shrinking, not only in absolute terms, but relative to the overall Jewish population in the area.* As a result, it is likely to lead to a shrinkage in membership, which may accelerate over time, unless some means can be found to maintain the interest of a larger percentage of the suburban households, and/or to recapture the interest of those that have left the Center. Even then, the demographic realities of the area's population will still have to be reckoned with, but certainly any decline can be slower than would appear likely on the basis of the trends that we have identified.

*although we have no direct evidence on the point, it would be interesting to surmise whether many families' involvement with the JCC declined when they moved from Trenton to the suburbs; as was noted, a very large proportion of today's suburbanites were yesterday's Trenton residents. It should be noted further that in 1961, 50.2% of the households were JCC members; today, the Trenton residents still make up a similar ratio (46.1%), but only 39% of suburban families are members.

Leaving aside the question of membership trends in the present JCC, the remaining issue deals with the potential future demand for community center activities and facilities, in particular in the new area - the Windsors, Princeton, and Twin Rivers. The question of future demand is the composition of a series of questions, including:

- what interest exists in membership in a Jewish Community Center in the new area?
- what conditions would have to be met in order to generate actual membership?
- what activities and facilities, and in what time periods, are most desired?

Each of these questions will be addressed in turn.

(1) level of interest: the level of interest, as shown in Table 4-4 below, is extremely high, in each area:

TABLE 4-4: INTEREST IN JOINING A JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER, FOR
NEW AREA

	WINDSORS	PRINCETON	TWIN RIVERS	TOTAL
% interested*	70.2%	48.2%	61.0%	62.0%
Families with children - % interested	74.6%	62.2%	65.3%	68.3%

*responding in the affirmative to question "do you believe that you would join, at that fee level (\$150/year), if a high quality physical facility were located conveniently for you?"

The percentages above suggest that, if a substantial proportion of those expressing interest would actually join a center, the membership could be equal to or greater than the current membership of

Jewish Community Center; specifically, we are talking about at least some serious interest on the part of over 1,000 families.

(2) conditions of distance, mode, and cost: although a large number of families expressed interest in joining a community center, many of these families indicated that the availability of bus service and a short travel time (particularly if there was no bus service) were potentially important considerations. Although relatively few families indicated that bus service was a necessary condition for their joining, a majority suggested that it was desirable; by inference, that its availability would increase the likelihood of their joining (Table 4-5).

TABLE 4-5: IMPORTANCE OF HAVING BUS SERVICE TO/FROM A COMMUNITY CENTER

	WINDSORS	PRINCETON	TWIN RIVERS	TOTAL
bus necessary	27.9%	18.5%	32.0%	27.6%
bus desirable but not needed	63.2	59.3	64.0	62.8
bus of no importance	8.8	22.2	4.0	9.7

NOTE: responses only from those people expressing an interest in joining a Jewish Community Center

Thus, the availability of bus service would be a major factor in generating membership for a community center among residents of the new area. It can be surmised that bus service, in addition to being a convenience for some people, may be a virtual necessity for others, particularly in households where neither parent is in a position to

provide chauffeur service in the classic suburban tradition. The importance of bus service in the respondents eyes is substantiated by their feelings on the question of travel time (table 4-6):

 TABLE 4-6: ACCEPTABLE TRAVEL TIME TO COMMUNITY CENTER, WITH AND WITHOUT BUS SERVICE

	under 30 minutes	30 minutes	over 30 minutes	median travel time
<u>a. with bus service</u>				
WINDSORS	37.5%	59.4%	3.1%	30 minutes
PRINCETON	58.3	41.7	0	28 minutes
TWIN RIVERS	64.5	31.3	4.2	24 minutes
TOTAL	50.7	46.3	2.9	29 minutes
<u>b. without bus service</u>				
WINDSORS	60.6%	37.9%	1.5%	19 minutes
PRINCETON	82.6	17.4	0	19 minutes
TWIN RIVERS	72.9	27.1	0	19 minutes
TOTAL	68.6	30.7	0.7	19 minutes

WITH bus service, the typical respondent is willing to travel 20-30 minutes a community center; WITHOUT bus service, the acceptable travel time drops to between 15-20 minutes.

In either case, with or without bus service, the majority of respondents are not likely to be interested in joining the present Jewish Community Center in Ewing Township, in view of the travel times accepted. 30 minutes is an upper limit for the overwhelming majority of the respondents, most of whom live more than 30 minutes away from Lower Ferry Road.

The question of cost was incorporated into the question on

interest, to a limited degree, so that it is to be expected that those families who were interested in joining a center felt that a fee level of \$150/year was reasonable:

TABLE 4-7: ACCEPTABILITY OF A \$150/YEAR COMMUNITY CENTER MEMBERSHIP

	WINDSORS	PRINCETON	TWIN RIVERS	TOTAL
reasonable	75.0%	76.0%	86.0%	79.0%
too high	23.5	20.0	14.0	19.6
too low	1.5	5.0	0	1.4

note: responses only from those respondents expressing an interest in joining a Jewish Community Center.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the overwhelming majority of respondents, in the new area, and a majority, although a smaller one in the Federation area felt that a smaller membership fee with additional charges for costly programs and activities was clearly preferable to a single, larger but comprehensive, membership fee:

TABLE 4-8: PREFERENCE IN MEMBERSHIP FEE STRUCTURE FOR COMMUNITY CENTER

	FEDERATION AREA	NEW AREA
single comprehensive fee	36.7%	23.4%
small membership fee with additional charges	63.3	76.6

This section can be summarized then as follows: a considerable number of residents of the new area are actively interested in a Jewish Community Center, and are willing to pay adequate fees for its

support, PROVIDED IT MEETS THEIR (HIGH) STANDARDS WITH REGARD TO CONVENIENCE AND TRANSPORTATION SERVICES. Although our data cannot provide a conclusive picture with regard to demand, they certainly support further investigation in this area.

(3) which services and when: The survey further attempted to assess the demand for particular types of community center service in the new area, and the preference as regards the time of day, or day of week, in which that service should be offered. In addition to providing information for planning of facilities, this should be useful in developing programming to meet immediate needs in the area, in advance of more long-range facility planning. For each of eight service areas respondents were asked if they would be very interested, moderately interested, or not interested in utilizing that service if it were available (subject, of course, to the considerations discussed earlier). In order to provide a basis for comparison, an expression of moderate interest was weighted $\frac{1}{2}$; i.e., it was assumed that roughly one-half of that interest would materialize. Table 4-9 on the following page shows the percentage of the population, based on the above weighing scheme, that would potentially utilize each service.

In addition, respondents were asked when they would utilize the service (or have their children use the service); the choices were (1) after school weekdays; (2) weekdays (generally); (3) evenings; and (4) weekends. Combinations were also entered. In many cases it was apparent that only one time period was at all

TABLE 4-9: POTENTIAL DEMAND FOR COMMUNITY CENTER SERVICES

a. level of potential demand (% of population potentially utilizing service)

	WINDSORS	PRINCETON	TWIN RIVERS	TOTAL
nursery	14.4%	12.5%	35.4%	21.1%
childrens' programs	51.0	24.1	57.3	46.9
teenagers' programs	48.6	39.3	44.5	45.0
adult rec/ath programs	56.7	46.4	59.1	55.2
adult ed/cult programs	56.7	59.8	57.9	58.1
senior citizen programs	43.3	17.9	29.3	32.6
summer outdoor pool programs	36.5	21.4	16.5	26.2
summer day camp	48.6	33.0	57.3	47.9

b. preferred time period for program participation

	preference	alternative
nursery	day	none
childrens programs	afterschool	weekends
teenagers programs	afterschool	weekends
adult rec/athletic	evenings	weekends
adult ed/cultural	evenings	weekends
senior citizens	day	none
summer outdoor pool	day	none
day camp	day	none

responsive to the needs of the community; e.g., nursery or senior citizens' programs. It should be stressed that the alternative time slot is not really an alternative; rather, it represents a time slot for which a significant demand existed, although less than that demand existing for the preferred time period.

A rough approximation of the numerical level of demand can be arrived at by taking the percentage of potential demand from table 4-9, and adjusting it by the percentages of respondents who (a) indicated that they would join a center if it were available and (b) indicated that they considered \$150/year a reasonable fee. These percentages, in effect, screen that proportion of the population that can be expected not to pursue an interest, however strongly expressed. For example, if we wanted to arrive at a rough figure for the number of households in Princeton who might utilize conveniently located nursery services, the following would provide an estimate:

600	(number of Jewish households)
<u>X .125</u>	(percentage interested in nursery)
75	
<u>X .622</u>	(percentage interested in joining)
47	
<u>X .76</u>	(percentage considering fee reasonable)
35	

The rough estimate for the number of households, then, would be 35 families. This is discussed in further detail in the last chapter, on planning for the future.

C. Jewish Family Service: The Jewish Family Service agency, located in the Greenwood House building in Ewing Township, provides a variety of counseling, guidance, and related services to the community. Unlike some of the other facilities, there is evidence (independent of this survey) that a growing part of the agency's caseload is coming from the new area, in particular from Twin Rivers.* It is difficult if not impossible to assess potential demand for services of this nature with precision, since it is in the nature of the subject matter that the conventional interview format cannot yield accurate information -- it is too common that individuals consider the use of a counseling service, either real or potential, as a reflection on their own capacity to deal with their problems and needs.

Nevertheless, we have made some effort to assess both past use and likely future demand for this service, albeit in a relatively non-quantified manner. In particular, we have examined the question of preference for Jewish-related services in this area as a major indicator of potential use of services provided by Jewish Family Service.

Table 4-10 on the following page presents a summary of the use of counseling services by respondents, and their rating of Jewish Family Service, by those respondents who have had exper-

*It is in the nature of this service that it does not serve a mass base, and is therefore not likely to be reflected in a sample survey.

ience with the agency in the local area.

TABLE 4-10: USE OF COUNSELING SERVICES BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS

	Used local JFS agency	Used other JFS agency	Used other local agency	Never used counseling
Trenton	13.5%	0.8%	2.4%	83.3%
Suburbs	11.3	2.1	5.2	81.4
Windsors	10.6	10.6	5.6	73.1
Princeton	1.8	8.9	7.1	82.1
Twin Rivers	2.4	9.8	8.5	79.3
TOTAL	9.4%	5.2%	5.3%	80.1%

	Use of local JFS as % of total use	Local JFS rating
Trenton	81.0%	3.94
Suburbs	61.1	3.96
Windsors	39.3	3.82
Princeton	10.0	(4.00) (single case)
Twin Rivers	11.8	(4.33) (two cases)

NOTE: the rating scale used above is from 1 (very poor) to 5 (very good)

Although residents of all areas tend to make roughly the same use of counselling services (Windsors/Twin Rivers slightly more), the use of Jewish Family Service is much heavier within the Federation area. This has to do as much with the recency of many of the new area's residents arrival; based on their past use of JFS (most likely in New York City), they would appear to be a natural clientele for the local JFS agency.

As was mentioned above, the issue of preference for Jewish-

related services is considered a significant indicator:

 TABLE 4-11: NATURE OF COUNSELLING SERVICES PREFERRED

	Jewish	Secular/No Difference
Trenton	71.3%	28.7%
suburbs	55.5	44.5
Windsors	48.0	52.0
Princeton	37.0	63.0
Twin Rivers	46.3	53.7
Federation area	60.8%	39.2%
New area	44.9	55.1

The lower level of preference for Jewish-related services in the new area suggests that there is more of a competitive element involved; i.e., it is unlikely that a majority of these individuals will seek out a JFS agency if a more convenient alternative, most probably secular, is available. Nonetheless, it is clear that if the services of JFS are readily available, they will be used.

To meet the needs of the largest number of people who are potential recipients of services, those services must be:

- available within a travel time of no more than half an hour
- available during evening hours, preferably in addition to rather than instead of, regular weekday business hours.

Of those residents of the new area preferring Jewish-related services 81.6% responded that they would travel at least one half hour to obtain such services; the great majority of this number, however, indicated that a half hour was their upper as well as lower travel limit. Again, given the number of people that have already sought

the agency out in Ewing Township, it is most likely that a facility located within that travel distance of the Windsors/Twin Rivers will be well utilized.

The latter point is also worthy of note; 55% of the new area respondents stated that that evening hours were the most convenient for them, while only 14% indicated that evening hours would be a problem. The level of demand for weekday business hour appointment was only half that of evening time period, while many people stated that they would have difficulty making appointments for that time period (Table 4-12):

TABLE 4-12: WHAT ARE THE BEST AND WORST TIMES FOR COUNSELLING APPOINTMENTS?

	FEDERATION AREA	NEW AREA
best:		
business hours	40.2%	26.4%
weekday evenings	52.2	55.9
weekends	7.6	17.7
worst:		
business hours	56.6%	66.7%
weekday evenings	26.5	14.2
weekends	16.9	19.2

Finally, in order to assess in a general way the types of problems that may be relevant to future counseling needs, respondents were asked to identify which three social-psychological problems, or areas of concern, they considered most important to themselves and their immediate area. The problems that respondents identified, in order of priority, are presented in Table 4-13 on the following

page:

TABLE 4-13: PERCEIVED SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEM AREAS

	Most important	Second	Third
Trenton	racial conflict*	drugs	problems of teenagers
Suburbs	drugs	parent-child relations	marital problems problems of teenagers
Windsors	teenagers' problems	marital	parent-child conflict
Princeton	marital problems	stress	intergroup conflict
Twin Rivers	teenagers' problems	marital problems	drugs parent-child conflict

*coded as intergroup conflict

The consistency between the responses in the Windsors and Twin Rivers suggests an interrelated matrix, as it were, of social and psychological problems clearly within the scope and role of the Jewish Family Service agency.

D. Trenton Hebrew Academy

The Trenton Hebrew Academy, located on West State Street in Trenton, is the Hebrew day school serving the Trenton area. It provides a full-time education, including secular as well as Jewish religious studies, for students through the eighth grade. The survey respondent families included a total of 25 children who are at present students at the Hebrew Academy, distributed in a manner presented in Table 4-14 on the following page. It should be noted that, of the children in the sample households, roughly 5% of all children aged 5 to 18 study at the Hebrew

Academy; roughly 11% of all children who are enrolled in some form of Jewish education are students at the Hebrew Academy.

 TABLE 4-14: ENROLLMENT IN JEWISH EDUCATION AND AT THE TRENTON HEBREW ACADEMY

	% of children 5-18 in Jewish education	% of children 5-18 in Hebrew Academy	% of children in Jewish ed. in Hebrew Academy
Trenton	70.0%	25.0%	35.7%
Suburbs	57.9	6.2	10.7
Windsors	36.2	3.9	10.9
Princeton	47.8	1.4*	3.0*
Twin Rivers	20.2	1.1*	5.2*
Federation	59.0%	7.9%	13.3%
New area	33.8	2.4	7.1
total	44.9%	4.8%	10.7%

*single case

With regard to the future of the Hebrew Academy, a number of points are apparent; although it is not out of the question that the ratio of Hebrew Academy students to total children increase in the Federation area (the suburban part), the aging of that population is such that superhuman efforts will be required to keep the enrollment from that quarter level. As a result, the key areas for future enrollment growth are in the new area - in particular the Windsors and Twin Rivers.

Responses to the question dealing with interest in Jewish education for the future uncovered a not insignificant measure of interest in Jewish day school education in those areas, as well as in the suburban part of the Federation area. As shown in

Table 4-15, there would appear to be considerable potential enrollment in the making in the survey area:

 TABLE 4-15: PRESENT AND FUTURE INTEREST IN JEWISH DAY SCHOOL
 (% of households with children in each category)

	STRONG PRESENT INTEREST	ANY PRESENT OR FUTURE* INTEREST	Households with children/% of total households
Trenton	5.9%	17.6%	13.0%
Suburbs	8.7	20.0	56.4
Windsors	16.2	27.0	71.2
Princeton	0	13.2	67.9
Twin Rivers	11.0	23.3	86.9
total	9.8	21.5	54.9

*in forthcoming five year period

The key groups are first, the Trenton suburbs within the Federation area, which appear to have a small, but non-negligible, potential enrollment not yet tapped; and second, the Windsors and Twin Rivers, in which substantial demand may exist. Given the large numbers of young children in the Twin Rivers/Windsor areas, should 5% to 10% of them be potential day school enrollees, the effect could be considerable.

Specifically, as presented in the table on the following page, and using conservative assumptions (we assume here that 90% of those expressing strong interest, and 10% of those expressing moderate interest represent the population base),

the following numbers are obtained:

 TABLE 4-15(a): NUMBER OF POTENTIAL ADDED PUPILS PER YEAR BY AREA
 TO JEWISH DAY SCHOOL (based on level of demand among
 children presently aged 0-4)

	Children 0-4	% demand for day school	annual demand 1976-1980
Federation area			
suburbs	168	9.8%	3
Windsors	313	17.3	11
Princeton	93	1.3	
Twin Rivers	533	12.3	13
Total			27

 It should be noted parenthetically that the number of Jewish pre-school children in the city of Trenton is so small that even if all of them were to enroll in day school, the effect would still be limited.

In any event, it would appear that the area of the Windsors and Twin Rivers should be able to support a day school of a size roughly comparable to the present Hebrew Academy.

Two major questions remain in the area of demand, which must be addressed, specifically:

- conditions which must be met, with regard to travel time, cost, etc. if the potential demand is to be turned into real enrollment.

- the credibility of the expressed interest; to what degree that interest is likely to be turned into reality.

(1) conditions on day school enrollment: As with the subventions already discussed, three conditions were considered: availability of bus service, length of travel time from home to school, and cost. In the case of day school, the number of respondents is too small to cite the responses with great confidence; nonetheless, certain concerns are clear enough to draw initial conclusions. The following discussion concentrates on the Trenton suburbs, and the Windsor/Twin Rivers areas. As has been noted, the basic demand data suggest that (a) demand in the City of Trenton has largely been met; and (b) no appreciable demand exists at present or in the foreseeable future in Princeton.

The felt need for bus services is unequivocal -- a clear majority of households with a strong interest in day school also stated that bus service was necessary if they were to send their child there. (Table 4-16)

TABLE 4-16: IMPORTANCE OF HAVING BUS SERVICE TO/FROM JEWISH DAY SC

	Suburbs	Windsors	Twin Rivers	Total
Necessary	77.8%	66.7%	87.5%	75.9%
desireable, but not necessary	11.1	33.3	12.5	20.7
not important	11.1	0	0	3.4

Despite the small sample, the direction of the table is unequivocal

The findings on the question of travel time acceptable are also clear, except that the population is not unanimous -- indeed, the respondents are evenly split, with approximately 40% holding 15 minutes the maximum, another 40% considering 30 minutes to be the upper limit, and the remaining 20% generally willing to have their children travel over 30 minutes to day school. Approximately half the Windsor/Twin Rivers families felt that 15 minutes would be the longest travel time they would consider acceptable. In either case, it strongly suggests that only a small minority of those families interested in day school would be willing to travel to Trenton to the Hebrew Academy at its present location.

 TABLE 4-16(a): ACCEPTABLE TRAVEL TIME TO/FROM JEWISH DAY SCHOOL

	Suburbs	Windsors	Twin Rivers	TOTAL
15 minutes	12.5%	54.5%	42.9%	38.5%
20-29 minutes	0	0	14.3	3.8
30 minutes	50.0	27.3	42.9	38.5
over 30 minutes	37.5	18.2	0	19.2

The third condition is cost acceptability. Many respondents were not willing to hazard an estimate in this area (few had any idea of actual, or current, costs for private education of any kind, with the occasional exception of nursery schools), and those who did were often uncertain. The level of information, varying widely from the Trenton suburbs to the Windsors, was apparent -- 62.5% of the Trenton suburban respondents indicated a figure between \$1000 and \$1500 per year, in essence comparable to the actual charges, while nearly all the Windsor/Twin Rivers respondents were either well below

or well above a realistic figure. A realization of the actual cost

 TABLE 4-16(b): ACCEPTABLE COST LEVEL FOR A JEWISH DAY SCHOOL

	Suburbs	Windsors	Twin Rivers	TOTAL
\$0-\$499		16.7%*		5.0%
\$500-\$999	25.0%	66.7	50.0%	45.0
\$1000-\$1499	62.5	16.7*	16.7*	35.0
\$1500-\$1999	12.5*			5.0
\$2000+			33.3	10.0

*single case

levels involved may deter some families from carrying through on the interest expressed here.

(2) Credibility: Credibility, as noted above, is used here to describe whether the interest expressed here is likely to be turned into reality. This is examined by looking at internal consistency; i.e., is the expressed interest in day school consistent with other attitudinal or behavioral elements relevant to the decision? In order to measure this we examined the interest in day school in the light of a series of such elements. Three were taken as paradigms of the whole: fasting on Yom Kippur (traditional practices); strong feelings about intermarriage/assimilation (traditional values); and negative assessment of the local public schools.

It was gratifying to discover that the families expressing an interest in Jewish day school diverged sharply from their neighbors in each of these areas, particularly in the last two. In Twin River in particular, the values and perceptions of the group under consideration was at sharp variance to the consensus of the community; e.g.

while the majority of Twin Rivers respondents felt that schools in the area were improving, the families interested in day school felt that they were deteriorating. Furthermore, while the majority of Twin Rivers respondents felt that intermarriage was not an issue, nearly all the families interested in day school felt that it was.

 TABLE 4-17: ATTITUDE & PERCEPTION COMPARISON IN TWIN RIVERS - FAMILIES INTERESTED IN DAY SCHOOL AND OTHERS

	the local public schools are:		
	IMPROVING	STAYING THE SAME	DETERIORATING
day school	0	28.6%	71.4%
other	59.5%	21.4	19.0
"too much fuss is made about assimilation and intermarriage"			
	AGREE	DISAGREE	
day school	12.5%	87.5%	
other	61.7	38.3	

Although the divergence was not as sharp in the other areas, it was not because of any change in the day school families, but rather because the consensus in the other two areas was closer to that of a more traditionalist perspective. The consensus about public education was also more negative in other areas; Twin Rivers, in fact, was the only area in which the majority of respondents felt that their public schools were improving. As Table 4-18 on the following page illustrates, a growing number of suburbanites today perceive their public schools as deteriorating. This could plausibly lead in the future to increased interest in Jewish day school among families sharing some of the relatively traditionalist values mentioned above.

TABLE 4-18: PERCEPTIONS OF DIRECTION OF LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOL

	IMPROVING	STAYING THE SAME	DETERIORATING
Trenton	2.3%	6.8%	90.9%
Suburbs	24.6	35.6	39.8
Windsors	25.7	30.0	44.3
Princeton	17.2	62.1	20.7
Twin Rivers	48.1	27.8	24.1
Federation area	18.5	27.8	53.7
New area	32.0	35.3	32.7

The comparisons for establishing credibility of the demand for Jewish day school show that, by and large, those families expressing strong interest are almost entire prime candidates -- we believe that perhaps as many as 90% of this group would conceivably send their child(ren) to day school if the conditions discussed above were met. In the case of families expressing moderate interest the opposite is true -- we believe that the interest expressed is merely casual, and few if any of these families are likely to translate that interest into reality, under any plausible set of circumstances.

E. Greenwood House

Greenwood House is a center located in Ewing Township, near the Jewish Community Center, that provides institutional care for elderly people. The issues that concern us with regard to Greenwood House are principally demographic; i.e., the number of elderly residents of the area that will need the services it provides. In addition, a further potential demand element is provided by those younger residents of the area, particularly new in-migrants, who may, in the event that their parents need institutional care,

seek to have them admitted to an institution in this area.

This section discusses three separate questions relevant to this concern: (1) the demographic base for Greenwood House in the area; (2) attitudes and concerns on the part of senior citizens in the area, relevant to Greenwood House; and (3) the potential demand from younger residents obtaining services for their parents.

(1) the demographic base: Although it is clearly impossible to tell from demographic data how many individuals will need the services Greenwood House provides, it is possible to assemble surrogate data; i.e., a measurement that serves as an equivalent for analysis purposes. It was noted earlier (Table 2-8, on page 2-19) that at present there are 139 Jews over age 80 in the Federation area; since (a) the average admission age to Greenwood House is over 80, and (b) the combined resident population and waiting list run from 60-70, we can use as our analysis figure that of .50 the population over 80. This population is on the increase:

TABLE 4-19: POPULATION PROJECTION OF PEOPLE OVER 80 - FEDERATION AREA

1975	139	
1980	214	aged 74-79 in 1975
	- 32	deaths in group 1975-1979
	182	
	X .9	adjustment for out-migration
	164	people over 80 added by 1980

(continued)

1985 335 aged 70-74 in 1975
 - 73 deaths in group 1975-1984
 262
 X .8 adjustment for out-migration
 210 people over 80 added by 1985

summary:

1975		1980		1985
139	surviving	73	surviving	27
		164	surviving	87
				210
	<u>total</u>	<u>237</u>		<u>324</u>

Thus, the population over 80 will increase by nearly 100 in the next five years, and by an addition 8-90 people during the five year period after that. If one adopts the figure of .50 of this population as the potential demand for Greenwood House, the following demand figures are reached:

1975	70
1980	119
1985	162

If one takes a more conservative approach, and, for example, argues that 45 beds, which is .32 of 139 (present population) should be the ratio, the following figures are reached:

1975	45
1980	76
1985	104

In either case, one can assume a substantial increase in demand for institutional care facilities for senior citizens in the near future.

(2) Attitudes toward Greenwood House: Given the level of potential demand, from a demographic perspective, one finds further that Greenwood House has a generally very positive image among the senior citizens of the Trenton area*, suggesting that, to the degree that they need the services it provides, they will in large numbers attempt to take advantage of them at Greenwood House.

Nearly all our respondents had heard of Greenwood House (94%), and 62% have at least one friend who is, or has been, a resident of Greenwood House. Thus, it would appear that knowledge about the facility, including some first-hand information, is widely diffused among the senior citizens of the area. As a result, the positive ratings are most likely a reliable assessment:

TABLE 4-20: ATTITUDES OF SENIOR CITIZENS TOWARD GREENWOOD HOUSE

(1) own rating	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR
Trenton	67.3%	26.5%	4.1%	0	2.0%
Suburbs	42.5	35.0	10.0	10.0%	2.5
Total	56.2	30.3	6.7	4.5	2.2

(2) assessment of residents' satisfaction (respondents with friends in Greenwood House)

	GENERALLY SATISFIED	SOME SATISFIED SOME NOT	GENERALLY UNSATISFIED
Trenton	84.6%	7.7%	7.7%
Suburbs	76.0	20.0	4.0
Total	81.3	12.5	6.3

*Throughout this section we have concentrated exclusively on the Federation area, since the number of senior citizens in the new area, particularly in the older years, is insignificant, and it was impossible to draw an adequate sample of the area.

Although the consensus is somewhat less enthusiastic among suburban respondents, even there it is overwhelmingly favorable. Of those few respondents who commented that their friends were unsatisfied there was no specific or single facet of the agency that was the problem; rather, complaints generally had to do with the quality of services provided by Greenwood House staff.

A substantial majority of respondents further indicated that, if they should have to move to such a facility, Greenwood House would be their first choice. This was the overwhelming consensus of Trenton residents, and the choice of about half of the suburban senior citizens. A closer look at these responses suggests that, rather than having specific objections to Greenwood House, many senior citizens flatly do not want to consider the eventuality that they may need the facilities provided there. Needless to say, however high people perceive the quality of the Greenwood House facility, the prospect of becoming dependent on the facility, and losing one's ability to be self-sufficient, are frightening prospects for a great number of people.

Finally, another difference between the Trenton and the suburban senior citizens was the concern for Kashrut at the facility, and the availability of chapel, or shul, on the premises. Both were considerably more important to the Trenton residents, as illustrated by the table on the following page.

TABLE 4-20(a): IMPORTANCE OF (A) KASHRUT (B) A CHAPEL OR SHUL

	TRENTON	SUBURBS	TOTAL
(a) Kashrut			
necessary	51.0%	30.0%	43.0%
desireable only	12.2	26.7	17.7
not important	36.7	43.3	39.2
(b) a chapel or shul on the premises			
necessary	52.9%	36.7%	46.9%
desireable only	27.5	40.0	32.1
not important	19.6	23.3	21.0

It would appear, therefore, that a majority of the senior citizens in the area consider maintenance of traditional practices either necessary or desireable; certainly, the number who are ready entirely to dismiss them, whether Trenton or suburban, are few.

Thus, in short, it would appear that there do not exist the kinds of objections or problems that might lead actual demand to be substantially below the demand projected from the demographic base; as a result, the suggested figures presented on page 4-27 above are, to the degree reasonably feasible, substantiated.

(3) Demand for services to residents' parents: The relative precision with which the local demographic base for services can be estimated cannot be duplicated in this area; too many uncertainties affect future demand, potential or real. Certainly, from an abstract standpoint the potential is enormous - there are thousands of parents 'out there', making up a potential service demand. In practice, of course, large numbers will prefer to remain in their own communities if they need services, others will move to the

communities of their other children, and still others will never need institutional care. We will make some effort to narrow the base down in this manner.

 TABLE 4-21: NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF PARENTS OF AREA RESIDENTS LIVING OUTSIDE AREA

	TRENTON	SUBURBS	WINDSORS	PRINCETON	TWIN RIVERS
% families with living parents:	23.7%	49.5%	69.2%	75.0%	79.3%
average number parents/family:	3.0	3.18	3.50	3.07	3.72
% parents living outside area:	59.5%	59.6%	83.3%	94.6%	95.0%
households	1002	1548	720	600	800
	<u>X.237</u>	<u>X.495</u>	<u>X.692</u>	<u>X.750</u>	<u>X.793</u>
with parents	237	766	498	450	634
	<u>X3.00</u>	<u>X3.18</u>	<u>X3.50</u>	<u>X3.07</u>	<u>X3.72</u>
total parents	711	2436	1743	1382	2358
	<u>X.595</u>	<u>X.596</u>	<u>X.833</u>	<u>X.946</u>	<u>X.950</u>
outside area:	423	1452	1452	1307	2240
<u>total - Federation area</u>	1875				
<u>total new area</u>			4999		
<u>total</u>	6874				

 This is a substantial pool, concentrated in the new area - in the Windsors and Twin Rivers. To narrow it down, somewhat, we will look at a series of questions:

(a) how many are likely to move to this area? Very few respondents felt that their parents were likely to move to this area. Of respondents in the Federation area, 1.4% said their parents would definitely move, and 32.2% said they would possibly move; the figures for the new area were 1.4% definite and 21.9% possible. If we estimate that one-third of the 'possible's will move, that yields

a figure of likely moves as follows:

Federation area:	1875 X .121*	= 227
new area:	4999 X .087	= <u>435</u>
total		662

Since this movement can be expected to take place gradually, over a long period of time, it is doubtful that this in-migration of senior citizens will have more than a small effect on the senior citizen population in the area in general, and a minimal effect on demand for Greenwood House. If we assume that it is distributed over 25 years, the annual senior citizen in-migration will be between 25 and 30 people; of these, most likely, between 2 and 5 per year will be over 80. Although this may increase, for example, during the 1980's or 1990's, as the parents of the Twin Rivers group become collectively older, it is never likely to increase demand for Greenwood House by more than 1-3 people per year. Thus we can discount in-migration that takes place independently of a need for services as a potential significant demand element.

(E) how many are likely to need institutional care? A substantial proportion of the area's residents expect that one or more of their parents may need institutional care within the next five years. Even if we assume that this need applies to only one parent per household, and discount it by 50%, it remains substantial as illustrated in the table on the following page. On the basis of these conservative assumptions, the number whose children anticipate will need care remains over 200 people.

TABLE 4-21(a): NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF PARENTS LIVING OUTSIDE AREA AND NEEDING CARE WITHIN NEXT FIVE YEARS

Trenton	suburbs	Windsors	Princeton	Twin River
14	44	40	76	40
total federation area = 58		total new area = 156		total = 214

note: calculations as follows (Twin Rivers example) total outside area 2240/divide by number/household (3.72) = 602. % needing care in five years 14%. $602 \times .14 \times .95$ (percent of those needing care living outside area) = 80. divided by 2 = 40.

If this is an accurate reflection of need, then there will be a potential demand for institutional facilities (whether in this area or elsewhere) of 40-45 people per year in the combined areas.

(c) how many will their children attempt to find space for in this area? The great majority of respondents indicate that if their parents needed care, they would seek a facility in this area. 77% in the Federation area and 74% in the new area felt this way. This must be discounted, however, by the fact that many of the respondents are not the individuals who would be responsible for their parents in the event a decision of this sort would have to be made; 59% of the children in the Federation area, and 64% in the new area indicated that they are responsible. We can assume that in many, if not most of the remaining cases, another child, presumably living elsewhere, will take the responsibility. If we adjust the figures in Table 4-21(a) above, to reflect the two factors presented here -- the effort to locate parents in this area

and the question of responsibility, we obtain:

Federation area:	58	new area:	156
	<u>X.77</u>		<u>X.74</u>
	45		115
	<u>X.59</u>		<u>X.64</u>
	26		74

Thus, on this basis, the effective demand for facilities in this area during the five year period will be a total of 100 people from the combined areas, or about 20 per year.

It is possible that the level of demand will not be this great at first, since apparently the ages of the individuals involved, in the new area at least, are lower than the typical age for institutional care demand. The sons of the individuals (or sons-in-law) are aged, on the average 50 years in the Federation area, and 42 years in the new area. Thus many of the parents (whom their children expect to need institutional care) are unlikely to be more than 70, or 75 at most, during the five year period under discussion. Even if we cut the demand level from the new area in half on this basis, we remain with a figure of 12 to 13 per year.

Of these, the great majority will actively seek a Jewish facility: 90% of the respondents in the Federation area, and 71% in the new area, indicated that this was the case - 9% of the respondents in the new area, and none in the Federation area, stated that they would be seeking non-Jewish facilities for their parents. The question made no difference to the remainder. Thus, assuming that the quality was competitive, which our evidence

suggests is the case, the great majority of families in need will turn to Greenwood House as their first choice. It should be noted, however, that as was shown in Table 4-2, only about a third of the families in the new area have ever heard of Greenwood House .

Finally, for comparison with Table 4-20(a), the following table shows the preferences expressed by children on behalf of their parents with regard to Kashrut and the availability of a chapel or shul.

 TABLE 4-21(b): IMPORTANCE OF (A) KASHRUT AND (B) A CHAPEL OR SHUL AS
 CHILDREN ASSESSING PARENTS' PREFERENCE

	FEDERATION AREA	NEW AREA	TOTAL
(a) Kashrut			
necessary	36.7%	44.7%	40.2%
desireable only	18.3	23.4	20.6
not important	45.0	31.9	39.3
(b) a chapel or shul on the premises			
necessary	33.9%	48.9%	40.4%
desireable only	45.2	42.6	44.0
not important	21.0	8.5	15.6

 Interestingly, the residents of the new area, who are themselves generally less observant than those of the Federation area, believe that observant practices are more important to their parents; perhaps this is reflective of some measure of guilt vis a vis their own departure from the observances of their upbringing, and perhaps not. In either case, the results are similar to those of Table 4-20 and are illustrative of a demand for the ability to maintain traditional practices in any facility.

F. Other Services for the Elderly

Two other service areas should be discussed briefly, since a demand exists, and given the increase in the population of senior citizens in the area, are likely to become progressively more important.

(1) Institutional Day Care: A substantial minority of respondents indicated that their parents presently, or within the next five years, would be likely to benefit from the availability of institutional day care services:*

TABLE 4-22: DEMAND FOR INSTITUTIONAL DAY CARE SERVICES BY AREA

Trenton	Suburbs	Windsors	Princeton	Twin Rivers
13.3%	19.6%	15.3%	27.9%	11.4%

note: percentage of respondents with living parents indicating that one or more parents would benefit from such services

Although hardly definitive, this suggests that this area is definite worth exploring in greater detail.

(2) housing for senior citizens: There would appear to be considerable demand for moderately priced senior citizens housing both from elderly people residing in the area, and from younger residents who would want to relocate their parents into the area. 30.6% of the Federation area respondents (excluding those resident in Trent Center) expressed an interest in moderate cost senior citizens housing in the suburban Trenton area; of those expressing an interest, 42% stated that it was a definite, and urgent, need.

Furthermore, 29% of the Federation area younger residents, and 38% of those in the new area, indicated that their parents were interested in senior citizens housing. Of these, 72.5% of the Federation area respondents and 78% of those in the new area, stated that they would encourage their parents (those expressing an interest) to locate in this area if senior citizens housing were available. Thus we have a two-tier phenomenon here: there not only a demand for senior citizens housing present in the area but there is a second level of potential demand, that would be triggered by the construction of senior citizens housing, and probably require additional housing to be developed.

In view of the latter demand, it is possible that, despite the relatively small numbers there at present, it may be worth considering the development of senior citizens housing in the new area as well as in the Federation area. In either case, we suggest that the need for senior citizens housing will be a major concern of the Trenton area Jewish community in the foreseeable future, that it could well be a major area toward which the Federation should direct efforts and resources.

CHAPTER 5: PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

In the four chapters preceding this we have described a wide range of aspects, features, and conditions of the Jewish community in the greater Trenton area. This chapter, then, will attempt to summarize the most directly relevant findings of the first four chapters, and draw from them some direction that can assist the Federation and its subventions in the planning of the future of the organized Jewish community.

The demographic trends outlined in the first chapter are perhaps the most dramatic single group of findings in the study as a whole, as well as being highly relevant for planning. The implications are serious:

- a shrinking population base in the Federation area, likely to be, within a decade, less than 2/3 its peak population (of the early and mid-1960's).
- a population to be made up more and more of senior citizens, with their concomitant needs for more services, and reduced incomes.
- a population with fewer young adults, and progressively fewer families raising children, and fewer children, particularly in the pre-school and grade school ages.

Each of these features has direct implications for the individual subventions as well as the Federation as a whole.

At the same time, a noticeable contrast was found in the area we have termed the 'new' area, in particular the Windsors and Twin Rivers. Here is a population that has come into being

almost from scratch within the past decade, in particular within the past five years. It is a population of young families, with large numbers of grade school and pre-school children, a population that is as affluent/ ^{and} as educationally and occupation-ally qualified as the population of the Federation service area.

Nothing in the above should come as a particular surprise to the informed leadership of the Federation, or of the Jewish community outside the present Federation service area. As far back as 1961, in the last Federation survey, a sharp increase was visible (between 1961 and 1949) in the number of senior citizens, as well as a decline in the number of pre-school children in the area. More recently, many observers have noted gradual shifts in the demand for services, and an increasing visibility of a Jewish community in the East Windsor - Twin Rivers area, as progressively more families from that area seek out the Jewish services (JFS, day school) available in the Federation area. Still, although it may not be surprising, it is difficult to accept in its full scope, since its implications are so far-reaching, and have such a direct bearing on the future not only of the specific services, but on the organized Jewish community in this area as a whole.*

From all accounts, the organized Jewish community of Trenton

*It is interesting to note that, on the basis of conversations with leaders of the Jewish community, the consensus was that the Jewish population of the Federation service area was in the area of 10,000. This is amazing, since even without the current survey, a casual perusal of the 1961 data would have made it clear that a high figure of that sort would have been, to say the least, extremely unlikely.

in its heyday, and still today, is outstanding among Jewish communities in the level of organizational and synagogue involvement, the scope of its communal service network, and the level of contributions for a relatively small community. According to the survey, 90% of all households interviewed in the Federation area contributed to the Federation campaign, 84% were members of at least one Jewish organization, and 76% were members of a synagogue. These levels of participation are high, and are a deserved source of pride among the members of the community.

As the size of the population in the Federation service area declines, and the senior citizen share of that population becomes larger, it will become progressively more difficult to maintain the historical level of financial, organizational, and programmatic activity in the area. The resource base for both financial support and organizational activity will decline; that base, for certain particular services, will shrink even more rapidly. This change will not take place overnight, certainly, and its effects in some areas may not be significant for another five, ten, or fifteen years; nonetheless, it is happening.

As a result of their awareness of these trends, as well as for many other reasons, much of the leadership in the Federation has been exploring the implications of various ways of relating to the Jewish communities of those areas not part of the service area. Although the overall thrust of the survey findings not only supports this movement, but actively encourages it, some limited

caveats, or warnings, are also implicit in the survey data.

It would have been unrealistic to expect that the Jewish community of the Windsors-Twin Rivers area would have the same level of organizational or communal commitment as that of the Federation area, and indeed we found no such thing. Instead of a community in which observance, organizational membership, and commitment to the community, are the rule and the consensus, the Windsor-Twin Rivers community is one in which a large part of the community are largely non-observant, and not actively concerned with communal services and activities. We do not believe that this is in any sense a function of the newness of the community; as was discussed in earlier chapters, we consider it a basic attitudinal matter. We do not know whether to attribute it to a generational difference, or to the New York origin of so many Twin Rivers and Windsor residents; whatever the reason, it is a major reality that must be accepted.

This has a number of implications, two that should be pointed out. First, it means that levels of membership, levels of fund-raising, and the like, are not likely at any point to reach the level (in proportion to population) reached in the Federation area. Second, the reduced sense of communal solidarity, if you will, suggests that most Jewish communal services, to gain a strong population base in the Windsors-Twin Rivers area, will

have to compete directly with services provided by secular sources for the same audience.

Although most probably no Jewish service in modern times in this country has been entirely free of competition from secular sources, the information about the Federation area population strongly suggests that many of the households in that area have had a strong predilection for use of Jewish services; i.e., unless a secular agency provides a service that is clearly and substantially preferable, they will choose the Jewish service. This is closely tied to the concept we have dubbed the 'communal obligation', which is strongly felt in the Federation area.

The same is not true of the Windsor-Twin Rivers area. The predilection for use of Jewish services, if it exists, is weaker. Demand for Jewish services is less tied to their being Jewish, and is more a function of a generalized demand. The survey found, for example, that a very large number of Twin Rivers residents would be ready to join a Jewish Community Center if it located near them. We believe that most of those people would be equally likely to join a secular center providing the same services at similar cost, and if both the Jewish and the secular center existed side by side, many might very well end up choosing the secular center, perhaps for very minor reasons.

In a similar vein, it is not surprising that the families in Twin Rivers who want to send their children to a Jewish day school are most negative about the public schools, relative to

the local consensus, of any area. Given the underlying value structure, the negative reaction to local public education is likely to be a more significant element in that area than in other areas, because the positive push, associated with Jewish identity and commitment, is weaker.

This is not to suggest that there are not large numbers of residents in the Windsor-Twin Rivers area who are dedicated, civically involved, Jews. There are large numbers of people who are committed and involved. It is that these people are not as representative of the total Jewish community in that area, as the counterparts in the Federation area are. This has significant implications for planning.

Given this overall picture, what, then, are the implications for the Federation, and for the individual subventions. Below we attempt to identify some of the major concerns, and some of the key issues, first for each subvention, and then for the Federation.

The Jewish Community Center is one of the two major subventions with the classic problem of a shrinking base, resulting in large part from the demographic shifting of the population, but also from a decline in its service base relative to the population. As our statistics illustrated, the suburban movement of the Trenton Jewish population weakened the ties many Jewish households had to the JC

Suburban residents within the Federation area tend only to be members as long as they have young children (and even then a substantial percentage do not join), and then leave. Other suburbanites join when they are new to the area, and leave after (one assumes) they have acclimated, and developed social and recreational resources independent of the JCC. At the same time, Trenton residents tend to remain members.

Since the suburban share of the population is growing, at Trenton's expense, and will continue to do so, if the share of the suburban population that is interested in JCC services is smaller than that of the Trenton population, then the potential membership base will continue to dwindle. The same is true, of course, of families with and without children. In either case, the JCC must arrive at a means of holding/recapturing those people who tend to leave, or watch it continue to decline. Conceivably this could be done in part by redirecting JCC activities and functions to the age and population groups most affected. In addition to the obvious area of additional services for senior citizens, two other areas come to mind: programs and activities for non-senior citizen older adults (in their 40's and 50's), and programs for young adults, not yet members of independent households, in their 20's. In the latter case, it is conceivable that greater attention by the organized Jewish community to the needs and interests of this group could perhaps encourage a larger number

to remain in the Trenton area (the same would apply to college students from the area, as far as summer and vacation time activities are concerned). As was noted, this appears to be the largest group of out-migrants.

The preference and condition responses from the Twin Rivers and Windsor residents strongly suggest that, although they are interested in JCC-type activities, they are generally unwilling to travel the distance that would be required to participate in activities at the center on Lower Ferry Road. Barring a major change, it is doubtful that the JCC can count on any major membership increment from that quarter. The strong level of interest, however, and the current relative absence of competition from other sources suggest that the construction of a facility, or on a more modest scale the provision of activities and services in borrowed facilities, may be worth considering in the East Windsor Twin Rivers area.

The Trenton Hebrew Academy is the other service confronted with problems directly linked to the demographic change in its traditional service area. Simply stated, our information suggests that, if the Hebrew Academy continues to rely on the Federation area to draw a student body, it will not be able to assemble an entering class for many more years. The number of children of pre-school age in the Federation area, including the suburbs,

is so small (and shrinking) as to be almost insignificant in future educational planning.

If full-time Jewish education has a future in this area, and we believe it does, that future lies in the Windsor-Twin Rivers area. That area, which is relatively compact, is the only part of the overall region that has the demographic base to support the major part of a Jewish day school. The other parts of the region -- Trenton, Lawrence, Yardley -- in toto may not be able to provide more than 5 enrollees per year to a day school. Similarly, Princeton residents show no interest in Jewish day education worth noting.

As with the JCC, the evidence is unequivocal that East Windsor and Twin Rivers parents are unlikely to send their children to the Hebrew Academy in Trenton, with limited exceptions. A facility will have to be situated much more closely to them if it is to achieve anything approach the potential enrollment.

It should be stressed with regard to both the Trenton Hebrew Academy and the Jewish Community Center that the findings of the survey do not provide conclusive evidence that a move to the Windsor-Twin Rivers area would be successful, and economically justifiable. The data support such a contention, but do not demonstrate it; we strongly urge, with regard to both services, that if the interest in pursuing a move exists, that more detailed, more precisely focused, analysis be done to assess the various pros and cons.*

*We should note that a variety of specific manipulations of the data for this survey can still be done that can refine these points, based on particular needs of the subventions in their planning.

Jewish Family Service is in a less problematical position than the two services mentioned above. We have noted that there has already been some use of the JFS services in Ewing by residents of the Windsors; unlike JCC and day school, people in need are generally willing to travel longer distances for counseling (up to an hour). Thus, while a significant part of the population in need will travel to the existing office, there is little doubt that there are others who would not. Similarly, the number of Jewish households in the East Windsor area is such that the volume of business that an office in that area would do might be comparable to that done in the Ewing office. In any case, providing facilities in that area is under consideration by the agency, and the information is supportive of the idea. Not in the sense that the data can identify X households who need counseling at this moment, but in the sense of more general demographic and social trends relevant to the potential need for such services. Again, this is a 'competitive' service; only a minority of area residents expressed any preference for services provided by a Jewish, rather than a secular agency. At this time, of course, there is something of a vacuum to be filled, in any case.

Greenwood House is in the opposite position. Rather than face either a geographic or programmatic redirection as an alternative to actual curtailment of its activities (which may be the case with

the first two services mentioned) , Greenwood House may have to expand considerably. We anticipate a substantial increase in demand for places at Greenwood House, based on a sharp increase in the age group (80+) representing the principal clientele for Greenwood House. A strong positive feeling about Greenwood House among the prospective clientele, as well as potential added demand from parents of younger residents of this area as well as the Windsor-Twin Rivers area, only add to this potential increase. Greenwood House, unlike the two other services (JCC and Hebrew Academy) is not geographically constrained; assuming there is adequate space, the location is suitable to serve a wide geographic area, since children, relatives, and friends of Greenwood House residents are not as constrained in travel time.* In any case, the great bulk of the prospective clientele is located in Trenton and Ewing, in any case, so that the travel question does not really arise.

The application that Greenwood House has made for a Certificate of Need for additional beds is eminently reasonable; if anything, we suspect that the potential demand, within the fairly near future will be greater than the addition proposed. As a result, it is likely that a further increment will be required shortly after the one proposed at the moment is completed.

*A variety of factors go into what a respondent considers an appropriate travel time; in particular, the purpose of the trip, whether the driver is the beneficiary of the service, or whether he/she is chauffeuring someone else; how often the trip must be made, etc. Estimating what will be acceptable travel times, beyond a certain level, becomes more of an art than a science,

In addition to the specific service that Greenwood House provides, in terms of institutional care, we support the proposal of Greenwood House to study the feasibility of providing institutional day care for mentally impaired individuals. Furthermore, we urge the Federation to undertake a serious and systematic study, for which this survey should provide the starting point, on the need for senior citizens housing in the area. There is no doubt that there is a significant need, and that a reasonable part of that need should be met in the future through locations and housing types other than the urban high-rise type that has dominated senior citizens housing up to now. A variety of issues should be addressed, including preferred housing types and configurations, desirability of separate senior citizens vs. mixed age group housing, etc. Similarly, an effort should be made to quantify the potential demand more precisely.*

In general, given the increasing share of the population made up of senior citizens, there should be great emphasis given to the other services - social, nutritional, cultural, supportive, and so on -- that might be needed. We expect that this will be one of the most important concerns of the Federation during the coming decade.

*In view of the recent Mt. Laurel decision of the New Jersey Supreme Court, barriers to construction of moderate cost housing in the suburbs should be substantially less, although in some cases there may still be a need for litigation to make it possible.

The Jewish Federation of Greater Trenton itself, as the funding, planning, and administrative umbrella for Jewish communal services in the area must confront all of the issues mentioned, although from perspectives that sometimes may vary from those of the direct service providers. One area that must be looked into closely is the medium and long-range financial picture of the Federation and its subventions; we have suggested that the increasing share taken by senior citizens in the area population could have the effect of reducing the fiscal resource base at the same time that demands for services increase. One would not be human under those circumstances not to look at the fiscal potential in the East Windsor-Twin Rivers area in terms of future need. Again, these are not immediate problems; still, it is best to begin thinking about them soon.

Along those lines a detailed fiscal study may be timely; a study that will evaluate costs of the various operations and revenues, both from subventions and from Federation, in the context of the near and middle-range demographic future, to identify as precisely as possible when, and in what areas, the potential fiscal problems will take place. This could be an important element in a planning process.

With or without a fiscal study, as well as the other specific investigations and analyses that we have suggested in

this chapter, the most important step at this time is to begin framing the alternatives and their implications in the light of the information presented in this report. We honestly believe that Federation is at a crossroads in the Trenton area; in 1962, at least in part on the basis of the 1961 survey, the decision was made to suburbanize - to move the preponderance of Jewish communal facilities to the suburbs, at that time Ewing Township. At that time East Windsor was farmland, and Twin Rivers a potato field. Today, a set of decisions equally important lie ahead, with even greater risks. We do not underestimate the risks; our attitudinal findings with regard to the Windsor-Twin Rivers population suggest that it will not be an easy task to build the communal base in that area that will be needed to support a significant Jewish communal infrastructure.* Nonetheless, it must be confronted. At the risk of repeating a time-worn cliché, this is in actuality one of those situations where not to decide is to decide. The continued movement of demographic reality will not allow the Federation to stand still.

*In this discussion the role of the Princeton Jewish community has been touched upon only marginally. Although it is a large community, with roughly 600 families, the evidence suggests that by and large its internal structure tends to meet its needs, and that there is no strong support in that area for major institutional changes, or rearrangement of services. If a JCC-type center was built within reasonable distance of Princeton in the Windsors it might attract some members from there, but little more. 9692

