Understanding Jewish Community Needs: The Greater Los Angeles Regional Needs Survey*

SAUL ANDRON, Ph.D.

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

Needs assessment research . . . has many applications beyond priorities ranking and impacting on resource allocation patterns. The regional focus of these survey findings provides JFC and its agencies a valuable instrument to engage in a continuing examination of the relevance of existing service activities to changing human and communal service needs and priorities.

Introduction

This paper summarizes the findings from a major community needs assessment conducted by the Jewish Federation Council (JFC) of Greater Los Angeles. This needs assessment, undertaken within the framework of the Federation's Community Priorities System, was designed to generate a valid and current information base about community needs and problems to assist JFC leaders in determining overall service priorities for allocations purposes.

Needs assessment research is not new to the Jewish communal planning context although its use has been limited in number, scope, and sophistication.¹ Needs assessment is recognized in the general health and human services field, both in the public and volunteer sectors, as an integral and indispensable component of the service planning process. The 1960s and 1970s witnessed a dramatic growth in the needs assessment field, spurred on primarily by government mandates for accountability, efficiency and service planning made explicit in federal, state, and local legislation.² Parallel to these government requirements was a growing concern and demand within the private sector for greater program economy, accountability and efficiency.

This latter development has intensified over the past decade as volunteer agencies increasingly strain to service the community most effectively with ever-shrinking and limited resources. Needs assessment is viewed as one effective tool to identify the most pressing needs and deprived target populations to ensure that agency resources are utilized most appropriately and effectively.

Before proceeding further, it is important to clarify and emphasize the distinction between needs assessment and priorities setting. As noted in the

^{*}Acknowledgments: This study was carried out with the lay and professional support of the Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles. Special thanks go to Executive Vice President, Ted Kanner, and Federation Vice President, Marcie Greenberg, for their commitment to the production of action research. Dr. Steven Huberman, Dr. Adrianne Bank, and Dr. Robert Wenkert assisted in the formulation of the final report summarized in this paper.

¹ Jewish communal research has focused primarily on demography—population size, composition and changing trends. There have been studies also undertaken of particular target groups, such as the elderly and immigrants.

² Government legislation, including Public Law 93-641, the National Health Planning and Resources Development Act of 1974, Public Law 94-63, the Community Mental Health Center Amendments of 1975 are two examples of legislative statutes which mandated human service agencies to plan and evaluate their programs in terms of meeting the human needs of those living in the communities serviced by them.

United Way monograph entitled *Needs* Assessment: The State of the Art, "Needs assessment is sometimes linked with the process of determining and ranking priorities. The two are separate and distinct processes. A valid needs assessment is, of course, an indispensable tool for priorities setting. But ultimately, all priority determination exercises are colored by value judgments."³

Needs assessment, whatever the approach and method used, is essentially a data collection and measurement process. It is a tool for collecting and analyzing accurate, timely data to feed into a broader planning process to develop programs, identify resources, and influence resource allocations. Priorities setting, on the other hand, is essentially a political process. It strives to sort out and choose among competing values and judgments, only one of which is relative need, as identified by one or a combination of needs assessment strategies. A sound needs assessment provides information essential to promote an informed priorities setting process; however, it alone does not constitute the total process.

Turning now specifically to the Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles Regional Needs Survey, an extensive community needs assessment was conducted in 1982 in the five JFC geographic regions. The survey sought the judgments and perceptions of a knowledgeable cross section of individuals from the five JFC geographic regions regarding the most serious social and communal problems and needs facing Jews in the regions and in greater Los Angeles. The results of this needs survey do not constitute in themselves the final JFC community priorities. Rather, the needs findings served as significant

pieces of information, along with other data and criteria, to help determine overall service priorities in the JFC regions and for JFC as a whole. Needs data, then, were one ingredient integrated and translated into broad service priorities.

Research Methods

The findings presented in this paper are based on information collected through what is commonly referred to in the needs assessment literature as the "key informant" approach.4 The primary emphasis of this approach is to gather information about community needs and perceptions of service utilization from persons who are designated as familiar with the community, its people, their particular needs, and the availability and use of services. A key informant survey focuses sample selection on respondents with exceptional knowledge of the social need area, target population, or geographic area under study. The IFC Regional Needs Survey followed this selection strategy for the most part.

As emphasized above, this Regional Needs Survey was conducted primarily to develop a broad information base to assist lay decision-makers in establishing community priorities so as best to allocate scarce resources among programs and agencies in the community. In order to achieve that specific goal, we primarily wanted to approach people closely involved with and knowledgeable about Jewish community life in each of the IFC regions; hence the use of key informants. Further, we recognized other advantages of this approach: its relatively simple design, low cost, and short time frame.

³ Needs Assessment: The State of the Art. Alexandria: United Way of America, 1982, p. 5.

⁴ Ibid., Chapter III, pp. 13-28.

Respondent Selection Process

The usefulness of the information obtained from the key informant approach is based to a large degree on the effectiveness of the procedures for identifying respondents who are best qualified to provide the desired information.

The five regional directors of the Iewish Federation Council were contacted by the Planning & Budgeting Department and asked to identify key individuals in their respective regions whom they regarded as knowledgeable about the region, its Jewish residents, their problems and need for services, and the patterns of service received. We asked for a diverse set of nominees, collectively familiar with the major population groups and human and Jewish communal needs in the region. A checklist was devised to ensure that balance was achieved, and that a broadly representative group had been selected in each region. It should be noted that respondents selected by the key informant approach are not intended to be representative of a community's population in a statistical sense.

Respondents were in approximately equal numbers, male and female. However, consistent with our desire, they were more likely to be opinion leaders or influentials, to be more involved in and affiliated with Jewish and community affairs and institutions, and to be older than the Jewish population of any region as a whole. These factors should be kept in mind when interpreting their responses.

Data Collection

Altogether, 237 key individuals were interviewed. The interviews were conducted in person by a group of professional and volunteer interviewers. The respondent sample, approximately pro-

portional to the population size of each region was as follows:

Distribution of Respondents

		Jewish
Region	Number	${\it Population}$
Metropolitan	60	169,000
San Fernando Valley	75	207,000
Western	37	53,000
Eastern	34	34,000
Southern	31	38,000
Total	237	

All findings reported here are based on the responses of these 237 individuals.

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was designed to elicit problem identification and diagnosis information, as well as priority choices among problems and needs facing Jews in the JFC regions. Its specific content revolves around two extensive lists of problems divided into social and communal areas. Social problems relate to individual and social functioning. Jewish communal problems relate to areas of need specific to Jews and the Jewish community. These two problem lists were formulated by the researchers in consultation with JFC agency executives, regional directors, the Planning & Budgeting Research Committee, and outside consultants. The final lists were extensive (22 social problems and 25 Jewish communal problems were included) and cover a broad range of problem and need areas.5

Both closed and open-ended questions were included in the questionnaire. For each social problem item, respondents were asked:

1. whether the problem exists in their particular region

⁵ See the Appendix for a listing of the social and communal problems covered in the survey.

- 2. its degree of seriousness
- 3. the specific geographic focus
- 4. changing conditions surrounding the problem

Respondents were then asked to select the three most serious social problems and give a rationale for these selections. Further problem diagnosis was solicited through questions asking about respondent awareness of Jewish and community programs dealing with these problems and the adequacy of these programs. Finally, respondents had the opportunity to offer suggestions to JFC and its agencies for dealing with these problems.

These same questions, following the same sequence, were asked in regard to the Jewish communal problems.

Respondents were finally asked to consider social and Jewish communal service problems together. The three most serious social and Jewish communal problems were rank-ordered by degree of seriousness. Lastly, Jewish population groups were ranked in terms of their need for additional resource allocations.

Findings

The presentation which follows considers the two sets of problems together so as to highlight and understand the major problems facing Jews in the JFC regions. Table I lists the ten most serious problems in each region and in all regions combined. This table was derived by merging the separate responses for the three most serious social and the three most serious communal problems in the regions.

The Most Serious Problems

Social and communal problems are intermingled among the top ten problems with half of the ten most serious problems in each region social, the other

half communal; this despite differing regional problems and variations in the order of problems. Both social and communal problems thus are perceived equally as among the most serious in all IFC regions. Among the five problems included as the ten most serious in every region, three are family relatedintermarriage, divorce/marital conflict, and emotional or psychological problems of children and adolescents. The other two on every regional list are: large numbers of Jews unaffiliated with any Jewish (non-synagogue) group or organization, and isoaltion of the elderly. These five problems, although ranked differently in each region, are judged as among the ten most serious problems everywhere.

Near the end of the interviews with respondents, after they had selected the three most serious social problems and the three most serious communal problems in their region, they were asked to consider together and rank all six problems, from one to six, in terms of their seriousness. On the basis of this commingled ranking of social and communal problems rank scores were computed for each problem in each region, and for all regions combined. These scores were weighted and standardized so as to make them comparable across regions.⁶

Weighted Rank Scores as an Indication of Seriousness

There is one major advantage in the use of such weighted standardized rank

⁶ Rank scores were calculated by a mathematical formula based on two factors: (a) the number of respondents who identified the problem as one of the most serious in their region, and (b) the rank they assigned to the problem (1–6) among the six most serious ones they had chosen. A weighting factor was included in the calculations, and the raw scores were standardized to promote comparability. Under the method used, rank scores can range from 0 to 200.

Table 1
What Are the Most Serious Problems In Your Region?
(Social and Communal Problems Combined)

JFC Region	Percent	JFC Region	Percent
Metro		SF Valley	
No afford. elderly housing	65	Divorce/marital conflict	61
Divorce/marital conflict	43	No afford, elderly housing	36
Intermarriage	40	Intermarriage	3 2
Low Jewish group affil.	35	Child/teen emotional probs.	29
Isolation of elderly	32	Isolation of elderly	28
Anti-semitic activity	30	Low Jewish group affil.	27
Few UJWF contributors	28	Anti-semitic activity	26
No Jewish child educ.	23	Low synagogue affil.	26
Child/teen emotional probs.	23	Adult emotional problems	24
Permanent poverty	23	Few UJWF contributors	
Number of Respondents (60)		Number of Respondents (75)	
Western		Eastern	
No afford, elderly housing	76	Divorced/marital conflict	59
Divorce/marital conflict	51	Low synagogue affil.	53
Low Jewish group affil.	43	Intermarriage	44
Few UJWF contributors	41	Isolation of elderly	44
Intermarriage	38	Low Jewish group affil.	38
Child/teen emotional probs.	27	No afford, elderly housing	35
No Jewish recreat'l. facil.	24	Anti-semitic activity	35
Anti-Israel propaganda	22	Quality of Jewish educ.	21
Isolation of elderly	22	Child/teen emotional probs.	21
No elderly home help	22	Adult emotional problems	
Number of Respondents (37)		Number of Respondents (34)	
Southern		Totals	
Divorce/marital conflict	77	Divorce/marital conflict	57
Intermarriage	58	No afford, elderly housing	47
Isolation of elderly	48	Intermarriage	40
Child/teen emotional probs.	39	Low Jewish group affil.	34
Low Jewish group affil.	29	Isolation of elderly	33
Few UJWF contributors	26	Child/teen emotional probs.	27
Low synagogue affil.	26	Few UJWF contributors	26
No Jewish child educ.	26	Anti-semitic activity	24
No elderly institut'l care	26	Low synagogue affil.	23
Adult emotional problems	2 3	No Jewish child educ.	21
Number of Respondents (31)		Number of Respondents (237)	

scores rather than simple percentages for ordering the most serious problems. Percentages reflect the proportion of respondents who choose a problem as serious, but do not reflect the intensity of respondent feeling about that particular problem relative to others also selected as most serious.

Table 2 orders problems using weighted standardized rank scores. Such scores take into account not only the number of respondents who choose a particular problem as one of the six most serious social and communal problems (3 from each list),

but also the priority rating they assign that problem relative to the other five problems from the merged lists they have designated to the most serious category. Thus, a problem chosen by fewer respondents to whom it is the most serious among the six in their region can obtain a rank score as high as a problem chosen by more respondents who have designated it as the least serious of the six. The higher rank scores are assigned, of course, to those problems designated by many respondents as most serious of their six, and the lower rank scores characterize problems cho-

JOURNAL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

Table 2
What is the Rank-order of the Most Serious Problems In Your Region?
(Social and Communal Problems Combined)

Rank Rank					
JFC Region	Score	Rank	JFC Region	Score	Rank
Metro			SF Valley		
No afford, elderly housing	78	l	Divorce/marital conflict	82	1
Intermarriage	63	2	Intermarriage	51	2
Divorce/marital conflict	45	3	No afford, elderly housing	42	3
Low Jewish group affil.	42	4	Low Jewish group affil.	35	4
No Jewish child educ.	39	5	Anti-semitic activity	32	5
Few UJWF contributors	38	6	Child/teen emotional probs.	3 2	6
Anti-Semitic activity	37	7	Few UJWF contributors	30	7
Child/teen emotional probs.	31	8	No Jewish child educ.	29	8
Isolation of elderly	31	9	Low synagogue affil.	29	9
Permanent poverty	22	10	Adult emotional problems	29	10
Number of Respondents (60)			Number of Respondents (75)		
Western			Eastern		
No afford, elderly housing	94	1	Divorce/marital conflict	76	1
Divorce/marital conflict	66	2	Low synagogue affil.	70	2
Few UJWF contributors	54	3	Intermarriage	65	3
Low Jewish group affil.	50	4	Anti-semitic activity	57	4
Intermarriage	47	5	Low Jewish group affil.	50	5
No Jewish recreat'l facil.	29	6	Isolation of elderly	43	6
No Jewish child educ.	22	7	No afford, elderly housing	32	7
Anti-Israel propaganda	22	8	Quality of Jewish educ.	31	8
Isolation of elderly	22	9	No elderly home help	26	9
Child/teen emotional probs.	22	10	Child/teen emotional probs.	22	10
Number of Respondents (37)			Number of Respondents (34)		
Southern			Totals		
Divorce/marital conflict	89	i	Divorce/marital conflict	70	1
Intermarriage	87	2	Intermarriage	60	2
Low Jewish group affil.	54	3	No afford. elderly housing	55	3
Isolation of elderly	44	4	Low Jewish group affil.	44	4
Few UIWF contributors	38	5	Few UJWF contributors	35	5
Low synagogue affil.	38	6	Isolation of elderly	32	6
No Jewish child educ.	37	7	Anti-semitic activity	32	7
Child/teen emotional probs.	30	8	No Jewish child educ.	29	8
No Jewish recreat'l facil.	25	9	Child/teen emotional probs.	28	9
Quality of Jewish educ.	24	10	Low synagogue affil.	28	10
Number of Respondents (31)			Number of Respondents (237)		

sen by only a few respondents who designate them as least serious. Table 2 lists the ten problems in each region receiving the highest rank scores in that region.

A close examination of this table makes it readily apparent that regional variations are significant and should be underscored. Only four of the sixteen problems included on each of the five regional lists are on all the lists. Three of the four are family problems—divorce/marital conflict, intermarriage, and the emotional or psychological

problems of children and adolescents—and the fourth is the low number of Jews affiliated with Jewish groups or organizations. The remaining twelve problems appear on only some of the regional lists. For example, no affordable housing for the elderly is ranked first in the Metropolitan and Western regions but does not appear as a serious problem in the Southern region. Further, even the problems that appear on every list tend to be ranked somewhat differently within each region. Their corresponding rank scores

clearly vary across regions, further highlighting variations in respondent perceptions regarding the seriousness of these particular problem items. Divorce and marital conflict is a good example of this spread in rank scores across regions. Thus, the widely held view that marked and important differences exist among the IFC regions in terms of the existence and intensity of social and communal problems is substantiated by this analysis. This finding has important service delivery implications for communal agencies striving to provide the most appropriate services catered to the specific needs of target groups and geographic areas within the greater Los Angeles Jewish community. This point will be amplified further in this paper.

When categories of problems are discussed, however, some broad generalizations highlighting commonalities among the JFC regions can be attempted. At this broader level there is general agreement across regions as to the most serious types of problems facing Jews in the individual regions in greater Los Angeles. Family problems are clearly important in every region. Divorce and marital conflict and intermarriage are among the top five ranked problems in all regions. A third familyrelated problem-emotional or psychological problems of children and adolescents-is found in all regions although with somewhat lower rankings. Problems of the elderly, while varying in particulars, seem serious in every region. They consist primarily of the lack of affordable housing and social isolation. Varying regional demographics and geographic factors play important parts in determining the constellation and intensity of problems facing the Iewish elderly in the various regions.

Problems of lack of organizational affiliation—either with Jewish groups,

or synagogues, or both-rank high in every region. Communal problems that affect all population groups, e.g., the small number of United Jewish Fund contributors and the prevalence of anti-Semitic activity, also rank among the ten most serious in almost every region. Jewish educational problems of one sort or another are also found among the ten most serious problems in every region. The remaining two particular problems—conditions of permanent poverty, and lack of Jewish recreational and social facilities—rank among the ten most serious problems in one or two regions, respectively. Altogether, these problem categories account for fourteen of the sixteen individual problems on the regional lists in the table.

Reasons for Problems Being Considered Serious

It is interesting to explore and compare the criteria utilized by respondents to make distinctions between serious and less serious problems. For each social problem they designated as most serious, respondents were asked for an explanation of their ranking. A variety of answers were given, but they can be grouped into four broad categories.

1. Individual Impact

The problem is serious because individuals are at risk. For example, respondents saw the problems of the elderly in terms of immediate personal hardship: "People have to have shelter; they can't live in the street." "They are unable to solve the problem themselves or even help themselves." For children and young people, they were likely to note the long-term effects of having individuals continue at risk. "If we can't help children, we are jeopardizing their adjustment to later life." "If they don't get help, they will never be any good."

And, "We are raising a group of children who are not able to assume the responsibilities of adulthood and who have no respect for others."

2. Large Numbers Affected

The problem is serious because many individuals are now or will soon be affected. Some respondents noted the present extensiveness of the problem: "I know a lot of kids in big trouble, seriously disturbed." Others emphasized the likelihood that the problem will become even more widespread in the future because of social conditions: "Stress is higher," "People don't have extended families," "We live in complicated times with changing values," "Inflation and high interest rates make it difficult for people on fixed incomes to survive." Others thought of the ripple effect which occurs when families break up: "The children are the sufferers as well as the parents." Still others saw that large numbers of people could be affected by the problems in the future: "It costs more later and for longer. People become problems in the community, have bad marriages."

3. Jewish Survival

The problem is serious because Jewish survival is threatened. For example, "(Divorce and marital conflict) eat away at the basic fabric of the family which is the backbone of Jewish society," and "When a family has dissolved, it is extremely difficult to recreate that joyful Jewish experience." The problems of the elderly are also seen as problems for Jewish survival: "We are losing their value to the community."

4. Jewish Responsibility

The problem is serious because the Jewish community has responsibility for dealing with it. Respondents suggested that there were some basic human rights to which people were entitled and that the Jewish community should ensure that people had them. This came out

most strongly in relation to the elderly: "Food is a basic human need," "(Services) are life-sustaining to them," "Their lack is very detrimental." "(The elderly) have a right to a choice. We should not force people to be institutionalized."

Turning now to the communal problems, the reasons given by respondents for their designations of the most serious problems were remarkably consistent with one another. For example, the seriousness of the intermarriage problem was justified by statements such as, "It breaks up Jewish family life," "It speeds up assimilation," and, "Traditionally, the Jewish family is the basis of the survival of the Jewish culture. Continually diminishing this is endangering the continuation of the culture."

The low levels of affiliation with Jewish groups or organizations was seen as a serious problem because "If we cannot get Jews in this (Eastern) region to affiliate with anything, they eventually will disappear as Jews entirely," and, "Jews with no affiliations are the ones that become non-Jews."

In the minds of respondents, it appears that intermarriage and nonaffiliation of Jews with Jewish groups or organizations are both serious issues, not because individuals are at risk, nor because individuals are leading nonfulfilling or unrewarding lives, but because collective Jewish identity is endangered. Respondents express the fear that Jews may disappear into the general society. The survival and continuity of the Jewish community are thus threatened by these problems.

This same sense of foreboding about the future is evident from the reasons given for the remaining most serious communal problems. Some respondents said that the seriousness of the small number of contributors to the United Jewish Fund is that it results in the lack of sufficient money to run programs. But many did note that "the UJF fails to involve Jews in communal life" and, "(non-participating Jews) are not of value to the community. They don't accept the fate and responsibility of being Jewish."

Low level of synagogue affiliation, like the low level of affiliation with Jewish groups, is specified as a serious problem by respondents because it is an indication of a potential loss of Jewishness. "Without the synagogue, I don't think we have a chance to survive." Respondents who chose this as a serious problem regarded the synagogue as a cohesive bond for Jews. Their fear that this bond was loosening was synonymous with their fear that the community was being weakened.

The same rationale was used by respondents who saw the large number of Jewish children not receiving a Jewish education as a serious problem. Their comments can be captured by two quotes: "Jewish education insures Jewish survival. We need some way to reach the unaffiliated and pull them into Jewish education." "The fewer Jewish children to receive a Jewish education, the fewer Jewish adults in the next generation to support the Jewish community. Without Jewish education, there will soon be no need for the Jewish Federation Council."

Respondents, then, regarded these communal problems as serious conditions either because they perceived them as evidence of an eroding Jewish community or as contributing to that erosion. Unlike the social arena, where the suffering of growing numbers of individual people, or Jewish attitudes about human rights were used to justify the seriousness of particular concerns, the serious problems in the communal area were almost exclusively linked to

Jewish community survival and continuity.

Discussion and Implications

The findings presented above are significant in their meaning and implications. They represent the collective judgments of 237 highly knowledgeable and diverse individuals, including Jewish communal professionals, key agency and Federation leadership, rabbis, and users of Jewish communal services. The needs assessment covered a wide range of problems facing individual Jews and the Jewish community today. Upon analyzing the data, it was clear that these individuals took a broad perspective on Jewish communal problems and needs and were not merely responding in terms of their own professional or volunteer interests and biases. While not the sole determinant of community priorities, the findings of this needs assessment constituted information central to promoting an informed and responsible priorities setting process.

The analysis of respondent perceptions provide important insights into the nature of social and Jewish communal problems. Both social and Jewish communal problems are diverse and, in many cases, getting worse. According to respondents, many of the problems analyzed in this study have intensified over the last few years. Social problems were seen as worsening at a more rapid pace than communal problems.

The survey uncovered a high level of awareness about services dealing with the most serious social and Jewish communal problems. Persons are aware of programs geared to divorce and marital conflict and problems of the elderly, and are even more aware of Jewish programs dealing with communal threats such as anti-Semitism, anti-Israel prop-

aganda and the quality of Jewish education. Our respondents score high on awareness but rate Jewish and general community responses to these problems as woefully inadequate. The highest adequacy rating, where 44 percent of the respondents said that the program response was adequate, was for general community programs dealing with the isolation of the elderly. The highest ratings for adequacy for Jewish programming related to programs to combat anti-Semitic activity, where 63 percent of the respondents asserted the programs were adequate. However, on the whole, only an average of one person in four perceived either communal or general programs to be adequate.

When one places the list of problems and the judgment of adequacy side by side, there is a natural inclination to conclude that the problems can be ameliorated simply by "more" and "better" services of the kind already in existence. While this may turn out to be a correct interpretation for some problems, e.g., lack of affordable housing for the elderly does beckon a direct and concrete response, it does not fully take into account the complexity of social and Jewish communal problems. Indeed, the existence of a problem per se does not mean the existence of an effective solution. It may be desirable to solve all the 47 problems covered in the survey, but solutions are not necessarily easily attainable.

Problem solutions might not necessarily be achieved by investing more money in existing programs directed toward the worsening conditions. Problems are caused by a variety of factors, only some of which can be controlled by particular Jewish communal interventions. For example, the problem of Jewish intermarriage has worsened over the past decade. It is, however, doubtful that by investing more funds in current

programming we can reverse this trend significantly. Jewish intermarriage may be caused by a multiplicity of family, educational, peer group, or other life experience factors. It is difficult, if not impossible, to isolate a specific cause and to propose a specific solution and thereby solve the overall problem. Such "quick-fixes" only deal with a single manifestation of a highly complex social phenomenon.

The implication of this analysis is the need to take a more systemic approach to the definition and solution of social and Jewish communal problems. Many problems do not fall neatly within strict organizational boundaries. Given the broadness and complexity of problems, it may be necessary to consider responses across agencies and across Jewish communal functions. Innovative linkages between agencies and other institutions, such as synagogues and other Jewish communal organizations, have great potential in this regard.

To sum up, in many cases, there is no one-to-one correspondence between particular problems, especially Jewish communal problems, and potential solutions. Problems are multidimensional, interrelated and complex and so should the approaches be to their solution.

As emphasized throughout this paper, the principal motive for undertaking this needs assessment was to develop a data base for the priorities determination process. The regional focus of the needs assessment was consistent with the design of our priorities ranking effort which also was executed at the initial stage on a regional basis. Therefore, the needs profiles developed by the *Regional Needs Survey*, together with other data sources, helped improve the formal regional ranking process.

Needs assessment research, however, has many applications beyond priorities

ranking and impacting on resource allocation patterns.⁷ The regional focus of these survey findings provides JFC and its agencies a valuable instrument to engage in a continuing examination of the relevance of existing service activities to changing human and communal service needs and priorities. Regional service delivery patterns are of growing concern to JFC and its network of agencies. Staff deployment, service emphasis, and service population mix for any agency can be matched against the

needs information to elicit essential feedback as to the adequacy, appropriateness, and relevance of the current array of services in the individual regions.

Needs assessment research, then, represents a valuable planning tool which should be given serious consideration in the communal planning context. The JFC Regional Needs Survey represents one model which could be easily adopted or adapted by other Jewish communities. The strength of this form of research is that it lends itself to a variety of approaches and technologies with creativity being an important factor.

Appendix

List of Social Problems Used in Needs Survey

a.	Alcohol abuse.	(Alcohol abuse)
b.	Divorce and marital conflict.	(Divorce/marital conflict)
c.	Emotional or psychological problems of	
	children and adolescents.	(Child/teen emotional probs.)
d.	Emotional or psychological problems of	
	adult-age individuals.	(Adult emotional problems)
e.	Juvenile delinquency.	(Juvenile delinquency)
f.	Adult unemployment.	(Adult unemployment)
g.	Inability of teenagers to obtain part-time or	
	summer employment.	(Teen unemployment)
h.	Drug abuse.	(Drug abuse)
i.	Lack of institutional and foster care for	
	children and adolescents.	(No child institutional care)
j.	Child abuse/neglect.	(Child abuse/neglect)
k.	Lack of affordable legal services for the poor.	(No poor legal services)
l.	Jews in permanent poverty conditions.	(Permanent poverty)
m.	Social isolation of the elderly.	(Isolation of elderly)
n.	Inability of elderly to obtain in-home care or	
	housekeeping assistance.	(No elderly home help)
о.	Lack of affordable housing for the elderly.	(No afford. elderly housing)
p.	Lack of appropriate institutional care for the	
	elderly when necessary.	(No elderly institut'l care)
q.	Nutritional needs of the elderly.	(Elderly nutritional needs)
r.	Lack of transportation for the elderly.	(No elderly transportation)
s.	Lack of opportunities for the disabled, i.e.,	
	deaf, blind or developmentally disabled to	
	obtain socialization and community living	
	skills.	(No disabled opportunities)
t.	Emergency financial needs of Jews caught in	
	life crisis situations.	(No emergency money)
u.	Inability of immigrants to obtain jobs.	(No immigrant jobs)
v.	Difficulty of immigrants to adjust to American	
	society and life styles.	(Immigrant adjustment)

⁷ Needs Assessment: The State of the Art, op. cit. Ch. V, pp. 37-40.

JOURNAL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE

List of Communal Problems Used in Needs Survey

List of Communal Problems Used in Needs Survey			
a.	Intermarriage.	(Intermarriage)	
b.	Influence of cults and missionaries on Jews.	(Influence of cults)	
c.	Small number of Jewish children receiving a	,	
	Jewish education.	(No Jewish child educ.)	
d.	Cost of synagogue membership.	(Synagogue member costs)	
e.	Cost of Jewish education (day school or sup-	, , ,	
	plementary).	(Jewish educ. costs)	
f.	Lack of Jewish social and cultural activities.	(No Jewish social activ.)	
g.	Anti-semanitic activity, e.g., vandalism, dis-	,	
_	criminatory literature, etc.	(Anti-semitic activity)	
h.	Chaplaincy needs of Jews in hospitals, in-		
	stitutions, and residences for the elderly.	(Jewish chaplaincy needs)	
i.	Inadequate cultural and Jewish educational		
	activities on college campuses.	(No Jewish campus activ.)	
j.	Anti-Israel propaganda.	(Anti-Israel propaganda)	
k.	Large number of Jews not affiliated with		
	synagogues.	(Low synagogue affil.)	
l.	Lack of cultural and Jewish educational pro-		
	grams for individuals with disabilities and		
	handicaps.	(No disabled Jewish activ.)	
m.	Cost of Jewish summer camps.	(Jewish summer camp costs)	
n.	Inadequate interaction between the Jewish		
	community and other religious/ethnic		
	groups.	(No outsider interactions)	
о.	Quality of Jewish education.	(Quality of Jewish educ.)	
p.	Small number of Jewish adults receiving a		
	Jewish education.	(No Jewish adult educ.)	
q.	Lack of recreational facilities and leisure-		
	time activities in Jewish settings.	(No Jewish recreat'l facil.)	
r.	Isolation of immigrant groups from main-		
	stream of Jewish community life.	(Immigrant isolation)	
s.	Large number of Jews not affiliated with any		
	Jewish (non-synagogue) groups or organi-		
	zations.	(Low Jewish group affil.)	
t.	Declining levels of religious observance by		
	Jews.	(Less religious observance)	
u.	Lack of Jewish-sponsored child-care facil-	AY Y 11 191	
	ities.	(No Jewish child care)	
v.	Lack of young leadership for Jewish	(No young one leadow)	
***	organizations/synagogues. Small number of contributors to United	(No young org. leaders)	
w.	Jewish Welfare Fund.	(Few UJWF contributors)	
x.	Insufficient community relations activity,	(rew bjwr contributors)	
Λ.	e.g., lobbying, information programs related		
	to current political and legislative issues.	(No political/legis. activ.)	
у.	Lack of organized opportunities for single	(110 political/legis, activ.)	
,.	Jewish men and women to meet and socialize.	(No singles social opport.)	
	James and women to meet and socialize.	(1.10 singles social opports)	