

**THE JEWS OF SOUTH AFRICA 2005
- REPORT ON A RESEARCH STUDY**



SHIRLEY BRUK RESEARCH

Prepared for Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and
Research at the University of Cape Town
May 2006

**THE JEWS OF SOUTH AFRICA 2005
- REPORT ON A RESEARCH STUDY**

No part of the report may be reproduced without permission of the author

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is a Kaplan Centre initiative, with the need for the study being recognised specifically by Mendel Kaplan. The study will hopefully make a useful contribution to the data bank relating to South African Jewry and will be yet another contribution from Mendel Kaplan to the Jewish Community of South Africa.

We are fortunate to have been able to base the study design and questionnaire on the 1998 JPR study¹ since this set the basic format and allowed for important comparative data to be obtained. There have however been a large number of changes to accommodate the 2005 objectives. This study was designed and undertaken by Shirley Bruk. Appreciation goes to Professor Milton Shain of the Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research at the University of Cape Town for his support and input. Valuable input relating to the questionnaire was also obtained from Yehuda Kay, National Director of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies. The review of the questionnaire by representatives of various Jewish communal and religious organisations provided useful suggestions prior to commencement of the survey. These suggestions and amendments were incorporated wherever possible.

Thanks to all those who made a major contribution to this study i.e. Carmen Mayers and her team for their integrity, enthusiasm and commitment to quality and to the project as such. This appreciation also extends to the interviewers in Johannesburg, Cape Town, Pretoria and Durban, for their data-gathering and for their commitment which was often beyond the call of duty. In addition, thanks go to: David Saks of the Board of Deputies, Kevin Parry of Statistics South Africa and also organisations which provided communal register data for Cape Town, Pretoria and Durban.

¹ The 1998 study was undertaken by The Institute for Jewish Policy Research in London (JPR) in association with the Isaac and Jessie Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research at the University of Cape Town. Decision Surveys International (DSI) was the market research company which conducted the fieldwork, sampling and data processing under the direction of Shirley Bruk who also provided input for making the questionnaire relevant to the South African situation. The study was reported on in: Barry A. Kosmin, Jacqueline Goldberg, Milton Shain, Shirley Bruk, *Jews of the 'new South Africa': highlights of the 1998 national survey of South African Jews*.

CONTENTS

Background.....	1
Study Objectives.....	2
Methodology and Sample Details.....	6
Sample Composition: Additional Data.....	10
Questionnaires, Interviewer Instructions and Showcards.....	17
Fieldwork and Data Processing.....	18
Timing.....	18
Presentation of Results.....	18

REPORT ON THE FINDINGS

I. Schooling, with focus on types of schools	
A. Background.....	20
B. Nursery schools/preschools.....	21
C. Primary and Middle/High schools.....	23
D. Jewish versus non-Jewish schools.....	28
II. Focus on Jewish Education	
A. Perceived quality of Jewish Education.....	37
B. The role of formal Jewish Education	39
III. Attitudes to South Africa	
A. Political Party Affiliation.....	44
B. Racial Prejudice, Antisemitism and Anti-Zionism.....	48
C. SA: Quality of life, Overall situation, Jewish community	56
D. Rating of South Africa on various factors.....	61
E. Additional input on Attitudes to South Africa.....	66
F. Future for Jews in South Africa.....	68
IV. Migrants who have returned	
A. Proportion who have emigrated but returned.....	75
B. Countries went to.....	77
C. When emigrated.....	77
D. When returned.....	78
E. Reasons underlying leaving and reasons for returning.....	78
V. Likelihood of moving within and from South Africa with related preferences, reasons and attitudes	
A. Likelihood of moving from current address.....	81
B. Within own city, to another city, to another country.....	83
C. Suburb preferences and City preferences.....	84
D. Country preferences	88
E. Likelihood of staying in/leaving SA, reasons and attitudes.....	99

VI. Focus on Israel	
A. Reasons for not wanting to emigrate to Israel.....	107
B. Rating of Israel on various factors.....	110
C. Bonds with and extent of attachment to Israel	114
D. Middle East situation.....	119
E. Jewish/Zionist Youth Movements.....	120
VII. Jewish Identity, Related issues and Activities	
A. Insight into Jewish Identity and Bonds.....	124
B. The link between Jews, their Future, their Past.....	129
C. Marriage/Partners, Inter-marriage, Conversion.....	132
D. Participation in Jewish Educational and other programmes, trips, websites, other activities.....	141
VIII. Religiosity	
A. God, Torah and Prayer.....	143
B. Classification in terms of Jewish Religious Practice.....	148
C. Upbringing in terms of Jewish Religious Practice.....	157
D. Observance of practices/rituals (incl. synagogue attendance)...	159
E. Focus on Kosher Meat Issue.....	170
F. Types of Synagogue.....	175
IX. Jewish Community and Communal Organisations	
A. Jewish Community and Role (perceptions of those not married).	182
B. Requirements from Jewish Community Structure.....	185
C. Jewish community support/facilities for specific groups.....	189
D. Membership and participation in organisations.....	192
E. The Organisations.....	196
F. Focus on fourteen selected organisations.....	204
G. Summary table for the fourteen organisations.....	236
<u>STUDY HIGHLIGHTS AND SUMMARY</u>	237

APPENDIX

Contact Questionnaire

Main Questionnaire

Interviewer Instructions

BACKGROUND:

The last survey amongst Jewish people in South Africa was conducted in 1998. It was recognised that a new survey is necessary. The initial brief for the survey was that the focus this time should be on gathering data which will be helpful to the community. A two-pronged approach has been utilized to achieve this i.e.

- Where relevant, questions from the 1998 survey were repeated to allow for comparisons and thus detection of trends and changes. With the results from the 1998 survey as a benchmark, the repetition of key questions allowed for the monitoring of changes in the last seven years. Furthermore, the issues can be remeasured in future surveys thus enabling us to keep a finger on the pulse of what is happening within the Jewish community i.e. we would be developing an “attitude-needs-and-behaviour-pattern barometer”.
- In addition, a battery of new questions have been included to heighten the usefulness of the survey to the community

This study, as was the 1998 study, is a Kaplan Centre¹ initiative. The study design and questionnaire have been based on the 1998 JPR² survey to allow for comparisons and for detection of trends. However, the questionnaire was sizeably trimmed, amended and supplemented in accordance with the new 2005 objectives.

To ensure that the survey was indeed geared to communal requirements, preliminary versions of the questionnaire were submitted to representatives of various Jewish communal organisations for their comments and suggestions. In addition, there were a number of meetings and amendments relating to the study and questionnaire so as to ensure the gathering of useful, meaningful information.

¹ The Isaac and Jessie Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research at the University of Cape Town.

² The 1998 study was undertaken by The Institute for Jewish Policy Research in London (JPR) in association with the Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research at the University of Cape Town. Decision Surveys International (DSI) was the market research company which conducted the fieldwork, sampling and data processing under the direction of Shirley Bruk who also provided input for making the questionnaire relevant to the South African situation. The study was reported on in: Barry A. Kosmin, Jacqueline Goldberg, Milton Shain, Shirley Bruk, *Jews of the 'new South Africa': highlights of the 1998 national survey of South African Jews*. Additional documents relating to more detailed analysis of the findings were prepared by Shirley Bruk.

STUDY OBJECTIVES:

Some key issues investigated in this survey are:

- Schooling: Type of school at which adults finished school (e.g. whether private school or not; whether Jewish school or not); type of school children currently attend; attitudes to Jewish vs. non-Jewish schools; perceived quality of Jewish education at schools; attitudes to the role of formal Jewish education.
- Emigrated but returned: Proportion who emigrated and returned and underlying reasons for each of these actions; which country they emigrated to; who – demographically speaking – are the returnees?
- Likelihood of staying in or leaving South Africa in next five years (and related reasons), with input on whether those likely to leave in the next five years see this as a permanent move.
- Focus on South Africa: Political party affiliations; attitudes to South Africa generally and in relation to Jews; perceptions relating to anti-Semitism.
- Focus on Israel: perceptions regarding conditions in Israel in comparison with those in South Africa; type of attachment felt towards Israel; extent of visiting Israel; likelihood of emigrating to Israel as opposed to emigrating to other countries; if not Israel then why not; whether feel Israel should give up some territory in exchange for peace.
- Extent of involvement with Jewish/Zionist youth movements
- Jewish Identity
- Religiosity
- Specific forms of support and assistance required from the Jewish community
- Perceived quality of services provided by the Jewish community
- The needs and attitudes of Jewish single people
- Attention paid to the needs and attitudes of different age sectors
- Focus on Jewish communal organisations: awareness of listed Jewish organisations; extent of membership and/or involvement; reasons for not being a member of Jewish organisations; knowledge about functions of selected key organisations; extent to which each of these organisations is perceived as fulfilling its function. Information on extent of awareness of, knowledge about and involvement with various South African Jewish organisations coupled with some needs expressed, should facilitate communal planning and provide input as to how to “market” the organisations to the Jewish community.

The specific objectives of this study have been detailed below.

1. General demographic, household and other data (i.e. age, gender, marital status, number of people in household, type of abode, whether abode owned or rented, country of birth, country of citizenship, whether in paid employment, whether self-employed or not, occupation details, whether covered by medical aid, level of education, languages spoken). This information is for sample definition purposes and to facilitate analysis of data.
2. Type of school at which finished school e.g. private school or not; Jewish school or not.
3. Details about their children with focus on schooling and related attitudes:
 - whether or not have children
 - current school details for each child i.e. not at preschool yet, at preschool/nursery school, at primary school etc.
 - whether children 22 yrs and older live in South Africa or elsewhere
 - whether likely to send pre-nursery school children to a non-Jewish or Jewish preschool/nursery school and reasons underlying choice
 - type of preschool/primary/middle/high school their children currently attend (e.g. private or not, Jewish or not)
 - type of school their children who have left school finished school at
 - if had a child who was going to start primary school tomorrow whether they would choose a Jewish or non-Jewish school for that child; and if had a child who was going to start high school tomorrow whether they would choose a Jewish or non-Jewish high school for that child (with reasons underlying choices).
4. Jewish education, that is:
 - perceived quality of Jewish education provided by Jewish schools in South Africa
 - extent of agreement with a series of attitudinal statements relating to the role of formal Jewish education
5. Focus on South Africa:
 - party voted for in 1994 elections
 - party voted for in 2004 elections
 - attitudes to the new South Africa
 - attitudes to the new South Africa in relation to Jews
 - perceptions as regards extent of : racial prejudice, antisemitism, anti-Zionism (and how problematic each is perceived as being in South Africa and in the rest of the world)
 - forms of antisemitism experienced
 - which groups are perceived as posing the greatest threat to South African Jews
 - perceptions as to: extent of religious freedom allowed by the South African government, the South African government's attitude to Jews, the South African government's attitude to Israel, the South African media's attitude to Israel
 - extent of agreement with statements relating to the future of Jews in South Africa
 - extent of agreement with statements about conditions in South Africa as regards crime, personal safety, corruption, affirmative action etc.
6. Whether emigrated and returned and, if so: year emigrated, year returned, country emigrated to, whether was still living there just before returning to live in South Africa, why emigrated, why returned.

7. Emigration and internal migration within the next three years, that is:
 - likelihood of moving in next three years
 - if were to move, whether would be within city of abode, elsewhere in South Africa or to another country
 - if were to move within city of abode, which suburb would move to
 - if were to move elsewhere in South Africa, which city would move to
 - if were to move to another country, which country would move to as well as second and third choice
 - likelihood of staying in or leaving South Africa in next five years (with reasons)
 - whether or not those likely to leave in next five years see this move as permanent
 - a check on what, if anything, would encourage a decision to leave South Africa to live elsewhere

8. Rating of South Africa and Israel in terms of various factors e.g. economic situation, personal safety, political situation etc.

9. Extent of involvement with Jewish/Zionist youth movements as such and specific movements (with information also relating to SAUJS and YAD)

10. Focus on Israel:
 - reasons for not mentioning Israel as one of the top three countries most likely to move to
 - whether or not: have any close friends/relatives living in Israel; ever visited Israel and how many times in last ten years
 - type of attachment feel towards Israel
 - whether feel Israel should give up some territory for peace
 - whether or not: had Israel experience during schoolgoing age, went to Yeshiva in Israel after school, participated in other post-matric Israel programme (and input on: whether attended Yeshiva in South Africa after leaving school; whether attended Yeshiva in country other than South Africa or Israel after leaving school)

11. Identity:
 - whether feel: more South African, more Jewish, or both equally
 - whether if were to be born again would want to be born Jewish
 - how strongly Jewish they feel
 - extent to which believe: an unbreakable bond unites Jews all over the world; it is important that Jews survive as a people; in a crisis Jews can only rely on other Jews; the Holocaust should be included in the core of young people's Jewish identity; a Jew should marry someone who is also Jewish

12. Religiosity:
 - extent to which the Torah is perceived as being the word of God
 - self-classification i.e. whether: non-practising (secular) Jew; Just Jewish; Reform/ Progressive; Traditional (not strictly Orthodox); Strictly Orthodox (with additional information on which of these categories applies to how they were brought up)
 - specific rituals and practices: whether candles are lit in the home on Friday night; extent to which they attend Passover Seders; whether they fast on Yom Kippur; whether they refrain from work on the Jewish New Year etc.
 - whether : Kosher meat is used in home; meat and milk is separated
 - extent of synagogue attendance
 - synagogue type(s): attend now; attended in past; attitudes to types
 - beliefs and experiences: ability to express oneself spiritually in a synagogue, belief that the universe came about by chance, belief that Jewish people have a special relationship with God, belief that belief in God is central to being a good Jew etc.
 - whether or not had a Bar Mitzvah/Bat Mitzvah.

13. Whether or not married to/living with Jewish person
14. The needs and attitudes of Jewish single people as regards:
 - meeting other Jewish singles/ Jewish partners
 - perceived community support
 - specific forms of support and assistance require more of from Jewish community e.g. medical assistance, emotional support, social/friendship gatherings, organized activities/outings, financial assistance, personal safety assistance, assistance with meals, assistance with transport
15. Perceived quality of services provided by the Jewish community for various groups i.e. the physically disabled, mentally ill people of normal intellectual ability, people who are intellectually disabled, the elderly, financially disadvantaged people, pre-primary school children
16. Focus on Jewish communal and religious organisations:
 - extent of membership and/or involvement with such organisations
 - awareness of listed Jewish organisations
 - awareness of functions of selected key organisations and extent to which each of these organisations is perceived as fulfilling its function
 - Jewish organisations which they are involved with
 - (if applicable) reasons for not being a member of Jewish organisations

METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLE DETAILS:

The sample comprised 1000 face-to-face interviews with a nationally representative sample of adult South African Jews in the major cities in which Jews reside. As in 1998, the 1000 interviews amongst Jewish males and females, 18 years and older, was distributed as follows:

- 650 in Johannesburg
- 250 in Cape Town
- 50 in Pretoria
- 50 in Durban

Within the cities the samples were methodically drawn in the following way:

- **Pretoria and Durban:** These samples were drawn from communal lists³ in the same way as in 1998. The lists showed names in alphabetical order and featured addresses and phone numbers. To ensure that all suburbs were proportionately represented, we colour-coded the suburbs shown for listed addresses and counted the number of listings per suburb grouping. The nth number method was used to draw the sample from the list for each of the two cities. For each of these cities the resulting sample's suburb proportions were checked against the proportions yielded by the colour-coding count and, if necessary, adjusted accordingly. For each city we drew up a list of "originals" to be interviewed and a substitute list for instances when the "original" could not be interviewed. "Original" and "Substitute" lists indicated households rather than individuals. Within the selected household the "last birthday" method was used for selecting respondents i.e. of all adult males and females in the household who consider themselves to be Jewish, the last one to have had a birthday was chosen as the respondent to be interviewed and was regarded as an "original" respondent. Interviewers were instructed to make every effort to obtain as many interviews as possible with "original" respondents. Only if it was impossible to interview an "original" was a substitute sought at another household. "Substitutes" were also selected rigorously.
- **Cape Town:** This sample was drawn slightly differently since the current communal register for the Cape was not as user-friendly as was the 1998 one⁴. In 1998 we were given a copy of the list⁵ for Cape Town as such and we colour-coded the suburbs to calculate suburb proportions. We later

³ It should be borne in mind that sample quality is dependant on how good the lists are i.e. if the lists do not provide full coverage of the city/area they purport to cover or if they provide biased coverage, the sample will be affected accordingly.

⁴ They hoped to have a better computer system up and running during 2006. Apparently this has since been achieved.

⁵ For Cape Town also, the sample quality is dependant on how good the list is i.e. if the list does not provide full coverage of Cape Town or if it provides biased coverage, the sample will be affected accordingly.

destroyed our copy of this list (and those for other cities) to ensure that confidentiality requirements were met. This time however, we were unable to obtain copies of the list to work on/colour-code. Even if we had been allowed to have copies to take away, the list would have been cumbersome to work with i.e. the communal register at the time of drawing the sample was comprised of four large volumes of names listed in alphabetical order without division into towns. The register included not only Cape Town but also other towns in the Cape. In addition, no suburb proportion data was available for us to work with. We worked around the problem by using the communal register in the location where it is situated. Every nth page was selected and then Cape Town names were methodically chosen from the relevant pages. Suburb proportions obtained were checked against census data and – if necessary - adjusted accordingly. Here too, we drew up a list of “Originals” and “Substitutes” and used the last birthday method to select respondents in the household.

- **Johannesburg:** Since there was no comprehensive communal list for Johannesburg when the sample was drawn, we used the most recent census data as a starting point. The data was adjusted (as was the case in 1998), in association with the SAJBD in accordance with information on proportionate distribution of Jewish people in various suburbs. The number of interviews to be done per suburb was calculated. If, for example, 15 interviews were required for a particular suburb, interviewers were each given different starting points within that suburb to ensure that a spread throughout the suburb was obtained.
- Interviewers were fully briefed as to how to select respondents and how to substitute households/respondents if necessary.
 - Here too the “last birthday” method was used for selecting respondents within a selected household. As in other cities, interviewers made every effort to obtain as many interviews as possible with “original” respondents and only used “substitutes” if it was impossible to interview an “original”. “Substitutes” were also selected rigorously.
 - As the interviews came in, age and gender proportions were checked against census data to determine if any sample adjustment was necessary.

The suburb composition of the sample is detailed below.

JOHANNESBURG:	SAMPLE OBTAINED Jhb 650=100%	SAMPLE REQUIRED Jhb 650=100%
Morningside, Sandown, Gallo Manor, Wendywood, Atholl, Atholl Extension, Atholl Gardens, Bramley North, Bramley Park, Hyde Park, Sandhurst, Strathaven, Inanda, Woodmead, Woodmead East, Benmore, Parkmore, Riverclub, Sunninghill (referred to as Sandton area)	24%	24%
Glenhazel, Sandringham, Lyndhurst, Kew, Sunningdale, Fairmount, Percelia, Fairvale, Silvamonte, Glensan, Raedene(referred to as Glenhazel area)	17%	17%
Highlands North, Corlett Gardens, Sydenham, Waverley, Savoy, Gresswold, Bramley, Raumarais Park (i.e. Highlands North area).	14%	12%
Orange Grove, Norwood, Linksfield, Linksfield Ridge, Orchards, Gardens, Oaklands, Cheltondale, Bedford Park, Bagleystone, Forbesdale, Victoria, Fellside (referred to as Orange Grove area)	13%	12%
Killarney, Houghton, Riviera, Saxonwold, Rosebank (i.e. Houghton area)	7%	7%
Victory Park, Emmarentia, Greenside, Parkhurst, Northcliff, Montgomery Park, Pierneef Park, Pine Park, Linden (referred to as Western Suburbs).	6%	6%
Melrose North, Illovo, Fairways, Elton Hill, Kentview, Dunkeld (Northern Suburbs).	5%	6%
Observatory, Mountain View, Dewetshof, Cyrildene, Bruma (referred to as Cyrildene).	3%	3%
Parkwood, Greenside East, Parktown, Parktown North, Berea/Hillbrow, Yeoville (referred to as Parktown/Parkview).	3%	4%
Senderwood, Dowerglen, St.Andrews, Bedford View (referred to as Bedford View).	2%	2%
Randburg (i.e. Blairgowrie, Windsor, Ferndale, Robindale, Craighall)	2%	4%
Rest of Jhb i.e. Jhb. East (Kensington, Glendower, Edenvale), Jhb South (i.e. Turfontein, Robertsham, South Hills, Bassonia, Lynmeyer, Winchester hills), Jhb. Far North (Kyalami, Rivonia, Bryanston, Paulshof, Khyber Rock)	4%	3%
Total	100%	100%

CAPE TOWN:	SAMPLE OBTAINED CT 250=100%	SAMPLE REQUIRED CT 250=100%
Sea Point, Fresnaye, Greenpoint, Mouille Point, Three Anchor Bay, Waterfront.	41%	41%
Blouberg, Brooklyn, Century City, Edgemoed, Goodwood, Milnerton, Tableview, Parow, Tygerhof, Monte Vista, Sunset Beach, Sunset Links, Panorama, Sunningdale, Summer Greens (incl.1% in Bellville/Durbanville)	15%	15%
Camps Bay, Bakoven, Clifton, Hout Bay	11%	11%
Claremont, Kenilworth, Newlands, Wynberg.	10%	10%
Cape Town - City bowl, Devil's Peak, Gardens, Higgovale, Highlands Estate, Oranjezicht, Tamboerskloof, Vredehoek, Zonnebloem, Kloofnek, University Estate.	9%	9%
Constantia, Bishopscourt.	6%	6%
Rondebosch, Rosebank, Mowbray, Observatory, Pinelands.	4%	4%
Muizenburg, Steenberg, Tokai, Sunvalley, Lakeside, Kirstenhof, Marina Da Gama.	2%	2%
Bergvliet, Diepriver, Meadowridge, Plumstead, Kreupelbosch.	2%	2%
Total	100%	100%

PRETORIA:	SAMPLE OBTAINED Pta 50=100%	SAMPLE REQUIRED Pta 50=100%
Waterkloof, Groenkloof etc.	50%	41%
Sunnyside, Brooklyn, Menlo Park etc.	48%	54%
Colbyn, Silverton etc.	2%	3%
Centurion	-	2%
Total	100%	100%

DURBAN: (Communal register listings often had street names not suburbs, thus full suburb list not shown here)	SAMPLE OBTAINED Dbn 50=100%	SAMPLE REQUIRED Dbn 50=100%
Musgrave, Berea area	42%	40%
Glenwood, Glenmore, Congella etc.	20%	21%
Durban North, Umhlanga, La Lucia	16%	17%
Westville, Cowies Hill, Pinetown, Kloof etc.	12%	8%
Snell Parade	10%	14%
Total	100%	100%

Below we have shown the 2005 survey sample alongside the most recent (2001) census data. Generally-speaking, gender and age proportions are on track except that in Pretoria there was some oversampling of females at the expense of males and some undersampling of the 18-24 year sector. Because the Pretoria sample was small, overall sample proportions were not affected. Also, in the total sample, age proportions show some under-representation of the “75 years and older” sector as compared to the census proportions. This was actually planned i.e. to facilitate comparability of data between the 1998 and 2005 surveys⁶.

	OBTAINED IN 2005 SURVEY					MOST RECENT CENSUS DATA (2001)				
	Total 1000 (100%)	Jhb 650 (100%)	Pta 50 (100%)	CT 250 (100%)	Dbn 50 (100%)	Total 1000 (100%)	Jhb 650 (100%)	Pta 50 (100%)	CT 250 (100%)	Dbn 50 (100%)
<u>Gender</u>										
Male	46%	46%	38%	46%	44%	46%	47%	44%	46%	46%
Female	54%	54%	62%	54%	56%	54%	53%	56%	54%	54%
<u>Ages</u>										
18-24 yrs	11%	12%	4%	12%	8%	11%	11%	10%	11%	9%
25-34 yrs	16%	17%	16%	15%	10%	15%	16%	13%	13%	12%
35-44 yrs	17%	17%	16%	16%	16%	16%	17%	17%	16%	15%
45-54 yrs	17%	16%	20%	19%	18%	18%	19%	17%	17%	18%
55-64 yrs	18%	18%	18%	16%	16%	16%	16%	18%	15%	16%
65-74 yrs	13%	13%	14%	12%	14%	11%	10%	12%	13%	13%
75 yrs and older	8%	7%	12%	10%	18%	13%	11%	13%	15%	17%

As was done in 1998, in 2005 we conducted a set number of interviews in each of the cities. Below we have shown how the proportions compare with those calculated from census data.

	2005 SURVEY	CENSUS (2001)
<u>City:</u>		
Johannesburg	65%	70%
Pretoria	5%	2%
Cape Town	25%	24%
Durban	5%	4%

It should be noted that of the total interviews, 83% were conducted with “original” households and only in 17% of the cases was it necessary to use a substitute household. The 17% breaks down as follows: 5% can be attributed to the

⁶ When the 1998 survey was being conducted, the 1996 census figures were not available. As the survey was progressing, the proportion of interviews with those 75 years and older seemed to be high. It was decided in association with JPR to curtail the proportion of interviews for this age group. When the survey was completed and in the process of being reported on, the census data became available and showed the proportion of over 75 year olds in the survey to be lower than in the population. In association with JPR it was decided that “given the concern of the sponsors about the future of the Jews in the ‘new South Africa’, this may not be regarded as a serious deficiency.”

selected respondent not being available during the interviewing period (e.g. on leave/holiday/seriously ill/in hospital), 5% refused, 3% related to the selected respondent not being able to be contacted after at least 3 attempts and 4% gave other reasons.

SAMPLE COMPOSITION: ADDITIONAL DATA

Below we have shown some of the survey data which defines the Jewish population of South Africa or, more specifically, the Jewish population within the four cities covered in the survey. For interest we have also shown comparative data for the 1998 survey.

(i) Education, Employment and Language ability

		2005	1998
		Total Respondents 1000=100%	Total Respondents 1000=100%
Highest level of education reached:			
No	Some high school	4%	7%
Matric	Diploma/Certificate (e.g. technical/other)	1%	2%
Matric	Matric	31%	35%
	Diploma/Certificate (e.g. technical/ other) but not at Technikon/ University	17%	14%
	Technikon Diploma/Degree	11%	10%
	Bachelor's degree at University	16%	20%
	Honours degree at University	12%	8%
	Masters degree at University	5%	3%
	Doctorate	2%	1%
	Other	1%	-
Currently in paid employment (irrespective if work for self or someone else):			
NO		32%	32%
YES		68%	68%
	Yes, full-time	51%	51%
	Yes part-time	17%	17%
	Yes, employee	37%	39%
	Yes, self-employed	31%	29%
Not in paid employment		32%	32%
Not in paid employment and currently:			
	Full-time housewife/househusband/mother/father	11%	12%
	Student	7%	7%
	Unemployed and seeking work	1%	2%
	Retired	11%	11%
	Other	1%	<1%
	Don't know/no answer	1%	-
Languages speak fluently:			
	English	99%	98%
	Afrikaans	48%	53%
	Hebrew	17%	13%
	Yiddish	11%	9%
	African language (e.g. Zulu, Sotho, Xhosa, etc.)	2%	2%
	French	2%	3%
	German	1%	4%
	Other (specify)	4%	3%
Average no. of languages (per respondent)		1.84	1.84

- **It is interesting and important to note that the average level of education has increased in the last seven years:**
 - There is a hint of an increase in matriculation rate i.e. In 1998, **91%** had at least a matric qualification with 9% not having matriculated, while for 2005, **95%** have a matric and the no-matric score is 5%.
 - The increase in post-matric qualifications is clearer i.e. from an already sizeable **56%** in 1998 to **64%** in 2005.
 - What stands out is the increase in those who have qualifications above a Bachelor's degree at university i.e.
 - In 1998**, a noteworthy 32% had university qualifications, with this splitting: 20% Bachelor's degree and 12% Honours or above i.e. of all those with university degrees, **38%** had Honours or above.
 - In 2005**, there is an upward trend to more and higher qualifications. More specifically, 36% have university qualifications, with this splitting: 16% Bachelor's and 20% Honours or above i.e. of the total with university degrees **56%** have Honours or above.

- The extent to which Jewish people in South Africa are in paid employment (irrespective of whether they are self-employed or work for someone else) has remained uncannily the same over the last 7 years! In both 1998 and 2005 those employed comprised just over two-thirds (68%) of the total Jewish adults and those unemployed just under one-third (32%),
 - with the 68% splitting (in both 1998 and 2005): 51% full-time and 17% part-time i.e. just over half (51%) of all the Jewish adults⁷ employed full-time and - looked at another way - of all those employed, three quarters employed full-time and one-quarter part-time.
 - the "employee:self-employed" ratio is, statistically-speaking, similar in 2005 (37%:31%) to what it was in 1998 (39%:29%) i.e. over half employed by someone else and under half self-employed.

- Those not in paid employment (32%) are similarly distributed now (2005) to what they were in 1998 i.e.
 - 11% or 12% full-time housewives/househusbands/mothers/ fathers (which represents approximately, or just over, one-third of the 32% not in paid employment),
 - 11% retired (which represents approximately one-third of the 32% not in paid employment)
 - 7% students (which together with a small proportion of other options comprises the remaining one-third of the 32%)

- The similarity between the 1998 and 2005 findings for languages spoken fluently is - once again – uncanny:

⁷ The four cities covered in the survey represent the bulk of South African Jews. Should the employment data differ for the cities/towns/areas not covered in the survey it is unlikely that the overall findings would be sizeably affected.

- **On an average each South African adult can speak 1.84 languages fluently (and the result was the same in 1998).**
 - **Virtually all (99%) can speak English** (in 1998 the score was 98% which, statistically-speaking, is not significantly different).
 - **Approximately half (48%) can speak Afrikaans**, but here there is an indication that the ability to speak Afrikaans may have decreased slightly from 53% in 1998 to 48% in 2005. Although this difference is not large and is not statistically verifiable at this stage, it may indicate the beginning of a trend.
 - **Hebrew (with 17%)** may be reflecting a slight increase – even if not in statistical terms - from the 1998 score of 13%. If there has, in fact, been a slight increase perhaps it could be due to a larger sector of the overall sample having gone to Jewish schools and learning Hebrew there. This is a hypothesis only and requires checking, particularly since there is - statistically-speaking – a small difference between the two scores **and** learning Hebrew at school does not necessarily lead to fluency in the language.
 - **Yiddish (11%)** scores similarly to what it did in 1998 (9%).
 - **Other languages obtained low scores i.e. below 5%.** The unchanged African language score (2% now as well as 2% in 1998) is interesting considering the “Africanisation” of South Africa within the context of the “new South Africa”. However, perhaps the need to learn an African language has not developed because English has been selected to be the main language in use for official purposes.
- It is interesting to compare these findings with comparable data from the 1974 South African Jewish Population Study⁸. Although, the 1974 study included two additional cities (i.e. Port Elizabeth and Bloemfontein) and the exact demographic composition of the sample is not clearly outlined in the report, the language comparisons are interesting i.e. languages claimed to be spoken fluently in 1974: English 98%, Afrikaans 42%, Yiddish 20%, Hebrew 8%. Data for other languages is not shown in that report. Comparison of 1974, with 1998 and 2005 data, reflects **English** as consistently being the language virtually all claimed to be fluent in; fluency in **Afrikaans** rose from 1974 to 1998 but hints at a slight downtrend by 2005 - even if not quite down to the 1974 level (perhaps because English has been given such prominence in the “new” South Africa and Afrikaans has been relegated a back seat); fluency in **Yiddish** has undoubtedly decreased over the years (i.e. in 1974, 1 in every 5 claimed to be able to speak it fluently whereas now the figure is approximately 1 in every 10); fluency in **Hebrew** has increased to double of what it was in 1974.

⁸ Table 11, p.13, A.A. Dubb, S. Della Pergola and D. Tal, *South African Jewish Population Study- Advance Report no. 6, Educational attainment and Languages*. Study directed by Prof A.A. Dubb, University of the Witwatersrand 1977. The document, dated 1978 with the data gathered in 1974, will hereinafter be referred to as: S. Della Pergola et al. SAJPS 1974.

(ii) Country of Birth and Citizenship Details

	2005	1998
	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Total Respondents 1000=100%
<u>Country born in:</u>		
South Africa	89%	87%
Israel	3%	2%
Sub-Saharan Africa (including Zimbabwe, Zambia, Zaire)	2%	3%
United Kingdom	2%	3%
Germany	<1%	1%
Eastern Europe	1%	2%
Other Europe	<1%	1%
United States of America	1%	<1%
Other country	1%	<1%
<u>South African citizen:</u>		
Yes	97%	94%
No	3%	3%
Dual	-	3%

- **The majority of Jewish people living in South Africa were born in South Africa (89%)** and the 1998 figure is similar (87%).
- **No other country features sizeably now nor did in 1998** i.e. next in line is Israel (3% now and a similar score of 2% for 1998), Sub-Saharan Africa e.g. Zimbabwe, Zambia, Zaire (2% now and 3% in 1998), United Kingdom (2% now and 3% in 1998). Each other country scores less than 2% now and scored 2% or less in 1998.
- Had these surveys been done 30 or 40 years ago, the score for Jews born in Eastern Europe would have been very high and scores for Germany and the United Kingdom would have been substantial even if not as high as the scores for Eastern Europe. Now, the generation born in Eastern Europe, the core of Jewish heritage in South Africa, is down to 1% of the Jewish population.
- The majority of Jews living in South Africa are citizens of the country (97%). In 1998 the results were similar except that the 97% was split as follows: South African citizens (94%) and dual citizenship (3%) i.e. citizenship of South Africa and another country.

(iii) Marital Status, Household and Other Details

	2005	1998
	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Total Respondents 1000=100%
<u>Marital Status:</u>		
Married	57%	55%
Divorced	8%	9%
Separated	1%	1%
Single (never married and not living with partner)	23%	24%
Widowed	9%	9%
Unmarried but living with partner	2%	2%
<u>No. of people in household:</u>		
1	19%	20%
2	29%	29%
3	14%	15%
4	22%	20%
5	13%	11%
6 or more	3%	5%
Average no. of people per household⁹	2.94	2.92
<u>Lives in:</u>		Not covered in 1998 survey
House	60%	
Townhouse/Cluster House	18%	
Flat/Apartment	20%	
Hotel	1%	
Jewish Aged Home (incl.apartments)	0.3%	
Other Aged Home	0.4%	
Other Retirement Complex	0.4%	
<u>Ownership of residence:</u>		
Owned by self or spouse	72%	66%
Owned by other household member	16%	16%
Owned by family member not living in household	2%	1%
Rented not owned by self/spouse/other household/family member	10%	16%
None of these – live in hotel	<0.5%	-
Don't Know/No answer	-	1%
<u>Have Medical Aid/Hospital plan:</u>		
Yes	95%	87%
No	5%	13%

- **Tracking surveys are done to determine trends and changes over a period of time. On the other hand, the validity of a survey is heightened if certain key issues remain relatively consistent from survey to survey.**
- **We have seen this type of consistency in the additional sample data discussed thus far. We see it again in the marital status data: 57% married (55% in 1998), 9% widowed (same score in 1998), 8% divorced (9% in 1998), 1% separated (same score in 1998), 23% single i.e. never married and not living with partner (24% in 1998), 2% unmarried but living with a partner (same score in 1998).**

⁹ In the 2005 tabular findings the number per household is shown in more detail i.e. the “6 or more” is broken down further showing number of households with 6, 7 or 8 household members. The average number per household could thus be calculated accurately for 2005 i.e. 2.94 people. However, in the 1998 survey the “6 or more” is not broken down further. In order to calculate a comparable number per household score for 1998, we applied the average number per “6 or more” household from the 2005 study to the 1998 “6 or more” category and then calculated the average number per household for 1998 i.e. 2.92

- **As can be observed in the foregoing tabulation, there are also no sizeable changes as regards the number of people per household.** What is interesting to note (and is not shown in the tabulation) is that there are differences between the cities as regards average number per household i.e. the 2005 data shows Johannesburg to have an above average number per household and it is the only city exhibiting this tendency. It should be noted that demographic data (e.g. number of people per household and related projections) should ideally be obtained in a large-scale study specifically designed for the purpose. The data shown here can be used as a starting point for further investigation.

	Total Sample 1000=100%	Jhb 650=100%	Pta 50=100%	CT 50=100%	Dbn 50=100%
Average no. per household	2.94	3.04	2.94	2.76	2.54

- A far higher proportion live in houses (60%) than in townhouses/cluster houses (18%) or flats/apartments (20%). The rest live in: hotels (1%) and aged homes/retirement complexes (1%). It should be noted that the proportions for townhouses/cluster houses were decidedly higher in Johannesburg (particularly) and Pretoria than elsewhere. These two cities, particularly Johannesburg, are likely to be more security-conscious and thus more likely to seek this type of accommodation. This data relates to 2005. In the 1998 survey the type of abode was not recorded.

	Total 1000=100%	Jhb 650=100%	Pta 50=100%	CT 250=100%	Dbn 50=100%
Live in: Townhouse/ Cluster House	18%	23%	18%	6%	10%

- **Home ownership has increased since 1998:**
 - **In this 2005 survey: 72%** claimed to live in a home owned by them or their spouse. This ownership score rises to **90%** with inclusion of ownership by another household member or by a family member not living in the household. It is necessary to consider this expanded score since some of those interviewed were not in a position to own/run homes e.g. young unmarrieds living with their parents; and/or elderly parents living with their home-owner children. Only **10%** claimed to live in rented homes.
 - **In the 1998 survey:** The ownership scores were not as high i.e. **66%** claimed to live in a home owned by them or their spouse, the overall ownership score was **83%** and the renting score (**16%**) was higher than it is now.
- **An overwhelming majority (95%) have medical aid or a hospital plan.** This is decidedly higher than the 1998 proportion (87%) which means that the bulk of the Jewish population now has this type of protection.

(iv) Respondents' children who are 22 years and older: where they live

We established from all those with children 22 years and older, whether those children live in South Africa or elsewhere. The data is shown below:

	Total with children 22 yrs or older 410=100%	THUS OVERALL:
<u>Their children 22 yrs and older:</u>		
All live in South Africa	42%	Of those with children 22 yrs and older: ➤ 85% have children in SA ➤ 58% have children elsewhere
Some live in South Africa and some live in another country	43%	
All live in another country	15%	

- **Of those with children 22 years and older, more claimed that all their children in this age category live in South Africa (42%) than claimed that they all live in another country (15%) and 43% claimed that some live in another country and some live in South Africa.** At first glance it seems that because the majority (85%) have at least one child in South Africa the communal leaders need not be overly concerned that as the community ages the older parents will be left in South Africa without children to attend to their needs. However, “the big picture” includes the finding that 58% have at least one of their children 22 years and older living elsewhere at present. This reduces the overall pool of children who will be there – viz. physically present - for their parents as the parents age.
- **This question was not asked in the 1998 study. However, there is an interesting comparison to be made with results from the 1991 Sociodemographic study i.e. we reworked the 1991 data for children living in South Africa or elsewhere¹⁰.** That study comprised a different sample structure¹¹ and different question wording. Furthermore, the 2005 study checked on where those “over 22 years and older” are living, while the 1991 study checked on where “children no longer living at home” are living. **Having said all that, the comparison of the findings is nevertheless interesting. In the main, there is very little difference between the two sets of findings as can be observed below!**

¹⁰ Table 4.23, p.93, Allie A. Dubb, *The Jewish Population of South Africa – The 1991 Sociodemographic Survey*, Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research, University of Cape Town 1994.

¹¹ The current 2005 study covered methodically selected individuals per household in Johannesburg, Pretoria, Cape Town and Durban. The 1991 sample comprised **household heads** in the same cities **and** included an additional city i.e. Port Elizabeth. Since we do not have separate data for the cities, we cannot exclude the data for Port Elizabeth and are therefore obliged to consider the results overall.

	2005		1991	
	Total with children 22 yrs or older 410=100%	Thus, overall:	Total with children who have left home 100% ¹²	Thus, overall:
Those children: All live in South Africa	42%	Of those with children 22 yrs and older: ➤ 85% have children in SA ➤ 58% have children elsewhere	43%	Of those with children who have left home: ➤ 83% have children in SA ➤ 57% have children elsewhere
Some live in South Africa and some live in another country	43%		40%	
All live in another country	15%		17%	

- **Bearing in mind that “children” are defined slightly differently in the two studies, the results reflect minimum change in the fourteen year period:**
 - The proportion with all their children in South Africa is, statistically-speaking, the same in 2005 (42%) as it was in 1991 (43%). The proportions for “some children in South Africa and some in another country” are, statistically-speaking, similar for the two studies (43% in 2005 from 40% in 1991)
 - The “all living in another country” score has also, statistically-speaking, remained virtually unchanged (17% now and 15% in 1991)
 - The overall proportion for having at least some children in South Africa has remained relatively unchanged (85% in 2005 and 83% in 1991) as has the overall proportion for at least some children elsewhere (58% now and 57% in 1991).

QUESTIONNAIRES, INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTIONS AND SHOWCARDS:

In the Appendix of this document we have included:

- The contact questionnaire
- The main questionnaire
- Interviewer instructions.

To prevent the report from becoming too bulky and cumbersome to handle, the showcards have not been included.

¹² We cannot show the sample size since the 1991 report shows this data as population projections rather than actual sample data.

FIELDWORK AND DATA PROCESSING:

It was considered imperative that Jewish interviewers should be used for this study. Interviewers were recruited via advertisements in Jewish newspapers and by word-of-mouth. Some of the interviewers had worked on the 1998 study as well. Interviewers were fully trained, with ongoing monitoring throughout the survey so as to ensure that a high standard of interviewing took place. Interviewers were all briefed face-to-face and in detail and they were provided with instructions to adhere to.

All interviews were thoroughly checked and respondents were recontacted if omissions or errors necessitated this. Back-checking procedures were implemented to ensure that the information obtained was accurate. Overall, at least 40% of the respondents were recontacted for their responses to be checked. This was done to ensure authenticity of interviews and accuracy in recording of responses.

Data processing of a high standard was undertaken by experts in this field who have been doing data processing for a number of years. Most of the data processors who worked on this study worked on the 1998 study as well.

It should be noted that prior to commencement of the survey, pilot testing was conducted. This was done to check on: the suitability of the questions, question wording, instructions within the questionnaire and the general flow of the questionnaire.

TIMING:

Interviewer briefings commenced during the last week of May 2005. Interviewing was conducted from June to October 2005, with some sample-balancing interviews taking place in November. By coincidence the timing of the fieldwork was the same as in the 1998 study i.e. the length of the interviewing period and the time of year the study was conducted. A preliminary draft of this report was prepared in February 2006.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS:

The results are being presented as follows:

1. This document, entitled:
 “Jewish Survey 2005 – Report On a Research Study”
 This is a full report on the findings and includes a “Study Highlights and Summary” section towards the end of the document.
2. A separate document i.e.
 “Jewish Survey 2005 – Tabular Report”
 This shows all the results in tabular form, with the data shown in total and by demographic and other relevant breakdowns.

Both documents can also be made available on disk if required.

REPORT ON THE FINDINGS

- I. SCHOOLING, WITH FOCUS ON TYPES OF SCHOOLS
- II. FOCUS ON JEWISH EDUCATION
- III. ATTITUDES TO SOUTH AFRICA
- IV. MIGRANTS WHO HAVE RETURNED
- V. LIKELIHOOD OF MOVING WITHIN AND FROM SOUTH AFRICA WITH RELATED PREFERENCES, REASONS AND ATTITUDES
- VI. FOCUS ON ISRAEL
- VII. JEWISH IDENTITY, RELATED ISSUES AND ACTIVITIES
- VIII. RELIGIOSITY
- IX. JEWISH COMMUNITY AND COMMUNAL ORGANISATIONS

STUDY HIGHLIGHTS AND SUMMARY

I. SCHOOLING, WITH FOCUS ON TYPES OF SCHOOLS

A. Background

Of the total respondents, 71% have children i.e. irrespective of whether they live with them or not. It must be borne in mind that approximately one-quarter of the respondents are single and have never been married. Looking only at those ever married (i.e. currently married, divorced or widowed), 93% have children¹³.

All those with children were asked:

“Tell me for each of the categories on this list whether or not it applies to you?”

A showcard featuring nine categories was handed to them.

	Total with children 711=100%
<u>CATEGORY IN WHICH HAVE CHILD/CHILDREN</u>	
(i) Below pre-school/nursery school age and not at crèche or playschool	11%
(ii) At a crèche or playschool	5%
(iii) At pre-school/nursery school	11%
(iv) At primary school	24%
(v) At middle school ¹⁴	3%
(vi) At high school	20%
(vii) Out of school but under 22 yrs of age	13%
(viii) 22-35 yrs of age	35%
(ix) Over 35 years of age	34%
<u>CATEGORY IN WHICH HAVE CHILD/CHILDREN (BROADER CATEGORY CLASSIFICATION)</u>	
Below schoolgoing age (i.e. still at home/at crèche/at nursery school)	20%
At school (i.e. primary/middle/high)	35%
Out of school but under 35 yrs	42%
Over 35 yrs	34%

- In evaluating the above data it is important to bear in mind that:
 - we are not looking at number of children. There could be more than one child per respondent per category. Also,
 - respondents may have children in one category only or in more than one category. The above scores can thus not be added in any way e.g. 35% have children in the 22-35 yr. category and 34% in the over 35 yr. category BUT additional analysis (not shown above) shows a total score of 41% in the age category “22 years and older”
- In the broader classification section of the above tabulation we see - for interest - that of those with children: 20% have children below schoolgoing age, 35% have children at school, 42% have children out of school but under 35 years of age and 34% have children over 35 years of age.

¹³Statistically-speaking, the proportions for 1998 were not significantly different i.e. in 1998: 69% of the total respondents claimed to have children and 93% of the currently/ever marrieds claimed to have children.

¹⁴ This category only applies if the school attended has a middle school.

B. Nursery schools/preschools

(i) Jewish versus non-Jewish nursery schools: The future

Those who have very young children i.e. children **below** preschool/ nursery school age (whether at a crèche/playschool/at home/looked after by someone) comprised: 9% of the total sample, but 13% of those who have children.

This sector was asked: “Thinking only of your child (or children) not yet at nursery or preschool, if you had a choice would you be likely to send that child (those children) to a Jewish or a non-Jewish preschool/nursery school?”

- **An overwhelming majority (94%) claimed that if they had a choice they would be likely to choose a Jewish preschool/nursery school.**
- 5% claimed that they would select the non-Jewish option
- 1% were not certain and said “don’t know”/gave no answer

Those who would choose the “Jewish” option were asked: “If you had a choice, why would you send your child/children to a Jewish preschool/nursery school?”

	Total would choose a Jewish preschool/nursery school 88=100%
Reasons:	
Jewish ones teach them about Jewish religion/Judaism	68%
Want my child to be with Jewish children	44%
Jewish environment/upbringing/heritage/identity/tradition/atmosphere/values/awareness	24%
Jewish education/begin Jewish education while still young/learn about festivals etc.	21%
Jewish ones have better teachers/curriculum	14%
My friends will be sending their children there/to Jewish one	5%
Children’s friends/children they know will be going there	5%
Non-Jewish ones too far from where we live/Jewish ones closer	3%
Loving, caring environment for a small child	1%
I never had this opportunity so want my child to have it	1%
Other	1%
Don’t Know/No answer	3%
Average number of comments per respondent	1.87

- On an average, those who would choose the Jewish nursery/preschool option gave 1.87 (i.e. almost two) reasons for this preference
- Clearly, the overwhelming majority of those with very young children want them to attend Jewish nursery schools when the time comes. They feel strongly that they want them to learn about Judaism, the Jewish religion and have a Jewish education. Also, they essentially want them to be surrounded by “Jewishness” i.e. they want them to be with Jewish children in a Jewish environment/atmosphere at that stage of their lives. Other

reasons not related to the Jewish aspect featured far less prominently e.g. that Jewish preschools/nursery schools offer better teachers/curriculum, convenience of location.

Those preferring the “non-Jewish” option were asked: “If you had a choice, why would you not send your child/children to a Jewish preschool/nursery school?”

The proportion claiming that they would **not** choose the Jewish option was so small that the responses cannot be meaningfully interpreted i.e. 5% (which represents only 5 of the respondents with very young children). The few comments made relate to: not wanting to separate their children from non-Jewish children; wanting to send their children to where their friends will be going; and location or closeness of the school. In essence, to this very small proportion it is either preferable not to send their children to Jewish preschools/nursery schools or not important to make the Jewish choice.

(ii) Jewish versus non-Jewish nursery schools: The current situation

In the section above we dealt with those who have children below nursery/preschool age and the option they are likely to choose for those children in the future. Now we will look at those who currently have children at preschool/nursery school.

They were asked: “Thinking only of your child (or children) at nursery school/preschool, is that child (those children) at a Jewish or non-Jewish preschool/nursery school?”

- 96% have their children at a Jewish preschool/nursery school
- 3% mentioned a non-Jewish preschool/nursery school
- 1% mentioned Reddam

Thus, what was true for the immediate future is also true for the current situation i.e. amongst Jewish parents there is an overwhelming preference for Jewish nursery schools. Those with children **currently at** nursery school/preschool have essentially chosen the Jewish option and those with children **who will be going** to nursery school/preschool in the near future are – in the main - also likely to select the Jewish option.

In both these instances, the heavy emphasis on the Jewish rather than non-Jewish choice applies not only in total but also to Johannesburg and Cape Town separately. For Durban and Pretoria, where the samples were small, only a very small number of respondents are reflected as having children below or at preschool/nursery school. We cannot, therefore, draw final conclusions about these two cities. However, preliminary indications are that these cities fit in with the overall trend towards the Jewish option (if available).

C. Primary And Middle/High Schools

(i) Schools currently attended

Those who currently have children at **primary school** were asked which type of schools those children currently attend. Similarly, those who currently have children at **middle/high school** were asked which type of schools those children currently attend.

Below we have shown the results for those with children at: primary school (columns 1-3), middle/high (columns 4-6) and a combined section for primary/middle/high (columns 7-9).

	CURRENTLY HAVE CHILDREN AT PRIMARY SCHOOL			CURRENTLY HAVE CHILDREN AT MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL			CURRENTLY HAVE CHILDREN AT SCHOOL I.E. PRIMARY/MIDDLE/HIGH		
	Total 168 (100%)	Jhb 104 (100%)	CT 47 (100%)	Total 152 (100%)	Jhb 97 (100%)	CT 35 (100%)	Total 245 (100%)	Jhb 161 (100%)	CT 59 (100%)
<u>Type of school</u> ¹⁵ :									
Jewish private	77%	86%	83%	70%	82%	74%	77%	86%	81%
Non-Jewish government	14%	11%	15%	12%	8%	14%	13%	10%	15%
Crawford College	6%	1%	-	9%	3%	-	7%	2%	-
Non-Jewish private	4%	4%	-	4%	4%	-	5%	4%	-
Eden College	2%	3%	-	4%	6%	-	3%	5%	-
Reddam House	2%	-	6%	2%	-	9%	2%	-	9%
Other private college for middle/high (e.g. Abbott's, Boston, Damelin)	N/A	N/A	N/A	3%	2%	6%	2%	1%	3%
Total ¹⁶	105%	104%	104%	104%	105%	103%	109%	108%	108%

Primary schools:

- **Looking at the overall situation (1st column) for parents with children currently at primary school, the majority (77% i.e. over three-quarters) currently have these children at Jewish private schools.**
- A far lower proportion have them at non-Jewish schools i.e. 14% at non-Jewish government schools and 4% at non-Jewish private schools.

¹⁵The Durban and Pretoria samples were small, therefore isolating those with children at school gives us too low a figure to base type-of-school data on. These two cities cannot thus be shown separately in the above tabulation but are included in the total columns.

¹⁶ Totals higher than 100% indicate that a small percentage of parents mentioned more than one type of school per category e.g. some parents currently have children at more than one type of school.

- The other schools/colleges which offer some Jewish subjects account for the rest of the children i.e. Crawford (6%) then Eden (2%) and Reddam House (2%).
- Thus, at the primary level, Jewish children are far more likely to be attending Jewish schools than other schools. Nevertheless, it is evident that the Jewish option does not have quite as much drawing power as it does at nursery/preschool level, where we saw that 96% of those with children at nursery/preschools have chosen the Jewish option.
- **Do any differences emerge when the results for individual cities are examined (2nd and 3rd column)? In Johannesburg and Cape Town, the Jewish primary scores are much higher (i.e. 86% and 83% respectively) than the score for the total sample (77%).** In each of these two cities, government schools are next in line but at a much lower level. In Johannesburg a few other options feature at an even lower level, whereas in Cape Town the only other option which features noticeably is Reddam. Although we have not shown the Pretoria and Durban scores separately here an overall glance at the data for those cities shows that Crawford seems to feature noticeably as do totally non-Jewish options. The fact that the total score for Jewish schools is lower than the scores for Johannesburg and Cape Town is understandable, since the total score includes Durban and Pretoria where specifically Jewish schools do not exist as they do in Johannesburg and Cape Town.

Middle/High schools:

- **Once again Jewish schools are dominant i.e. Of those with children currently at middle/high school (4th column), 70% currently send their children to Jewish private schools**
- Non-Jewish schools score far lower i.e. 12% send their children to non-Jewish government schools and 4% to non-Jewish private schools
- Other schools/colleges which offer some Jewish subjects account for the rest of the children i.e. Crawford (9%); Eden (4%); Reddam House (2%).
- Other private colleges (e.g. Abbott's, Boston, Damelin) scored 3% in total.
- **How do individual cities score for middle/high schools (5th and 6th columns above)? In Johannesburg the figure for Jewish private school is higher (82%), while the Cape Town score (74%) is not quite as high.** The Cape Town score should however be checked and validated against other available data since the base (35 respondents) is small. Pretoria and Durban bases are too small to be shown above but - in essence (and subject to validation) - Pretoria middle/high children are mainly divided between going to a non-Jewish government school or Crawford College, while those in Durban tend more towards Crawford College than elsewhere.
- **When comparing the middle/high results with those for primary schools, there are hints that at the middle/high level there is a slight move towards Crawford/Eden/Other colleges at the expense of Jewish schools e.g.**

- Jewish private schools score 77% at primary level and drop to 70% at middle/high level. (Government schools show such a small change between primary and middle/high that, statistically-speaking, this is not interpretable).
- At primary level we see Crawford with 6%, Eden with 2% and obviously no other colleges (since other colleges do not offer primary school facilities), whereas at middle/high level there are hints of an increase: Crawford 9%, Eden 4%; Other colleges 3%.
- **Is this trend carried through to individual cities? Yes** i.e. in Johannesburg there are indications that in middle/high school compared with primary school, there is a slight move towards Crawford/Eden/Other colleges (e.g. Boston, Damelin) at the expense of Jewish dayschools and possibly also at the expense of non-Jewish government schools. Also, in Cape Town there are indications that there is a move to Reddam and colleges (e.g. Abbott's, Boston, Damelin) at the expense of Jewish dayschools.

All schools i.e. Primary and Middle/High

- For additional insight we combined results for primary and middle/high schools to have a bigger base to work with in evaluating the type of schools South African Jewish children currently attend.
- **Overall, of all the respondents with children at school (7th column in above tabulation), 77% have children at a Jewish private school.** (Understandably, this overall score - which combines primary and middle/high - hides the finding that there tends to be a lower score for Jewish middle/high than for Jewish primary schools). Non-Jewish schools score far below (i.e. non-Jewish government schools 13% and non-Jewish private schools 5%). Other schools which cater for Jewish children (e.g. offer some subjects geared for Jewish children) feature overall as follows: Crawford 7%, Eden 3%, Reddam House 2%. Also, 2% claimed to have children at other private colleges (e.g. Abbott's, Boston, Damelin).
- **Looking at the results within city (8th and 9th column): In Johannesburg, 86% have a child/children at a Jewish school, 10% at a non-Jewish government school, 5% at Eden, 4% at a non-Jewish private school, 2% at Crawford, 1% at other private colleges. In Cape Town the comparable scores are: Jewish school (81%), non-Jewish government (15%), Reddam House (9%), Other private colleges (3%).** Pretoria and Durban bases were too small for results to be shown separately. However, it seems that – subject to further checking - **Pretoria** schoolchildren go mainly to non-Jewish government schools and Crawford College, while their **Durban** counterparts are more likely to go to Crawford College than elsewhere.
- What should also be taken into account is that the school situation is not a static one e.g. while the survey was in progress Eden bought Crawford in Durban and Damelin High in Johannesburg!

(ii) Schools at which under 22 year olds finished school

Those with under 22 year olds who have left school were asked which type of school those children had finished school at.

	Total with under 22 yr olds who have left school 90=100%
<u>PROPORTION WHOSE UNDER 22 YR OLDS FINISHED SCHOOL AT:</u>	
Jewish private school	76%
Non-Jewish government school	12%
Crawford College	12%
Non-Jewish private school	2%
Eden College	6%
Reddam House	1%
Other private college for middle/high school purposes (e.g. Abbott's, Boston, Damelin)	4%
Total	113% ¹⁷

- These results follow the trend set by current school attendance i.e. Jewish schools are dominant and other types follow far below.
- The results can be compared broadly rather than in detail with those for children currently at school, since the results for “under 22 year olds who have left school” only reflect scores for where they finished school i.e. no indication as to other schools possibly attended before their final year.

(iii) Own schooling

All respondents were asked about their own schooling i.e. where they finished school: “Please think about your own schooling and choose the letter next to the answer which applies to you”. A card was shown featuring various school options (including “still at school”, “never went to school” and “other - specify”)

	Total Respondents 1000=100%
<u>FINISHED SCHOOL AT:</u>	
Non-Jewish government school	57%
Jewish private school	25%
Non-Jewish private school	6%
Other private college(e.g. Abbott's,Boston, Damelin)	5%
Eden College	2%
Crawford college	1%
Other (e.g. Convent, other)	1%
Out of South Africa (e.g. Israel, Iraq, other country)	2%
Still at school	1%
Total	100%

¹⁷ The total of 113% indicates that of the respondents with under 22 year olds who have finished school, some did not have all these children at one type of school.

- **When considering all Jewish South Africans, 18 years and older, we are looking at a population more likely to have been schooled at non-Jewish government schools than elsewhere i.e. 57% finished school at a non-Jewish government school. Jewish private schools score far below i.e. 25%. Other options scored distinctly lower.**
- We are talking about a wide range of respondents here i.e. ranging in age from 18 years to over 75 years. It is therefore to have been expected that the school data would be very different to that which was reflected for schools being attended by children today!
- The tabulation which follows speaks for itself and illustrates the very different picture for where respondents personally finished school in comparison with where their children are currently at school:
 - the first column shows schools currently attended by the **children** of respondents who have children at school
 - the second column shows schools respondents with schoolchildren **personally** finished school at
 - the third column also shows the schools **personally finished school at, but for the total sample** (i.e. irrespective of whether they have children at all)

	RESPONDENTS WITH CHILDREN CURRENTLY AT SCHOOL		TOTAL RESPONDENTS (IRRESPECTIVE OF WHETHER HAVE CHILDREN OR NOT)
	SCHOOLS CURRENTLY ATTENDED BY THEIR CHILDREN 245=100%	SCHOOLS RESPONDENTS FINISHED SCHOOL AT PERSONALLY 245=100%	SCHOOLS RESPONDENTS FINISHED SCHOOL AT PERSONALLY 1000=100%
<u>SCHOOL:</u>			
Jewish private	77%	26%	25%
Non-Jewish government	13%	56%	57%
Non-Jewish private	5%	6%	6%
Other e.g. <u>For schoolchildren:</u> Crawford/Reddam/Eden/other colleges <u>For respondents:</u> Crawford/Reddam/Eden/other colleges/ schools in other countries/convent	14%	12%	11%
Still at school	N/A since all are "still at school"	N/A	1%
Total	109% ¹⁸	100%	100%

¹⁸ The total of 109% indicates that some parents do not have all their children at one type of school.

- As discussed earlier, Jewish private schools are dominant as regards the schools currently attended by schoolchildren (1st column).
- **Those who have children at school (2nd column) interestingly have virtually the same score pattern as the sample as a whole (3rd column) i.e. a similar emphasis on having finished school at a Jewish government school (56% or 57%), with Jewish schools at the 25% or 26% level and other options at a lower level.** At first glance this seems strange since the total sample comprises a sizeable sector who are older and may have had different schooling patterns to those who currently have children at school. However, the similarity of the scores is understandable when we consider that the total sample also comprises a sizeable sector of young unmarrieds without children to counterbalance the older respondents. This (interestingly) results in coinciding proportions for: “schools finished at” for the total sample **and** for the sample of parents with schoolchildren!
- **What is also interesting is that non-Jewish private schools feature to a similar extent for schoolchildren now (5%) as they did for their parents (6%) and as they did for the sample as a whole (6%).** Clearly non-Jewish private schools as such have not made major inroads into the Jewish sector. However, specific types of private schools and colleges (some of which gear themselves to cater for Jewish children), whilst not reflecting major shares of the “schoolgoers market” at present, are not to be ignored as there are indications that they could be gaining ground.

D. Jewish versus Non-Jewish schools

(i) Type of school would hypothetically choose for their children

Because we (correctly) anticipated that we were likely to have very small bases for some of the school-related breakdowns, we asked **all** respondents, irrespective of whether they have children or not, the following questions:

“If you had a child who was going to start primary school tomorrow and you had a choice of sending him/her to a Jewish primary school or a non-Jewish primary school, which of the two would you be most likely to choose?”

“If you had a child who was going to start high school tomorrow and you had a choice of sending him/her to a Jewish high school or a non-Jewish high school, which of the two would you be most likely to choose?”

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Total Respondents 1000=100%
	FOR PRIMARY WOULD CHOOSE	FOR HIGH WOULD CHOOSE
Jewish school	86%	82%
Non-Jewish school	13%	17%
Don't Know	1%	1%
Total	100%	100%

- **Thus, there was an overwhelming vote for the Jewish option**
- For primary schools: 86% said Jewish primary school, 13% non-Jewish primary school and the remaining 1% said “don’t know”.
- For high schools: 82% said Jewish high school, 17% said non-Jewish high school and the remaining 1% said “don’t know”.
- Whilst Jewish schools emerge exceptionally strongly for both primary and high, there is a hint (but hint only) that preference for Jewish schools is a touch more intense when primary schools are being considered. This ties in with the actual situation discussed earlier i.e. current attendance of schools reflects Jewish schools featuring a bit more at the primary than middle/high level.

For additional insight we merged responses for the two questions (the primary and the middle/high questions) as to type of school respondents would be likely to choose for their child.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%
	OVERALL WOULD CHOOSE
Jewish school for primary <u>and</u> high	81%
Non-Jewish school for primary <u>and</u> high	11%
Jewish primary, non-Jewish high	5%
Non-Jewish primary, Jewish high	2%
Don't Know	1%
Total	100%

- **Clearly, the overwhelming majority (81%) would only choose a Jewish school i.e. irrespective of whether their (hypothetical) child were to be starting primary or high school “tomorrow”**
- **In fact, in total 88% would choose a Jewish school at all** i.e. 81% for both primary and high, 5% for primary only and 2% for high only
- **In total 18% would choose a non-Jewish school at all** i.e. 11% for both primary and high, 5% for high only and 2% for primary only.
- Once again we see the hint (but hint only) of the Jewish choice emphasised a bit more for primary than high schools: 5% for primary only and 2% for high only. This cannot be interpreted as statistically significant but cannot be dismissed since it ties in with earlier findings.

- 1% were not sure whether or not they would choose a Jewish school for their (hypothetical) child.

Do the results differ from city to city? And does the strength of Jewish identity make a difference to the type of school they (hypothetically) would choose for their children?

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	C I T Y				J E W I S H F E E L I N G		
		Jhb 650=100%	Pta 50=100%	CT 250=100%	Dbn 50=100%	Mild 79=100%	Quite Strong 424=100%	Very Strong 496=100%
School would choose:								
Jewish primary and high	81%	85%	78%	73%	68%	48% -->	76% -->	90%
Non-J primary and high	11%	10%	10%	15%	14%	34% ←	14% ←	5%
Jewish primary, non-J high	5%	3%	12%	9%	8%	10%	8%	2%
Non-J primary, Jewish high	2%	2%	-	1%	-	5%	1%	2%
Don't Know	1%	-	-	2%	10%	3%	1%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
In summary, would choose:								
Jewish at all (primary and/or high)	88%	90%	90%	83%	76%	63% -->	85% -->	94%
Non-Jewish at all (primary and/or high)	18%	15%	22%	25%	22%	49% ←	23% ←	9%

- **All cities strongly emphasise the Jewish option but the Johannesburg sector is most emphatic, with Pretoria tending to be second, Cape Town third and then Durban.** Incidentally, in each city a relatively small sector would not choose the same option for both primary and high school i.e. in Johannesburg (5%), Pretoria (12%), Cape Town (10%) and Durban (8%). In Johannesburg, this small sector tends to be almost equally divided between thinking that the Jewish option is preferable for high school only and thinking that it is preferable for primary school only. In the other three cities, this sector would essentially choose the Jewish option for their children for primary school but not high school.
- **The stronger the Jewish feeling, the greater the likelihood that the Jewish option would be chosen.** This correlation is apparent when we look at the first row of figures (i.e. those choosing Jewish schools for primary and high) and also when we look at the second last row of figures (i.e. those choosing Jewish schools at all - for primary and/or high).
- **The converse is also true i.e. the milder the Jewish feeling, the greater the tendency to opt for the non-Jewish option.** Nevertheless, because a far smaller proportion have mild Jewish feelings than have quite strong/strong Jewish feelings, the overall emphasis is far more on choosing Jewish than non-Jewish schools.
- **Just as extent of Jewish feeling correlates with the tendency to opt for Jewish rather than non-Jewish schools, so too is there a trend related to religiosity i.e. the closer to Orthodoxy the greater the tendency to choose the Jewish option. Related to this, the greater the tendency to believe that the Torah is the actual word of God, the greater the tendency to choose the Jewish school option e.g. looking**

only at those who would (hypothetically) choose a Jewish school for both primary and high:

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	TORAH WORD OF GOD ¹⁹			RELIGIOUS PRACTICE			
		Yes Actual 365=100%	Yes but Inspired 376=100%	Histo-moral 229=100%	Secular/Just Jewish 118=100%	Reform/Progressive 74=100%	Traditional 663=100%	Strictly Orthodox 141=100%
Would choose Jewish school for primary and high	81%	91%	←82%	←64%	41%→	55%→	87%→	97%

- **We found no discernable age-related trend** as regards (hypothetically) opting for Jewish versus non-Jewish schools.
- **What we do observe is that type of school respondents personally finished school at is an important determinant as regards whether or not they would send a child to a Jewish school or not i.e. if they had a child “starting school tomorrow”.**

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	PERSONALLY FINISHED SCHOOL AT:		
		Non-Jewish government school 568=100%	Non-Jewish private school 60=100%	Jewish private school 254=100%
Would choose for child:				
Jewish primary <u>and</u> high	81%	80%	68%	87%
Non-J primary <u>and</u> high	11%	13%	15%	4%
Jewish primary, non-J high	5%	5%	12%	5%
Non-J primary, Jewish high	2%	1%	2%	3%
Don't Know	1%	1%	3%	<0.5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
In summary, would choose:				
Jewish at all (primary and/or high)	88%	86%	82%	95%
Non-Jewish at all (primary and/or high)	18%	19%	29%	12%

- **Clearly, those who attended Jewish schools themselves (or more specifically finished school at Jewish schools) are the sector most likely to choose the Jewish school option for their children. Those from non-Jewish government schools follow closely, while those from non-Jewish private schools are the least oriented towards sending their children to Jewish schools. Although there are distinct differences between the three sectors regarding this issue, all three**

¹⁹ **Yes Actual** represents the sector believing that the Torah is the actual word of God.
Yes but Inspired represents the sector believing that the Torah is the inspired word of God but not everything should be taken literally word for word.
Histomoral represents the sector believing that the Torah is an ancient book of history and moral precepts recorded by man.

sectors do focus far more on choosing the Jewish rather than non-Jewish option.

How does the type of school their children currently attend relate to their responses as to whether they would (hypothetically) send a child to a Jewish or non-Jewish school if they had a child who was about to start school tomorrow?

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Total Respondents with children at school 245=100% ²⁰	HAVE CHILDREN AT:		
			Non-Jewish government school 32=100%	Crawford/Eden/Reddam 31=100%	Jewish private school 188=100%
Would choose for child:					
Jewish primary and high	81%	85%	41%	74%	94%
Non-J primary and high	11%	10%	50%	16%	2%
Jewish primary, non-J high	5%	3%	6%	7%	2%
Non-J primary, Jewish high	2%	1%	3%	-	1%
Don't Know	1%	1%	-	3%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
In summary, would choose:					
Jewish at all (primary and/or high)	88%	89%	49%	81%	97%
Non-Jewish at all (primary and/or high)	18%	14%	59%	23%	5%

- **Whether respondents have children at school or not, they are heavily oriented towards the Jewish school option (1st and 2nd columns). However, when looking only at those with children at school, the type of school they would (hypothetically) choose for a child “tomorrow”, understandably, relates to the type of school they currently have children at:**
 - **The relatively small proportion with children at a government school, are divided in their opinions as to whether they would choose a Jewish or non-Jewish school in this hypothetical situation. Thus, even amongst those who currently have children at government schools, approximately half are attracted to the Jewish school idea to some extent. This indicates that for this sector it is not always the Jewish school concept which is keeping them away from Jewish schools i.e. other factors also play a part. More insight will be obtained as we proceed through the report.**

²⁰ Of the 245 respondents with children “currently” (in 2005) at primary/middle/high school: 32 have children at non-Jewish government schools (shown in 3rd column), 31 have children at Crawford/Eden/Reddam i.e. the schools which cater sizeably for Jewish children but are not Jewish schools as such (shown in 4th column), 188 have children at Jewish private schools (5th column) and a further 15 have children at other non-Jewish schools/colleges. The last category is not shown in the table above since the base is too small for meaningful analysis. What should also be noted is that the total of all these categories is more than 245 since some parents have children at more than one type of school.

- **Those with children at Crawford/Eden/Reddam would hypothetically - if given only the Jewish vs. non-Jewish choice “tomorrow” - be far more likely to choose the Jewish option.** With the indication that the Jewish aspect of a school is important to a large sector of these parents, it is likely that some of these parents were attracted to the degree of Jewish focus at Crawford/Reddam/Eden but some are likely to have made this choice on the basis of other reasons as well.
 - **Those with children at a Jewish school would overwhelmingly choose the Jewish option (again). They are obviously satisfied overall with the Jewish school concept.**
- **It is interesting that parents who went to a government school themselves (as we saw earlier) would primarily opt for a Jewish school for a child “tomorrow”.** This is partly explained by the finding that government schools were more firmly entrenched in days gone by and Jewish schools less firmly entrenched. With time the Jewish school concept has been very successful in appealing to parents and thus drawing in their children as pupils.

(ii) Reasons underlying hypothetical choices of schools

Those who chose a Jewish school at all (88%), whether it be primary and/or high were asked: “Why would you send your child to a Jewish primary school/high school/school?”

Those who chose a non-Jewish school at all, whether it be primary and/or high (18%), were asked: “Why would you send not send your child to a Jewish primary school/high school/school?”

REASONS FOR <u>BEING LIKELY</u> TO CHOOSE A JEWISH SCHOOL	Would choose Jewish school (primary and/or high) 880=100%	Would choose Non- Jewish school (primary and/ or high) 184=100%	REASONS FOR <u>NOT BEING LIKELY</u> TO CHOOSE A JEWISH SCHOOL
<u>REASONS RELATING TO WHAT TAUGHT ABOUT JUDAISM/JEWISH-RELATED ISSUES AT JEWISH SCHOOLS:</u> Jewish ones teach them about Jewish religion/Judaism	72%	15%	<u>REASONS RELATING TO WHAT TAUGHT ABOUT JUDAISM/JEWISH-RELATED ISSUES AT JEWISH SCHOOLS</u> Jewish ones have too much emphasis on Jewish religion/Judaism
	-	2%	King David's position on Reform is very extreme/don't feel comfortable there/King David far too dogmatic
To study Hebrew/prepare for Bar/Bat Mitzvah	3%	-	
Want my child to have more than I did as a child/ never even went to Cheder/had to have Hebrew lessons after school	1%	-	
Can learn basic Jewish principles at primary school/during formative years	<0.5%	-	
Other (each mentioned by one respondent):: Zionistic education; Very opposed to Jewish education until my children turned to the opposite extremes - now feel Jewish education is the only alternative	<0.5%	-	
<u>REASONS RELATING TO JEWISH ENVIRONMENT/ IDENTITY/VALUES/CONTINUITY:</u> Want my child to be with Jewish children	46%	67%	<u>REASONS RELATING TO JEWISH ENVIRONMENT/ IDENTITY/ VALUES/ CONTINUITY:</u> Jewish ones too insular/don't believe in separating my child from non-Jewish children
Gives children identity/ when developing identity/ to ultimately be part of the community	15%	1%	Am Jewish but wife/husband and children not
Want my children to be in Jewish environment/ atmosphere/culture	7%	-	
For Jewish values/morals	4%	-	
Gives them confidence/character building/sense of solidity/makes them independent/outgoing	1%	12%	Don't like the values at Jewish schools/children too materialistic and competitive/elitist/materialistic values/brats
Yiddishkeit	1%	-	
Each mentioned by one or two respondents: Judaism would die/fade if there were no Jewish schools; I went to a Jewish school; Know that school is Kosher	<0.5%	-	
<u>REASONS RELATED TO SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL ISSUES BUT HINGING ON JEWISH ENVIRONMENT:</u> Pleasant experience/children happy there/ caring atmosphere	1%	1%	<u>REASONS RELATED TO SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL ISSUES BUT HINGING ON JEWISH ENVIRONMENT:</u> Some are happier elsewhere
They have friends there/to be with their friends	1%	-	
Close-knit community/easier to communicate and monitor - you know other parents/support system	<0.5%	2%	Problem with parents at Jewish schools/cliqey/materialistic parents
<u>REASONS NOT RELATED TO JEWISH ASPECTS:</u> Jewish ones have better teachers/curriculum	25%	5% 4% 1% 1%	<u>REASONS UNRELATED TO JEWISH ASPECTS</u> Non-Jewish ones better teachers/ curriculum Lack of discipline/control by teachers at Jewish schools Too much emphasis at Jewish schools on academic achievement Some do better at other schools/Jewish schools don't suit all children
Children can't go to government schools/because standard of education in government schools has dropped/government schools too black	4%	-	
Jewish ones closer to where we live/Non-Jewish ones too far	2%	5%	Jewish ones too far from where we live/non-Jewish ones closer/no Jewish ones where we live
Non-Jewish ones too expensive/Jewish ones cheaper	1%	5%	Jewish ones too expensive/non-Jewish ones cheaper
Jewish ones have better sporting facilities	1%	4%	Non-Jewish ones have better sporting facilities
<u>OTHER</u>	2%	5%	<u>OTHER</u>
Average no. of reasons per respondent (for being likely to choose a Jewish school)	1.85	1.28	Average no. of reasons per respondent (for being likely to choose a non-Jewish school)

The reasons for selecting the **Jewish school** option clearly centre around three factors:

- **Being taught about Judaism/Jewish-related issues emerged as the most important reason underlying wanting their children to go to Jewish schools.** Almost three-quarters (72%) claimed that they would like their children to go to a Jewish school because at Jewish schools they teach them about Jewish religion/Judaism. Also, a small percentage (3%) mentioned that they want them to learn Hebrew and a further 1% claimed that they want their children to have advantages they personally did not have as regards learning Hebrew. One person wanted them to learn to be Zionistic and one added an interesting comment: "I was very opposed to Jewish education until my children turned to the opposite extremes - now I feel that Jewish education is the only alternative".
- **The Jewish environment/identity/values acquired at a Jewish school also emerged as an important factor.** Almost half (46%) claimed that it is important for their children to be with other Jewish children; 15% spoke about a Jewish school giving Jewish children an identity/Jewish identity - with some adding "so that they will ultimately be part of the community"; 7% spoke about wanting their children to be in a Jewish environment/culture/atmosphere and 4% wanted them to acquire Jewish values/morals; 1% mentioned "confidence/character building/a sense of solidity/making them independent/outgoing"; and 1% said "Yiddishkeit". Two respondents added "Judaism would die/fade if there were no Jewish schools"; other Jewish-related aspects emerged less frequently.

It is worth noting that a small sector gave reasons relating to social/emotional issues but hinging on the Jewish environment at Jewish schools i.e.1% mentioned that being at a Jewish school "is a pleasant experience, the children are happy there, there is a caring atmosphere"; 1% claimed that the children have friends there; and below 1% spoke of the advantages of being part of a "close-knit (Jewish) community/easier to communicate and monitor because you know other parents/have a support system".

- **Reasons not related to Jewish aspects also emerged sizeably but less frequently, with better teachers/curriculum being the main aspect emerging here:** 25% mentioned that Jewish schools offer better teachers and/or a better curriculum; 4% spoke of the standard of education being lower in government schools; 2% said that the Jewish schools are physically closer to them; 1% spoke of non-Jewish schools being too expensive; 1% said Jewish ones have better sporting facilities.
- **Something interesting occurred which is not shown in the above tabulation i.e. some of those who chose the Jewish school option – in addition to giving their reasons for doing so – spontaneously added some negative comments as well.** Although there are not many comments of this type, the fact that they emerged spontaneously should

not be ignored. We have tried to put the scatter of comments together so that they make some sense:

“Brattiness/materialism/competitiveness/cliquery/so some unhappy” (1%)

“Jewish schools don’t necessarily cater for children with learning problems/disabilities.....Jewish schools are mainly for bright kids” (1%)

“Herzlia/King David are not religious enough....want more religious school/Torah values/Torah environment” (1%)

The reasons for **not selecting the Jewish school option** - as expressed by those who opted for a non-Jewish primary and/or high school - can also be related to the three factors (or more specifically, variations of the three factors):

- **Here however, the main factor is the one relating to the environment i.e. not wanting their children restricted to an insular Jewish environment.** 67% expressed a preference for not enveloping their children in an insular, Jewish environment i.e. not separating their children from non-Jewish children. Also, 12% claimed that they do not like the values and attitudes at Jewish schools e.g. the materialism, the competitiveness, “the brats”. With regard to social/emotional issues hinging on the environment at Jewish schools: 2% have problems with the parents of children at Jewish schools – they find them “cliquery” and “materialistic”; a few added that some children are happier at non-Jewish schools.
- **Some (15%) feel that at Jewish schools there is too much emphasis on Jewish religion/Judaism.** Also, 2% mentioned that “King David’s position on Reform is very extreme/don’t feel comfortable there/King David far too dogmatic”.
- **A sector gave reasons unrelated to Jewish aspects.** 5% claimed that Jewish ones are too far from where they live/non-Jewish ones are closer; 5% said that Jewish ones are too expensive; 5% claimed that non-Jewish ones have better teachers/curriculum ; 4% mentioned that non-Jewish ones have better sporting facilities;4% spoke about lack of discipline/control by teachers at Jewish schools;1% specified that there is too much emphasis on academic achievement at Jewish schools;1% said some do better at other schools or Jewish schools don’t suit all children.
- **Reading between the lines and reviewing comments from each of the three factors, we see that negative perceptions about people occur to a noticeable extent.** Such perceptions relate to the children who attend Jewish schools and this spills over slightly into perceptions of the parents and teachers. These comments are to an extent reinforced by the extra unsolicited negative comments made by a small percentage of those favouring Jewish schools (as discussed earlier).

Although there was a short section on schooling in the 1998 study, a more meaningful and extended section was developed for this 2005 study. Thus, comparison between the two studies is not possible here. Hopefully the 2005 results will serve as a benchmark for data from future studies.

What we do have, for interest, is data obtained 31 years ago in the South African Jewish Population Study²¹. This data – reworked as far as possible - illustrates the known fact that Jewish dayschool attendance was lower in the mid-seventies than it is three decades later. The data must be interpreted with care since the figures are not directly comparable because of sample²² and other differences e.g.

- In row a) 1974 data relates to Jews **15** years and older, while 2005 data relates to those **18** years and older;
- in row b) 1974 data shows proportion of all children at Jewish schools, while 2005 data shows proportion of parents with children at Jewish schools i.e. irrespective of the number of children each parent has.

1974 data (Jewish Population Study)	2005 data (current study)
a) Of Jews 15 years and older: 10% attended Jewish schools (i.e. some in the past, some “currently”)	a) Of Jews 18 years and older, (99% of whom <u>have finished school</u>): 25% finished at a Jewish private school
b) Of all children “currently” (1974) at school: 29% attend a Jewish dayschool	b) Of all parents with children at school: 77% have a child/children at a Jewish school

II. FOCUS ON JEWISH EDUCATION

A. Perceived Quality Of Jewish Education

All were asked about their perceptions of the quality of Jewish education:
 “Please think specifically about the quality of Jewish education provided by Jewish schools in South Africa. Irrespective of whether or not you or any of your family members have ever attended Jewish schools in South Africa and just from the impression you have, would you say that overall the quality of Jewish education provided by South African Jewish schools is: very good, fairly good, fairly poor or very poor?”

	Very good	Fairly good	Neither good nor poor	Fairly poor	Very poor	Do not know/ No answer	Total Respondents 1000=100%
<u>Quality of:</u> Jewish Education	52%	37%	2%	2%	1%	6%	= 100%

- **The overall picture is decidedly positive i.e. 89% rated Jewish education at Jewish schools in South Africa as very or fairly good,**

²¹ p.1, Advance Report no. 12, S. Della Pergola et al. SAJPS 1974.

²² As stated earlier, the sample includes two additional cities (Port Elizabeth and Bloemfontein), the questions were not quite the same and other sample proportions may have been different.

with focus on “very good” (52%). However, there is possibly room for improvement in that approximately half of the respondents (52%) unreservedly said “very good”, whilst the rest – even though focusing on “fairly good” - did not unreservedly choose the “very good” option.

How do the results compare for cities? And within religious practice breakdowns?

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	C I T Y				RELIGIOUS PRACTICE			
		Jhb 650=100%	Pta 50=100%	CT 250=100%	Dbn 50=100%	Secular/ Just Jewish 118=100%	Reform/ Prog. 74=100%	Traditional 663=100%	Strictly Orth. 141=100%
Jewish education:									
Very good	52%	50%	44%	58%	52%	52%	64%	52%	45%
Fairly good	37%	39%	52%	32%	30%	34%	23%	39%	41%
Neither good nor poor	2%	3%	-	1%	2%	3%	4%	2%	4%
Fairly poor	2%	2%	2%	2%	4%	2%	3%	2%	3%
Very poor	1%	<1%	-	1%	2%	-	1%	<1%	1%
Don't Know/ No answer	6%	6%	2%	6%	10%	9%	5%	5%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Average ²³ rating	4.46	4.44	4.41	4.54	4.40	4.49	4.53	4.47	4.36

- **The overall conclusion applies also when the results are viewed by each city separately i.e. A decidedly positive overall picture but with some room for improvement.** Cape Town hints (but hints only) at a slightly more positive view than other cities as regards the quality of Jewish education at Jewish schools in South Africa and Pretoria is less positive than other cities (i.e. focuses more on “fairly” than “very good”).
- **Within religious practice sectors, Reform/Progressive is more positive than are other sectors about the quality of Jewish education at Jewish schools in South Africa. The Strictly Orthodox are the least likely of the four religious practice sectors to focus on “very good” but their overall emphasis is still on “good” rather than “poor”.**

The issue relating to the perceived quality of Jewish education (i.e. dealt with above), is new to the 2005 study. Comparisons with 1998 are thus not possible.

²³ Average rating = $\frac{\text{Total weighted score}}{\text{Total who rated}}$

The scores were weighted ‘5’ for **very good**, ‘4’ for **fairly good**, ‘3’ for **neither good nor poor**, ‘2’ for **fairly poor** and ‘1’ for **very poor**. **Don’t know/no answer** was excluded from the calculation i.e. it was not weighted and it was excluded from the divisor. Thus the closer the average rating is to ‘5’, the closer it is to **very good** and the closer it is to ‘1’ the closer it is to **very poor**.

B. The role of formal Jewish education

Respondents were asked: “How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the role of formal Jewish education. Tell me according to this scale”. CARD: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	DK/No answer		Average Rating ²⁴
(i) Jewish education insulates children from the reality of the world around them	10%	38%	11%	34%	6%	1%	=100%	3.11
(ii) It is important that all Jewish children attend some form of formal Jewish education	45%	51%	2%	2%	<0.5%	<0.5%	=100%	4.38
(iii)The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater the knowledge about Judaism	32%	50%	8%	9%	<0.5%	1%	=100%	4.04
(iv)The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the stronger the Jewish identity	25%	47%	12%	15%	1%	<1%	=100%	3.81
(v)The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater commitment there is to a Jewish life in adulthood	18%	42%	18%	20%	1%	1%	=100%	3.56

- **Virtually all (96%) consider it “important that all Jewish children attend some form of formal Jewish education”**. The 96% splits: 45% strongly agree and 51% agree. The average rating of 4.38 (which positions this factor between “strongly agree” and “agree”) emphasises the strong convictions of Jewish people in South Africa in this regard.
- **The majority (82%) agree with the statement that “the greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater the knowledge about Judaism”**. The 82% splits: 32% strongly

²⁴ Average rating = $\frac{\text{Total weighted score}}{\text{Total who rated}}$

Scores were weighted ‘5’ (strongly agree), ‘4’ (agree), ‘3’ (neither agree nor disagree), ‘2’ (disagree) and ‘1’ (strongly disagree). Don’t know/no answer was excluded from the calculation i.e. not weighted and excluded from the divisor. Thus, the closer the average rating is to ‘5’, the closer it is to **strongly agree** and the closer it is to ‘1’ the closer it is to **strongly disagree**.

- agree and 50% agree. A low proportion (not quite 10%) disagreed with that statement. On an average the statement is positioned around “agree” (with an average rating of 4.04).
- **For the statement “the greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the stronger the Jewish identity”, the tendency to agree (72%) is far greater than the tendency to disagree (16%) and the average rating (3.81) positions the statement on intensification of Jewish identity close to the “agree” mark. However, the agreement here is not quite as emphatic as was the agreement relating to knowledge about Judaism intensifying with the number of years spent in such classes.**
 - **Although still giving Jewish education the benefit of the doubt, respondents are not quite so sure that “the greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater commitment there is to a Jewish life in adulthood”. 60% agree that commitment intensifies with the number of years in such classes, but the “strongly agree” score is not high and is clearly outweighed by the combined score of: those who disagree and those who “neither agree nor disagree”. The average weighting of 3.56 positions this factor between “agree” and “neither agree nor disagree”.**
 - **Opinions are divided on whether “Jewish education insulates children from the reality of the world around them”. Scores are spread on both sides of the scale i.e. on the “agree” side and the “disagree” side. Overall, the scores are pulling almost evenly to both sides with a (very) slightly greater tendency towards agreeing that such insulation occurs. The average rating of 3.11 confirms this since: it is around the midpoint of the scale but a touch towards the “agree” side.**

Do those with children at Jewish schools differ from those with children at other schools as regards how they rate Jewish education?

	TOTAL RESPONDENTS (AVERAGE RATINGS) (Base:1000)	AVERAGE RATINGS ²⁵ FOR THOSE WITH SCHOOLCHILDREN:				
		Total with schoolchildren (Base: 245)	Children at Jewish private school (Base: 188)	Children at Crawford/Eden/Reddam (Base:31)	Children at non-Jewish government school (Base: 32)	Children at other non-Jewish school/college (Base: 15)
(i) Jewish education insulates children from reality of the world around them	3.11	3.13	3.11	3.16	3.34	3.33
(ii) It is important that all Jewish children attend some form of formal Jewish education	4.38	4.48	4.55	4.43	4.06	4.53
(iii)The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater the knowledge about Judaism	4.04	4.11	4.19	4.06	3.56	4.00
(iv)The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the stronger the Jewish identity	3.81	3.88	3.92	3.65	3.59	3.87
(v)The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater commitment there is to a Jewish life in adulthood	3.56	3.60	3.68	3.48	3.13	3.53

- As discussed earlier, the concept of Jewish education insulating children from the reality of the world around them obtained an overall average rating of 3.11 positioning it around the midpoint of the scale but a touch towards the “agree” side. **We see in the preceding tabulation that those whose children are not at Jewish schools are more likely to agree that Jewish education is insulating** (i.e. their average score is more to the agreement side than are other scores) but even they do not move distinctly to the “agree” side. In this regard, parents with children at Crawford/Eden/Reddam House - schools which cater for Jewish children to some extent - tend to score closer to parents of children at Jewish schools than to those with children at non-Jewish schools or colleges.
- **“It is important that all Jewish children attend some form of formal Jewish education” was agreed with unequivocally overall (as discussed earlier) and this emerges again within all the sectors shown in the tabulation above.** Those with schoolchildren are even more convinced of this than is the sample as a whole but those whose children are at non-Jewish government schools are less emphatic about

²⁵ As stated earlier, the closer the average is to ‘5’ the closer it is to **strongly agree** and the closer it is to ‘1’ the closer it is to **strongly disagree**. The midpoint would be ‘3’ for **neither agree nor disagree**. However, for this particular tabulation, some of the average rating scores (i.e. where the bases are very small) should be used only as an aid to judgement and should not be evaluated in terms of statistical significance i.e. particularly the “other non-Jewish schools/colleges” with a base of 15 respondents. The unreliability of the very small base (15) is highlighted by the fact that some scores do not fit into the trend set by other sectors.

- the importance of formal Jewish education than are the rest. However, even this sector reflects an average rating which is at the “agree” level.
- **Those with schoolchildren - particularly those with children at Jewish schools - show a slightly above average belief that the greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes: the greater the knowledge about Judaism; the stronger the Jewish identity; and the greater commitment there is to a Jewish life in adulthood.** On the other hand, the sectors with children at non-Jewish schools hint at below average belief with regard to these statements. The Crawford/Eden/Reddam set generally veer between the Jewish and the non-Jewish school sectors with regard to these factors.

Results by city, extent of Jewish feeling and type of religious practice follow:

	TOTAL RESPONDENTS (AVERAGE RATINGS) ²⁶ (Base:1000)	RESULTS BY CITY		RESULTS BY EXTENT OF “JEWISH FEELING”		RESULTS BY “RELIGIOUS PRACTICE”	
		Jhb (Base:650)	Pta (Base:50)	Mild (Base: 79)	QuiteStrong(Base:424)	Secular/JJ(Base:118)	Reform/Prog(Base:74)
(i) Jewish education insulates children from the reality of the world around them	3.11	CT (Base: 250)	Dbn (Base: 50)	Very Strong(Base:496)	Str.Orth(Base:141)		
		Jhb	3.19	Mild	3.62	Secular	3.48
		Pta	3.10	QuiteStrong	3.27 ↑	Reform	3.33 ↑
		CT	3.00	Very Strong	2.90 ↑	Trad.	3.13 ↑
(ii) It is important that all Jewish children attend some form of formal Jewish education	4.38	Dbn	2.73			Str Orth	2.63 ↑
		Jhb	4.41	Mild	3.72 ↓	Secular	3.73 ↓
		Pta	4.47	QuiteStrong	4.30 ↓	Reform	4.15 ↓
		CT	4.27	Very Strong	4.55	Trad.	4.43 ↓
(iii)The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater the knowledge about Judaism	4.04	Dbn	4.38			Str Orth	4.47
		Jhb	4.11	Mild	3.62 ↓	Secular	3.65 ↓
		Pta	3.94	QuiteStrong	3.89 ↓	Reform	3.77 ↓
		CT	3.87	Very Strong	4.24	Trad.	4.06 ↓
(iv)The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the stronger the Jewish identity	3.81	Dbn	4.04			Str Orth	4.42
		Jhb	3.91	Mild	3.29 ↓	Secular	3.49
		Pta	3.66	QuiteStrong	3.67 ↓	Reform	3.42 ↓
		CT	3.57	Very Strong	4.01	Trad.	3.82 ↓
(v)The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater commitment there is to a Jewish life in adulthood	3.56	Dbn	3.90			Str Orth	4.23
		Jhb	3.68	Mild	3.24 ↓	Secular	3.09 ↓
		Pta	3.36	QuiteStrong	3.42 ↓	Reform	3.16 ↓
		CT	3.28	Very Strong	3.74	Trad.	3.61 ↓
		Dbn	3.65			Str Orth	3.95

²⁶ The closer the average is to ‘5’ the closer it is to **strongly agree** and the closer it is to ‘1’ the closer it is to **strongly disagree**. The midpoint would be ‘3’ for **neither agree nor disagree**.

- **There are some intercity differences** e.g. Broadly-speaking, **Johannesburg** shows above average focus on the importance of formal Jewish education and the resultant benefits but with indications that there is still some room for improvement e.g. as regards Jewish education influencing greater commitment to Jewish life; **Pretoria** shows above average belief in the importance of Jewish education but tends to reflect below average conviction that such education is as beneficial as it should be; **Cape Town** shows below average conviction as to the importance or benefits of such education; **Durban** reflects more positive scores than does Cape Town as to the importance of formal Jewish education and tends towards the above average side as regards formal Jewish education having a positive influence on Jewish identity and commitment to Jewish life in adulthood.
- **Clearly, the milder the Jewish feeling the greater the likelihood that Jewish education will be perceived as insulating children from the reality of the world around them. Similarly, the move from the Strictly Orthodox category towards the Secular category is accompanied by an increase in the perception that Jewish education insulates children from the reality of the world around them.**
- For all other categories, the “extent of Jewish feeling” and the “Religious Practice” categories show the reverse trend i.e. **the stronger the Jewish feeling, the greater the extent of agreement with the importance of formal Jewish education and the greater the belief in the benefits of Jewish education. Similarly, the closer to Strictly Orthodox, the greater the extent of agreement with the importance of formal Jewish education and the greater the belief in the benefits of Jewish education.**

In both 1998 and 2005 we asked the question about the extent of agreement with various statements relating to Jewish education. For comparison we have shown, for each statement, a combined “strongly agree/agree” score and an average rating²⁷ for 2005 and alongside this the comparative scores for 1998.

²⁷ As detailed earlier, the highest possible rating is “5” representing **strongly agree**; “4” represents **agree**; “3” is for **neither agree nor disagree**; “2” represents **disagree**; the lowest possible is “1” which represents **strongly disagree**. Thus, the closer the average is to “5” the closer it is to **strongly agree** and the closer it is to “1” the closer it is to **strongly disagree**. The midpoint would be “3” for **neither agree nor disagree**.

	2005		1998	
	Strongly agree/ agree	AVERAGE RATING	Strongly agree/ agree	AVERAGE RATING
(i) Jewish education insulates children from the reality of the world around them	47%	3.11	41%	2.97
(ii) It is important that all Jewish children attend some form of formal Jewish education	96%	4.38	94%	4.25
(iii) The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater the knowledge about Judaism	82%	4.04	81%	3.94
(iv) The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the stronger the Jewish identity	72%	3.81	69%	3.70
(v) The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater commitment there is to a Jewish life in adulthood	60%	3.56	58%	3.49

- The 2005 scores are generally a bit higher than the 1998 scores but are – in essence – in the same score range.
- **Now, as was the case seven years ago, an exceptionally high proportion consider it important for Jewish children to attend some form of formal Jewish education classes.** The combined “strongly agree/agree” score is 96% now and was 94% in 1998. Then and now, average ratings range between “agree” and “strongly agree” but closer to the “agree” side.
- **Again, as in 1998, opinions are divided on whether or not Jewish education insulates children from the reality of the world around them.** In both surveys the average scores centre around the midpoint score level of “neither agree nor disagree”
- **In the main, the 1998 survey and the 2005 survey indicated that respondents perceived knowledge about Judaism as increasing with an increase in the number of years spent in Jewish education classes. However, they were (in 1998 and 2005) a touch less certain about Jewish identity increasing according to time spent on Jewish education and still less certain about commitment to Jewish life in adulthood increasing accordingly. Nevertheless, for these two factors also, the emphasis was distinctly more on the positive side.**

III. ATTITUDES TO SOUTH AFRICA

A. Political party affiliation

Two questions were asked in this regard:

“Now we are going to talk about South Africa. Which party did you vote for in the 2004 elections?” (1st column below).

“Going back to the 1994 elections, which party did you vote for in the 1994 elections? (2nd column below).

It emerged that there are memory-related inaccuracies relating to asking respondents in 2005 how they voted in 1994 (eleven years earlier). Greater

accuracy has thus been obtained by using 1998 survey results for the 1994 election data (3rd column below).

	2005 SURVEY		1998 SURVEY
	2004 ELECTIONS Total Respondents 1000=100%	1994 ELECTIONS Total Respondents 1000=100%	1994 ELECTIONS Total Respondents 1000=100%
Proportion claimed to have voted for:			
Democratic Party (DP) / Democratic Alliance (DA)	67%	62%	44%
African National Congress (ANC)	3%	5%	8%
Independent Democrats (ID)	1%	-	-
National Party (NP) / New National Party (NNP)	1%	4%	24%
United Democratic Movement (UDM)	1%	1%	< 0.5%
Freedom Front / Vryheidsfront (FF/VF)	< 0.5%	< 0.5%	< 0.5%
Inkhatha Freedom Party (IFP)	< 0.5%	1%	1%
Progressive Federal Party (PFP)	-	< 0.5%	<0.5%
Soccer Party	-	< 0.5%	< 0.5%
Other	-	< 0.5%	< 0.5%
Did not vote though qualified to	15%	5%	4%
Did not vote, too young	3%	15%	8%
Refused/my business/personal/irrelevant question	1%	1%	2%
Unqualified to vote/wrong ID/not citizen/not on register	3%	1%	1%
Out of SA at time/overseas/lived elsewhere then	1%	1%	< 0.5%
Voted but don't know / no answer	4%	4%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%

With regard to the 2004 election voting pattern:

- **Jewish people are essentially Democratic Alliance (DA)²⁸ supporters. Approximately two-thirds (67%) claimed to have voted DA in the 2004 elections. No other party scored above 3%. In fact, when we exclude those who did not vote and those who gave no answer as to who they voted for, we observe that: Of those who mentioned who they voted for in 2004, 9 in every 10 voted for the DA.**
- **It is important to note that there appears to have been sizeable voter apathy i.e. 14% claimed that they did not vote in 2004 though they were qualified to. This voter apathy is definitely greater than that which occurred in the 1994 elections. Later on in the report we will look at who comprises the apathetic sector.**

With regard to the 1994 election voting pattern and how it compares with the 2004 voting pattern:

²⁸ The Democratic Party (DP) and National Party (NP) were in existence at the time of the 1994 elections, but they subsequently combined to form the Democratic Alliance (DA). By the time the 2004 elections took place the Democratic Alliance (DA) was still in existence but a faction had broken away to form the New National Party (NNP).

- The **2005** survey gives the impression that there has not been much change in the voting pattern from 1994 to 2004 i.e. it reflects the DP (the forerunner of the DA) as the only party featuring sizeably in 1994. However, there are memory-related inaccuracies related to asking respondents in 2005 how they voted in 1994 (eleven years earlier). Clearly, by the time the 2005 survey was conducted there was distinct blurring of recall related to voting in the 1994 elections.
- **Because of the part played by memory and resultant blurred recall, the 1998 data (3rd column) which is based on a 4 year gap, is likely to be more reliable** than the 2005 data (2nd column) which is based on an 11 year gap. Comparison between the two sets of data for 1994 shows that the National Party (NP) featured more in the 1994 voting pattern of South African Jews than Jews today remember/are aware of! Perhaps it is not memory alone but also a possibility that some may not want to recall or admit now that they voted NP in 1994.
- **We will thus consider only the 1998 data for evaluation of the 1994 voting pattern. In so doing, we see that the Democratic Party (DP) clearly received far more votes (44%) than did the National Party (NP) with 24%. The African National Congress (ANC) was in third place with 8%.** All other parties scored below these. However, by the time the 2004 elections took place there had been a clear move to the Democratic Alliance (DA). Voter apathy seemed to be less of a problem in 1998 than in 2004.
- Incidentally, as can be noticed in the above tabulation (2nd column), 15% of the 2005 sample claimed that in 1994 they had been too young to vote. This is understandable i.e. those who are currently young adults would have been too young to vote then. Exclusion of this sizeable sector of young people from the evaluation of 1994 voting patterns means that there is an extra factor preventing the 2005 survey from giving a true reflection of voting in 1994. The data from the 1998 study is likely to prove more accurate overall for reflecting 1994 voting patterns.

Thus far when examining the 2004 voting pattern, we have looked at results in total. Below the data is shown by city (with the total shown for comparison).

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Jhb 650=100%	Pta 50=100%	CT 250=100%	Dbn 50=100%
Proportion claimed to have voted for:					
Democratic party (DP)/Democratic Alliance (DA)	67%	67%	74%	64%	66%
African National Congress (ANC)	3%	2%	4%	6%	2%
All other parties in total	3%	3%	4%	4%	-
Did not vote though qualified to	15%	15%	12%	12%	20%
Did not vote, too young	3%	3%	2%	3%	-
Refused/not your business/personal/ question not relevant	1%	1%	-	3%	-
Not qualified to vote/wrong ID/not citizen/not on register	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%
Out of SA at time/out of country/overseas/lived elsewhere	1%	1%	-	2%	-
Voted but don't know / no answer	4%	5%	2%	3%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- As mentioned, the DA was the party voted for by the majority of the respondents in the 2004 elections. This applies in total and when looked at within each city separately. The voter apathy proportion (i.e. did not vote though qualified to) is similar throughout the cities, with Durban tending to show a higher proportion. Other than the DA, the ANC is the only party with a noticeable score. The ANC is thus shown separately and all other parties are shown within a combined score. The ANC appeared to score more noticeably in Cape Town than in other cities but the score difference between Cape Town and other cities is not statistically significant and requires further checking.
- What about the age groups, do they show similar voting pattern trends?

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	18-24 yrs 115 (100%)	25-34 yrs 159 (100%)	35-44 yrs 167 (100%)	45-54 yrs 171 (100%)	55-64 yrs 176 (100%)	65 yrs and older 212 (100%)
Proportion claimed to have voted for:							
Democratic party (DP)/ Democratic Alliance (DA)	67%	35%	70%	64%	68%	71%	79%
African National Congress (ANC)	3%	-	3%	6%	4%	4%	2%
All other parties in total	3%	1%	-	2%	6%	6%	3%
Did not vote though qualified to	15%	33%	17%	17%	10%	9%	9%
Did not vote, too young	3%	24%	-	-	-	-	-
Refused/not your business/ personal/ question not relevant	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
Not qualified to vote/wrong ID/ not citizen/not on register	3%	2%	3%	7%	2%	3%	1%
Out of SA at time/out of country/overseas/lived elsewhere	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	2%
Voted but don't know / no answer	4%	3%	5%	3%	7%	5%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- Jewish people essentially supported the (DA) in the 2004 elections. This was true in total and at city level and is also true for each of the age groups. At first glance the 18-24 age group appears to show a far lower DA figure than do other age groups. However, what we see is that of the 18-24 year olds who did vote, virtually all voted DA.
- The sizeable voter apathy in the 2004 elections is greater amongst the age categories under 45 years of age, but is particularly apparent in the 18-24 year age group. Amongst 18-24 year olds, one in every three (33%) claimed not to have voted though qualified to.

B. Racial prejudice, antisemitism and anti-Zionism

(i) Extent of racial prejudice, antisemitism and anti-Zionism

Respondents were asked three questions:

“Generally speaking do you think there is more racial prejudice in South Africa now than there was 5 years ago, less or about the same amount?”

“Do you think there is more antisemitism in South Africa now than there was 5 years ago, less or about the same amount?”

“Thinking about anti-Zionism, do you think there is more anti-Zionism in South Africa now than there was 5 years ago, less or about the same amount?”

For additional input they were asked:

“Do you believe that at present in South Africa, antisemitism is a major problem, a minor problem or not a problem at all?”

“Do you believe that at present in the world generally, antisemitism is a major problem, a minor problem or not a problem at all?”

“Do you believe that at present in South Africa, anti-Zionism is a major problem, a minor problem or not a problem at all?”

“Do you believe that at present in the world generally, anti-Zionism is a major problem, a minor problem or not a problem at all?”

The responses can be summarised as follows:

In comparison with 5 yrs ago:

Racial prejudice: Less 40%> Same 32%> More 27%> Don't know/no answer 1%

Antisemitism: Same 54%> More 28%> Less 15%> Don't know/no answer 3%

Anti-Zionism: More 55%> Same 32%> Less 7% = Don't know/no answer 6%

Extent of the problem now:

Antisemitism SA: Major 16%< Minor 67%> Not problem 15%> DK /No ans 2%

Antisemitism world: Major 73%> Minor 24%> Not problem 2%= DK/No ans 1%

Anti-Zionism SA: Major 35%< Minor 50%> Not problem 10%> DK/No ans 5%

Anti-Zionism world: Major 66%> Minor 26%> Not Problem 3%= DK/No ans 5%

Thus, as regards racial prejudice:

- **South African Jews tend to be more likely to think that racial prejudice in South Africa has decreased in the last 5 years (40%) than to think that it has increased (27%). According to a further 32% there is the same amount now as 5 years ago and 1% said “Don't know/No answer”. Although it is a positive finding that - in the main - racial prejudice tends to be perceived as not having increased, this should not be interpreted at face value. Much depends on how much racial prejudice they think there was 5 years ago e.g. if racial prejudice is perceived as having been high in the past then the 32% who say “about the same as 5 years ago” would be perceiving it as still being as high as it was then. On the other hand, if it was perceived as being low 5 yrs ago then the 32% who perceive it as being the same now could be read in a positive way.**

- Incidentally, 18-44 year olds tended to be more emphatic about decreases in racial prejudice than were those 45 years and older.

In relation to antisemitism:

- **With regard to the extent of antisemitism in South Africa , more (54%) think that the situation has remained the same as 5 years ago than think it has increased (28%) and a still smaller proportion (15%) think it has decreased.** The full interpretation depends on whether the level of antisemitism is perceived as having been high or low 5 years ago. If perceived as having been high 5 years ago, the 28% mentioning an increase in antisemitism would be bolstered up by the extra 54% who say “same as 5 years ago” and the overall finding would be very negative. If however antisemitism is perceived as having been low 5 years ago then the 54% saying “same as 5 years ago” would swing to the positive side to bolster up the 15% seeing it as lower now. More insight in this regard will be obtained later on in the report. However, considering the following, indications are that the current findings should be read in a more positive than negative light, but with some reservations:
 - **It is apparent that South African Jews essentially detect the extent of antisemitism in South Africa as being a minor problem (67%),** with only (16%) seeing it as a major problem. Although the emphasis is strongly on the “minor” side, we cannot ignore the fact that overall 83% see it as a problem (whether major or minor) and only a relatively small percentage (15%) claim that it is not a problem at all.
 - **What is undoubtedly perceived by South African Jews as a major problem is antisemitism in the world generally** i.e. almost three-quarters (73%) spoke of it as a major problem in the world generally, while virtually a quarter (24%) spoke of it as a problem even if minor. In total therefore, 97% see it as a problem in the world generally and the emphasis is on it being a major rather than minor problem.
 - As regards the extent of antisemitism in South Africa, The 35-44 year group was particularly emphatic about it having remained the same as it was 5 years ago and less focused on it having decreased or increased. In response to how great a problem antisemitism is in South Africa at present, there was heavy emphasis in all age categories on it being a minor problem. The 35-44 year age group was even more emphatic than was the sample as a whole about it being a minor problem in South Africa. With regard to antisemitism in the world generally, all age groups emphasised that it is a major problem.

With regard to anti-Zionism:

- **Anti-Zionism is definitely perceived as having increased in South Africa in the last 5 years. Over half (55%) detect an increase, almost one-third (32%) speak of the situation remaining the same and only 7% detect a decrease.** No matter what the additional data is likely to show, the level of anti-Zionism is problematic. Just how problematic it is

- would depend on whether those who think it has remained the same, think that 5 years ago the level of anti-Zionism was high or low. If they think it was high then the 32% could be read together with the “increase” data as meaning that anti-Zionism is a major problem. On the other hand, if they think that 5 years ago it was low then the overall situation does not emerge quite as negatively but it is strongly negative nevertheless.
- **Anti-Zionism emerges as being more of a problem in South Africa than is antisemitism. Although the focus is more on the minor problem side, the major problem score is higher than that exhibited for antisemitism.** More specifically 85% see anti-Zionism in South Africa as being a problem with this splitting: 35% for major problem and 50% for minor problem. Only 10% do not regard it as a problem at all.
 - **South African Jews distinctly perceive anti-Zionism within the rest of the world as being a problem and the emphasis is distinctly on it being a major problem.** Approximately two-thirds (66%) say it is a major problem in the rest of the world and approximately a quarter (26%) regard the problem as minor.
 - Perceptions relating to anti-Zionism in South Africa having increased or decreased show no clear age-related trends. Looking at how much of a problem anti-Zionism is in South Africa, the 18-24 year sector perceives anti-Zionism as less of a problem than do other age groups. With regard to anti-Zionism in the world generally, all age groups perceive this as a major problem, but 18-24 year olds and those over 65 years of age are a bit less emphatic about this.
 - **A check on other data breakdowns shows that those with a strong attachment to Israel and also the Strictly Orthodox, detect more anti-Zionism in South Africa than does the sample as a whole. Also, they tend to be more likely than the sample as a whole to consider anti-Zionism in South Africa and (more so) anti-Zionism in the world as being a major problem.**

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Strong attachment to Israel 529=100%	Strictly Orthodox 141=100%
<u>More</u> anti-Zionism in SA now than 5 years ago	55%→	60%	64%
At present anti-Zionism in SA is <u>major</u> problem	35%→	44%	40%
At present anti-Zionism in world is <u>major</u> problem	66%→	73%	78%

How do the 2005 results discussed above compare with those for 1998? How were racial prejudice, antisemitism and anti-Zionism assessed in 1998 in comparison with now?

	2005			1998		
	Racial Prejudice in SA 1000=100%	Anti-semitism in SA 1000=100%	Anti-Zionism in SA 1000=100%	Racial Prejudice in SA 1000=100%	Anti-semitism in SA 1000=100%	Anti-Zionism in SA 1000=100%
At present there is:						
More than 5 yrs ago	27%	28%	55%	42%	34%	51%
Less than 5 yrs ago	40%	15%	7%	29%	8%	6%
About same as 5 yrs ago	32%	54%	32%	28%	55%	37%
Don't Know/No answer	1%	3%	6%	1%	3%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- **Racial prejudice in South Africa:** The comparative findings reflect a positive trend. More specifically, whereas in 1998 there was a greater tendency to perceive racial prejudice in South Africa as having increased in the preceding 5 years than as having decreased, the 2005 situation shows a more positive finding i.e. the proportion for “less racial prejudice than 5 years ago” is higher than the proportion for “more than 5 years ago”. However, there is still a way to go! Ideally the majority should perceive racial prejudice in South Africa as decreasing while scores for increasing/staying static should be minimal.
- **Antisemitism in South Africa:** There have been no dramatic changes with regard to perceptions of the extent of antisemitism in South Africa. Although there are hints of a very small decrease, essentially the score patterns for 1998 and 2005 are very similar. There is and was focus on the extent as having “remained the same”. The meaning of “remained the same” takes a positive turn when we review it in the light of the additional data below i.e. the data shows that in this country, anti-Semitism is now and was in 1998 regarded mainly as a minor problem. Nevertheless, ideally, even a minor problem of this type cannot be ignored and ideally the “not a problem at all” score should be the largest. Furthermore, even if it is perceived mainly as a minor problem in South Africa, this should be seen against the background of perceptions relating to the situation in the world generally i.e. **As discussed earlier anti-semitism is currently perceived as being a major problem “in the world generally”.** Comparison with 1998 data shows that it is in fact perceived now as far more of a problem in the world generally than it was in the survey conducted 7 years ago.

	Antisemitism in South Africa		Antisemitism in the world generally:	
	2005 1000=100%	1998 1000=100%	2005 1000=100%	1998 1000=100%
At present is:				
Major problem	16%	22%	73%	48%
Minor problem	67%	63%	24%	45%
Not problem	15%	13%	2%	4%
Don't Know/No answer	2%	2%	1%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

- **Anti-Zionism in South Africa:** This is definitely perceived as having increased in South Africa in the last 5 years and in 1998 the perceptions were similar. The perceived increase is problematic no matter what the base level of anti-Zionism in South Africa is perceived to have been in the past. Unfortunately, we do not have comparative 1998 data for how much of a problem anti-Zionism was perceived to have been in South Africa or the world generally i.e. the question was not asked in 1998. However, whether there have been changes since 1998 or not, what is relevant is that anti-Zionism is currently undoubtedly perceived as a major problem in the world generally. This coupled with the fact that it is definitely perceived as having increased in South Africa emphasises that anti-Zionism has the potential for becoming an even greater problem overall.

(ii) Personal experiences relating to antisemitism

“Thinking now of your own experience, please tell me which, if any, of the forms of antisemitism on this list you have experienced personally in the past 5 yrs?”
LIST SHOWN

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	
<u>Experienced antisemitism in past 5 yrs:</u>		
No	56%	
Yes	44%	
<u>What they claimed to have experienced:</u>		
Heard someone making derogatory remarks about Jews		39%
Called a Jew in a derogatory way		20%
Picked on or victimised at work		2%
Been refused employment		1%
Business contracts or orders refused		1%
Had heard/seen derogatory remarks about Jews in the media e.g. on the radio or on pamphlets in the post		1%
They or their children had been refused membership of or a place in a club or school		1%
All other mentions which emerged less often		4%
Total		69%
Average no. of types experienced (per respondent who experienced it)		1.5
Average no. of types experienced (based on total respondents)		0.7

- **Those who had not experienced antisemitism in the last 5 years (56%), outnumbered those who did (44%). However, it cannot be denied that the proportion claiming to have experienced it was high.**
- Those who did mention having experienced such incidents in the last 5 years, on average, mentioned one or two types of incidents. Looked at within the sample as a whole, each respondent – on average – claimed to have experienced 0.7 types.
- **The types experienced are primarily related to antisemitic remarks. The most frequently mentioned incident type was “hearing**

- derogatory remarks about Jews”** (referred to by 39% of the total sample which accounts for 9 in every 10 of those who did mention incidents). **Next in line was “having been called a Jew in a derogatory way”**, with mentions by 20% of the total sample (i.e. almost 5 in every 10 of those who acknowledged having experienced anti-Semitism in the last 5 years). **Other** incident types were mentioned infrequently.
- **When comparing the findings with those for 1998 we observe that personal experiences of antisemitism appear to have decreased between 1998 and 2005:**
 - In 1998, 65% said that they had and 35% said that they had not experienced some form of antisemitism in the past 5 years.
 - In 2005, 44% said that they had and 56% said that they had not experienced antisemitism in the past 5 years. The proportion claiming to have experienced it was thus decidedly lower than in 1998 and the emphasis has moved more towards not personally having experienced it in the past 5 years.
 - **The 1998 and 2005 data reflects similar scores for types of anti-semitism experienced** i.e. in both 1998 and 2005, of those claiming to have experienced antisemitism: 9 in every 10 said that they had actually heard someone making derogatory remarks about Jews; between 4 and 5 in every 10 claimed to have been called a Jew in a derogatory way; 1 or 2 in every 10 respondents mentioned other types; on average, those who claimed to have experienced antisemitism, mentioned 1.5 types they had experienced.

(iii) Groups perceived as posing the greatest threat to Jews in South Africa

Additional insight into antisemitism/threats against Jews was obtained: “Which groups, if any, pose the greatest threat to Jews in South Africa?”

- Each respondent on an average mentioned approximately two categories (i.e. 1.98) of people as being “the greatest threat”.
- **Muslims were far and away considered to be the biggest threat to Jews in South Africa.** An overwhelming proportion (82%), spontaneously referred to Muslims in this context. **This conclusion applies to the sample as a whole and to most demographic breakdowns.** In fact some of the other categories mentioned also comprise a sizeable Muslim element e.g. Pagad, Hamas and Arabs.
- **Pagad, Hamas and Arabs were next in line. These were mentioned sizeably but at a far lower level:** Pagad (30%), Hamas (26%) and Arabs (24%). Such mentions were essentially made by Johannesburg respondents. Their mention of Pagad is interesting since it was primarily Cape Town based but has not been noticeably active in the last few years. The organisation has obviously retained an impression of still being a sizeable threat to Jews in South Africa i.e. of those in Johannesburg, 43% spoke of Pagad as a threat. The comparable scores for other cities were: Durban 14%, Pretoria 2%, Cape Town 4%.

- Other categories fell far below as regards being perceived as a threat to Jews in South Africa i.e. Blacks (6%); Indians (6%); Afrikaners/right wing Afrikaners (4%); Extremists/fundamentalists/fanatics of various types including Muslim militant extremists, black extremists, coloured fanatics etc. (3%); Jews of one type or another/Jews are their own worst enemy, Israelis, Israeli Mafia, Jews for Jesus, uninvolved Jews (3%). Mentioned by 1% or 2% each were: Coloureds, government/ANC, ignorant uneducated people. Mentioned by less than 0.5%: All non-Jews. Some did not mention any groups/types of people i.e. 3% said “none” and 3% said “don’t know”/gave no answer.
- **Comparison of the results with those from 1998 show that in both 1998 and 2005, an overwhelming majority of respondents mentioned Muslims as being the group posing the greatest threat to Jews i.e. 75% (in 1998) and 82% (in 2005). Also, in both studies, other categories comprising a sizeable Muslim element followed i.e. Pagad, Hamas, Arabs.** Next in line in 1998 were “Afrikaners” (12%) and an additional 5% for right wing/far right wing/AWB. All other categories scored 8% or less. In 2005 no other category scored above 6% and the perceived Afrikaner/right wing Afrikaner “threat” dropped from 17% in 1998 to 4% in 2005. In 1998 each respondent, on an average, mentioned 2.26 different groups as posing the greatest threat to Jews i.e. higher than the 1.98 score for 2005.

	Muslims	Pagad	Hamas	Arabs	Afrikaners	Right wing/ far right wing/ AWB	Each of all others
1998 (1000=100%)	75%	39%	36%	29%	12%	5%	8% or less
2005 (1000=100%)	82%	30%	26%	24%	(categories combined in 2005) 4%		6% or less

Moving back to the 2005 survey, we examined some additional aspects relating to perceived attitudes and behaviour towards Jews.

(iv) Perceptions of South African government and media attitudes to Jews

“Would you say that the South African government allows religious freedom for Jews: always, sometimes or never?”

“Would you say that the South African government’s attitude to Israel is: always fair, sometimes fair or never fair?”

“Would you say that thinking of the South African media (i.e. press, TV and radio), their attitude to Israel is: always fair, sometimes fair or never fair?”

“Would you say that the South African government is hostile towards Jews: always, sometimes or never?”

	Always	Sometimes	Never	Don't know/ No answer	
South African government allows religious freedom for Jews	88%	11%	< 0.5%	1%	= 100%
South African government's attitude to Israel is fair	7%	75%	14%	4%	= 100%
South African media (i.e. press, TV and radio)'s attitude to Israel is fair	4%	68%	26%	2%	= 100%
The South African government is hostile towards Jews	3%	48%	45%	4%	= 100%

- **Clearly, Jews in South Africa unequivocally feel that the government allows them religious freedom.** Almost 9 in every 10 Jews in South Africa (i.e. 88%) claimed that the South African government always allows religious freedom for Jews. Most of the remainder chose “sometimes” as a response and a negligible proportion said “never” or “do not know/no answer”. All age sectors reflected high scores, with a tendency for the scores to increase with increase in age. All cities reflected high scores as did all religious subgroups.
- **They are however not quite as certain about the government's attitude to Jews.** Although only 3% say that the government is always hostile to Jews and 4% do not know or did not answer, the majority were divided in their opinions between the claim that the South African government is never hostile to Jews (45%) and the claim that the government is sometimes hostile to Jews (48%). The overall findings tend to apply to most subgroups but a check on subgroup data shows that the Secular Jews tend not to reflect opinions which are divided between “sometimes” and “never” – instead they tend to place more emphasis on the government as “never” being hostile to Jews.
- **The South African government's attitude to Israel emerged less positively than did the government's attitude to Jews. In the main, the government's attitude to Israel was regarded as “sometimes fair” (75%),** with the remainder tending a touch (but a touch only) more to the “never fair” (14%) than the “always fair” (7%) side. Most subgroups also focused heavily on “sometimes fair”. The Strictly Orthodox showed an above average score for “never fair” but their main emphasis remained on “sometimes fair”.
- **The South African media was regarded as being even less fair to Israel than is the South African government.** Only 4% said that the media are always fair to Israel, 68% chose “sometimes fair” and 26% said “never fair”. 18-24 year olds were less convinced about the media being fair to Israel i.e. only 48% chose “sometimes fair” and the bulk of the remainder (44%) said “never fair”. There were no sizeable differences between the cities in this regard. What we do see is that claims that the media are never fair to Israel increase with the strength of Jewish feeling,

also with the strength of attachment to Israel and with the tendency towards Orthodoxy.

PROPORTION CLAIMING SA MEDIA NEVER FAIR TO ISRAEL:										
Total Sample 1000=100%	JEWISH FEELING			ATTACHMENT TO ISRAEL			RELIGIOUS PRACTICE			
	Mild 79= 100%	Quite Strong 424= 100%	Very Strong 496= 100%	Strong 529= 100%	Moderate 328= 100%	None/ Negative 142= 100%	Secular 118= 100%	Reform 74= 100%	Tradi- tional 663= 100%	Str Orth 141= 100%
26%	11%-->	22%-->	31%	33%	←20%	←12%	18%	11%-->	24%-->	47%

- Comparisons with 1998 are not possible, since in that survey questions were not asked about the South African government allowing religious freedom for Jews, their attitude to Jews and their attitude to Israel. A media bias question was asked in both 1998 and 2005 but different wording makes the results not directly comparable.

C. South Africa : Quality of life, Overall situation, Jewish community

“Thinking of the new South Africa and the quality of life, please tell me according to this card (CARD G) how much you agree or disagree with each statement.”

STATEMENTS

- ❖ The new South Africa has benefited the people of South Africa as a whole
- ❖ The new South Africa has benefited me
- ❖ The new South Africa has benefited the Jewish community
- ❖ The quality of my life in South Africa will improve over next five years

	<u>New SA has benefited people of SA as whole</u> Total Respondents 1000=100%	<u>New SA has benefited me</u> Total Respondents 1000=100%	<u>New SA has benefited Jewish community</u> Total Respondents 1000=100%	<u>Quality of my life in SA will improve over next five yrs</u> Total Respondents 1000=100%
Proportion who:				
Strongly Agree	12%	5%	3%	3%
Agree	42%	27%	30%	31%
Neither agree nor disagree	16%	30%	35%	31%
Disagree	25%	33%	25%	25%
Strongly Disagree	4%	4%	3%	5%
DK/No Answer	1%	1%	4%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Average rating ²⁹ (per respondent who rated)	3.32	2.95	3.05	3.03

²⁹ Average rating = $\frac{\text{Total Weighted Score}}{\text{Total who rated}}$

Strongly agree was weighted ‘5’; agree was weighted ‘4’; neither agree nor disagree was weighted ‘3’; disagree was weighted ‘2’ and strongly disagree ‘1’. Do not know/no answer was excluded from the ratings i.e. it was not weighted and was excluded from the divisor. The closer the average is to ‘5’ the closer it is to strongly agree and the closer it is to ‘1’ the closer it is to strongly disagree.

- **There is more of a focus on the positive side than the negative side as regards believing that the “new South Africa” has benefited the people of South Africa as a whole.** More specifically, over half i.e. 54% agree with the statement (42% agree and a further 12% strongly agree). A lower proportion disagree i.e. 29%, which splits as follows: disagree 25% and strongly disagree 4%. Some (16%) neither agree nor disagree and 1% do not know/did not answer. The average rating (3.32) positions the statement as veering a bit towards the “agree” side.
- **Opinions are divided on the issue of “the new South Africa has benefited me”.** The bulk of the responses centre almost evenly around three categories, with a hint of veering a little more to the negative side: agree (27%), neither agree nor disagree (30%), disagree (33%). Because the majority of respondents centre around these three categories, scores are low for: strongly agree (5%) and strongly disagree (4%). The average rating (2.95) positions the statement around the midpoint of the scale but a touch to the negative side.
- **With regard to whether or not “the new South Africa” has benefited the Jewish community, opinions are also divided** but here there is a hint of a slight tendency to the positive side: agree (30%), neither agree nor disagree (35%), disagree (25%). Here too low scores were reflected for the extremes: strongly agree (3%) and strongly disagree (3%). The average rating (3.05) positions the statement around the midpoint of the scale but a touch to the positive side.
- **Opinions are divided once again as regards whether or not the quality of their lives will improve in the next five years.** Here again there is a hint (but hint only) of a slight tendency to the positive side: agree that will improve (31%), neither agree nor disagree (31%) and disagree (25%). Once more, very small proportions emerged for strongly agree (3%) and strongly disagree (5%). The average rating (3.03) positions the statement around the midpoint of the scale but a touch to the positive side.

Considering that South African Jews are divided in their opinions as to whether or not the “new South Africa” has benefited them specifically and whether or not it has benefited the Jewish community as such, it is not surprising that they cluster around the midpoint and close to either side of it when it comes to committing themselves as to the next five years.

While these results may appear interesting, they become dramatically so later on in the report when we compare them to the 1998 results for the same questions! For the present we will look at the data by some demographic and other breakdowns i.e. the extent of agreement with the statements has been shown below in summary form for various breakdowns - average ratings only³⁰.

³⁰ The average ratings round off the findings but do not show as crisp a version of the results as do the scores on which they are based i.e. the averages tend to blur some of the differences. Nevertheless, since the report would become too cumbersome if we were to show the full score range, we show only average ratings for some of the demographic and other breakdown data. The average ratings allow for overall tendencies and trends to be detected.

	<u>New SA benefited people of SA as whole</u>	<u>New SA has benefited me</u>	<u>New SA has benefited Jewish community</u>	<u>Quality of my life in SA will improve over next five yrs</u>
Average rating ³¹ (per respondent who rated)				
Total sample	3.32	2.95	3.05	3.03
<u>Gender</u>				
Male	3.38	3.01	3.12	3.13
Female	3.26	2.91	2.99	2.95
<u>Age</u>				
18-24 yrs	3.29	3.01	3.13	3.00
25-34 yrs	3.51	3.15	3.16	3.36
35-44 yrs	3.37	3.02	2.99	3.19
45-54 yrs	3.42	3.03	2.95	3.08
55-64 yrs	3.30	2.85	3.13	2.86
65 yrs and older	3.08	2.75	3.00	2.79
<u>City</u>				
Johannesburg	3.31	2.93	3.07	3.08
Pretoria	3.39	2.88	3.06	2.71
Cape Town	3.39	3.03	3.01	3.00
Durban	2.94	3.00	3.02	2.95
<u>In 2004 voted</u>				
ANC	4.00	3.53	3.55	3.65
DA	3.28	2.94	3.02	3.01
<u>Religious Practice</u>				
Secular	3.39	3.05	3.06	2.90
Reform/Progressive	3.70	3.19	3.04	3.20
Traditional	3.25	2.91	3.01	3.04
Strictly Orthodox	3.37	3.00	3.22	3.05

Using the average rating per total respondent (top row of figures) as a basis for comparison, we can observe which scores are above average:

- **Even if not to a dramatic extent, males are more positive than females about the benefits of the “new South Africa” and are more optimistic about the likely quality of their lives in the next five years.** However, the male scores are still close to the midpoint (i.e. neither agree nor disagree) tending more to the positive side thereof than do female scores.
- **Age-wise, none of the scores for these factors are high in absolute terms but overall the 25-54 year olds (particularly the 25-34 year olds) are more positive than are other age groups.** The 25-34 year age group is in fact more positive about their future in South Africa in the next five years than is any other age group and is the one which is most positive about the benefits of the “new South Africa”. Incidentally, the two age

³¹ Average rating = $\frac{\text{Total Weighted Score}}{\text{Total who rated}}$

Strongly agree was weighted “5”; **Agree** was weighted “4”; **Neither agree nor disagree** was weighted “3”; **Disagree** was weighted “2” and **Strongly disagree** “1”. The closer the average is to “5” the closer it is to **Strongly agree** and the closer it is to “1” the closer it is to **Strongly disagree**.

groups over 54 years of age (i.e. 55-64 years and 65 years and older) are less likely than those younger than themselves to perceive that they personally have benefited from the “new South Africa” or that the quality of their lives will improve in the next five years.

- **Johannesburg respondents hint at being more optimistic about the next five years than those from other cities.** To some extent cities differ as to which factors they score higher on.
- **Those who voted ANC in 2004 clearly reflect more positive scores** than do those who voted DA. In fact, those who voted ANC reflect decidedly positive scores for these factors.
- **The Strictly Orthodox sector is more likely than other sectors to feel that the “new South Africa” has benefited the Jewish community but they do not feel this strongly. For all other factors the Reform/ Progressive sector reflected more positive scores.**

How do the overall 2005 results compare with results obtained in the 1998 survey?

	<u>New SA benefited people of SA as whole</u>		<u>New SA has benefited me</u>		<u>New SA has benefited Jewish community</u>		<u>Quality of my life in SA will improve over next five years</u>	
	2005 1000 (100%)	1998 1000 (100%)	2005 1000 (100%)	1998 1000 (100%)	2005 1000 (100%)	1998 1000 (100%)	2005 1000 (100%)	1998 1000 (100%)
<u>Proportion:</u>								
Agree/strongly agree	54%	35%	32%	16%	33%	12%	34%	13%
Neither agree nor disagree	16%	12%	30%	21%	35%	26%	31%	19%
Disagree/strongly disagree	29%	52%	37%	63%	28%	59%	30%	65%
DK/No Answer	1%	1%	1%	<1%	4%	3%	5%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Average rating ³² (per respondent who rated)	3.32	2.72	2.95	2.35	3.05	2.38	3.03	2.23

- **Statement: “The ‘new’ South Africa has benefited the people of South Africa as a whole”.** South Africa has come a long way since 1998! In 1998 the responses veered more towards disagreeing with this suggestion about the ‘new South Africa’. In 2005 the responses veer more towards agreeing. There is, of course, still room for improvement. In 1998 more disagreed than agreed with the statement and the average rating (2.72) positioned it towards the negative side of the scale midpoint. However, in 2005, more agreed than disagreed and the average rating (3.32) positioned the statement towards the positive side of the scale midpoint.

³² Average rating = $\frac{\text{Total Weighted Score}}{\text{Total who rated}}$

Strongly agree was weighted “5”; **Agree** was weighted “4”; **Neither agree nor disagree** was weighted “3”; **Disagree** was weighted “2” and **Strongly disagree** “1”. The closer the average is to “5” the closer it is to **Strongly agree** and the closer it is to “1” the closer it is to **Strongly disagree**.

- **Statement: “The ‘new’ South Africa has benefited me”.** The 2005 survey reflects divided opinions on this issue **but the results are more positive than in 1998**. In 1998, 63% said that the ‘new South Africa’ had not benefited them and the average rating (2.35) positioned the statement close to “disagree”. In 2005, the bulk of the responses are spread almost evenly around: “agree”, “neither agree nor disagree” and “disagree”, with the average rating (2.95) near the midpoint of the scale but a touch to the negative side – a more positive finding than for 1998.
- **Statement: “The ‘new’ South Africa has benefited the Jewish community”.** Here too the 2005 results were an improvement on the 1998 results. The 1998 results tended to the negative side (59% rated it negatively with the average rating of 2.38 confirmed its average positioning as close to “disagree”), whilst the 2005 results showed divided opinions but hinting to the positive side as confirmed by the average rating (3.05).
- **Statement: “The quality of my life in South Africa will improve over the next five years”.** Although opinions are divided now (2005 study) and a more optimistic finding would be preferable, there can be no doubt that the optimism level has risen since 1998. In 1998, 65% disagreed that the quality of their lives would improve in the next five years and the average rating (2.23) was lower/less positive than were the ratings for any other statements. However, in 2005, opinions are divided and the average rating (3.03) positions the statement around the midpoint of the scale but a touch to the positive side.

Additional questions, covering similar aspects but slightly differently, were asked in the 2005 survey but not in the 1998 survey:

“Would you say that since the new South Africa began in 1994, the overall situation in South Africa has: improved substantially, improved slightly, deteriorated slightly, deteriorated substantially or remained the same?”

“And would you say that since the new South Africa began in 1994, the overall situation for the Jewish community in South Africa has: improved substantially, improved slightly, deteriorated slightly, deteriorated substantially or remained the same?”

	<u>Overall situation in SA</u> Total Respondents 1000=100%	<u>Overall situation for Jewish community in SA</u> Total Respondents 1000=100%
Proportion who claim:		
Improved substantially	22%	8%
Improved slightly	39%	24%
Deteriorated slightly	19%	18%
Deteriorated substantially	12%	5%
Remained the same	5%	40%
DK/No answer	3%	5%
Total	100%	100%

Here we see even more clearly that:

- **With regard to South Africa as a whole, the emphasis is on the positive side i.e. 61% claimed that the overall situation in South Africa has improved since the new South Africa began in 1994** (with this splitting: 22% for improved substantially and 39% for improved slightly). The negative side is far smaller (i.e. 31% claimed that there has been deterioration and this splits: 19% slight deterioration and 12% substantial deterioration). Things have certainly not been static. Only 5% claimed that the situation has remained the same. These findings tie in with the results discussed earlier where we saw that there is more of a focus on the positive side than the negative side as regards believing that the “new South Africa” has benefited the people of South Africa as a whole with the average rating positioning the statement close to the midpoint of the scale but towards the “agree” side.
- **With regard to the overall situation for the Jewish community in South Africa, there was sizeable focus on the opinion that since 1994 the situation has remained the same/unchanged for the Jewish people (40%), with the rest of the respondents placing more emphasis on the positive than the negative side i.e. 32% spoke of improvement in the overall situation for the Jewish community in South Africa and 23% of deterioration.** These results are in keeping with the earlier finding that opinions are divided, but with a hint of a tendency to the positive side, regarding whether or not “the new South Africa” has benefited the Jewish community.

D. Rating of South Africa on various factors

Respondents were asked: “Please think about South Africa at present, purely according to your own judgement how would you rate it as regards.....(each factor in turn was rated by choosing one of the following answers from a card: very good, fairly good, neither good nor poor, fairly poor, very poor) ?”

	Very Good	Fairly Good	Neither Good nor Poor	Fairly Poor	Very Poor	Don't Know/ No answer		Average Rating ³³
FACTORS:								
Economic situation	12%	56%	17%	11%	3%	1%	=100%	3.61
Personal safety	2%	19%	19%	34%	26%	< 0.5%	=100%	2.37
Political situation	3%	30%	34%	22%	9%	2%	=100%	2.96
Health care provision	10%	25%	11%	22%	30%	2%	=100%	2.61
Education system	6%	28%	16%	26%	18%	6%	=100%	2.76
Personal family and friendship network	68%	25%	4%	2%	1%	<0.5%	=100%	4.58

- **The economic situation in South Africa is distinctly more likely to be perceived in a positive than a negative light.** Of the total respondents, just over two-thirds (68%) gave it a positive rating i.e. they rated it as very or fairly good. Of these, most chose the “fairly good” option. The remainder were divided between choosing the “neither good nor poor” option (17%) and the negative options (14%). Thus, overall, only 14% spoke of the economy in South Africa as being fairly/very poor, with more emphasis on fairly poor than on very poor. The average rating was 3.61 which falls close to the “fairly good” option i.e. closer to “4” than to “3”
- **There is however a problem with regard to personal safety, since the emphasis in the ratings is more on the negative side.** Of the total respondents, 60% regard personal safety in South Africa as being “poor” (i.e. this splits: fairly poor 34% and very poor 26%). The remainder are divided between saying very/fairly good 21% and neither good nor poor 19%. The average rating of 2.37 emphasises that personal safety is perceived as being on the poor side of the scale, with the average veering towards “fairly poor”.
- **Opinions are divided regarding the political situation in the country.** Approximately one-third (33%) perceive it positively, just under one-third (31%) view it negatively and approximately one-third (34%) said that the political situation in the country is “neither good nor poor”. The average rating of 2.96 - which is close to 3 – confirms that overall the rating veers neither to the good nor the poor side, as can be expected since opinions are divided.
- **Health Care provision emerged in a controversial light.** Over half (52%) claimed that health care provision is fairly poor/very poor in South Africa (with this splitting: very poor 30% and fairly poor 22%). The

³³Average Rating = $\frac{\text{Total Weighted score}}{\text{Total who rated}}$

The scores were weighted ‘5’ for **very good**, ‘4’ for **fairly good**, ‘3’ for **neither good nor poor**, ‘2’ for **fairly poor** and ‘1’ for **very poor**. **Don’t know/no answer** was excluded from the calculation i.e. it was not weighted and it was excluded from the divisor. Thus the closer the average rating is to ‘5’, the closer it is to **very good** and the closer it is to ‘1’ the closer it is to **very poor**.

remainder were more focused on the positive (35%) than on the neutral/neither good nor poor side (11%). However, these responses should be treated with care, since a sizeable sector of respondents found it difficult to give a rating. They claimed that there are differences between what the government offers and what the private sector offers. Those who hesitated ultimately chose an answer based on one of the following: health care generally; a combination of what private and government health care facilities offer; government facilities only. Also, some said “don’t know/no answer”. The average rating (2.61) shows that, on an average, the tendency is towards the neutral side but tending a bit more to the negative side. We wish to emphasize that if the respondents had been required to rate only government health care, ratings would have been lower than those reflected. Conversely, had they been required to rate only private care, ratings would have been higher than those which emerged. What we can conclude from the ratings is that Health Care does not unequivocally emerge positively. In fact, 52% regard it in a negative light.

- **What applies to health care applies also to the education system i.e. the education system also emerges in a controversial light.** The average rating (2.76) is in keeping with the conflicting pull between positive (34%) and negative (44%). The 44% negative rating of fairly/very poor splits: 26% fairly poor and 18% very poor. The positive total of 34% splits: 6% very good and 28% fairly good. The remainder said neither good nor poor (16%) or chose “do not know/cannot rate this factor” (6%). The latter included some who claimed that the private sector and government sector differ so they cannot rate the factor. Of those who did rate the factor, some did so with difficulty and – as was the case for the health care factor - those who hesitated ultimately chose an answer based on one of the following: the education system overall; a combination of what the private and government education system offers; government facilities only. The responses should thus be treated with care.
- **Understandably, since the survey was done amongst respondents who live in South Africa, a very high rating was given to the factor: Personal family and friendship network.** Of the total respondents, 93% claimed to have a very good/fairly good family and friendship network, with heavy focus on it being very good (68% said “very good” and 25% said “fairly good”). The small proportion remaining, were divided between the other categories. The factor scored, on an average, 4.58 – a very positive score considering that 5.0 is the maximum positive score possible.

A few key points are worth noting about the results by various breakdowns:

- **In the main, there was a tendency for males to give more positive ratings than did females** (e.g. as regards Economic situation, Personal Safety, Political situation, Health Care provision). However, males and females were in unison as regards their scores for Education system (with the average rating tending towards the “poor” side) and Family and friendship network (where scores were generally “very good”).

- **In the main, there was no clear age-related trend except for the Health Care provision factor** i.e. over 45 year olds were less positive about South Africa in this regard than were the under 45 year olds.
- **With regard to the cities:** Pretoria and Cape Town gave more positive ratings for Economic situation and Political situation. Johannesburg tended to give more positive scores than did other cities for Family/friendship network. For Personal Safety, Cape Town and Durban gave more positive ratings than did Johannesburg and Pretoria. No meaningful city differences emerged for Health Care and Education.
- **For all these South Africa-related factors, those who voted ANC in the 2004 elections gave higher ratings than did those who voted DA.**

These factors relating to South Africa were also checked on in the 1998 survey.

		Very Good	Fairly Good	Neither Good nor Poor	Fairly Poor	Very Poor	Don't Know/ No answer	= 100%	Average Rating ³⁴
FACTORS: Economic situation	2005	12%	56%	17%	11%	3%	1%	= 100%	3.61
	1998	<0.5%	4%	9%	38%	47%	1%	= 100%	1.71
Personal safety	2005	2%	19%	19%	34%	26%	< 0.5%	= 100%	2.37
	1998	<0.5%	4%	6%	25%	65%	< 0.5%	= 100%	1.50
Political situation	2005	3%	30%	34%	22%	9%	2%	= 100%	2.96
	1998	<0.5%	8%	18%	30%	42%	1%	= 100%	1.93
Health care provision	2005	10%	25%	11%	22%	30%	2%	= 100%	2.61
	1998	<1%	9%	10%	32%	48%	1%	= 100%	1.81
Education system	2005	6%	28%	16%	26%	18%	6%	= 100%	2.76
	1998	1%	8%	13%	37%	40%	1%	= 100%	1.91
Personal family and friendship network	2005	68%	25%	4%	2%	1%	<0.5%	= 100%	4.58
	1998	49%	37%	7%	4%	2%	1%	= 100%	4.28

- **There are dramatic differences between the 1998 and the 2005 results! Jewish adults in South Africa are far more positive about South Africa now than they were in 1998.**
- **With regard to the economic situation, the perceptions of the economic situation in South Africa are far more favourable now than they were in 1998. There has been a definite swing from primarily rating the economic situation as “poor” to mainly rating it as “good”. This is a very positive finding.** In 1998: 85% of Jewish adults chose ratings of fairly poor/very poor, with the average rating (1.71) positioning

³⁴ Average Rating = $\frac{\text{Total Weighted score}}{\text{Total who rated}}$

The scores were weighted ‘5’ for **very good**, ‘4’ for **fairly good**, ‘3’ for **neither good nor poor**, ‘2’ for **fairly poor** and ‘1’ for **very poor**. **Don’t know/no answer** was excluded from the calculation i.e. it was not weighted and it was excluded from the divisor. Thus the closer the average rating is to ‘5’, the closer it is to **very good** and the closer it is to ‘1’ the closer it is to **very poor**.

- this factor, overall, as being closer to “fairly poor” than “very poor”. By contrast, the current 2005 survey shows the economic situation in South Africa as being perceived in a distinctly more positive than negative light (68% rated it as very/fairly good with the average rating (3.61) positioning it closer to “fairly good” than to the midpoint of the scale).
- **Personal safety should ideally be improved since it is perceived as being problematic, with the rating emphasis more on the negative side. However, perceptions are not as negative as they were in 1998.** In 2005: the fairly/very poor proportion (60%) and the average rating (2.37) emphasises that personal safety is perceived as being on the poor side of the midpoint, veering towards “fairly poor”. In 1998: a far higher proportion (90%) rated personal safety as fairly/very poor and on average (1.50) positioned the factor as falling distinctly between very and fairly poor.
 - **Although opinions are currently divided regarding the political situation in the country (with a spread ranging across the positive, midpoint and negative parts of the scale and the average of 2.96 positioning it close to “neither good nor poor”), there has been a distinct improvement in perceptions since 1998.** In 1998 the political situation in South Africa was viewed in a distinctly negative light (72% saw it as very/fairly poor and the average rating of 1.93 emphasised that – on an average – the political situation was perceived as being “fairly poor”).
 - **Health Care Provision scored negatively in 1998 and although it is reflected less negatively now, it still emerges in a controversial light and needs attention.** In 1998: 80% rated it as fairly/very poor and the average rating of 1.81 positions it as falling between very and fairly poor but closer to fairly poor. In 2005: the fairly/very poor proportion drops to 52% and the average score rises to 2.61 which positions it between “fairly poor” and “neither good nor poor” but closer to “neither good nor poor”. However – as mentioned earlier - responses relating to health care provision should be treated with care, since a major difference is perceived between what the government offers and what the private sector offers in this regard. Responses are not all based on the same set of criteria. Some may have given ratings based on health care generally; some on a combination of what private and government health care facilities offer; and some on government facilities only. We wish to emphasise that were the respondents rating only the government health care, the ratings would have been lower than those reflected. Similarly, were they to be rating only private care, the ratings would have been higher than those which emerged.
 - **What applies to health care applies also to the education system i.e. the education system emerges in a less negative light now than it did in 1998 but it emerges in a controversial light nevertheless. The improved perceptions are encouraging but it cannot be ignored that the education system requires attention.** In 1998: 77% rated it as fairly/very poor with an average rating of 1.91 positioning it around the fairly poor mark. In 2005: The average rating of 2.76 is in keeping with the

conflicting pull between positive (34%) and negative (44%). Here too caution must be exercised in evaluating the findings since the private sector and government sector were sizeably perceived as differing in what they offer and – as occurred for the health care factor - those who hesitated ultimately chose an answer based on one of the following: the education system overall; a combination of what the private and government education system offers; government facilities only.

- **In both 1998 and 2005, a very high rating was given to: Personal family and friendship network. As mentioned earlier, this is understandable since the survey was conducted amongst those living in South Africa and most of them were born in South Africa.**

E. Additional Input on Attitudes to South Africa

Later on in the questionnaire respondents were asked: “Tell me according to this card how much you agree or disagree with each statement I read to you”. CARD: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	DK/No ans.	=100%	AVE-RAGE RATING ³⁵
Statements:								
Crime is a problem in SA	67%	31%	1%	1%	-	-	=100%	4.65
Personal safety is a problem in SA	53%	40%	4%	3%	-	-	=100%	4.44
There are always teething problems when a new government takes over so all things considered, things will work out well in SA	6%	44%	31%	14%	2%	3%	=100%	3.40
The government should do more for the people of South Africa	41%	53%	4%	2%	<0.5%	<0.5%	=100%	4.33
The SA economy is improving	11%	62%	14%	10%	1%	2%	=100%	3.74
Corruption is a problem in SA	64%	34%	1%	<0.5%	<0.5%	<0.5%	=100%	4.62
I would rather stay in SA with the problems that I know than in another country which has its problems too	19%	57%	12%	9%	1%	2%	=100%	3.85
Affirmative action is a good idea	3%	21%	18%	42%	15%	1%	=100%	2.53
I personally have suffered because of affirmative action	5%	15%	7%	56%	12%	5%	=100%	2.43

³⁵ Average = $\frac{\text{Total Weighted Score}}{\text{Total who rated}}$

“Strongly Agree” was weighted “5” ; “Agree” was weighted “4”; “Neither agree nor disagree” was weighted “3”; “Disagree” was given the weight of “2” and “Strongly Disagree” was weighted “1”. The closer the average is to “5” the closer it is to “Strongly Agree” and the closer it is to “1” the closer it is to “Strongly Disagree”.

- **Crime is undoubtedly considered to be a problem in South Africa. Virtually all respondents (98%) classify it as such.** While some (31%) merely say that they agree that it is a problem, a heavy proportion (67%) emphatically claimed that they strongly agree. The high average rating of 4.65 highlights how intensely South African Jews feel about crime being a problem in South Africa.
- **Corruption is also unequivocally regarded as a problem in South Africa. Virtually all (98%) regard it as such.** While some (34%) said that they agree that it is a problem, the emphasis was distinctly on strongly agree (64%). The high average rating of 4.62 highlights how strongly they feel about the existence of this problem.
- **Personal Safety also clearly emerges as a problem with the majority of the respondents (83%) specifying that this is so.** This splits: strongly agree (53%) and agree (40%). The high average rating of 4.44 positions this factor, overall, between “strongly agree” and “agree” thus emphasising the intensity of the problem.
- **The government should do more for the people of South Africa say the majority of respondents (94%).** Some claimed to agree with this (53%) and some claimed to strongly agree (41%). A high average (4.33) was achieved for extent of agreement with this statement.
- **In the main, there tends to be frequent (but not intense) agreement with the statement that the South African economy is improving.** Almost three-quarters (73%) agree that the economy is improving, with most of these agreeing (62%) rather than strongly agreeing (11%). The remainder are mainly divided between neither agree nor disagree (14%) and disagree (10%). The average rating is 3.74 which positions this factor virtually at the “agree” level.
- **Similarly, there tends to be frequent (but not intense) agreement with the statement I would rather stay in South Africa with the problems that I know than in another country which has its problems too.** Approximately three-quarters (76%) agree but most do not agree strongly i.e. the 76% splits: 19% strongly agree; 57% agree. Here too the remainder are mainly divided between neither agree nor disagree (12%) and disagree (9%) and the average rating (3.85) positions this factor, on an average, virtually at the “agree” level.
- **There are always teething problems when a new government takes over so all things considered, things will work out well in South Africa.** Half (50%) go along with this statement i.e. most of these agree (44%) rather than strongly agree (6%). The remainder veer more towards neither agree nor disagree (31%) than towards disagree/strongly disagree (16%). A small percentage (3%) said “do not know”. An average rating of 3.40 for this statement shows its positioning as being towards the agree side of the scale.

- **Although – in the main – Jewish people in South Africa have not suffered because of affirmative action, they more often viewed it in a negative than in a positive light.**
 - **Approximately two-thirds (68%) disagree with the statement “I personally have suffered because of affirmative action”,** while 20% (one in every five) claim that they have suffered. The remainder did not commit themselves either way (7%) or said “don’t know”/gave no answer (5%). The average rating (2.43) positions the statement on the disagree side of the scale.
 - **Approximately two-thirds (67%) do not think that affirmative action is a good idea** (i.e. 42% disagree with the statement that affirmative action is a good idea and another 15% strongly disagree). The remainder were distributed as follows: 24% agree that it is a good idea (i.e. 21% agree and 3% strongly agree), 18% neither agree nor disagree and 1% “do not know”/gave no answer. The average rating (2.53) positions the statement on the negative side of the scale i.e. towards not thinking affirmative action is a good idea.

A review of the above data by demographic and other breakdowns shows that, overall, what applies to the total sample also applies to subgroups:

- **Crime, corruption and personal safety are clearly perceived as severe problems in South Africa.** This conclusion applies to the sample as a whole and to demographic and other breakdowns.
- **There was also general agreement (at total sample and individual breakdown level) that the government should do more for the people of South Africa.**
- **At the total sample and individual breakdown level, there tends to be frequent agreement with the concept that the South Africa’s economy is improving and with the idea of staying in South Africa with known problems rather than in another country which has its problems too.** Although for both these statements “agree” was emphasized more than “strongly agree”, the findings were undoubtedly positive.
- **What also applies to the sample as a whole and to demographic and other segments is the finding that: Whilst – in the main – Jewish people in South Africa claim not to have suffered because of affirmative action, they more often viewed the idea of affirmative action in a negative than in a positive light.**

F. Future for Jews in South Africa

“There is a good deal of discussion nowadays about the future of South African Jewry. I will read some of the opinions to you. Please say to what extent you agree or disagree with each. CARD: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/No ans.		AVERAGE RATING
Statements: There will still be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa in 20 years	8%	44%	20%	22%	2%	4%	=100%	3.35
The only long term future for Jews is in Israel	7%	20%	13%	53%	6%	1%	=100%	2.70
Only the Orthodox section of the community will survive as recognisably Jewish	5%	22%	9%	54%	8%	2%	=100%	2.61
The South African Jewish community is an ageing community	6%	40%	12%	37%	4%	1%	=100%	3.08
It is likely that most Jews under the age of 30 years do not see a future for themselves in South Africa	7%	44%	18%	26%	2%	3%	=100%	3.28

- **Approximately half think that there will still be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa in 20 years time** (i.e. 52% splitting: 44% agree and 8% strongly agree). The remainder are divided between disagreeing (24% splitting: 22% disagree and 2% strongly disagree) and not committing themselves either way (20% neither agree nor disagree and 4% said “don’t know”/gave no answer). The average rating (3.35) shows the overall positioning as veering more towards the agree than disagree side of the scale.
- **More than twice as many do not think that only the Orthodox section of the community will survive as recognisably Jewish than do think so.** Those disagreeing with the idea that only the Orthodox sector will survive as recognisably Jewish (62% splitting: 54% disagree and 8% strongly disagree) heavily outweigh those agreeing that it will be only the Orthodox sector doing so (27% splitting: 22% agree and 5% strongly agree). The remainder (11%) did not commit themselves either way or said “don’t know”. The average rating (2.61) shows an overall positioning tending more towards disagreeing that only the Orthodox sector will survive as recognisably Jewish.
- **Whether or not the South African Jewish community is an ageing community emerged in a controversial light.** Opinions are divided between agreeing (46% splitting: 40% agree and 6% strongly agree) and disagreeing (41% splitting: 37% agree; 4% strongly agree). The remainder did not commit themselves either way or could not answer. The average rating of 3.08 positions the statement at the “neither agree nor disagree level” overall.

- **There is more of a tendency to think that “most Jews under the age of 30 years do not see a future for themselves in South Africa” than to think otherwise.** Approximately half (51%) agree that most Jews below 30 years of age do not see a future for themselves in South Africa, with most of these agreeing rather than strongly agreeing. The remainder are more likely to disagree (28%) than to be undecided. All scores considered, the overall average rating (3.28) veers towards the agree side of the scale.
- **More than twice as many disagree with the idea that the only long term future for Jews is in Israel than agree with it.** Of the total respondents, 59% disagree about the only long-term future being in Israel (with most of these disagreeing rather than strongly disagreeing). This proportion is more than twice as high as the proportion for “agree” i.e. just over one-quarter (27%) agree that the only long term future for Jews is in Israel (with most of these agreeing rather than strongly agreeing). The remainder neither agreed nor disagreed (13%) or said “don’t know”/no answer (1%). With the disagree score being higher than the other scores combined, it is understandable that the average score (2.70) positions this statement towards the disagree side of the scale.

As can be observed in the foregoing, and as has been mentioned earlier, the average ratings round off the findings but do not show as crisp a version of the results as do the scores on which they are based i.e. the averages tend to blur some of the differences. Nevertheless, for the demographic and other breakdown data below we have shown only average ratings³⁶ since the report would become too cumbersome if we were to show the full score range. The average ratings do allow for overall tendencies and trends to be detected.

³⁶ Average rating = $\frac{\text{Total Weighted Score}}{\text{Total who rated}}$

Strongly agree was weighted “5”; **Agree** was weighted “4”; **Neither agree nor disagree** was weighted “3”; **Disagree** was weighted “2” and **Strongly disagree** “1”. The closer the average is to “5” the closer it is to **Strongly agree** and the closer it is to “1” the closer it is to **Strongly disagree**.

	Total Sample	A G E						C I T Y				RELIGIOUS PRACTICE			
		18-24 yrs	25-34 yrs	35-44 yrs	45-54 yrs	55-64 yrs	65+ yrs	JHB	PTA	CT	DBN	Sec /JJ	Ref/ Prog	Trad.	Str. Orth
<u>Statements:</u> There will still be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa in 20 yrs	3.35	3.34	3.41	3.46	3.25	3.45	3.21	3.44	3.38	3.18	2.96	3.13	3.43	3.32	3.63
The only long-term future for Jews is in Israel	2.70	2.62	2.63	2.53	2.61	2.69	3.01	2.73	3.00	2.48	3.00	2.34	2.03	2.68	3.42
Only the Orthodox section of the community will survive as recognisably Jewish	2.61	2.68	2.70	2.71	2.65	2.62	2.39	2.68	2.88	2.42	2.48	2.44	1.92	2.57	3.33
The South African Jewish community is an ageing community	3.08	2.89	2.83	2.83 →	3.11 →	3.25 →	3.42	2.84	3.82	3.41	3.87	3.30	3.36	3.08	2.82
It is likely that most Jews under age of 30 yrs do not see a future for themselves in South Africa	3.28	3.13	3.01	3.18 →	3.34	3.35 →	3.54	3.22	3.82	3.31	3.29	3.28	3.25	3.33	3.09

Using the “Total Sample” column (1st column) as a basis for comparison, averages in the breakdowns can be evaluated in terms of which scores are above the average shown in the 1st column. In addition the data can be examined to determine trends.

There are some age-related trends :

- **The older the respondents are, the more pessimistic they are about Jewish young people staying in the country and about a balance of age groups being maintained in the South African Jewish community** i.e. in particular it is those over 44 years of age who reflect an increasing tendency to be pessimistic about these issues. In essence, the older the over 44 year olds are, the more likely they are to think that “the South African Jewish community is an ageing community” and the more inclined they are to consider it “likely that most Jews under 30 years do not see a future for themselves in South Africa”.
- **This age-related finding is very interesting since younger Jewish people (i.e. 18-44 year olds and even more so under 35 year olds) are less likely than their older counterparts to think that those under 30 year of age do not see a future for themselves in South**

Africa and correspondingly – under 45 year olds are less likely than their older counterparts to perceive the South African community as an ageing community. This finding bodes well for the future of the South African Jewish community. The finding would be decidedly less positive if younger people did not see a future for themselves in the country!

- **Other factors show no clear and/or meaningful age-related trends**

Within the results for the cities there are some differences:

- **Johannesburg** respondents are more positive than their counterparts in other cities about there still being a substantial Jewish community in South Africa in 20 years and are less likely to classify the South African Jewish community as an ageing community.
- **Pretoria** Jews show a touch more pessimism about the future of Jews in South Africa i.e. they are a bit more inclined than those from other cities to claim that the only long-term future for Jews is in Israel and that only the Orthodox section of the community will survive as recognisably Jewish. However, whilst scoring above average on these factors, the scores are not high i.e. these beliefs are not held intensely. What Pretorians score above average on and feel intensely about is that it is likely that most Jews under 30 years do not see a future for themselves in South Africa and that the South African Jewish community is an ageing community.
- **Cape Town** shows an above average score for claiming that the South African Jewish community is an ageing community but they do not make these claims to the extent that Jews in Pretoria and Durban do. Cape Town Jews are less certain than Johannesburg and Pretoria Jews that there will still be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa in 20 years time.
- **Durban** shows above average scores for claiming that the only long-term future for Jews is in Israel and (particularly) for believing that the South African Jewish community is an ageing community. Also, of all the cities, they are the least likely to think that there will still be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa in 20 years time.

There are differences between the religious practice subgroups:

- **The Strictly Orthodox.** Although they reflect an above average score for thinking that the only long-term future for Jews is in Israel and an above average score for thinking that only the Orthodox sector of the community will survive as recognisably Jewish, what they feel even more strongly is that there will still be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa in 20 years time. They feel more strongly about this 20-years-time scenario than do other sectors and they also feel more strongly about this than they do about any of the other statements checked on here. They reflect a particularly low score for the South African Jewish community being an ageing community i.e. they are

inclined slightly towards the disagree side for this concept. This means that they are more inclined to think that the Jewish community in South Africa is not ageing and fading but instead will survive by maintaining a balanced age presence. Essentially, the Strictly Orthodox sector is more optimistic than are other sectors about the future for South African Jewry, **but** it is the Orthodox sector which they feel more optimistic about.

- **The Traditional sector.** Since they form such a large part of the Jewish population, it is understandable that they set the tone for the overall findings and that the results they reflect tend to be in keeping with the overall findings. As is the case for the overall Jewish population, the Traditionals are a touch more inclined towards thinking that there will still be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa in 20 years time. They are clearly not as intense about this belief as are the Strictly Orthodox or Progressive/Reform. As is the case for the sample as a whole – on an average – the Traditionals are not convinced that the only long-term future for Jews is in Israel, that only the Orthodox section of the community will survive as recognisably Jewish and that the South African Jewish community is an ageing community. They do tend to feel a touch more strongly than other sectors that it is likely that most Jews under the age of 30 years do not see a future for themselves in South Africa. However, even though they tend to feel this a bit more than do the other sectors, they do not feel this intensely i.e. the score for this factor veers a touch towards “agree” but closer to “neither agree nor disagree side”.
- **The Reform/Progressive sector.** Whilst believing more than do other sectors that the Jewish community in South Africa is an ageing community, they also agree to an above average extent (even if not to the extent that the Strictly Orthodox do) that in 20 years time there will be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa. They believe to a below average extent that the long term future for all Jews is in Israel and – understandably - reflect a decidedly below average belief that only the Orthodox sector of the community will survive as recognisably Jewish.
- **The Secular sector** also reflect above average agreement with the ageing South African Jewish community concept and they are less likely than other sectors to think that the Jewish community will be substantial in 20 years time.

Have there been overall changes since 1998 with regard to the perceived future of the Jewish community in South Africa? The summary table below clearly shows the comparison between the overall 1998 and 2005 study results.

		Strongly Agree/ Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Strongly Disagree/ Agree	DK/No answer	=100%	AVERAGE RATING
<u>Statements:</u> There will still be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa in 20 years	2005	52%	20%	24%	4%	=100%	3.35
	1998	21%	16%	61%	2%	=100%	2.45
The only long term future for Jews is in Israel	2005	27%	13%	59%	1%	=100%	2.70
	1998	33%	20%	46%	1%	=100%	2.89
Only the Orthodox section of the community will survive as recognisably Jewish	2005	27%	9%	62%	2%	=100%	2.61
	1998	28%	17%	53%	2%	=100%	2.72
The South African Jewish community is an ageing community	2005	46%	12%	41%	1%	=100%	3.08
	1998	65%	12%	22%	1%	=100%	3.55
It is likely that most Jews under the age of 30 years do not see a future for themselves in South Africa	2005	51%	18%	28%	3%	=100%	3.28
	1998	86%	8%	5%	1%	=100%	4.08

- **In the main South African Jews are far more positive about the future of the Jewish community in South Africa than they were in 1998! This applies to every factor checked on for this section. More specifically:**
- **“There will still be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa in 20 years”:** In 1998 there was more of a tendency to disagree with this, whereas in 2005 there is a sizeable move to the agreement side. There is, of course, still work to be done to intensify this perception.
- **“The South African Jewish community is an ageing community”:** In 1998 the main tendency was to regard the South African Jewish community as an ageing community but in 2005 we see divided opinions rather than clearcut perceptions in this regard. This shows that now – as compared to 7 years ago - there is less pessimism amongst South African Jews as regards young people staying in the country rather than emigrating. This change in perceptions is a step forward. A further move towards distinctly clearcut optimism about the potential for an age-balanced Jewish community would be an advantage.

- “It is likely that most Jews under the age of 30 years do not see a future for themselves in South Africa”: Tying in with the results for the previous statement we observe that in 1998 there was overwhelming agreement with the statement that under 30 year old Jews do not see a future for themselves in South Africa yet 7 years later (in 2005) there is a dramatic drop in the extent of agreement with the idea that young Jewish people see no future for themselves in South Africa. A further drop in agreement with the statement would, of course, be desirable as this would indicate intensification of the belief that the Jewish community in South Africa will be age-balanced rather than ageing in the future.
- “The only long term future for Jews is in Israel”: This is a complex statement because it incorporates attitudes to Israel and (indirectly) whether there is a future for Jews in South Africa. The differences between the 1998 results and the 2005 results are thus not dramatic. There is however a tendency for more disagreement in 2005 than in 1998 with the idea of Israel – in the long term - being the only country for Jews to live in. This could mean greater satisfaction with South Africa now and/or a less positive attitude to Israel. That there is a more positive attitude to South Africa now cannot be denied as has been shown thus far in the report. Attitudes to Israel will be dealt with in detail later on in the report.
- “Only the Orthodox section of the community will survive as recognisably Jewish”: Here too we are looking at a complex factor. In fact this factor is even more complex. It incorporates attitudes to the Orthodox sector/Orthodoxy, perceptions of their attitudes to living in South Africa, perceptions of attitudes of the non-Orthodox to living in South Africa, underlying implications of non-Orthodox sectors of the community veering away from Judaism etc. Because of the complexity of this factor, the results for 2005 do not differ dramatically from those for 1998. In 1998 those who would commit themselves were more likely to disagree than agree with the idea that only the Orthodox sector will survive in South Africa. In 2005 this tendency is intensified.

IV. MIGRANTS WHO HAVE RETURNED

A. Proportion who emigrated but returned

Only respondents currently resident in South Africa were interviewed in the 2005 study. We established the proportion who had emigrated from 1982 onwards but returned³⁷ i.e. “Since January 1982 did you ever leave South Africa with the intention of settling in another country?”

³⁷ The 1998 survey checked on the period 1975 to the latter part of 1998 (almost 24 years). For comparability, we also checked on a period of almost 24 years (1982 to the latter part of 2005). Comparisons with the 1998 survey data will be made later on in the report.

- **91% claimed that they had made no attempt to emigrate since January 1982** (i.e. 90% unequivocally said that during the stated period they had not left South Africa with the intention of settling in another country. A further 1% said that prior to 1982 they had been living in another country i.e. either they had originally lived elsewhere and then come to live in South Africa or they had left South Africa prior to 1982 but then came back sometime after 1982 and had made no attempt to leave again).
- **8% (or more specifically 8.4%) had actually left since January 1982, with the intention of settling in another country, but had returned.**
- **1% had gone to look elsewhere with the possibility of emigrating but had returned.** They went overseas “just to look” because they had considered leaving, but they decided not to go and did not actually move there.
- **A check on the demographic details relating to the 8% who had “left but returned” showed that:**
 - there are no sizeable male-female differences as regards proportion who left but returned (i.e. 8% of males and 9% of females fell into this category)
 - the 25-54 year age category shows higher scores for “emigrating but returning” than do those below or above this age category.
 - In Cape Town a higher percentage “left but returned” i.e. Johannesburg (8%), Pretoria (4%), Cape Town (11%), Durban (8%). However, because Johannesburg has a much higher proportion of Jews (and thus comprised a higher proportion of the sample), in real terms more from Johannesburg actually “left but returned” i.e. almost twice as many of those who left but returned came from Johannesburg as came from Cape Town. More specifically, of the 84 who left but returned: 60% were from Johannesburg, 33% were from Cape Town, 5% were from Durban, 2% were from Pretoria.

When comparing 1998 and 2005 data for the questions relating to “emigrating and returning” it should be borne in mind that we are drawing from two periods which are not mutually exclusive. 1975-1998 and 1982-2005 overlap for 1982-1998.

Of the current Jewish adult population in South Africa, the bulk (91%) have not (during the last 24 yrs) “emigrated and returned” from this country, 8% have “emigrated and returned” and 1% have “been to look” but not emigrated. Comparable scores in the 1998 survey for the preceding 24 year period were: 87% did not “emigrate and return”, 13% did “emigrate and return”. The hint that emigration accompanied by subsequent returning could have decreased slightly in the last few years requires investigation and/or checking within other more specific data available to Jewish community organisations.

B. Countries went to

Those (8%) who emigrated from 1982 onwards but came back to live in South Africa were asked: "To which country did you go?"

Of the 84 respondents who left from 1982 onwards but returned:

- 33% went to Israel
- 18% went to the USA
- 18% went to Australia
- 17% went to the United Kingdom
- 5% went to Canada
- 9% went to other countries/regions (e.g. each mentioned by less than 1% were: New Zealand, Germany, other countries in Europe, countries in Sub-Saharan Africa other than South Africa).

These findings must be interpreted with care. They do not indicate which countries are the most popular because we only know which countries they emigrated to but subsequently left i.e. our sample only covers those who emigrated but returned and are now resident in South Africa again. We do not have data relating to those who emigrated but did not return. If, for example more emigrated to Israel than to Canada it could explain why the Israel return score is higher than the one for Canada. If, on the other hand, more emigrated to Canada yet Canada's return score is lower than that reflected for Israel, then it may mean that there is greater satisfaction with Canada than with Israel i.e. because Canada is better able to hold onto those who go to live there.

C. When emigrated

When the 8% who had left and returned over the 24 year period are split (according to when they left) into three groups, each comprising 8 years, we see:

- 3.4% had left during the period 1982 -1989
- 2.5% had left during 1990 -1997
- 2.5% had left during 1998 - 2005³⁸
(with this splitting: 1.6% for 1998-2001 and 0.9% for 2002-2005)

Essentially the data shows that of all those who emigrated and returned within the 24 year period (1982-2005), similar proportions left within each successive seven year period. Because the base is so small, there is no statistical difference between the proportions falling into each 7 year period.

³⁸ This period was not quite 8 years because interviewing was conducted during 2005 rather than after 2005.

D. When returned

When the 8% who had left and returned over the 24 year period are split (according to when they returned) into three groups, each comprising 8 years, we see the following:

- 2.1% returned during the period 1982-1989
- 2.1% during the period 1990-1997 and
- 4.2% during 1998-2005 (1998-2000 1.68%; 2001-2005 2.52%)

Because the base is so small, there is no statistical difference between the proportions falling into each 7 year period. However, there is a hint (but hint only) that returns during the last few years could have intensified. Unfortunately, conclusions in this regard cannot be drawn from this study. A survey comprising a suitable sample of returnees would have to be conducted to investigate this fully and accurately.

E. Reasons underlying leaving South Africa and reasons for coming back

Those (84 respondents) who had left and returned were asked:

“Why did you leave South Africa inYEAR IN WHICH LEFT? What made you decide to go?” And then:

“Why did you return to South Africa? What made you decide to come back?”

Some returnees spontaneously gave one reason for having left and some gave more, with the average being 1.6 reasons per returnee. Similarly, some gave one reason for coming back and some gave more, with an average number of 1.7 reasons being given for coming back.

REASONS FOR LEAVING			REASONS FOR RETURNING		
		Total (84=100%)	Total (84=100%)		
Attitudes to SA		62%	39%	Attitudes to SA	
Worries about future of SA	39%			6%	New govt./improvement in country
	-			13%	Love of SA
Personal safety concerns	14%			13%	Roots here/settled here/ place of birth/familiarity/ used to it/ its my home
Quality of life for children/ thought couldn't safely raise children here	5%			4%	Climate better here
Political situation	2%			1%	Easier life here
Education of children	2%			2%	Education of children better here
Career/Financial		43%	60%	Career/Financial	
Career move	26%			35%	Career/business better for me here/couldn't find suitable job/occupation there
Financial/To improve finances	10%			14%	Difficult to manage there financially
Economy/Economic situation here	7%			11%	Standard of living better here
Family/friends		25%	51%	Family/friends	
To be with family already settled there	11%			36%	To be back with family here
Parents/other family members were going so no choice/choice not by me	10%			10%	Family problems made it necessary for me to be back
To be with friends	4%			5%	To be back with friends
Israel		17%	3%	Israel	
To live in Israel	11%			2%	Poor political situation/ developments in Israel
Pro-Zionist	5%			-	
Religious and wanted to live that life	1%			1%	Disillusioned with religious life in Israel/double standards
Personal/ personal interest		8%	13%	Personal/ personal interest	
Out of interest/see what its about/change in life-style/just to look/travel	6%			-	
Personal reasons	2%			4%	Personal reasons
	-			4%	Health/mobility problems so had to come back
	-			4%	Marriage/ met husband/wife so came back and stayed
	-			1%	To study further
Other		6%	4%	Other	
Other	6%			2%	Other
	-			2%	Couldn't get in/ not allowed to stay there

When looking at the above reasons for leaving South Africa, we observe that:

- **62% (i.e. approximately 6 in every 10) of those who left South Africa to settle elsewhere, claimed to have left because of the situation in South Africa.** The main concern was for the overall future of South Africa. In addition some specified concerns about personal safety and some spoke specifically about concerns relating to their children (e.g. as regards quality of life, safety and education). Other comments relating to South Africa featured less prominently.
- **43% gave reasons relating to their careers and/or financial aspects.** In the main they wanted to further their careers/make a career move or they wanted to improve their financial situation. A small proportion specifically claimed that the South African economy was a reason for their wanting to leave.
- **25% left to be with family or friends, but – as can be observed- family featured far more prominently than did friends. The 25% splits as follows : 21% mentioned family and 4% mentioned friends.** Those going to be with family were split between those who were going to join family who were already there and those who had no choice but to go because their parents or other family members were going.
- **17% gave reasons relating to Israel. Essentially, they wanted to live in Israel/were Zionistic.** A small proportion (1%) spoke of being religious and wanting to live the religious life in Israel.
- **8% gave reasons relating to their personal interests/stage of life/ personal situation.** They spoke of spoke of leaving to explore personal interests, experiencing other countries and lifestyles etc. A few were not specific and merely cited “personal reasons” for having left South Africa.
- **Clearly, when emigrating from South Africa, the emigrants had the negatives relating to South Africa uppermost in their minds. The second most important factor centered around their hopes for an improvement in their careers and/or finances.** The reason which was third in line was related to joining family who had or were going to emigrate. Next in line was the appeal of Israel (obviously expressed by some of those who went to Israel). In addition a small sector added that they emigrated for personal reasons, particularly an interest in other countries, travel, other lifestyles and experiences.

Looking at why they returned to live in South Africa, we observe that:

- **60% (i.e. 6 in every 10) mentioned the career/financial factor.** In essence those who gave this answer claimed that South Africa offers them better career and business opportunities and a better standard of living than did the other countries where it was difficult to find suitable jobs/occupations and thus difficult to manage financially.
- **51% claimed that they came back to be with family or friends but once again it is primarily family which features rather than friends.** The 51% splits: 46% mentioned family and 5% mentioned friends.

- **39% gave “pro-South Africa” reasons**, primarily focusing on their strong attachment to South Africa. They expressed a “love of South Africa” and spoke of “having roots here.... settled here...place of birth...familiarity ... used to it.....its my home”. A few added that South Africa has/offers a better climate, better education for children, easier life.
- **13% claimed to have come back for personal reasons**, with some being specific and stating health/mobility problems, getting married and coming back to live in South Africa, coming back to study further etc.
- **3% claimed to have come back from Israel because of dissatisfaction with some aspect there** e.g. the political situation or the quality of religious life.
- **Undoubtedly there was disappointment with regard to making it careerwise and financially in other countries. This was the main reason given for returning. Next in line, but also very important, is the finding that the presence of family back in South Africa was a major drawcard. Third in line, but also featuring strongly, are generally positive attitudes to South Africa** which they described as a country : they love, are familiar with, they have their roots in, which is their home etc. Personal reasons for returning feature next in line but at a much lower level of importance.

The base of returnees is too small for meaningful demographic analysis or for detailed comparison with 1998 data as to countries emigrated to but returned from or proportions leaving or returning within specific periods. We also cannot compare 2005 reasons for leaving and/or returning with 1998 data since the question was not asked in 1998.

V. LIKELIHOOD OF MOVING WITHIN AND FROM SOUTH AFRICA WITH RELATED PREFERENCES, REASONS AND ATTITUDES

A. Likelihood of moving from current address:

All respondents were asked: “Do you think it is very likely, somewhat likely or not at all likely that you will move from this address within the next three years?”

	Total Respondents 1000=100%
<u>Likelihood of moving from current address in next three years:</u>	
Very likely	20%
Somewhat likely	20%
Not at all likely	57%
Don't know	3%
Total	100%

- Thus, almost 6 in every 10 (57%) would be unlikely to move at all in the next three years, 20% would be very likely to do so and 20% somewhat likely to do so. The remaining 3% said “don’t know”.
- Who, demographically-speaking, are those “very likely to move”?

WOULD BE VERY LIKELY TO MOVE FROM CURRENT ADDRESS														
Total Respondents 1000= 100%	A G E						C I T Y				MARITAL STATUS			
	18-24 yrs 115= 100%	25-34 yrs 159= 100%	35-44 yrs 167= 100%	45-54 yrs 171= 100%	55-64 yrs 176= 100%	65+ yrs 212= 100%	Jhb 650= 100%	Pta 50= 100%	CT 250= 100%	Dbn 50= 100%	Marr. 571= 100%	Div. 82= 100%	Single 230= 100%	Widowed 93= 100%
<u>Very likely to move from current address</u> 20%	33%	43%	17%	13%	8%	14%	20%	22%	22%	6%	14%	15%	37%	13%

- Durban reflects a sizeably below average score for being “very likely” to move from the current address, while other cities show essentially average scores of 20%-22%.
- The tendency to claim that they will be “very likely” to move, is far greater amongst 18-24 year olds and 25-34 year olds than amongst other sectors.
- The single people are the ones showing above average scores. Other sectors fall below average for being “very likely” to move.
- In summary, those “very likely” to move are often single and 18-34 years of age.
- Has the likelihood of moving increased or decreased in the last 7 years?

	2005 Total Respondents 1000=100%	1998 Total Respondents 1000=100%
<u>Likelihood of moving from current address in next three years:</u>		
Very likely	20%	29%
Somewhat likely	20%	22%
Not at all likely	57%	44%
Don't know	3%	5%
Total	100%	100%

- Overall, there has been a decrease in the tendency to consider moving from the current abode. In 1998: 44% claimed that they are not at all likely to move, 22% said somewhat likely to move and 29% very likely. The comparable 2005 score for not being likely to move (57%) is higher than for 1998 and the likely to move scores lower: somewhat likely to move (20%) and very likely (20%).

B. Likelihood of moving: within own city, to another city, to another country

Irrespective of whether they would consider moving or not in the next three years, all respondents were asked: “If you were to move in the next three years, do you think it would be to another address in this city, elsewhere in South Africa or to another country?”

	Total Respondents 1000=100%
<u>Irrespective of whether would move or not, if were to do so, would move to:</u>	
Address in this city	68%
Elsewhere in SA	9%
Another country	14%
Don't Know	8%
Refused/won't move	1%
Total	100%

- **The bulk (68% i.e. almost 7 in every 10) spoke of an address in the same city as they were living in**, while 9% said “elsewhere in South Africa”, 14% mentioned “another country”, 8% said “don’t know” and 1% refused to speak hypothetically because of being adamant about not moving.
- How do the demographic subgroups compare in this regard?

	Total 1000= 100%	A G E						C I T Y				M A R I T A L S T A T U S			
		18-24 yrs 115= 100%	25-34 yrs 159= 100%	35-44 yrs 167= 100%	45-54 yrs 171= 100%	55-64 yrs 176= 100%	65+ yrs 212= 100%	Jhb 650= 100%	Pta 50= 100%	CT 250= 100%	Dnb 50= 100%	Marr. 571= 100%	Div. 82= 100%	Single 230= 100%	Wid. 93= 100%
Address in this city	68%	58%	74%	75%	68%	67%	66%	68%	58%	72%	60%	69%	68%	67%	71%
Elsewhere in SA	9%	12%	8%	7%	9%	12%	7%	8%	14%	8%	20%	8%	6%	11%	10%
Another country	14%	24%	12%	11%	16%	14%	13%	15%	24%	11%	14%	14%	17%	16%	8%
DK/ No Ans.	9%	6%	6%	7%	7%	7%	14%	9%	4%	9%	6%	9%	9%	6%	11%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- **All demographic subgroups spoke primarily of an “address in their own city” but there were some subgroup differences.** The 25-44 year olds were particularly emphatic about choosing an address in their own city. 18-24 year olds also emphasised staying in their city but in addition they show an above average tendency - in comparison with other age groups - to want to venture from their city i.e. either elsewhere in South Africa (or more so) to another country. Capetonians tended to be more

- emphatic than those from other cities about staying in their own city. Those from Pretoria and Durban also emphasised staying in their own city but in addition showed a sizeable tendency to (hypothetically) move elsewhere. For Pretoria leaving the country has more attraction than moving to another city in South Africa, while for those in Durban the “elsewhere in South Africa” option has sizeable appeal.
- How does 2005 data compare with 1998 data - have there been changes in likelihood of moving: within city, intercity and to other countries?

	2005 Total Respondents 1000=100%	1998 Total Respondents 1000=100%
<u>Irrespective of whether would move or not, if were to do so, would move to:</u>		
Address in this city	68%	44%
Elsewhere in SA	9%	9%
Another country	14%	35%
Don't Know	8%	11%
Refused/won't move	1%	<0.5%
Total	100%	100%

- **Overall, the likelihood of moving away from South Africa has decreased and staying in the current city of abode has become a more popular option than it was 7 years ago.** In 1998 respondents were – generally speaking – more likely to move to another address in their own city (44%) than to move to another country (35%), but the “other country” score was not dramatically lower. However, in 2005 a very different picture emerges i.e. a very high proportion (68%) opted for another address in their own city and only 14% selected the “other country” option. The elsewhere in South Africa score is and was 9%.

C. Suburb preferences and City preferences

In the 2005 study, everyone, irrespective of whether likely to move or not, was asked: “If you were to move elsewhere in this city, which suburb would you be most likely to move to?” AND “If you were to move elsewhere in South Africa which city would you be most likely to move to?”

Suburb most likely to move to:

- **Overall, 49% (approximately half) did not mention a suburb** i.e. 40% refused and/or said that they would not move and 9% said “don't know”. Looking at the data separately for each city we observe:
- **In Johannesburg, 48% did not mention a suburb.** This splits as follows: 35% insisted they “would not move”, 12% said that they “don't know” which suburb they would move to, 1% spoke of a retirement home without specifying the suburb. The remainder did mention suburbs, with Glenhazel

- (12%) and Morningside (8%) reflecting the highest scores. Full evaluation of suburb data will not be undertaken in this report³⁹.
- **In Cape Town 55% did not mention a suburb.** This splits as follows: 49% insisted that they “would not move”, 4% said that they “don’t know” which suburb they would move to, 2% spoke of a retirement home without specifying the suburb. The remainder did mention suburbs, with Sea Point (12%) reflecting the highest score and no other suburb scoring more than 3%.
 - **In Pretoria 50% did not mention a suburb.** This splits as follows: 46% insisted that they “would not move” and 4% spoke of a retirement home without specifying the suburb. The remainder did mention suburbs, with Groenkloof (32%) reflecting the highest score and no other suburb scoring more than 8%.
 - **In Durban 56% did not mention a suburb** i.e. 54% emphatically stated that they “will not move” and 2% mentioned that they would move to a retirement home without specifying the suburb. The remainder did mention suburbs, with Berea-Musgrave and Umhlanga Rocks each scoring 12% and no other suburb scoring more than 6%.

The following is a comparison of 1998 and 2005 data relating to “suburb most likely to move to”:

	2005 Total Respondents 1000=100%	1998 Total Respondents 1000=100%
<u>Irrespective of whether would move elsewhere in own city, if were to do so, which SUBURB⁴⁰ likely to move to:</u>		
Refused to give suburb/would not move	40%	40%
Do not know	9%	6%
Mentioned suburb	51%	54%
Total	100%	100%

- **Thus, there has not been much change as regards willingness or otherwise to mention a suburb which would (hypothetically) be considered for moving to within the city of abode.** In 1998, 54% mentioned a suburb in their city which they would (hypothetically) consider moving to if they were to move within their city, while 46% did not mention a suburb (i.e. 40% refused/claimed that they would not move and 6% said “do not know”). In 2005 the scores are similar: 51% mentioned a suburb

³⁹ Full evaluation of suburb data for each of the cities can be undertaken if necessary by examining the suburb and broader suburb groupings for: (i) where they reside at the moment (ii) in relation to where they would consider moving to.

⁴⁰ Detailed suburb data per city can be obtained from the tabular reports. The suburb data will be more meaningful if taken to the suburb grouping level rather than individual suburb level since individual suburbs did not obtain high scores.

while 49% did not (i.e. 40% refused/claimed that they would not move and 9% said “do not know”).

However, whilst there may not be sizeable overall changes in terms of reluctance to mention a suburb, there are differences when we look at the results within city.

DID NOT NAME A SUBURB WOULD MOVE TO:		
	2005	1998
Of Total sample	49%	46%
Of JHB sample	48%	38%
Of CT sample	55%	60%
Of PTA sample	50%	64%
Of DBN sample	56%	62%

In 1998 Cape Town, Pretoria and Durban displayed decidedly above average reluctance to move from their suburb. In 2005, Cape Town and Durban still show above average reluctance. However, Pretoria shows a greater readiness to move than it did in 1998, while Johannesburg shows the reverse trend i.e. they are not as ready to move from their suburb now as they were in 1998. More specifically, in Johannesburg the reluctance to name a suburb is greater now than it was in 1998.

City most likely to move to

- **Approximately one-third (34%) of the total sample insisted that they will not move, with a further 2% saying “don’t know”. The remainder did mention where they would move to if they were to move from the city they currently reside in. It is appropriate to show this data by the city they currently live in rather than in total.**

	CITY CURRENTLY LIVE IN:			
	Jhb 650=100%	Pta 50=100%	CT 250=100%	Dbn 50=100%
<u>If were to move to another city, would move to :</u>				
Cape Town	52%	38%	N/A	52%
Johannesburg	N/A	50%	28%	26%
Durban/Umhlanga/Natal	8%	4%	4%	N/A
Plettenberg Bay	3%	2%	2%	-
Knysna/George/Garden Route/Wilderness	1%	-	2%	-
Pretoria	1%	N/A	1%	4%
Port Elizabeth	<0.5%	2%	1%	2%
Other mentions	2%	-	6%	4%
Will not move	32%	4%	52%	12%
Don't know	1%	-	4%	-

- **Capetonians were the most emphatic about not moving to another city i.e. over half (52%) of those living in Cape Town insisted that they would not move and a further 4% claimed that they do not know/**

- could not name a city that they would move to. Those who did specify a city they would move to, more often mentioned Johannesburg than any other city/place i.e. of the total living in Cape Town, 28% (i.e. over one-quarter) referred to Johannesburg as a place they would move to. No one other city/place was mentioned by more than 4% of those from Cape Town.
- **Those from Johannesburg also reflected a sizeable “will not move” score (32%) and 1% for “don’t know”, but – as can be observed –they are less emphatically bound to their current city of abode than were their Cape Town counterparts. In fact, those from Johannesburg were more likely to specify Cape Town as a city they would move to (52%) than to claim that they will not move from Johannesburg!** Other options of cities/places those from Johannesburg would consider moving to come in at a much lower level i.e. 8% or below.
 - **Durban respondents found it easy to mention a city they would move to. Only 12% said “would not move”. A high proportion opted for Cape Town (52%); Johannesburg (26%) was next in line as a choice; and no other city/place scored more than 4%.**
 - **Those from Pretoria readily mentioned a city they would move to. Only 4% claimed that they would not move. Their main choice was Johannesburg (50%), with Cape Town next in line (38%) and all other cities/places each scoring 4% or lower.**

Comparison of 1998 and 2005 city data is shown below.

	2005 Total Respondents 1000=100%	1998 Total Respondents 1000=100%
<u>Irrespective of whether would move elsewhere in SA or not, if were to do so, which CITY likely to move to:</u>		
Will not move	34%	34%
Do not know	2%	4%
Mentioned city	64%	62%
Total	100%	100%

- **There has also not been much overall change as regards their willingness or otherwise to mention a South African city (other than their own) which they would (hypothetically) consider moving to if they were to move to another city.** In 1998, 62% mentioned a city which they would (hypothetically) consider moving to if they were to move to another city in South Africa, while 38% did not mention a city (i.e. 34% refused/claimed that they would not move and 4% said “do not know”). The 2005 scores are similar: 64% mentioned a city, 36% did not (i.e. 34% refused/claimed that they would not move and 2% said “do not know”).

Thus, as was the case for readiness to move to other suburbs, we see that with regard to readiness to move to other cities: Overall there has not been a significant change from 1998 to 2005, but there are changes within city.

DID NOT NAME A CITY WOULD MOVE TO:		
	2005	1998
Of Total sample	36%	38%
Of JHB sample	33%	25%
Of CT sample	56%	79%
Of PTA sample	4%	24%
Of DBN sample	12%	6%

Those in Johannesburg exhibit slightly less readiness (i.e. a bit more reluctance) in 2005 as compared to 1998 to mention another city they would move to; in 1998 those in Durban found it exceptionally easy to mention a city they would move to – they find it almost as easy now; those in Cape Town dug their heels in in 1998 (79% did not mention a city they would move to) – in 2005 they are not as intense about this (56%) but the score is still high and indicates that they still display an above average tendency not to name another city i.e. a greater reluctance to move from their city than displayed by those from other cities.

D. Country preferences

All respondents were asked: "If you were to move to another country, which country would you be most likely to move to? And which country would be your 2nd choice? And your 3rd choice?"

	First choice country 1000=100%	Total mentioned country (1 st , 2 nd or 3 rd) 1000=100%
Australia	31%	61%
United States	21%	55%
Israel	23%	51%
United Kingdom	13%	38%
Canada	4%	18%
New Zealand	2%	8%
Germany	<0.5%	1%
Other Europe	2%	7%
Sub-Saharan Africa (incl. Zimbabwe, Zambia, Zaire)	<0.5%	1%
Eastern Europe	<0.5%	<0.5%
Other	1%	2%
Don't Know	3%	3%

- **Australia is the most popular choice.** It is the first choice country for approximately three in every ten (31%). Furthermore when we look at the total mentions (i.e. a total of 1st, 2nd and 3rd choice), Australia is in the lead.

- It was mentioned by 61% (six in every ten respondents) as one of the top three countries they would consider moving to.
- **The United States and Israel tend to share the second position.** Each is the first choice country of approximately two in every ten i.e. Israel (23%) and USA (21%). At the total mentions level (viz. 1st, 2nd and 3rd choice), USA scores 55% and Israel 51%. This means that just over half mentioned Israel as one of the top three countries they would consider. Similarly, just over half mentioned the USA in this way.
 - **United Kingdom is next in line but at a noticeably lower level,** with 13% giving it as their first choice and a total of 38% mentioning it as one of their top three choices.
 - **Canada follows decidedly below the United Kingdom.** It was the first choice for 4% but, considering all three mentions, it scored 18% overall.
 - **All other countries obtained lower scores.**
 - We have dealt with the countries respondents would move to, hypothetically-speaking, if they were to move to another country. Looking specifically (in the tabulation which follows) at the “first choice” country by age and city breakdowns we observe that:
 - **Whilst overall Australia emerges as the most popular choice, with the USA and Israel sharing the second position and the UK next in line,**
 - **Amongst 18-24 year olds,** the USA followed by the UK are the top scorers, with Australia next in line and then Israel. The 25-34 year olds however reflect a score pattern similar to that exhibited by the total sample.
 - **35-44 year olds and 45-54 year olds** emphasise Australia to an above average extent. For the former the USA is next in line and then Israel, while for the latter the USA and Israel share the second position
 - **55-64 year olds and those 65 years and older** emphasise Israel to an above average extent as the first choice country, with Australia following.
 - Within city, **Pretoria** shows an above average preference for Israel; while **Cape Town** and **Durban** show an above average preference for Australia. In Cape Town the UK features more than it does in other cities but Australia is dominant. Because the **Johannesburg** sector of the sample is so big, the Johannesburg score pattern tends not to differ sizeably from the total score pattern.

	FIRST CHOICE COUNTRY 1000=100%	A G E						C I T Y			
		18-24 yrs 115= 100%	25-34 yrs 159= 100%	35-44 yrs 167= 100%	45-54 yrs 171= 100%	55-64 yrs 176= 100%	65+ yrs 212= 100%	Jhb 650= 100%	Pta 50= 100%	CT 250= 100%	Dbn 50= 100%
Australia	31%	18%	30%	38%	43%	27%	26%	30%	18%	34%	42%
United States	21%	31%	21%	23%	19%	15%	20%	23%	22%	17%	10%
Israel	23%	14%	22%	17%	18%	32%	28%	24%	36%	15%	22%
United Kingdom	13%	24%	14%	11%	9%	15%	10%	11%	12%	19%	12%
Canada	4%	1%	6%	4%	5%	4%	6%	5%	4%	5%	4%
Other (e.g. Europe, New Zealand, Africa, eastern Europe, Europe)	5%	12%	5%	3%	2%	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%
Don't Know	3%	-	2%	4%	4%	3%	6%	2%	4%	5%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The following is a comparison of 1998 and 2005 data for countries “most likely to move to”.

	2005 Total Respondents 1000=100%	1998 Total Respondents 1000=100%
<u>Irrespective of whether would move to another country or not, if were to do so, which COUNTRY most likely⁴¹ to move to:</u>		
Australia	31%	27%
Israel	23%	27%
United States	21%	20%
United Kingdom	13%	13%
Canada	4%	5%
New Zealand	2%	1%
Other (mentioned by less than 1% each)	3%	1%
Don't Know	3%	6%
Total	100%	100%

- **Changes relating to countries they would hypothetically move to - if they were to move to another country - were also (uncannily) minimal when examined within the sample as a whole! There is however a hint (even if a hint only) that Israel could slip slightly as a country to emigrate to. This should be checked on for validity rather than ignored i.e. Australia, Israel and the USA occupied the top three slots in 1998 and still do in 2005, with the UK next in line. However, the difference is that while Australia and Israel shared the top slot in 1998, Australia has risen above Israel to first place now and Israel has moved down to share**

⁴¹ In the 2005 survey, respondents were asked to mention the country they would be most likely to move to as well as their second and third choices. However, in the 1998 survey only the first choice was dealt with. Thus, in the above tabulation we only deal with first choice results.

the next slot with the USA. It should be borne in mind that these results are hypothetical i.e. all respondents (irrespective of whether they would consider emigrating or not) indicated where they would move to **if** they were to move. Nevertheless, the findings should be investigated further where relevant.

We have examined 2005 data in comparison with 1998 data as regards likelihood of moving from the current address and where they would (hypothetically) move to if they were to move: within their own city, to another South African city or to another country. Essentially, there has been an overall decrease in the tendency to consider moving from their current abode and if (hypothetically-speaking) they were to move, this move is far less likely than in 1998 to be to another country i.e. it is far more likely to be to an address in the city where they currently live. As discussed, intercity differences do occur for 1998 in comparison with 2005.

E. Likelihood of staying in/leaving South Africa, reasons and attitudes.

(i) Likelihood of continuing to stay in South Africa or leaving

We have dealt with the results for the question wherein all respondents – irrespective of whether they intend moving or not – were asked whether they would be more likely to move within their city of abode, to another city or to another country. However, for a better fix on likelihood of staying in or leaving South Africa a further question was asked:

“Thinking of the next five years which of the following alternatives comes closest to what applies to you: very likely that will continue living in South Africa, fairly likely that will continue living in South Africa, fairly likely that will leave South Africa to live elsewhere, very likely that will leave South Africa to live elsewhere?”

- **The responses were overwhelmingly oriented towards continuing to live in South Africa in the next five years:**
 - **79%** said that they were very likely to continue living in South Africa in the next five years
 - **13%** claimed to be fairly likely to continue living in South Africa
 - 4% chose the fairly likely to leave option
 - 3% claimed to be very likely to leave
 - 1% said ‘don’t know’/gave no answer

- **Thus 92% claimed to be likely to continue living in South Africa in the next five years and the bulk of these claimed to be “very” rather than merely “fairly” likely to be doing so! Only 7% mentioned that they are likely to leave with this splitting: 4% fairly likely to leave and 3% very likely to leave. Overall these results bode extremely well for South African Jewry.**

- **Who – demographically-speaking - are those very/fairly likely to leave? And those very/fairly likely to stay? And how does the profile of each of these sectors compare with the total sample profile?**

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Total Very/fairly likely to stay 924=100%	Total Very/Fairly likely to leave 69=100%
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	46%	46%	49%
Female	54%	54%	51%
<u>Age</u>			
18-24 yrs	11%	10%	32%
25-34 yrs	16%	15%	26%
35-44 yrs	17%	17%	12%
45-54 yrs	17%	18%	11%
55-64 yrs	18%	18%	9%
65+ yrs	21%	22%	10%
<u>City</u>			
Jhb	65%	65%	57%
Pta	5%	5%	10%
CT	25%	25%	30%
Durban	5%	5%	3%

- The proportion likely to leave is so low that the results for the very/fairly likely to leave sector are based on a small sub-sample (i.e. only 69 respondents). The comparisons between the profiles should thus be handled with caution.
- **Those very/fairly likely to stay are well-balanced in accordance with the total sample profile.**
- **Those very/fairly likely to leave hint (but not to a statistically-significant extent) at slight over-representation of males i.e. a slightly greater tendency for males to claim that they are likely to leave.** However, even if this tendency was statistically significant, the likely-to-leave sector is so small that it does not upset the male-female balance of those likely to stay.
- **Age-wise the 18-34 year sector shows a greater tendency to claim that they are likely to leave,** hence an over-representation of this age sector in the profile of those likely to leave but again no significant effect on the age profile of those likely to stay.
- **Pretoria and Cape Town reflect over-representation in the “likely to leave” profile (i.e. a greater tendency towards leaving) and – correspondingly – Johannesburg and Durban show some under-representation (i.e. less of a tendency towards leaving). This should however all be seen in context i.e. the proportion likely to leave is, overall, very small.**

Earlier on in the report we discussed the countries respondents claimed that they would be likely to go to **if** they were to emigrate i.e. most were talking

hypothetically about emigration. Since we have now isolated a sector claiming to be very/fairly likely to emigrate, it is worth checking on how this sector differs from the sample as a whole as regards likely choices of countries to emigrate to.

Below we have re-shown the country-related results in total and, alongside, the results for those very/fairly likely to leave. We wish to caution that because the proportion likely to leave is so low the results for this sector are based on a small sub-sample (69 respondents) and will thus be interpreted with care.

	TOTAL RESPONDENTS		THOSE VERY/FAIRLY LIKELY TO LEAVE	
	First choice 1000=100%	Total mentions (1 st , 2 nd or 3 rd) 1000=100%	First choice 69=100%	Total mentions (1 st , 2 nd or 3 rd) 69=100%
Australia	31%	61%	31%	51%
United States	21%	55%	26%	54%
Israel	23%	51%	19%	54%
United Kingdom	13%	38%	16%	51%
Canada	4%	18%	4%	22%
New Zealand	2%	8%	1%	3%
Germany	<0.5%	1%	-	-
Other Europe	2%	7%	2%	12%
Sub-Saharan Africa (i.e.Zimbabwe,Zambia, Zaire)	<0.5%	1%	1%	1%
Eastern Europe	<0.5%	<0.5%	-	-
Other	1%	2%	-	4%
Don't Know	3%	3%	-	-

- The sample as a whole (most of whom do not intend emigrating and were speaking hypothetically) position Australia first; with the close second position shared by USA and Israel; and then the UK follows.
- **Those very/fairly likely to leave South Africa, tend to reflect the same countries in the top four slots. However, they show Australia and the USA as scoring above Israel and the UK i.e. at the 1st choice level, Israel emerges less favourably amongst those very/fairly likely to leave South Africa than amongst the total respondents** (most of whom were speaking hypothetically about countries they would emigrate to). Later on in the report we will be dealing with Israel in more detail and we may obtain greater insight into attitudes to the country.

Has the likelihood of leaving increased or decreased in the last 7 years?

	2005	1998
In next five years:		
Very likely to continue living in SA	79%	44%
Fairly likely to continue living in SA	13%	27%
Fairly likely to leave SA to live elsewhere	4%	15%
Very likely to leave SA to live elsewhere	3%	12%
Do not know/no answer	1%	2%
Total	100%	100%

- **Clearly, South African Jews are far more oriented now - than they were in 1998 - towards staying in South Africa rather than leaving. Although the results speak for themselves and we will be stating the obvious, it is imperative to comment on the exceptionally positive shift in attitude from 1998 to 2005.**
- **Whereas in 1998, 44% claimed that they would be very likely to remain in South Africa in the next five years, the 2005 figure is an astounding 79%! Also, the combined “very/fairly likely to stay” score was 71% in 1998 but has risen to an exceptionally positive 92% in 2005.**
- **This obviously means that the likelihood of leaving scores have dropped dramatically i.e. In 1998, 12% claimed that they would be very likely to leave South Africa in the next five years and 15% said fairly likely. In 2005, only 3% say that they are very likely to leave in the next five years and only 4% say that they are fairly likely to do so!**
- **Earlier on in the report when discussing the 2005 results, we concluded that there was a heavy orientation towards staying in South Africa rather than leaving and that “overall these results bode well for South African Jewry”. Now, after having observed the strongly positive shift which has taken place in the last 7 years, this conclusion applies even more intensely.**

For interest we have some comparative data for 1973⁴² and 1974⁴³. The sets of results are based on different samples⁴⁴ and different questions⁴⁵ but we have reworked the data to allow for some comparison.

⁴² Table 9.14, p.142, Allie A. Dubb, *Jewish South Africans: A Sociological View of the Johannesburg Jewish Community*. Occasional Paper Number Twenty-one, Institute of Social and Economic Research, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa, 1977. The document is dated 1977 but the data was gathered in 1973. The document will hereinafter be referred to as: Dubb et al. Jhb. 1973.

⁴³ Table 6, p.7, Advance Report no. 2, Della Pergola et al. SAJPS 1974.

⁴⁴ The 1973 sample covered Johannesburg only and the 1974 sample included the four cities covered in 1998 and 2005 (Johannesburg, Pretoria, Cape Town and Durban) plus Port Elizabeth and Bloemfontein.

⁴⁵ 1973: “Do you intend to remain in South Africa all your life?”

1974: Likelihood of remaining in South Africa - Actual question not shown in document e.g. whether referring to short-or long-term future.

1998 and 2005: “Thinking of the next five years which of the following alternatives comes closest to what applies to you: very likely that you will continue living in South Africa, fairly likely that you will continue living in South Africa, fairly likely that you will leave South Africa to live elsewhere, very likely that you will leave South Africa to live elsewhere?”

Bearing the sample and question differences in mind, the results are interesting in that, broadly-speaking, they reinforce conclusions relating to how very positive the prevailing attitudes are towards staying in the country i.e. very positive in absolute terms and unquestionably more positive than in 1973, 1974 and 1998!

	2005		1998		1974 ⁴⁶		1973 ⁴⁷	
2005 and 1998 study with same question	Total 1000 (100%)	Jhb 650 (100%)	Total 1000 (100%)	Jhb 650 (100%)	1974 study	Total Jhb,Pta,CT, Dbn,PE,Bftn 2074 (100%)	1973 study i.e. different question	Total Jhb 283 (100%)
Very/fairly likely will continue living in SA	92%	93%	71%	69%	Will definitely/probably remain in SA	78%	Yes remaining in SA/yes if possible/as far as I know/yes if still alright for Jews here/yes if political developments allow it/yes unless emigrate to Israel	78% ⁴⁸
Very/fairly likely will leave SA to live elsewhere	7%	6%	27%	28%	Will definitely leave/maybe/contemplate leaving/depends	22%	No, not remaining in SA	12%
Don't Know/no answer	1%	1%	2%	3%	Don't know	-	Don't Know	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	Total	100%	Total	99% ⁴⁹

What are the reasons underlying the current heavy orientation towards remaining in South Africa in the next five years?

(ii) Reasons underlying likelihood of staying

In the current (2005) study, those very/fairly likely to stay in South Africa in the next 5 years were asked: “You say that you are likely to remain living in South Africa in the next five years. What would you say are your three most important reasons for staying?”

⁴⁶ Table 6, p.7, Advance Report no. 2, Della Pergola et al. SAJPS 1974.

⁴⁷ Table 9.14, p.142, Dubb et al., Jhb. 1973.

⁴⁸ 5% said “yes unless I emigrate to Israel”. These have been included in the “yes will stay in South Africa” category but strictly-speaking could also belong to the “No” or “don’t know” category. If excluded from the “yes” category the total would be 73% rather than 78%.

⁴⁹ Because of rounding off, this column totals 99% instead of 100%

	Very/Fairly Likely to remain in SA in next five years ⁵⁰	
	Total mentions (Base: 924= 100%)	First mentions (Base: 924=100%)
Reasons:		
To stay close to family	69%	45%
Roots here/settled here/place of birth/familiarity/used to it/its my home	33%	9%
Financial security/have income here/financially stable here	27%	7%
Career/Business	25%	8%
Love of South Africa	23%	8%
To stay close to friends	19%	2%
Too old to start new life/career elsewhere	17%	6%
Climate	12%	1%
Like lifestyle here/good quality of life/standard of living /wonderful lifestyle	12%	4%
Education of children/children still being educated here	9%	2%
Financial restrictions on emigration e.g. currency control	9%	4%
To play an active role in the future of the new South Africa	6%	1%
Poor Rand exchange/would have to drop standard of living overseas	6%	1%
Skills/business/ability/occupation not suited/not easily transferable	6%	1%
Yiddishkeit/Jewish way of life here/Jewish community good here/ unique/freedom to practice religion	4%	1%
Health/mobility problems	3%	<0.5%
Want to be buried here/want to be buried next to wife/husband/family	<0.5%	
Lubavitche Rebbe said must stay/obligation to community/Rabbi	<0.5%	<0.5%
No deterioration in life in SA/see no need to leave	<0.5%	-
Fear of the unknown	<0.5%	-
Emigrated once before and returned to live in SA/no desire to emigrate again	<0.5%	<0.5%
Other	1%	<0.5%
Don't know/ no answer at all	<0.5%	<0.5%

- **With regard to the “holding power” of family and friends, we see that wanting to stay close to family is the most powerful reason given for the desire to stay in South Africa.** In total virtually 7 in every 10 mentioned it (i.e. 69%). Almost half (45%) gave it as their first reason and the remaining 24% mentioned it second or third. Friends do not play as

⁵⁰ Of the 1000 respondents, a total of 924 claimed that they were very or fairly likely to remain in South Africa in the next 5 years. The tabulation is thus based on 924 respondents.

- great a part i.e. 19% gave “staying close to friends” as a reason for staying and most of these did not give it as the first/main reason i.e. only 2% mentioned it first. All the reasons mentioned relating to family and friends (88%) as a proportion of all the reasons given, shows that almost one in three reasons given relate to the “holding power” of people. However, as mentioned, family members are mentioned far more often than friends as a reason for being likely to stay in South Africa.
- **Another powerful reason for Jewish people wanting to stay in South Africa rather than emigrate, is their underlying emotional attachment to South Africa and to what it has to offer.** At first glance this reason would appear to be far less important than the family factor because it is spread over a number of categories. However, when grouping the facets of this factor it becomes clear just how important it is. In total it received mentions totaling for 86% (i.e. 23% at the first mention level and the remaining 63% at the second/third mention level). As a proportion of all the reasons given this factor also accounts for almost one in three reasons given for wanting to stay in South Africa. It is particularly at the “Total mentions” level that we see how important a factor it is i.e. there were sizeable references to an emotional attachment to South Africa i.e. “roots are here...settled here...place of birth....its my home” was referred to by 33% and “love of South Africa” by 23%. There was also praise for the climate by 12%, for the “lifestyle/wonderful lifestyle/ quality of life” by 12% and the desire to “play an active role in the future of South Africa” was mentioned by 6%. Thus, this conglomerate factor is one of the very important reasons underlying likelihood of staying in South Africa.
 - **The financial/business/career factor is also a very important and powerful reason for Jewish people wanting to stay in South Africa.** This factor is also spread over a number of categories i.e. in total 90% of mentions related to this factor (27% at the 1st mention level and the 63% at the 2nd/3rd mention level). Total references to this factor as a proportion of all reasons mentioned also shows that almost one in every three mentioned some facet of this factor. Specific facets of the factor were: need for “financial security...being where they have an income/financial stability” (27%); being here where they have a career/business (25%); “too old to start a new life/career elsewhere” (17%); concern about not being able to get enough money out of the country because of perceptions relating to “currency control” (9%); concern about “the Rand exchange.... having to drop their standard of living overseas” (6%); concern that their “skills/business/ability/occupation” might not be easily transferable (6%).
 - **All other factors featured far below the main three factors discussed above** i.e. 9% spoke about staying to educate their children; 4% mentioned Jewish-related aspects such as appeal of “Yiddishkeit... Jewish way of life here....unique Jewish community.... obligation to the Jewish community/Rabbi; 3% claimed that health/mobility problems keep them here; all other mentions (e.g. wanting to be buried in South Africa/next to a spouse) scored below 0.5% each.

How does 2005 and 1998 data compare for reasons underlying being very/fairly likely to stay in South Africa in the next 5 years. The first two columns show total scores for the three reasons (2005 then 1998) and the next two columns show only the first mention/top-of-mind reason (2005 then 1998).

	VERY/FAIRLY LIKELY TO REMAIN IN SA IN NEXT FIVE YEARS			
	TOTAL MENTIONS		FIRST MENTION	
	2005 (Base: 924=100%)	1998 (Base: 711=100%)	2005 (Base: 924=100%)	1998 (Base: 711= 100%)
Reasons relating to family/friends:				
To stay close to family	69%	66%	45%	39%
To stay close to friends	19%	24%	2%	2%
Reasons relating to attachment to SA:				
Roots here/settled here/place of birth/familiarity/ used to it/its my home	33%	5%	9%	1%
Love of South Africa	23%	29%	8%	9%
Climate	12%	3%	1%	1%
Like lifestyle here/good quality of life/standard of living/ wonderful lifestyle	12%	2%	4%	<0.5%
To play active role in future of new SA	6%	7%	1%	1%
Financial/business/ career reasons:				
Career/Business	25%	16%	8%	8%
Financial security/stability/have income here	27%	3%	7%	1%
Too old to start new life/career elsewhere	17%	29%	6%	10%
Financial restrictions on emigration e.g. currency control	9%	17%	4%	12%
Poor Rand exchange/would have to drop standard of living overseas	6%	29%	1%	8%
Skills/business/ability/occupation not suited/ not easily transferable	6%	14%	1%	2%
Other reasons:				
Education of children/children still being educated here	9%	3%	2%	1%
Yiddishkeit/Jewish way of life here/Jewish community good here/ unique/freedom to practice religion	4%	2%	1%	<0.5%
Health/mobility problems	3%	8%	<0.5%	1%
Want to be buried here/next to spouse/family	<0.5%	-	-	-
Lubavitche Rebbe said must stay/obligation to community/Rabbi	<0.5%	1%	<0.5%	<0.5%
No deterioration in SA life/no need to leave	<0.5%	-	-	-
Fear of the unknown	<0.5%	-	-	-
Emigrated before and returned to live in SA/ no desire to emigrate again	<0.5%	-	<0.5%	-
Other	1%	4%	<0.5%	3%
Don't know/ no answer at all	<0.5%	10%	<0.5%	<0.5%

- **Then (in 1998) and now, attachment to and presence of family in South Africa is shown to have very powerful “holding power” for those being likely to remain in South Africa. The immense importance of this factor essentially remains unchanged.** In total and even at first mention/top-of-mind level it emerges very strongly both in 1998 and 2005. Friends feature (then and now) far less prominently as a

- reason for staying. However, the holding power of the “people factor”, comprising both family and friends cannot be denied.
- **As discussed earlier, a factor which also emerges powerfully in 2005 as a reason for Jewish people wanting to stay in South Africa rather than emigrate, is their underlying emotional attachment to South Africa and to what it has to offer. Various elements comprise this factor and its power lies in the combination rather than in one element featuring strongly. However, in 1998 it did not feature as strongly.** Respondents were not as likely then as now to emphasise their emotional attachment to South Africa.
 - **The financial/business/career factor emerges (in 2005) as another very important and powerful reason for Jewish people wanting to stay in South Africa. As mentioned earlier, it comprises a number of elements which together make it feature strongly as a reason for staying. In 1998 it also featured very strongly (i.e. more strongly than the emotional attachment factor). However:**
 - **An important change of emphasis is detectable when comparing the results of the two studies.**
 - **In 2005 the emphasis is more on the positive than the negatively-stated elements of this factor** (i.e. more emphasis on not wanting to leave because of career/business and/or financial benefits/stability here and less emphasis on difficulties related to starting again elsewhere).
 - **In 1998 there was heavy emphasis on negatively-stated aspects** (i.e. financial/age/career/occupation-related difficulties of going elsewhere).
 - **As we saw earlier, the economy in South Africa is perceived as having improved since 1998. Whereas the economic situation and exchange rate could have held some back from thinking of emigrating in 1998, the improved situation is likely to be impacting positively on the financial/business/career factor and is important to a sizeable sector of those likely to stay in the country now.**
 - **In both 1998 and 2005 all other factors featured far below the three main factors discussed above.**

(iii) Factors which could negatively influence the likelihood of staying

At present, an exceptionally large sector of South African Jews are likely to continue living in South Africa and are able to give a number of reasons for choosing to do so. Are there factors which (hypothetically speaking) could make them change their minds? And, if so, what are these factors?

Those claiming to be very/fairly likely to continue living in South Africa were thus asked an additional question: "What, if anything, would make you feel that you no longer want to live in South Africa?"

They responded readily to the question. Only 3% said "don't know" or could not think of anything which would make them leave. On an average, each respondent mentioned 3.2⁵¹ aspects which could influence them to leave.

Responses are shown in detail below.

⁵¹ Those who are very/fairly likely to stay, each made, on an average, 3.2 comments which means that (based on the 924 respondents in this sector) the comments total was 322%.

	TOTAL MENTIONS (Base: 924=100%) ⁵²	
Crime/personal safety concerns/militancy/anarchy/corruption	97%	
If crime were to increase/to reach levels feel cannot live with		47%
Personal safety concerns/if were to become more physically dangerous than at present		35%
If there were a threat to whites in SA/total onslaught of blacks against whites as in Zimbabwe/ blacks getting too militant against whites		6%
Complete lawlessness/anarchy/complete turmoil and strife/chaos/revolution/ complete absence of democracy/intolerable		4%
If there were to be political unrest/on a large scale		3%
If corruption continues		1%
If Zuma became president/if Zuma hadn't been dismissed/ if corrupt Zuma gets off ⁵³		1%
Issues relating to Jews	64%	
If government and/or legislation makes it difficult for Jews in SA		34%
If Jewish community dwindles too much here		13%
Standard of Jewish education/if became difficult to get suitable Jewish education for children		9%
Increased antisemitism/persecution of Jews/complete antisemitism/Jews threatened		7%
To make Aliyah		<0.5%
If Moshiach comes		<0.5%
Would leave if didn't have obligation to Rabbi		<0.5%
Family/friends/relationship issues	38%	
If other members of my family left/or wanted to leave/to be with family		34%
If good friends/main friends left/to be with friends		3%
Relationship issues e.g. death of spouse/end of relationship/remarrying/if meet man/woman who wants to emigrate/if spouse wants to leave SA		1%
Quality of life	68%	
If quality of life in South Africa deteriorates substantially		24%
If government and/or legislation becomes difficult for me to live with/ accept		23%
Action of health services/if quality of health services deteriorated		10%
If standard of education dropped/ if became difficult to educate children way should be		10%
For children's sake/future for children/opportunities for children/freedom for children		1%
Career/financial/business/economy	55%	
Career move/if good career opportunity arose elsewhere		15%
Economy/if economic situation in SA deteriorated		15%
If good financial opportunity arose elsewhere		13%
Affirmative action		8%
If job opportunities decreased for me/ or for my children		3%
If could afford to live elsewhere/if acquired lot of money and could afford to living elsewhere/if Rand improved		1%
Total Mentions	322%	
No answer/Don't know/Would not leave/would never leave	3%	

⁵² The data must be interpreted with care. Percentages are based on the 924 respondents who said that they would be very/fairly likely to stay in South Africa. Each respondent could make as many comments as they wished to. It is thus possible that they could have made more than one comment per category. Thus, for example, 97% for the category "crime/personal safety etc" does not mean that 97% of the respondents mentioned something in this category. Instead it is a total of the references falling into that category and should be assessed as a proportion of the total of 322%. Doing so allows us to conclude that 3 in every 10 of the total responses relate to this factor. Similarly, 38% for family/friendship issues can be seen as 1 in every 10 of the total mentions of 322% and so on.

⁵³ This reference is to Jacob Zuma's corruption trial and not his subsequent rape trial which had not yet taken place when the interviews were being conducted.

- **Clearly, there are factors which (hypothetically speaking) could make them change their minds. It is imperative to take note of these factors** and to be aware that if a scenario incorporating these negative factors were to begin to play itself out there could be a serious threat to the stability of the South African Jewish population and thus to maintaining the current, strong “holding power” being exerted upon the Jews in South Africa.
- **The crime/personal safety/militancy/anarchy/corruption factor, with 97% total mentions (which means 3 in every 10 mentions relate to this) emerged as the most important. Within this factor the focus was particularly on escalation of crime and also on increased threats to personal safety.** More specifically, almost half of the likely-to-stay sector (47%), claimed that if crime were to escalate to levels they felt they could not live with, they could begin to feel that they no longer want to live in South Africa and, in addition, over one-third of the likely-to-stay sector (35%) claimed that if there was an increased threat to their personal/physical safety they may feel that they no longer want to live in South Africa. Some (6%) specifically added that thoughts about leaving would occur if there were to be a threat to whites or militancy towards whites as in Zimbabwe; some (4%) spoke about complete lawlessness/anarchy/chaos/absence of democracy being a factor; some (3%) spoke about large-scale political unrest as a factor and for 2% increased corruption could be a factor.
- **Issues relating to Jews also emerged as important, with 64% total mentions (which means 2 in every 10 mentions centered around issues relating to Jews).** Within this factor there was particular emphasis on the likely-to-stay sector changing towards no longer wanting to live in South Africa if the government and/or legislation were to make it difficult for Jews in South Africa (mentioned by 34%). Other Jewish-related aspects each featured less often but featured sizeably if considered as part of the overall “Jewish issues” factor i.e. some (13%) said that they would entertain thoughts of leaving if the Jewish community dwindles too much here; some (9%) said that they could become negatively disposed to South Africa if the standard of Jewish education for their children became a problem; some (7%) specified that heightened antisemitism/persecution of Jews would be a factor for them; other aspects related to Jewish issues also featured but infrequently.
- **Family/friends/relationship issues received mentions totaling 38% (i.e. just over 1 in every 10 mentions relate to this). However, the responses were essentially family-focused rather than friend-focused. The emphasis was mainly on leaving to be with family i.e. they are very/fairly likely to continue living in South Africa but if important family members left the country they might feel that they wish to do so too (according to 34%). Only 3% would leave if**

- friends/main friends left and only 1% would leave for other relationship-related reasons.
- **Quality of life mentions totalled 68% (i.e. 2 in every 10 mentions relate to this).** A sizeable sector (24%) claimed that if the quality of life were to deteriorate substantially they would feel that they no longer want to live in South Africa; another 23% claimed that what would affect them would be if the government and/or legislation made it difficult for them to live in South Africa; some (10%) mentioned deterioration of health services; some (10%) claimed that a drop in the standard of education for children would be a factor for them
 - **Career/financial/business/economy-related issues showed a total mentions score of 55% (i.e. almost 2 in every 10 of the mentions relate to this).** In essence, of those likely to stay in South Africa: 15% claimed that they would feel that they no longer want to live here if the economy in South Africa deteriorated, 15% claimed that they could find a good career opportunity elsewhere appealing, 13% could find a good financial opportunity elsewhere appealing, 8% spoke of affirmative action possibly reaching the stage of causing them to feel that they no longer want to live in South Africa, 3% would feel that they want to leave if job opportunities were to decrease in South Africa; 1% claimed that they could develop the desire to leave if they happened to acquire enough money to enable them to afford to live elsewhere.

What should be borne in mind is that the above section deals with a hypothetical situation only i.e. the respondents who answered are the likely-to-stay-in-South-Africa sector. We do, however, see clearly that there are danger points or thresholds to be monitored since there are certain negative developments which could influence them to feel that they no longer want to live in South Africa.

(iv) Reasons underlying likelihood of leaving

As observed earlier, only a small proportion (7%) claimed to be likely to leave South Africa to live elsewhere in the next five years. They were asked: “You say that you are likely to leave South Africa to live in another country during the next five years. What would you say are your three most important reasons for leaving?”

	Very/Fairly Likely to leave SA to live elsewhere in next five years ⁵⁴	
	Total mentions (Base: 69= 100%)	First mentions (Base:69=100%)
Reasons:		
Personal safety concerns	54%	23%
To be with family	44%	35%
Worries about future of SA	35%	6%
Career move	29%	20%
Financial/improved finances	12%	4%
Economy/economic situation	12%	-
To live in Israel/feel at home in Israel	10%	4%
Freedom/adventure/new culture/new places	10%	3%
Education of children	10%	1%
No strong Jewish community here/dwindling Jewish community/to be in a bigger Jewish community	9%	1%
Affirmative action	7%	1%
To be with friends	3%	-
Religious reasons	3%	-
Standard/quality of Jewish education	3%	-
Quality of health services	3%	-
More culture/music/art	3%	-
Other	4%	-

- We must bear in mind that these results are based on only 69 respondents (i.e. 7% of the sample, which splits: 4% fairly likely to leave and 3% very likely to leave). Thus, although the above tabulation shows percentages, the numbers are often so small that the percentages can be misleading. Therefore, in discussing these specific results below we will avoid percentages wherever possible.
- **Personal safety concerns were cited as a key reason for being very/fairly likely to emigrate.** Over half mentioned this. However, the emphasis tended to be more on it being a subsidiary reason for their claimed likelihood of leaving than on it being the main/first reason.
- **Leaving to be with family is also a key factor underlying the likelihood of leaving.** Of the very/fairly likely to leave sector, just below half mentioned this as a reason and here we see that most of them gave it as their main reason. A few added that they would leave to be with friends and none of them gave this as a prime/first reason.
- **General concern about the future of South Africa also featured sizeably.** It was mentioned by approximately one-third overall, with most of these being at the second/third rather than first mention level.
- **The career/finances/economy factor was also reflected as being important.** At the first mention level, the “career move” facet of this factor featured noticeably.

⁵⁴ Of the 1000 respondents, a total of 69 claimed that they were very or fairly likely to leave South Africa to live elsewhere in the next 5 years. The tabulation is thus based on 69 respondents.

- **Jewish and/or Israel issues featured to some extent as a factor** i.e. approximately 1 in every 10 of the likely-to-leave sector claimed that “there is no strong Jewish community here/dwindling Jewish community/want to be in a bigger Jewish community”; approximately 1 in every 10 would like “to live in/feel at home in Israel”. Also mentioned by a few respondents each were: “religious reasons” and “standard/ quality of Jewish education”.
- Other aspects were referred to even less frequently.

The tabulation below shows a comparison of 2005 and 1998 data for reasons underlying being very/fairly likely to leave South Africa to live elsewhere in the next five years. The first two columns show the total scores for the three reasons (2005 and 1998) and the next two columns show only the first mention/top-of-mind reason (2005 and 1998).

	VERY/FAIRLY LIKELY TO LEAVE SA IN NEXT FIVE YEARS			
	TOTAL MENTIONS		FIRST MENTION	
	2005 (Base: 69=100%)	1998 (Base: 267=100%)	2005 (Base: 69=100%)	1998 (Base: 267= 100%)
Reasons:				
Personal safety concerns	54%	79%	23%	45%
To be with family	44%	32%	35%	13%
Worries about future of SA	35%	49%	6%	13%
Career move	29%	21%	20%	6%
Financial/improved finances	12%	11%	4%	2%
Economy/economic situation	12%	5%	-	2%
To live in Israel/feel at home in Israel	10%	6%	4%	3%
Freedom/adventure/new culture/ new places	10%	-	3%	-
Education of children	10%	40%	1%	8%
No strong Jewish community here/dwindling Jewish community/to be in a bigger Jewish community	9%	5%	1%	3%
Affirmative action	7%	5%	1%	1%
To be with friends	3%	9%	-	1%
Religious reasons	3%	-	-	-
Standard/quality of Jewish education	3%	-	-	-
Quality of health services	3%	7%	-	<0.5%
More culture/music/art	3%	-	-	-
Better quality of life	-	3%	-	1%
Future of my children	-	2%	-	2%
Other	4%	<0.5%	-	<0.5%

- We must bear in mind that since (in the 2005 survey) such a small proportion claimed to be very/fairly likely to leave, the results are based on only 69 respondents in comparison with the larger base for 1998. Although a base of 69 is meaningful and the comparisons between the two surveys are definitely valid, some of the smaller

percentages for 2005 refer to a few respondents only (e.g. 3% could represent 2 respondents). Detailed examination of the smaller 2005 scores should thus be avoided. With this in mind let us look at the comparisons between 1998 and 2005 scoring patterns.

- **In 1998:** Concern about personal safety was cited - overall and at first mention/top-of-mind level - as the key reason for wanting to leave South Africa to live elsewhere. This major concern should be viewed in association with sizeable concerns relating to the future of South Africa and sizeable concerns about education for children. When considered together, these three factors highlight that for those very/fairly likely to consider leaving South Africa, the heavy level of concern and anxiety prevalent in 1998 was a driving force underlying their desire to live elsewhere. Two additional factors also featured sizeably in 1998 i.e.
 - the combined career/finance/economy factor (i.e. the desire to improve their situation regarding one or more of the facets comprising this factor) and
 - the desire to move to be with family.

In 2005: The small proportion who claim to be very/fairly likely to leave the country, still cite personal safety concerns and concerns about the future of South Africa as major reasons underlying their likelihood of leaving **but** they do not express this as strongly as they did in 1998. In addition concern about education of children features minimally now. The career/finances/economy factor - viewed as a combined factor - emerges (in 2005) as an important reason for moving elsewhere, particularly the “career move” facet. Leaving to be with family is also a key factor underlying the likelihood of leaving.

(v) Whether the move from South Africa is likely to be permanent or not

Bearing in mind that we have been talking hypothetically about perceived likelihood of leaving (and related reasons), it is nevertheless interesting to take this issue further. Can we presume that those who claim that they will leave are likely to be lost to South African Jewry if indeed they do leave? Or is there a chance that they will return?

Those who claimed (in 2005) that they are likely to leave in the next five years were asked: “You say that during the next five years you are likely to leave South Africa to live in another country. Do you see yourself permanently living in another country or do you think that long-term you may come back to live in South Africa?”

The results are shown in total for the “very/fairly likely to leave” category and then separately for “very likely” and “fairly likely” categories. Although the respondent bases are relatively small, we will be able to assess whether or not those who are

more insistent about leaving are more likely to claim that the move will be permanent.

	Total very/fairly likely to leave in next 5 yrs 69=100%	Those fairly likely to leave in next 5 yrs 40=100%	Those very likely to leave in next 5 yrs 29=100%
Permanently in another country	61%	60%	62%
Long-term may come back to SA	30%	33%	28%
DK/No answer	9%	7%	10%

- Permanence was mentioned more often than the return option (i.e. overall 61% spoke of a permanent move, 30% spoke of the possibility that they may come back long-term and 9% claimed that they do not know). It cannot however be ignored that while 6 in every 10 of those likely to leave think that they will remain in another country permanently, the remaining 4 in every 10 either think that they will eventually come back or are not certain.
- The results tend to be similar for the overall very/fairly likely to leave category and its components i.e. those very likely to leave are no more certain that their move will be permanent than are those fairly likely to leave. The apparent differences are not statistically significant because of the small sample sizes involved in this particular tabulation.

VI. FOCUS ON ISRAEL AND RELATED ISSUES

A. Reasons for not wanting to emigrate to Israel

Earlier on we saw that when all respondents (in the 2005 study) were asked which country/ies they would be likely to move to if they were to move to another country, Israel was mentioned by 51% (i.e. the total of 1st, 2nd and 3rd choices). This leaves 49%⁵⁵ (486 of 1000 respondents) who did not mention Israel as a country they would consider.

⁵⁵ Comparable scores for other countries might be relevant at this point i.e. 39% did not mention Australia within the top three countries they would go to; 45% did not mention the USA; 49% did not mention Israel; 62% did not mention the UK; 82% did not mention Canada; and percentages for “not mentioned in top three” were even higher for other countries.

Those who would not consider Israel were asked: “You did not mention Israel as one of the top three countries you would consider moving to. What would you say are your three most important reasons for not choosing Israel as one of the countries you would consider moving to if you were to move to another country?”

	Total did not mention Israel as a country would move to 486=100%	
	Total mentions 1 st ,2 nd ,3 rd reasons (Base:486=100%)	Mentioned as first reason (Base:486=100%)
Reasons:		
Want to go to an English-speaking country	49%	20%
Personal safety concerns in Israel	37%	18%
Family elsewhere/want to be with family who live elsewhere	31%	19%
Relate better to people in other countries/difficult to relate to Israelis	21%	7%
Like the lifestyle in other countries more	14%	5%
Difficult to get jobs in Israel	14%	3%
Economy better in other country(ies)/ financially easier to live in other countries/Israel too expensive to live in	12%	3%
Career/business more likely to be successful elsewhere/skills/occupation more suited to other country(ies)	10%	2%
Political situation in Israel/political instability (no mention of violence or personal safety concerns)	9%	4%
Would have to drop standard of living if went to Israel	9%	2%
Unfamiliar to me/never been there/ don't know enough about it/ negative perceptions of Israel	7%	4%
Hard to live there/tough life/difficult life in Israel	5%	3%
Not a Zionist/Not a committed/staunch Zionist/disillusionment with Zionist ideology and with state of Israel	5%	3%
Friends elsewhere/want to be with friends living elsewhere not Israel	3%	1%
Don't relate to ultra-Orthodox/family in Israel live extremist religious life	<0.5%	<0.5%
Spouse not Jewish/would not cope in Israel	<0.5%	<0.5%
I am a Rabbi and the Jewish community work I do is more important than going to Israel	<0.5%	<0.5%
No future for kids in Israel	<0.5%	-
Don't want to go to the army	<0.5%	-
Other	6%	3%
Too old/can't travel/will be a burden to society/lost spouse so unable to go/husband/wife won't go	3%	1%
Not going to any country/ not only Israel that would not go to	<0.5%	<0.5%
Don't know/no answer	3%	3%

- **Lack of familiarity and/or lack of identification with the language, the people, the lifestyle and the country as such emerges as a major reason for Israel not being one of the top three countries this sector would emigrate to. Within this factor, the facet relating to wanting to go to an English-speaking country is of particular importance in total and at the first mention level.**

At the total mention level, the overall factor accounts for 4 in every 10 of the reasons given. The factor comprises several facets i.e. of those not choosing Israel:

- Almost half (49%) claimed that they do not want to go to Israel because they want to go to an English-speaking country. As mentioned, at the first mention level this particular facet of the factor (i.e. wanting to go to an English-speaking country) emerged as particularly important.
- 21% said that they relate better to people in other countries or said that Israelis are difficult.
- 14% claimed to like the lifestyle in other countries more than the Israeli lifestyle.
- 7% spoke of Israel being unfamiliar to them e.g. because they had never been there, did not know enough about it, or even because they have negative perceptions about it.
- 5% specifically claimed that they are not Zionist and/or that they are disillusioned with Israel.
- A few added that they do not relate to the ultra-Orthodox in Israel
- A few said that because their spouses are not Jewish they would not cope in Israel.

At first mention level, the pattern for this factor mirrors that reflected by total mentions i.e. the factor accounts for 40% of first mentions; preference for English-speaking countries is the facet showing the highest score; and overall it is clear (at both first mention and total mentions level) that they seek familiarity of language, country, people, lifestyle etc.

- **Another reason which emerged as important was the current situation in Israel i.e. as regards personal safety and the overall political situation. The personal safety facet of the overall factor was focused on, not only in total but at the first mention level as well.** The overall factor accounts for 2 in every 10 of the total reasons given and comprises two facets i.e.
 - 37% mentioned personal safety concerns. In fact, at the first-mention level, this facet of the factor (i.e. not wanting to live in Israel because of concerns about personal safety) emerged as particularly important.
 - 9% spoke generally about the political situation/political instability (without specifically mentioning violence or personal safety)

Thus overall, at the total mentions level, this factor emerges as being the second most important factor. It is imperative to note that at the first mention level, the personal safety facet of this factor emerges as being very important.

- **Sharing the second position slot with the “current situation in Israel” factor is: The “financial/career/job opportunity/ standard of living” factor.** i.e. it also accounts for 2 in every 10 of the total reasons given, with:

- 14% saying it is difficult to get jobs in Israel
- 12% saying it is financially easier to live in other countries/where the economy is better/and where it is less expensive to live
- 10% think that their careers/skills/business would be better suited to other countries
- 9% feel that their standard of living would have to drop if they were to live in Israel

Although no one specific facet of this factor features prominently at either the first or total mentions level - the factor as a whole is relevant i.e. reluctance to go to a country where they anticipate problems relating to financial, career/job or standard of living issues.

- **Wanting to be with family or friends who live elsewhere/not in Israel is the factor which follows closely. In fact at the first mention level this factor emerges as more important than the financial/career/job factor described above.** Once again, the emphasis is essentially on the importance of family rather than friends. Of the total respondents:
 - 31% said that have family living elsewhere, not in Israel, and that they want to be where their family members are. This facet of the factor is very important at the first mention level.
 - 3% mentioned that they want to be in other countries where their friends are (rather than in Israel)
- Mentions relating to factors other than the four factors discussed above, occurred less often (i.e. 5% spoke about Israeli life being hard/tough without being specific as to in what way this is so; no one other comment emerged sizeably as can be observed in the above tabulation)

B. Rating of Israel on various factors

“Please think about Israel. Purely according to your own judgement how would you rate it as regards.....(each factor in turn was rated by choosing one of the following answers from a card: very good, fairly good, neither good nor poor, fairly poor, very poor)?”

	Very Good	Fairly Good	Neither Good nor Poor	Fairly Poor	Very Poor	Don't Know/No answer		Average Rating ⁵⁶
FACTORS:								
Economic situation	5%	31%	18%	20%	4%	22%	= 100%	3.15
Personal safety	8%	36%	19%	23%	7%	7%	= 100%	3.15
Political situation	1%	16%	27%	30%	16%	10%	= 100%	2.52
Health care provision	27%	32%	7%	3%	<0.5%	30%	= 100%	4.20
Education system	31%	36%	6%	1%	<0.5%	26%	= 100%	4.30
Personal family and friends living there	24%	30%	10%	11%	12%	13%	= 100%	3.49

- **Israel scores well on health care provision.** Approximately 3 in every 10 consider Israel to be very good in this regard and another 3 in every 10 rate it as being fairly good. Thus, in total 59% rated Israel as being very good/fairly good as regards health care provision. Only 3% rated it as very/fairly poor and 7% said “neither good nor poor”. It should be noted that 30% (3 in every 10) felt unqualified to comment on this issue and these were excluded from the average rating. The average rating which was attributed to Israel on this factor (i.e. by those able to rate it) was 4.20. This score is very high considering that the highest possible average rating is 5. In essence, Israel was rated positively for health care provision by the majority of those who felt able to rate it on this factor.
- **In addition Israel scores well as regards its education system.** Just under one-third rate it as being very good in this regard and just over one-third as being fairly good. Thus, in total 67% rate its education system as being very/fairly good. Virtually all of the remainder (26%) could not rate it and fell into the do not know/no answer category. Only 1% spoke of the education system as being very/fairly poor. Based on those who could rate Israel on this factor, the average rating was 4.30 which is very high considering that the highest possible rating is 5. Here too Israel was rated positively by most of those able to rate it. The fact that 26% (approximately one-quarter) felt unqualified to rate Israel on this factor should be noted.

⁵⁶ The average rating was calculated as follows: “Very Good” was given a weighting of “5”; “Fairly Good” was weighted “4”; “Neither Good nor Poor” was weighted “3”; “Fairly Poor” was weighted “2”; and “Very Poor” was weighted “1”. “Don’t Know” was excluded from the calculation i.e. for example if 10 respondents said “Don’t Know”, the divisor in the calculation would be 990 rather than 1000 etc. The formula applied was as follows:

$$\text{Average Rating} = \frac{\text{Total Weighted score}}{\text{Total who rated}}$$

The closer the average rating is to “5” the more positive the score and the closer it is to “1” the more negative the score e.g. an average rating of 4.2 on a particular factor is positive and indicates an average of “Fairly Good”, whereas an average of 1.2 would indicate that Israel scores very poorly on that factor.

- **With regard to “personal family and friends living there”, Israel also scores well, even if not quite as well as it does on education and health care.** However, this is a very different factor and cannot be directly compared. It is nevertheless a positive finding that over half (54%) rated Israel as good in this regard (i.e. very good 24% and fairly good 30%). Just under a quarter (23%) said very/fairly poor; 10% said neither good nor poor and 13% said “don’t know/no answer”. On an average those who did rate it, gave it a rating of 3.49
- **The economic situation in Israel was seldom perceived as being very good or very poor i.e. scores centered around the middle range but tending a bit to the positive side** The very/fairly good score was 36%, with the bulk of these saying fairly good. The very/fairly poor score was 24% with the bulk focusing on fairly rather than very poor. The remainder were divided between saying “neither good nor poor” (18%) and “do not know/no answer” (22%). Those who did give a rating (i.e. all except the DK/No answer sector) reflected an average score of 3.15, which is a bit more positive than neutral.
- **Personal safety in Israel was a factor which most (93%) felt that they could rate. Personal safety in Israel was infrequently perceived as being very good or very poor i.e. scores centered around the middle range but tending to the positive side.** The very/fairly good score (44%) showed emphasis on fairly good, the very/fairly poor score (30%) reflected emphasis on fairly poor, the neither good nor poor score was 19% and DK/No answer 7%. The average rating of 3.15 is a bit more positive than neutral.
- **The political situation tended to be rated more negatively than positively.** Almost half (46%) regarded the political situation in Israel as being very/fairly poor with the emphasis tending to be more on fairly poor (30%) than on very poor (16%). Only 17% saw it as very/fairly good with most of these focusing on fairly rather than very good. Just over a quarter (27%) rated Israel as neither good nor poor in this regard and 10% said “don’t know”/gave no answer. The average rating (2.52) positions the political situation in Israel more towards the negative than positive side.

How do the overall ratings compare with those for 7 years ago? For this section we will show the results in summarised form i.e. by combining the scores for “very good” and “good” and also for “very poor” and “poor”. To ensure accuracy, the average ratings will be based on the original, separate ratings.

		Very/ Fairly Good	Neither Good nor Poor	Very/ Fairly Poor	Don't know/ no answ.		Average Rating ⁵⁷
FACTORS: Economic situation	2005	36%	18%	24%	22%	= 100%	3.15
	1998	46%	21%	16%	17%	= 100%	3.40
Personal safety	2005	44%	19%	30%	7%	= 100%	3.15
	1998	61%	19%	12%	8%	= 100%	3.65
Political situation	2005	17%	27%	46%	10%	= 100%	2.52
	1998	15%	28%	49%	8%	= 100%	2.47
Health care provision	2005	59%	7%	4%	30%	= 100%	4.20
	1998	65%	10%	2%	23%	= 100%	4.14
Education system	2005	67%	6%	1%	26%	= 100%	4.30
	1998	75%	6%	1%	18%	= 100%	4.33
Personal family and friends living there	2005	54%	10%	23%	13%	= 100%	3.49
	1998	61%	14%	15%	10%	= 100%	3.72

- **Today and 7 years ago, Israel's scores for health care provision and education emerge as its most positive scores.** There has not been much change over the seven year period in this regard i.e. Israel is perceived as performing consistently well with regard to these factors. It should be noted that in 1998 and in 2005 a sizeable sector felt unable to rate these two factors. The "don't knows" are always excluded from the average ratings.
- **Personal safety is perceived as having deteriorated.** Whereas in 1998 it was – on an average – regarded as veering towards the "good" side, the score for this factor has dropped to be closer to the midpoint of the scale.
- **The economic situation is also perceived as having deteriorated.** According to respondents' perceptions, the economic situation in Israel was veering a bit towards the "good" side of the scale in 1998 but it is being pulled more towards the midpoint now.
- **The political situation is now, and was in 1998, the lowest scoring factor with the scores centering primarily around "poor"**
- **With regard to "personal family and friends living there", Israel scores relatively well, even if not quite as well as it did in 1998.**

⁵⁷ Average Rating = $\frac{\text{Total Weighted score}}{\text{Total who rated}}$

Very Good was weighted "5"; **Fairly Good** was weighted "4"; **Neither Good nor Poor** was weighted "3"; **Fairly Poor** was weighted "2"; and **Very Poor** was weighted "1". **Don't Know** was excluded from the calculation. The closer the average rating is to "5" the more positive the score and the closer it is to "1" the more negative the score.

How does Israel currently compare with South Africa with regard to the above six factors? The ratings for South Africa were discussed in an earlier section of this report. Comparing the results for the two countries we observe that:

- **Israel fares well and distinctly better than South Africa with regard to perceptions about the education system and health care provision.** For South Africa these two factors emerged in a controversial light, whereas for Israel the results were positive amongst those able to rate Israel on these factors.
- **As regards personal family and friendship network, Israel scored quite well but South Africa, understandably, fared better.** Since the respondents live in South Africa and the majority are South African, it is understandable that they rated South Africa very highly for this factor i.e. far above Israel.
- **Economic situation was rated more positively for South Africa than it was for Israel.** Israel was rated, on an average, a bit more to the positive than neutral side. South Africa was distinctly more likely to be perceived in a positive than a negative light, with focus on “fairly good”.
- **With regard to the personal safety situation, neither country emerged particularly well. However, South Africa emerged less positively than did Israel.** Israel, on an average, scored a bit more to the positive than neutral side, while for South Africa the emphasis in the ratings was more on the negative side.
- **Neither of the countries was perceived as offering a positive political situation.** The political situation for Israel tended to be rated more negatively than positively. For South Africa it tended to be perceived as being a bit better but it cannot be said to be good overall i.e. For South Africa opinions were divided: some perceive the political situation positively, some negatively and some as “neither good nor poor”.

C. Bonds with and extent of attachment to Israel

What proportion of South African Jews have close friends or relatives in Israel? What proportion have ever visited Israel? Considering those who have visited in the past 10 years, how many times have they visited in that period?

	Total Respondents 1000 = 100%
Yes, have close friends or relatives living in Israel	78%
Yes, have ever visited Israel	83%
Have visited Israel within past 10 years	55%

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Total Ever been to Israel 830=100%	Total been in Past 10 yrs 553=100%
<u>Number of times in past 10 yrs:</u>			
None	45%	33%	Not applicable
Once	23%	28%	42%
Twice	11%	14%	20%
Three times	7%	9%	13%
Four times	3%	4%	6%
Five times	4%	5%	7%
Six times	2%	2%	3%
Seven times	< 0.5%	< 0.5%	< 0.5%
Eight times	1%	1%	2%
Nine times	< 0.5%	< 0.5%	< 0.5%
Ten times	2%	2%	3%
More than ten times	2%	2%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%
<u>Average number of times in last 10 yrs:</u>	1.73	2.09	3.13

- **There are strong links with Israel as regards having friends or relatives there (78%) and ever having visited (83%) but not all of these have visited in the past 10 years i.e.**
 - The 83% who have been in the last 10 years splits: 55% within the past 10 years and 28% more than 10 years ago. The 55% who have been in the last 10 years splits: 34% once or twice and 21% more often. Thus, considering the sample as a whole, each Jewish person has, on an average, been to Israel 1.73 times in the last 10 years. It will be noted that 2% of the sample have been to Israel more than 10 times in the past 10 years and some of these have been as many as 20 times or more. Back-checking on the validity of these findings showed that these respondents had been a large number of times for business or family reasons and/or a few had alternative homes in Israel.
 - When we consider only those who have ever been to Israel: 33% have not been in the last 10 years, 42% have been once or twice, and 25% more often. Each person who has ever been to Israel has, on an average, been 2.09 times in the last 10 years.
 - Looking only at those who have been in the last 10 years, we see that 62% have been once or twice in this period and the remaining 38% have been more often. On average, each person who has been in the last 10 years, has been there 3.13 times.

- **Demographic subgroup results are as follows:**

	Total Sample	A G E						C I T Y			
		18-24 yrs	25-34 yrs	35-44 yrs	45-54 yrs	55-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	Jhb	Pta	CT	Dbn
Have friends/relatives in Israel	78%	82%	77%	74%	74%	82%	80%	78%	92%	75%	80%
Ever visited Israel	83%	79%	79%-->	81%-->	84%	84%-->	89%	82%	82%	84%	90%
Visited Israel in last 10 yrs	55%	77%	64%	43%	45%	57%	54%	56%	58%	51%	60%

- **With regard to having friends/relatives in Israel**, the youth side and the older side of the age scale tended to reflect slightly higher scores. Also, we see confirmation that Pretoria and Durban respondents reflect above average scores for having friends/relatives in Israel.
- **For ever having visited Israel**, a very slight age trend emerges i.e. the older they are the greater the likelihood to have ever visited Israel. This finding is understandable since the older people are the more time they have had to visit. However, what is interesting is that the age trend is slight i.e. all age sectors show a high score for ever having visited Israel and the difference between age categories is not that large. **With regard to having visited in the last 10 years**, a higher proportion of younger people have done so i.e. Of the 18-24 year age sector, a high proportion (77%) have visited in the last 10 years and for the 25-34 year sector the proportion (64%) is also high. With regard to the cities, the Durban score for ever having visited is decidedly above average, whilst for visits in the last 10 years, Durban also tends to score above other cities.

Overall, how strong an attachment do South African Jews feel towards Israel? And do demographic subgroups differ in this regard? The question asked was: "Whether or not you visit, what type of attachment (or otherwise) do you feel towards Israel?" ANSWER CHOSEN FROM CARD: Strong attachment, Moderate attachment, No special attachment, Negative feelings towards Israel.

	Total Sample	A G E						C I T I E S				
		18-24 yrs	25-34 yrs	35-44 yrs	45-54 yrs	55-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	Jhb	Pta	CT	Dbn	
<u>Attachment towards Israel</u>												
Strong	53%	39%	53%	48%	48%	55%	67%	52%	66%	47%	80%	
Moderate	33%	45%	31%	35%	35%	33%	24%	34%	28%	35%	14%	
No special attachment	13%	15%	15%	16%	15%	11%	9%	14%	6%	15%	6%	
Negative feelings to Israel	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	-	<1%	-	3%	-	
Average rating ⁵⁸	3.38	3.23	3.36	3.30	3.29	3.41	3.58	3.37	3.60	3.28	3.74	

- **The emphasis was clearly on the positive side.** Of the total respondents in the sample: Over half (53%) feel a strong attachment towards Israel; approximately one-third (33%) spoke of a moderate attachment; 13% claimed to feel no special attachment; 1% claimed to have negative feelings towards Israel; and less than 0.5% said “do not know/no answer”
- Looking only at the first row of the above table (i.e. where “strong” attachment is shown):
 - **There is no clear age trend, but the oldest age group (65 years and older) shows a distinctly above average attachment to Israel, while the youngest sector (18-24 years) shows a decidedly below average attachment. This is interesting in that this young age sector reflects an above average tendency to have visited Israel yet their extent of attachment is below average.** Looking at the last row of the tabulation (at average ratings) we also observe that the youngest age sector shows a lower average rating than other sectors. This is an issue which undoubtedly needs attention from those who are promoting Zionist ideals.
 - **Pretoria and (more particularly Durban) reflect above average attachment to Israel.**
- **What is interesting but understandable is that, amongst those who have ever visited Israel, the stronger the attachment to Israel, the greater the number of visits to Israel in the past 10 years. Or looked at another way, the greater the attachment to Israel, the greater the likelihood of more visits.**

⁵⁸ Unlike most of the average ratings in this report, the highest possible average rating is “4” and the lowest possible is “1”. The closer the average rating is to “4” the greater the attachment to Israel and the closer to “1” the closer it is to a negative attachment. More specifically: **Strong** was weighted “4”, **Moderate** “3”, **No special attachment** “2” and **Negative** “1”. The weighted scores were totalled and divided by the total respondents rating so as to obtain an average.

	Total ever been to Israel (Base=830 respondents)	ATTACHMENT TO ISRAEL		
		Strong (Base=487)	Moderate (Base=264)	None/ Negative (Base=79)
Average no. of times been to Israel in last 10 yrs	2.09	2.76	1.20	0.91

To what extent have there been changes in the last 7 years as regards: having close friends and relatives living in Israel; visiting Israel; feelings of attachment towards Israel?

	2005	1998
	Total Respondents 1000 = 100%	Total Respondents 1000 = 100%
Yes, have close friends or relatives living in Israel	78%	83%
Yes, have ever visited Israel	83%	79%
Have visited Israel within past 10 years	55%	59%
<u>Number of times in past 10 yrs:</u>		
None	45%	41%
Once	23%	25%
Twice	11%	13%
Three times	7%	8%
Four times	3%	4%
Five times	4%	6%
Six times or more	7%	6%
Total	100%	100%
<u>Type of attachment feel towards Israel:</u>		
Strong	53%	54%
Moderate	33%	33%
No special attachment	13%	12%
Negative feelings	1%	1%
Do not know/no answer	<0.5%	<0.5%
Total	100%	100%

- **Essentially there has been no distinct change in the last 7 years as regards: proportion with close friends and relatives in Israel; proportion who have visited Israel (ever or in the last 10 years); and number of times visited in the last 10 years.** In 1998 and still in 2005 a particularly high proportion (approximately 8 in every 10 respondents) mentioned having close friends and relatives in Israel, a particularly high proportion (8 in every 10) claimed to have ever visited Israel and almost 6 in every 10 claimed to have done so in the last 10 years. Any differences between these 1998 and 2005 results are so small that, statistically-speaking, they should not be interpreted as differences.

- **Also, there is unbelievable consistency in the two sets of score patterns relating to attachment towards Israel. The 1998 and 2005 scores are either exactly the same or show a negligible 1% difference.** In both 1998 and 2005, just over half (53% or 54%) feel a strong attachment, approximately one-third (33%) feel a moderate attachment, approximately one-eighth (12% or 13%) have no special feelings towards Israel, only 1% have negative feelings and less than 0.5% said “do not know/no answer”.

D. The Middle East situation

To round off the section on Israel, respondents were asked:

“Considering present developments in the Middle East, do you feel that Israel should give up some territory in exchange for credible guarantees of peace?”

- **Of the total respondents, 6 in every 10 opted for some territory to be given up in exchange for credible guarantees of peace i.e. 60% said “Yes”, 32% said “No” and 8% mentioned “don’t know/no answer”.**
- **When looked at within age groups**, broadly-speaking: Under 35 year olds are essentially divided between saying “Yes” and “No”; in the 35-64 year sector 6 or 7 in every 10 opted for “Yes”; amongst those 65 years and older the emphasis was even more heavily (almost 8 in every 10) on “Yes”.
- **Within cities:** “Yes” was chosen by 55% in Johannesburg, 54% in Durban, 70% in Pretoria and 74% in Cape Town.
- **The “Yes” score was essentially the same for those with a strong attachment to Israel (60% said “yes”) and those with a moderate attachment (59% said “yes”). However, those with a negative attachment or no attachment at all were more inclined to say “Yes” (68%).**
- We saw earlier that there has been minimal change as regards having friends/relatives in Israel, as regards visiting Israel and as regards extent of attachment to Israel. However, **there is definite change as to whether or not Israel should be giving up some territory in exchange for peace. Whereas in 1998 opinions were essentially divided in this regard, in 2005 the emphasis is decidedly more on “Yes”.**

	2005 Total Respondents 1000 = 100%	1998 Total Respondents 1000 = 100%
<u>Should Israel give up some territory in exchange for credible guarantees of peace?</u>		
Yes	60%	49%
No	32%	42%
Don't know/no answer	8%	9%
Total	100%	100%

E. Jewish/Zionist Youth Movements

(i) Personal involvement

- **Within the total sample, 71% claimed to have personally ever attended a Jewish or Zionist youth movement.** Of those who had personally ever attended such movements:
 - **43% did so for under 4 years**, with this splitting:
1 year or less (15%), 2-3 years (28%)
 - **56% attended for 4 years or more**, splitting:
4-5 yrs (27%), 6-7 yrs (12%), 8-9 yrs (5%), 10 yrs or more (12%).
 - Less than 1% said “don’t know”/gave no answer.
- Of those who had personally ever attended such movements:
 - 54% were most involved with Habonim, 21% with Bnei Akiva, 14% with Betar, 4% with Netzer/Maginim and 3% with Bnei Zion. Other movements were mentioned less often.
- **The 1998 figure for personally having attended Jewish/Zionist youth movements (71%) is exactly the same as the 2005 score. Thus overall, a level is being maintained for “ever having attended” youth movements. However, both sets of data relate to: the overall Jewish population (18 yrs to over 75 yrs), “ever having attended”, without indicating frequency or intensity of involvement.**

How do youth movements respondents claim to personally have been involved with compare for the two surveys?

	2005 SURVEY	1998 SURVEY
In 1998 all who “ever attended” were asked to name movements attended when <u>10-18 yrs</u> of age. In 2005 all who “ever attended” named movements they were <u>mainly</u> involved with and <u>not restricted</u> to specific age.	Total who personally ever attended Jewish/Zionist youth movements 708=100%	Total who personally ever attended Jewish/Zionist youth movements 707=100%
<u>Movements mentioned:</u>		
Habonim Dror	54%	55%
Bnei Akiva	21%	20%
Betar	14%	21%
Netzer/Maginim	4%	4%
Other mentions	13%	19%
Don't know/don't remember name	2%	2%
Total ⁵⁹	107%	121%

⁵⁹ Totals are above 100%, indicating that some mentioned more than one youth movement.

- As can be noted that there was a difference in the questions for the two studies. The question was changed in 2005 since in 1998 it was found that not all respondents restricted themselves to talking about attendance when they were 10-18 years of age.
- **Habonim and Bnei Akiva score similarly now to what they did in 1998, with Habonim mentioned by over half (54% or 55%) and Bnei Akiva by approximately one-fifth (20% or 21%). However, the Betar score has dropped i.e. scoring 21% in 1998 it shared the second position with Bnei Akiva but now (with 14%) it has dropped to third position. All others score far below. Netzer/Maganim has maintained the 4% score which it reflected in 1998.** We must bear in mind that in both 2005 and 1998 we were talking about youth movements mentioned by the sample as a whole and the sample encompasses a wide age range from 18 years to over 75 years of age. The time span is large and some youth movement attendance dates back to many years ago. Nevertheless, the score pattern is interesting. Incidentally, what can also be noted in the tabulation above is that in 1998 there was a greater inclination than in 2005 to insist on mentioning more than one youth movement i.e. the total movements mentioned in 1998 was greater than in 2005. This can be attributed to the difference in the questions asked in the two studies (i.e. in 2005 we asked for youth movement “most involved with while in 1998 the question was more open to a larger number of movements being mentioned).

(ii) Children’s attendance

In the 2005 study, parents were also asked about their children’s Jewish youth movement attendance. Those with children at primary/middle/high school or out of school (but under 22 years of age)⁶⁰, were asked: whether any of these children had ever attended Jewish or Zionist youth movements; whether any of these children had attended for at least three years; and whether any are attending at present.

	With children in primary/middle/high/out of school but under 22 yrs of age		
	Total sample (i.e. Jhb, Pta, CT, Dbn) 290=100%	Jhb 192=100%	CT 68=100%
Jewish/Zionist youth movements			
Ever attended by any of those children	61%	61%	57%
Attended for at least 3 yrs by any of those children	41%	42%	35%
Attended at present by any of those children	35%	33%	40%

⁶⁰ Of the total sample, 29% (i.e. 290 respondents) claimed to have children in primary/middle/high school/out of school (but under 22 years of age). Because the samples were small in Pretoria and Durban, there are too few with children “at school/out of school but under 22 years” for us to evaluate the Jewish/Zionist youth movement data for these cities separately but they are included in the total score.

- Overall, of the parents with children in the relevant age category:
 - 61% have children in this age category who “ever attended” Jewish/Zionist youth movements. This splits: 41% claiming that they have children in this age category who attended for at least 3 years and 20% claiming that none of their children in this age category attended for this long a period.
 - 35% claiming that they have children in this age category attending at present.
- Whether or not the above score pattern is satisfactory should be decided by organisers of youth movements.
- **Johannesburg** scores are very similar to the total scores. **Cape Town** reflects a slightly lower proportion for children having “ever attended” (57%) and for their having attended “for at least 3 years” (35%). However, the proportion for children attending at present tends to be a bit higher for Cape Town (40%). A spurt of new attendance may have occurred to some extent in Cape Town in the last 7 years.
- Still dealing with the 2005 study, which Jewish/Zionist youth movements were mainly attended by those children who had “ever attended” (1st column of figures below) and how does this compare with which Jewish/Zionist youth movements respondents themselves had personally been most involved with (2nd column)? An additional question was also asked of all respondents irrespective of whether they have children or not i.e. “If you were to send a child to a Jewish or Zionist youth movement tomorrow, which one would you choose for your child?” (3rd column).

	Total whose children in primary/middle/high/out of school (but under 22 yrs) “ ever attended ” Jewish/Zionist youth movements 177=100%	Total who personally ever attended Jewish/Zionist youth movements 708=100%	Total Respondents hypothetically selected a youth movement for a child 1000=100%
	CHILDREN MAINLY ATTEND/ATTENDED	WERE PERSONALLY MOST INVOLVED WITH	WOULD HYPOTHETICALLY SELECT FOR CHILD
<u>Youth movements</u>			
Habonim Dror	45%	54%	35%
Bnei Akiva	62%	21%	35%
Betar	12%	14%	6%
Netzer/Maganim	9%	4%	3%
Other mentions	2%	13%	1%
Don't know	-	2% ⁶¹	17%
Kids must choose themselves/will go where their friends go	N/A	N/A	2%
None/wouldn't send	N/A	N/A	1%
Total	130%	107%	100%

⁶¹ These respondents do not remember the name of the youth movement.

- **Those whose children (currently in this specified age group) “ever attended” Jewish/Zionist youth movements, claimed that these children mainly attend/attended (1st column): Bnei Akiva (62%), Habonim (45%), Betar (12%) and Netzer (9%).** Some parents mentioned more than one youth movement. This could be because they have more than one child in this age category and not all children mainly attend/attended the same movement. Also, some may have insisted that a particular child/children had been very involved with more than one movement. Because only a sector of the sample have children in the specified age group, demographic breakdown of the scores would result in bases which are too small in most instances. However, since the Johannesburg sector is relatively large, we checked on those results and found that in that city the “children mainly attended” scores show: Bnei Akiva (with 71%) emerging above average, Habonim (39%) next in line but tending towards below average, Betar (17%) scoring above average – in fact it hardly features in other cities, Netzer/Maganim (3%) scoring below average. Also mentioned in Johannesburg only was “other” (3%).
- The Jewish/Zionist youth movements which respondents were personally most involved with (2nd column above) were discussed earlier, but **what is interesting overall is Bnei Akiva’s rise over time from the personal involvement level to the children’s involvement level.**
- **With regard to (hypothetically) choosing a Jewish/Zionist youth movement for a child’s future attendance (3rd column above),** all respondents were included in the sample i.e. not only those with children nor only those who had experienced Jewish/Zionist youth movements themselves. In the responses, Habonim and Bnei Akiva feature equally (each mentioned by 35%) and others score far below. Also: 17% said “don’t know”, 2% said children must choose themselves and 1% said that they would not send their children to such youth movements. The Netzer/Maganim score (3%) is - as we will see later – lower than would have been expected in relation to the proportion of Reform/Progressives in the sample.

VII. JEWISH IDENTITY, RELATED ISSUES AND ACTIVITIES

A. Insight into Jewish identity and bonds

“Would you say that you feel more South African than Jewish, more Jewish than South African or both equally?”

	Total Respondents 1000=100%
<u>Feel</u>	
More SA than Jewish	7%
Equally Jewish and SA	50%
More Jewish than SA	42%
DK/No answer	1%
<u>Overall, mentioned:</u>	
More or equally Jewish	92%
More or equally SA	57%
Total	100%

- Opinions tend to be divided between feeling more Jewish than South African and feeling equally Jewish and South African. Only a small percentage feel more South African than Jewish. It is clear that, overall, Jews in South Africa feel strongly Jewish but with an undoubtedly strong loyalty to South Africa as well.
- There are some differences within demographic categories.**

	Total 1000= 100%	A G E						C I T Y			
		18-24 yrs 115= 100%	25-34 yrs 159= 100%	35-44 yrs 167= 100%	45-54 yrs 171= 100%	55-64 yrs 176= 100%	65 yrs and older 212= 100%	Jhb 650= 100%	Pta 50= 100%	CT 250= 100%	Dbn 50= 100%
<u>Feel</u>											
More SA than Jewish	7%	17%	7%	5%	9%	3%	6%	6%	6%	9%	12%
Equally Jewish and SA	50%	46%	34%	50%	57%	52%	59%	49%	48%	54%	50%
More Jewish than SA	42%	37%	58%	45%	34%	44%	34%	44%	46%	37%	38%
DK/No answer	1%	-	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-
<u>Overall, mentioned:</u>											
More or equally Jewish	92%	83%	92%	95%	91%	96%	93%	93%	94%	91%	88%
More or equally SA	57%	63%	41%	55%	66%	55%	65%	55%	54%	63%	62%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- Briefly, all age sectors focus primarily on the two main categories (i.e. “more Jewish” and “equally Jewish and South African”) but they differ in what they emphasise i.e. 18-24 year olds show a higher “more South African” score than do other age sectors but this score is still lower than the scores for the two main categories; 25-34 year olds also focus on the two main categories but show decidedly more emphasis on “feeling more Jewish”; 45-54 year olds and those 65 years and older also emphasise both of the main categories but show their greater emphasis on “feeling equally South African and Jewish”. In the cities, although there is more Jewish than South African emphasis overall, Johannesburg and**

Pretoria tend to show that emphasis a bit more than do Cape Town and Durban.

- Understandably, when the data is checked according to extent of Jewish feeling, **the stronger the Jewish feeling the greater the likelihood that the Jewish choice will feature more. Conversely, the milder the Jewish feeling the more the South African choice features.**

	Total 1000=100%	JEWISH FEELING		
		Mild 79=100%	Quite Strong 424=100%	Very Strong 496=100%
Feel more SA than Jewish	7%	37%	←8%	←2%
Feel equally Jewish and SA	50%	53%	62%	40%
Feel more Jewish than SA	42%	10%-->	30%-->	58%
DK/No answer	1%	-	1%	1%
Overall, mentioned:				
More or equally Jewish	92%	63%-->	92%-->	98%
More or equally SA	57%	90%	←70%	←42%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

- When comparing 2005 data and 1998 data, we observe that: **In both 1998 and 2005, opinions were divided between feeling more Jewish than South African and feeling equally Jewish and South African, with only a small percentage feeling more South African than Jewish.**

	2005	1998
	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Total Respondents 1000=100%
Feel more Jewish than South African	42%	45%
Feel equally South African and Jewish	50%	47%
Feel more South African than Jewish	7%	7%
Do not know/no answer"	1%	1%

- The very slight tendency for the “equally South African and Jewish” proportion to have risen slightly (by 3%) in 2005 and the “more Jewish than South African” proportion to have dropped accordingly (3%), cannot - statistically-speaking - be interpreted as an increase. Essentially, it can be restated that in both 1998 and 2005 opinions were divided between feeling more Jewish and feeling equally Jewish and South African, with “more South African than Jewish” featuring minimally. **Overall, it is clear that in both 1998 and 2005, Jews in South Africa emerged as feeling strongly Jewish but with a strong loyalty to South Africa as well.**

How strongly Jewish they feel is clear from the responses to a question asked only in the 2005 study: “If you were to be born all over again, would you want to be born Jewish?”

- **Virtually all said “Yes” (95%);** a minimal proportion said “No” (2%); a few said “doesn’t matter to me/no importance either way” (< 0.5%) and a minimal proportion said “don’t know/gave no answer” (3%).
- Who, demographically-speaking, does not unequivocally state that if they were to be born again they would want to be born Jewish?

	Total Sample 1000 (100%)	A G E						C I T Y				RELIGIOUS PRACTICE			
		18-24 yrs	25-34 yrs	35-44 yrs	45-54 yrs	55-64 yrs	65 yrs and older	Jhb	Pta	CT	Dbn	Sec/ JJ	Re- form/ Prog	Tradi- tional	Str. Orth
<u>Want to be born Jewish</u> No/not important to me/ doesn't matter to me/DK	5%	7%	3%	5%	5%	2%	6%	3%	2%	8%	6%	20%	9%	2%	1%

- Although the overall percentage is small and differences between subgroups within it are not statistically significant, there are hints (which require confirmation before being regarded as valid in any way) that the 18-24 year sector, those 65 years and older, those from Cape Town and Durban, the Reform/Progressive sector and (particularly) the Secular sector show a slightly greater tendency to comprise the sort of person who feels that if they were to be born again they would not want to be born Jewish or they would not mind whether or not they were born Jewish.

The nature and extent of their bonds with being Jewish were explored further: “Some people are far more conscious of being Jewish than are others. Bearing in mind that this question is NOT concerned with your level of observance, which of the following best describes your feelings (CARD SHOWING FOUR STATEMENTS): Although I was born Jewish I do not think of myself as being Jewish in any way; I am aware of my Jewishness but do not think about it very often; I feel quite strongly Jewish but I am equally conscious of other aspects of my life; I feel extremely conscious of being Jewish and it is very important to me”

In the tabulation below we have classified the statements in terms of indicating mild, quite strong and very strong bonds with being Jewish.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	BOND WITH BEING JEWISH
Although I was born Jewish I do not think of myself as being Jewish in any way	< 0.5%	MILD
I am aware of my Jewishness but do not think about it very often	8%	
I feel quite strongly Jewish but I am equally conscious of other aspects of my life	42%	QUITE STRONG
I feel extremely conscious of being Jewish and it is very important to me	50%	VERY STRONG
None of these	< 0.5%	
Total	100%	

- Clearly, the majority are divided between: those who feel a **very strong bond with Judaism (50%)** in that they are extremely conscious of being Jewish and it is very important to them; and **those who feel quite a strong bond with Judaism (42%)** since they claimed that they feel quite strongly Jewish while being equally conscious of other aspects of their lives. **Only a small proportion of South Africans (8%) have “mild” Jewish feelings** i.e. they are aware of their Jewishness but do not think about it very often and less than 0.5% said that although they were born Jewish they do not think of themselves as Jewish in any way. The data is shown by demographic subgroup below.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	BOND WITH BEING JEWISH	GENDER		A G E						C I T Y			
			Male	Female	18- 24 yrs	25- 34 yrs	35- 44 yrs	45- 54 yrs	55- 64 yrs	65 yrs and older	Jhb	Pta	CT	Dbn
Although I was born Jewish I do not think of myself as being Jewish in any way	< 0.5%	8% MILD	9%	7%	15%	9%	5%	7%	7%	7%	7%	8%	10%	10%
I am aware of my Jewishness but do not think about it very often	8%													
I feel quite strongly Jewish but am equally conscious of other aspects of my life	42%	42% QUITE STRONG	43%	42%	48%	41%	47%	45%	33%	43%	41%	32%	49%	36%
I feel extremely conscious of being Jewish and it is very important to me	50%	50% VERY STRONG	48%	51%	37%	50%	47%	48%	60%	50%	52%	60%	41%	54%
None of these	< 0.5%		-	<0.5%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	<0.5%	-

- There are no sizeable gender differences. With regard to age, 18-24 year olds show some over-representation for “mild” and “quite strong” bonds and thus some under-representation for “very strong” bonds. 55-64 year olds show over-representation (i.e. greater intensity) as regards feeling “very strongly” Jewish. Other age groups tend to follow the overall sample trend with some showing a bit more focus on the “quite strong” category. For cities, because the sample was so big in Johannesburg, this city sets the overall trend. Thus, the Johannesburg results are approximately in keeping with the overall results i.e. with emphasis on the “very strong” category. Pretoria shows clear emphasis on “very strong” bonds, while Cape Town shows under-representation for “very strong” bonds and over-representation for other bonds. Durban shows under-representation of the middle category while hinting at over-representation in the others. In summary, Cape Town’s bonds with being Jewish are less intense than is the case for other cities, while Pretoria shows the greatest intensity and Johannesburg sets the trend for the sample as a whole.
- How do 1998 and 2005 results compare overall? The results are, in effect, the same – an unbelievable finding! There has been no change in the level of Jewish identity (as measured by this key question) in the last 7 years.** In both studies, the majority are divided between those (49% or 50%) who feel a very strong bond with Judaism in that they are extremely conscious of being Jewish and it is very important to them and those (41% or 42%) who feel quite a strong bond with Judaism since they claimed that they feel quite strongly Jewish while being equally conscious of other aspects of their lives. In both instances, only a small proportion (8% or 9%) claimed to have “mild” Jewish feelings (i.e. they are aware of their Jewishness but do not think about it very often or they claim that although they were born Jewish they do not think of themselves as Jewish in any way)

	2005		1998	
	Total Respondents 1000=100%	BOND WITH BEING JEWISH	Total Respondents 1000=100%	BOND WITH BEING JEWISH
Although I was born Jewish I do not think of myself as being Jewish in any way	< 0.5%	MILD 8%	< 0.5%	MILD 9%
I am aware of my Jewishness but do not think about it very often	8%		9%	
I feel quite strongly Jewish but I am equally conscious of other aspects of my life	42%	QUITE STRONG 42%	41%	QUITE STRONG 41%
I feel extremely conscious of being Jewish and it is very important to me	50%	STRONG 50%	49%	STRONG 49%
None of these	< 0.5%		1%	
Total	100%		100%	

B. The link between Jews, their future and their past

The extent of agreement with various statements was checked on. Four of the statements are relevant in this Jewish identity section of the report:

- ❖ An unbreakable bond unites Jews all over the world
- ❖ It is important that Jews survive as a people
- ❖ When it comes to a crisis Jews can only depend on other Jews
- ❖ The Holocaust should be included in the core of young people's Jewish identity

	An unbreakable bond unites Jews all over the world 1000=100%		It is important that Jews survive as a people 1000=100%		When it comes to a crisis Jews can only depend on other Jews 1000=100%		The Holocaust should be included in the core of young people's Jewish identity 1000=100%	
Strongly Agree	43%	91% AGREE	68%	97% AGREE	14%	42% AGREE	53%	94% AGREE
Agree	48%		29%		28%		41%	
Neither agree nor disagree	4%	4% NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	1%	1% NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	14%	14% NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	3%	3% NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
Disagree	4%	4%	1%	1%	36%	44% DISAGREE	2%	2%
Strongly Disagree	<0.5%	DISAGREE	<0.5%	DISAGREE	8%		<1%	DISAGREE
Don't know/No answer	<0.5%	<0.5% DK/NO ANSWER	1%	1% DK/NO ANSWER	<1%	<1% DK/NO ANSWER	1%	1% DK/NO ANSWER
Average rating ⁶²	4.30		4.63		3.04		4.45	

- **There is a powerfully strong belief amongst South African Jews that “an unbreakable bond unites Jews all over the world” (91% agree with this statement).** Of the 91%, approximately half “agree” and approximately half agree more emphatically/strongly. With the highest possible average rating being 5, an average rating of 4.30 positions this factor between “agree” and “strongly agree” but closer to the agree side.
- **Another powerfully held belief – even more intensely expressed - is that it is important that Jews survive as a people.** Virtually all (97%) feel this way, with a very large percentage doing so emphatically i.e. the

⁶² Strongly agree was weighted “5”, Agree “4”, Neither agree nor disagree “3”, Disagree “2” and Strongly disagree “1”. The weighted scores were totaled and divided by the total respondents rating to yield an average rating. The highest possible average rating (on the agree side) is thus “5” and the lowest possible (which is on the disagree side) is “1”.

- 97% splits: 68% strongly agree and 29% agree, with the average rating (4.63) between “agree” and “strongly agree” but closer to “strongly agree”.
- **That the Holocaust should be included in the core of young people’s Jewish identity is another particularly strongly held belief.** 94% agree: 53% strongly agree and 41% agree. The average rating (4.45) positions this factor between “agree” and “strongly agree”.
 - **What emerges as controversial is whether Jews in a crisis situation can depend only on other Jews. Opinions are divided in this regard.** Some agreed (42%), some disagreed (44%) and 14% could not commit themselves either way. The average rating (3.04) centering around the midpoint of the scale highlights that opinions were divided in this regard.

Are there demographic or other differences with regard to these factors?

	AVERAGE RATINGS ⁶³ FOR EACH FACTOR:			
	An unbreakable bond unites Jews all over the world	It is important that Jews survive as a people	When it comes to a crisis Jews can only depend on other Jews	The Holocaust should be included in the core of young people’s Jewish identity
Total	4.30	4.63	3.04	4.45
<u>Gender</u>				
Male	4.29	4.67	3.03	4.44
Female	4.32	4.60	3.06	4.46
<u>Age</u>				
18-24 yrs	4.17	4.60	2.49	4.39
25-34 yrs	4.39	4.75	2.97	4.49
35-44 yrs	4.35	4.60	3.04	4.38
45-54 yrs	4.25	4.56	2.82	4.48
55-64 yrs	4.38	4.70	3.30	4.51
65+ yrs	4.26	4.59	3.37	4.45
<u>City</u>				
Jhb	4.31	4.60	3.14	4.50
Pta	4.30	4.74	3.36	4.44
CT	4.27	4.68	2.73	4.34
Dbn	4.42	4.68	3.08	4.41
<u>Jewish feeling</u>				
Mild	3.73↓	4.10↓	2.44↓	3.94↓
Quite Str.	4.14↓	4.56↓	2.76↓	4.37↓
Very Str.	4.54	4.77	3.39	4.60
<u>Religious Practice</u>				
Secular	3.83↓	4.30↓	2.47↓	4.14↓
Reform/Prog.	3.97↓	4.52↓	2.35↓	4.26↓
Traditional	4.36↓	4.66↓	3.12↓	4.52↓
Strictly Orth.	4.60	4.83	3.51	4.52

⁶³ In the tabulation each column shows the average rating for a particular statement, with the average rating for the total sample at the top of the column. By comparing the scores down the column with the total score at the top it can be determined which demographic subgroups score above and which below average.

- There are no meaningful differences between the scores for males and females for any of the factors.
- Although there are no clear age trends there are some aspects worth noting i.e. the **25-34 year olds** are the most convinced that it is important that Jews survive as a people; **those 55 years and older** are the most convinced that when it comes to a crisis Jews can only rely on other Jews.
- Some city tendencies can also be observed.
- **For all the factors, the stronger the Jewish feeling the greater the extent of agreement (i.e. the higher the average rating). Also, for all the factors, the Strictly Orthodox reflect the highest scores for extent of agreement, the Traditionals are next in line, followed by the Reform/Progressives and then the Secular/Just Jewish with the lowest scores for extent of agreement.**

The summary table shown below shows that – in essence – there has been minimal change in the 7 year period between the studies i.e.

- In 1998 and still in 2005, we observe a powerfully strong belief amongst South African Jews with regard to three factors “an unbreakable bond unites Jews all over the world”, “it is important that Jews survive as a people, “the Holocaust should be included in the core of young people’s Jewish identity”. What emerged as controversial in 1998 and still does in 2005 is whether Jews who are in a crisis situation can depend only on other Jews. Opinions are divided in this regard.

	An unbreakable bond unites Jews all over the world		It is important that Jews survive as a people		When it comes to a crisis Jews can only depend on other Jews		The Holocaust should be included in the core of young people’s Jewish identity	
	2005	1998	2005	1998	2005	1998	2005	1998
Strongly agree/ Agree	91%	88%	97%	98%	42%	44%	94%	90%
Neither agree nor disagree	4%	8%	1%	1%	14%	18%	3%	6%
Strongly disagree/ Disagree	4%	4%	1%	1%	44%	37%	2%	3%
Don’t know/ no answer	<0.5%	<0.5%	1%	<0.5%	<1%	1%	1%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

C. Marriage/partners, intermarriage, conversion

(i) The unmarried sector: Importance or otherwise of a partner being Jewish

Those who are not in a marriage relationship (irrespective of whether they live with a partner or not) were asked: “Irrespective of whether or not you are looking for a partner, how important is it to you that your partner is Jewish? PROBE: Very important, important, of minor importance, completely unimportant?”

	2005 Total <u>not</u> in marriage relationship 429=100%
<u>Importance of partner being Jewish</u>	
Very important	59%
Important	20%
Of minor importance	13%
Completely unimportant	6%
Don't know/no answer	2%

- **The majority (79%) claim that it is important to them that their partner should be Jewish** i.e. 20% saying important, but the bulk (59%) emphasising that it is very important. It is of minor importance to some (13%) and completely unimportant to a very small proportion (6%). The remaining 2% said “do not know”/no answer.
- **A review of the data within various demographic and other subgroups shows some trends.**
- **Age-related trends: Under 35 year olds (i.e. 18-24 year olds and 25-34 year olds) tend to show an above average tendency towards wanting Jewish partners**, 55-64 year olds are not quite as intense about this but – on an average - undoubtedly consider a Jewish partner to be important, while 35-54 year olds tend to score a bit below the older sector as regards the intensity but with scores still centering more on “important” than “unimportant”.
- **Cities: Those in the Johannesburg/Pretoria area are more emphatic than those in Cape Town or Durban about the importance of their partners being Jewish.** However – on an average – all cities reflect scores showing that they consider it important for their partners to be Jewish.
- **Marital status: Those who are divorced are less emphatic about specifying that their partners should be Jewish than are those who are single or widowed.**
- **Strength of Jewish feeling: Understandably, the stronger the Jewish feeling the greater the tendency to consider it important that partners should be Jewish.** In fact, those whose extent of “Jewish feeling” is classified as “Mild”, tend to focus more on it being unimportant that their partners should be Jewish.

- **Religious practice sectors:** Also understandable is the finding that there are differences between various religious categories in this regard i.e. the Strictly Orthodox virtually all claimed that it is very important for partners to be Jewish; the Traditionals also emphasised Jewish partners to an above average extent but not as intensely as did the Strictly Orthodox; Reform/Progressives reflected the tendency to a below average extent; and the Secular/Just Jewish sector scored still lower and veered towards regarding it unimportant that their partners should be Jewish.

Once again we see very similar score patterns for 2005 and 1998 i.e. no major changes in the 7 year period. In 1998 and still in 2005, those not in a marriage relationship⁶⁴ primarily claimed that it is important to them that their partner should be Jewish and the focus was, in both instances, more on “very important” than on “important”.

	2005 Total <u>not</u> in marriage relationship 429=100%	1998 Total <u>not</u> in marriage relationship 452=100%
<u>Importance of partner being Jewish</u>		
Very important	59%	53%
Important	20%	21%
Of minor importance	13%	12%
Completely unimportant	6%	6%
Don't know/no answer	2%	8%

**(ii) The “ever married” or currently paired/married sector:
whether spouse/partner is/was Jewish or not**

What proportion of “paired” Jews in South Africa are currently married to Jews/living with Jewish partners? What proportion of currently divorced/separated and widowed Jews were married to Jews?

Those who are “**paired**” (i.e. **married or living with a partner**) were asked: “Does the person you are married to/living with consider himself/herself to be Jewish or non-Jewish?”

Those who are **divorced or separated** were asked: “Does the person you are divorced/separated from consider himself/herself to be Jewish or non-Jewish?”

Those who are **widowed** were asked: “Did the person you were married to consider himself/herself to be Jewish or non-Jewish?”

⁶⁴ The 1998 and 2005 questions were slightly different.

1998: “If you are interested in finding a partner, how important is it that your partner should be Jewish?”

2005: “Irrespective of whether or not you are looking for a partner, how important is it to you that your partner is Jewish?”

The reason for the change in question was that some respondents felt uncomfortable about answering the 1998 question with its direct focus on their being interested in finding a partner. The amended 2005 question did not give rise to any objections.

In the context of these questions, “Jewish” refers to “considers himself/herself Jewish”. It includes Jewish by birth or conversion as well as those who may not be halachically Jewish but consider themselves Jewish.

Total ever married or currently “paired” 770=100% ⁶⁵		Total “Paired” i.e. married or living with partner 590=100%		Total Divorced/ Separated 87=100%		Total Widowed 93=100%	
Spouse/ Partner is/was Jewish	Spouse/ Partner is/was Non- Jewish	Spouse/ Partner is Jewish	Spouse/ Partner is Non- Jewish	Ex- spouse is/was Jewish	Ex- spouse is/was Non- Jewish	Spouse was Jewish	Spouse was Non- Jewish
94%	6%	95%	5%	85%	15%	96%	4%
100%		100%		100%		100%	

- **Most mentioned that their spouses/partners are/were Jewish.** This applies whether we look at the overall total in the 1st column (94%) OR whether we look at each of the three sectors comprising the total (i.e. 3rd, 5th and 7th columns).
- **What is interesting is that there seems to be a tendency for divorce/separation to be slightly greater in an intermarriage situation (where one spouse is Jewish and one not) than in a situation where both spouses are Jewish.** This is indicated by the fact that the divorced/separated sector reflects a slightly lower “Jewish” proportion and – correspondingly – a slightly higher “non-Jewish” proportion than do the other sectors.
- **Those currently married/living with a partner show some differences within demographic subgroup:**
 - **The 45-54 year sector dips a bit** i.e. 91% of this sector mentioned that their spouses/partners are Jewish, whereas Jewish spouse/partner scores hint at being higher amongst under 45 year olds (95%) and over 54 year olds (96%).

⁶⁵ This total of 770 respondents includes all who were ever married or still are (751 respondents) plus those currently living with a partner (19 respondents). The only sector excluded from this total are those who are “single i.e. never married and not living with a partner” (230 respondents). Strictly-speaking, if we wish to examine the Jewish spouse proportion only amongst those who are or were ever married, those not married but living with partners should be excluded from the tabulation. Only a very small sector (19 respondents i.e. 2% of the sample) are currently living with a partner. Because this sector is so small, its removal from the tabulation does not alter the findings. The percentages remain the same and the overall conclusions apply. Incidentally, when we examine the 19 respondents currently living with a partner, we see that: 15 are living with a Jewish partner and 4 with a non-Jewish partner. The proportion living with a Jewish partner should be used as a guide only rather than be considered as statistically significant since the base of 19 respondents is very small.

- **Higher Jewish spouse/partner scores are currently reflected for Johannesburg (98%) and Pretoria (95%) than for Cape Town (89%) and Durban (85%).**
- **The more intensely Jewish they feel the more likely they are to have Jewish spouses/partners** i.e. the proportion mentioning Jewish spouses/partners amongst those whose Jewish identity is: “Mild” was 75%, among the “Quite Strong” it was 94%, and for “Very Strong” it was 97%.
- **Jewish spouse/partner scores are lower for Secular/Just Jewish (80%) and Reform/Progressive (80%) than for Traditional (97%) and Strictly Orthodox (100%)**
- We saw earlier that there seems to be a tendency for divorce/separation to be slightly greater in an intermarriage situation (where one spouse is Jewish and one not) than in a situation where both spouses are Jewish. Demographic insight into this tendency is difficult since the divorced/separated sector comprises 9% (i.e. 87 respondents). Breaking this down into detailed demographic and other subgroups makes the bases very small and the resultant percentages unreliable.
- As discussed, the 2005 survey covered the Jewish spouses/partners issue for those currently married/living with a partner as well as the Jewish spouse issue for the past i.e. for those now divorced/separated/widowed. However, in 1998 only the current situation was checked on. For the sector for which we do have a comparison, the results are similar now to what they were in 1998 i.e. most mentioned that their spouses/partners are Jewish:

2005		1998	
Total “Paired” i.e. married or living with partner 590=100%		Total “Paired” i.e. married or living with partner 574=100%	
Spouse/Partner is Jewish	Spouse/Partner is non-Jewish	Spouse/Partner is Jewish	Spouse/Partner is non-Jewish
95%	5%	93%	7%
100%		100%	

(iii) Attitudes to marrying a Jewish vs. non-Jewish person

For more input on attitudes regarding marriage to a Jewish or non-Jewish person, extent of agreement or disagreement was obtained for three statements:

“A Jew should marry someone who is also Jewish”:

- **It was agreed with by the majority (81%)** i.e. 44% strongly agree and 37% agree. The remaining scores were: neither agree nor disagree (12%), disagree/strongly disagree (7%), don’t know/no answer (< 0.5%). With an average rating of 4.15 (where the highest possible average rating is 5) this statement is positioned at the “agree” level.

- **Looked at within breakdowns there are some differences.** There is no major male-female difference but males tend to be a bit more intense about the spouse being Jewish; there is no clear age-related trend; Johannesburg (4.24) and - even more so - Pretoria (4.52) show higher agreement scores than do Durban (4.16) and the lower-scoring Cape Town (3.84). Religious sectors show differences i.e. Strictly Orthodox reflected the highest extent of agreement (4.79), Traditional was next (4.29), then a bit to the agree side but distinctly close to “neither agree nor disagree” were Reform/Progressive (3.21) and Secular/Just Jewish (3.21).
- **“A Jew should marry someone who is also Jewish” was agreed with by the majority in 1998 (79%) and a similar proportion in 2005 (81%).**

“Having a Jewish partner is only important if you intend to have children”:

- **This was disagreed with by almost three-quarters of the respondents (73%)** i.e. 49% disagree and 24% strongly disagree. Only 19% agreed/strongly agreed with the statement, 7% neither agreed nor disagreed and 1% said “do not know”/gave no answer. An average rating of 2.26 positions this statement close to “disagree”.
- **Within demographic breakdowns there are some differences** i.e. under 45 year olds (but particularly 18-24 year olds) disagree more than those 45 years and older that having a Jewish partner is only important if you intend to have children; Johannesburg does not disagree quite as intensely as other cities; the stronger the Jewish identity the more they disagree; the Strictly Orthodox show more intense disagreement than does any other demographic sector covered in the survey.
- **“Having a Jewish partner is only important if you intend to have children” was disagreed with by 76% in 1998 and – a similar proportion - 73 % (in 2005).**

“It is purely by chance that I married a Jew”:

- **Of those qualifying to rate this statement, an overwhelmingly large proportion (88%) disagreed with it** i.e. 42% disagreed and 46% strongly disagreed. The remainder of the scores were: agree/strongly agree (7%), neither agree nor disagree (2%), don’t know/no answer (3%). The average rating for this statement was 1.71 which unequivocally indicates disagreement. Only those currently married to Jews, those currently divorced/separated from Jews and those currently widowed whose deceased spouse was Jewish, qualified to indicate their extent of agreement or disagreement with this statement.
- **Breakdown analysis reflects some differences.** Females definitely disagree but not quite as intensely as do males; there are no clear age or city-related trends; the greater the Jewish identity the more they disagree that it is purely by chance that they married a Jew; although all religious practice sectors disagree the Strictly Orthodox disagree more than do the Traditionals who in turn disagree more than do the Secular/Just Jewish and the Reform/Progressives.

- Of those qualifying to rate “It is purely by chance that I married a Jew”, an overwhelmingly large proportion disagreed in 1998 (87%) and virtually the same proportion disagreed in 2005 (88%).

(iv) Jewish internet dating sites

We checked on whether or not respondents have gone onto Jewish internet dating sites. **6% claimed to have done so.** Who - demographically-speaking – are the users of these sites? **As can be observed below, those 25-44 years of age (but particularly 25-34 year olds) show a greater tendency for involvement in such sites than do other sectors** i.e. considering that 6% of the total reflect participation in this activity, these sectors (but particularly the 25-34 year sector) show an above average participation.

	TOTAL RESPONDENTS	18-24 yrs	25-34 yrs	35-44 yrs	45-54 yrs	55-64 yrs	65+ yrs
Have participated in Jewish internet dating sites	6%	4%	15%	8%	5%	2%	2%

In the above we looked at the proportion, within each age group, who have participated in Jewish internet dating sites. We can look at the data in a different way as well i.e. of those who have participated in such sites, what proportion fall into each age category? More specifically, what is the profile of the users of Jewish internet dating sites? We will look at age and other breakdowns.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	USER PROFILE
		Have participated in Jewish internet dating sites 58=100%
<u>Age</u>		
18-24 yrs	11%	7%
25-34 yrs	16%	41%
35-44 yrs	17%	24%
45-54 yrs	17%	14%
55-64 yrs	18%	7%
65+ yrs	21%	7%
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	46%	55%
Female	54%	45%
<u>City</u>		
Jhb	65%	71%
Pta	5%	9%
CT	25%	19%
Dbn	5%	2%
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Married	57%	29%
Divorced	8%	14%
Single	23%	50%
Widowed	9%	3%
<u>Religious Practice</u>		
Secular	12%	5%
Reform	7%	7%
Traditional	66%	64%
Str. Orth.	14%	24%

- **Of all the “users” of Jewish internet dating sites, almost two-thirds (65%) are 25-44 years of age. This splits: 25-34 years (41%) and 35-44 years (24%), indicating that the 25-34 year sector is clearly the prime user group.** This age group is heavily over-represented in the user profile i.e. whilst 41% of users fall into this age group, the age group comprises only 16% of the total sample. **The 35-44 years age sector can be considered to be the secondary user group.** There is some over-representation of this age group in the user profile, but this is not as intense as is the case for the prime user group i.e. of the total users 24% are 35-44 years while in the total sample 17% fall into this age group. Other age sectors, particularly those over 54 years of age, reflected under-representation in the user profile.
- **Whilst both males and females are strongly represented in the user profile, males tend to be more inclined to use these sites.** In the total sample there is a higher proportion of females (54%) than males (46%). However, in the profile of Jewish internet dating site users these proportions are reversed: 55% of users are male and 45% are female.
- **Those in Johannesburg and Pretoria show an above average propensity towards using such sites, whereas those in Cape Town and Durban show a below average tendency.** This can be observed by comparing the total sample profile with the profile for the Jewish internet dating site user.
- **Those who use such sites are far more often from the single sector than from other sectors. However, the divorced sector also shows some over-representation in the profile.**
- **Because a very large proportion of the Jewish population are Traditionals, a very large sector of the users belong to the Traditional category. However, the Strictly Orthodox sector shows an above average propensity to use such sites, while the Secular sector hints at below average interest in such sites.**

(v) Whether or not their parents were Jewish

“When we say Jewish, we mean Jewish irrespective of whether Jewish by birth or Jewish by conversion. Bearing this in mind, which one of the following statements applies to you: both your parents were Jewish, only your mother was Jewish, only your father was Jewish, neither of your parents was Jewish?”

This question was asked in both 1998 and 2005 and the results were similar i.e. **an overwhelming majority (94% for 2005 and 96% for 1998) claimed that both of their parents were Jewish. In effect, 96% (in 2005) and - a similar proportion - 97% (in 1998) claimed to have had a Jewish mother or both**

parents Jewish⁶⁶. As will be observed these proportions tie up with the data in the next section – section (vi) - relating to whether respondents claimed to have been born Jewish or converted to Judaism.

	2005 Total Respondents 1000=100%	1998 Total Respondents 1000=100%
Both parents Jewish	94%	96%
Only mother Jewish	2%	1%
Only father Jewish	1%	1%
Neither parent Jewish	3%	2%
Total	100%	100%

Looking at the 2005 data by city we observe that **in Durban the score for both parents being Jewish (88%) was lower than for other cities, with the “only mother was Jewish” (8%) proportion being correspondingly higher than for other cities. However, a total of these two scores shows that the combined “both parents/mother Jewish” score for Durban (96%) is in keeping with the overall sample score.** As mentioned, at this point we do not have the breakdown of the Orthodox and Reform sectors within this.

	2005				
	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Jhb 650=100%	Pta 50=100%	CT 250=100%	Dbn 50=100%
Their parents:					
Both parents Jewish	94%	95%	94%	92%	88%
Only mother Jewish	2%	2%	2%	1%	8%
Only father Jewish	1%	1%	-	2%	-
Neither parent Jewish	3%	2%	4%	5%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

(vi) Conversion

“Which one of the following alternatives on this card applies to you?” (Born Jewish, Converted to Judaism before the age of 13 years e.g. with parent converting, Converted to Judaism between 13 and 17 years of age, Converted to Judaism at 18 years or older. IF CONVERTED: Did you convert Reform or Orthodox?)”

The question was asked in 1998 and 2005 and the “born Jewish” scores were very high in both instances.

⁶⁶ Within these combined scores, we do not know, without further analysis, the proportion of these who were born Orthodox and the proportion who were born Reform. The Orthodox sector would consider only those born of an Orthodox mother (and this includes both parents being Orthodox), to be halachically Jewish i.e. Jewish according to Jewish law. Insight into Orthodox and Reform proportions will be obtained in the next section of the report which deals with religiosity.

	2005 Total Respondents 1000=100%	1998 Total Respondents 1000=100%
<u>Self:</u> Born Jewish	96%	97%
Converted to Judaism at 18 yrs or older	3%	3%
Converted to Judaism before 18yrs of age	1%	0.1%
Total	100%	100%

- **There has been no significant change since 1998. In both studies an exceptionally large proportion were born Jewish and the results, statistically-speaking, are similar:** In 1998, 97% were born Jewish, 3% converted at 18 years or older and 0.1% converted earlier. In 2005, 96% were born Jewish, 3% converted at 18 years or older and 1% at an earlier age.
- For interest we will show the 2005 results by city.

	2005				
	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Jhb 650=100%	Pta 50=100%	CT 250=100%	Dbn 50=100%
<u>Self:</u> Born Jewish	96%	97%	96%	94% ⁶⁷	96%
Converted to Judaism at 18 yrs or older	3%	2%	4%	5%	4%
Converted to Judaism before 18yrs of age	1%	1%	-	<0.5%	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- In 2005 we asked an additional question of all those who converted: “Did you convert Reform or Orthodox?”
Of the total who converted (i.e. 40 respondents), just under half (45%) converted to Reform and just over half (55%) converted to Orthodox. One of those who converted, spontaneously specified that she had converted from Reform to Orthodox. We cannot be certain of the extent of conversion from Reform to Orthodox since there was no question in the survey to check on this.

⁶⁷ The Cape Town combined “both parents/mother Jewish” score was – as can be seen in the earlier tabulation – 93%, whereas this “born Jewish” score is 94%. The difference is due to rounding off. For all other cities it can be observed that the “both parents/mother Jewish” score coincides with the “born Jewish” score.

D. Participation in Jewish educational and other programmes, trips, websites, other activities

Respondents indicated whether or not they “personally participated in any of the following”. A list of activities, experiences and organisations were read to them one at a time. Scores are shown below for the sample as a whole and by city.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Jhb 650=100%	Pta 50=100%	CT 250=100%	Dbn 50=100%
<u>Ever participated in:</u>					
Machaneh	46%	45%	52%	51%	40%
Israel experience during schoolgoing age	20%	22%	10%	19%	10%
Yeshiva/seminary in Israel after leaving school	7%	8%	4%	4%	6%
Other post-matric programme in Israel	13%	15%	8%	10%	6%
Yeshiva in South Africa after leaving school	3%	3%	-	2%	6%
SAUJS e.g. meetings, social gatherings etc.	23%	21%	28%	28%	16%
YAD e.g. meetings, social gatherings etc.	7%	4%	2%	15%	4%
Studying Kabala	8%	9%	4%	8%	10%
Going on Jewish heritage trips e.g. to Poland, Russia, Lithuania	7%	8%	6%	3%	12%
Surfing Jewish websites	31%	29%	56%	30%	48%
Jewish internet dating sites	6%	6%	10%	4%	2%
Jewish adult education courses	38%	36%	60%	38%	38%
Listening to Jewish music	58%	57%	76%	55%	68%

- Full evaluation for each of the activities, experiences and organisations listed above, should be done within the context of its target group. A few points are noted below.
- **Almost half (46%) of the total respondents have ever attended Machaneh i.e. Jewish/Zionist youth camps. What is worth noting is that Machaneh, which is actually targeted at the younger sector, would appear to be becoming increasingly more popular within the sector it is targeted at.** Amongst those under 35 years of age (and particularly amongst the 18-24 year olds) the scores are higher than amongst those above 35 years of age i.e. 73% of 18-24 year olds have attended Machaneh and 59% of 25-34 year olds, while for older age sectors the scores are below 45%. Some differences between the cities can be noted, but these are not dramatic differences. The Durban score does however tend towards being below average. **Incidentally, a review of past data shows that the score for having attended Machaneh has gone up since 1998 i.e. the current overall score (46%) is higher than the 1998 score (38%).**
- **20% (i.e. 1 in every 5) went to Israel during schoolgoing age. They are more likely to be from Johannesburg and Cape Town than elsewhere and a check on age shows that under 35 year olds but particularly 18-24 year olds are more likely to have experienced this i.e. amongst 18-24 year olds 55% have experienced this, amongst those 25-44 years 32% have and amongst those 45 years and older 6%. For this 2005 study**

- the score for an Israel experience during schoolgoing age (20%) tends towards being higher than the comparable score for 1998 (15%).
- **Scores for other Israel-related experiences can be observed in the tabulation above. Generally-speaking, Johannesburg reflects above average scores for Israel-related and Yeshiva/seminary-related experiences** i.e. looking overall at: Israel during schoolgoing age, Yeshiva/seminary in Israel after leaving school, Other post-matric programme in Israel, Yeshiva in South Africa after leaving school.
 - **23% claimed to have participated in SAUJS, with Pretoria and Cape Town scoring above and Durban below average for having participated.** A check on age breakdowns (not shown above) indicates that those under 35 years of age are more likely to have participated than those over 35 years. **Also, worth mentioning is the fact that the SAUJS score seems to be moving up i.e. 18% in 1998 to 23% in 2005.**
 - **7% claim to have participated in YAD and since YAD is targeted at “young adults” it is understandable that the 25-34 year group shows the highest score (17%) and all other age groups scored 8% or less. With regard to cities, the Cape Town participation score (15%) is decidedly above average.** If we were to check specifically on the 25-34 year sector in Cape Town, it is likely that the score would be far higher than 17%. However, the sample is too small to be broken down to that extent. **It is worth mentioning that the score for having participated in YAD has gone up from 2% in 1998 to 7% now and Cape Town has gone up from 8% in 1998 to 15% now.**
 - **Details for other activities participated in can be observed in the above tabulation.** Briefly, the overall scores for these were: studying Kabala (8%) and no clear age-related trend emerged; going on Jewish heritage trips (7%) and with some focus on 18-24 year olds and 55-64 year olds; surfing Jewish websites (31%) and this is more likely to be done by under than over 45 year olds; Jewish internet dating sites (6%) – this was discussed in detail earlier; Jewish adult education courses (38%) – no distinct age trend; listening to Jewish music (58%) with the score being highest amongst those over 54 years of age but nevertheless sizeable in all age groups i.e. it may well be that not all age groups are talking about the same type of Jewish music. **Incidentally, the adult education factor was checked in 1998 as well – the participation score was the same as for the 2005 study (38%).**

VIII. RELIGIOSITY

A. God, Torah and Prayer

The following question was asked:

“Which one of the following comes closest to describing your feelings about the Bible (Torah): The Torah is the actual word of God; The Torah is the inspired word of God but not everything should be taken literally word for word; The Torah is an ancient book of history and moral precepts recorded by man?”

	T O T A L	A G E						C I T Y				RELIGIOUS PRACTICE			
		18-24 yrs	25-34 yrs	35-44 yrs	45-54 yrs	55-64 yrs	65+ yrs	Jhb	Pta	CT	Dbn	Sec-ular/JJ	Ref/Pr.	Tradi-tional	Str. Orth
Bible (Torah): Torah is the actual word of God	36%	43%	50%	40%	33%	32%	27%	43%	36%	21%	30%	7%	8%	34%	89%
Torah is the inspired word of God but not everything should be taken literally word for word	38%	44%	36%	35%	36%	36%	40%	34%	40%	42%	58%	27%	45%	45%	9%
Torah is an ancient book of history and moral precepts recorded by man	23%	12%	11%	20%	29%	29%	30%	19%	24%	36%	10%	61%	46%	18%	1%
Don't know/ No answer	3%	1%	3%	5%	2%	3%	3%	4%	-	1%	2%	5%	1%	3%	1%
Total	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100%	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

- Thus, **36%** believe that the Torah is the actual word of God; **38%** claimed that it is the inspired word of God but not everything should be taken literally word for word; **23%** say that it is an ancient book of history and moral precepts recorded by man and **3%** said “Don’t know”/gave no answer.
- Under 45 year olds are overall more likely to choose one of the two “word of God” options than are those over 45 years of age. In fact, under 45 year olds (and particularly 25-34 year olds) are clearly more likely to focus on the Torah being the **actual** word of God than are the 45-64 year olds. Those least likely to believe that it is the actual word of God are those 65 years and older.
- Of the four cities, **Cape Town** reflects the least Orthodox view. **Johannesburg** tends more to the “actual word of God” option than towards the “inspired word of God” option and shows far less focus on the

“histomoral”⁶⁸ option. **Pretoria** reflects more of a spread i.e. the two word-of-God options score similarly (with a hint of the “inspired” option scoring a bit higher) and the histomoral option scores below these. **Cape Town’s** focus is away from “the actual word of God” and tending (but not to a major extent) towards more emphasis on the “inspired word of God” than on the “histomoral” belief. **Durban** is heavily focused on the “inspired” option.

- **The Strictly Orthodox, understandably, focus primarily on the Torah being the “actual word of God”. Traditionals are divided between “actual” and “inspired”, tending to focus more on “inspired”. Reform/Progressives are divided between “inspired” and “histomoral” beliefs and the Secular/Just Jewish show heavy focus on “histomoral” with noticeable reference to the “inspired” option.**

Have there been changes in relation to these beliefs about the Torah?

- **It is remarkable that in the last seven years there has been minimal change in this regard. The recent results were (statistically-speaking) the same as the results for 7 years ago:**

	2005 1000=100%	1998 1000=100%
Torah is:		
Actual word of God	36%	36%
Inspired word of God but not everything should be taken literally word for word	38%	41%
Ancient book of history and moral precepts recorded by man	23%	23%
Don't Know/No answer	3%	-
Total	100%	100%

Respondents were also asked:

“I am going to read some statements to you about beliefs and experiences. For each one please tell me according to this card (CARD: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree) how much you agree or disagree with this statement”

Three of the statements checked on in this question are relevant to this section:

- ❖ The Jewish people have a special relationship with God
- ❖ The universe came about by chance
- ❖ Praying to God can help to overcome personal problems

⁶⁸ The word “histomoral” has been coined to refer to the option “The Torah is an ancient book of history and moral precepts recorded by man”.

	The Jewish people have a special relationship with God 1000=100%		The universe came about by chance 1000=100%		Praying to God can help to overcome personal problems 1000=100%	
Strongly agree	30%	79% AGREE	2%	13% AGREE	25%	69% AGREE
Agree	49%		11%		44%	
Neither agree nor disagree	10%	10% NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	17%	17% NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	16%	16% NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
Disagree	8%	9% DISAGREE	40%	63% DISAGREE	11%	13% DISAGREE
Strongly disagree	1%		23%		2%	
Don't know/ No answer	2%	2% DK/NO ANSWER	7%	7% DK/NO ANSWER	2%	2% DK/NO ANSWER
Average Rating ⁶⁹	4.01		2.23		3.81	

- **There is particularly strong agreement with the concept that the Jewish people have a special relationship with God.** Approximately 8 in every 10 (79%) agreed with this statement, with a sizeable sector of these emphatically saying that they strongly agree. Only 1 in every 10 disagreed with the statement and approximately 1 in every 10 did not commit themselves either way. The average rating of 4.01 places this statement clearly on the “agree” side of the scale.
- **Jewish people in South Africa are far more likely to believe that the universe did not come about by chance than that it did.** According to 63% it did not come about by chance. Only 13% think that it did come about by chance and they are heavily outweighed by those who tend to be uncertain and did not commit themselves either way (i.e. 24% which splits: 17% neither agree nor disagree and 7% DK/No answer). The average rating (2.23) summarises the fact that there is a weighting towards disagreement with the idea that the universe came about by chance.
- **A large sector believe in the power of prayer.** According to 69%, praying to God can help to overcome personal problems and a noticeable sector showed themselves to be emphatic about this by strongly agreeing with the statement. Only 13% disagree i.e. they do not think that praying to God can help to overcome personal problems. The remaining 18% claimed that: they neither agree nor disagree (16%) or said “do not know/no answer” (2%). The average rating of 3.81 shows that there is more emphasis on believing than not believing in the power of prayer.

⁶⁹ Strongly agree was weighted “5”, Agree “4”, Neither agree nor disagree “3”, Disagree “2” and Strongly disagree “1”. The weighted scores were totaled and divided by the total respondents rating to yield an average rating. The highest possible average rating (on the agree side) is thus “5” and the lowest possible (which is on the disagree side) is “1”.

How do the demographic and other subgroups score as regards extent of agreement with these factors? Here we have shown only the average ratings for each statement.

	A V E R A G E R A T I N G S ⁷⁰		
	The Jewish people have a special relationship with God 1000=100%	The universe came about by chance 1000=100%	Praying to God can help to overcome personal problems 1000=100%
Total Sample	4.01	2.23	3.81
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	4.15	2.20	3.81
Female	3.89	2.26	3.80
<u>Age</u>			
18-24 yrs	4.17	2.06	3.73
25-34 yrs	4.25	1.96↓	3.95
35-44 yrs	4.07↑	2.04↓	3.82
45-54 yrs	3.99↑	2.25	3.65
55-64 yrs	3.91↑	2.25↓	3.88
65+ yrs	3.78↑	2.66	3.80
<u>City</u>			
Jhb	4.07	2.13	3.81
Pta	4.16	2.31	4.04
CT	3.80	2.49	3.69
Dbn	4.12	2.11	4.13
<u>Religious Practice</u>			
Secular	3.21↓	3.08	3.14↓
Reform/Progressive	3.62↓	2.72↑	3.75↓
Traditional	4.04↓	2.22↑	3.78↓
Strictly Orthodox	4.69	1.36↑	4.48

- **The Jewish people have a special relationship with God:** Overall (i.e. in total), as discussed, there is distinct agreement with this concept but males tend to agree even more strongly with the concept than do females. Age-wise, all age groups – on an average - show distinct agreement but the under 45 year olds do so to an above average extent. There is, in fact, a clear age-related trend i.e. in the main, the younger the Jewish person the greater the agreement with this concept. The youngest age sector (18-24 years) varies slightly i.e. it does not score above the 25-34 year sector. However, when the two youngest age sectors are considered together (i.e. 18-24 years and 25-34 years) they do score above the 35-44 year sector. Overall, therefore the general age trend principle does apply, but the finding for the youngest age sector should be borne in mind. The Strictly Orthodox are the most emphatic about Jewish people having a special

⁷⁰ Strongly agree was weighted “5”, Agree “4”, Neither agree nor disagree “3”, Disagree “2” and Strongly disagree “1”. The weighted scores were totaled and divided by the total respondents rating. This yielded an average rating. The highest possible average rating (on the agree side) is thus “5” and the lowest possible (which is on the disagree side) is “1”.

- relationship with God, the Traditionals are next in line, then Reform/Progressives and then Secular/Just Jewish – with the Secular/Just Jewish scoring close to the “neither agree nor disagree” part of the scale.
- **The universe came about by chance:** As discussed earlier, Jewish people in South Africa are far more likely to believe that the universe did not come about by chance than that it did. Males and females do not differ sizeably in this regard. Age-wise, all sectors – on an average –believe that it did not come about by chance. There is, once again, an age-related trend i.e. in the main, the younger the respondent the more likely they are to disagree that the universe came about by chance. However, here again the 18-24 year group does not quite fit the trend. It would be more correct to consider the broader age categories i.e. 18-44 year olds are less likely to think it came about by chance than 45-64 year olds who in turn are less likely to think it came about by chance than those over 65 years of age. Within religious practice sectors, the Strictly Orthodox are the most adamant that the universe did not come about by chance, the Traditionals are also essentially convinced that it did not come about by chance but they are not as intense about this as are the Strictly Orthodox. The Reform are veering a bit more towards “neither agree nor disagree” and the Secular/Just Jewish tend to neither agree nor disagree, veering very slightly towards the side of agreeing that it did come about by chance.
 - **Praying to God can help to overcome personal problems:** Most of the scores tend to the agree side. There are no male-female differences and no clear age trends. Pretoria and Durban show above average scores for believing in the power of prayer. Although the Strictly Orthodox score is far above average (and essentially at maximum score level) and the other religious practice groups follow the score pattern trend exhibited for other factors, it would seem that the perceptions relating to the power of prayer are not related to religiosity alone e. g. the Secular/Just Jewish tend (even if slightly) towards the positive side of the scale. The demographic subgroup scores do not fit clearly into the expected pattern. It is therefore likely that perceptions about the power of prayer could be related to additional factors e.g. perceived psychological effects of prayer; or prayer not related to the traditional concept of a God but to variations thereof. This is a hypothesis only and would need verification.

A check on how the overall data for these statements compared with 1998 data shows that:

- **There is now and was in 1998 particularly strong agreement with the concept that the Jewish people have a special relationship with God (and this belief has intensified with time); Jewish people in South Africa were in 1998 and in 2005 far more likely to believe that the universe did not come about by chance than that it did (and the scores are very similar for 1998 and 2005); Praying to God is and was perceived as being able to help in overcoming personal problems (and here again the scores are very similar for 1998 and 2005).**

	The Jewish people have a special relationship with God 1000=100%		The universe came about by chance 1000=100%		Praying to God can help to overcome personal problems 1000=100%	
	2005 1000=100%	1998 1000=100%	2005 1000=100%	1998 1000=100%	2005 1000=100%	1998 1000=100%
Strongly agree/ Agree	79%	65%	13%	12%	69%	69%
Neither agree nor disagree	10%	18%	17%	20%	16%	17%
Disagree/ Strongly disagree	9%	16%	63%	61%	13%	12%
Don't know/No answer	2%	1%	7%	7%	2%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

B. How Jews classify themselves in terms of Jewish religious practice

“In terms of Jewish religious practice, which one of the following best describes your position CARD: Non-practising (i.e. Secular) Jew, Just Jewish, Reform/Progressive Jew, “Traditional” (not Strictly Orthodox), Strictly Orthodox (e.g. would not turn on a light on Sabbath?)”

	Total Sample 100= 100%	A G E						C I T Y			
		18-24 yrs 115= 100%	25-34 yrs 159= 100%	35-44 yrs 167= 100%	45-54 yrs 171= 100%	55-64 yrs 176= 100%	65+ yrs 212= 100%	Jhb 650= 100%	Pta 50= 100%	CT 250= 100%	Dbn 50= 100%
Self-classification:											
Non-practising i.e. Secular Jew	4%	4%	4%	3%	4%	4%	6%	3%	-	8%	6%
Just Jewish	8%	7%	6%	5%	9%	7%	10%	7%	6%	10%	2%
Reform/ Progressive	7%	3%	4%	7%	12%	9%	8%	5%	6%	13%	12%
Traditional (not Strictly Orthodox)	66%	68%	58%	69%	63%	68%	71%	67%	70%	64%	68%
Strictly Orthodox (e.g. would not turn on light on Sabbath)	14%	18%	28%	15%	12%	12%	4%	17%	18%	5%	12%
Don't know/ No answer	1%	-	-	1%	-	-	1%	1%	-	-	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- **Traditional Jews (66%) form the largest sector** i.e. Virtually two-thirds classified themselves as belonging to this category; **Strictly Orthodox (14%) follows far below; Reform/Progressives (7%) are next in line; the less involved total 12%** (Just Jewish 8% and Non-practising/Secular Jew 4%). Below 1% could not classify themselves (i.e. do not know/no answer).
- **The major category in each age sector is unequivocally the Traditional sector. However, under 35 year olds (but more so 25-34 year olds), show over-representation of the Strictly Orthodox category** i.e. 25-34 year olds, although comprising far more Traditionals than Strictly Orthodox Jews, have a relatively high proportion of the latter i.e. almost 3 in every 10 of 25-34 year olds claim to be Strictly Orthodox . As we proceed up the age scale the tendency towards Strict Orthodoxy decreases. Of all age sectors, those 65 years and older comprise the lowest proportion of Strictly Orthodox.
- **In Johannesburg:** there tends to be over-representation of the Strictly Orthodox, Traditionals are virtually on a par with the overall score, the Secular/Just Jewish sectors combined hint at under-representation as does the Reform/Progressive sector. **In Pretoria:** there is over-representation of Traditionals and Strictly Orthodox and under-representation of Secular/Just Jewish, with Reform/Progressive virtually on par with the overall score. **In Cape Town:** the Traditional score hints (but hints only) at being below average, Strictly Orthodox definitely scores below average, the Secular/Just Jewish sector combined tends towards being higher than elsewhere. Also, the Reform/Progressive proportion is higher in Cape Town than in the Johannesburg/Pretoria area but similar to the Durban score. **In Durban:** the combined Secular/Just Jewish score tends to be below the total sample score, Reform/Progressives score above average (and similar to the Cape Town score), Traditionals hint at being slightly above the national average and Strictly Orthodox hints at being below the national average.
- **Looking at this another way (for additional insight), what is the age and city-related profile for each religious practice sector?** Now, instead of examining each age and each city to see the penetration/proportion of religious practice groups within it, we look within each religious sector and check demographic profiles/proportions within these.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Sec/JJ 118=100%	Ref/Prog 74=100%	Trad 663=100%	Str Orth 141=100%
<u>Gender</u>					
Male	46%	46%	47%	43%	57%
Female	54%	54%	53%	57%	43%
<u>Age:</u>					
18-24 yrs	11%	11%	4%	12%	15%
25-34 yrs	16%	14%	9%	14%	31%
35-44 yrs	17%	11%	16%	17%	18%
45-54 yrs	17%	19%	27%	16%	14%
55-64 yrs	18%	16%	22%	18%	16%
65+ yrs	21%	29%	22%	23%	6%
<u>City:</u>					
Johannesburg	65%	56%	43%	66%	80%
Pretoria	5%	3%	4%	5%	7%
Cape Town	25%	38%	45%	24%	9%
Durban	5%	3%	8%	5%	4%

- **The Secular/Just Jewish sector:** has a male-female profile in keeping with the total and shows over-representation in the 65 years and older category. Furthermore, it shows over-representation in Cape Town and sizeable under-representation in Johannesburg.
- **The Reform/Progressive sector:** also shows a male-female profile in keeping with the total. It shows over-representation in the older age groups (i.e. 71% are over 44 years of age whereas in the total sample only 56% fall into this older category). There is also over-representation in Cape Town particularly and to some extent in Durban, with distinct under-representation in Johannesburg. There is a point to be emphasised here. For those concerned about ensuring the future of the Reform/Progressive sector, it is imperative to attract younger people whose future is beginning rather than have the future of the Reform/Progressive sector depending primarily on those who are older.
- **The Traditional sector** hints at over-representation of females but other than that is basically in keeping with the total profile. It should be borne in mind that because the Traditional sector is so big, it essentially sets the tone for the total sample profile.
- **The Strictly Orthodox sector** shows: clear over-representation of males and 18-34 year olds (but particularly 25-34 year olds); undoubted under-representation of those over 65 years of age; definite over-representation of Johannesburg and clear under-representation in Cape Town.

For additional insight we have – where possible - analysed the data by suburb grouping within the cities. Because of sample size restrictions more detail has been provided for Johannesburg and Cape Town than for Durban and Pretoria.

SUBURB GROUPINGS
<u>JOHANNESBURG:</u>
<u>Sandton</u> represents: Morningside, Sandown, Gallo Manor, Wendywood, Atholl, Atholl Extension, Atholl Gardens, Bramley North, Bramley Park, Hyde Park, Sandhurst, Strathaven, Inanda, Woodmead, Woodmead East, Benmore, Parkmore, Riverclub, Sunninghill.
<u>Glenhazel:</u> Glenhazel, Sandringham, Lyndhurst, Kew, Sunningdale, Fairmount, Percelia, Fairvale, Silvamonte, Glensan, Raedene.
<u>Orange Grove:</u> Orange Grove, Norwood, Linksfield, Linksfield Ridge, Orchards, Gardens, Oaklands, Cheltondale, Bedford Park, Bagleystone, Forbesdale, Victoria, Fellside.
<u>Highlands North:</u> Highlands North, Corlett Gardens, Sydenham, Waverley, Savoy, Gresswold, Bramley, Raumarais Park.
<u>Houghton:</u> Killarney, Houghton, Riviera, Saxonwold, Rosebank.
<u>Northern Suburbs:</u> Melrose North, Illovo, Fairways, Elton Hill, Kentview, Dunkeld.
<u>Western Suburbs:</u> Victory Park, Emmarentia, Greenside, Parkhurst, Northcliff, Montgomery Park, Pierneef Park, Pine Park, Linden.
<u>Cyrildene:</u> Observatory, Mountain View, Dewetshof, Cyrildene, Bruma.
<u>Bedford View:</u> Senderwood, Dowerglen, St.Andrews, Bedford View.
<u>Parktown/Parkview:</u> Parkwood, Greenside East, Parktown, Parktown North, Berea/Hillbrow, Yeoville.
<u>Randburg</u> (incl. Blairgowrie, Windsor, Ferndale, Robindale, Craighall)
<u>Johannesburg South , Johannesburg East and Johannesburg Far North.</u>
<u>Rest of Jhb i.e. Jhb. East</u> (Kensington, Glendower, Edenvale), <u>Jhb South</u> (i.e. Turfontein, Robertsham, South Hills, Bassonia, Lynmeyer, Winchester hills), <u>Jhb. Far North</u> (Kyalami Rivonia, Bryanston, Paulshof, Khyber Rock).
<u>IN CAPE TOWN:</u>
<u>Sea Pt/Greenpt to Fresnaye</u> represents: Sea Point, Fresnaye, Greenpoint, Mouille Point, Three Anchor Bay, Waterfront.
<u>Bloubg/Brooklyn/Cent.City/Goodw/Milnerton/Tableview/Parow:</u> Blouberg, Brooklyn, Century City, Edgemead, Goodwood, Milnerton, Tableview, Parow, Tygerhof, Monte Vista, Sunset Beach, Sunset Links, Panorama, Sunningdale, Summer Greens.
<u>Camps B/Bakoven/Clift./Ht By:</u> Camps Bay, Bakoven, Clifton, Hout Bay
<u>Claremont/Ken/Newl./Wynb:</u> Claremont, Kenilworth, Newlands, Wynberg.
<u>City bowl/Dev. Peak/Gardens/Higgov./Highl./ Vredehoek:</u> Cape Town -City bowl, Devil's Peak, Gardens, Higgovale, Highlands Estate, Oranjezicht, Tamboerskloof, Vredehoek, Zonnebloem, Kloofnek, University Estate.
<u>Constantia/Bish Crt:</u> Constantia, Bishopscourt.
<u>Rondb/Roseb/Mowbray:</u> Rondebosch, Rosebank, Mowbray, Observatory, Pinelands.
<u>Muiznb/Tokai:</u> Muizenburg, Steenberg, Tokai, Sunvalley, Lakeside, Kirstenhof, Marina DaGama.
<u>Bergvl/Diepr/Meadr/Plumst etc:</u> Bergvliet, Diepriver, Meadowridge, Plumstead, Kreupelbosch.

An important note:

The suburbs (and proportions) comprising each suburb grouping were listed in the “Methodology and Sample Details” at the beginning of this report. It is however appropriate to relist them here to facilitate reading and interpretation of the tabulation which follows, since - within the tabulation - it was not possible to mention all the suburbs in detail i.e. in Johannesburg, one suburb (or area name) was used to represent the grouping; in Cape Town a few suburbs/suburb abbreviations were used to represent the grouping.

<u>SUBURB COMPOSITION WITHIN RELIGIOUS SECTORS</u>	<u>RELIGIOUS SECTOR COMPOSITION WITHIN SUBURB GROUPINGS</u>
---	--

(i.e. suburb grouping proportions within each religious sector ⁷¹)						(i.e. proportion of each religious sector within grouped suburbs ⁷²)				
	Total Resp. 1000 (100%)	Sec/ JJ 118 (100%)	Ref/ Prog. 74 (100%)	Trad. 663 (100%)	Str. Orth. 141 (100%)	Total Resp. 1000(100%)	Sec/ JJ 12%	Ref/ Prog. 7%	Trad. 66%	Str. Orth. 14%
JOHANNESBURG	65%	56%	43%	66%	80%					
Total Jhb	650= 100%	66= 100%	32= 100%	435= 100%	113= 100%	650 (100%)	10%	5%	67%	17%
Sandton	24%	23%	16%	24%	26%	154 (100%)	10%	3%	68%	19%
Glenhazel	17%	5%	6%	17%	28%	113 (100%)	3%	2%	66%	28%
Orange Grove	13%	18%	9%	13%	9%	84 (100%)	14%	4%	67%	12%
Highlands Nrth	14%	11%	9%	14%	15%	88 (100%)	8%	3%	69%	19%
Houghton	7%	11%	13%	7%	5%	46 (100%)	15%	9%	63%	13%
Northern subs.	5%	9%	3%	6%	2%					
Western subs	6%	8%	-	8%	2%					
Cyrlidene	3%	-	3%	2%	7%					
Bedford View	2%	-	6%	2%	-					
Parktn/Parkvw	3%	12%	-	3%	-					
Randburg	2%	1%	3%	1%	3%					
Jhb. South	1%	-	6%	1%	1%					
Jhb. East	2%	1%	3%	2%	2%					
Jhb. Far North	1%	1%	22%	-	-					
	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%					
CAPE TOWN	25%	38%	45%	24%	9%					
Total CT	250= 100%	45= 100%	33= 100%	159= 100%	13⁷³ (X)	250 (100%)	18%	13%	64%	5%
Sea Pt/ Greenpt. to Fresnaye etc.	41%	38%	15%	47%	(7)	103 (100%)	16%	5%	72%	7%
Bloubg/Brooklyn/Cent.City/ Goodw/ Milnerton/Tableview/Parow etc.	15%	7%	12%	18%	(2)					
Camps B/Bakoven/Cliff./Ht By	11%	13%	27%	7%	(2)					
Claremont/Ken/ Newl./Wynb etc.	10%	11%	9%	10%	(1)					
City bowl/Dev. Peak/Gardens/ Higgov./Highl./ Vredehoek etc.	9%	13%	12%	7%	-					
Constantia/ Bish. Crt etc.	6%	4%	9%	6%	(1)					
Rondb/Roseb/ Mowbray etc.	4%	11%	6%	2%	-					
Muizenb/ Tokai etc.	2%	-	9%	1%	-					
Bergvl/Diepr/ Meadr/Plumst etc.	2%	2%	-	2%	-					
	100%	99%	99%	100%	(13)					
PRETORIA	5%	3%	4%	5%	7%	50 (100%)	6%	6%	70%	18%
DURBAN	5%	3%	8%	5%	4%	50 (100%)	8%	12%	68%	12%

Number per suburb grouping too small to serve as base for percentaging i.e. too small for detailed analysis

Number per suburb grouping too small to serve as base for percentaging i.e. too small for detailed analysis

In Johannesburg:

⁷¹ Where columns do not add to 100%, it is due to rounding off of percentages.

⁷² Only suburbs comprising at least 40 respondents were profiled as regards religious sector composition. Where totals of the religious practice sectors within city or within suburb grouping do not add to 100%, it is because of rounding off and/or because of a small percentage of respondents not having committed themselves to a religious category i.e. they said "don't know"/gave no answer.

⁷³ The base (13 respondents) is too small for percentaging. Actual figures are thus shown in brackets.

- **Clearly, the areas we refer to in this report as Sandton, Glenhazel, Orange Grove and Highlands North, account for just over two-thirds of Jews, 18 years and older in Johannesburg and the bulk (78%) of the Strictly Orthodox live there. However, within these four areas there are similarities and differences.**
- **Sandton and Glenhazel together account for over half (54%) of the Strictly Orthodox in Johannesburg but the Traditionals are nevertheless dominant in both areas i.e. they account for approximately two-thirds of the adult Jews in each of these areas.**
 - **Sandton shows a touch of over-representation of the Strictly Orthodox sector and distinct under-representation of Reform/Progressive, with Traditionals and Secular/Just Jewish tending to be proportionate in accordance with the population e.g. of the Jews in Johannesburg 24% live in Sandton; of the Strictly Orthodox 26% do; of the Reform/Progressives 16% do and of the Traditionals 24% live there..**
 - **Glenhazel however, shows a different picture. Of the Jewish over 18 year olds living in Glenhazel, approximately 3 in every 10 (28%) are Strictly Orthodox. Glenhazel shows heavy over-representation of the Strictly Orthodox and decided under-representation of Secular/Just Jewish and Reform/Progressives, with Traditionals reflecting a proportion in keeping with the overall sample. e.g. within the Johannesburg sample 17% live in Glenhazel - whereas within the Strictly Orthodox sector 28% live there; and the proportions living there are low within Secular/Just Jewish (5%) and Reform/Progressive (6%).**
 - **Orange Grove, on the other hand, shows over-representation of the Secular/Just Jewish sector and under-representation of Reform/Progressive and the Strictly Orthodox, while the Traditional proportion is in keeping with the overall sample.**
 - **Highlands North shows under-representation of Secular/Just Jewish and Reform/Progressive, proportionate representation of Traditionals and moves towards over-representation of Strictly Orthodox.**
- **Details for other suburb groups, each of which comprises less than 8% of the over 18 year old Jews in Johannesburg, can be observed above but must be interpreted with caution because of the low proportions. Most of these have a Traditional sector focus but we do, for example, see that: Houghton shows an over-representative proportion for Secular/Just Jewish and Reform/Progressive; Northern Suburbs and Parktown/Parkview show some Secular/Just Jewish emphasis; Bedfordview, Johannesburg South and Johannesburg Far North show some Progressive/Reform emphasis; Cyrildene shows some Strictly Orthodox emphasis.**

In Cape Town, Pretoria and Durban:

- The “Sea Point and surrounds” area shows over-representation of the Traditionals and under-representation of Reform/Progressive i.e. 41% of the total sample live in Sea Point, whereas 47% of Traditionals do and only 15% of Reform/Progressives do. Of all those in Sea Point, 72% are Traditionals which is higher than the overall Cape Town proportion (64%) for Traditionals and higher than the national total (66%).
- Other details relating to Cape Town can be observed in the preceding tabulation.
- Because of small sample sizes we have not examined Pretoria and Durban within suburb.

What has happened since 1998 regarding how Jewish people in South Africa classify themselves in religious terms i.e. within the total sample and by city?

	Total Sample 100=100%		C I T Y							
			Jhb 650=100%		Pta 50=100%		CT 250=100%		Dbn 50=100%	
	2005	1998	2005	1998	2005	1998	2005	1998	2005	1998
Classification in terms of Jewish religious practice:										
Non-practising i.e. Secular Jew	4%	5%	3%	6%	-	4%	8%	5%	6%	6%
Just Jewish	8%	12%	7%	12%	6%	-	10%	11%	2%	22%
Reform/ Progressive	7%	7%	5%	4%	6%	4%	13%	10%	12%	16%
Traditional (not Strictly Orthodox)	66%	61%	67%	59%	70%	76%	64%	67%	68%	54%
Strictly Orthodox (e.g. would not turn on light on Sabbath)	14%	14%	17%	18%	18%	16%	5%	6%	12%	2%
Don't know/ No answer	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	-	-	<0.5%	-	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- As we saw with beliefs relating to the Torah, classification in terms of Jewish religious practice also reflects similar scores for 1998 and 2005, but there has been some movement. The Traditional sector is and was the largest sector. In fact, it tends to have increased slightly (from 61% to 66%) by drawing from the combined “Just Jewish/Non-practising/Secular” sector which in turn shows a slight tendency to have dropped from 17% to 12%. Strictly Orthodox has retained a score of 14% and Reform/Progressive has retained its score of 7%.
- The direction of the move is interesting i.e. from secularity towards embracing more aspects of being Jewish. The move is either towards wanting more of what Traditional Judaism offers or it is an indication of a move towards being Strictly Orthodox but not quite having achieved the degree of observance necessary to allow for self-classification as being Strictly Orthodox.

- **Johannesburg** reflects a similar situation to what applies to the sample as a whole i.e. a tendency for decrease in the Secular/Just Jewish sector and increase in the Traditional sector i.e. a tendency towards embracing more aspects of Judaism rather than a move towards secularity. In fact, when compared to total sample data, this tendency for an increase in the Traditional sector at the expense of the combined Secular/Just Jewish sector hints at having happened to an above average extent in Johannesburg. **Pretoria** shows a slight decrease for Traditional with a hint of an increase for all other sectors. However, these tendencies for increase per sector are too slight to be interpreted as statistically significant. **Cape Town** shows an increase of Secular/Just Jewish and Reform/Progressive with a corresponding decrease in Traditional and Strictly Orthodox combined i.e. opposite to the trend exhibited in Johannesburg. **Durban** shows a decrease in Just Jewish, a slight decrease for Reform/Progressive and a decided increase for Traditional and Strictly Orthodox.
- **Comparison of some gender and age data for 1998 and 2005 follows.**
 - **Gender in the Secular/Just Jewish sector.** Whilst in 1998 males exhibited a slightly greater tendency towards secularity than did females, this is no longer so i.e. the 2005 male-female proportions are in keeping with the total sample profile **indicating a tendency for males to show a slight move away from secularity.**

	2005		1998	
	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Secular/ Just Jewish 118=100%	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Secular/ Just Jewish 177=100%
<u>Gender</u>				
Male	46%	46%	46%	51%
Female	54%	54%	54%	49%

- **The Strictly Orthodox profile has become more male-oriented than it was.** i.e. the overall male:female ratio is (and was in 1998) 46%:54%, while the ratio for the Strictly Orthodox in 1998 was 51%:49% compared with 57%:43% in 2005. There is thus some evidence of an increased tendency towards Orthodoxy amongst males in the past 7 years. This is interesting in the light of the finding that males show a slight tendency to move away from secularity. These are not necessarily the same males but the direction of the move is interesting.

	2005		1998	
	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Strictly Orthodox 141=100%	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Strictly Orthodox 140=100%
<u>Gender</u>				
Male	46%	57%	46%	51%
Female	54%	43%	54%	49%

- Within the **Strictly Orthodox** profile, there is now - and was in 1998 - over-representation of the 18-34 sector – a positive finding in that drawing the youth bodes well for the future of the sector. However, whereas in 1998 the 18-24 year olds and the 25-34 year olds showed similar over-representation, now the 25-34 year sector shows the tendency more distinctly. For those interested in ensuring the future of Strict Orthodoxy, the success in the 25-34 year sector is good but it is also important to attract the youngest sector to a greater extent. The young people of today are the older people of tomorrow.

	2005		1998	
	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Strictly Orthodox 141=100%	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Strictly Orthodox 140=100%
<u>Age:</u>				
18-24 yrs	11%	15%	13%	21%
25-34 yrs	16%	31%	17%	24%
Total 18-34 yrs	27%	46%	30%	45%

- The **Reform/Progressive** profile is (and was in 1998) essentially balanced in accordance with the population profile as regards gender. This is unlike the Strictly Orthodox profile which tended to show an over-representation of males in 1998 and (more so) in 2005. This gender balance is understandable in the light of the similar role of males and females within the Reform/Progressive sector. **However, as regards age, the tendency towards under-representation of younger age groups and over-representation of older age groups reflected 7 years ago has intensified now.** As mentioned earlier, those involved with the future of the Reform/Progressive movement should work towards attracting the youth sector.

	2005		1998	
	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Reform/ Progressive 74=100%	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Reform/ Progressive 65=100%
<u>Gender</u>				
Male	46%	47%	46%	46%
Female	54%	53%	54%	54%
<u>Age</u>				
18-44 yrs	44%	29%	49%	41%
45 yrs and older	56%	71%	51%	59%

C. Type of upbringing they had in terms of Jewish religious practice

“Which one of the alternatives on this card describes the kind of upbringing you had as a child?” CARD: Non-practising Jewish (i.e. Secular), Just Jewish, Reform/Progressive, “Traditional” (not strictly Orthodox), Strictly Orthodox (e.g. would not turn on a light on Sabbath), Not raised in a Jewish family?

We will show the results for the kind of upbringing they had alongside the results discussed earlier i.e. how they classify themselves now in religious terms.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Total Respondents 1000=100%
	UPBRINGING	CURRENTLY
Traditional	72%	66%
Strictly Orthodox	7%	14%
Reform/Progressive	6%	7%
<u>Less involved:</u>		
Just Jewish	8%	8%
Secular	4%	4%
Not raised in Jewish family	3%	Not Applicable
DK/No answer	-	1%
Total	100%	100%

- **For upbringing: Traditional (72%) – once again - forms the largest sector; Strictly Orthodox (7%) follows far below; Reform/Progressive (6%) essentially scores at the same level as Strictly Orthodox; those less involved total 12% (i.e. Just Jewish 8% and Non-practising/Secular Jew 4%); and not raised in a Jewish family scored 3%.**
- **When comparing this upbringing data with how they classify themselves now, it is clear that:** “Traditional” is, and was, far and away the dominant sector. However, Strictly Orthodox shows an increase at the expense of the Traditional sector. Furthermore, while Strictly Orthodox and Progressive/Reform reflect similar scores for upbringing, we see that currently, Strictly Orthodox has risen above Reform/Progressive. Reform/Progressive has essentially held its own by reflecting similar “current” and “upbringing” scores.
- **Movements from one sector to another may look simple and clearcut but it is not quite so!** This can be seen in the cross-tabulation below. We looked at which “upbringing” sector each of the “current” sectors has drawn from. More specifically, which religious practice category or categories were those who currently classify themselves as Strictly Orthodox brought up in? And those who currently classify themselves as: Traditional? Reform/Progressive? Secular/Just Jewish?

	CURRENT RELIGIOUS PRACTICE									
	Total Respondents 1000=100%		Secular/ Just Jewish 118=100%		Reform/ Progressive 74=100%		Traditional 663=100%		Strictly Orthodox 141=100%	
UPBRINGING										
Traditional	72%		56%		35%		83%		51%	
Strictly Orthodox	7%		2%		-		4%		29%	
Reform/Progressive	6%		4%		30%		4%		4%	
<u>Less involved:</u>										
Just Jewish	8%	{12%	25%	{37%	13%	{16%	5%	{7%	6%	{12%
Secular	4%		12%		3%		2%		6%	
Not raised in Jewish family	3%		1%		19%		2%		4%	
Total	100%		100%		100%		100%		100%	

- **What should be noted is that although we saw earlier when directly comparing “current” to “upbringing” scores that the Strictly Orthodox have gained ground at the expense of the Traditionals, there have been other movements within the sectors:**
 - **Amongst those who currently classify themselves as Traditional, most (83%) have been familiar with this sector from childhood and the relatively small sector remaining (17%) come from a spread of religious practice categories.**
 - **Of those who currently classify themselves as Secular/Just Jewish, over one-third (37%) claim to have been brought up that way but over half (56%) claim to have been brought up as Traditional. Only a small sector mentioned having been brought up any other way.**
 - **Of those who currently classify themselves as Reform/Progressive, just under one third (30%) claim to have been brought up in this sector, over one-third (35%) claimed to have had a Traditional upbringing and over one-third (35%) can be split: 16% Just Jewish/Secular and 19% “not brought up in a Jewish family”. Thus, Reform/Progressive draws sizeably from Traditionals, but does so less than do other sectors i.e. it reflects a below average score for drawing from the Traditional sector. Incidentally, although approximately 1 in 5 (19%) of the currently Reform/Progressives were not raised in a Jewish family and no other current religious sector reflects as high a proportion for not having been raised in a Jewish family, these results must be read with care e.g. those who were not raised in a Jewish family are as likely to move into the Traditional as the Reform/Progressive sector. However, because the Traditional sector is so big they form only 2% of those currently Traditionals and because the Reform/Progressive sector is relatively small they comprise 19% of the Reform/Progressives.**
 - **Of those currently Strictly Orthodox, just over half (51%) had a Traditional upbringing, under a third (29%) were brought up as Strictly Orthodox and the rest come from other sectors. (It is interesting that amongst the Strictly Orthodox, the proportion not raised in a Jewish**

family - 4% - is not lower than the proportion -1% - in the Secular/Just Jewish sector).

- **After all this movement, the overall score balance brings us back to the earlier conclusion that when directly comparing “current” to “upbringing” scores, the Strictly Orthodox have gained ground at the expense of the Traditionals. We have however, also been able to discern what each of the current religious practice sectors are comprised of as regards the type of upbringing they had in religious practice terms.**

Below we have examined “upbringing” and “current” classification data for 2005 (discussed earlier) with the comparable data for 1998. We see that in both studies: the “Traditional” sector dominates throughout but those brought up in the “Traditional” sector show a slight tendency to be vulnerable to moving to other sectors e.g. in both studies the Strictly Orthodox shows gains when comparing “upbringing” and “current” scores.

	2005 1000=100%		1998 1000=100%	
	Total Respondents 1000=100% UPBRINGING	Total Respondents 1000=100% CURRENTLY	Total Respondents 1000=100% UPBRINGING	Total Respondents 1000=100% CURRENTLY
Traditional	72%	66%	70%	61%
Strictly Orthodox	7%	14%	9%	14%
Reform/Progressive	6%	7%	5%	7%
<u>Less involved:</u> Just Jewish/ Secular	12%	12%	14%	17%
Not raised in Jewish family	3%	Not Applicable	2%	Not applicable
DK/No answer	-	1%	-	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

D. Level of observance of religious practices and rituals

(i) Various practices and rituals

For additional input as to religiosity, respondents were asked:

a) Are candles lit in your home on Friday night?

b) At Passover do you attend a Seder meal, irrespective of whether it be at home or elsewhere? If ‘Yes’: every year, most years, some years, no/never?”

“Please indicate whether you do any of the following: Fast on Yom Kippur; on Friday night usually participate in Sabbath dinner with family or friends; refrain from work on the Jewish New Year; refrain from driving or travelling on Sabbath; eat out only in Kosher restaurants; have refrained from writing exams during Jewish holidays (or would if the situation arose)?”

	2005 1000=100%
<u>Candles lit in home on Friday night:</u>	
Always	76%
Sometimes	16%
No/never	8%
Refused	-
	100%

	2005 1000=100%
<u>Exceptionally high level of observance</u>	
Attend Passover Seder every year	95%
Fast On Yom Kippur	90%
Refrain from work on the Jewish New Year i.e. Rosh Hashanah	87%
<u>Medium level of observance</u>	
Have (or would if situation arose) refrained from writing exams on Jewish holidays	52%
<u>Low level of observance</u>	
Refrain from driving or travelling on Sabbath	18%
Eat out only in Kosher restaurants	16%

- **Jewish people in South Africa exhibit a high level of observance for some practices and rituals, a medium level for some and a low level for some.**

High level practices and rituals:

- **A very high proportion of Jews in South African claim that candles are lit in their homes every Friday night (76%).** A further 16% say “sometimes” and 8% say “no/never”. When examining this by demographic subgroup it emerges that all age groups reflected similarly high scores but the 18-24 year (88%) and 55-64 year groups (81%) showed even higher scores. Johannesburg (81%) and Pretoria (78%) showed higher scores for candles being lit in the home every Friday night than did the other cities which, in fact, scored below average i.e. Cape Town (64%) and Durban (66%).

Virtually all the Strictly Orthodox (98%) live in homes where candles are always lit on a Friday night, the Traditionals (80%) are next in line, while at the other end of the religiosity scale are the Secular/Just Jewish reflecting the lowest score (38%). This score of 38% is nevertheless sizeable considering the level of religious affiliation of this sector. The Reform/Progressives (with 54%) are positioned above Secular/Just Jewish but below the Traditionals. Overall, candlelighting scores are above average amongst Traditionals and (particularly) the Strictly Orthodox. Whilst extent of Sabbath candlelighting is greatest amongst the Strictly Orthodox, it is not

exclusively within their domain. The practice is a strongly traditional one and features in all religious practice sectors. It even features sizeably (though less intensely) within the Secular/Just Jewish sector.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	RELIGIOUS PRACTICE			
		Secular/ Just Jewish 118=100%	Reform/ Progressive 74=100%	Traditional 663=100%	Strictly Orthodox 141=100%
Candles are <u>always</u> lit in home on Friday night	76%	38%→	54%→	80%→	98%

- An exceptionally high proportion (95%) attend a Seder every Passover.** A check on demographic subgroups reflected scores as being exceptionally high in all age groups and cities e.g. even though the Durban score (86%) was lower than the scores for other cities, it was still exceptionally high. Attending a Pesach Seder every year is such a widespread practice that scores are high within all religious practice sectors. Nevertheless, the Secular/Just Jewish score (72%), whilst being high, is not as high as the other scores: Reform/Progressive (93%), Traditional (98%), Strictly Orthodox (100%). The Seder attendance scores are above average amongst Traditionals and (particularly) the Strictly Orthodox. However, we are looking at another practice which has become a tradition amongst Jewish people rather than being exclusive to those who are fully observant e.g. even the Secular/Just Jewish sector exhibits a high score for this factor.
- For fasting on Yom Kippur, the proportion is also exceptionally high (90%)** and there were exceptionally high scores for all age groups i.e. the 65 years and older group scored 82% and all other age groups reflected scores between 89% and 95%. We cannot discount the fact that health and age-related reasons could prevent a sector of those 65 years and older from fasting. Although the scores for fasting on Yom Kippur are high for all cities, they tend to be higher for Johannesburg (92%) and Pretoria (94%) than for Cape Town (84%) and Durban (88%).

Fasting on Yom Kippur also shows a relationship with religiosity i.e. the closer the identification with Orthodoxy the greater the likelihood of fasting on Yom Kippur. Reform/Orthodox is once again positioned between Traditionals and Secular/Just Jewish. Yet again, scores are above average amongst Traditionals and (particularly) the Strictly Orthodox. However, once again, we see that even the Secular/Just Jewish claim sizeable adherence to this practice.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	RELIGIOUS PRACTICE			
		Secular/ Just Jewish 118=100%	Reform/ Progressive 74=100%	Traditional 663=100%	Strictly Orthodox 141=100%
Fast on Yom Kippur	90%	60%→	80%→	94%→	100%

- **An overwhelming majority (90%) usually participate in a Sabbath dinner with family or friends on Friday nights.** This is higher in Johannesburg (94%) and Pretoria (92%) than in Cape Town (81%) or Durban (80%). The link with religious practice category occurs once again and once more, scores are above average amongst Traditionals and (particularly) the Strictly Orthodox. Nevertheless, even the lowest score (i.e. reflected by the Secular/Just Jewish category) is sizeable.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	RELIGIOUS PRACTICE			
		Secular/ Just Jewish 118=100%	Reform/ Progressive 74=100%	Traditional 663=100%	Strictly Orthodox 141=100%
Participate in Friday night Sabbath dinner with family/friends	90%	60%→	77%→	95%→	100%

- **An exceptionally high proportion (87%) claimed to refrain from work on Rosh Hashanah (the Jewish New Year).** There is no clear age trend except that the 18-24 year group's score (77%) is not quite as high as the others. Perhaps this is because this sector comprises a higher proportion than other sectors of those who have not yet been gainfully employed. Some of these may take the word "work" literally and thus could not claim that they have refrained from work on the Jewish New Year. The city scores are all high, with Pretoria (92%) and Johannesburg (89%) being higher than Cape Town (81%) and Durban (80%).

The relationship with religious sector occurs here too and - once again - the Traditionals and (particularly) Strictly Orthodox score above average.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	RELIGIOUS PRACTICE			
		Secular/ Just Jewish 118=100%	Reform/ Progressive 74=100%	Traditional 663=100%	Strictly Orthodox 141=100%
Refrain from work on Jewish New Year	87%	59%→	73%→	91%→	98%

- **Incidentally, a check (in a later section of the questionnaire) on whether or not males had had a Bar Mitzvah showed that 97% of males had done so.** The comparable score for females having had a Bat Mitzvah was much lower (37%). This is understandable considering that a Bar Mitzvah is a religious requirement for males whereas a Bat Mitzvah for females is not a religious requirement. The 1998 scores were: Bar Mitzvah amongst males (93%), Bat Mitzvah amongst females (31%). In 1991⁷⁴ the score for Bar Mitzvah amongst males was similar (95%) but only 17% of females had had a Bat Mitzvah. Bat Mitzvahs for females had not made such inroads at that stage. It should be noted that proportions are based on

⁷⁴ Table 5.5, p.116, Dubb et al., 1991 Sociodemographic Study.

the sample as a whole (ranging from 18 years of age to 75 years and older). Scores within younger age groups are higher for Bat Mitzvahs.

Medium level practice

- **Jews in South Africa are currently divided as regards refraining from writing exams during Jewish holidays. Approximately half (52%) have refrained or would do so if the situation arose**, while approximately half (48%) claimed that they would not/did not. It is imperative to note that a sizeable sector added spontaneously that it would depend on which Jewish holiday it was. With regard to age sector differences, those under 35 years of age are more likely than older age groups to claim that they have or would refrain i.e. over 60% of under 35 year olds have (or would refrain), while the comparable scores for older age groups range between 43% and 53%. Pretoria respondents (with 78%) show an above average tendency for saying that they have or would refrain from writing exams on the Jewish New Year.

Low level practices and rituals:

- **A low level score was reflected for refraining from driving or travelling on Sabbath (only 18%).** The 65 years and older sector showed the lowest score (7%).The 25-34 year group (with a score of 33%) shows a decidedly above average tendency to make this claim and the 35-44 year sector's score (21%) is a bit above average. Pretoria (28%) and Johannesburg (22%) reflected higher scores than did Cape Town (8%) and Durban (12%).

With regard to the religious practice sectors, there is an exceptionally high correlation between not driving/travelling on the Sabbath with being Strictly Orthodox. This practice is almost exclusively the domain of the Strictly Orthodox. Of the total, only 18% do not drive/travel on the Sabbath, while amongst those claiming to be Strictly Orthodox, 96% do not. Other religious practice sectors show very low or no adherence to this practice.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	RELIGIOUS PRACTICE			
		Secular/ Just Jewish 118=100%	Reform/ Progressive 74=100%	Traditional 663=100%	Strictly Orthodox 141=100%
Refrain from driving or travelling on Sabbath	18%	1%	-	6%	96%

- **Eating out only in Kosher restaurants also reflected a low adherence score (16%).** Under 35 year olds, but particularly those 25-34 years of age reflect above average scores in this regard i.e. 18-24 years (18%), 25-34 years (28%), all other age groups (9% - 16%). Pretoria (24%) and Johannesburg (19%) show higher scores than Durban (12%) and Cape Town (6%).

Here again we are looking at a practice which is the domain of the Strictly Orthodox, but it is not quite as characteristic of the Strictly Orthodox as is not driving/travelling on a Sabbath i.e. whilst a heavy majority (87%) of those who classify themselves as Strictly Orthodox eat out in Kosher restaurants only, there are some (13%) who do not only eat in Kosher restaurants.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	RELIGIOUS PRACTICE			
		Secular/ Just Jewish 118=100%	Reform/ Progressive 74=100%	Traditional 663=100%	Strictly Orthodox 141=100%
Eat out in Kosher restaurants only	16%	1%	-	5%	87%

What has happened in the last 7 years as regards observance of various practices and rituals?

	2005 1000=100%	1998 1000=100%
<u>Candles lit in home on Friday night:</u>		
Always	76%	75%
Sometimes	16%	16%
No/never	8%	9%
Refused	-	<0.5%
	100%	100%

	2005 1000=100%	1998 1000=100%
<u>Exceptionally high level of observance</u>		
Attend Passover Seder every year	95%	93%
Fast On Yom Kippur	90%	91%
Refrain from work on the Jewish New Year i.e. Rosh Hashanah	87%	92%
<u>Medium level of observance</u>		
Have or would if situation arose refrain from writing exams on Jewish holidays	52%	64%
<u>Low level of observance</u>		
Refrain from driving or travelling on Sabbath	18%	18%
Eat out only in Kosher restaurants	16%	16%

- **There has been minimal change in the 7 year period between 1998 and 2005 as regards most religious practices and rituals.**
- Virtually the same very high proportion of South African Jews claimed then and claim now that candles are always lit in their homes on Friday night and exceptionally high proportions (and very similar to each other) emerged in 1998 and 2005 for: attending a Passover Seder, fasting on Yom Kippur; and refraining from work on Rosh Hashanah. The “refraining from work on Rosh Hashanah” score appeared to drop slightly but remains particularly high.

- The low level scores for “refraining from driving on the Sabbath” and “eating out only in Kosher restaurants” were – remarkably - exactly the same for 1998 and 2005.
- With regard to “refraining from writing exams during Jewish holidays”, the score has dropped – perhaps in the 1998 survey those who refrain on some Jewish holidays and not on others were more likely to classify themselves as refraining than were their 2005 counterparts. This is however a hypothesis only.

An interesting tabulation follows. This shows comparison of results with past surveys dating back to 1973!

1973 ⁷⁵		1974 ⁷⁶		1991 ⁷⁷		Same questions in 1998 and 2005	1998 ⁷⁸	2005 ⁷⁹
	Total males and females (Jhb only) 283 (100%)		Total household heads (Jhb,Pta,CT, Dbn,PE,Bftn) 2074 (100%)		Total household heads (Jhb,Pta,CT, Dbn,PE) 1800 (100%)			Total males and females (Jhb,Pta, CT,Dbn) 1000 (100%)
<u>Candles lit in home Friday evenings:</u> Usually/regularly	78%	<u>Candles lit in home on Sabbath:</u> Yes	84%	<u>Candles lit home Friday night:</u> Always/usually	74%	<u>Candles lit in home Friday night:</u> Always	75%	76%
Occasionally	7%	N/A in 1974 study		Sometimes	13%	Sometimes	16%	16%
Seldom/not at all	14%			Never	13%	No/never	9%	8%
No answer	1%			No answer	-	Refused	<0.5%	-
1973 Passover, Yom Kippur, Sabbath questions/answers not comparable to other studies		Participate Passover Seder	94%	Always attend Passover Seder	92%	Attend Pass-over Seder every yr.	93%	95%
		Observe Yom Kippur	89%	Fast on Yom Kippur	91%	Fast on Yom Kippur	91%	90%
		Full Sabbath observance i.e. abstaining from work,travel, smoking etc.	9%	Not dealt with in comparable way in 1991		Refrain from driving/travelling on Sabbath	18%	18%

- **Although for the 1973-1991 period we are looking at data from studies with different samples and different question wording, the results are – in essence – very similar to those shown for 1998 and 2005.**

⁷⁵ Table 8.5, p.120, Dubb et al., Jhb. 1973.

⁷⁶ Table 8, p.11, Advance Report no. 11, Della Pergola et al. SAJPS 1974.

⁷⁷ Table 5.5, p.116, Dubb et al. 1991 Sociodemographic Study.

⁷⁸ Kosmin et al., 1998 National Survey of SA Jews.

⁷⁹ Study reported on in this document.

- **In essence, the Sabbath candle lighting proportion for “always lighting” appears not to have changed significantly over the last 33 years!** In the 1st row of figures, the only figure which – at first glance - seems out of line (and higher) is the 1974 score but this seems not to be restricted to candles “always” being lit on a Friday night. Access to the 1974 questionnaire (which is not in the document) would provide more insight in this regard. Further scrutiny shows that 1973 and 1991 (1st row) scores also do not necessarily relate to “always” (i.e. they include “usually”) while 1998 and 2005 scores are definitely restricted to “always”. We do not therefore know whether pre-1998 scores would have been lower had they been restricted to “always”. What we do see is that the “never” score seems to have dropped from 1991 to 1998/2005.
- **Furthermore, from the mid-seventies through to the nineties and up to the present (i.e. 2005), there has been a consistently (and exceptionally) high level of observance as regards: Passover Seder attendance and fasting on Yom Kippur.** (The 1974 category was however slightly different in that it related to “observing Yom Kippur” as opposed to “fasting on Yom Kippur”).
- **What does seem to have increased is Sabbath observance.** The questions/criteria on which we base this conclusion are not quite the same but do give some indication as to the extent of strict Sabbath observance i.e. from 9% in 1974 to 18% in 1998/2005.

(ii) Synagogue attendance

“Excluding weddings, barmitzvahs or batmitzvahs, how often have you attended a synagogue service in the past year?”

- 11% said “not at all”
- 13% said “once or twice”
- 15% said 3 to 5 times
- 13% said 6 to 10 times
- 7% mentioned “about once a month”
- **41% said “Most Sabbaths or more often”**
(i. e. looked at separately within gender: 52% of males and 33% of females claimed to attend “most Sabbaths or more often”. This indicates the extent of penetration of frequent synagogue attendance into these sectors).

We have touched on the penetration of frequent synagogue attendance. What about the profile of the frequent attendees i.e. **Who – demographically-speaking - are those who claimed to attend synagogue services “most Sabbaths or more often”?**

	P R O F I L E O F:	
	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Frequent ⁸⁰ attendees i.e. Attend synagogue service most Sabbaths or more often 415=100%
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	46%	58%
Female	54%	42%
<u>Age</u>		
18-24 yrs	11%	12%
25-34 yrs	16%	19%
35-44 yrs	17%	17%
45-54 yrs	17%	17%
55-64 yrs	18%	18%
65+ yrs	21%	17%
<u>City</u>		
Jhb	65%	68%
Pta	5%	7%
CT	25%	20%
Dbn	5%	5%
<u>Religious Practice</u>		
Secular/Just Jewish	12%	1%
Reform/Progressive	7%	6%
Traditional	66%	60%
Strictly Orthodox	14%	32%
Don't Know/No ans.	<1%	<1%

- **Whereas within the profile of the sample as a whole, the male:female ratio is 46%:54%, it is more male-oriented (58%:42%) within the frequent synagogue attendee profile** i.e. those attending “most Sabbaths or more often”. The male emphasis is understandable considering their role within the synagogue service i.e. synagogues operating within the Orthodox tradition. The heavier emphasis on males is accompanied by some over-representation of under 35 year olds, but more so the 25-34 year olds, and under-representation of those 65 years and older. Furthermore, the Johannesburg/Pretoria area tends to show above average synagogue attendance, while Cape Town shows below average attendance and Durban scores in keeping with its overall profile.
- **The Strictly Orthodox are clearly over-represented in the profile** i.e. of all those attending synagogue once a week or more often, 32% are Strictly Orthodox (in the total sample only 14% are). Of those who attend once a week or more often, a large sector are Traditionals (60%) but this tends towards under-representation since, overall, Traditionals comprise 66% of Jews. Thus, the average Traditional Jew does not show as great a tendency to be a frequent synagogue-attende as does the average Strictly Orthodox Jew. The Secular/Just Jewish sector is (understandably)

⁸⁰ We are using the term “frequent” to apply to attending at least once a week. Although the Strictly Orthodox sector may not consider “attending at least once a week” as indicating frequent attendance, within the context of the study the terminology is appropriate.

under-represented in the frequent-attendee profile, while Reform/ Progressive shows representation in keeping with the overall profile.

In past surveys questions asked and/or frequency categories were not quite the same. Full comparison of results is thus not possible. However, some comparisons can be made incorporating variations of the two ends of the scale i.e. “not attending at all” and the other extreme “attending frequently - at least once a week”.

Similar question in 1998 and 2005	2005	1998	1991 ⁸¹		1974 ⁸²		1973 ⁸³	
	Total 1000 (100%)	Total 1000 (100%)		Total household heads (Jhb,Pta,CT Dbn,PE) 1800 (100%)		Total household heads (Jhb,Pta,CT, Dbn,PE,Bftn) 2074 (100%)		Total Jhb males and females 283 (100%)
<u>In past yr attended synagogue</u> Not at all	11%	9%→	<u>How often attend synagogue service</u> Not at all	15%	<u>Yearly attendance</u> Never	17%→	<u>Frequency of synagogue attendance</u> Don't attend	21%
Most Sabbaths/ more often	41%	39%	Fri. night/ Sat. morn/ several per week	←30%	Every day/every week	←17%	Weekly/ daily/ Sabbaths and festivals	23%

- **For 1998/2005, frequent attendance scores are distinctly higher than in earlier years and “not at all” scores are lower. Statistically-speaking, there has not been much change in the 7 year period from 1998 to 2005 but, overall, it can be stated that the proportion attending synagogue at least once a week or more often has (since 1973) never been higher than it is now.**

There was also a check on the extent of agreement or disagreement with the statement: “I find it very difficult to express myself spiritually in a synagogue”

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	
Strongly agree	7%	28% AGREE
Agree	21%	
Neither agree nor disagree	16%	16% NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
Disagree	41%	
Strongly disagree	13%	54% DISAGREE
Do not know/No answer	2%	2% DK/NO ANSWER
Total	100%	

⁸¹ Table 5.4, p.115, Dubb et al., 1991 Sociodemographic Study.

⁸²Table 7, p.9, Advance Report no. 11, Della Pergola et al., SAJPS 1974.

⁸³ Table 6.3, p.59, Dubb et al., Jhb. 1973.

- **There is a greater tendency to disagree than to agree with this statement i.e. 54% do not find it difficult to express themselves spiritually in a synagogue.** Approximately a quarter of these emphatically disagree i.e. strongly disagree about such expression being difficult.
- **A smaller proportion (28%) claim that they do find it difficult to express themselves spiritually in a synagogue,** with approximately 3 in every 4 of these choosing the “agree” option and 1 in 4 choosing the “strongly agree” option.
- **The remainder (18%) did not commit themselves either way** (16% neither agreed nor disagreed and 2% said “don’t know/no answer”).
- **Although the weighting tends more towards than away from the ease of spiritual expression in a synagogue, it cannot be denied that a sizeable proportion find such expression difficult and a noticeable proportion could not commit themselves either way.**
- Data breakdowns appear below i.e. data shown as average ratings.

Total Sample	A V E R A G E R A T I N G S ⁸⁴ :															
	Male	Female	18-24 yrs	25-34 yrs	35-44 yrs	45-54 yrs	55-64 yrs	65+ yrs	Jhb	Pta	CT	Dbn	Secular/Just Jewish	Ref/Prog	Traditional	Str. Orth
2.68	2.62	2.73	2.40 →	2.58 →	2.76	2.61 →	2.75 →	2.85	2.60	2.55	2.91	2.73	3.59	2.94 ←	2.69 ←	1.77 ←

- **Males are a bit less likely to find such expression difficult** i.e. their average score (2.62) is a touch lower than that of females (2.73), which means that it is a touch closer to disagree. Nevertheless, as can be observed, even the females - on an average - do not find such expression difficult i.e. they are on the disagree side of the scale.
- **An age-related trend is discernable i.e. in the main – the younger the respondents the lower the score i.e. the younger the respondents the more likely they are to disagree with the idea that they find spiritual expression in a synagogue difficult. Conversely, the older the respondents the greater the tendency to agree that they find spiritual expression in a synagogue difficult.** The age-related trend is not always clearcut and has some “hiccups” e.g. the score dips for the 45-54 year age group but then goes back on track and starts to rise again after that.
- **Cape Town and Durban respondents are less likely than are those in Johannesburg and Pretoria to disagree with the idea of spiritual expression in a synagogue being difficult.**

⁸⁴ Strongly agree was weighted “5”, Agree “4”, Neither agree nor disagree “3”, Disagree “2” and Strongly disagree “1”. The weighted scores were totalled and divided by the total respondents rating to yield an average rating. The highest possible average rating (on the agree side) is thus “5” and the lowest possible (which is on the disagree side) is “1”

- **The Strictly Orthodox are those least likely to agree with the idea of spiritual expression in a synagogue being difficult i.e. they are inclined to find it easy.** Traditionals are not quite as convinced about the ease of expression, while Reform/Progressives are even less convinced and the Secular/Just Jewish even less i.e. the Secular/Just Jewish sector tends to find spiritual expression in a synagogue difficult.
- **There has been improvement since 1998 with regard to ease of spiritual expression in a synagogue.** In 1998, just over one-third (35%) claimed to find such expression difficult, 45% claimed that they do not and the remainder (20%) did not commit themselves either way. In 2005 however, the situation has improved i.e. 28% find spiritual expression in a synagogue difficult, 54% disagree with the idea that it is difficult and the remainder (18%) do not commit themselves either way. **Although the weighting tends more towards than away from the ease of spiritual expression in a synagogue and there has been improvement since 1998, it cannot be denied that a sizeable proportion still find such expression difficult and/or could not commit themselves either way.**

E. Focus on the Kosher meat issue

“What kind of meat, if any, is bought for your home....CARD: None (vegetarian); Only meat from a Kosher butcher; From an ordinary (non-Kosher) butcher but not pork or bacon; From an ordinary (non-Kosher) butcher including pork and bacon; Sometimes from a Kosher butcher and sometimes from a non-Kosher butcher but not pork or bacon; Sometimes from a Kosher butcher and sometimes from a non-Kosher butcher including pork and bacon?”

	Total Respondents 1000=100%		
Only meat from a Kosher butcher	39%	39% KOSHER ONLY	89% “NO PORK NO BACON” POLICY
From an ordinary (non-Kosher) butcher <u>but not</u> pork or bacon	28%	50% NO PORK/BACON	
Sometimes from a Kosher butcher and sometimes from a non-Kosher butcher <u>but not</u> pork or bacon	22%		
From an ordinary (non-Kosher) butcher <u>including</u> pork and bacon	6%	7% INCLUDING PORK/BACON	
Sometimes from a Kosher butcher and sometimes from a non-Kosher butcher <u>including</u> pork and bacon	1%		
None (vegetarian)	3%		
Do not buy meat/live in hotel/old age home	1%		
Total	100%		

- **39% claim that only Kosher meat is bought for their homes** i.e. this represents approximately 4 in every 10 Jewish homes in the major cities where Jews reside in South Africa.
- **A further 50% do not necessarily have Kosher meat but they have no pork or bacon in their homes**
- **Considering the above-mentioned categories (89% in total), we can conclude that Jews in South Africa – in the main – have a “no pork-no bacon” policy in their homes.**
- **A small percentage (7%) do have pork/bacon in the home**
- **3% do not have meat in the home because they are vegetarians**
- **1% do not buy meat because of living in a hotel or Aged Home**

We have observed that overall, 39% claimed that only Kosher meat is bought for their homes. How does the penetration of usage of “only Kosher meat” compare within age groups? And within cities? The results are shown using the split table approach below.

	KIND OF MEAT BOUGHT FOR THE HOME :												
	Total Sample 1000= 100%	GENDER		A G E						CITY			
		Male 459= 100%	Female 541= 100%	18-24 yrs 115= 100%	25-34 yrs 159= 100%	35-44 yrs 167= 100%	45-54 yrs 171= 100%	55-64 yrs 176= 100%	65+ yrs 212= 100%	Jhb 650= 100%	Pta 50= 100%	CT 250= 100%	Dbn 50= 100%
Only Kosher meat	39%	41%	38%	50%	46%	41%	33%	38%	33%	46%	50%	22%	26%
Possibly but not necessarily Kosher but no pork/no bacon	50%	49%	51%	45%	44%	49%	52%	52%	56%	46%	42%	61%	58%
Total “No pork no bacon” i.e. Kosher only OR not necessarily Kosher but no pork/bacon	89%	90%	89%	95%	90%	90%	85%	90%	89%	92%	92%	83%	84%

Total “No pork no bacon” i.e. Kosher only OR not necessarily Kosher but no pork/ bacon	89%	90%	89%	95%	90%	90%	85%	90%	89%	92%	92%	83%	84%
Including pork/bacon	7%	7%	8%	4%	7%	6%	11%	6%	7%	5%	-	12%	10%
None(vegetarian)	3%	2%	3%	1%	3%	4%	4%	4%	2%	2%	6%	4%	6%
Don't buy meat/live hotel/OldAgeHome	1%	1%	<0.5%	-	-	<0.5%	-	-	2%	1%	2%	1%	-
Overall Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- In the top section of the two-part tabulation: **The “only Kosher meat” category (1st row of the tabulation) shows that there are no significant male-female differences. However, there is an age-related trend i.e. under 45 year olds (and particularly those under 35 years of**

age) are far more likely than older respondents to claim that only Kosher meat is bought for their homes. The 45-54 year group and the 65 years and older group show the lowest scores. **There are definite differences between the cities.** Johannesburg and Pretoria show an above average tendency towards Kosher meat usage, while Durban and Cape Town show far below average scores for claiming usage of Kosher meat only. The implication here is that Jewish adults under 45 years of age (and particularly those under 35 years of age) are more likely to live in Kosher homes than are those from older age groups and that Jewish adults from the Johannesburg/Pretoria area are more likely to live in Kosher homes than are their counterparts in the other two cities.

- Irrespective of whether or not only Kosher meat is brought into the home, the tradition of not eating pork/bacon is firmly entrenched amongst Jewish people in South Africa i.e. within all age sectors and within each city at least 8 or 9 in every 10 Jewish adults claim that their household has a “no pork no bacon” policy (3rd row of top tabulation). The 18-24 year sector shows an above average proportion here (95%). In addition Johannesburg and Pretoria Jews reflect higher scores than do Cape Town and Durban Jews.
- The second part of the tabulation shows the “total no pork no bacon” row again and the remainder of the results. Here we see a hint (but hint only) of greater pork/bacon eating amongst 45-54 year olds as well as Cape Town and Durban. However, even within these sectors, the overwhelming majority do not eat pork/bacon.
- What about various religious practice sectors – how do they fare in this regard?

	KIND OF MEAT BOUGHT FOR THE HOME :				
	Total Respondents 1000=100%	RELIGIOUS PRACTICE:			
		Total Secular 118=100%	Total Reform/ Progressive 74=100%	Total Traditional 663=100%	Total Strictly Orthodox 141=100%
Only meat from Kosher butcher	39%	4%	1%	37%	96%
Not necessarily Kosher but no pork/ bacon	50%	60%	70%	57%	1%
Total “No pork no bacon” i.e. Kosher only OR Not necessarily Kosher but no pork/ bacon	89%	64%	71%	94%	97%

Total “No pork no bacon” i.e. Kosher only OR Not necessarily Kosher but no pork/no bacon	89%	64%	71%	94%	97%
Including pork/bacon	7%	24%	26%	4%	-
None(vegetarian)	3%	10%	3%	2%	2%
Don't buy meat/live in hotel/Old Age Home	1%	2%	-	<0.5%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

- **The Strictly Orthodox almost exclusively claimed that only Kosher meat is bought for their homes.** The 4% who did not make this claim were distributed as follows: 2% vegetarians; 1% living in circumstances

- where they do not buy meat and 1% emerged as unexplained – perhaps this relates to people considering themselves as being Strictly Orthodox but who live in homes (e.g. parents' homes) which have not moved towards being Strictly Orthodox but do have a “no pork/no bacon” policy..
- **Amongst the Traditionals, 37% spoke of only Kosher meat in the home** and a higher proportion (57%) spoke of the meat for their homes as not necessarily being Kosher but mentioned that “no pork or bacon” is bought for the home. This brings the “no pork no bacon” total for these homes to 94%.
 - **Of the Reform/Progressives only 1% claim that only Kosher meat is bought for their homes.** Overall, 71% claim to have a “no pork no bacon” policy in their homes and 26% mentioned that pork/bacon is brought into their homes.
 - **Within the Secular/Just Jewish sector, 4% claimed that only Kosher meat is bought for their homes,** in total 64% spoke of a “no pork/no bacon” policy, 24% said that pork/bacon is brought into the home and 10% (a higher proportion than for other sectors) spoke of being vegetarians. Just as we hypothesized that some who call themselves Strictly Orthodox could be living in homes which do not adhere to Strictly Orthodox requirements, it is also possible that some regard themselves as Secular/Just Jewish but live in homes not this way inclined. This would account for the very small percentage of Secular/Just Jewish who claim that Kosher meat is bought for their homes. However, what is interesting is the high proportion of “no pork/no bacon” within the Secular sector.
 - The classification of respondents in terms of their Kosher meat purchasing habits or otherwise is not as clearcut as it seems i.e. another question was asked of all those who claimed that only Kosher meat is bought for their homes: “You have only Kosher meat at home. Do you separate it from milk products (i.e. as regards cooking, serving etc.)?” The 39% who claim that Kosher meat is bought for their homes splits as follows: Although most said “yes” (36%), a small percentage (3%) did say “no”. Not separating “milk and meat “in a home which buys Kosher meat, means that the home is not Kosher i.e. irrespective of whether or not other Kashrut requirements are met.
 - A check on the demographic details shows that: After discounting those in whose homes meat and milk products are not separated, we can still conclude that Jewish adults under 45 years of age (and particularly those under 35 years of age) – provided their homes meet other Kashrut requirements - are more likely to live in Kosher homes than are those from older age groups and that Jewish adults from the Johannesburg/Pretoria area are more likely to live in Kosher homes than are their counterparts in the other two cities.

Below we show a comparison of the results with those from the 1998 survey:

	2005	1998		
	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Total Respondents 1000=100%		
Only meat from a Kosher butcher	39%	40%	KOSHER ONLY 39% (2005) 40% (1998)	TOTAL NO PORK/NO BACON POLICY 89% (2005) 91% (1998)
From an ordinary (non-Kosher) butcher <u>but not</u> pork or bacon	28%	33%	NO PORK/BACON 50% (2005) 51% (1998)	
Sometimes from a Kosher butcher and sometimes from a non-Kosher butcher <u>but not</u> pork or bacon	22%	18%		
From an ordinary (non-Kosher) butcher <u>including</u> pork and bacon	6%	6%	INCLUDING PORK/BACON 7% (2005) 7% (1998)	
Sometimes from a Kosher butcher and sometimes from a non-Kosher butcher <u>including</u> pork and bacon	1%	1%		
None (vegetarian)	3%	2%		
Do not buy meat/live in hotel/old age home	1%	-		
Total	100%	100%		

- Thus, broadly-speaking, there have been no statistically significant changes between 1998 and 2005 with regard to claims that Kosher meat is bought for the home. In fact, the results are essentially the same now as they were in 1998. Also, overall, the extent to which homes adopt a “no pork no bacon” policy is similar for 1998 and 2005. An additional check on results for pre-1998 surveys shows that the questions asked were not quite the same but there is some comparable data i.e. in the 1991⁸⁵ study, 38% claimed that only Kosher meat is bought for their homes. Clearly, the

⁸⁵ Table 5.5, p.116, Dubb et al. 1991 Sociodemographic Study.

- proportion buying only Kosher meat for their homes has not changed significantly since 1991 !
- Incidentally (and not shown above), results for separation of meat and milk products in the home are also - statistically-speaking - similar for 1998 and 2005 i.e. of those who only have Kosher meat at home, 95% (in 1998) and 93% (in 2005) claimed to separate their meat and milk products as regards cooking, serving etc.

F. Types of Synagogue

(i) Type which parents belonged to:

“Here is a list of different types of synagogues. Please use the appropriate letter codes to answer the following questions” LIST: Traditional Orthodox, Sephardi, Lubavitch/Chabad, Ohr Somayach, Conservative, Reform/Progressive.

- (i) Which type of synagogue/s (if any) did your parents belong to when you were growing up?
(ii) Which type of synagogue/s (if any) do you belong to now?
(iii) Which type of synagogue/s (if any) do you attend?
(iv) Other than the ones you belong to or attend, which other types of synagogue on this list, if any, do you think you might like to try attending in the future?
(v) Which of the types of synagogue on this list, if any, do you think will show the greatest increase in membership in the future?
(vi) Which of the types of synagogue on this list, if any, do you think will show the greatest decrease in membership in the future?”

	(i) Their parents belonged to 1000=100%	(ii) Respondents belong to now 1000=100%	(iii) Respondents attend now 1000=100%	(iv) Might like to try 1000=100%	(v) Think will show greatest increase 1000=100%	(vi) Think will show greatest decrease 1000=100%
<u>From list:</u>						
Traditional Orthodox	81%	68%	73%	6%	20%	14%
Sephardi	2%	1%	2%	6%	1%	6%
Lubavitch/Chabad	2%	7%	10%	20%	31%	5%
Ohr Somayach	1%	5%	8%	17%	31%	1%
Conservative	<0.5%	<0.5%	<0.5%	4%	2%	7%
Reform/Progressive	8%	8%	9%	4%	9%	32%
<u>Spontaneously mentioned:</u>						
Other(e.g. Mizrahi, Kollel, Morasha)	-	<0.5%	<0.5%	<0.5%	<0.5%	<0.5%
None/not applicable	7%	11%	6%	43%	6%	12%
DK/No answer	1%	1%	1%	8%	12%	28%
Total ⁸⁶	102%	101%	109%	109%	112%	105%

⁸⁶ Where columns total more than 100% respondents mentioned more than one synagogue type.

- **Traditional Orthodox is the dominant synagogue type in South Africa and has been for some time.**
 - **81%** (approximately 8 in every 10 respondents) claimed that while they (the respondents) were growing up, their parents had belonged to a Traditional Orthodox synagogue.
 - **68%** (virtually 7 in every 10) claimed to currently belong to this type of synagogue.
 - **73%** (over 7 in every 10) claimed to attend a Traditional Orthodox synagogue, irrespective of whether they belong to it or not. The “attend” figure is higher than the “belong to” figure since not all of those who attend officially belong to the synagogue. There is however always potential for those who attend a synagogue to actually become members.
 - Overall, a very high proportion are familiar with Traditional Orthodox synagogues, either from their childhood days and/or because of their current involvement. It is therefore not surprising that the additional “might like to try” score for this synagogue type is low (6%) i.e. most have already tried it. In spite of Traditional Orthodox’s already high score, a fair proportion (20%) mentioned that Traditional Orthodox is the synagogue type which will show the greatest increase in the future. This score is however counterbalanced to some extent by those (14%) who think this synagogue type will show the greatest decrease.
- It should be noted that there were a small number of spontaneous mentions of “other” types of synagogue which were not listed. It may well be that some of these falling into “other” would have received a higher number of mentions if there had been an extended list e.g. some might have been likely to choose the Mizrachi option had it been on the list **but** chose another option closest to it without specifying Mizrachi separately. Should more input be required as to this issue, additional research specifically geared for this purpose can be undertaken. In such research it should be ensured that the sample is large enough to yield sufficient detail for the smaller synagogue sectors for which input is required.
- **In spite of the very high Traditional Orthodox score, there has been – as can be seen - a tendency for movement away from Traditional Orthodox** i.e. although the “belong to” (68%) and “attend now” (73%) scores are very high, they tend to be not quite as high as the “parents belonged to” score (81%). In what direction the siphoning off has taken place should become apparent as we proceed through the report.
- **Because the Traditional sector scores are so high the other scores are obviously much lower by comparison e.g.**
 - **Sephardi** : 2% say that their parents had belonged to this synagogue type, 1% say that they themselves belong to this type of synagogue and 2% say that they currently attend this type irrespective of whether they are members or not. Statistically-speaking, initial indications are that as regards attendance there

have been no dramatic changes over time. However, the numbers are too small for this to be conclusively stated. What the future holds for the Sephardi sector is not clear e.g. an additional 6% claimed that they “might like to try” attending a Sephardi synagogue, yet – on the other hand - 6% chose this synagogue type as likely to show the greatest decrease in the future.

- **Conservative** hardly features for current and past attendance/ membership, but this is understandable since this type of synagogue has not established itself noticeably in South Africa. Some might like to try it (4%) or think it will increase in membership (2%) but this is counterbalanced by those who think this is the synagogue type where membership will “show the greatest decrease” (7%).
- **Although scoring far below the Traditional sector, the synagogue types which are more right wing in terms of religion (i.e. Lubavitch/ Chabad and Ohr Somayach) feature noticeably when considered together and when considered separately:**
 - **Lubavitch/Chabad shows a positive growth pattern.** Of the total respondents, only 2% had parents who belonged to this synagogue, yet 7% claim to be members, while in total 10% claimed to actually attend. The growth pattern potential for this sector cannot be denied, particularly since an additional 20% of the respondents claimed that they might like to try attending Lubavitch/Chabad synagogues in the future. Furthermore, when all respondents were asked which synagogue type they think will show the greatest increase in membership in the future, 31% (almost one-third) mentioned Chabad/Lubavitch. Only 5% thought that this synagogue type is likely to show the greatest decrease in membership in the future.
 - **Ohr Somayach also shows a positive growth pattern.** Only 1% of the respondents have parents who belonged to Ohr Somayach while the respondents were growing up. However, 5% of the respondents are members of this synagogue now and in total 8% of respondents actually claimed to attend Ohr Somayach synagogues. A further 17% claimed that they would like to try attending. Just as was the case for Chabad/Lubavitch, when all respondents were asked which synagogue type they think will show the greatest increase in membership in the future, 31% (almost one-third) mentioned Ohr Somayach. Here a minimal proportion (only 1%) thought that this synagogue type is likely to show the greatest decrease in membership in the future.
 - **These two synagogue types, which are more right wing (in religious terms) than Traditional Orthodox or Reform/ Progressive, should be considered not only separately but together as well i.e. the fact that both show a positive growth/potential growth pattern must be noted.** The scores for

the two cannot however be directly added to each other to obtain a score since some respondents may have mentioned both of these in response to a particular question. The fact that they each have noticeable “might like to try” scores and “greatest increase potential” scores cannot be ignored.

- **Scoring far below the Traditional sector but holding its own is the Reform/Progressive sector. However, it exhibits a maintenance rather than growth pattern:**

- 8% claimed that their parents had belonged to this type of synagogue
- 8% said that they personally belong to it now
- 9% claimed to attend this type of synagogue, irrespective of whether they belong to it or not
- It's maintenance rather than growth pattern can mean erosion in the future, particularly when considered in the light of the additional data i.e. besides those who belong to Reform/Progressive: only a very small percentage (4%) claim that they would like to try attending it in the future; while 9% think that it will increase its membership in the future, 32% (almost one-third) think that it will decrease in membership in the future.

- **It will be noted that in the sample as a whole:**

- A small sector (7%) said that their parents had not belonged to a synagogue. From some additional comments made it is apparent that some respondents had converted and therefore their parents had not belonged to a synagogue. The percentage of respondents who had converted are dealt with elsewhere in this report.
- A sector of respondents (11%) claimed not to belong to a synagogue at present, while 6% claimed that they do not attend a synagogue. This means that – as has been apparent from other findings too - some attend but do not belong.
- In total, approximately half did not name any other synagogue they would like to try i.e. 51% (splitting: 43% None/not applicable and 8% Don't know/No answer).
- Overall respondents found it easier to mention a synagogue type likely to show an increase in membership in the future than a synagogue type likely to show a decrease i.e. only 18% said “none” or “don't know” for a synagogue type likely to show the greatest **increase** in membership in the future, whereas 40% did not mention a synagogue type likely to show the greatest **decrease** in membership in the future. As we saw earlier, Lubavitch/Chabad and Ohr Somayach fared best as regards perceptions that membership will increase in the future, with **each** being mentioned by 31% (almost one-third) of respondents. Reform/Progressive on the other hand obtained a higher score than other synagogues for perceptions that it will show a decrease in membership in the future i.e. it was mentioned in this context by 32% (almost one-third) of

respondents. The fact that the bulk of the sample was not oriented towards Reform/Progressive could partly have coloured perceptions of the future of this sector. However, in spite of this having played some part, it would be unwise for those concerned about the future of the Reform/Progressive sector to totally dismiss or discount this score.

A check on demographic data relating to synagogue membership and current and potential attendance has yielded the following observations:

- **Whilst 18-24 year olds currently show above average involvement with Traditional Orthodox, they also show an above average desire to try Chabad/Lubavitch and Ohr Somayach.** More specifically, in this age sector: 83% claim to belong and 84% to attend Traditional Orthodox synagogues (whereas the overall total for belonging is 68% and attending 73%). Furthermore, 32% of this age sector as compared to 20% of the total sample, want to try Chabad/Lubavitch and 22% of this age sector as compared to 17% of the total sample want to try Ohr Somayach.
- **Even though Traditional Orthodox scores below average amongst 25-34 year olds, it is still dominant in this age sector. However, Chabad/Lubavitch synagogues and (even more so) Ohr Somayach synagogues tend to score above average in this age sector. More specifically:**
 - **Traditional Orthodox:** 60% claim to belong to and 67% claim to attend Traditional Orthodox synagogues (as compared to the higher scores of 68% and 73% respectively in the total sample).
 - **Chabad/Lubavitch:** 11% claim to belong and 15% to attend Chabad/Lubavitch synagogues (as compared to lower scores 7% and 10% respectively within the total sample). The “would like to try” score is not - statistically speaking - above average. (i.e. “would like to try” Chabad/Lubavitch 22% as compared to a total sample score of 20%).
 - **Ohr Somayach:** Scores reflected amongst 25-34 year olds are even more above average than those shown for Chabad/ Lubavitch (i.e. within this age group, 13% claimed to belong to Ohr Somayach, 21% claimed to attend and 23% would like to try it as compared to lower total sample scores of 5% for belonging, 8% for attending and 17% for “would like to try”).

- **Amongst 35-44 year olds Traditional Orthodox synagogues are dominant as in all age sectors, but scores for this synagogue type tend to be below average. Also, there is a tendency in this age group (but this tendency is not as great as amongst 25-34 year olds) for above average involvement with Chabad/Lubavitch and Ohr Somayach. Synagogues which they would like to try in the future tend to be in line with the total sample specifications. More specifically:**
 - **Traditional Orthodox:** In this age group, 64% claimed to belong to and 70% claimed to attend this synagogue type (as compared to 68% and 73% respectively in the total sample)
 - **Chabad/Lubavitch:** Of the 35-44 year olds, 10% claim to belong (compared to 7% of the total sample), 14% claim to attend (compared to 10% for the total sample), 21% “would like to try it” (compared to a similar score of 20% in the total sample).
 - **Ohr Somayach:** 8% claimed to belong (compared to 5% of the total sample), the attend score is 12% (compared to the total sample score of 8%), “would like to try” 18% (with the total sample of 17% being similar in this instance).
- **Amongst 45-54 year olds: Although Traditional Orthodox still dominates, Reform/Progressive shows above average involvement at the “belong to/attend” level but not at the “would like to try” level. In fact, in this age sector, none of the synagogue types score above average for potential trial i.e. “would like to try”.**
 - **Traditional Orthodox:** Of the 45-54 year olds, 70% belong to and 72% attend this synagogue type (with total sample scores being 68% and 73% respectively)
 - **Reform/Progressive:** 14% claimed to belong to this synagogue type (compared to the lower score of 8% for the total sample), 14% attend (compared to the lower score of 9% for the total sample), 1% “would like to try” it (with 4% for the total sample).
- **55-64 year olds and those 65 years and older do not show distinctly above average involvement with particular synagogue types i.e. scores are approximately in keeping with total scores and – as occurs throughout – Traditional Orthodox is dominant. However, for “belonging”, there is a hint (but hint only) of over-representation of Reform/Progressives in the 55-64 year sector. Also, there is a hint of under-representation of Ohr Somayach at the belonging and attending level – this hint of Ohr Somayach under-representation actually starts within the 45-54 year sector and extends into the 55-64 year and 65 years and older sectors.**
- **All cities are primarily involved with Traditional Orthodox i.e. within each city at least 66% claim to belong to and at least 70% claim to attend this type of synagogue. Other synagogue types feature less prominently. Some do however feature to an above average extent in various cities:**

- **Chabad/Lubavitch:** As regards “belonging”, Johannesburg (with 9%) is more involved with this synagogue type than are other cities (i.e. others score no more than 2% each for this synagogue type). As regards “attending”, the Johannesburg/Pretoria area (12%) scores above Cape Town (6%) and Durban (6%). Lack of access to this synagogue type in some areas is, of course, a factor which influences the scores.
- **Ohr Somayach:** With regard to “belonging”, Ohr Somayach features only in Johannesburg (6%) and Cape Town (4%), with other cities (zero). However, for “attending”, Pretoria also features i.e. Johannesburg/Pretoria 9%, Cape Town 9%, Durban zero. Would like to try scores are higher in Pretoria, Cape Town and Durban than in Johannesburg (i.e. Johannesburg 14%, Pretoria 26%, Cape Town 23%, Durban 22%).
- **Reform/Progressive:** Cape Town shows above average involvement with the Reform/Progressive synagogue type but Durban involvement is greater i.e. Belong: Johannesburg 5%, Pretoria 6%, Cape Town 14%, Durban 20%, with the total sample score being 8%. Attend: Johannesburg 6%, Pretoria 8%, Cape Town 14%, Durban 24%, with the total sample score being 9%.

The following is a comparison of 1998 and 2005 data as to: types of synagogue their parents belonged to, types respondents belong to now and types respondents attend now.

	(i) Their parents belonged to 1000=100%		(ii) Respondents belong to now 1000=100%		(iii) Respondents attend now 1000=100%	
	2005	1998	2005	1998	2005	1998
<u>From list</u>						
Traditional Orthodox	81%	83%	68%	72%	73%	79%
Sephardi	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Lubavitch/Chabad	2%	1%	7%	3%	10%	4%
Ohr Somayach	1%	-	5%	-	8%	-
Conservative	<0.5%	1%	<0.5%	1%	<0.5%	1%
Reform/Progressive	8%	8%	8%	8%	9%	8%
<u>Others mentioned spontaneously (e.g. Mizrachi, Kollel, Morasha)</u>	-	-	<0.5%	-	<0.5%	-
None/not applicable	7%	6%	11%	15%	6%	7%
DK/No answer	1%	-	1%	-	1%	-
Total ⁸⁷	102%	100%	101%	100%	109%	100%

- **Traditional Orthodox scored dramatically above any other synagogues in 1998 and 2005 irrespective of whether we look at the synagogues “their parents belonged to”, the ones they personally belong to or the ones they attend (irrespective of whether they belong or not). There have, however, been some changes since 1998.**

⁸⁷ When columns total more than 100% it means that respondents mentioned more than one synagogue type in response to that question.

- **The changes between 1998 and 2005 are not evident when we look at the synagogue types their parents belonged to i.e. in this regard there are no sizeable differences between the 2005 and 1998 results.** In both studies, Traditional Orthodox was the dominant synagogue which “their parents belonged to”, with over 8 in every 10 respondents mentioning it in that context. All other synagogue types scored very far below e.g. in both studies Reform/Progressive scored 8% and all other synagogues scored even lower.
- **With regard to the synagogue type belonged to now, Traditional Orthodox is as dominant in 2005 as it was in 1998 but there are hints that Lubavitch/Chabad and Ohr Somayach are drawing from Traditional Orthodox** i.e. the Traditional Orthodox score for 2005 is a bit lower than the 1998 score while the Lubavitch/Chabad score is higher than it was in 1998 and Ohr Somayach features whereas it was not yet a factor in 1998. The combined score for these two is higher than the Reform/Progressive score. Reform/Progressive has, however, been holding its own by maintaining its score of 8% from 1998 to 2005.
- **Looking at synagogue types which they attend (but do not necessarily belong to):**
 - **In 1998, Traditional Orthodox was dominant (79%). Progressive/Reform (8%) was next then Lubavitch/Chabad (4%). No others featured noticeably.**
 - **In 2005, Traditional Orthodox (73%) is still dominant but Lubavitch/Chabad (10%) and Ohr Somayach (8%) show growth. Each of these is positioned at a similar level to Reform/Progressive (9%). Reform/Progressive emerges in 2005 as still holding its own with a similar score to what it reflected in 1998.**

IX. JEWISH COMMUNITY AND COMMUNAL ORGANISATIONS

A. The Jewish community and its role – perceptions of those not married

All respondents not currently married (i.e. 429 of the 1000 respondents) were asked: “Which one of the following statements do you think applies.....CARD:

- ❖ The Jewish community makes a major attempt to help Jewish single or unattached people meet each other
- ❖ The Jewish community does make some attempt to help Jewish single or unattached people meet each other
- ❖ The Jewish community does not really attempt to help Jewish single or unattached people meet each other
- ❖ The Jewish community makes no attempt at all to help Jewish single or unattached people meet each other”

Those not currently married were also asked: “Do you as a ...READ AS APPROPRIATE..... single/unmarried/divorced/widowed/separated person feel adequately supported by the Jewish community structure? IF YES: Would you say: always, often, sometimes?”

	Total <u>not</u> currently in marriage situation 429=100%
<u>Attempt made by Jewish community to help Jewish single or unattached people meet each other:</u>	
Major attempt	15%
Some attempt	52%
Does not really attempt	17%
No attempt at all	12%
Don't Know/No Answer	4%
Total	100%
<u>Feel adequately supported by the Jewish community structure :</u>	
Yes always	35%
Yes often	17%
Yes sometimes	19%
No/Never	19%
DK/No answer/don't need support	10%
Total	100%

- **Those not currently in a marriage situation, tend, in the main, to claim that the Jewish community attempts to help Jewish single or unattached people meet each other. However, as can be observed, there is room for intensification of such attempts.** Of the sector not currently within a marriage, approximately two-thirds (67%) say that the Jewish community makes such attempts. The emphasis, however, is more on “some attempt (52%) than on a ”major attempt” (15%). The remainder are primarily divided between saying that the Jewish community “does not really attempt” this (17%) and “makes “no attempt at all” in this direction (12%). 4% said “Don’t know”/gave no answer.
- **With regard to generally feeling supported by the Jewish community structure, those not currently within a marriage situation tend more towards feeling that there is such support than towards feeling that there is none. However, improvement in this regard would be an advantage.** Just over half (52%) said that they always or often feel supported by the Jewish community structure (which splits: 35% “always” and 17% “often”). A further 19% said “sometimes”. Only 19% said that they never experience this type of support and 10% said “don’t know/no answer” or that they do not need this type of support.

How do the demographic subgroups compare as to attitudes in this regard?

	Total not currently married ⁸⁸ 429= 100%	GENDER		A G E						C I T Y ⁸⁹	
		Male 200= 100%	Female 229= 100%	18-24 yrs 114= 100%	25-34 yrs 83= 100%	35-44 yrs 37= 100%	45-54 yrs 42= 100%	55-64 yrs 59= 100%	65+ yrs 94= 100%	Jhb 288= 100%	CT 105= 100%
<u>Attempt made by Jewish community to help Jewish single or unattached people meet each other:</u>											
Major attempt	15%	15%	15%	16%	18%	19%	10%	12%	14%	15%	11%
Some attempt	52%	56%	49%	59%	59%	51%	45%	44%	46%	56%	48%
Does not really attempt	17%	15%	18%	17%	13%	8%	17%	20%	21%	14%	21%
No attempt at all	12%	10%	14%	7%	7%	14%	26%	20%	11%	12%	12%
Don't Know/No Answer	4%	4%	4%	1%	3%	8%	2%	4%	8%	3%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<u>Feel adequately supported by Jewish community structure :</u>											
Yes always	35%	42%	29%	48%	40%	35%	26%	24%	27%	39%	28%
Yes often	17%	18%	16%	20%	14%	22%	12%	17%	14%	17%	13%
Yes sometimes	19%	20%	19%	16%	24%	13%	22%	22%	19%	19%	25%
No/Never	19%	12%	24%	12%	10%	22%	33%	27%	22%	16%	22%
DK/No answer/ don't need support	10%	8%	12%	4%	12%	8%	7%	10%	18%	9%	12%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Bearing in mind that we are only examining responses made by those not currently in a marriage situation:

- **In essence, there are no sizeable gender differences with regard to the extent to which they feel that the Jewish community helps Jewish single or unattached people meet each other i.e. both males and females place their emphasis on the positive side but with more focus on “some attempt” being made, than on a “major attempt” being made by the Jewish community in this regard. However, when considering feelings of overall support from the Jewish community structure (i.e. not only in relation to meeting people), males undoubtedly claim to experience more adequate support from the Jewish community structure:**
 - Of the males, 60% claim that they always/often feel adequately supported by the Jewish community structure, with this splitting: 42% always and 18% often.
 - Of the females, a lower proportion (45%) claim to always/often feel adequately supported by the Jewish community structure, with this splitting: 29% always and 16% often.
- **Agewise, under 45 year olds - but more particularly 18-34 year olds – have a positive view of the community’s attempts to help single/unattached Jewish people meet each other. The emphasis within this under 45 year sector is however still heavily on “some attempt” being made rather than a “major attempt”. With regard to generally feeling adequately supported by the Jewish community**

⁸⁸ “Total not currently married” includes: single, unmarried but living with partner, divorced, separated, widowed.

⁸⁹ For the sector “not currently married”, responses for Pretoria and Durban have been included in the overall results but have not been broken down separately here.

- structure there is an age-related trend once again, with 18-24 year olds reflecting greater satisfaction than 25-34 year olds who in turn are more satisfied than 35-44 year olds who are more satisfied than the grouped 45 years and older sector.
- **Cities:** Generally-speaking, those in Johannesburg who are not married at present are more satisfied with what the community does for them than are those in Cape Town i.e. as regards helping them to meet other single/unattached people but more particularly as regards making them feel adequately supported by the Jewish community structure. Because we are looking only at those who are not currently in a marriage situation the numbers in Pretoria and Durban are too small to be viewed separately from the overall sample.

B. Requirements from the Jewish community structure

All respondents, irrespective of whether they are currently in a marriage relationship or not, were asked: “Which, if any, of the following do you personally require more of from the Jewish community than you have at present? You may mention as many or as few as you wish. CARD FEATURING: Emotional support, Financial Assistance, Meals/Assistance with Meals, Medical Assistance, Organised Activities/Outings, Personal Safety Assistance, Social/Friendship Gatherings, Transport/Assistance with Transport, Anything else?”

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Total who mentioned that do require more from the Jewish community structure 479=100% ⁹⁰
<u>Require more of from Jewish community structure than have at present:</u>		
Social/Friendship gatherings	20%	41%
Emotional Support	16%	33%
Personal Safety Assistance	13%	27%
Organised Activities/Outings	11%	23%
Financial Assistance	7%	14%
Medical assistance	5%	11%
Assistance with Transport	2%	5%
Meals/Assistance with meals	1%	2%
None of these listed (and no mention of any others)	50%	N/A
Don't know/no answer	2%	N/A
<u>Other/additional mentions not from list:</u>		
More Torah learning/religious learning/religious activities/ Shiurim/educational system to lead towards observance	1%	1%
Adult education/learning programmes	<0.5%	1%
Other (one mention each)	2%	5%
Total	130%	163%

⁹⁰ Excluding those who said “none” (502 respondents i.e. 50%) and “don’t know/no answer” (19 respondents i.e. 2%), there were **479** respondents who did mention what they would like more of. We have thus shown the results based on the total sample (1000) in the first column and based on those who do have requests (479) in the second column.

- **Guided by the items shown on the list⁹¹, half of the respondents (50%) claimed that there is nothing which they personally require more of from the Jewish community than they have at present.** The remaining half did specify what they personally would like more of.
- **Broadly-speaking there are two categories to be considered: social/emotional requirements and physical assistance.**
- **Social/Emotional requirements top the list i.e. Social/friendship gatherings.** Overall 20% require this but the importance is highlighted when we look only at those with requirements i.e. of those who have requirements, 41% require more social/friendship gatherings. Emotional support is required by 16% of the total respondents which accounts for 33% of those who do have requirements. Organised activities/outings were requested by 11% of the total, which translates to 23% of those who do have requests.
- **Physical assistance of one type or another accounts for most of the remaining responses.** Some facets of this factor were related to finance or to needs created by the absence of finance. Personal safety assistance emerges more prominently than other facets of this broadly-based factor. It was requested by 13% of the total respondents but comprised over a quarter (27%) of the requests by the sector which requires more from the Jewish community structure. Financial assistance was mentioned by 7% of the total which accounts for 14% of those who do have requests. Medical assistance was specified by 5% of the total which is 11% of those who made requests. Assistance with transport was mentioned by 2% of the total which is 5% of those with requests. Meals/assistance with meals was referred to by 1% of total and 2% of those with requests.

It is interesting to look at total sample data alongside data for the “paired” and “unpaired” sectors. “Paired” includes all currently in a marriage relationship plus those unmarried but living with a partner. “Unpaired” includes all who are: single (not living with a partner)/widowed/divorced/separated.

⁹¹ Although the question allows for mentions other than those listed, it was primarily geared for responses relating to the aspects featured on the list. Other aspects were thus mentioned minimally. Because of not having been listed, the other aspects are not reflected in their true proportions e.g. had the list included “Torah learning/religious activities/Shiurim etc.” then more respondents would have thought about this issue and it is possible that the figure for that aspect could have been higher than in this instance where it emerged spontaneously.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Total Paired 590=100%	Total Unpaired 410=100%
<u>Require more of from the Jewish community structure than you have at present:</u>			
Social/Friendship gatherings	20%	15%	26%
Emotional Support	16%	16%	16%
Personal Safety Assistance	13%	15%	11%
Organised Activities/Outings	11%	10%	13%
Financial Assistance	7%	7%	5%
Medical assistance	5%	6%	5%
Assistance with Transport	2%	2%	2%
Meals/Assistance with meals	1%	1%	1%
None of these listed (and no mention of any others)	50%	53%	47%
Don't know/no answer	2%	1%	2%
<u>Other/additional mentions not from list:</u>			
More Torah learning/religious learning/religious activities/ Shiurim/educational system to lead towards observance	1%	1%	1%
Adult education/learning programmes	<0.5%	<0.5%	<0.5%
Other (one mention each)	2%	3%	1%
Total	130%	131%	130%

- **The “unpaired” tend to be more likely than the “paired” to mention that they require more from the Jewish community.** Of the “paired” sector, 53% claimed **not** to require more from the Jewish community which means that 47% do require more. Within the “unpaired” the reverse situation applies: 47% claimed that they do **not** require more from the Jewish community structure which means that 53% do.
- **Overall, those who are “unpaired” need more social assistance than those who are “paired”.** On an average, within the total sample, 20% expressed a need for social/friendship gatherings. The “unpaired” reflected an above average need in this regard (26%). The comparable score for their “paired” counterparts was 15%. The “unpaired” also hinted (but hinted only) at wanting more organised outings and activities (13%) than did those who are “paired” (10%).

For greater insight we will look at the demographic profile of those who have requirements.

		Total who claimed	WHAT REQUIRE MORE OF FROM JEWISH COMMUNITY				

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	do require more from the Jewish community structure 479=100% ⁹²	Social/ friendship gatherings 196=100%	Emotional support 159=100%	Personal safety assistance 129=100%	Organised activities/ outings 110=100%	Financial assistance 66=100%	Medical assistance 55=100%
<u>Gender:</u>								
Male	46%	44%	44%	37%	44%	47%	42%	53%
Female	54%	56%	56%	63%	56%	53%	58%	47%
<u>Age:</u>								
18-24 yrs	11%	11%	15%	8%	10%	14%	6%	5%
25-34 yrs	16%	16%	19%	9%	16%	22%	15%	9%
35-44 yrs	17%	17%	13%	15%	20%	16%	17%	18%
45-54 yrs	17%	18%	19%	19%	17%	15%	26%	22%
55-64 yrs	18%	19%	16%	25%	24%	15%	17%	26%
65 yrs and older	21%	19%	18%	24%	13%	17%	19%	20%
<u>City:</u>								
Jhb	65%	68%	58%	67%	81%	57%	76%	75%
Pta	5%	6%	9%	8%	5%	15%	6%	-
CT	25%	21%	26%	21%	12%	24%	14%	16%
Dbn	5%	5%	7%	4%	2%	4%	4%	9%

- Those who **overall** do require more from the Jewish community (2nd column of figures) are, demographically-speaking, not very different from the sample as a whole (1st column) as regards the gender proportions, the ages and the city proportions. However, looking at those with **specific requirements** (3rd - 8th column) we observe some differences:

- those who require more social/friendship gatherings and those who require more organised activities/outings are spread over the age groups but show an over-representation of 18-34 year olds.
- those who require more emotional support are spread over the age groups but show an over-representation of those over 45 years of age and more particularly those over 55 years of age.
- with regard to requiring more medical assistance, there is under-representation of 18-34 year olds, over-representation of the 45-64 year category (yet not the 65 years and older category – this age category is proportionately represented).
- with regard to financial assistance, there is a spread over the age categories but it is the 45-54 year category which shows over-representation in the profile.
- those who speak of personal safety assistance show an over-representative proportion of 55-64 year olds and hint at over-representation of 35-44 year olds.

C. The Jewish community's support/facilities for specific groups

⁹² Excluding those who said “none” (502 respondents i.e. 50%) and “don’t know/no answer” (19 respondents i.e. 2%), there were **479** respondents who did mention what they would like more of. We have thus shown the results based on the total sample (1000) in the first column and based on those who do have requests (479) in the second column.

The question asked was: “To what extent do you feel the Jewish community provides appropriate support and facilities for the following groups i.e. for each group I read to you please tell me if you think the Jewish community provides them with excellent services, adequate services or poor services?”

	Excellent services	Adequate Services	Poor Services	DK/No answer	
People with physical disabilities	39%	37%	9%	15%	=100%
People who are mentally ill i.e. of normal intellectual ability but mentally ill	40%	35%	11%	14%	=100%
People who are intellectually disabled	51%	35%	5%	9%	=100%
Elderly people	52%	38%	7%	3%	=100%
Financially disadvantaged people	40%	43%	8%	9%	=100%
Pre-primary school children	45%	28%	5%	22%	=100%

- **A quick glance shows that overall the Jewish community is perceived as providing excellent or at least adequate services for each of the groups checked on i.e. none of the categories scored poorly.**
- **An overwhelming majority (90%) rated the Jewish community very positively as regards providing support/facilities for the elderly and their emphasis was decidedly more on “excellent” (52%) than on “adequate” (38%).** Only 7% said “poor” and only 3% felt unable to rate community performance on this factor (i.e. said “do not know”), thus indicating that overall there is widespread knowledge about the positive work by the community in this regard.
- **With regard to providing support/facilities for the intellectually disabled, once again, an overwhelming majority (86%) rated the Jewish community very positively, with the focus more on excellent (51%) than on adequate (35%).** Only 5% gave a rating of “poor” and only 9% said “do not know”/felt unable to rate community performance on this factor. Thus, here too, there would seem to be widespread knowledge about the Jewish community performing well.
- **The extent of Jewish community support/facilities for pre-primary school children was very positively perceived by those who felt able to comment in this regard i.e. 73% rated this positively, with the focus decidedly more on excellent (45%) than on “adequate” (28%).** Only 5% said “poor”. However, a sizeable sector (22%) mentioned “do not know” possibly because children of this age group do not play a part in their daily lives at present e.g. do not have children; do not have children in or close to this age group; do not have friends or family members with young children etc. The extent of mentions of “excellent” and the positive ratio of “excellent” to “adequate” reflects this category in a very positive light amongst those familiar with matters relating to the pre-primary sector.

- **Extent to which the Jewish community provides for those who are mentally ill (i.e. of normal intellectual ability but mentally ill) reflected a positive rating overall (of 75%) but with opinions divided between “excellent” (40%) and “adequate” (35%). The score for “poor” was 11% and “don’t know/no answer” 14%**
- **People with physical disabilities also emerged as well-catered for by the Jewish community, with an excellent/adequate rating of 76%. Here too, opinions were divided as to whether the support/facilities are excellent (39%) or adequate (37%). Only 9% gave a “poor” rating. “Do not know” was mentioned by 15%.**
- **Support/facilities for financially disadvantaged people reflected a positive score overall (83%), with opinions divided between “excellent” (40%) and “adequate” (43%). Only 8% said “poor” and 9% “don’t know/no answer”**
- **Although the scores are generally good, it may be advantageous for organisations which offer support/facilities for the sectors dealt with above to ensure that:**
 - **Jewish people in South Africa are fully aware of everything being done for all the sectors of the community and**
 - **enough information is given so as to minimize “don’t know” scores.**

When examining the data for the ratings of services provided by the Jewish community, it is apparent that the cities differ as to how they rate the services.

	AVERAGE RATINGS⁹³				
	Total Sample	Jhb	Pta	CT	Dbn
People with physical disabilities	2.35	2.36	2.28	2.33	2.33
People who are mentally ill i.e. of normal intellectual ability but mentally ill	2.35	2.38	2.13	2.27	2.41
People who are intellectually disabled	2.50	2.51	2.22	2.52	2.63
Elderly people	2.47	2.45	2.74	2.41	2.62
Financially disadvantaged people	2.36	2.42	2.36	2.14	2.38
Pre-primary school children	2.53	2.51	2.49	2.57	2.46

⁹³ Average rating = $\frac{\text{Total weighted score}}{\text{Total who rated}}$

Excellent was weighted 3, **Adequate** was weighted 2 and **Poor** was weighted 1. The closer to 3 the average, the closer it is to **Excellent**; the closer to 2, the closer it is to **Adequate**; and the closer to 1 it is, the closer it is to **Poor**.

- **Johannesburg** gave above average ratings for services for financially disadvantaged people.
- **Pretoria** gave below average scores for several factors and some were on a par (or virtually on a par) with the overall sample average. However, the Pretoria rating of services for the elderly (2.74) was higher than any other rating for any service within any city. This Pretoria rating positioned services for the elderly as close to “excellent”.
- **Cape Town** scores were not too different to the total sample ratings (some were a bit higher and some a bit lower). Cape Town’s lowest score was for services for the “financially disadvantaged”.
- **Durban** reflected above average scores for services for the mentally ill, the intellectually disabled and the elderly.
- It should be noted that the question specified that they should rate the Jewish community, rather than their own cities specifically, on provision of the services. However, to a sizeable extent they are likely to have been rating on the basis of what their city provides.

Most of the questions in this section (i.e. Section X. The Jewish community and communal organisations) were new to the 2005 survey. We can however provide comparisons with the 1998 data for the quality of services provided by the Jewish community for specific sectors. We have shown total sample comparisons for 2005 and 1998 in the form of average ratings.

	AVERAGE RATINGS ⁹⁴	
	2005	1998
People with physical disabilities	2.35	2.20
People who are mentally ill i.e. of normal intellectual ability but mentally ill	2.35	2.26
People who are intellectually disabled	2.50	Not done in 1998
Elderly people	2.47	2.26
Financially disadvantaged people	2.36	2.13
Pre-primary school children	2.53	2.43

- **All sectors achieved average ratings which were higher in 2005 than in 1998.**

D. Membership and participation in Jewish communal organisations

⁹⁴ Average rating = $\frac{\text{Total weighted score}}{\text{Total who rated}}$

Excellent was weighted 3, **Adequate** was weighted 2 and **Poor** was weighted 1. The closer to 3 the average, the closer it is to **Excellent**; the closer to 2, the closer it is to **Adequate**; and the closer to 1 it is, the closer it is to **Poor**.

To what extent are Jewish people in South Africa involved with Jewish communal organisations? And for those not involved, what are their reasons for lack of involvement?

The question asked was: “We are going to talk about Jewish organisations in South Africa i.e. Jewish communal organisations, institutions, societies, religious organisations etc. Some Jewish people are involved with such organisations and some are not. Some are members of such organisations, some show some interest in them but are not members and some are not involved with such organisations at all. Which one of the following applies to you” CARD SHOWING FOUR OPTIONS.

	Total Respondents 1000=100%
I <u>am</u> a member of some Jewish communal or religious organisations <u>and</u> I <u>participate</u> in related activities	40%
I <u>am</u> a member of some Jewish communal or religious organisations <u>but</u> I <u>do not participate</u> much in related activities	27%
Although I <u>am not</u> a member of any Jewish communal or religious organisations, I <u>do sometimes participate</u> in events organised by them or facilities they provide	16%
I <u>am not</u> a member of any Jewish communal or religious organisations and <u>do not participate</u> in events organised by them or facilities they provide	17%
Total	100%

- **Approximately two-thirds (67%) are members of such organisations and more often than not they are active, participating members:**
 - 40% say that they are members of such organisations and they participate in related activities. We will refer to them as Type A.
 - 27% claim to be members but without participating much. We will refer to these as Type B.
- **The remaining one-third (33%) claim not to be members. Nevertheless, approximately half of these participate in activities arranged by such organisations:**
 - 16% are not members but participate in activities offered. We will call these Type C.
 - 17% are not members and do not participate. We will refer to these as Type D.

Before moving to reasons given by Types C and D for not being members of any Jewish organisations, we will look at the profile of types A, B, C and D i.e. Who demographically-speaking comprises each of the four types?

	<u>TYPE A</u>	<u>TYPE B</u>	<u>TYPE C</u>	<u>TYPE D</u>
	I <u>am</u> member of some Jewish communal or	I <u>am</u> a member of some Jewish communal or	Although I <u>am not</u> a member of any Jewish communal or religious	I <u>am not</u> a member of any Jewish communal or religious organisations

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	religious organisations and I participate in related activities 400=100%	religious organisations but I do not participate much in related activities 274=100%	organisations, I do sometimes participate in events organised by them or facilities they provide 157=100%	and do not participate in events organised by them or facilities they provide 169=100%
<u>Gender:</u>					
Male	46%	50%	43%	41%	46%
Female	54%	50%	57%	59%	54%
<u>Age:</u>					
18-24 yrs	11%	12%	6%	11%	20%
25-34 yrs	16%	17%	16%	16%	12%
35-44 yrs	17%	15%	14%	25%	18%
45-54 yrs	17%	18%	17%	15%	17%
55-64 yrs	18%	17%	20%	17%	16%
65 yrs and older	21%	21%	27%	16%	17%
<u>City:</u>					
Jhb	65%	65%	58%	63%	79%
Pta	5%	9%	4%	1%	-
CT	25%	21%	33%	30%	18%
Dbn	5%	5%	5%	6%	3%

- **Type A:** The tendency to be Type A (i.e. participating members) tends **not** to be age-related; tends to be characteristic of both males and females with a bit more emphasis on males; and tends to be prevalent in all cities but Pretoria exhibits the Type A tendency noticeably strongly and Capetonians show a below average inclination to be type A.
- **Type B:** This type (i.e. members who do not participate much) tends to be more female-focused than Type A but is strongly comprised of both males and females; exhibits some over-representation of over 55 year olds and of Capetonians and under-representation of those from Johannesburg.
- **Type C:** This type (i.e. not members but sometimes participate) shows more female-focus, over-representation of 35-44 year olds, under-representation of Pretoria and over-representation of Cape Town.
- **Type D:** Type D (i.e. completely uninvolved in Jewish communal or religious organisations/events/facilities) shows proportionate male-female focus, over-representation of 18-24 year olds, over-representation of those from Johannesburg and under-representation of those from other cities. Thus, the tendency to be Type D, is not characteristic of a particular gender but is disproportionately characteristic of those from Johannesburg and of 18-24 year olds.

Those who are not members (i.e. types C and D accounting for virtually one-third of respondents), were asked: “What would you say your reasons are for not being a member of any Jewish organisations?”

	Total Respondents 326=100%
Lack of interest.....	46%

Lack of interest in Jewish organisations.....	31%
I've got other interests/these organisations don't offer what interests me...	14%
All involve fundraising/not interested in that/don't enjoy that.....	1%
Not interested in ORT – doesn't exist in same form as when I belonged...	<0.5%
Not interested in Zionist charities.....	<0.5%
Current situation/stage of life/lifestyle.....	46%
Time constraints/I am too busy.....	39%
Financial reasons/cannot afford it.....	6%
Too old/age no longer allows me to participate.....	1%
Problems with the people/organisations as such.....	15%
<u>People</u>	
The people in the organisations are too cliquey/ not welcoming.....	5%
Don't like the people involved in the organisations.....	2%
No young people/none of my friends there.....	1%
Too shy to join/very insecure/don't push myself on people.....	1%
<u>Organisations</u>	
Never had the opportunity/never been approached to become member....	5%
Don't know where to join/lack of information.....	1%
Put my name down with Broth Zion and never contacted by them.....	<0.5%
Kicked out by SAUJS as no RAU people could play rugby for SAUJS.....	<0.5%
Other (one mention each)	5%
Don't know/no answer/no reason	8%
Total	119%
Average ⁹⁵ no. of reasons given per respondent	1.1

- **Most of the respondents who are not members of any Jewish organisations (i.e. types C and D), could give a reason or reasons for not being a member.** On an average, 1.1 reasons were mentioned per respondent
- **Two main factors emerged i.e. lack of interest and current situation/lifestyle/stage of life**
- **Lack of interest.** Of all the reasons given, 4 in every 10 were related to lack of interest⁹⁶. In the main they spoke of lack of interest in Jewish organisations as such (without being specific as to why this is so), while some claimed that Jewish organisations do not offer what they are interested in. A few additional, more specific comments were made, but there were too few of these for evaluation. Because this study covered a wide range of topics, timing and methodology did not allow for detailed investigation of each issue covered⁹⁷. Furthermore, answers relating to the broadly-based question as to why they are not members of any Jewish

⁹⁵ 8% could not give a reason for not being a member. The reasons given thus totalled 111%. Thus, on an average, 1.1 reasons were given per respondent (based on total of 326 respondents)

$$\text{Average no. of reasons} = \frac{\text{Total reasons (111\%)}}{\text{Total Respondents (100\%)}}$$

⁹⁶ Considering the total reasons (111%), 46% represents approximately 4 in every 10 respondents.

⁹⁷ This particular issue should ideally be investigated in a qualitative, in-depth study (e.g. comprising group discussions). Should organisations require full input as to what Jewish people in South Africa require from Jewish organisations, a study specifically geared for this purpose is necessary. The study should, for example, focus on the requirements, interests, likes, dislikes and needs of various demographic and interest

organisations, cannot - in fact - be very specific since there are so many organisations. The “lack of interest” reponse does however show that there is work to be done by organisations as regards attempting to attract members. Additional sections of this report should provide more input on problems which need to be tackled overall.

- **Current situation/ lifestyle/stage of life.** This factor also accounts for 4 in every 10 of the reasons given for not belonging to any Jewish organisations⁹⁸. The comments here were primarily related to time constraints/not having enough time for membership of such organisations. It should be noted that while a lot of people are very busy (e.g. with work, family commitments or other responsibilities), claiming not to have time for something can be an indication of that activity not being a priority in the life of those making such claims. Many of the people involved in Jewish organisations are busy people (e.g. in their professional, business or private lives) yet they do not experience the same time constraint problems when it comes to being involved in Jewish organisations. A small sector spoke of financial reasons/not being able to afford to be members. Other current situation/stage of life comments were made less often.
- **Problems with people or the organisations as such.** This was referred to far less often (i.e. by over 1 but not quite 2 in every 10). There were:
 - personal/people-related aspects e.g. that the people in such organisations are generally not appealing to them, too cliquy and not welcoming, and/or not of their type or age group. Some added that they feel uncomfortable or shy to join.
 - organisation-related aspects e.g. that the organisations have never reached out to them, have not offered/allowed them the opportunity to join nor provided the necessary information.

Although this people/organisation factor did not emerge as strongly as did the two main factors, it should not be ignored nor underestimated. Respondents are touching on something without realising just how important it is. If an organisation requires an increase in membership/usage/involvement, it should be suitably “packaged” and “marketed” just as products are marketed to consumers. Some (understandably only some) of those not currently involved in Jewish organisations, may become interested if the correct approach is used to attract them.

E. The Organisations

The success of any organisation is measured according to the objectives which have been set for that particular organisation. Nevertheless, awareness of the organisation as such is always the starting point irrespective of the objectives.

group sectors. Furthermore, consideration should be given to gearing the study to provide information relating to specific organisations and/or categories of organisations.

⁹⁸ Here again, considering the total reasons (111%), 46% represents approximately 4 in every 10 respondents.

Without achieving awareness an organisation cannot begin to attract potential users/members/contributors/beneficiaries.

Below we have shown the overall list aided awareness⁹⁹ of various Jewish organisations and then the overall extent to which there is involvement with these organisations.

The **awareness** and **involvement** results tabulated below are based on **total respondents**. This provides useful input but it should be borne in mind that some organisations are targeted at specific geographic, demographic or other groups and should thus not only be evaluated in total but also within relevant sectors where possible. When discussing the tabulated results we will discuss some of the demographic findings. Final evaluation with regard to the demographics should be made by each organisation as such since each organisation is aware of its target market.

All respondents were shown a list of 31 organisations in alphabetical order and asked two questions:

“Which, if any, of these organisations on this list have you ever heard of?”

“Thinking only about the present, which - if any - of these organisations are you personally a member of, benefiting from, contributing to or involved with in any way at present?”

	Total Respondents 1000=100%	Total Respondents 1000=100%
	LIST AIDED AWARENESS	INVOLVED WITH AT

⁹⁹ In evaluating the data below it should be borne in mind that list aided awareness scores are always higher than spontaneous awareness scores i.e. where respondents are not exposed to a list. The list reminds respondents about what they have heard of. Although spontaneous awareness scores would have added an interesting dimension for interpretation, this type of question was not possible since there were too many and too varied a range of organisations to allow for this within the context of this broad-ranging study.

	I.E. "EVER HEARD"	PRESENT
B'nai B'rith	88%	2%
Beth Din	98%	7%
Beyachad Library	43%	2%
Bnoth Zion Association	49%	6%
Chevra Kadisha (Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society)	98%	17%
CSO (Community Security Organisation)	83%	11%
Gitlin Library	34%	4%
Hebrew Order of David (HOD)	89%	2%
Holocaust Centre	86%	3%
Israel Centre	45%	1%
Israel United Appeal (IUA) – United Communal Fund (UCF) ¹⁰⁰	87%	18%
Jewish National Fund of South Africa (JNF)	89%	9%
Jewish Women's Benevolent Society	83%	6%
Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research	61%	2%
MaAfrika Tikkun	41%	2%
Maccabi SA	97%	4%
Magen David Adom (MDA)	82%	3%
Nechama	69%	3%
ORT – South Africa	80%	5%
South Africa-Israel Chamber of Commerce (SAICC)	50%	1%
South African Board of Jewish Education (SABJE)	92%	5%
South African Jewish Board of Deputies (SAJBD)	95%	3%
South African Jewish Museum	76%	2%
South African Union for Progressive Judaism (SAUPJ)	46%	2%
South African Union of Jewish Students (SAUJS)	86%	4%
South African Zionist Federation (SAZF) (called Western Province Zionist Council in Cape Town and Kwa-Zulu Natal Zionist Council in Durban)	92%	4%
Staff Wise Recruitment Consultants	74%	2%
Union of Jewish Women of South Africa (UJW)	91%	9%
Union of Orthodox Synagogues of South Africa (UOS)	83%	6%
United Sisterhood	53%	2%
Women's Zionist Organisation of South Africa (WIZO)	88%	11%
NONE/ None of the organisations	-	51%
Average number of organisations mentioned per respondent	23.3	1.6

(i) Awareness:

- **Awareness was very high for a large number of the organisations.** Even though this awareness check was list-aided (and aided awareness scores are always far higher than those for spontaneous awareness), a large number of the scores were very high. On an average, each

¹⁰⁰ When the questionnaire was being pilot-tested, the name United Jewish campaign (UJC) was being introduced to encompass the IUA-UCF concept. However, it was too early to check on awareness of the new name as indicated by pilot-testing.

respondent was aware of 23.3 of the 31 organisations i.e. three-quarters of the organisations checked on.

- **Exceptionally high awareness (at least 90%) was achieved by:** Beth Din (98%), Chevra Kadisha (98%), Maccabi SA (97%), South African Jewish Board of Deputies -SAJBD (95%), South African Board of Jewish Education – SABJE (92%), South African Zionist Federation – SAZF - called Western Province Zionist Council in Cape Town and Kwa-Zulu Natal Zionist Council in Durban (92%), Union of Jewish Women of South Africa – UJW (91%). These are unquestionably exceptionally well-known organisations overall. In addition these organisations scored well even when looked at within each of the four cities separately. What should be noted is that one of these top-scoring organisations (UJW), is targeted at women yet it scored exceptionally well overall. Looking at the male and female scores separately, it emerges that it does score higher amongst females (96%) but the awareness amongst males is also particularly high (85%). Although these organisations all scored well within each of the age sectors, some tended to be not quite as well-known in the younger as in the older age groups i.e.
 - the SABJE tends to be better known amongst those over 34 years of age (awareness 93%-95% within the over 34 year age groups) than amongst those in under 35 year age groups (87%-88%)
 - the SAZF/WPZC/KZNZC is better known amongst over 25 year olds (90%-97%) than amongst 18-24 year olds (77%)
 - UJW is better known amongst those over than under 45 years of age. In addition, within the three categories below the 45 year cut-off point the awareness scores become lower as we move towards the younger side of the age scale.

<u>18-24yrs</u>	<u>25-34yrs</u>	<u>35-44yrs</u>	<u>45-54yrs</u>	<u>55-64yrs</u>	<u>65+ yrs</u>
72%	82%	89%	98%	98%	96%

The remaining top scorers did exceptionally well in all age groups as regards awareness i.e. Beth Din, Chevra Kadisha, Maccabi SA, SAJBD.

- **Following very closely, also at a particularly high level (80%- 89%) were:** Hebrew Order of David – HOD (89%), Jewish National Fund of South Africa – JNF (89%), B’nai Brith (88%), Women’s Zionist Organisation of South Africa - WIZO (88%), Israel United Appeal IUA – United Communal Fund UCF (87%), Holocaust Centre (86%), South African Union of Jewish Students - SAUJS (86%), CSO – Community Security Organisation (83%), Jewish Women’s Benevolent Society (83%), Union of Orthodox Synagogues of South Africa – UOS (83%), Magen David Adom – MDA (82%), ORT South Africa (80%). Two of these organisations are actually targeted at females and even though they scored better amongst females, male scores were also very high thus rendering a particularly high total score overall i.e. WIZO scored 80% amongst males and 94% amongst females; and Jewish Women’s Benevolent Society scored 78% amongst males and 87% amongst females. When looked at within each of the four cities separately, three of

these organisations showed sizeably lower awareness scores for Cape Town and/or Durban:

- Hebrew Order of David (HOD) scored 77% in Cape Town and at least 92% elsewhere
- Jewish Women’s Benevolent Society scored 56% in Cape Town, 74% in Durban and 93%/96% in Johannesburg/Pretoria.
- UOS scored 72% in Durban and 82%-92% elsewhere.

Awareness of some of these organisations shows age-related trends i.e.

- Some are better-known as we proceed from the younger towards the older side of the age-scale, with some organisations showing more dramatic awareness differences between the age groups than others:

	<u>18-24yrs</u>	<u>25-34yrs</u>	<u>35-44yrs</u>	<u>45-54yrs</u>	<u>55-64yrs</u>	<u>65+yrs</u>
B'nai Brith.....	58% →	83% →	86% →	98%	97%	94%
HOD.....	77% →	79% →	92%	92% →	96%	93%
IUA-UCF.....	52% →	81% →	88% →	95% →	97%	95%
JNF.....	82%	81% →	90% →	92% →	94%	93%
WIZO.....	63% →	72% →	92% →	96% →	97%	95%
Jewish Women’s						
Benev. Soc.....	64% →	79% →	81% →	87% →	89%	89%
UOS.....	55% →	78% →	84% →	93%	89%	88%
MDA.....	70%	60% →	78% →	87% →	93%	93%
ORT.....	40% →	71% →	84%	83% →	94%	92%

- Some are exceptionally well-known at the younger end of the age-scale but show awareness peaks within other age sectors as well:

	<u>18-24yrs</u>	<u>25-34yrs</u>	<u>35-44yrs</u>	<u>45-54yrs</u>	<u>55-64yrs</u>	<u>65+yrs</u>
Holocaust						
Centre.....	90% ←	80% →	84% →	90%	91% ←	84%
SAUJS.....	90% =	91% ←	83% →	88% →	90% ←	77%
CSO.....	97% ←	89% →	92% →	86% →	79%	66%

- **Next in line with 61% - 76% were:** South African Jewish Museum (76%), Staff Wise Recruitment Consultants (74%), Nechama (69%), Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research (61%). It should be noted that there were indications during the interviewing that the Kaplan Centre score could have been inflated by the fact that respondents were told that the survey was being done for the Kaplan Centre. The extent of inflation cannot be estimated. The positive side is that the survey may have increased awareness of the Kaplan Centre. Looking at the results within cities we see that, understandably, Cape Town reflects higher awareness of the South African Jewish Museum and the Kaplan Centre than do other cities i.e. South African Jewish Museum (98% in Cape Town and 67%-82% elsewhere); Kaplan Centre (93% in Cape Town and 48%-64% elsewhere). Awareness of Nechama is highest in Cape Town (79%) and lowest in Durban (42%) with Pretoria/Johannesburg at the 66%/67% level. Johannesburg (with 80%), followed by Cape Town (71%) show higher

scores for Staff Wise than do the other cities (i.e. Pretoria 60% and Durban 20%). With regard to age-related awareness:

- For the **Kaplan Centre**: The 18-24 year sector reflects the highest awareness score, followed by over 45 yr olds, with a dip for the age sector between the two i.e. the 25-44 year age group. Although the awareness score for the Kaplan Centre should – as mentioned - be treated with caution, it does seem appropriate that the score for 18-24 year olds should be higher than that for other age groups since the Kaplan Centre is situated at a university (i.e. University of Cape Town) and even those who do not attend that university are likely to have sizeable contact with people who do.
- For the **SA Jewish Museum**: awareness is higher amongst those over 45 years of age but particularly those 55-64 years.
- **Staff Wise** reflects highest awareness in the 25-64 year age category i.e. those who happen to be more in the working/job market than those older or younger.
- **Nechama** reflects its lowest awareness score amongst 18-24 year olds and its highest amongst 45-64 year olds, but particularly 55-64 year olds.

	<u>18-24yrs</u>	<u>25-34yrs</u>	<u>35-44yrs</u>	<u>45-54yrs</u>	<u>55-64yrs</u>	<u>65+yrs</u>
Kaplan Centre..	73% ←	53%	52%	→ 64%	67%	61%
SA Jewish Museum.....	68%	70%	69%	→ 78%	→ 86%	← 79%
Staff Wise.....	46%	→ 80%	81%	78%	82%	← 67%
Nechama.....	46%	→ 66%	→ 70%	→ 75%	→ 81%	← 67%

- **Less well-known, with scores below 55% were:** United Sisterhood (53%), South Africa-Israel Chamber of Commerce – SAICC (50%), Bnoth Zion (49%), South African Union for Progressive Judaism – SAUPJ (46%), Israel Centre (45%), Beyachad Library (43%), MaAfrika Tikkun (41%), Gitlin Library (34%). Awareness of United Sisterhood was higher in the small cities (Durban and Pretoria) than in Johannesburg and Cape Town; SAICC reflected its lowest awareness score in Cape Town; Bnoth Zion awareness was very high in Cape Town and distinctly lower elsewhere; Israel Centre reflected its lowest score in Cape Town; Beyachad Library – understandably because of being located in Johannesburg - reflected its highest scores in Johannesburg and the nearby city Pretoria and low scores in Cape Town and Durban; MaAfrika Tikkun scored higher in Cape Town than elsewhere; Gitlin Library scored exceptionally well in Cape Town and poorly elsewhere – understandable because it is located in Cape Town. Looking at age-related awareness,

- Here again, several organisations show increased awareness as we proceed up the age scale, with some doing so more dramatically and clearly than others e.g. **United Sisterhood** and **SAUPJ** start from very low awareness at the younger end of the scale and awareness moves up steadily to being highest towards the older end of the scale.

	<u>18-24yrs</u>	<u>25-34yrs</u>	<u>35-44yrs</u>	<u>45-54yrs</u>	<u>55-64yrs</u>	<u>65+yrs</u>
United						
Sisterhood.....	17% →	27% →	46% →	66% →	74%	72%
SAICC.....	26% →	46%	47% →	52% →	61%	57%
Bnoth Zion.....	32% →	44% →	51%	52% →	55%	52%
SAUPJ.....	15% →	23% →	43% →	56% →	62%	63%
Gitlin Library....	20% →	31% →	34%	33% →	42%	38%

- An organisation which scores far better amongst 18-24 year olds than amongst other age groups is the **Israel Centre**:

	<u>18-24yrs</u>	<u>25-34yrs</u>	<u>35-44yrs</u>	<u>45-54yrs</u>	<u>55-64yrs</u>	<u>65+yrs</u>
Israel Centre.....	72%	38%	41%	49%	47%	35%

- No clear age trend is shown for awareness of **Beyachad Library** and **MaAfrika Tikkun** and although some age groups show higher scores, overall there are no dramatic differences between the age groups as regards awareness of these organisations.

	<u>18-24yrs</u>	<u>25-34yrs</u>	<u>35-44yrs</u>	<u>45-54yrs</u>	<u>55-64yrs</u>	<u>65+yrs</u>
Beyachad						
Library.....	45%	40%	37%	44%	51%	40%
MaAfrika						
Tikkun.....	44%	36%	42%	44%	46%	37%

(ii) Involvement

- **Approximately half (51%) claimed not to be involved with any of these organisations at present.** The remaining 49% claimed that they are involved in some way.
- **The top scorers as regards being organisations which respondents claim to “personally be a member of, benefiting from, contributing to or involved with in any way at present”, are:**

- **IUA-UCF (18%) and Chevra Kadisha (17%).**

Both of these organisations tend to reflect greater involvement amongst those over than under 45 years of age, with the 18-24 year sector, understandably, reflecting very low involvement scores.

	<u>18-24yrs</u>	<u>25-34yrs</u>	<u>35-44yrs</u>	<u>45-54yrs</u>	<u>55-64yrs</u>	<u>65+yrs</u>
IUA-UCF.....	4%	14%	17%	21%	20%	27%
Chevra						
Kadisha.....	6%	13%	12%	20%	24%	19%

Johannesburg, which forms the largest part of the sample, sets the tone as regards the overall involvement with various organisations e.g. involvement with the Chevra Kadisha in Johannesburg (17%) is in keeping with the overall sample score. However, IUA-UCF involvement tends to be below average in Johannesburg. This requires further checking. Pretoria shows

above average involvement for most organisations – an aspect which also requires verification e.g. Chevra Kadisha and IUA-UCF¹⁰¹. Cape Town reflects above average involvement with the IUA-UCF and below average involvement with the Chevra Kadisha. The difference between the Johannesburg Chevra Kadisha and the Chevra Kadisha in other cities should be borne in mind when evaluating this data i.e. the Johannesburg Chevra Kadisha is a much broader-based organisation as will be observed later in the description of this organisation's functions. Durban scores for involvement with these organisations are (statistically-speaking for a sample of this size) relatively close to the overall score i.e. Chevra Kadisha (12%) and IUA-UCF (12%).

▪ **Next in line for involvement are:**

- **CSO** and **WIZO** (each reflecting a total involvement score of 11%); **UJW** and **JNF** (with 9% each); **Beth Din** (7%); and **Jewish Women's Benevolent Society**, **UOS** and **Bnoth Zion** (with 6% each). We have moved into relatively small scores here thus making demographic comparisons difficult. Some overall observations are, however, possible.

Age-wise: Generally-speaking these organisations do not reflect as much young as older sector involvement e.g. Bnoth Zion, JNF, UJW, WIZO and Jewish Women's Benevolent Society show heavier emphasis as we move towards the older sector of the age scale. CSO is the exception. It reflects a reverse pattern i.e. greater youth focus (except that the 45-54 year sector also shows sizeable involvement):

<u>18-24yrs</u>	<u>25-34yrs</u>	<u>35-44yrs</u>	<u>45-54yrs</u>	<u>55-64yrs</u>	<u>65+yrs</u>
18%	18%	9%	14%	8%	5%

Cities: Johannesburg involvement scores – because of this city's sector of the sample being so large – sets the tone and thus reflects scores in keeping with overall scores. The exception is Bnoth Zion with it's particularly low score (1%); Pretoria – as mentioned – reflects above average involvement for most organisations but shows no involvement at all with Bnoth Zion; Cape Town shows an above average score for involvement with Bnoth Zion (20%) and UJW (16%); Durban's UJW score (18%) and WIZO (24%) scores are above average. The minimal scores for Bnoth Zion in Johannesburg/Pretoria and contrasting high score in Cape Town are understandable considering that Cape Town has historically

¹⁰¹ Since the Pretoria sample was small score variations could – statistically-speaking - be expected but the extent of the variation indicates that another factor could be at play. What should be investigated is whether the Pretoria scores could be a function of the list provided for the sample to be drawn from.

opted primarily for usage of the name “Bnoth Zion” and other cities for the name “WIZO”. That the two should actually be considered together was not conveyed prior to commencement of the study nor in the survey material (i.e. statement as to WIZO’s functions).

Gender: It should be borne in mind that Bnoth Zion, WIZO, UJW and Jewish Women’s Benevolent Society are all women’s organisations yet the “involvement scores” discussed for the age groups and cities include both males and females. The figures are not high enough for assessing separate male-female figures within each age sector and each city separately. However, overall the data shows that for the women’s organisations, involvement scores are decidedly higher for females than for males. Nevertheless, male involvement cannot be discounted since a sizeable sector of males claimed to be involved with such organisations. Additional probing amongst some of these males yielded an explanation i.e. involvement can be through making contributions to these organisations on behalf of wives.

- **Then follows::**
 - **SABJE** and **ORT** (with involvement scores of 5% each); and 4% each for **Maccabi SA**, **SAUJS**, **Gitlin Library** and **South African Zionist Federation – SAZF (called Western Province Zionist Council in Cape Town and Kwa-Zulu Natal Zionist Council in Durban)**; and 3% each for **SAJBD**, **Holocaust Centre**, **MDA**, **Nechama**. The involvement scores are too low for meaningful analysis by demographic subgroup. The only score which “jumps out” as being particularly high within a subgroup is the SAUJS involvement score of 23% amongst 18-24 year olds. This score is worth noting when one considers that not all 18-24 year olds are at institutions which offer access to SAUJS.

- **And at the lowest involvement level:**
 - With 2% each: **HOD**, **B’nai B’rith**, **South African Jewish Museum**, **Staff Wise Recruitment Consultants**, **Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research**, **United Sisterhood**, **South African Union for Progressive Judaism – SAUPJ**, **Beyachad Library**, **MaAfrika Tikkun**; and with 1% each: **South Africa-Israel Chamber of Commerce (SAICC)** and **Israel Centre**. Understandably these scores are too low for breakdown analysis.

F. Focus on Fourteen Selected Organisations

Although it is important for the success of an organisation that potential users/members/participants should be aware of the organisation as such, the path towards the success of an organisation also depends on awareness of what the organisation offers/promises/does/requires. In addition it is important for each

organisation to be aware of the extent to which it is perceived as fulfilling its stated functions. This facilitates future planning. This study provides some input with regard to these issues. Should more detailed and specific input be required for any of the organisations this could be covered in a study designed and tailored to focus on that organisation or organisations.

We could not check each of the 31 organisations in detail. This would have caused respondent fatigue and resultant score bias. The decision was taken to focus on 14 key organisations with only three checked on per respondent. The three asked for in each interview were organised methodically to ensure that each of the 14 was dealt with a substantial number of times with a spread throughout the cities and demographic categories covered. It was recognised when the study was designed that this methodology would provide a good overall picture for each organisation but that data per city (particularly for Durban and Pretoria) would be based on very small samples per organisation. It should be noted that for each respondent only organisations they claimed to have heard of were asked about in detail. We obtained a minimum of 106 respondents answering per organisation but for most organisations over 200 answered.

The questions asked for **each** organisation checked on were:

First Question: “ Please think aboutMENTION ORGANISATION.....What do you think its function is i.e. What does it set out to do? PROBE FULLY: Please explain? What do you mean by that? Anything else?”

Second Question: “Considering everything you know about NAME OF ORGANISATION.....to what extent would you say that it seems to fulfill its functions as stated on this card. Would you say it seems to fulfill the stated functions: very well, fairly well, not really well or not well at all? HAND VERSION OF **CARD X** WHICH DESCRIBES THAT ORGANISATION”.

The results for each organisation are dealt with below.

(i) Beth Din

a) How South African Jews perceive the Beth Din

We saw earlier that 98% of Jewish South Africans residing in the four major cities included in the survey claimed to be aware of the Beth Din. As discussed earlier,

respondent fatigue and thus bias would have resulted had all respondents been required to answer detailed questions about each organisation they were aware of. Thus, of those aware of the Beth Din, a sector was methodically selected using a random selection procedure. This sector was asked the first question i.e. the question relating to what they think the Beth Din's function is/what they think it sets out to do.

Of the total respondents required to answer the question:

- **Virtually all (98%) could answer. Only 2% said “don't know”.** On an average, each respondent made 4.74 comments about what the Beth Din's functions are/what it sets out to do.
- **Approximately two-thirds (68%) focused on Kashrut.** They claimed that it “regulates/monitors Kashrut/Kosher laws/regulations”
- **Another main function attributed to the Beth Din is that it is generally involved with Jewish law/Halacha and legal issues relating to Jews.** These comments were spread over a variety of categories. The scores for the categories cannot be directly added and totalled since some respondents may have mentioned aspects falling into more than one of the categories.

- 29% classified the Beth Din broadly by saying that it “oversees Jewish law/ supervises Judaism, Halachic laws/Judaism including Kashrut, shul guidance, legal issues/keeps tabs on all Jewish affairs”
- 26% spoke about it in terms of being “a Jewish court/law court for all Jewish affairs”
- 6% added that it “settles/arbitrates disputes/problems”
- 6% said “legal issues” without any further specification

Overall, it cannot be denied that this factor, together with the more specific Kashrut monitoring function, primarily define how the Beth Din is perceived by Jews in South Africa.

- **Other functions mentioned (some of which are actually linked to the Jewish law/Halacha factor) were:**
 - That it handles Jewish divorces (17%), Jewish marriages (13%), conversions to Judaism (9%), provision of Mohellim for circumcisions (3%)
 - Dealing with family issues/Jewish life (3%) e.g. helping needy families, family counselling, approachable for providing information on family history/ancestry/Jewish issues.
- **It should be noted that some respondents (5%), in addition to mentioning what they perceived the functions of the Beth Din to be, felt it necessary to spontaneously add some negative comments.** Although this percentage is very small, it should not be regarded as negligible since the comments were made spontaneously. However,

further research would be needed to determine whether these aspects are, in fact, sizeably problematic.

➤ **Some spoke about the Beth Din's role in making Kosher food expensive:**

"Money grabbers/make Kosher food unaffordable for a lot of people/very difficult to keep Kosher as there is a huge difference in price/rip-off"

➤ **Some felt that the Beth Din "makes things difficult" and/or does not always behave as they should:**

"They make conversions impossible/set unrealistic standards for people who want to become Jewish"

"They put obstacles in peoples way" (not specific as to what was being obstructed)

"Hold themselves holier than thou/don't practice what they preach/change laws to suit themselves"

"Sometimes out of touch with present day society"

Do Jewish South Africans' perceptions of the Beth Din's functions tie in with the actual functions as described below?

BETH DIN

The **Beth Din** deals with general queries of Jewish law and with matters requiring the application of Jewish law. This involves a wide range of functions and issues i.e. Kashrut (the Kashrut Department monitors the manufacture of all kosher products, publicises regular kashrut information to the Jewish public and provides *mashgichim* for kosher functions); providing information relating to times of sunset and sunrise; dealing with adoptions, divorce, chalitzot; conversions; dealing with disputes (Dinei Torah); mohellim for circumcisions; matters pertaining to shechita (ritual slaughter).

Conclusion:

Virtually all South African Jews in the cities sampled have heard of the Beth Din. Furthermore, respondent perceptions regarding what the Beth Din is all about seem to be on track. Nevertheless, should it be felt – after evaluating the perceptions outlined above - that any of the elements are insufficiently conveyed, steps should be taken to rectify the impression held.

b) Extent to which the Beth Din is perceived as fulfilling its stated functions

We have evaluated the extent to which perceptions of the Beth Din's functions tie in with its actual functions. However, respondents were also asked for their overall evaluation i.e. once they had spontaneously described the Beth Din's

functions, they were exposed to the statement describing the Beth Din and required to answer the second question i.e. to what extent they think the Beth Din seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the statement card.

- **59%** said “very well”
- **28%** said “fairly well”
- 2% mentioned “not really well” and
- 4% “not well at all”
- 7% claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

Thus, the majority regard the Beth Din as fulfilling its function well, with the emphasis on “very well”. This is undoubtedly a positive result. An average rating was calculated for the Beth Din which confirms this finding i.e. An average rating¹⁰² of 3.54 shows that those who are aware of the Beth Din and are able to rate it – on an average - perceive it as performing its stated function: between very and fairly well but closer to very well.

When reviewing this result in context, the Beth Din emerges as scoring well i.e. virtually all are aware of it; of those aware of it virtually all felt able to describe it in some way; their descriptions were on track; and overall they gave a distinctly positive rating as to the extent to which they think the Beth Din fulfills its function as set out on the card. The current perceptions of the Beth Din should however – as mentioned earlier – be assessed to determine whether any elements should be given a different emphasis.

(ii) Chevra Kadisha

a) How South African Jews perceive the Chevra Kadisha

¹⁰² Average Rating = $\frac{\text{Total weighted score}}{\text{Total able to rate this organisation}}$

Very well was given the weight of **4**, **Fairly well** the weight of **3**, **Not really well** the weight of **2** and **Not well at all** the weight of **1**. Thus, the closer the average is to **4** the closer it is to **very well**, the closer it is to **3** the closer it is to **fairly well**, the closer to **2** the closer to **not really well** and the closer to **1** the closer it is to **not well at all**. The highest possible average rating was thus **4**. It should be noted that average ratings for the other organisations were calculated in the same way.

As is the case for the Beth Din, the Chevra Kadisha is particularly well-known with, as we saw earlier, 98% claiming to have heard of it. A methodically selected sector of those who have heard of the Chevra Kadisha were asked two questions about this organisation. The first question related to what they think the Chevra Kadisha's function is/What they think it sets out to do.

- **Virtually all (98%) felt able to comment on the Chevra Kadisha's function/what it does. Only, 2% said "don't know".** On an average, each respondent made 4.17 comments about what the Chevra Kadisha's functions are/what it sets out to do.
- **Over two-thirds (69%) perceived a function of the Chevra Kadisha as being that it provides financial assistance. Thus, this distinctly emerges as a major function.** These respondents claimed that "they provide financial assistance/help the needy/poor/give welfare to the needy" (As will be discussed later in the report, there are justifiable differences between the cities with regard to the extent to which this aspect was mentioned)
- **Another major function of the Chevra Kadisha emerged i.e. the burial/funeral function.**
 - **Over two-thirds (68%) referred to it directly** by claiming that the Chevra Kadisha has a "burial society function/help with/deals with burials/funerals".
 - Some additional comments were made, which may have been made by some of the main sector mentioning burials or by an additional sector: "They control cemeteries" according to 6% and "assist financially when a death occurs/provide a death and burial charity"
- **Other comments were mentioned less frequently:**
 - 9% say that they are "involved with all charities/an umbrella organisation for all charities/everything related to charity" and some of these added that "they help run the institutions"
 - 4% mentioned that they are involved with "Staff Wise/provide jobs"
 - 3% spoke of their involvement with "the elderly/Old Age Homes"
 - 2% mentioned that they "help with education for the poor"

How do the perceptions of the Chevra Kadisha's function tie up with the actual functions as stated below?

CHEVRA KADISHA **(JEWISH HELPING HAND AND BURIAL SOCIETY)**

Chevra Kadisha: Since being founded in September 1888, the Johannesburg Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society (Chevra Kadisha) has performed two functions vital to Jewish community life, viz. attending to burial of the departed and providing welfare to those in need. Today, the Johannesburg Chevra Kadisha, in addition to conducting burials in accordance with all details of Jewish law, directs over 90% of its resources towards welfare work and family services. It supports over a thousand impoverished Jewish families and the two Johannesburg Jewish aged homes, Jewish Community Services, Arcadia Jewish Orphanage (amongst others) fall under its umbrella. Other services provided include Staffwise - an employment finding service - and Marriage Wise. There is a Chevra Kadisha in Pretoria and Cape Town and two in Durban (one Orthodox and one Reform). These primarily, although not exclusively, deal with issues relating to Jewish burials, with welfare organisations like aged homes (Jaffa in Pretoria, Highlands House in Cape Town and Beth Shalom in Durban) and charities (e.g. Pretoria Gemillut Chasodim, Durban Jewish Social Services and, in Cape Town, IUA-UCF-Welfare) operating independently of them.

Conclusion:

Virtually all have heard of the Chevra Kadisha. Also, the Chevra Kadisha's two main functions clearly emerge as being well-known i.e. the welfare function and the burial function. However, since the Johannesburg Chevra Kadisha differs in function from the others, greater clarity will be obtained in a later section of the report where we deal with results not only in total but separately for each city.

The final decision as to whether or not the detailed functions of the Chevra Kadisha are being sufficiently linked with this organisation, should be evaluated by those involved with the image of the Chevra Kadisha e.g. whether it is felt that - considering the results shown above - the impression held of the Chevra Kadisha's functions embodies sufficient emphasis on the Chevra Kadisha's focus on: family services, the Johannesburg Jewish aged homes, Arcadia Jewish Orphanage, Staff Wise, Marriage Wise.

b) Extent to which the Chevra Kadisha is perceived as fulfilling stated functions

We have assessed the extent to which the perceptions tie in with the statement describing the Chevra Kadisha. Respondents were also exposed to the statement describing the Chevra Kadisha and then answered the second question i.e. to what extent they think the Chevra Kadisha seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the card.

- **78%** said “very well”
- **15%** said “fairly well”
- 2% mentioned “not really well” and
- 2% “not well at all”
- 3% claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

This is a particularly positive finding. The bulk regard the Chevra Kadisha as fulfilling its function well, with heavy emphasis (by almost 8 in every 10 respondents) on “very well”. An average rating was calculated for the Chevra Kadisha which confirms this finding i.e. An average rating¹⁰³ of 3.74 shows that those who are aware of the Chevra Kadisha and are able to rate it – on an average – undoubtedly perceive it as performing its stated function: very well.

When we review this result in context, the Chevra Kadisha emerges as scoring particularly well i.e. virtually all are aware of it; of those aware of it virtually all felt able to describe it (and they provided multi-faceted descriptions); and overall a very positive rating was given as to the extent to which the Chevra Kadisha fulfills the function as set out on the statement card. The multi-faceted perceptions which emerged for the Chevra Kadisha seemed to be on track but final evaluation by those involved with this organisation should indicate whether any impressions require adjustment.

(iii) CSO – Community Service Organisation

a) How South African Jews perceive the CSO

¹⁰³ As mentioned earlier: Highest possible rating is **4 (very well)** and lowest possible is **1(not well at all)**.

As we saw earlier, the CSO is also very well-known (83% claimed to have heard of it) even if it is not quite as well-known as the Beth Din and Chevra Kadisha. Of those claiming to have heard of it, a methodically selected sector was asked two questions. The first question dealt with what they think the CSO's function is/ What they think it sets out to do.

- **Virtually all (98%) could describe the CSO in some way. Only 2% said “don't know”.** On average, each respondent made 1.27 comments about what the CSO's functions are/what it sets out to do. This average number of comments per respondent is smaller than that for other organisations discussed thus far. This is because the CSO is perceived in a less multi-faceted way than are the other organisations – this is understandable since it is less multi-faceted.
- **Responses were almost exclusively focused on security being the CSO's function (mentioned by 92%).** They spoke of it “providing security/protection for the community” and included comments about this bringing “peace of mind/protection of the Jewish way of life”
- **That the CSO guards the shuls was specifically mentioned to a sizeable extent (23% referred to it)**
- **Other descriptions/functions were referred to less frequently i.e.**
 - 3% claimed that they “have an intelligence network to find out if anyone wants to harm the community/keep abreast of anti-Semitism in the country”
 - 3% said that they are involved with “medical help/Hatzollah/Ezra”
 - 3% said that they “train volunteers/teach self-defence/run relevant courses”
 - 1% added that they helped in the Tsunami
- **Although we were checking on the perceived functions of the organisation and not on what people thought of the organisation, two respondents thought it necessary to (spontaneously) add negative comments.** One said “Good for basic security but not qualified to deal with serious security issues” and one said “ they overdo the security”

Do perceptions the CSO coincide with the actual functions as described below?

CSO (COMMUNITY SECURITY ORGANISATION)

The Community Security Organisation (CSO) is the security arm of the South African Jewish community. It works to ensure the safety of the Jewish community and the security of its communal institutions. It is a volunteer-based organisation run

by a core of professional staff and involves itself with recruiting and training Jewish volunteers, both male and female, from the age of 18 upwards to perform various tasks relating to community security. The CSO works to increase the community's awareness of possible security threats and to take appropriate steps to upgrade the security needs of their institutions. Its head offices are in Johannesburg and it has branches in Cape Town, Durban, Pretoria and Plettenberg Bay.

Conclusion:

Awareness of the CSO has penetrated a very large sector of the Jewish community, even if not quite as large a sector as is the case for the Beth Din and Chevra Kadisha. Jewish South Africans are undoubtedly aware that security is the main function of the CSO. It would however seem that more detail relating to the range and extensiveness of their activities would enhance their image.

b) Extent to which the CSO is perceived as fulfilling its stated functions

In the foregoing we evaluated respondent's perceptions of the CSO. In addition, the relevant sector of respondents were later exposed to the CSO description and then answered the second question i.e. to what extent they think the CSO seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the statement card.

- **83%** said "very well"
- **12%** said "fairly well"
- 1% mentioned "not really well" and
- <1% "not well at all"
- 4% claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

This finding is exceptionally positive. An overwhelming majority (95%) regard the CSO as fulfilling its function well, with heavy emphasis (by over 8 in every 10) on "very well". The average rating¹⁰⁴ (3.84) calculated for the CSO confirms this finding i.e. it shows that, on average, those aware of and able to rate the CSO, undoubtedly perceive it as performing its stated function very well indeed.

When reviewing this result in context, the CSO emerges particularly well: a very high percentage are aware of it; of those aware of it virtually all felt able to describe it; and overall a very positive rating was given for the extent to which it fulfills the stated function. However, as mentioned earlier, it would seem that more detail relating to the range and extensiveness of their activities would enhance their image.

(iv) Israel United Appeal (IUA) – United Communal Fund (UCF)

a) How South African Jews perceive the IUA - UCF

¹⁰⁴ Highest possible rating is 4 (very well) and lowest possible is 1(not well at all).

As we saw earlier, the IUA-UCF is also very well-known (87% had heard of it) but, as is the case for the CSO, it is not quite as well-known as the Beth Din and Chevra Kadisha. Of those who had heard of the IUA-UCF, a methodically selected sector was asked two questions about it. The first question dealt with what they think the IUA-UCF's function is / What they think it sets out to do.

- **Of the sector who were asked to describe the function of the IUA-UCF, 93% were able to answer and the remaining 7% said “don't know/gave no answer.** On an average, each respondent mentioned 1.13 comments relating to the function of the IUA-UCF. The average number of comments per respondent seems low for this type of organisation. From the low average number of comments made per respondent, it would seem that it is not perceived as a multi-faceted organisation.
- **The descriptions centered mainly around fundraising for Israel. This was mentioned by 73%.** They mentioned that “the IUA-UCF collects/raises money for Israel/for projects in Israel”
- **That they also help the local Jewish community was referred to by 21% i.e.** “helps the local community as well – not only Israel/ helps SA organisations/also helps the needy at Pesach”. One respondent added that “the beneficiaries are the Rabbi and the Board of Education”
- **6% added that the IUA-UCF intensifies the bond between South African Jews and Israel and a further 1% added that they “create Israel awareness”**
- **3% referred generally to their fundraising/being a charity organisation** without being specific as to who the money/charity is for
- **3% mentioned that they “help non-Jews as well/and underprivileged Black children”**
- **Although they were asked for their perceptions of the functions of the IUA-UCF and not their opinions of the organisation as such, a very small proportion (2%) spontaneously made negative comments relating to:**
 - **whether the money actually reaches the destination it was intended for :** “I doubt if the money goes to Israel/I don't know where it goes/never actually see or hear what they do with it”
 - **whether the focus should not rather be on South Africa than Israel:** “money should go to helping South African Jews/Chevra has knocked them (IUA-UCF) as they believe that charity begins at home”.

Do the perceptions of what the IUA-UCF is all about coincide with the actual functions as described below?

ISRAEL UNITED APPEAL (IUA) –
UNITED COMMUNAL FUND (UCF)

Israel United Appeal (IUA) - United Communal Fund (UCF) comprises two sections, the IUA and the UCF. The Israel United Appeal (IUA) is the only recognised body in South Africa for the collection of funds for and on behalf of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem. The funds are used for rescue and nation building i.e. the rescuing of Jews from distressed communities, the absorption of new olim, encouraging Jewish children throughout the Diaspora to embrace their heritage through Jewish education and the setting up of a fund for the victims of terror.

The United Communal Fund (UCF)'s mission is maintaining the formal, national structures and institutions of the South African Jewish community. Their main goal is securing the future of the Jewish community through various beneficiaries. The main beneficiaries are Jewish Education, The South African Jewish Board of Deputies (SAJBD), Community Security Organisation (CSO), Union of Jewish Women (UJW), Office of the Chief Rabbi and South African Union of Jewish Students (SAUJS).

Conclusion:

That the IUA-UCF does fundraising for Israel and Israeli causes emerges as being well-known. However, unless the IUA-UCF is totally satisfied with the level of success it has achieved, it might be to its advantage to make the community more aware of how the money is used in Israel and more aware of the variety of Israeli causes into which the money is channelled. Heightened and better-informed perception of how the money is used can only be advantageous to the organisation. Furthermore, there is definitely work to be done as regards heightening awareness of the functions of the UCF arm of the organisation. There appeared to be insufficient playback of the charitable functions relating to South Africa and to relevant South African institutions which are beneficiaries. The low average number of comments per respondent describing the IUA-UCF is understandable in the context of the overall conclusions drawn here i.e. there seems to be insufficient perception of and knowledge about what this organisation does. Those currently involved with the United Jewish Campaign (UJC), formerly the IUA-UCF, should bear these conclusions in mind.

b) Extent to which the IUA - UCF is perceived as fulfilling stated functions

In addition to our evaluation of how perceptions of the IUA-UCF tie in with the actual description of its functions, respondents gave their overall evaluation i.e. the relevant sector of respondents were exposed to the statement describing the IUA-UCF and then answered the second question i.e. to what extent they think the IUA-UCF seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the statement card.

- **49%** said “very well”
- **28%** said “fairly well”
- 4% mentioned “not really well” and
- 2% “not well at all”
- 17% claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

The majority regard the IUA-UCF as fulfilling its function well, with the emphasis more on “very well” (49%) than on “fairly well” (28%). However, the “very well” score is lower than that for other organisations dealt with thus far. Furthermore, the “don’t know/no answer” score (17%) is higher here than for organisations dealt with thus far. An average rating¹⁰⁵ of 3.50 positions this organisation, broadly-speaking, as performing between very and fairly well. It should be borne in mind that the average rating was based only on responses of those able to rate the organisation.

These findings coupled with the conclusion drawn earlier about the perceptions of the functions of the IUA-UCF indicate that there would appear to be room for more information to be imparted to Jewish people in South Africa about the functions of the IUA-UCF. While some may be well-informed, there are undoubtedly those who need more information.

(v) MaAfrika Tikkun

¹⁰⁵ As mentioned earlier: Highest possible rating is **4 (very well)** and lowest possible is **1(not well at all)**.

a) How South African Jews perceive MaAfrika Tikkun

We saw earlier that MaAfrika Tikkun is not one of the well-known organisations. With list aid, 41% claimed to have heard of it. Of those who claimed to have heard of it, a methodically selected sector was asked two questions about it. The first question dealt with what MaAfrika Tikkun's function is/What they think it sets out to do.

- **Of the sector asked to describe the function, 79% were able to answer and the remaining 21% said “don't know”/gave no answer.** On an average, each respondent mentioned only one comment relating to the function of this organisation.
- **Awareness seems to be a problem here i.e. 41% claim to know of this organisation and within a methodically selected sector of those who know it, approximately one-fifth do not know anything about it and cannot describe the function i.e. they have heard of it (or have heard the name) but know nothing about it. This would bring the 41% down to 32% who know of the organisation and feel able to describe it in some way.**
- **Those who do know the organisation primarily spoke about their work with and for underprivileged/disadvantaged non-Jewish people** i.e. of the sector required to describe the function: 54% said that they “help the underprivileged in South Africa/the underprivileged of all communities/those from impoverished townships/those previously disadvantaged”; 6% mentioned their “social upliftment programme”; 10% claimed that “they educate blacks/coloureds/people of colour”; 2% spoke of job creation.
- **Some (17%) spoke of a related aspect i.e. an “outreach programme/ they foster relationships”**
- **9% claimed that they are “a charity organisation/raise money”**
- One person spontaneously made a negative comment even though not required to give an opinion in this question. The comment is being shown for interest: “I would prefer the help to go to the Jewish community”.

How do perceptions of MaAfrika Tikkun's function/what it sets out to do compare with the actual function which is shown below?

MA'AFRIKA TIKKUN

MaAfrika Tikkun is a legally authorized, non-profit, social upliftment organisation based in South Africa. The MaAfrika Tikkun mission is to strive for the upliftment of all disadvantaged people in South Africa. By making a meaningful, sustainable contribution in these areas of South African society, MaAfrika Tikkun aims to enrich the lives of thousands of South Africans - young and old – thus empowering them to contribute constructively to the socio-economic development of South Africa.

Conclusion:

Those able to describe what MaAfrika Tikkun does, tend to do so correctly but fleshing out of their perceptions could be an advantage. More importantly, there should be heightening of the proportion aware of the organisation as such and heightening of the proportion able to describe what the organisation does. There is work to be done regarding awareness of and knowledge about the organisation.

b) Extent to which MaAfrika Tikkun perceived as fulfilling stated functions

When respondents were actually exposed to the statement describing MaAfrika Tikkun, they were required to answer the second question i.e. to what extent they think MaAfrika Tikkun seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the statement card.

- **42%** said “very well”
- **27%** said “fairly well”
- 4% mentioned “not really well” and
- 1% “not well at all”
- **26%** claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

Just over two-thirds regard MaAfrika Tikkun as fulfilling its function well, with the emphasis being more on “very well” (42%) than on “fairly well” (27%). However, the “very well” score is lower than for other organisations dealt with thus far. Furthermore, the “don’t know/no answer” score (26%) is high considering that it occurs amongst people who claim to have heard of the organisation. This finding highlights the awareness problem this organisation experiences. An average rating¹⁰⁶ of 3.49 positions this organisation as performing, broadly-speaking, between very and fairly well. However, this average score is based only on those able to rate the organisation and 26% (of the selected sector claiming to have heard of the organisation) could not rate it. For maximum effectiveness, MaAfrika Tikkun should aim to increase awareness of the organisation and what it does.

(vi) ORT – South Africa

¹⁰⁶ The highest possible rating is **4 (very well)** and lowest possible is **1(not well at all)**.

a) How South African Jews perceive ORT

We saw earlier that ORT is well-known (80% have heard of it). Of those claiming to have heard of it, a methodically selected sector answered two questions about it. The first question dealt with ORT's function/What they think it sets out to do.

- **Of the sector asked to describe the function of ORT, 73% were able to answer and the remaining 27% said “don't know”/gave no answer.** On average, each respondent made only one comment relating to this organisation's function. This gives an impression of ORT as unifaceted whereas, in fact, the average was brought down by those aware of the organisation but not able to answer as to its function. Those able to describe ORT sometimes made more than one comment in this regard.
- **Although “overall awareness” is not a problem (i.e. 80% claim to know of this organisation), awareness of what the organisation does requires attention.** Within a methodically selected sector of those who have heard of ORT, just over one-quarter do not know anything about it and cannot describe its function. This brings the 80% down to 58% who know of the organisation and feel able to describe it in some way.
- **The main function of ORT (mentioned by 45%) was perceived as being that it provides training to enable those who are trained to work/earn money** i.e. most of those who felt able to describe ORT claimed that “it provides training/is a training organisation/training facility/provides skills training/preparing youngsters to earn a living/providing technical/educational/skills training programmes”, with some specifying that the handicapped are catered for by them.
- **Some (11%) described it as “a charity/fundraising organisation” and additional comments (2%) were made about the fund-raising being for South African projects**
- **A small sector (5%) claimed that it helps the Jewish community** “supports Jewish children/ looks after the young in the Jewish community/ involved in Jewish community activities/educates Jews”
- **4% claimed that they “run shops/send gifts/creative gifts to make money”**
- **4% spoke of their involvement with “projects for the disadvantaged/ underprivileged in South Africa”**
- **4% mentioned Israelis as beneficiaries** i.e. “ helps the underprivileged in Israel/collects/raises money for Israel/trains young Israelis”
- **3% spoke of it being non-denominational**
- **3% said that they are involved in job creation/helping with employment/sheltered employment**
- **2% spoke of it as “a women's organisation/empowers women”**
- **Other aspects emerged less often and received one mention each.**

To what extent does the impression which Jewish people in South Africa have of ORT-SA tie in with its actual functions? The description of ORT follows.

ORT - SOUTH AFRICA

ORT SA is a Jewish-led, non-profit, Public Benefit Organization (PBO), specialising in delivering technological and vocational training to South Africa's impoverished communities. The qualifications ORT-SA graduates receive enable them to build productive lives, with the skill and knowledge necessary to earn a living and foster economic self-sufficiency. ORT-SA is an autonomous member of WORLD ORT, a Jewish charity organization that operates in over 60 countries and has trained over 3 million people enabling them to become useful members of society.

Conclusion:

Those able to describe ORT, primarily tend to understand its main function. However, there could be some advantage for ORT-SA if there were to be a higher proportion who know more than just the name and if there were to be greater clarity regarding the organisation and how it works.

b) Extent to which ORT is perceived as fulfilling its stated functions

When respondents were actually exposed to the ORT-SA description, they were required to answer the second question i.e. to what extent they think this organisation seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the statement card.

- **32%** said “very well”
- **25%** said “fairly well”
- 2% mentioned “not really well” and
- 4% “not well at all”
- **37%** claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

Over half regard ORT-SA as fulfilling its function well, with a tendency for more emphasis on “very well” (32%) than on “fairly well” (25%). The “very well” score is lower than for other organisations dealt with thus far. Furthermore, the “don’t know/no answer” score (37%) is particularly high considering that it occurs amongst people who claim to have heard of the organisation. The average rating¹⁰⁷ (3.33) positions this organisation as performing, broadly-speaking, between very and fairly well but closer to fairly well. However, this score is based only on those able to rate the organisation i.e. it excludes 37% of those who claimed to have heard of it (because they said “don’t know” when asked to rate how well it performs). As was the case for MaAfrika-Tikkun (but even more intensely so), this finding highlights the awareness problem which ORT-SA should take note of.

¹⁰⁷As mentioned earlier: Highest possible rating is 4 (**very well**) and lowest possible is 1(**not well at all**).

(vii) South African Board of Jewish Education (SABJE)

a) How South African Jews perceive the SABJE

We saw earlier that the SABJE reflects an exceptionally high awareness score i.e. 92% claimed to have heard of it. Of those who claimed to have heard of it, a methodically selected sector was asked two questions about it. The first question dealt with what SABJE's function is/What they think it sets out to do.

- **Of the sector asked to describe the function of the SABJE, 95% were able to answer and only 5% said “don't know”/gave no answer.** On an average, each respondent mentioned 1.17 comments relating to the function of this organisation. This gives the impression of an organisation which is not perceived in a multi-faceted way. How it is actually perceived by those asked to describe its function will emerge below.
- **Descriptions centered around two main functions:**
 - **Involvement with Jewish schools in South Africa.** Over half (54%) associated the SABJE with “governing/regulating/controlling/overseeing all Jewish schools in South Africa”. Linked with this: a small sector (5%) spoke of their involvement with the financial running of the schools/maintaining the schools/giving bursaries for the schools; and 5% said that they help with subsidies/financial assistance (for schoolchildren)
 - **Involvement with Jewish education** i.e. 42% said that they “Provide Jewish education for young people/ensuring Jewish education for young people/involved with standard of Jewish education/try to get Jewish children to go to Jewish schools”; 5% claimed that they “educate (Jewish) people about religion/Judaism/ provide religious education/make people more aware of their Judaism/so kids can have a Jewish identity”; 3% mentioned that “in outlying areas/and also in non-Jewish schools they assist with Hebrew and Jewish studies”; 1% spoke about them being involved with recruiting/training Hebrew/Jewish studies teachers; 1% mentioned that they “set the syllabus/papers for Jewish exams”

Overall, how do perceptions of the functions of the organisations tie up with the actual functions as stated below?

SOUTH AFRICAN BOARD OF JEWISH EDUCATION **(SABJE)**

Since its inception the **South African Board of Jewish Education (SABJE)**, the largest body of its kind in the Diaspora, has acted as the address for Jewish Education in South Africa and has committed itself to providing whatever is necessary for furthering this goal. It represents the Jewish education community of South Africa in negotiating with the South African government and interacts with various Israeli authorities on behalf of the SA Jewish schools. The SABJE is directly responsible for the educational and financial policies of the King David schools, and also for administering the United Hebrew Schools directorate. The SABJE has affiliates throughout Southern Africa. These include the Herzlia schools in Cape Town, Theodore Herzl School in Port Elizabeth and Sharon School in Zimbabwe.

Conclusion:

Awareness of this organisation is exceptionally high. Furthermore, in essence, Jewish people in South Africa would appear to correctly perceive that the SABJE is involved with both Jewish education as such and Jewish dayschools. Whether or not the SABJE would like more detail about their type of involvement to be conveyed, is an issue to be decided by them.

b) Extent to which the SABJE is perceived as fulfilling its stated functions

When actually exposed to the statement describing the SABJE, they were required to answer the second question i.e. to what extent they think this organisation seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the statement card.

- **45%** said “very well”
- **38%** said “fairly well”
- 4% mentioned “not really well” and
- 4% “not well at all”
- 9% claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

The majority (83%) regard the SABJE as fulfilling its function well, with a tendency for more emphasis on “very well” (45%) than on “fairly well” (38%). All scores considered, an average rating¹⁰⁸ of 3.38 positions this organisation as performing, broadly-speaking, between very and fairly well but closer to fairly well.

¹⁰⁸ As mentioned earlier: Highest possible rating is **4 (very well)** and lowest possible is **1(not well at all)**.

(viii) **South African Jewish Board of Deputies (SAJBD)**

a) **How South African Jews perceive the Board of Deputies**

Earlier we saw exceptionally high awareness (95%) for the SAJBD. Of those who had heard of it, a methodically selected sector answered two questions about it. The first dealt with what its function is/What they think it sets out to do.

- **Of those asked to describe the function, 88% did so and 12% said “don’t know”/gave no answer.** On average, 1.24 function-related comments were made per respondent.
- **The South African Jewish Board of Deputies clearly and strongly emerged as protecting/looking after the Jewish community. This was mentioned in broad terms and in relation to specific issues:**
 - **33% stated broadly that it looks after/protects the Jewish community** (i.e. “watches over/protects Jewish community/welfare of community/looks after interests of all Jews”) **with another 13% saying that they look after Jews in general** (i.e. “look after Jews in general/deal with/monitor all Jewish communal affairs”).
 - **23% said that it negotiates with government/deals with politics regarding Jewish issues** i.e. “negotiate with government on Jewish issues/represent SA Jews politically/deal with Jewish rights”
 - **11% spoke of their dealing with anti-Semitism** i.e. “Expose anti-Semitic activities/deal with/object against anti-Semitism”
 - **6% mentioned financial assistance for Jews in need/assistance with jobs**
 - **5% spoke about their role in education** i.e. “run Board of Education/educational activities/organise money for education of children/see to affairs relating to educational side of the community”
 - **5% referred to “promotion of goodwill between Jews and people of other religions” and a few (1%) claimed that they “facilitate debate to represent all views of Jewish community”**
 - **5% saw them as the base for all other organisations** and 2% spoke of the CSO being run by them
 - **A scatter of other aspects were each mentioned by 2% or less:** “Involved with Jews worldwide/Jewish organisations/causes in rest of world”; “Foster Israel awareness”; “Involved with Orthodox issues/Kashrut/run Orthodox community”; “Deal with all Jewish non-religious issues”; “Sets standards/boundaries/forums for all ideas”; “Deal with business side of community’s commercial matters”; “watch press/media”; “inform about Jewish history/heritage”; “Look after country shuls/small communities”
 - **Although required to mention the organisation’s functions and not opinions relating to it, 2% spontaneously made negative comments** (“too politically right wing...I don’t always agree with their opinions....where does all the money go.....too many chiefs”).

To what extent do perceptions of what the organisation is all about coincide with what it actually is (as detailed in the statement below).

SOUTH AFRICAN JEWISH BOARD OF DEPUTIES **(SAJBD)**

The SA Jewish Board of Deputies (SAJBD) is the umbrella organization of South African Jewry. Its stated mission is to work for the betterment of human relations between Jews and other peoples of South Africa - based on mutual respect, understanding and goodwill - and to protect the civil liberties of South African Jews. The Board monitors and exposes anti-Semitic and racist activities in South Africa, counters biased media coverage and examines legislation affecting the Jewish community. It provides the wider community with information about Jewish life, history, and beliefs. The Board also: provides for the needs of Jewish communities in outlying areas, provides a consultancy service to other communal organizations, houses and maintains the Archives of the South African Jewish community and pursues communications with other Jewish communities abroad.

Conclusion:

An extremely high proportion are aware of the Board of Deputies and most of these are able to describe it in some way. Broadly-speaking, their perceptions of this organisation's functions are correct. The SAJBD should however examine the findings to determine whether they are satisfied with the extent to which various aspects are being conveyed to the Jewish people of South Africa. Furthermore, they should decide whether there are any misperceptions (even if minor) which they wish to correct.

b) Extent to which the SAJBD is perceived as fulfilling stated functions

When actually exposed to the SAJBD description, they answered the second question i.e. to what extent they think this organisation seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the statement card.

- **50%** said "very well"
- **32%** said "fairly well"
- 1% mentioned "not really well"
- 3% "not well at all"
- 14% claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

The majority (82%) regard the SAJBD as fulfilling its function well, with more emphasis on "very well" (50%) than on "fairly well" (32%). An average rating¹⁰⁹ of 3.50 positions this organisation, broadly-speaking as performing between very and fairly well.

¹⁰⁹ As mentioned earlier: Highest possible rating is **4 (very well)** and lowest possible is **1(not well at all)**.

(ix) South African Union for Progressive Judaism (SAUPJ)

a) How South African Jews perceive SA Union for Progressive Judaism

We saw earlier that the South African Union for Progressive Judaism (SAUPJ) is not one of the well-known organisations. With list aid, 46% claimed to have heard of it. Of those claiming to have heard of it, a methodically selected sector was asked two questions about it. The first question dealt with what its function is/What they think it sets out to do.

- **Of the sector asked to describe the function of SAUPJ, 79% were able to answer and the remaining 21% said “don’t know”/gave no answer.** Because of the high proportion of “don’t knows”, each respondent on average, made less than one (i.e. 0.89) function-related comments.
- **Awareness seems to be a problem here i.e. 46% claim to know of the SAUPJ and within a methodically selected sector of those claiming to know it, approximately one-fifth do not know anything about it and cannot describe its function i.e. they claim to have heard of it but know nothing about it. This decreases the 46% to 36% who know of the organisation and are able to describe it in some way.**
- **Those who do know the organisation primarily described it as catering for, controlling or ensuring the future of the Reform/Progressive sector of the Jewish community:**
 - **26% referred to them as catering for the Reform/Progressive sector** i.e. “They cater for the Reform shul/for Reform movement as opposed to Orthodox in SA/caters for alternate Jewish worship”
 - **22% saw them as the controlling body of this sector** i.e. “the controlling body of the Reform/Progressive shul/community”
 - **21% said that they are concerned with ensuring and promoting the future of Reform/Progressive Judaism** i.e. “looking after future of Progressive Judaism/promote/spread word of Reform movement” and someone added “fighting for recognition”.
 - **3% spoke about their overseeing their Rabbis** i.e. “they make sure that the Rabbis lead the congregation in the correct manner”
 - **2% mentioned work on relationships with other sectors** (“try to foster relationship between Reform and greater Jewish community”)
- **The type of person they cater for and what they offer was referred to:**
 - **9% claimed that they are there for those not interested in Judaism in its Orthodox form** (“For those not interested in traditional Orthodoxy/people looking for Jewry in a lesser degree/more modern approach to the Jewish religion”)
 - **3% claimed they “allow a simpler form of conversion” and someone added “they help those married out of the faith to have a Jewish identity”**
- **Other comments were made less frequently**

Do the descriptions above tie up with the actual description (as stated below).

SOUTH AFRICAN UNION FOR PROGRESSIVE JUDAISM **(SAUPJ)**

The **South African Union for Progressive Judaism (SAUPJ)** is the umbrella body for all Progressive Jewish congregations in South Africa. It consists of 9 congregations located in major cities throughout the country. Other organisations affiliated with Progressive Judaism in the country are: the Southern African Union of Temple Sisterhoods, the Southern African Association of Progressive Rabbis, the Southern African Union for Progressive Judaism Beth Din, and Netzer Olami youth movement.

Conclusion:

Those able to describe what the South African Union for Progressive Judaism’s function is, appear – in broad terms - to understand what it is about. However, awareness of the SAUPJ is not high. Furthermore, the proportion actually able to describe what the organisation does should be heightened. The SAUPJ should ideally review the results to determine whether there are any impressions which they wish to change, enhance and/or convey more intensely.

b) Extent to which the SA Union for Progressive Judaism is perceived as fulfilling its stated functions

Those exposed to the statement describing the SAUPJ, were required to answer the second question i.e. to what extent they think this organisation seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the statement card.

- **24%** said “very well”
- **22%** said “fairly well”
- 4% mentioned “not really well”
- 2% “not well at all”
- **48%** claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

Opinions were divided between its function being performed very/fairly well (46%) and “do not know/no answer” (48%), indicating that a large sector (almost half) are not familiar enough with the SAUPJ and its activities to comment in this regard. An average rating¹¹⁰ of 3.32 positions this organisation, broadly-speaking, as performing between very and fairly well but closer to fairly well. However, this rating is based only on responses of those able to rate this organisation and 48% of those who claimed to have heard of it could not rate it.

¹¹⁰As mentioned earlier: Highest possible rating is **4 (very well)** and lowest possible is **1(not well at all)**.

(x) South African Union of Jewish Students (SAUJS)

a) How South African Jews perceive SAUJS

We saw earlier that the South African Union of Jewish students (SAUJS) is particularly well-known: 86% claimed to have heard of it and 14% had not. Of those who claimed to have heard of it, a methodically selected sector was asked two questions about it. The first question dealt with what its function is/What they think it sets out to do.

- **Of the sector asked to describe the function of SAUJS, all were able to answer.** Each respondent on an average, mentioned 1.27 comments relating to the function of this organisation.
- **The functions of SAUJs were perceived as centering around three main factors each of which has several facets:**
 - **They organise activities to bring Jewish students together:** “Organises activities/outings/socials/cultural activities/shiurim for Jewish students/brings young Jewish students together” (21%); “Brings Jewish students together” (19%)
 - **SAUJS represents/supports Jewish students and looks after their interests:** “They represent Jewish students in Universities” (18%); “Mouthpiece for Jewish students/supports students with issues in education/anti-Semitism/looks after students interests” (16%); Jewish Student Council Representative body” (8%); “controls the studying of Jewish students/teaching/bursaries” (2%)
 - **They promote Jewish identity and/or Zionism amongst Jewish students:** “Promotes Jewish identity at university/creates Jewish awareness/instills Jewish values into students” (13%); “Promotes Zionism/educates students about Israel/organises trips to Israel” (8%)
- **A sizeable proportion (19%) made the general statement that “it is an organisation for students”**

Does the impression which South African Jews have of the functions of SAUJS coincide with or differ from the actual functions as stated below?

SOUTH AFRICAN UNION OF JEWISH STUDENTS (SAUJS)

SAUJS is the central representative and co-ordinating body of South African Jewish Students, representing Jewish students on 18 campuses throughout South Africa. It works within a framework of three main pillars: Zionism, South Africa and Judaism. Activities include the promotion of Israel, Zionism and Aliya on campuses; community welfare projects; the upliftment of underprivileged sectors of South Africa; establishing contact with other youth organisations; education on Jewish culture, religion and identity; and ensuring that the youth are active members of the community.

Conclusion: In accordance with the SAUJS mission statement, this organisation is perceived as representing students and looking after their interests. However, it is interesting that Jewish people in South Africa perceive SAUJS as having an important social function i.e. bringing Jewish students together, often by means of organising activities for them. In the SAUJS statement this is not specified as one of its functions. Although SAUJS may be aware of this as one of the functions it is linked with, it should acknowledge it more and include it in the SAUJS mission statement. This is particularly so because this function is of great importance to students. South African Jews are reasonably aware that SAUJS aims to promote Jewish identity and Zionism but no mention was made of SAUJS being involved in South African issues.

b) Extent to which SAUJS is perceived as fulfilling its stated functions

When actually exposed to the statement describing the SAUJS, they were required to answer the second question i.e. to what extent they think this organisation seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the statement card.

- **31%** said “very well”
- **34%** said “fairly well”
- 6% mentioned “not really well”
- 4% “not well at all”
- **25%** claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

Almost two-thirds (65%) regard SAUJS as fulfilling its function well, with this being split between “very well” (31%) and “fairly well” (34%). The bulk of the remainder claimed that they “do not know”/gave no answer. It may well be that those who could not answer have no involvement with students and therefore are not familiar with how well SAUJS does or does not perform.

An average rating¹¹¹ of 3.24 positions SAUJS, broadly-speaking, as performing between very and fairly well but closer to fairly well. This rating was based only on responses of those who had heard of SAUJS and felt able to rate it.

¹¹¹ As mentioned earlier: Highest possible rating is **4 (very well)** and lowest possible is **1(not well at all)**.

(xi) **South African Zionist Federation – SAZF (called Western Province Zionist Council in Cape Town and Kwa-Zulu Natal Zionist Council in Durban)**

a) **How South African Jews perceive the SAZF/WPZC/KZNZC**

Earlier we saw the exceptionally high awareness score (92%) achieved by the South African Zionist Federation – SAZF (called Western Province Zionist Council in Cape Town and Kwa-Zulu Natal Zionist Council in Durban). Of those who had heard of it, a methodically selected sector answered two questions. The first dealt with what its function is/What they think it sets out to do.

- **Of those asked to describe its function, 94% were able to answer and 6% said “don’t know”/gave no answer.** On average, each respondent made 1.33 comments as to the function of this organisation.
- **Understandably, the bulk of the comments were related to Israel and Zionism:**
 - **43% said they promote Aliyah/relocation/emigration to Israel**
 - **20% claimed that they collect funds/work for Israel**
 - **19% spoke of their linking South African Jews with Israel in some way** e.g. “Keeps South African Jewry informed on what is happening in Israel/works on establishing relations between South Africa and Israel” **and a further 6% said that “they educate people about Israel”**
 - **17% mentioned that they promote Zionism**
 - **6% mentioned organising tours/trips/study programmes to Israel**
- **Other Jewish community related functions were also mentioned less often:**
 - **8% spoke of protection of the Jewish community** i.e. “Eyes and ears to ensure Jews are not victimised/prevents propaganda and educates wider community/stops anti-Zionism/interact with the government where necessary”
 - **4% perceived it as an “umbrella organisation of all Jewish organisations”**
 - **3% referred to provision of information relating to Jews** i.e. “Library/historical information”
 - **2% mentioned support/helping Jewish community/institutions** i.e. “Supports Jewish community/raises funds for SA Jewish families/institutions”
- Although not asked for, a few spontaneously made negative comments in addition to merely answering the question about the perceived functions. These comments were made to a minimal extent and are mentioned for interest rather than as a reflection of the findings i.e. A few said that the poor in South Africa - whether Jews or non-Jews - should be considered before Israel; one said that before people go to Israel, jobs should be found for them there; and one complained that the organisation “bums money from the community”

Do the perceptions of the functions of this organisation tie up with what it actually sets out to do (as detailed in the statement below)?

SOUTH AFRICAN ZIONIST FEDERATION (SAZF)
CALLED WESTERN PROVINCE ZIONIST COUNCIL IN CAPE TOWN
AND KWA-ZULU NATAL ZIONIST COUNCIL IN DURBAN

The South African Zionist Federation (SAZF), whose national headquarters are in Johannesburg, is the umbrella body to which all Zionist organisations in SA are affiliated. Its functions in Durban and Cape Town are performed, respectively, by the Durban Zionist Council and Western Province Zionist Council. The SAZF is responsible for all aspects of Zionist endeavour in South Africa and for the entire range of the Jewish Community's multi-faceted relationship with Israel. The SAZF's work involves the promotion and facilitation of Aliyah, while its information (Hasbarah) department is concerned with counter-propaganda to ensure a positive image of Israel in the media. This department is also responsible for the promotion of Israeli culture in SA, for running Hebrew language "Ulpan" courses, for the dissemination of Zionist and Israel-related education, information and policy, and for public relations. Included under the SAZF umbrella are the Women's Zionist Association of South Africa, Jewish National Fund, the Zionist youth movements (viz. Bnei Akiva, Habonim and Netzer) and Maccabi South Africa.

Conclusion: An extremely high proportion are aware of this organisation and are able to describe it in some way. In essence their perceptions are on target in that they are focused on Israel and Zionism. However, there are details which the Jewish community tends not to be aware of e.g. the organisation's involvement with various activities; the organisations and youth movements falling under their umbrella etc. The final decision as to whether or not perceptions are sufficiently on target must be made by the SAZF/WPZC/KZNZC.

b) Extent to which the SAZF/WPZC/KZNZC is perceived as fulfilling its stated functions

With regard to the second question about this organisation (i.e. how well it seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the statement card):

- 46% said "very well"
- 34% said "fairly well"
- 4% mentioned "not really well"
- 3% "not well at all"
- 13% claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

The majority (80%) regard the SAZF/WPZC/KZNZC as fulfilling its function well, with a tendency for more emphasis on "very well" (46%) than on "fairly well" (34%). All scores considered, the average rating¹¹² (3.43) positions it as fulfilling stated functions: between very and fairly well but a touch closer to fairly well. This positioning is based only on the responses of those able to rate the organisation.

¹¹² As mentioned earlier: Highest possible rating is 4 (very well) and lowest possible is 1(not well at all).

(xii) **Union of Jewish Women of South Africa (UJW)**

a) **How South African Jews perceive the Union of Jewish Women**

We saw earlier that an exceptionally high awareness score (91%) was achieved by the Union of Jewish Women of South Africa. Of those who claimed to have heard of it, a methodically selected sector was asked two questions about it. The first question dealt with what its function is/What they think it sets out to do.

- **Of the sector asked to describe its function, 87% were able to answer and 13% said “don’t know”/gave no answer.** On an average, each respondent mentioned 1.13 comments relating to the function.
- **A sizeable sector (32%) specified that they help both Jews and non-Jews/people of all types/underprivileged irrespective of colour** i.e. “helps non-Jews as well as Jews/less fortunate Jews and non-Jews/underprivileged no matter what colour/help the whole community”. **1% added that they help African schools**
- **That they raise money for charity/make charitable contributions emerged strongly overall and emerged in relation to three categories:**
 - **23% were not specific about the type of charity they raise money for** e.g. “Raises money/money for charity/charity work/fundraising”
 - **17% specified Jewish charities** e.g. “charity work for the Jewish community/raise money for Jewish charities”
 - **11% mentioned Israeli charity** e.g. “collects money for Israel”
 - **3% mentioned bursaries** e.g. “give bursaries/scholarships/financial assistance at tertiary institutions”
- **A noticeable sector spoke of the UJW as being geared for women:**
 - **19% referred to it as offering activities for women** e.g. “adult education/ lectures for women/get-togethers for women/social activities or Jewish cultural events for women”
 - **1% spoke of support for women** i.e. “women can come to them for support/emotional support/for women and children”
- **Other functions/activities were mentioned by a small sector**
 - **4% mentioned “meals on wheels”**
 - **2% spoke of “organising entertainment for the elderly/underprivileged”**
 - **1% said that they “promote Aliyah”**
- **Although only perception of functions and not evaluation was asked for, a few negatives emerged spontaneously** e.g. “they concentrate too much on other races/not enough done for Jews.....they do nothing.....UJW have a low profile”

Does this overall impression tie in with or differ from the description of this organization as stated below?

UNION OF JEWISH WOMEN OF SOUTH AFRICA (UJW)

The Union of Jewish Women (UJW), affiliated to the International Council of Jewish Women, is a service organisation which, in addition to serving the Jewish community and Israeli projects, participates in the field of welfare and education. Through its important social outreach projects, it helps address poverty and hardship in both the Jewish and general community and thereby promotes goodwill and understanding amongst all sections of the South African population.

Conclusion: This is a well-known organisation and – in the main – its functions appear to be reflected appropriately. However, it is for the organisation to decide whether or not it requires more emphasis on any particular aspect.

b) Extent to which Union of Jewish Women (UJW) is perceived as fulfilling its stated functions

When actually exposed to the statement describing the UJW, they were required to answer the second question i.e. to what extent they think this organisation seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the statement card.

- **54%** said “very well”
- **23%** said “fairly well”
- 1% mentioned “not really well”
- 3% “not well at all”
- **19%** claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

A very large sector (77%) regard the UJW as fulfilling its function well, with distinctly more emphasis on “very well” (54%) than on “fairly well” (23%). However, we do see that 19% claim that they “do not know”/gave no answer. The average rating¹¹³ of 3.56 positions this organisation as fulfilling the stated functions: between very and fairly well but closer to very well. Those who said “don’t know”/gave no answer were excluded from the average rating.

¹¹³As mentioned earlier: Highest possible rating is **4 (very well)** and lowest possible is **1(not well at all)**.

(xiii) **Union of Orthodox Synagogues of South Africa (UOS)**

a) **How South African Jews perceive the UOS**

We saw earlier that very high awareness (83%) was achieved by the UOS. Of those who claimed to have heard of it, a methodically selected sector was asked two questions about it. The first question dealt with what its function is/What they think it sets out to do.

- **Of the sector asked to describe its function, 89% were able to answer and 11% said “don’t know”/gave no answer.** On an average, each respondent mentioned 1.16 comments relating to the function of this organisation.
- **It was very strongly perceived as being involved with/overseeing Orthodox synagogues (shuls)/congregations:**
 - **64% mentioned the synagogues/congregations aspect overall** e.g. “oversees Orthodox congregations...controlling office of Orthodox congregation....oversees all Orthodox shuls...authority... umbrella of all shuls”
 - **4% said that they “consolidate all shuls”**
 - **3% mentioned other synagogue/shul related aspects** e.g. “does administration of all shuls....collects money for shuls...organises speakers and functions at shuls”
- **Other functions related to religion were also mentioned:**
 - **11% said that they “set rules for Kashrut/take care of Orthodox standards”**
 - **7% mentioned their involvement with the Beth Din** e.g. “run the Beth Din/incorporate the Beth Din/governing body of the Beth Din/intermediary between the community and the Beth Din”
 - **5% spoke about a disciplining function in relation to the Rabbinat**
 - **5% said they maintain a strong religious presence in the country**
- **Some perceived it to have functions related to the Jewish community and not only religion:**
 - **6% claimed that they provide information** e.g. “source of information for Jewish communities/shares knowledge and answers queries”
 - **5% referred to them having a function of being beneficial to the Jewish community** e.g. “keep Jews together as a community/ enhance Jewish life/promote Jewish heritage in South Africa”
- There were a few unsolicited negative comments: “They make it difficult for converts....push Orthodoxy.....work for fanatical Judaism.....too monopolistic”

How does the impression of the UOS' functions coincide with or differ from the actual stated functions of the organisation?

UNION OF ORTHODOX SYNAGOGUES OF SOUTH AFRICA (UOS)

The Union of Orthodox Synagogues, **which has offices in both Johannesburg (head office) and Cape Town**, is the national umbrella body for all Orthodox Jewish congregations. It maintains the office of the Chief Rabbi and the Beth Din. The Kashrut Department monitors the manufacture of all kosher products, publicises regular kashrut information to the Jewish public and provides *mashgichim* for kosher functions. The Beth Din, **which also has offices in both Johannesburg and Cape Town**, oversees all adoptions, chalitzot, conversions, disputes (Dinei Torah), divorce, general queries of Jewish law, kashrut information, mohellim for circumcisions, shechita (ritual slaughter), times of sunset & sunrise.

Conclusion: Awareness of this organisation is very high and awareness of its functions seems very good overall. It is primarily linked with synagogues/shuls. Should it be required that it should be seen in a broader context (e.g. incorporating the Beth Din and related aspects), this should be attended to by relevant information being conveyed to the community.

b) Extent to which the UOS is perceived as fulfilling its stated functions

When actually exposed to the statement describing the UOS, they were required to answer the second question i.e. to what extent they think this organisation seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the statement card.

- **49%** said “very well”
- **30%** said “fairly well”
- 2% mentioned “not really well”
- 2% “not well at all”
- **17%** claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

Thus, a very large sector (79%) regard the UOS as fulfilling its function well, with more emphasis on “very well” (49%) than on “fairly well” (30%). However, we do see that 17% claim that they “do not know”/gave no answer. The average rating¹¹⁴ (3.52) positions this organisation, as fulfilling the stated functions: between very and fairly well but a touch closer to very well. The “don’t know/no answers” were excluded from the average rating.

¹¹⁴ As mentioned earlier: Highest possible rating is **4 (very well)** and lowest possible is **1(not well at all)**.

(xiv) Women’s Zionist Organisation of South Africa (WIZO)

a) How South African Jews perceive WIZO

We saw earlier that very high awareness (88%) was achieved by WIZO. Of those who claimed to have heard of it, a methodically selected sector was asked two questions about it. The first question dealt with what its function is/What they think it sets out to do.

- **Of the sector asked to describe its function, 89% were able to answer and 11% said “don’t know”/gave no answer.** On an average, each respondent mentioned 1.21 comments relating to the function of this organisation.
- **The responses were, understandably, focused on Israel:**
 - **43% said that they raise funds for Israel** e.g. Collects money for Israel/raises funds for Israel organises events to raise money for Israel/sends money to Israel”
 - **14% mentioned that “they promote Zionism/emigration to Israel/Aliyah”**
 - **10% spoke of their assisting Israelis in need** e.g. “Helps women/children in Israel/collects money for disadvantaged people/children in Israel”
 - **1% added that they offer help to Israel and South Africa** e.g. “represent the Jewish community here and in Israel/help with education in South Africa here and in Israel”
- **That they are a women’s organisation/voluntary women’s organisation emerged sizeably (23%)** e.g. “voluntary organisation of Jewish women/hold lectures/deal with women’s issues”
- **Some spoke about WIZO as a charity organisation and/or an organisation which helps various groups of people:**
 - **18% made general comments about them being a charity organisation** e.g. “charity/charity organisation/raise money for needy in the community/collect for the needy”
 - **4% claimed that “they are a charity for Jews and non-Jews”**
 - **4% spoke about WIZO “having gift shops/fetes (to raise money)”**
 - **1% said that “they help the elderly”**
 - **1% spoke of “help for battered women”**

How does the impression of WIZO's functions coincide with or differ from the actual stated functions of the organisation?

WOMEN'S ZIONIST ORGANISATION OF SOUTH AFRICA **(WIZO)**

The Women's Zionist Organisation of South Africa (WIZO), the largest Jewish women's organization in South Africa, empowers women to identify with the State of Israel through education, pragmatic commitment and support of beneficiaries and special projects. It also gives pragmatic assistance to the underprivileged and needy people of Israel. Through its projects, WIZO expresses love, concern and caring for the People and Land of Israel and commitment to playing a role in the ever changing fabric of Israeli society.

Conclusion: Awareness of this organisation is very high and the Israel-focus of its charitable activities is well-known. Full evaluation of whether the perceptions are suitably on target or require adjustment/change of emphasis can only be made by WIZO.

b) Extent to which WIZO is perceived as fulfilling its stated functions

When actually exposed to the statement describing WIZO, they were required to answer the second question i.e. to what extent they think this organisation seems to fulfill its functions as set out on the statement card.

- **49%** said "very well"
- **25%** said "fairly well"
- 3% mentioned "not really well"
- 3% "not well at all"
- **20%** claimed that they do not know/gave no answer

A large sector (74%) regard WIZO as fulfilling its function well, with distinctly more emphasis on "very well" (49%) than on "fairly well" (25%). However, we do see that 20% claim that they "do not know"/gave no answer.

All scores considered, the average rating¹¹⁵ of 3.50 positions this organisation, as fulfilling the stated functions: between very and fairly well.

¹¹⁵ Highest possible rating is **4 (very well)** and lowest possible is **1(not well at all)**.

G. Summary Table For The Fourteen Organisations

Although the results have been discussed in detail, for interest we are showing a summary table indicating the extent to which the 14 organisations are perceived by Jewish people in South Africa as fulfilling their stated functions. It should be borne in mind that those who rated an organisation were drawn only from those who claimed to be aware of the organisation.

The last row of the tabulation below, shows that – on average – organisations scored between very well and fairly well for fulfilling requirements as set out in the relevant statements. Some organisations scored below this and some above. CSO and Chevra Kadisha reflected very positive scores. Some of the others also did well.

	FULFILLS THE STATED FUNCTIONS:					Average rating based on those who could rate:	
	Very Well	Fairly well	Not really well	Not well at all	DK/ No answer	Average score ¹¹⁶	SUMMARY OF: “HOW WELL FULFILLS STATED FUNCTION”
CSO	83%	12%	1%	<1%	4%	3.84	Of those aware and required to rate it, virtually all (96%) could do so. On average they rated it Very well
Chevra Kadisha	78%	15%	2%	2%	3%	3.74	Of those required to rate it, virtually all (97%) were able to and on average they rated it Very well
UJW	54%	23%	1%	3%	19%	3.56	Of those required to rate it, approx. 8 in every 10 (81%) could. Average rating Between very and fairly well, but closer to very well
Beth Din	59%	28%	2%	4%	7%	3.54	Of those required to rate it, over 9 in every 10 (93%) could. Average Between very and fairly well, closer to very well
UOS	49%	30%	2%	2%	17%	3.52	Of those required to rate it, approx. 8 in every 10 (83%) could. Average rating Between very and fairly well, a touch closer to very well
IUA-UCF	49%	28%	4%	2%	17%	3.50	Of those required to rate it, approx. 8 in every 10 (83%) could. Average rating Between very and fairly well
SAJBD	50%	32%	1%	3%	14%	3.50	Of those aware and required to rate it, almost 9 in every 10 (86%) able to. Average rating Between very and fairly well
WIZO	49%	25%	3%	3%	20%	3.50	Of those required to rate it, 8 in every 10 (80%) could. Average rating Between very and fairly well
MaAfrika Tikkun	42%	27%	4%	1%	26%	3.49	Of those required to rate it, approx. three-quarters (74%) could and on average rated it Between very and fairly well
SAZF/ WPZC/ KZNZC	46%	34%	4%	3%	13%	3.43	Of those aware and required to rate it, almost 9 in every 10 (87%) able to. Average rating Between very and fairly well, touch closer to fairly well
SABJE	45%	38%	4%	4%	9%	3.38	Of those aware and required to rate it, approx. 9 in every 10 (91%) able to. Average rating Between very and fairly well, but closer to fairly well
ORT	32%	25%	2%	4%	37%	3.33	Of those aware and required to rate it, approx. 6 in every 10 (63%) could. On average rated it Between very and fairly well, but closer to fairly well
SAUPJ	24%	22%	4%	2%	48%	3.32	Of those aware and required to rate it, approx. half (52%) could. Average rating Between very and fairly well, but closer to fairly well
SAUJS	31%	34%	6%	4%	25%	3.24	Of those aware and required to rate it, approx. three-quarters (75%) could. Average rating Between very and fairly well, but closer to fairly well
Average per organisation	49%	27%	3%	3%	18%	3.49	On an average each organisation could be rated by 82% of those aware of and required to rate it. On average organisations were rated Between very and fairly well (i.e. 3.49)

¹¹⁶ **Very well** was weighted **4**, **Fairly well** was weighted **3**, **Not really well** was weighted **2** and **Not well at all** was weighted **1**. Thus, the closer the average is to **4** the closer it is to **very well** and the closer to **1** the closer it is to **not well at all**. “Don’t know/No answer” was excluded from the average.

STUDY HIGHLIGHTS AND SUMMARY

This 2005 survey was geared to be a follow-up on the 1998 JPR study amongst Jewish people in South Africa, with particular focus being on providing data which will be helpful to the community. This has hopefully been achieved by: including comparisons of 2005 and 1998 data allowing for detection of trends and changes in the last seven years; incorporating amended as well as additional questions to heighten the usefulness of the survey to the Jewish community; and providing detailed tabular analysis as well as comprehensive discussion of the data in this document.

The study comprised a nationally representative sample of South African Jewish males and females, 18 years and older, in the major cities in which Jews reside i.e. Johannesburg, Cape Town, Pretoria and Durban. In the main body of this document full details have been provided as to the methodology and sample details, including comparisons of sample data with census data.

Some characteristics of Jewish adults in South Africa

- It is interesting and important to note that the average level of education has increased in the last seven years i.e. not only has there been an increase in an already exceptionally high matriculation rate, but there has also been an increase in post-matric qualifications and in university qualifications above a Bachelor's degree – there is an upward trend to more and higher qualifications amongst Jewish people in South Africa.
- Employment data has remained the same over the last seven years. Now and in 1998: paid employment accounts for almost 7 in every 10 Jewish adults in South Africa, with more working full-time (i.e. 5 in every 7 employed full-time and 2 part-time) and with the self-employed proportion being sizeable and not much lower than the employee proportion (i.e. 3 in every 7 self-employed and almost 4 in every 7 employees). Those not in paid employment are housewives/househusbands, retired or students.
- Virtually all adult Jewish South Africans are fluent in English as has been the case for a number of years. This is evident from data dating back to 1974 through to 1998 and 2005. In addition, approximately half are currently fluent in Afrikaans as well. However, fluency in Afrikaans has not shown consistent levels through the years. The level was a higher in 1998 than in 1974 but there has been a slight dip in the last seven years – but not down to the 1974 level. Perhaps it has dipped since 1998 because of English having been given prominence in the “new South Africa” while Afrikaans has been relegated a back seat. Hebrew went up sizeably from 1974 to 1998 and hints at a further increase since then – the fluency proportion is currently one-sixth of adult Jews – the increase over time is a positive finding but decisions must be made as to whether or not the proportion should ideally be stepped up. Whereas in 1974, 1 in every 5 could speak Yiddish fluently, by 1998 this had dropped to 1 in 10 and is still at that level today – whether or not the Jewish community in South

Africa wishes to or can do anything about keeping this part of Jewish heritage alive is an issue to be considered. Other languages obtained lower scores. The fact that the African languages score remains unchanged from 1998 (1 in 50 claim to speak an African language fluently) is interesting considering the “Africanisation” of South Africa within the context of the “new” South Africa. Perhaps the need to learn an African language has not been developed or encouraged since the focus has been on English as the main language for official purposes.

- As was the case in 1998, the majority of Jews, 18 years and older, living in South Africa were born in and are citizens of South Africa – a very different picture to what would have been the case 30 or 40 years ago when there was still a sizeable proportion from Eastern Europe and elsewhere. Again, as in 1998, out of every 10, there are: approximately 6 married, 1 widowed, 1 divorced/separated and 2 single/unmarried. The average household size is 2.94, with Johannesburg tending to show the highest and Durban the lowest number per household. More live in houses (60%), with the rest divided mainly between townhouses/cluster houses and flats/apartments. A small percentage live in hotels/aged homes/retirement complexes. The townhouse/cluster house proportion was decidedly higher in Johannesburg (particularly) and Pretoria than elsewhere, possibly related to greater security-consciousness. Home ownership has increased slightly from the already high 1998 proportion. Currently, 90% live in homes owned by them, their spouses or other family members, compared to 83% in 1998. The bulk of the Jewish population in South Africa has the protection of a medical aid or hospital plan i.e. 95% which is an improvement on the 87% for 1998.
- In this study: of the total Jewish adults, 18 years and older, 71% have children, irrespective of whether the children live with them or not. Considering only the adults who are or have ever been married, the proportion with children rises to 93%. Of those with children: 20% have children below primary school age, 35% have children at primary/middle/high school, 42% have children out of school but under 35 years of age and 34% have children over 35 years of age. This does not cover number of children per category. Also, there were multi-category mentions for those with children in more than one category.
- Although the majority of those with children 22 years and older have at least one of those children in South Africa (85%), the “big picture” includes the finding that of all those with children 22 years and older, 58% have at least one of those children living out of South Africa at present. This reduces the overall pool of children who will be there - viz. physically present - for their parents as the parents age. What is however interesting and reassuring for communal planning purposes is that, contrary to popular belief that more and more children are leaving their parents behind as they move on to other countries, indications are that in the fourteen years since 1991 there has been minimum change in the proportions with children elsewhere as opposed to in South Africa!

Schooling, with focus on types of schools

- When evaluating the data discussed below it is imperative to bear in mind that we are not talking about number of children at various types of schools. Instead we are discussing number of parents with children at various types of schools.
- Amongst Jewish parents there is an overwhelming preference for Jewish nursery schools/preschools. Of those with nursery school/preschool children, most have essentially chosen the Jewish option (96%). Also, of those with children who will be attending nursery school/preschool in the near future, most are also likely to select the Jewish option (94%) i.e. provided there is a Jewish nursery school/preschool school in the city of residence.
- The reasons for the overwhelming majority being likely to opt for the Jewish choice when their very young children are ready for preschool/nursery school is that they feel strongly that they want their children to learn about Judaism and the Jewish religion and they want them to have a Jewish education. Also, they essentially want them to be surrounded by “Jewishness” i.e. to be with Jewish children in a Jewish environment/atmosphere at that stage of their lives. Other reasons not related to the Jewish aspect featured far less prominently e.g. that Jewish preschools/nursery schools offer better teachers/curriculum or convenience of location. The very small proportion claiming that when the time comes they would select the non-Jewish option, indicated that the Jewish preschool/nursery school concept is either not important to them or not appealing - they do not like the insularity of Jewish schools and/or they will be choosing according to convenience of location or where their children’s friends will be going.
- With regard to schools their children currently attend, Jewish parents in South Africa have opted for Jewish schools for their children far more often than they have for other schools i.e. where Jewish schools are accessible. However, the tendency to choose the Jewish school option is greatest at the preschool/nursery school level i.e. as mentioned 96% of parents with children of this age have their children at a Jewish nursery school/preschool. The tendency decreases at or during the primary level (i.e. of those with children in primary school a total of 77% have them at a Jewish school) and decreases slightly more at or during the middle/high school level (i.e. of those with children at middle/high school 70% have them at a Jewish school). It is evident that the Jewish option tends to lose some of its drawing power as children move up through the schools i.e. from nursery school to primary and to middle/high school.
- Thus, overall Jewish schools are dominant and parents are far less likely to send their children to other types of primary or middle/high schools i.e. non-Jewish government schools, other schools which are not Jewish but cater for Jewish children (i.e. Crawford, Eden, Reddam House), non-Jewish private schools, other private colleges (e.g. Abbott’s, Boston, Damelin which cater for high school only). However, the potential for

erosion of proportions going to Jewish schools should not be underestimated. When comparing primary with middle/high scores there are hints of a slight move towards Crawford/Eden/Other colleges at the expense of Jewish schools. This applies not only to the sample as a whole but also within city i.e. when we consider only cities which have Jewish private schools as such (i.e. Johannesburg and Cape Town), the scores for attending Jewish schools are decidedly higher than for the sample as a whole but reflect the same overall trends i.e. a tendency for a decrease in making the Jewish choice as children move from nursery/preschool to primary to middle/high school (with the tendency for decrease being more dramatic in Cape Town than in Johannesburg). Also, in Johannesburg there are indications that for middle/high school compared with primary school, there is a slight move towards Crawford/Eden/Other colleges (e.g. Boston, Damelin) at the expense of Jewish dayschools and possibly also at the expense of non-Jewish government schools. Also, in Cape Town there are indications that for middle/high school compared with primary school there is a move to Reddam and colleges (e.g. Abbott's, Boston, Damelin) at the expense of Jewish dayschools. It should be noted that the "move" is not necessarily made as they start the next school level (e.g. not necessarily as they move from primary to high). It could be that they make the move during high school.

- The Durban and Pretoria samples were too small for detailed analysis but - subject to validation - there are the following preliminary indications for primary and middle/high schools combined: Pretoria schoolchildren go mainly to non-Jewish government schools and Crawford College, while their Durban counterparts are more likely to be at Crawford College than elsewhere.
- What should also be taken into account is that the school situation is not a static one e.g. while the survey was in progress Eden bought Crawford in Durban and Damelin High in Johannesburg.
- When moving away from schoolchildren and considering all Jewish South Africans, 18 years and older, we are talking about a wide range of respondents ranging in age from 18 years to over 75 years. It is therefore to have been expected that their school data would be very different to that which was reflected for schools being attended by children today! It is. They are more likely to have been schooled at non-Jewish government schools than elsewhere i.e. 57% finished school at a non-Jewish government school. Jewish private schools score far below i.e. 25%. Other options scored distinctly lower.
- What is interesting is that "non-Jewish private schools" feature to a similar extent for schoolchildren now (5%) as they did for their parents (6%) and as they do for the sample as a whole, irrespective of whether they have children or not (6%). Clearly non-Jewish private schools as such have not made major inroads into the Jewish sector. However, a separate category comprising specific types of private schools and colleges (some of which gear themselves to catering for Jewish children), whilst not reflecting major

- shares of the “schoolgoers market” at present, are not to be ignored as there are indications that they could be gaining ground.
- When presented (irrespective of whether they have children or not) with the hypothetical situation of having a child about to start primary school and having to choose a school for that child, the majority would choose a Jewish school (86%). Similarly, when presented (irrespective of whether they have children or not) with the hypothetical situation of having a child about to start high school and having to choose a school for that child, the majority would choose a Jewish school (82%). The overwhelming majority would choose a Jewish school irrespective of whether their (hypothetical) child were to be starting primary or high school “tomorrow”, but - once again - there is a hint that preference for Jewish schools is a touch more intense when primary schools are being considered. All cities strongly emphasise the Jewish option but the Johannesburg sector is most emphatic, with Pretoria tending to be second, Cape Town third and then Durban.
 - The stronger the Jewish feeling, the greater the likelihood that the Jewish option would be chosen. The converse is also true i.e. the milder the Jewish feeling, the greater the tendency to opt for the non-Jewish option. Nevertheless, because a far smaller proportion have mild Jewish feelings than have quite strong or strong Jewish feelings, the overall emphasis is far more on choosing Jewish than non-Jewish schools. Just as extent of Jewish feeling correlates with the tendency to opt for Jewish rather than non-Jewish schools, so too is there a trend related to religiosity i.e. the closer to Orthodoxy the greater the tendency to choose the Jewish option. Related to this, the greater the tendency to believe that the Torah is the actual word of God, the greater the tendency to choose the Jewish school option.
 - The type of school respondents personally finished school at is an important determinant as to whether or not they would send a child to a Jewish school if they had a child “starting school tomorrow”. Clearly, those who attended Jewish schools themselves are the sector most likely to choose the Jewish school option for their children. Those from non-Jewish government schools follow closely, while those from non-Jewish private schools are the least oriented towards sending their children to Jewish schools. Although there are distinct differences between the three sectors regarding this issue, all three sectors still focus far more on choosing the Jewish rather than non-Jewish option. It is interesting that parents who went to a government school themselves would primarily opt for a Jewish school for a child “tomorrow”. This is partly explained by the finding that government schools were more firmly entrenched in days gone by and Jewish schools less firmly entrenched. With time the Jewish school concept has been very successful in appealing to parents and thus drawing in their children as pupils. For interest, data from the 1974 Jewish Population Study - reworked as far as possible - illustrates the known fact

- that Jewish dayschool attendance was far lower in the mid-seventies than it is three decades later.
- When looking only at those with children at school, the type of school they would (hypothetically) choose for a child “tomorrow”, understandably, relates to the type of school they currently have children at. The relatively small proportion with children at a government school, are divided in their opinions as to whether they would choose a Jewish or non-Jewish school in this hypothetical situation. Thus, even amongst those who currently have children at government schools, approximately half are attracted to the Jewish school idea to some extent. This indicates that for this sector it is not always the Jewish school concept which is keeping them away from Jewish schools i.e. other factors also play a part. Those with children at Crawford/Eden/Reddam would hypothetically - if given only the Jewish vs. non-Jewish choice “tomorrow” - be far more likely to choose the Jewish option. With the indication that the Jewish aspect of a school is important to a large sector of these parents, it is likely that some of these parents were attracted to the degree of Jewish focus at Crawford/Reddam/Eden but some are likely to have made this choice on the basis of other reasons as well. Those with children at a Jewish school would overwhelmingly choose the Jewish option (again). They are obviously satisfied overall with the Jewish school concept.
 - For future success of Jewish schools in South Africa, it is important to bear in mind that those most likely to send their children to Jewish schools are those who went to Jewish schools themselves and those who already have a child/children at a Jewish school. Clearly, the more parents are encouraged to send their children to Jewish schools the more likely it is that additional children they have in the future will also go to these schools. Also, the more likely it is that their children will send their own children to Jewish schools. Attracting children to Jewish schools thus has a two-fold function i.e. it increases the proportion at Jewish schools now and it works towards perpetuating Jewish schools in South Africa for some time to come. The Crawford/Reddam/Eden concept should however also be factored into the equation – they play a part not only where there are no Jewish schools but also as a possible alternative when there are aspects of Jewish schools which parents and/or their children find unsatisfactory i.e. they could be seen to offer a Jewish element whilst possibly also offering some parents/children another advantage which they are looking for.
 - Those who chose a Jewish school at all for the (hypothetical) children, whether it be for primary and/or high, gave reasons centering clearly around three factors. What emerged as most important is that they want their children to be taught about Judaism/Jewish-related issues, with some adding that they want them to learn Hebrew. (A small sector added criticism in that they want schools to be more religious, with more of a Torah environment and cited Herzlia and King David as inadequate in this way). Another important factor is the Jewish environment/atmosphere/

culture/identity/values/continuity with the presence of other Jewish children playing a major part and some added that being in a Jewish school environment encourages the development of confidence, character, stability and independence. A small sector gave reasons relating to social and emotional issues hinging on the Jewish environment e.g. they mentioned that being at a Jewish school is a pleasant experience, the children are happy there, they have friends there, there is a caring atmosphere, and there are advantages in being part of a close-knit (Jewish) community, making it easier to communicate and monitor because of knowing the other parents and thus having a support system. It should however be noted that a small sector of those choosing the Jewish option spontaneously added unsolicited criticisms relating to “brattiness/materialism/competitiveness/cliqueryness” at Jewish schools. This, when coupled with some perceptions of the schools as being geared for brighter children and/or children without learning problems/disabilities, makes some children unhappy. The third factor underlying the choice of Jewish as opposed to non-Jewish schools also emerged sizeably but less frequently - it is not related to Jewish aspects as such and the main aspect emerging here is that Jewish schools offer better teachers/curriculum. At the core, their reasons for choosing the Jewish school option for their hypothetical children are thus similar to the reasons (as discussed earlier) given by those who would be likely to choose a Jewish nursery school/preschool for their children not yet attending such schools.

- Those who would choose a non-Jewish school for their (hypothetical) child, whether it be primary and/or high, also gave reasons relating to the three factors (or more specifically, variations of the three factors). Here however, the main factor is the one relating to the environment i.e. not wanting their children restricted to an insular Jewish environment separated from non-Jewish children, with some adding that they do not like the values and attitudes at Jewish schools e.g. the materialism, the competitiveness, “the brats”. With regard to social/emotional issues hinging on the environment at Jewish schools, some have problems with the parents of children at Jewish schools – they find them “cliquery” and “materialistic” and a few added that some children are happier at non-Jewish schools. It is interesting that a small sector of those who chose the Jewish option also spontaneously criticised similar aspects in spite of preferring the Jewish option overall. The second factor which those not choosing the Jewish option disliked about Jewish schools is the extent of emphasis on Jewish religion/Judaism. Thirdly, a small proportion gave reasons unrelated to Jewish aspects e.g. better location, cost advantages, better quality of teachers/curriculum, better sporting facilities at other schools and Jewish schools having disadvantages of lack of discipline/control by teachers, too much emphasis on academic achievement, not suiting all types of children since some do better at other schools.

- Reading between the lines and reviewing comments from each of the three factors, we see that negative perceptions about people occur to a noticeable extent. Such perceptions relate to the children who attend Jewish schools and - to some extent - their parents and teachers as well as the type of academic focus. These comments from those not opting for the Jewish choice are reinforced by the extra unsolicited negative comments made by a small percentage of those favouring Jewish schools. Further investigation is required to determine the extent to which such aspects really are problematic and, if necessary and possible, what can be done to rectify the situation.

Jewish Education

- When rating Jewish education in Jewish schools in South Africa, a decidedly positive picture emerges overall but with room for improvement. Looking only at Johannesburg and Cape Town, those in Johannesburg – comprising a major proportion of the sample - set the overall tone by being divided in their opinions as to whether Jewish education in South Africa is very good or fairly good, whereas the Cape Town sector focused more on Jewish education in Jewish schools being very good. It should be borne in mind that not all were rating the same type of Jewish school i.e. whereas in Cape Town ratings were likely to be primarily based on Herzlia, in Johannesburg a range of Jewish schools may have been considered (with some being very right wing in religious terms) and yet the Johannesburg sector was not as positive as the Cape Town sector. A review of results within religious practice sector shows that: Reform/Progressive is more positive than are other sectors about the quality of Jewish education at Jewish schools in South Africa, while the Strictly Orthodox are the least likely of the four religious practice sectors to focus on “very good” but their overall emphasis is still heavily on “good” rather than “poor”. Here again we wish to emphasise that a range of Jewish schools underly the ratings, particularly in Johannesburg where the bulk of the Strictly Orthodox reside.
- Now, as was the case seven years ago, virtually all consider it important for Jewish children to attend some form of formal Jewish education classes. In addition, the majority feel that the greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater the knowledge about Judaism. They are not quite as convinced that the greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the stronger the Jewish identity, but here too they tend to agree more than disagree that the number of years do play a part in intensifying the extent of Jewish identity. Although still giving Jewish education the benefit of the doubt in that more agree than disagree, respondents are not quite so sure that the greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater commitment there is to a Jewish life in adulthood.
- Opinions are divided on whether “Jewish education insulates children from the reality of the world around them”. Those whose children are not at Jewish schools are more likely to agree that Jewish education is insulating

but even they do not move distinctly to the “agree” side. In this regard, parents with children at Crawford/Eden/Reddam House - schools which cater for Jewish children to some extent - tend to score closer to parents of children at Jewish schools than to those with children at non-Jewish schools or colleges. Again, as in 1998, opinions are divided on whether or not Jewish education insulates children from the reality of the world around them.

- Those with schoolchildren - particularly those with children at Jewish schools - show slightly above average belief that the greater the number of years in Jewish education classes: the greater the knowledge about Judaism; the stronger the Jewish identity; and the greater the commitment to Jewish life in adulthood. On the other hand, the sectors with children at non-Jewish schools hint at below average belief with regard to these statements. The Crawford/Eden/Reddam set generally veer between the Jewish and the non-Jewish school sectors with regard to these factors.
- There are some intercity differences. Broadly-speaking, Johannesburg shows above average focus on the importance of formal Jewish education and the resultant benefits but with indications that there is still some room for improvement e.g. as regards Jewish education influencing greater commitment to Jewish life; Pretoria shows above average belief in the importance of Jewish education but tends to reflect below average conviction that such education is as beneficial as it should be; Cape Town shows below average conviction as to the importance or benefits of such education; Durban reflects more positive scores than does Cape Town as to the importance of formal Jewish education and tends towards the above average side as regards formal Jewish education having a positive influence on Jewish identity and commitment to Jewish life in adulthood.
- Clearly, the milder the Jewish feeling the greater the likelihood that Jewish education will be perceived as insulating children from the reality of the world around them. Similarly, the move from the Strictly Orthodox category towards the Secular category is accompanied by an increase in the perception that Jewish education insulates children from the reality of the world around them. The stronger the Jewish feeling, the greater the extent of agreement with the importance of formal Jewish education and the greater the belief in the benefits of Jewish education. Similarly, the closer to Strictly Orthodox, the greater the extent of agreement with the importance of formal Jewish education and the greater the belief in the benefits of Jewish education.
- In the main, the 1998 survey and the 2005 survey indicated that respondents perceived knowledge about Judaism as increasing with an increase in the number of years spent in Jewish education classes. However, they were (in 1998 and 2005) a touch less certain about Jewish identity increasing according to time spent on Jewish education and still less certain about commitment to Jewish life in adulthood increasing accordingly. Nevertheless, for these two factors also, the emphasis was distinctly more on the positive side.

Political Party Affiliation

- Jewish people in South Africa are essentially Democratic Alliance (DA) supporters. This applies in total and when looked at within each city and each age group. Overall, approximately two-thirds claimed to have voted DA in the 2004 elections, with no other party scoring above 3% (i.e. ANC). In fact, excluding those who did not vote and those who gave no answer as to who they voted for, 9 in every 10 voted for the DA. It is important to note that there was sizeable voter apathy i.e. 14% did not vote though they were qualified to. The extent of voter apathy is similar throughout the cities, with Durban tending to show a higher proportion. Other than the DA, the ANC is the only party with a noticeable (but very low) score. The ANC hinted at doing better in Cape Town than in other cities but the difference was too small to be regarded as statistically significant and thus requires further checking.
- The sizeable voter apathy in the 2004 elections is greater amongst the age categories under 45 years of age, but is particularly apparent in the 18-24 year age group. Amongst 18-24 year olds, one in every three (33%) claimed not to have voted though qualified to.
- The 2005 survey gives the impression that there has not been much change in the voting pattern from 1994 to 2004 i.e. it reflects the DP (the forerunner of the DA) as the only party featuring sizeably in 1994. However, there are memory-related inaccuracies related to asking respondents in 2005 how they voted in 1994 (eleven years earlier). Clearly, by the time the 2005 survey was conducted there was distinct blurring of recall related to voting in the 1994 elections. Because of the part played by memory and resultant blurred recall, for insight into the 1994 election, the 1998 data, based on a 4 year gap, is likely to be more reliable than the 2005 data based on an 11 year gap. Comparison between the two sets of data for 1994 shows that the National Party (NP) featured more in the 1994 voting pattern of South African Jews than Jews today remember/are aware of! Perhaps it is not memory alone but also a possibility that some may not want to recall or admit now that they voted NP in 1994.
- Also, an extra factor preventing the 2005 survey from giving a true reflection of voting in 1994, is that some of those who are currently young adults were too young to have voted in 1994.
- The 1998 data for evaluation of the 1994 voting pattern, shows that although the Democratic Party–DP (44%), clearly received far more votes than did the National Party–NP (24%), the National Party vote was still sizeable. The African National Congress (ANC) was in third place with 8% and all other parties scored below these. By the time the 2004 elections took place there had been a clear move to the Democratic Alliance (DA). Voter apathy seemed to be less of a problem in 1998 than in 2004.

South Africa: Racial Prejudice, Antisemitism and Anti-Zionism

- With regard to racial prejudice in South Africa: Comparative findings reflect a positive trend. Whereas in 1998 there was a greater tendency to perceive racial prejudice in South Africa as having increased in the preceding 5 years than as having decreased, the 2005 situation shows more emphasis on a decrease than on an increase in the last 5 years. However, there is still a way to go! Ideally the majority should perceive racial prejudice in South Africa as decreasing while scores for increasing/staying static should be minimal.
- There have been no dramatic changes with regard to perceptions of the extent of antisemitism in South Africa. Although there are hints of a very small decrease, essentially the score patterns for 1998 and 2005 are very similar. There is and was focus on the extent as having “remained the same”. However, the meaning of “remained the same” takes a positive turn when reviewed in the light of additional data which shows that in South Africa, antisemitism is now and was in 1998 regarded mainly as a minor problem. Nevertheless, even a minor problem of this type cannot be ignored and ideally the “not a problem at all” score should be the largest. Furthermore, even if it is perceived mainly as a minor problem in South Africa, this should be seen against the background of perceptions relating to antisemitism the world generally i.e. South Africans currently perceive antisemitism as being a major problem “in the world generally”. In fact, comparison with 1998 data shows that it is perceived now as far more of a problem in the world generally than it was 7 years ago.
- Personal experiences of antisemitism decreased between 1998 and 2005 i.e. in 1998 almost two-thirds claimed to have experienced antisemitism in the last 5 years, whereas in 2005 less than half claimed to have had such experiences in the last 5 years. Although currently (2005 survey) those who have not experienced antisemitism in the last 5 years, outnumber those who have, it cannot be denied that the proportion claiming to have experienced it is still too high. Those who claim to have had such experiences primarily spoke of “hearing derogatory remarks about Jews” and “having been called a Jew in a derogatory way”. The types of antisemitism primarily experienced are essentially the same for 1998 and 2005.
- Anti-Zionism emerges as being more of a problem in South Africa than is antisemitism. The level of anti-Zionism is problematic i.e. almost 9 in every 10 regard it as a problem with almost 4 of these saying it is a major problem. Although the scores tend more to the minor problem side, the major problem score is sizeable. Furthermore, Anti-Zionism is definitely perceived as having increased in South Africa in the last 5 years. The significance of this intensifies when this is viewed within the context of perceptions relating to anti-Zionism in the world generally i.e. South African Jews distinctly perceive anti-Zionism within the rest of the world as being a problem and the emphasis is distinctly on it being a major problem. A check on other data breakdowns shows that those with a

- strong attachment to Israel and also the Strictly Orthodox, detect more anti-Zionism in South Africa than does the sample as a whole. Also, they tend to be more likely than the sample as a whole to consider anti-Zionism in South Africa and (more so) anti-Zionism in the world as being a major problem.
- Muslims were far and away considered to be the group posing the greatest threat to Jews in South Africa. An overwhelming proportion (82%) spontaneously referred to Muslims in this context. This conclusion applies to the sample as a whole and to most demographic breakdowns. In fact, some of the other categories (mentioned primarily by those in Johannesburg) also comprise a sizeable Muslim element e.g. Pagad, Hamas and Arabs. Mentions of Pagad are interesting since it was primarily Cape Town based but has not been noticeably active in the last few years. The organisation obviously made so strong an impression that it is still perceived as being a sizeable threat to Jews in South Africa. Other categories obtained very low scores as regards seeming to be a threat to Jews in South Africa. Comparison of these results with those from 1998 show that 7 years ago the Muslim score was – in essence – similar i.e. the score for “Muslim” was a bit lower but the scores for Pagad, Hamas and Arabs were higher. It is interesting that the perceived Afrikaner/right wing Afrikaner “threat” dropped from 17% in 1998 to 4% in 2005.
 - Jews in South Africa unequivocally feel that the government allows them religious freedom. All age sectors reflected positive scores, with a tendency for the scores to increase with increase in age. All cities reflected positive scores as did all religious subgroups. They are however not quite as certain about the government’s attitude to Jews - the majority were divided in their opinions between the claim that the South African government is never hostile to Jews and the claim that the government is sometimes hostile to Jews. The overall findings tend to apply to most subgroups but Secular Jews tend not to reflect opinions which are divided – instead they tend to place more emphasis on the government as “never” being hostile to Jews. The South African government’s attitude to Israel emerged less positively than did the government’s attitude to Jews. In the main, the government’s attitude to Israel was regarded as “sometimes fair”. Most subgroups also focused heavily on “sometimes fair”. The South African media was regarded as being even less fair to Israel than is the South African government, but there was more focus on “sometimes fair” than “never fair”. There were no sizeable differences between the cities in this regard. Claims that the media are never fair to Israel increase with the strength of Jewish feeling, also with the strength of attachment to Israel and with the tendency towards Orthodoxy. 18-24 year olds were less convinced than other age groups about the media being fair to Israel.

South Africa : Quality of life, Overall situation, Jewish community

- Although there is undoubtedly a great deal of room for improvement, it cannot be denied that the 'new' South Africa has come a long way since 1998! In 1998 responses veered more towards disagreeing that the 'new' South Africa had benefited the people of South Africa as a whole, whereas in 2005 the responses veer more towards agreeing that there have been such benefits. Intensification of such benefits would, of course, be desirable e.g. elsewhere it emerged that virtually all Jewish adults in South Africa feel that the government should do more for the people of South Africa. With regard to the 'new' South Africa having benefited "me", the 2005 survey reflects divided opinions on this issue, but the results are more positive than in 1998 where almost two-thirds claimed that the 'new' South Africa had not benefited them. With regard to the 'new' South Africa having benefited the Jewish community, the 2005 results showing divided opinions were - once again - an improvement on the 1998 results where results tended to the negative side. Similarly (and more intensely) perceptions that their quality of life in South Africa will improve over the next five years" are more favourable than they were in 1998 i.e. opinions are divided now and a more optimistic finding would be preferable, but there can be no doubt that the optimism level has risen since 1998 when almost two-thirds disagreed that the quality of their lives would improve in the next five years.
- The 25-34 year age group is more positive about their future in South Africa in the next five years than is any other age group and is the age group most positive about the benefits of the 'new' South Africa. Johannesburg respondents hint at being more optimistic about the next five years than are those from other cities. The Strictly Orthodox sector is more likely than other sectors to feel that the 'new' South Africa has benefited the Jewish community but they do not feel this strongly. For all other factors the Reform/Progressive sector reflected more positive scores.
- Additional questions, covering similar aspects but slightly differently, were asked in the 2005 survey indicating that opinions veer to the positive side i.e. twice as many think that the overall situation in South Africa has improved since the new South Africa began in 1994 than think it has deteriorated; three-quarters think that since 1994 the overall situation for the Jewish community in South Africa has not deteriorated, with a tendency for a bit more emphasis on the situation having remained the same/unchanged for the Jewish people than on it having improved. A lower proportion (one-quarter) think it has deteriorated.
- Rating of South Africa on specific factors shows a dramatic improvement in perceptions in the last 7 years. Jewish adults in South Africa are far more positive about South Africa now than they were in 1998. With regard to the economic situation, there has been a definite swing from primarily rating it as "poor" to mainly rating it as "good". This is an exceptionally positive finding. In another section of the study there was further

agreement that the South African economy is improving. Although personal safety should ideally be improved since it is perceived as being problematic (with the rating emphasis more on the negative side), perceptions are nevertheless far less negative than they were in 1998. Also, although opinions are currently divided regarding the political situation in the country, there has been a distinct improvement in perceptions since 1998 when the political situation was viewed in a distinctly negative light. Health Care Provision scored negatively in 1998 and although it is reflected less negatively now, it still emerges in a controversial light and needs attention. What applies to health care applies also to the education system i.e. it emerges in a less negative light now than it did in 1998 but it emerges in a controversial light nevertheless. The improved perceptions are encouraging but it cannot be ignored that the health care and education systems require attention. Incidentally when evaluating responses to these two factors, it should be borne in mind that a major difference is perceived between what the government and the private sector offer in this regard. Responses are not all based on the same set of criteria. Some may have rated on the basis of the overall situation; some on a combination of private and government facilities; and some on government facilities only. Current ratings would have been lower had they been based only on government facilities. Similarly, ratings would have been higher had they been based only on what the private sector offers. This cautionary note applies to 1998 and 2005 findings.

- In both 1998 and 2005, a very high rating was given to having a personal family and friendship network in South Africa. This is understandable since the survey was conducted amongst those living in South Africa and most of them were born in South Africa.
- Those who voted ANC in the 2004 elections rated all South Africa related factors more positively than did those who voted DA.
- Those in Johannesburg and Cape Town are more concerned about personal safety than those in Cape Town and Durban. Although, overall, improvements in personal safety have been detected since 1998, it is still considered to be a problem. Also, virtually all South African Jewish adults undoubtedly perceive crime and corruption in South Africa as major problems. Overall, crime, corruption and personal safety issues emerge as severe problems in South Africa. Although Jewish South Africans claim to be more likely to stay in South Africa with known problems rather than move to another country which has its problems too, they would prefer not to have the negative issues to contend with. In the main they do not disagree that “there are always teething problems when a new government takes over so all things considered things will work out well in South Africa”. However, by not agreeing intensely with the statement, they show cautious optimism.
- In the main, Jewish people in South Africa claim not to have suffered because of affirmative action, yet they more often viewed the idea of affirmative action in a negative than in a positive light!

Future for Jews in South Africa

- Although the findings with regard to the future of Jews in South Africa are not as satisfactory as they could be, South African Jews are far more positive about the future of the Jewish community in South Africa than they were in 1998! In 1998 the South African Jewish community was mainly regarded as an ageing community but in 2005 we see divided opinions rather than clearcut negative perceptions, thus showing less pessimism now than 7 years ago. This is a step forward. A further move towards distinctly clearcut optimism about the potential for an age-balanced Jewish community would be an advantage. Tying in with this, in 1998 it was overwhelmingly claimed that under 30 year old Jews do not see a future for themselves in South Africa yet 7 years later (in 2005) there is a dramatic drop in the extent of agreement with that concept. A further drop in agreement would, of course, be desirable as this would indicate intensification of the belief that the Jewish community in South Africa will be age-balanced rather than ageing in the future.
- What is interesting and particularly reassuring for the future of South African Jewry is that those who are older are the ones who are more pessimistic with regard to these two issues, while those who are younger are less so i.e. the older the over 44 year olds are, the more likely they are to think that “the South African Jewish community is an ageing community” and the more inclined they are to consider it “likely that most Jews under 30 years do not see a future for themselves in South Africa”. Conversely, younger Jewish people (i.e. 18-44 year olds and even more so under 35 year olds) are less likely than their older counterparts to think that those under 30 years of age do not see a future for themselves in South Africa and, correspondingly, under 45 year olds are less likely than their older counterparts to perceive the South African community as an ageing community. This finding bodes well for the future of the South African Jewish community. It would be decidedly more disconcerting if younger people were the ones more emphatic about the community being an ageing community and about not seeing a future for themselves in the country! Having said this, there is definitely room for greater optimism in all age sectors with regard to the future of under 30 year olds in South Africa and the future age balance of the Jewish community in South Africa.
- In 1998 there was more of a tendency to disagree that there will still be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa in 20 years, whereas in 2005 there is a sizeable move to the agreement side. There is, of course, still work to be done to intensify this perception, since a sizeable sector are still not convinced of a positive scenario in 20 years time.
- That the only long term future for Jews is in Israel is a complex statement because it incorporates attitudes to Israel and (indirectly) whether there is a future for Jews in South Africa. Although differences between the 1998 and 2005 results are not dramatic, there is a tendency for more disagreement in 2005 than in 1998 with the idea of Israel being the only

- country for Jews to live in in the long term. This could mean greater satisfaction with South Africa now and/or a less positive attitude to Israel. That there is a more positive attitude to South Africa now cannot be denied. Attitudes to Israel may also play a part.
- Another complex factor is “Only the Orthodox section of the community will survive as recognisably Jewish”. It incorporates attitudes to the Orthodox sector/Orthodoxy, perceptions of their attitudes to living in South Africa, perceptions of attitudes of the non-Orthodox to living in South Africa, underlying implications of non-Orthodox sectors of the community veering away from Judaism etc. Results for 2005 do not differ dramatically from those for 1998 and the interpretation is complicated by the complexity. However, in 1998 those who would commit themselves were more likely to disagree with the idea that only the Orthodox sector will survive as recognisably Jewish in South Africa and in 2005 this tendency was intensified i.e. more of a move towards thinking that it will not be only the Orthodox sector of the community which will survive as recognisably Jewish.
 - Although the Strictly Orthodox are inclined to think that the only long-term future for Jews is in Israel and that only the Orthodox sector of the community will survive as recognisably Jewish, what they feel particularly strongly is that there will still be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa in 20 years time. Furthermore, they are inclined to think that the Jewish community in South Africa is not ageing and fading but instead will survive by maintaining a balanced age presence. Essentially, the Strictly Orthodox are more optimistic than are other sectors about the future for South African Jewry, but it is the Orthodox sector which they feel more optimistic about.
 - The Reform/Progressive sector feel to an above average extent (even if not to the extent that the Strictly Orthodox do) that in 20 years time there will be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa. Understandably they tend not to think that only the Orthodox sector of the community will survive as recognisably Jewish. What the Reform/Progressives believe more than do other sectors is that the Jewish community in South Africa is ageing. This intensity may be contributed to by the finding that the Progressive/Reform sector itself tends to be ageing rather than drawing in young people. This will be discussed further on.

Migrants who have returned to South Africa

- In the last 24 years most Jews currently living in South Africa made no attempt to emigrate. Only 8% had emigrated (but then returned) in the 24 year period since 1982. Those who left but returned in that time period are now more likely to be in the 25-54 year age category than younger or older. Although those in Cape Town show a slightly greater tendency to have left but returned, Johannesburg has a much higher proportion of Jews and thus - in real terms - almost twice as many of those who left but returned came from Johannesburg as came from Cape Town.

- Israel tops the list of countries which they emigrated to but returned from and other countries featuring sizeably were USA, Australia and the UK. Canada scored below these and other countries still lower. These findings relating to countries must be interpreted with care. The study only covers those who emigrated but returned and are now resident in South Africa again. We do not have data relating to the proportion who emigrated to but did not return from each country, nor what the satisfaction rate is for each country i.e. the extent to which each country is able to hold onto those who go to live there.
- When comparing 1998 and 2005 data for the questions relating to “emigrating and returning” it should be noted that we are drawing from two periods which are not mutually exclusive. 1975-1998 and 1982-2005 overlap for 1982-1998. Comparable scores in the 1998 survey for the preceding 24 year period showed that 87% did not “emigrate and return”, while 13% did. The hint that emigration accompanied by subsequent returning could have decreased in the last few years requires investigation and/or checking within other more specific data available to Jewish community organisations.
- Those who left-but-returned frequently mentioned that they had left because of the situation in South Africa i.e. an overall concern about the future of South Africa, concerns about personal safety and concerns relating to their children (as regards quality of life, safety and education). They also left to further their careers and/or they wanted to improve their financial situation, with a small proportion citing the South African economy as a reason. A smaller sector of reasons related to leaving to be with family or friends, but particularly family. Some were Zionist/wanted to live in Israel and a small sector spoke of personal reasons and/or wanting to experience other countries and lifestyles etc.
- However, they came back and essentially found that the grass was not greener elsewhere. Undoubtedly there was disappointment with regard to making it careerwise and financially in other countries. This was the main reason given for returning. In essence those who gave this answer claimed that South Africa offers them better career and business opportunities and a better standard of living than did the other countries where it was difficult to find suitable jobs/occupations and thus difficult to manage financially. Next in line, but also very important, is the finding that the presence of family back in South Africa was a major drawcard. Third in line, but also featuring strongly, are generally positive attitudes to South Africa which they described as a country: they love, are familiar with, they have their roots in, which is their home and a few added that it has/offers a better climate, better education for children, an easier life. Personal/other reasons for returning feature next in line but at a much lower level of importance.

- Likelihood of moving within and from South Africa in the future
- Overall South African Jews show a decrease in the tendency to consider moving from their current abode. Now as compared to 1998 more claim that they are not likely to move from their homes in the next three years and if (hypothetically-speaking) they were to move, this move is far less likely than in 1998 to be to another country i.e. it is far more likely to be to an address in the city where they currently live. With regard to moving to another city, Capetonians are the most emphatic about not doing so, (even if not as emphatic about this as they were in 1998). Those who did specify a city they would move to, more often mentioned Johannesburg than any other city/place. Those from Johannesburg also reflected a sizeable “will not move” score (higher, in fact than in 1998) but they are less emphatically bound to their current city of abode than are their Cape Town counterparts. In fact, those from Johannesburg are more likely to specify Cape Town as a city they would move to than to claim that they will not move from Johannesburg! Durban respondents found it easy (as they did in 1998) to mention a city they would move to. Only a small proportion said that they would not move. A high proportion opted for Cape Town, with Johannesburg next in line as a choice. Those from Pretoria readily mentioned a city they would move to (more readily than in 1998) - their main choice was Johannesburg, with Cape Town next in line.
 - Irrespective of whether they would move or not, all mentioned the countries they would be likely to move to if they were to move. Australia is the most popular choice, with 31% regarding it as their first choice and a total of 61% placing it in the top three. The USA and Israel tend to share the second position with 21% and 23% respectively for first choice and 55% and 51% respectively for being in the top three. United Kingdom is next in line but at a noticeably lower level, with 13% giving it as their first choice and a total of 38% mentioning it as one of their top three choices. Other countries follow decidedly below. There are some age group differences e.g. amongst 18-24 year olds the UK and the USA score above average, 35-54 year olds are even more emphatic about choosing Australia than is the sample as a whole and those over 54 years of age emphasise Israel to an above average extent.
 - Changes in the last 7 years relating to countries they would hypothetically move to - if they were to move to another country - were minimal. There is however a hint that Israel has slipped slightly as a country to emigrate to. This should be checked on for validity rather than ignored i.e. Australia, Israel and the USA occupied the top three slots in 1998 and still do in 2005, with the UK next in line. However, the difference is that while Australia and Israel shared the top slot in 1998, Australia has risen above Israel to first place now and Israel has moved down to share the next slot with the USA. It should be borne in mind that these results are hypothetical i.e. all respondents (irrespective of whether they would consider emigrating or not) indicated where they would move to **if** they

- were to move. Nevertheless, the findings should be investigated further where relevant.
- For a better fix on likelihood of staying in or leaving South Africa, a further question was asked relating to how likely they actually are to continue living in South Africa and/or to leave to live somewhere else in the next five years. Responses were overwhelmingly oriented towards continuing to live in South Africa. Overall these results bode extremely well for South African Jewry. This particularly positive finding is enhanced dramatically by the major improvement in this regard since 1998 – an exceptionally positive shift has taken place i.e. South African Jews are clearly far more oriented now - than they were in 1998 - towards staying in South Africa rather than leaving. Whereas in 1998, 44% claimed that they would be very likely to remain in South Africa in the next five years, the 2005 figure is an astounding 79%! Also, the combined “very/fairly likely to stay” score was 71% in 1998 but has risen to an exceptionally positive 92% in 2005. This obviously means that the likelihood of leaving scores have dropped dramatically i.e. In 1998, 12% claimed that they would be very likely to leave South Africa in the next five years and 15% said fairly likely. In 2005, only 3% say that they are very likely to leave in the next five years and only 4% say that they are fairly likely to do so! The particularly positive 2005 findings are enhanced by the exceptionally positive shift that has taken place since 1998.
 - Incidentally, those (in 2005) claiming that they are very/fairly likely to stay are well-balanced in accordance with the total sample profile. Amongst those likely to leave, there is an above average proportion of 18-34 year olds but the likely-to-leave sector is so small that it does not upset the age balance of those likely to stay.
 - When the sample as a whole (most of whom do not intend emigrating and were speaking hypothetically) discussed countries they would be most likely to consider emigrating to, they positioned Australia first, with the close second position shared by USA and Israel, and then the UK followed. Looking at those who actually said that they are very/fairly likely to leave South Africa, they tend to reflect the same countries in the top four slots BUT they show Australia and the USA as scoring above Israel and the UK i.e. Israel emerges less favourably amongst those very/fairly likely to leave South Africa than it did when the sample as a whole was talking about where they would hypothetically emigrate to.
 - Bearing sample and question differences in mind, we compared the 2005 and 1998 data with data from 1973 and 1974 studies to check on proportions likely to remain in South Africa or emigrate and found that, broadly-speaking, there is reinforcement of conclusions relating to how very positive the prevailing attitudes are towards staying in the country i.e. very positive in absolute terms and unquestionably more positive than in 1973, 1974 and 1998!

- Reasons for wanting to continue living in South Africa
- Wanting to stay close to family is the most powerful reason underlying the heavy current orientation towards remaining in South Africa in the next five years, with wanting to stay close to friends playing a much smaller part but bolstering up the overall “holding power” of people. Another powerful reason for Jewish people wanting to stay in South Africa rather than emigrate, is their underlying emotional attachment to South Africa and to what it has to offer – this conglomerate factor comprises a variety of facets covering South Africa being their home, the place where they were born, where they have their roots, the place they love and are settled in, where they like the climate and “wonderful” lifestyle/quality of life, with some adding that they want to play an active role in the future of South Africa. The financial/business/career factor is also a very important and powerful reason underlying the desire to stay in South Africa and is also spread over a number of categories i.e. feeling bound to South Africa because of having an income, financial security and/or a career/business in the country, whilst feeling hesitant about going elsewhere e.g. fears about starting a career or business elsewhere because of concern that their skills/business/ability/occupation might not be easily transferable **or** being too old to start again, concern about not being able to get enough money out of the country because of perceptions relating to “currency control” and/or the Rand exchange, concern about having to drop their standard of living overseas. All other factors featured far below the main three factors discussed above i.e. some spoke about staying to educate their children, some mentioned Jewish-related aspects (viz. the Jewish way of life, the “Yiddishkeit” and the unique Jewish community in South Africa, obligation to the Jewish community/Rabbi) and some touched on other aspects e.g. health/mobility problems keep them here, wanting to be buried in South Africa/next to a spouse.
 - Comparison of reasons given in this study with those given in 1998 show that then and now, attachment to and presence of family in South Africa is shown to have very powerful “holding power” for those likely to remain in the country, with friends featuring far less prominently but contributing to the immensely important “holding power of people” factor. What is different is that whilst underlying emotional attachment to South Africa and to what it has to offer emerges powerfully now, in 1998 it did not feature as strongly i.e. there was less likelihood then than now to emphasise emotional attachment to South Africa. Another difference is that the financial/business/career factor which currently emerges as another very important and powerful reason for Jewish people wanting to stay in South Africa, also featured strongly in 1998 (i.e. more strongly than the emotional attachment factor), but with an important change of emphasis i.e. In 2005 the emphasis is more on positive reasons for staying than on the negatively-stated elements related to leaving (i.e. more emphasis on not wanting to leave because of career/business and/or financial benefits/stability here and less emphasis on difficulties related to starting again

elsewhere). In 1998 there was heavy emphasis on negatively-stated aspects (i.e. financial/age/career/occupation-related difficulties of going elsewhere). Thus whereas in 1998 there was more emphasis on staying in South Africa because of hesitancy about and fear of starting elsewhere, now there is more emphasis on financial/career benefits of staying. This ties in with perceptions of the economy having improved since 1998. Whereas in 1998 the economic situation and exchange rate could have held some back from thinking of emigrating, the improved situation is likely to be impacting positively on the financial/business/career factor and is important to a sizeable sector of those likely to stay in the country now.

Danger points or thresholds to be monitored in South Africa

- No matter how attached those very/fairly likely to stay in South Africa are, they would not stay unconditionally. Clearly, there are factors which (hypothetically speaking) could make them change their minds. It is imperative to take note of these factors and to be aware that if a scenario incorporating these negative factors were to begin to play itself out, this could affect the very strong bond which an exceptionally large sector of Jews in South Africa have with the country thus threatening the stability of the South African Jewish community. There are danger points or thresholds to be monitored.
- Most important is the crime/personal safety/militancy/anarchy/corruption factor i.e. They could begin to feel that they want to leave if crime and threats to personal/physical safety were to escalate to levels they felt they could not live with, if there were to be complete lawlessness/anarchy/chaos/absence of democracy, if there were to be a threat to whites or militancy towards whites as in Zimbabwe, if there were to be large-scale political unrest. A small sector added that increased corruption could also be a factor. Issues relating to Jews also emerged as being likely to affect their desire to stay in the country i.e. if the government and/or legislation were to make it difficult for Jews in South Africa and if there was heightened antisemitism/persecution of Jews. Some added that they would entertain thoughts of leaving if the Jewish community dwindles too much or if the standard of Jewish education for their children became a problem. Family/friends/relationship issues received sizeable mentions, with the emphasis being mainly on leaving to be with family i.e. they are very/fairly likely to continue living in South Africa but if important family members left the country they might wish to do so too. Quality of life also emerged sizeably i.e. they might consider leaving if the quality of life were to deteriorate substantially and/or if the government or legislation made it difficult for them. Some added that deterioration of health services and a drop in the standard of education for children could also affect their desire to stay in the country. Career/financial/business/economy-related issues also featured sizeably e.g. if the economy in South Africa deteriorated, if a good career or financial opportunity arose elsewhere, if affirmative action reached a problematic stage, if job opportunities were to decrease.

Reasons underlying likelihood of leaving

- Amongst those who in 1998 claimed to be very/fairly likely to leave South Africa in the next 5 years, concern about personal safety was cited as the key reason for wanting to leave South Africa to live elsewhere. This major concern, viewed in association with sizeable concerns about the future of South Africa and about education for children, highlighted that for those very/fairly likely to consider leaving South Africa, the heavy level of concern and anxiety prevalent was a driving force underlying their desire to live elsewhere. Two additional factors also featured sizeably in 1998 i.e. the career/finance/economy factor (i.e. the desire to improve their situation regarding one or more of the facets comprising this factor) and the desire to move to be with family.
- In 2005, the small proportion (far smaller than in 1998 and small in absolute terms as well) who claim to be very/fairly likely to leave the country, cite similar reasons but far less intensely. They still speak of personal safety concerns and concerns about the future of South Africa as major reasons underlying their likelihood of leaving **but** they do not express this as strongly as they did in 1998. In addition concern about education of children features minimally now. Leaving to be with family is also a key factor underlying the likelihood of leaving. The career/finances/economy factor emerges (in 2005) as an important reason for moving elsewhere, particularly the “career move” facet. Incidentally, Jewish and/or Israel issues were also mentioned but far less often than other factors, even though they featured a bit more than in 1998. e.g. “there is no strong Jewish community here/dwindling Jewish community/want to be in a bigger Jewish community.....I want to live in/feel at home in Israel.....religious reasons.... standard/quality of Jewish education”.
- Can we presume that those who claim that they will leave will be lost to South African Jewry if indeed they do leave? Or is there a chance that they will return? Permanence was mentioned more often than the return option i.e. twice as many said that their move would be permanent as said that they would possibly return to South Africa. It cannot however be ignored that some did not see their move as necessarily permanent.

Israel

- As mentioned, approximately half referred to Israel as one of the top three countries they would consider emigrating to if they (hypothetically-speaking) were to emigrate and approximately half did not select it. The major reason for not being likely to select it is lack of familiarity and/or lack of identification with the language, the people, the lifestyle and the country as such. Within this factor, the facet relating to wanting to go to an English-speaking country is of particular importance. Several other factors also emerged as important. One of these is the current situation in Israel particularly as regards personal safety and also as regards the overall political situation. In addition there is reluctance to go to a country where they anticipate problems relating to financial, career, job or standard of

- living issues i.e. they anticipate it being: difficult to get jobs in Israel, financially easier to live in other countries where the economy is better and where it is less expensive to live, more suitable in other countries for their careers/skills/business, difficult to maintain their standard of living in Israel. Wanting to be with family (particularly) or friends who live elsewhere/not in Israel is another important factor.
- All respondents were required to rate Israel on a range of factors using a scale ranging from very good through to very poor. Today and 7 years ago, Israel's scores for health care provision and education emerge as its most positive scores. There has not been much change over the seven year period in this regard i.e. Israel is perceived as performing consistently well with regard to these factors. However, it should be noted that in 1998 and in 2005 a sizeable sector felt unable to rate these two factors. Personal safety is perceived as having deteriorated. Whereas in 1998 it was – on average – regarded as veering towards the “good” side, the score for this factor has dropped to be closer to the midpoint of the scale. The economic situation is also perceived as having deteriorated. According to perceptions, the economic situation in Israel was veering a bit towards the “good” side of the scale in 1998 but it is being pulled more towards the midpoint now. The political situation is now, and was in 1998, the lowest scoring factor with the scores centering primarily around “poor”. With regard to “personal family and friends living there”, Israel scores relatively well, even if not quite as well as it did in 1998.
 - Comparing current results for Israel with those discussed earlier for South Africa, shows Israel faring well and distinctly better than South Africa regarding perceptions about the education system and health care provision. For South Africa these two factors emerged in a controversial light, whereas for Israel the results were positive amongst those able to rate Israel on these factors. As regards personal family and friendship network, Israel scored quite well but South Africa fared far better – understandably since the respondents live in South Africa and the majority are South African. Economic situation was rated more positively for South Africa than it was for Israel. For the personal safety situation, neither country emerged particularly well but South Africa emerged less positively than did Israel. Neither of the countries was perceived as offering a positive political situation but the situation in Israel was rated more negatively.
 - Essentially there has been no distinct change in the last 7 years as regards: proportion with close friends and relatives in Israel; proportion who have visited Israel (ever or in the last 10 years); and number of times visited in the last 10 years. In 1998 and still in 2005 a particularly high proportion (approximately 8 in every 10 respondents) mentioned having close friends and relatives in Israel, a particularly high proportion (8 in every 10) claimed to have ever visited Israel and almost 6 in every 10 claimed to have done so in the last 10 years. Any differences between the

- 1998 and 2005 results are so small that, statistically-speaking, they should not be interpreted as differences.
- Also, there is unbelievable consistency in the two sets of score patterns relating to attachment towards Israel. The 1998 and 2005 scores are either exactly the same or show a negligible 1% difference. In both 1998 and 2005, just over half (53% or 54%) feel a strong attachment, approximately one-third (33%) feel a moderate attachment, approximately one-eighth (12% or 13%) have no special feelings towards Israel, only 1% have negative feelings and less than 0.5% said “do not know/no answer”.
 - The oldest age group (65 years and older) shows a distinctly above average attachment to Israel, while the youngest sector (18-24 years) shows a decidedly below average attachment. This is interesting in that this young age sector reflects an above average tendency to have visited Israel yet their extent of attachment is below average. This is an issue which undoubtedly needs attention from those promoting Zionist ideals.
 - What is interesting but understandable is that, amongst those who have ever visited Israel, the stronger the attachment to Israel, the greater the number of visits to Israel in the past 10 years. Or looked at another way, the greater the attachment to Israel, the greater the likelihood of more visits.
 - To what extent do Jewish adults in South Africa feel that considering present developments in the Middle East, Israel should give up some territory in exchange for credible guarantees of peace? We saw earlier that there has been minimal change as regards having friends/relatives in Israel, as regards visiting Israel and as regards extent of attachment to Israel. However, there is definite change as to whether or not Israel should be giving up some territory in exchange for peace. Whereas in 1998 opinions were essentially divided (even if veering a touch to the “yes” side), in 2005 the emphasis is decidedly more on “Yes”. Of the total respondents, 6 in every 10 opted for some territory to be given up in exchange for credible guarantees of peace i.e. 60% said “Yes”, 32% said “No” and 8% mentioned “don’t know/no answer”.
 - The “Yes” score was essentially the same for those with a strong attachment to Israel (60% said “yes”) and those with a moderate attachment (59% said “yes”). However, those with a negative attachment or no attachment at all were more inclined to say “Yes” (68%). When looked at within age groups, broadly-speaking: Under 35 year olds are essentially divided between saying “Yes” and “No”; in the 35-64 year sector 6 or 7 in every 10 opted for “Yes”; amongst those 65 years and older the emphasis was even more heavily (almost 8 in every 10) on “Yes”. Within cities: “Yes” was chosen by 55% in Johannesburg, 54% in Durban, 70% in Pretoria and 74% in Cape Town.

Jewish identity

- Jews in South Africa feel strongly Jewish but with an undoubtedly strong loyalty to South Africa as well i.e. Opinions are divided between feeling more Jewish than South African and feeling equally Jewish and South African. Only a small percentage feel more South African than Jewish. These findings have not changed sizeably in the last 7 years. Understandably, the stronger the Jewish feeling the greater the likelihood that the Jewish choice will feature more. Conversely, the milder the Jewish feeling the more the South African choice features. The fact that virtually all said that if they were to be born all over again they would want to be born Jewish, emphasises how strongly Jewish they feel. The proportion not saying that they would want to be born Jewish was very small and was sizeably higher within the Secular/Just Jewish sector. In all cities there is currently more Jewish than South African emphasis overall, with Johannesburg and Pretoria tend showing that emphasis a bit more than do Cape Town and Durban.
- A key question was asked in 1998 and again in 2005 to investigate how strong the bonds are with being Jewish. The results are, in effect, the same – an unbelievable finding! There has been no change in the level of Jewish identity (as measured by this key question) in the last 7 years. In both studies, the majority are divided between those (49% or 50%) who feel a very strong bond with Judaism in that they are extremely conscious of being Jewish and it is very important to them and those (41% or 42%) who feel quite a strong bond with Judaism since they claimed that they feel quite strongly Jewish while being equally conscious of other aspects of their lives. In both instances, only a small proportion (8% or 9%) claimed to have “mild” Jewish feelings (i.e. they are aware of their Jewishness but do not think about it very often or they claim that although they were born Jewish they do not think of themselves as Jewish in any way). Although all cities focus is on having quite strong or very strong bonds with being Jewish, Cape Town’s bonds with being Jewish tend towards being less intense than is the case for other cities.
- There has been minimal change in the last 7 years with regard to some powerfully held beliefs relating to Jews i.e. In 1998 and still in 2005, a powerfully strong belief emerged amongst South African Jews with regard to three factors: “an unbreakable bond unites Jews all over the world”, “it is important that Jews survive as a people, “the Holocaust should be included in the core of young people’s Jewish identity”. What was controversial in 1998 and still is in 2005, is whether Jews who are in a crisis situation can depend only on other Jews. Opinions are divided in this regard. For all these factors, the stronger the Jewish feeling the greater the extent of agreement. Also, for all the factors, the Strictly Orthodox reflect the highest scores for extent of agreement, the Traditionals are next in line, followed by the Reform/Progressives and then the Secular/Just Jewish with the lowest scores for extent of agreement.

Jewish identity as regards: Spouse/Partner, Parents, Conversion

- There have been no major changes in the 7 year period since 1998 as regards wanting a Jewish rather than non-Jewish partner i.e. then and now, of those not in a marriage relationship (irrespective of whether they live with a partner or not), the majority would ideally want a Jewish partner and focus on it being very important. 18-34 year olds exhibit an above average tendency towards wanting Jewish partners. Those in the Johannesburg/Pretoria area are more emphatic than are those in Cape Town or Durban about the importance of partners being Jewish but – on an average – all cities consider this important. The divorced are less emphatic about specifying Jewish partners than are the single or widowed. Understandably, the stronger the Jewish feeling the greater the tendency to consider it important that partners should be Jewish. In fact, the small sector “mild Jewish feeling”, focus more on it being unimportant that their partners should be Jewish. Also understandable are differences between religious categories in this regard i.e. the Strictly Orthodox virtually all claimed that it is very important for partners to be Jewish; Traditionals also emphasised Jewish partners to an above average extent but not as intensely as did the Strictly Orthodox; Reform/Progressives reflected the tendency to a below average extent; and the Secular/Just Jewish sector veered towards considering it unimportant for their partners to be Jewish.
- Of those who have ever been married or who are currently married or living with a partner, most (94%) mentioned that their spouses/partners are/were Jewish. There is an interesting tendency for divorce/separation to be slightly greater in an intermarriage situation (where one spouse is Jewish and one not) than in a situation where both spouses are Jewish i.e. the divorced/separated sector reflects a slightly lower Jewish spouse proportion and correspondingly higher non-Jewish spouse proportion than do the other sectors. (“Jewish” here includes Jewish by birth or conversion as well as those who may not be halachically Jewish but consider themselves Jewish). In 1998 only the current spouse/partner was checked on and the Jewish vs. non-Jewish proportion has essentially not changed since then.
- Within demographic subgroups, there is a slight dip in the 45-54 year sector where 91% mentioned that their spouses/partners are or Jewish, whereas 95% or 96% of those under 45 years or over 54 years made that claim. The more intensely Jewish they feel the more likely they are to have Jewish spouses/partners. Higher Jewish spouse/partner scores are currently reflected for Johannesburg (98%) and Pretoria (95%) than for Cape Town (89%) and Durban (85%). Jewish spouse/partner scores are lower for Secular/Just Jewish and Reform/Progressive than for Traditional and Strictly Orthodox.
- In the main Jewish people in South Africa, irrespective of whether they are or have ever been married, feel that “a Jew should marry someone who is also Jewish”. The proportion agreeing with this was similar for 1998 and 2005 (i.e. then and now, 8 in every 10 expressed that opinion). Of those

- who feel that a Jew should marry someone who is also Jewish, approximately half are particularly emphatic about it. The Johannesburg/Pretoria area feels this even more intensely than does Durban, while Cape Town shows the least intensity but also tends - on average - towards the agreement side. The Strictly Orthodox reflected the highest extent of agreement, Traditional was next, then a bit to the agree side but distinctly close to “neither agree nor disagree” were Reform/Progressive and Secular/Just Jewish.
- Primarily, now and 7 years ago, the vote is/was against the idea that “having a Jewish partner is only important if you intend to have children”. Around three-quarters disagreed then and now. Under 45 year olds (but particularly 18-24 year olds) disagree more than those 45 years and older that having a Jewish partner is only important if you intend to have children. The stronger the Jewish identity the greater the disagreement. The Strictly Orthodox show more intense disagreement than does any other demographic sector covered in the survey.
 - To the same overall extent as emerged in the 1998 study, those who are or were ever married and whose spouse is/was Jewish, essentially disagreed (9 in every 10) with the idea that they married a Jew “purely by chance”. The greater the Jewish identity the more they disagree that it is purely by chance that they married a Jew. Although all religious practice sectors disagree, the Strictly Orthodox disagree more than do the Traditionals who in turn disagree more than do the Secular/Just Jewish and the Reform/Progressives.
 - With “Jewish” meaning Jewish irrespective of whether by birth or by conversion, an overwhelming majority claimed that both of their parents were Jewish (94% for 2005 and 96% for 1998), with this rising when we add those whose mother was Jewish but not the father i.e. a total of 96% in 2005 and 97% in 1998 had both parents Jewish **or** had a Jewish mother but not Jewish father. 1% spoke of only the father being Jewish and 3% (in 2005) or 2% (in 1998) of neither of the parents being Jewish. This ties in with the data relating to whether respondents claimed to have been born Jewish or converted to Judaism i.e. an exceptionally large proportion were born Jewish, with statistically the same proportion for 2005 (96%) as 7 years ago (97%) and the remainder having converted mainly at 18 years and older. Incidentally, this does not show the proportion of these born Orthodox and those born Reform. The Orthodox sector would consider only those born of an Orthodox mother as halachically Jewish i.e. Jewish according to Jewish law. We do know that of the total who converted, just under half converted to Reform and just over half to Orthodox.
 - Although Durban’s combined “both parents/mother Jewish” score (96%) is in keeping with the overall sample score, when broken down, Durban’s both-parents-Jewish score (88%) is lower than for other cities (92% - 95%), and the only-mother-was-Jewish proportion (8%) correspondingly higher than for other cities (1% or 2%).

- Jewish activities, programmes, youth movements, trips, websites etc.
- Overall, a level is being maintained for “ever having attended” youth movements i.e. the 2005 figure for personally having attended Jewish/Zionist youth movements is exactly the same as the 1998 score (71%). We must bear in mind that in both 2005 and 1998 we were talking about youth movements mentioned by the sample as a whole and this encompasses a wide age range from 18 years to over 75 years of age. The time span is large meaning that some youth movement attendance dates back many years. Nevertheless, the score pattern is interesting. Habonim and Bnei Akiva obtained similar scores now to what they did 7 years ago, with the top scorer being Habonim (mentioned by over half). Bnei Akiva was mentioned by approximately one-fifth. Betar has dropped from sharing the second position with Bnei Akiva 7 years ago to third position now. All others score far below. Netzer/Maganim has maintained the 4% score which it reflected in 1998.
 - In the 2005 study, parents were also asked about their children’s Jewish youth movement attendance. Of those with children at primary/middle/high school or out of school (but under 22 years of age), 61% have children in this age category who “ever attended” Jewish/Zionist youth movements (with 41% claiming that the children attended for at least three years and 35% saying that their children still attend at present). Whether or not the above score pattern is satisfactory should be decided by organisers of youth movements. Johannesburg scores are very similar to the total scores. Cape Town reflects a slightly lower proportion for children having “ever attended” and for their having attended “for at least 3 years”, but the proportion for children attending at present tends to be a bit higher. A slight spurt of new attendance may have occurred in Cape Town in the last 7 years – this requires further checking as does how long the current attendees will continue attending for.
 - What is interesting overall is Bnei Akiva’s rise over time from the personal involvement level to the children’s involvement level. Those whose children (currently in the specified age group) “ever attended” Jewish/Zionist youth movements, claimed that these children mainly attend/attended Bnei Akiva (62%), Habonim (45%), Betar (12%) and Netzer (9%). Some parents mentioned more than one youth movement. This could be because they have more than one child in this age category and not all children mainly attend/attended the same movement. Also, some may have insisted that a particular child/children had been very involved with more than one movement. In Johannesburg Bnei Akiva scores above average, Habonim is next in line but tending towards below average, then Betar at a lower level and Netzer/Maganim (3%) scoring below average. Also mentioned in Johannesburg only was “other” (3%). Incidentally, Betar hardly features in cities other than Johannesburg.
 - All respondents - whether they have children or not - were asked to (hypothetically) choose a Jewish/Zionist youth movement for a child’s

- future attendance. Habonim and Bnei Akiva featured equally (each mentioned by just over one-third), one-fifth could not commit themselves in this regard and other youth movements scored far below. The Netzer/Maganim score (3%) is - as will be seen later – lower than would have been expected in relation to the proportion of Reform/Progressives in the sample.
- Almost half of the total respondents have ever attended **Machaneh** i.e. Jewish/Zionist youth camps and the score has gone up since 1998. What is worth noting is that Machaneh, which is actually targeted at the younger sector, would appear to be becoming increasingly more popular within the sector it is targeted at i.e. amongst 18-24 year olds 73% have ever attended, amongst 25-34 year olds 59% have and amongst those over 34 years the scores are below 45%. The Durban score tends towards being below average.
 - 6% claimed to have gone onto **Jewish internet dating sites**, with 25-44 year olds (but particularly 25-34 year olds) showing a greater tendency for involvement in such sites than other sectors. Whilst both males and females are strongly represented in the user profile, males tend to be more inclined to use these sites. An above average propensity to use such sites is reflected: in Johannesburg and Pretoria (with Cape Town and Durban showing a below average tendency), amongst the singles, amongst the divorced and amongst the Strictly Orthodox. However, because a very large proportion of the Jewish population are Traditionals, the bulk of the users belong to the Traditional category. The Secular sector hints at below average interest in Jewish internet dating sites.
 - Of all Jewish adults 18 years and older, 1 in every 5 went to **Israel during schoolgoing age**. They are more likely to be from Johannesburg and Cape Town than elsewhere and under 35 year olds, but particularly 18-24 year olds, are more likely to have experienced this.
 - In total **other Israel-related experiences** (i.e. post-matric programmes in Israel and Yeshiva/seminary-related experiences in Israel), were mentioned by approximately 1 in 5, with Johannesburg reflecting higher scores here than other cities. A small percentage also mentioned having attended **Yeshiva in South Africa after leaving school**, but this was only in Johannesburg (where 3% mentioned this) and Cape Town (where 2% mentioned this).
 - Overall the **SAUJS** participation score seems to be moving up i.e. in 1998, 18% claimed to have ever participated in it and this rose to 23% in 2005. Pretoria and Cape Town score above and Durban below average for having participated in SAUJS, while the Johannesburg score is in keeping with the overall score. An above average proportion of under 35 year olds have participated. The score for having participated in **YAD** has gone up from 2% in 1998 to 7% now and the Cape Town participation score has gone up from 8% in 1998 to the decidedly above average score of 15% now. Since YAD is targeted at “young adults” it is understandable that the 25-34 year group shows the highest score (17%) and all other age

groups scored 8% or less. If we were to check specifically on the 25-34 year sector in Cape Town, it is likely that the score would be sizeably higher than 17%. However, the sample is too small to be broken down to that extent.

- For interest: the overall scores for some of the **other activities** were: studying Kabala (8%) and no clear age-related trend emerged; going on Jewish heritage trips (7%) and with some focus on 18-24 year olds and 55-64 year olds; surfing Jewish websites (31%) and this is more likely to be done by under than over 45 year olds; Jewish internet dating sites (6%) – as discussed in detail earlier; Jewish adult education courses (38%) – no distinct age trend; listening to Jewish music (58%) with the score being highest amongst those over 54 years of age but nevertheless sizeable in all age groups i.e. it may well be that not all age groups are talking about the same type of Jewish music. Incidentally, the adult education factor was checked in 1998 as well – the participation score was the same as for the 2005 study (38%).

Religiosity: God, Torah and Prayer

- It is remarkable that in the last seven years there has been minimal change as regards beliefs about the Torah. Currently, 36% believe that the Torah is the actual word of God, 38% that it is the inspired word of God but not everything should be taken literally word for word, 23% that it is an ancient book of history and moral precepts recorded by man and 3% said “Don’t know”/gave no answer. The Strictly Orthodox, understandably, focus primarily on the Torah being the “actual word of God”. Traditionals are divided between “actual” and “inspired”, tending to focus more on “inspired”. Reform/Progressives are divided between “inspired” and “histomoral” beliefs and the Secular/Just Jewish show heavy focus on “histomoral” with noticeable reference to the “inspired” option. Of the four cities, Johannesburg tends more to the “actual word of God” than towards the “inspired word of God” option and shows far less focus on the “histomoral” option, Pretoria is not quite as oriented to the Orthodox view, Durban is next in line and then Cape Town reflects the least Orthodox view i.e. the focus is away from “the actual word of God” and tending (but not to a major extent) towards more emphasis on the “inspired word of God” than on the “histomoral” belief.
- There is now and was in 1998 particularly strong agreement with the concept that the Jewish people have a special relationship with God (and this belief has intensified with time). Also, Jewish people in South Africa were in 1998 and are in 2005 far more likely to believe that the universe did not come about by chance than that it did (and the scores are very similar for 1998 and 2005); Praying to God is and was largely perceived as being able to help in overcoming personal problems (and here again the scores are very similar for 1998 and 2005).
- Clear age-related trends emerged for most of these issues. Broadly-speaking, the younger the Jewish adult the more likely they are to ascribe

to: beliefs about the Torah being the “word of God”, believing that Jewish people have a special relationship with God and not believing that the universe came about by chance. Scores escalate with movement down the age scale and the trend can also be seen by comparing results for under 45 year olds with those for over 45 year olds for these issues. However, the youngest age sector (18-24 years) does not always score above the 25-34 year sector. Although the general age trend principle does apply, the finding for the youngest age sector should be borne in mind.

- The Strictly Orthodox are the most emphatic about Jewish people having a special relationship with God and the most adamant that the universe did not come about by chance, the Traditionals are next in line for these issues but are not as quite as intense about them, then follow the Reform/Progressives and then Secular/Just Jewish.
- With regard to the belief that praying to God can help to overcome personal problems, the Strictly Orthodox score is far above average (and essentially at maximum score level) and the other religious practice groups follow the score pattern trend exhibited for other factors. However, it would seem that the perceptions relating to the power of prayer are not related to religiosity alone e. g. the Secular/Just Jewish tend (even if slightly) towards the positive side of the scale. The demographic subgroup scores do not fit clearly into the expected pattern. It is therefore likely that perceptions about the power of prayer could be related to additional factors e.g. perceived psychological effects of prayer; or prayer not only related to the traditional concept of a God but to variations thereof. This is a hypothesis only and would need verification.

Religious Practice Sectors

- Jewish adults were required to classify themselves according to Jewish religious practice, with the options being: Non-practising (i.e. Secular) Jew, Just Jewish, Reform/Progressive Jew, “Traditional” (not Strictly Orthodox), Strictly Orthodox (e.g. would not turn on a light on Sabbath). Traditional Jews (66%) form the largest sector. Strictly Orthodox (14%) follows far below. Reform/Progressives (7%) are next in line. The less involved total 12% (Just Jewish 8% and Non-practising/Secular Jew 4%). Below 1% could not classify themselves (i.e. do not know/no answer).
- The results were similar in 1998, but there has been some movement. The Traditional sector is and was the largest sector. In fact, it tends to have increased slightly (from 61% to 66%) by drawing from the combined “Just Jewish/Secular” sector, which in turn tends to have dropped slightly from 17% to 12%. Strictly Orthodox has retained a score of 14% and Reform/Progressive has retained its score of 7%. The direction of the move is interesting i.e. from secularity towards embracing more aspects of being Jewish. The move is either towards wanting more of what Traditional Judaism offers or it is an indication of a move towards being Strictly Orthodox but not quite having achieved the degree of observance

necessary to allow for self-classification as being Strictly Orthodox. Johannesburg exhibits this shift from 1998 to 2005 more clearly than do other areas. By comparison, Cape Town shows an increase of Secular/Just Jewish and Reform/Progressive in the last 7 years, with a corresponding decrease in Traditional and Strictly Orthodox combined i.e. opposite to the trend exhibited in Johannesburg. Durban, on the other hand, shows a decrease in Secular/Just Jewish, a slight decrease for Reform/Progressive and a decided increase for Traditional and Strictly Orthodox. Changes in Pretoria in the last 7 years are too small to be statistically significant.

- The major category in each age sector is unequivocally the Traditional sector. However, under 35 year olds (but more so 25-34 year olds), show over-representation of the **Strictly Orthodox** category. As we proceed up the age scale the tendency towards Strict Orthodoxy decreases, with over 65 year olds comprising the lowest proportion of Strictly Orthodox. Clearly, there is now - and was in 1998 - an above average tendency amongst 18-34 year olds towards Strict Orthodoxy. For those involved with this religious practice sector, this is a positive finding in that drawing the youth bodes well for the future of the sector. However, whereas in 1998 the 18-24 year olds and the 25-34 year olds showed similar over-representation, now the 25-34 year sector shows the tendency more distinctly. For those interested in ensuring the future of Strict Orthodoxy, the success in the 25-34 year sector is good but it is also important to attract the youngest sector to a greater extent. The young people of today are the older people of tomorrow. Incidentally, the Strictly Orthodox sector also shows clear over-representation of males, more so than was the case in 1998. There is thus some evidence of an increased tendency towards Orthodoxy amongst males in the past 7 years. This is interesting in the light of a finding that males show a slight tendency to have moved away from secularity since 1998. These are not necessarily the same males but the direction of the move is interesting.
- **The Reform/Progressive** profile now (and in 1998) was essentially balanced as regards gender, unlike the Strictly Orthodox profile which showed over-representation of males in 1998 and (more so) in 2005. This gender balance is understandable in the light of the similar role of males and females within the Reform/Progressive sector. However, as regards age, the tendency towards under-representation of younger age groups and over-representation of older age groups reflected 7 years ago has intensified now. Reform/Progressives currently show over-representation in the older age groups (i.e. 71% are over 44 years of age whereas in the total sample only 56% fall into this older category). For those concerned about ensuring the future of the Reform/Progressive sector, it is imperative to attract younger people whose future is beginning rather than have the future of the Reform/Progressive sector depending primarily on those who are older. Incidentally, the Secular/Just Jewish sector also shows over-representation in the 65 years and older category.

- **In Johannesburg:** there tends to be over-representation of the Strictly Orthodox, Traditionals are virtually on a par with the overall score, the Secular/Just Jewish sectors combined hint at under-representation as does the Reform/Progressive sector. **In Pretoria:** there is over-representation of Traditionals and Strictly Orthodox and under-representation of Secular/Just Jewish, with Reform/Progressive virtually on par with the overall score. **In Cape Town:** the Traditional score hints (but hints only) at being below average, Strictly Orthodox definitely scores below average, the Secular/Just Jewish sector combined tends towards being higher than elsewhere. Also, the Reform/Progressive proportion is higher in Cape Town than in the Johannesburg/Pretoria area but similar to the Durban score. **In Durban:** the combined Secular/Just Jewish score tends to be below the total sample score, Reform/Progressives score above average (and similar to the Cape Town score), Traditionals hint at being slightly above the national average and Strictly Orthodox hints at being below the national average.
- Religious practice sectors analysed by suburb grouping have not been detailed here but can be obtained from the main body of the report.
- When comparing the religious practice sector they were brought up in with the one into which they classify themselves now, “Traditional” is, and was, far and away the dominant sector. However, Strictly Orthodox shows an increase at the expense of the Traditional sector i.e. in the move from “upbringing” to “current” classification, the Traditional score dropped a bit and the Strictly Orthodox increased a bit. Furthermore, while Strictly Orthodox and Progressive/Reform reflect similar scores for upbringing, we see that currently, Strictly Orthodox has risen above Reform/Progressive. Reform/Progressive has essentially held its own by reflecting similar “current” and “upbringing” scores. A check on 1998 scores for “upbringing” and “current” classification data also shows that whilst the “Traditional” sector dominates throughout, those brought up in the “Traditional” sector tend to be vulnerable to moving to other sectors. In both 1998 and 2005 the Strictly Orthodox shows gains when “upbringing” and “current” scores are compared.

Observance of Various Practices and Rituals

- 97% of males claim to have had a Bar Mitzvah, with comparable scores for earlier years being: 1998 (93%) and 1991 (95%). Since a Bar Mitzvah is a religious requirement for males whereas a Bat Mitzvah for females is not, there were much lower scores for females having had a Bat Mitzvah and - clearly - Bat Mitzvahs have made progressively greater inroads with time: 2005 (37%), 1998 (31%) and 1991 (17%). It should be noted that these proportions are based on the sample as a whole (ranging from 18 to 75 years and older) and that scores within younger age groups are higher.
- Jewish people in South Africa exhibit a very high level of observance for some practices and rituals e.g. Sabbath candlelighting, attendance of a Passover Seder, fasting on Yom Kippur (Day of Atonement), participating

- in a Friday night/Sabbath dinner with family or friends and refraining from work on Rosh Hashanah (the Jewish New Year). These can be regarded as having become part of the Jewish tradition rather than as an indication of level of religiosity. Generally speaking, the Strictly Orthodox reflect higher observance scores for these practices and rituals. However, these practices and rituals are not exclusively their domain i.e. they have become strongly traditional and feature in all religious practice sectors. Traditionals reflect an extent of observance below the Strictly Orthodox, Reform/Progressives are next in line and observance even features sizeably (though least intensely) within the Secular/Just Jewish sector. For practices observed by a high proportion, scores are high in all age groups (with some differences as can be observed in the main body of the report).
- What can be regarded as a “medium level” practice is whether or not Jewish people have refrained (or would if the situation arose) from writing exams on Jewish holidays. Opinions are currently divided on whether or not they have done so (or would if the situation arose). It is imperative to note that a sizeable sector added spontaneously that it would depend on which Jewish holiday it was.
 - Low level practices and rituals are the ones which define the Strictly Orthodox as distinct from other sectors i.e. eating out only in Kosher restaurants (16%), but particularly refraining from driving or travelling on Sabbath (18%). There is an exceptionally high correlation between not driving/travelling on the Sabbath with being Strictly Orthodox. This practice is almost exclusively the domain of the Strictly Orthodox. Of the total, only 18% do not drive/travel on the Sabbath, while amongst those claiming to be Strictly Orthodox, 96% do not. Other religious practice sectors show very low or no adherence to this practice. Eating out in Kosher restaurants only is also the domain of the Strictly Orthodox, but is not quite as characteristic as is not driving/travelling on a Sabbath i.e. whilst a heavy majority (87%) of those claiming to be Strictly Orthodox eat out only in Kosher restaurants, some (13%) do not. For these two practices showing a low level of observance, observance is greater amongst under 45 year olds and particularly 25-34 year olds.
 - For all levels, there is a tendency for those in the Johannesburg/Pretoria area to exhibit greater observance than those in Cape Town and Durban.
 - There has been minimal change in the 7 year period between 1998 and 2005 as regards most religious practices and rituals. Virtually the same very high proportion of South African Jews claimed then and claim now that candles are always lit in their homes on Friday night and exceptionally high proportions (and very similar to each other) emerged in 1998 and 2005 for: attending a Passover Seder, fasting on Yom Kippur; and refraining from work on Rosh Hashanah. The “refraining from work on Rosh Hashanah” score appeared to drop slightly but remains particularly high. The low level scores for “refraining from driving on the Sabbath” and “eating out only in Kosher restaurants” were - remarkably - exactly the same for 1998 and 2005. With regard to “refraining from writing exams

- during Jewish holidays”, the score has dropped – perhaps in the 1998 survey those who refrain on some Jewish holidays and not on others were more likely to classify themselves as refraining than were their 2005 counterparts. This is however a hypothesis only.
- It is interesting that the Sabbath candle lighting proportion for “always lighting” appears not to have changed significantly over the last 33 years! This is apparent from comparing data from studies dating back to 1973, 1974 and 1991 with the 1998 and 2005 findings. Furthermore, from the mid-seventies through the nineties and up to the present, there has been a consistently (and exceptionally) high level of observance as regards: Passover Seder attendance and fasting on or observing Yom Kippur.
 - What does seem to have increased is Sabbath observance. The questions/criteria on which we base this conclusion are not quite the same but do give some indication: 9% in 1974 for “full Sabbath observance (i.e. abstaining from work, travel, smoking etc.)” and 18% in 1998/2005 for “refrain from driving/travelling on Sabbath”.

Focus on Kosher meat

- Irrespective of whether or not only Kosher meat is brought into the home, the tradition of not eating pork/bacon is firmly entrenched amongst Jewish people in South Africa i.e. within all age sectors and within each city at least 8 or 9 in every 10 Jewish adults claim that their household has a “no pork no bacon” policy. Overall, 89% of Jews in South Africa have a “no pork-no bacon” policy in their homes, with this splitting: 39% only Kosher meat and 50% no pork or bacon but not necessarily Kosher meat. A small percentage (7%) do have pork/bacon in the home, 3% do not have meat in the home because they are vegetarians and 1% claimed that they do not buy meat because of living in a hotel or aged home.
- The Strictly Orthodox almost exclusively claimed that only Kosher meat is bought for their homes – perhaps the score is not 100% because some (e.g. younger people) may have moved to Strict Orthodoxy but the homes in which they live have not. Amongst Traditionals, the proportion is in keeping with the overall total with more having a “no pork no bacon” policy than specifying that they have only Kosher meat in the home. Of the Reform/Progressives only 1% claim that only Kosher meat is bought for their homes, over two-thirds have a “no pork no bacon” policy in their homes, while just over a quarter claimed that pork/bacon is brought into their homes. Within the Secular/Just Jewish sector, 4% claimed that only Kosher meat is bought for their homes, almost two-thirds spoke of a “no pork/no bacon” policy, almost a quarter mentioned that pork/bacon is brought into the home and 10% (a higher proportion than for other sectors) spoke of being vegetarians. Just as we hypothesized that some who call themselves Strictly Orthodox could be living in homes which are not adhering to strictly Orthodox requirements, it is possible that some who classify themselves as Secular/Just Jewish could be living in homes which are not this way inclined. This would account for a percentage (though

- very small) of the Secular/Just Jewish claiming that Kosher meat is bought for their homes. However, the high proportion of “no pork/no bacon” is interesting within a secular population sector.
- Of all those who live in homes where only Kosher meat is used, the majority claimed that “milk and meat are separated in their homes”. The 39% who live in homes where only Kosher meat is used, splits: 36% say “milk and meat are separated in their homes” and 3% say it is not (which means that this small percentage of homes are not Kosher irrespective of whether or not other Kashruth requirements are met).
 - There is an age-related trend i.e. currently under 45 year olds (and particularly those under 35 years of age) are far more likely than older respondents to claim that only Kosher meat is bought for their homes, while the 45-54 year group and the 65 years and older group show the lowest scores. There are definite differences between the cities, with Johannesburg and Pretoria showing an above average tendency towards using Kosher meat only, while Durban and Cape Town show far below average scores in this regard. However, even in Cape Town and Durban an overwhelming majority do not eat pork/bacon.
 - Broadly-speaking, there have been no statistically significant changes between 1998 and 2005 with regard to claims that Kosher meat is bought for the home, claims that “meat and milk” are separated in the home and the extent to which homes adopt a “no pork no bacon” policy. An additional check on results for pre-1998 surveys shows that the questions asked were not quite the same but there is some comparable data i.e. in the 1991 study, 38% claimed that only Kosher meat is bought for their homes. Clearly, the proportion buying only Kosher meat for their homes has not changed significantly since 1991 !

Synagogue Attendance

- Excluding weddings, barmitzvahs or batmitzvahs, claimed synagogue attendance for the past year showed that: out of every 10 adult Jews in the cities covered by the survey: 4 attended “most Sabbaths or more often”, 2 attended once or twice a month, 3 attended once to five times a year and 1 said “not at all”. Those showing a greater disposition towards being frequent attendees (i.e. attending most Sabbaths or more often) were: males (an understandable emphasis considering the role of males within synagogues operating within the Orthodox tradition), under 35 year olds (but more so 25-34 year olds) and those from Johannesburg/Pretoria. There was under-representation of those 65 years and older and Cape Town, while Durban showed a score in keeping with its overall profile.
- The Strictly Orthodox show a far greater tendency to be frequent attendees than do other sectors. The average Traditional Jew does not show as great a tendency to be a frequent attendee as does the average Strictly Orthodox Jew. Although there are almost five times as many Traditionals as there are Strictly Orthodox Jews, amongst the frequent attendees, there are only twice as many Traditionals as Strictly Orthodox

- Jews. The Secular/Just Jewish sector is (understandably) under-represented in the frequent-attende profile, while the Reform/Progressive sector shows representation in keeping with the overall profile.
- In past surveys (1973 to 1998) the questions asked and frequency categories used for synagogue attendance were not quite the same. However, some comparisons can be made incorporating variations of the two ends of the scale i.e. “not attending at all” and the other extreme “attending frequently - at least once a week”. This shows that for 1998/2005, frequent attendance scores are distinctly higher than in earlier years and “not at all” scores are lower. Statistically-speaking, there has not been much change in the 7 year period from 1998 to 2005 but, overall, it can be stated that the proportion attending synagogue at least once a week or more often has (since 1973) never been higher than it is now.
 - Although the weighting tends more towards than away from the ease of spiritual expression in a synagogue and there has been improvement since 1998, it cannot be denied that a sizeable proportion still find such expression difficult and/or could not commit themselves either way. The Strictly Orthodox are inclined to find spiritual expression in a synagogue easy. Traditionals are not quite as convinced about the ease of expression, Reform/Progressives are even less convinced, while the Secular/Just Jewish tend to actually find such expression difficult. Males are a bit less likely than females to find such expression difficult and, in the main, the younger the respondents the more likely they are to disagree with the idea that such expression is difficult for them.

Types of Synagogue

- Clearly, **Traditional Orthodox** is the dominant synagogue type in South Africa and has been for some time. A very high proportion are familiar with Traditional Orthodox synagogues, either from their childhood days and/or because of their current involvement. In spite of the very high Traditional Orthodox score, there has been a tendency for movement away from Traditional Orthodox i.e. although the “belong to” and “attend now” scores are very high, they tend to be not quite as high as the “parents belonged to” score. The direction of the siphoning off that has taken place could partly be explained by growth of other synagogue types.
- Although scoring far below Traditional Orthodox, the synagogue types which are more right wing (in religious terms) than Traditional Orthodox or Reform/Progressive, feature noticeably when considered together and when considered separately i.e. Lubavitch/ Chabad and Ohr Somayach. **Lubavitch/Chabad** shows a positive growth pattern. Of the total respondents, only 2% had parents who belonged to this synagogue, yet 7% claim to be members, while in total 10% claimed to actually attend. The growth pattern potential for this sector cannot be denied, particularly since an additional 20% of the respondents claimed that they might like to try attending Lubavitch/Chabad synagogues in the future and 31% (almost one-third) claimed that this synagogue type is likely to show the greatest

- increase in membership in the future. Only 5% thought that this synagogue type was the one likely to show the greatest decrease in membership in the future. **Ohr Somayach** also shows a positive growth pattern. Although only 1% had parents who belonged to it, 5% are members of this synagogue now and in total 8% claimed to attend. A further 17% claimed that they would like to try attending and - just as was the case for Chabad/ Lubavitch – 31% think Ohr Somayach will show the greatest increase in membership in the future and a minimal proportion (only 1%) mentioned this synagogue type as the one likely to show the greatest decrease in membership in the future. The fact that both Chabad/Lubavitch and Ohr Somayach show a positive growth/potential growth pattern must be noted. The scores for the two cannot however be directly added to each other to obtain a total score since some respondents may have mentioned both of these in response to a particular question. The fact that they each have noticeable “might like to try” scores and “greatest increase potential” scores cannot be ignored.
- Because Traditional Orthodox scores are so high, other scores are obviously much lower by comparison. Scoring far below but holding its own is the **Reform/Progressive** synagogue, which exhibits a maintenance rather than growth pattern: 8% claimed that their parents had belonged to it, 8% claimed to personally belong to it now and 9% claimed to attend this type of synagogue. It's maintenance rather than growth pattern can mean erosion in the future, particularly when considered in the light of the additional data i.e. besides those who belong to Reform/ Progressive, only a very small percentage would like to try attending it in the future and a very low proportion think that it will increase its membership in the future. However, 32% (almost one-third) think that it will decrease in membership in the future – a higher score than any other synagogue for this factor. The fact that the bulk of the sample was not oriented towards Reform/Progressive could partly have coloured perceptions of the future of this sector but it would be unwise for those concerned about the future of this synagogue to totally dismiss or discount this score. **Sephardi** scores below 3% for each of: parents having belonged to, own “attendance” or own “belonging”. Statistically-speaking, initial indications are that as regards attendance there have been no dramatic changes over time, but the numbers are too small for this to be conclusively stated without further information. What the future holds for the Sephardi sector is not clear e.g. very low proportions claimed to want to try this synagogue type. Those involved with the Sephardi organisation are likely to be able to provide greater clarity in this regard.
 - It should be noted that there were a small number of spontaneous mentions of “other” types of synagogue which were not listed. It may well be that some of these would have received a higher number of mentions if there had been an extended list e.g. some might have been likely to choose (e.g. for attendance or belonging) the Mizrahi option had it been on the list but chose another option closest to it without specifying Mizrahi

- separately. Should more input be required as to this issue, additional research specifically geared for this purpose can be undertaken. In such research it should be ensured that the sample is large enough to yield sufficient detail for the smaller synagogue sectors.
- No sizeable changes are evident when comparing 1998 and 2005 data for synagogue types their parents belonged to. There have, however, been changes since 1998 with regard to the synagogue type belonged to now and types attend but do not necessarily belong to. Traditional Orthodox is as dominant in 2005 as it was in 1998 but there are indications that Lubavitch/Chabad and Ohr Somayach are showing growth by drawing from Traditional Orthodox. Reform/Progressive emerges in 2005 as still holding its own with a similar score pattern to what it reflected in 1998.
 - Traditional Orthodox is dominant amongst under 45 year olds (even though 25-34 year olds' involvement with this synagogue type is below average). However, all age groups under 45 years of age (including the more reticent 18-24 year olds) show an above average involvement with and/or interest in Chabad/Lubavitch and Ohr Somayach.
 - Amongst 45-54 year olds Traditional Orthodox still dominates but Reform/Progressive shows above average involvement at the "belong to/attend" level but not at the "would like to try" level. In fact, in this age sector, none of the synagogue types score above average for potential trial i.e. "would like to try".
 - 55-64 year olds and those 65 years and older do not show distinctly above average involvement with particular synagogue types i.e. scores are approximately in keeping with total scores and – as occurs throughout – Traditional Orthodox is dominant. However, for "belonging", there is a hint (but hint only) of over-representation of Reform/Progressives in the 55-64 year sector. Also, there is a hint of under-representation of Ohr Somayach at the belonging and attending level – this hint of Ohr Somayach under-representation actually starts within the 45-54 year sector and extends into the 55-64 year and 65 years and older sectors.
 - All cities are primarily involved with Traditional Orthodox and other synagogue types feature far less prominently. Some do however feature to an above average extent in various cities e.g. Chabad/Lubavitch in Johannesburg, Ohr Somayach in Johannesburg and Cape Town, Reform/Progressive in Cape Town and Durban.

Jewish Community and Communal Organisations:
Support from Jewish Community Structure

- Those not currently in a marriage situation tend more towards feeling supported by the Jewish community structure than towards feeling that there is no support and - in the main - they claim that the Jewish community attempts to help Jewish single or unattached people meet each other. However, there is room for improvement with regard to both issues. A greater tendency to mention receiving assistance in meeting people and/or general support from the community is evident in the

- following sectors: Johannesburg, males, under 45 year olds (particularly younger sectors within this broad age category).
- When all, irrespective of whether they are currently in a marriage relationship or not, were asked to indicate which listed services they require more of from the community than they have at present, half claimed not to require anything. Those with requirements spoke mainly of the social/emotional type. Overall, those who are “unpaired” (i.e. not married or living with a partner) need more social/emotional assistance than those who are “paired”.
 - Social/Emotional requirements requested were social/friendship gatherings particularly, emotional support and (but mentioned less often) organised activities/outings. Physical assistance of one type or another accounts for most of the remaining responses, more often personal safety assistance, while some spoke of financial assistance. Small sectors wanted: medical assistance, assistance with transport, meals/assistance with meals. Different age groups have different requirements as can be observed in the main body of the report.
 - Overall the Jewish community is perceived as providing excellent or at least adequate services for various groups checked on i.e. support/facilities for the elderly (obtained emphasis decidedly more on “excellent” than on “adequate”); support/facilities for the intellectually disabled (once again an overwhelming majority rated the Jewish community very positively for this with the focus more on excellent than on adequate); support/facilities for pre-primary school children was very positively perceived by those who felt able to comment in this regard; support/facilities for the mentally ill (i.e. of normal intellectual ability but mentally ill) reflected a positive rating overall but with opinions divided between “excellent” and “adequate”; people with physical disabilities also emerged as well-catered for by the Jewish community but with opinions divided between “excellent” and “adequate”; support/facilities for financially disadvantaged people reflected a positive score overall with opinions divided between “excellent” and “adequate”. It should be noted that all sectors achieved average ratings which were higher in 2005 than in 1998.
 - Although the scores are generally good, it may be advantageous for organisations which offer services for the sectors dealt with above to ensure that: Jewish people in South Africa are fully aware of everything being done for all the sectors of the community and enough information is given so as to minimize “don’t know” scores.

Membership and Involvement with Jewish Communal Organisations

- Approximately two-thirds (67%) are members of Jewish communal or religious organisations and more often than not they are active, participating members. The 67% splits: 40% type A (members of such organisations who participate in related activities) and 27% Type B (claim to be members but without participating much). The remaining one-third (33%) claim not to be members, but approximately half of these participate

- in activities arranged by such organisations even though they are not members (Type C) and the other half are not members and do not participate at all (Type D).
- The tendency to be Type A is not age-related, is characteristic of both males and females with a bit more emphasis on males and tends to be prevalent in all cities but Pretoria exhibits the Type A tendency noticeably strongly and Capetonians show a below average inclination to be Type A. Type B tends to be more female-focused than Type A, but is strongly comprised of both males and females, exhibits some over-representation of over 55 year olds and of Capetonians and under-representation of those from Johannesburg. Type C shows more focus on females than males focus, 35-44 year olds and Capetonians. Type D is not characteristic of a particular gender and shows an emphasis on Johannesburg and 18-24 year olds.
 - Respondents who are not members of any Jewish organisations (i.e. types C and D) gave reasons for this. Two main factors emerged i.e. lack of interest (in Jewish organisations as such or in what they have to offer) and current situation/lifestyle/stage of life (with comments here primarily related to time constraints/not having enough time for membership of such organisations). Also featuring but less often were comments about problems with people or organisations as such (e.g. that the people in such organisations are generally not appealing to them, too cliquey and not welcoming or not of their type or age group, with some adding that they feel uncomfortable or shy to join, that the organisations have never reached out to them or have not offered/allowed them the opportunity to join nor provided the necessary information). Although this people/organisation factor did not emerge as strongly as did the two main factors, it should not be ignored nor underestimated. Respondents are touching on something without realising just how important it is. If an organisation requires an increase in membership/usage/involvement, it should be suitably “packaged” and “marketed” just as products are marketed to consumers. Some (understandably only some) of those not currently involved in Jewish organisations, may become interested if the correct approach is used to attract them.

The Organisations as such

- The success of any organisation is measured according to the objectives which have been set for that particular organisation. Nevertheless, awareness of the organisation as such is always the starting point irrespective of the objectives. Without achieving awareness an organisation cannot begin to attract potential users/members/contributors/beneficiaries. Awareness and involvement details for 26 organisations are detailed in the main body of the report. Final evaluation with regard to the overall scores and results within the demographic and geographic subgroups (i.e. age, city and - where relevant - gender) should be made by each organisation as such since each organisation is aware of its target market.

- In addition, fourteen organisations were focused on in detail. Although it is important for the success of an organisation that potential users/members/participants should be aware of the organisation as such, the path towards the success of an organisation also depends on awareness of what the organisation offers/promises/does/requires. In addition it is important for each organisation to be aware of the extent to which it is perceived as fulfilling its stated functions. This facilitates future planning. This study provides some input with regard to these issues. The results have been discussed in full in the main body of the report for each of the organisations to evaluate. Should more detailed and specific input be required for any of the organisations this could be covered in a study designed and tailored to focus on that organisation or organisations.

OVERALL:

The Jews of South Africa are clearly bound to their Jewish identity. Various religious practices and rituals have become widely practiced traditions even amongst secular Jews. The majority of Jews not currently in a marriage relationship would ideally want a Jewish spouse/partner. The bulk of those who are or were ever married are/were married to Jews. Virtually all consider it important for children to have some kind of formal Jewish education. A positive picture emerges of the level of Jewish education in the country at present but there is room for improvement. With regard to schooling, there is an overwhelming preference for Jewish as opposed to non-Jewish preschools/nursery schools and in those cities which have Jewish primary/middle/high schools, the Jewish option features far more often than does the non-Jewish option. The appeal of children being with other Jewish children, having a Jewish education and learning about Judaism in a Jewish environment/atmosphere, which promotes Jewish values, continuity and identity, cannot be denied. However, the tendency for siphoning off with progress up the school scale must be noted since factors other than Jewish-related ones come into play.

There are varying degrees of religiosity amongst South African Jews, with the largest sector classifying themselves as Traditional Jews. There has been a slight tendency for a move from secularity towards embracing more aspects of being Jewish. The move is either towards wanting more of what Traditional Judaism offers or is an indication of moving towards being Strictly Orthodox but not quite having achieved the degree of observance necessary to allow for self-classification as being Strictly Orthodox. There has been a definite move towards synagogues which are more right wing in religious terms and there is a perception that these will increase in membership. The overall Strictly Orthodox and Reform/Progressive proportions have however not changed in the last 7 years. Within these two sectors there are issues to be noted. The Strictly Orthodox sector has a healthy age profile with emphasis on those who are younger which bodes well for its future. However, the Reform/Progressive sector needs to attract younger members to ensure its continuity.

The Jews of South Africa are strongly bound to South Africa and are far more positive about the country than they were 7 years ago. An overwhelming majority want to stay in South Africa and have no intention of leaving. They detect minimal antisemitism but acknowledge that it is more of a problem in the world generally. Anti-Zionism is perceived as more of a problem than is anti-Semitism, both in relation to South Africa and (particularly) elsewhere. Furthermore, it is seen as escalating. Muslims are perceived as a major threat to Jews. Whilst Jews perceive the government as allowing them religious freedom, there could be improvement as regards the government's attitude to Jews and to Israel as well as the media's attitude to Israel. Although there is undoubtedly a great deal of room for improvement, it cannot be denied that the 'new' South Africa has come a long way since 1998 as regards how it is perceived e.g. as regards the economic situation and other factors. Personal safety, although perceived as having improved is still a problem as is crime and to some extent corruption. Although a move towards clearcut optimism would be an advantage, there is decidedly less pessimism about the future of the Jewish community in South Africa. What is interesting and particularly reassuring for the future of South African Jewry is that those who are younger are more optimistic.

Israel could have slipped a bit as a country to emigrate to. Those who would not consider it speak of lack of familiarity/identification with the country, the language and the people or lifestyle. They are however also concerned about the current situation and resultant problems e.g. personal safety, the political situation, the economy and potential for jobs/career development. The majority do however feel a strong or moderate attachment towards Israel.

The Jewish community is essentially perceived as doing good work in being supportive where necessary and providing a range of necessary services and facilities. Jewish communal organisations are generally well-known but some are better known than others. Attention is required in this regard. In essence organisations are well-regarded. Impressions of functions of various organisations are often on target but results should be reviewed to determine whether there are additional aspects to be conveyed and whether any aspects require more emphasis.

In conclusion, after decades of instability it is apparent that Jews have greater confidence in South Africa and increasingly anticipate a future in the country.

APPENDIX



**JEWISH SURVEY 2005
CONTACT INTERVIEW**

JHB	PTA	CT	DBN

NAME: _____ INTERVIEWER: _____
 ADDRESS: _____ INTERVIEWER NUMBER: _____
 _____ CHECKED: _____ BACKCHECKED: _____

TEL. No: **DAY** (Code and No.) _____ **EVENING** (Code and No.) _____ **CELL** _____

IF INTERVIEWING IN JHB: SPEAK TO A PERMANENT HOUSEHOLD MEMBER AT LEAST 18 YRS OR OLDER. IF INTERVIEWING IN CT/PTA/DBN: TRY FOR AN "ORIGINAL" PERSON ON YOUR LIST (i.e. MR/MRS/MISS AS LISTED). IF UNAVAILABLE, SPEAK TO A PERMANENT HOUSEHOLD MEMBER AT LEAST 18 YEARS OF AGE.

Q.1. Do you or does any other person living permanently in this household consider yourself/themselves to be Jewish?

Yes	1
No	2

Q.2 Please think about all the **Jewish** adults (i.e. all those 18 years and older) living **permanently** in this household:

	NAME	DAY OF BIRTHDAY	MONTH OF BIRTHDAY
a) Please tell me what is the first name of each one and then for each of these please tell me when is his or her birthday (i.e. the day and month) CHECK THAT IS AWARE OF AND HAS CONSIDERED BIRTHDAY OF ALL PERMANENT JEWISH HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS AT LEAST 18 YRS OF AGE OR OLDER, INCLUDING SELF IF RELEVANT. ANY BIRTHDAY NOT KNOWN MUST BE CHECKED TO ENSURE THAT CORRECT RESPONDENT IS SELECTED	1. _____	_____	_____
	2. _____	_____	_____
	3. _____	_____	_____
	4. _____	_____	_____
	5. _____	_____	_____
	6. _____	_____	_____
	7. _____	_____	_____

	NAME OF LAST ONE TO HAVE A BIRTHDAY	DAY OF BIRTHDAY	MONTH OF BIRTHDAY
b) Looking at who the last one was who had a birthday it would seem to be CHECK ON LIST IN Q.2a) AND MENTION NAMEwhose birthday was onMENTION DAY AND MONTH. Is that correct? IF YES WRITE NAME, DAY AND MONTH	_____	_____	_____

- ASK TO SPEAK TO SELECTED RESPONDENT. IF SELECTED RESPONDENT AVAILABLE: CHECK WITH HIM/HER THAT WAS LAST ADULT IN HOUSEHOLD TO HAVE BIRTHDAY AND IF CORRECT CONDUCT (OR MAKE APPOINTMENT TO CONDUCT) **PERSONAL, FACE-TO-FACE INTERVIEW.** IF SELECTED RESPONDENT NOT AVAILABLE: ESTABLISH WHEN CAN PHONE TO SPEAK TO HIM/HER THEN PHONE RESPONDENT AT APPROPRIATE TIME. WHEN PHONE: CHECK THAT SELECTION IS CORRECT THEN MAKE APPOINTMENT TO CONDUCT **PERSONAL FACE-TO-FACE INTERVIEW.**
- IN THE UNLIKELY EVENT OF THE CONTACT INTERVIEW LEADING TO AN INCORRECT RESPONDENT, ESTABLISH WHO THE CORRECT/"SELECTED" RESPONDENT SHOULD BE AND CONTINUE IN THE SAME WAY.



JEWISH SURVEY 2005

Q.No.1-4 _____

GENDER		AGE							CITY			
Male	Female	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75+	Jhb	Pta	CT	Dbn
5-1	2	6-1	2	3	4	5	6	7	7-1	2	3	4

WHERE LIVES						
House	Townhouse/ Cluster house	Flat/ Apartment	Hotel	Jewish Aged Home (incl. apartments)	Other Aged Home	Other Retirement Complex
8-1	2	3	4	5	6	7

NAME: _____ INTERVIEWER: _____

ADDRESS: _____ INTERVIEWER No.: _____ **9-11**

--	--	--

CHECKED: _____

--	--	--

12-14

SUBURB: _____ BACKCHECKED: _____

TEL No : DAY (Code & No)	EVENING (Code & No):	CELL:
---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------

FINAL INTERVIEW WITH SELECTED RESPONDENT IN:	
Original household	15-1
Substitute household	2
REASONS FOR SUBSTITUTION	
Selected respondent unavailable during interviewing period (e.g. on leave/holiday/seriously ill/in hospital)	16-1
Selected respondent (permanently) mentally or physically disabled to extent that cannot be interviewed	2
Selected respondent could not be contacted/interviewed after at least 3 attempts at contacting at appointed times	3
Listed household/persons could not be contacted after at least 3 attempts at times likely to be at home (e.g. evenings or weekends) – COULD ONLY BE APPLICABLE IN AREAS WITH LISTS i.e. PTA/CT/DBN	4
Other (specify) :	5
Refusal	6

Introduction : Good morning/afternoon/evening. I am ... MENTION NAME We are doing a survey amongst Jewish people in South Africa to assist with communal planning. The survey is being done for the Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research at the University of Cape Town. In accordance with research ethics we assure you that everything which you tell us will be treated as confidential and no names will be mentioned in association with the results of the survey. The information will be converted into computerised data and statistics which cannot be linked to any individuals.

Q.1 We are going to start with some general information about your household. Including yourself, how many people are living in your household? Please exclude domestic servants and employees.

--	--

17-18

Q.2 What is your current marital status? Are you READ CATEGORIES BELOW AND RECORD **ONE** RESPONSE. DO NOT READ "REFUSED".

Married	19-1
Divorced	2
Separated	3
Single (never married and not living with partner)	4
Widowed	5
Unmarried but living with partner	6
Refused	7

PART 1

Q.3a) In which country were you born?

South Africa	20-1
Sub-Saharan Africa (including Zimbabwe, Zambia, Zaire)	2
United Kingdom	3
Germany	4
Eastern Europe (including former Soviet Union, Poland, Lithuania)	5
Other Europe	6
Israel	7
Canada	8
New Zealand	9
United States	21-1
Australia	2
Other country (specify) :	3
Don't know/no answer	4

Q.3b) Are you a South African citizen?

Yes	22-1	→ GO TO Q.4
No	2	→ CONTINUE TO Q.3c)

Q.3c) IF NO: Of which country are you a citizen :

Sub-Saharan Africa (including Zimbabwe, Zambia, Zaire)	23-2
United Kingdom	3
Germany	4
Eastern Europe (including former Soviet Union, Poland, Lithuania)	5
Other Europe	6
Israel	7
Canada	8
New Zealand	9
United States	24-1
Australia	2
Other country (specify)	3
Don't know/No Answer	4

Q.4a) ASK ALL : Do you have any children i.e. irrespective of whether they live with you or not?

Yes	25-1	→ CONTINUE
No	2	→ SKIP TO Q.7

Q.4b) IF "YES" : Tell me for each of the categories on this list whether or not it applies to you **HAND CARD A AND RECORD 'YES' OR 'NO' FOR EACH CATEGORY.**

	YES	NO
(i) You have a child or children <u>below pre-school/nursery school age and not at a crèche or playschool</u> i.e. looked after at home or by a family member or friend	26-1	2
(ii) You have a child or children looked after <u>at a crèche or playschool</u> i.e. not ready for a pre-school/nursery school yet	27-1	2
(iii) You have a child or children <u>at pre-school/nursery school</u> i.e. by pre-school/nursery school we do not mean a crèche or playschool. We mean the type of school after which they move to primary school	28-1	2
(iv) You have a child or children at <u>primary school</u>	29-1	2
(v) You have a child or children at <u>middle school</u> (this category only applies if there is a middle school where your child/children attend school)	30-1	2
(vi) You have a child or children at <u>high school</u>	31-1	2
(vii) You have a child or children already <u>out of school but under 22 yrs of age</u>	32-1	2
(viii) You have a child/children <u>22 yrs to 35 yrs of age</u>	33-1	2
(ix) You have a child/children <u>over 35 years of age</u>	34-1	2

**IF HAS CHILD/CHILDREN “22 – 35 yrs” AND/OR “OVER 35 YRS” (i.e. CATEGORIES (viii) or (ix) ABOVE) CONTINUE TO Q.4c).
IF NO CHILDREN IN CATEGORIES (viii) OR (ix) SKIP TO INSTRUCTION PRECEDING Q.5.**

Q.4c) IF HAS CHILD/CHILDREN 22-35 YRS OF AGE AND/OR OVER 35 YRS OF AGE i.e. CATEGORY (viii) AND/OR (ix):
Please think about all your children who are 22 years of age or older and tell me which ONE of the following applies **HAND CARD B**, READ THE THREE ALTERNATIVES AND RECORD ONE ANSWER.

PART 1

All your children who are 22 years or older live in <u>South Africa</u>	35-1
All your children who are 22 years or older live in <u>another country</u>	2
Of your children who are 22 years or older, <u>some</u> live in another country and <u>some</u> live in South Africa	3

IF NO CHILDREN UNDER 22 YRS (i.e. NO CHILDREN IN Q4b (i) – (vii), THEN GO TO Q.7.
IF HAS CHILDREN UNDER 22 YRS (i.e. “YES” TO ANY IN Q4b (i) – (vii), SEE INSTRUCTIONS BELOW.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR Q.5 AND Q.6:

ALL THOSE WHO HAVE CHILDREN UNDER 22 YRS (Q4b (i) TO (vii)) MUST ANSWER WHICHEVER QUESTIONS APPLY. SOME WILL ANSWER ONE, SOME TWO, SOME THREE ETC. MORE SPECIFICALLY:

- **ALL THOSE WITH CHILD/CHILDREN IN Q4b(i) or (ii) (i.e. “YES” TO BELOW PRESCHOOL OR STILL AT HOME) WILL ANSWER Q.5 AND OTHER QUESTIONS WHICH APPLY.**
- **ALL THOSE WITH CHILD/CHILDREN AT PRESCHOOL/NURSERY SCHOOL, i.e. ALL WHO ANSWERED “YES” TO Q.4b (iii), MUST ANSWER Q.6a) AND OTHER APPLICABLE QUESTIONS.**
- **ALL THOSE WITH CHILD/CHILDREN AT PRIMARY SCHOOL (i.e. “YES” TO Q.4b (iv)) MUST ANSWER Q.6b) AND OTHER QUESTIONS WHICH APPLY.**
- **ALL THOSE WITH CHILD/CHILDREN AT MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL (i.e. “YES” TO Q.4b (v) or (vi)) MUST ANSWER Q.6c) AND OTHER QUESTIONS WHICH APPLY.**
- **ALL THOSE WITH CHILDREN WHO HAVE LEFT SCHOOL BUT ARE UNDER 22 YRS OF AGE (YES TO Q.4b (vii)) MUST ANSWER Q.6d) AND THEN GO TO Q.7 IF ALL OTHER Q4/Q5/Q6 QUESTIONS WHICH APPLY HAVE BEEN ANSWERED.**

Q.5 IF HAS CHILD/CHILDREN BELOW PRESCHOOL/NURSERY SCHOOL i.e. CATEGORY (i) STILL AT HOME OR CATEGORY (ii) AT CRECHE/PLAYSCHOOL:

(a) Thinking only of your child (or children) not yet at nursery school/pre-school, if you had a choice would you be likely to send that child (those children) to a Jewish or a non-Jewish pre-school/nursery school? ONE ANSWER ONLY.

Jewish preschool/nursery school	36-1
Non-Jewish preschool/nursery school	2
Other response (specify)	3
DK / No answer	4

**IF “NON-JEWISH PRESCHOOL/NURSERY SCHOOL” GO TO Q.5b).
IF “JEWISH PRESCHOOL/NURSERY SCHOOL” SKIP TO Q.5c).**

(b) IF IN Q.5a MENTIONS NON-JEWISH PRESCHOOL/NURSERY SCHOOL : If you had a choice, why would you **not** send your child/children to a Jewish preschool/nursery school? RECORD SPONTANEOUS ANSWERS BELOW. **DO NOT** SHOW OR READ OUT. MULTIMENTIONS POSSIBLE. IF IN DOUBT AS TO CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONSE, RECORD VERBATIM IN “OTHER (SPECIFY)”.

Jewish one(s) too expensive/non-Jewish one(s) cheaper	37-1
Jewish one(s) too insular/don't believe in separating my child from non-Jewish children	2
Jewish one(s) too far from where we live/non-Jewish one(s) closer	3
Non-Jewish one(s) have better teachers/curriculum for preschool/nursery school children	4
Jewish one(s) have too much emphasis on Jewish religion/Judaism	5
My friends will be sending their children there/to a non-Jewish one	6
Children's friends/children they know will be going there/to a non-Jewish one	7
Other (specify) _____ _____ _____	
Don't know/no answer	9

SKIP TO Q.6 IF APPLICABLE, IF NOT APPLICABLE, MOVE TO Q.7

Q.5c) IF IN Q.5a MENTIONS JEWISH PRESCHOOL/NURSERY SCHOOL : If you had a choice, why would you send your child to a Jewish preschool/nursery school? RECORD SPONTANEOUS ANSWERS BELOW. **DO NOT SHOW OR READ OUT.** MULTIMENTIONS POSSIBLE. IF IN DOUBT AS TO CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONSE, RECORD VERBATIM IN "OTHER (SPECIFY)".

Non-Jewish one(s) too expensive/Jewish ones cheaper	39-1
Want my child to be with Jewish children	2
Non-Jewish one(s) too far from where we live/Jewish one closer	3
Jewish one(s) have better teachers/ curriculum for preschool/nursery school children	4
Jewish one(s) teach them about Jewish religion/Judaism	5
My friends will be sending their children there/to Jewish one	6
Children's friends/children they know will be going there/to Jewish one	7
Other (specify) _____ _____ _____ _____	
DK/No answer	9

GO TO Q.6 IF APPLICABLE, IF NOT SKIP TO Q.7

Q.6a) IF (IN Q.4b (iii)) HAS CHILD/CHILDREN AT PRESCHOOL/NURSERY SCHOOL : Thinking only of your child (or children) at nursery school/preschool, is that child (those children) at a Jewish or non-Jewish preschool/nursery school?

Jewish preschool/nursery school	41-1
Non-Jewish preschool/nursery school	2

CHECK IF Q.6b) APPLICABLE. IF Q6b) NOT APPLICABLE, MOVE TO Q.6c) OR NEXT APPLICABLE

Q.6b) IF (IN Q.4b) (iv)) HAS CHILD/CHILDREN CURRENTLY AT PRIMARY SCHOOL:
Thinking only of your child/children currently at primary school, please tell me which type of school your child (which type of schools your children) currently at primary school attend(s) at present. Mention the letter next to the type of school or schools he/she/they attend(s) at present. **HAND CARD C.**

MULTI-MENTION POSSIBLE

A	Non-Jewish government school (primary)	42-1
B	Non-Jewish private school (primary)	2
C	Jewish private school (primary)	3
D	Crawford College (primary)	4
E	Eden College (primary)	5
F	Reddam House (primary)	6

CHECK IF Q.6c) APPLICABLE. IF Q6c) NOT APPLICABLE, MOVE TO Q.6d) OR NEXT APPLICABLE.

Q.6c) IF (IN Q.4b (v) OR (vi)) HAS CHILD/CHILDREN CURRENTLY AT MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL :
Thinking only of your child/children currently at (READ AS APPROPRIATE) middle/high school, please tell me which type of school your child (which type of schools your children) at middle/high school attend(s) at present. Mention the letter next to the type of school or schools he/she/they attend(s) at present. **HARD CARD D.**

MULTI-MENTION POSSIBLE

G	Non-Jewish government school (middle/high)	43-1
H	Non-Jewish private school (middle/high)	2
I	Jewish private school (middle/high)	3
J	Crawford College (middle/high)	4
K	Eden College (middle/high)	5
L	Reddam House (middle/high)	6
M	Other private college for middle/high school purposes (e.g. Abbott's, Boston, Damelin)	7

IF APPLICABLE ASK Q.6d). IF Q6d) NOT APPLICABLE, MOVE TO Q.7.

PART 1

Q.6d) IF (IN Q4.b) (vii)) HAS UNDER 22 YR OLD WHO HAS LEFT SCHOOL :
Thinking of your under 22 year old(s) who has (have) left school, at which of the types of school on this card did that child/children finish school. **HAND CARD E.**

N	Non-Jewish government school (high)	44-1
O	Non-Jewish private school (high)	2
P	Jewish private school (high)	3
S	Crawford College (high)	4
T	Eden College (high)	5
Y	Reddam House (high)	6
Z	Other private college for high school purposes (e.g. Abbot's, Boston, Damelin, Eden)	7

ASK ALL:

Q.7 Please think about your own schooling and choose the letter next to the answer which applies to you.
HAND CARD F. ONE ANSWER ONLY.

a	Finished school at non-Jewish government school	45-1
b	Finished school at non-Jewish private school	2
c	Finished school at Jewish private school	3
d	Finished school at Crawford College	4
e	Finished school at Eden College	5
f	Finished school at Reddam House	6
g	Finished school at other private college (e.g. Abbot's, Boston, Damelin)	7
h	STILL AT SCHOOL	8
i	NEVER WENT TO SCHOOL	9
k	OTHER (SPECIFY)	

46

ASK ALL:

Q.8 a) If you had a child who was going to start primary school tomorrow and you had the choice of sending him/her to a Jewish primary school or a non-Jewish primary school, which of the two would you be likely to choose?

Jewish primary school	47-1
Non-Jewish primary school	2

Q.8b) If you had a child who was going to start high school tomorrow and you had the choice of sending him/her to a Jewish high school or a Non-Jewish high school, which of the two would you be likely to choose?

Jewish high school	48-1
Non-Jewish high school	2

IF "NON-JEWISH" IN BOTH Q8a) AND Q8b): ASK Q.8c) THEN SKIP TO Q8e)
IF "JEWISH" IN BOTH Q8a) AND Q8b): SKIP TO Q8d)
IF "JEWISH" IN ONE OF Q.8a) OR Q.8b) AND "NON JEWISH" IN OTHER: ASK Q.8c) AND Q.8d).

Q.8c) IF "NON-JEWISH" IN Q.8a) and/or Q.8b) : Why would you not send your child to a Jewish READ APPROPRIATE ONEprimary school/high school/school? READ "SCHOOL" ONLY IF MENTIONS "NON-JEWISH" FOR BOTH PRIMARY (Q.8a) AND HIGH (Q.8a). **DO NOT PROMPT.** RECORD RESPONSE IN PRECODED LIST BELOW. IF RESPONSE NOT LISTED OR IF IN DOUBT AS TO CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONSE, RECORD VERBATIM IN "OTHER (SPECIFY)". MULTI-MENTION POSSIBLE.

Jewish one(s) too expensive/non-Jewish ones cheaper	49-1
Jewish one(s) too insular/don't believe in separating my child from non-Jewish children	2
Jewish one(s) too far from where we live/non-Jewish one closer	3
Jewish one(s) have better teachers/curriculum for secular subjects (i.e. subjects not related to Judaism or Jewish issues)	4
Jewish one(s) have too much emphasis on Jewish religion/Judaism	5
Non-Jewish one(s) have better sporting facilities	6
Other (Specify)	

SKIP TO Q.8e)

PART 1

Q.8d) IF "JEWISH" IN Q.8a) and/or Q.8b) : Why would you send your child to a JewishREAD APPROPRIATE ONE OF FOLLOWING ALTERNATIVESprimary school/high school/school?
 READ "SCHOOL" ONLY IF MENTIONS "JEWISH" FOR BOTH PRIMARY (Q.8a) AND HIGH (Q.8b). **DO NOT PROMPT.** RECORD RESPONSE IN PRECODED LIST BELOW. IF RESPONSE NOT LISTED OR IF IN DOUBT AS TO CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONSE RECORD VERBATIM IN "OTHER (SPECIFY)".

MULTI-MENTION POSSIBLE

Non-Jewish one(s) too expensive / Jewish one(s) cheaper	51-1
Want my child to be with Jewish children	2
Non-Jewish one(s) too far from where we live / Jewish one closer	3
Jewish one(s) has/have better teachers/curriculum for secular subjects(i.e.subjects not relating to Judaism or Jewish issues)	4
Jewish one(s) teach them about Jewish religion/Judaism	5
Jewish one(s) have better sporting facilities	6
Other (Specify) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	

ASK ALL:

Q.8e) Please think specifically about the quality of Jewish education provided by Jewish schools in South Africa. Irrespective of whether or not you or any of your family members have ever attended Jewish schools in South Africa and just from the impression you have, would you say that overall the quality of Jewish education provided by South African Jewish schools is: very good, fairly good, fairly poor or very poor? RECORD BELOW. IF, AND ONLY IF, REFUSES TO COMMIT TO ONE OF THE FOUR CATEGORIES:
 (i) DETERMINE WHICH ONE OF THE TWO ADDITIONAL "BELOW THE LIST" CATEGORIES APPLIES **OR**
 (ii) WRITE COMMENTS IN FULL ALONGSIDE THIS QUESTION

Very good	52-5
Fairly good	4
Fairly poor	2
Very poor	1
Neither good nor poor	3
DK/No answer	0

Q.9a) Now we are going to talk about South Africa. Which party did you vote for in the 2004 elections. RECORD BELOW. **DO NOT PROMPT.**
 Q.9b) Going back to the 1994 elections, which party did you vote for in the 1994 elections? RECORD BELOW. **DO NOT PROMPT.**

	Q.9a) 2004	Q.9b) 1994
African National Congress (ANC)	53-1	55-1
National Party (NP) / New National Party (NNP)	2	2
Inkathata Freedom Party (IFP)	3	3
Freedom Front / Vryheidsfront (FF/VF)	4	4
Democratic Party (DP) / Democratic Alliance (DA)	5	5
United Democratic movement (UDM)	6	6
Independent Democrats (ID)	7	7
Other (Specify) _____		
Did not vote, too young	54-1	56-1
Did not vote though qualified to	2	2
Voted but don't know / no answer	3	3

PART 1

Q.10 Thinking of the new South Africa and the quality of life, please tell me according to this card **HAND CARD G** how much you agree or disagree with each statement. READ EACH STATEMENT IN TURN AND RECORD ANSWER.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/No Answer
(i)The new South Africa has benefited the people of South Africa as a whole	57-5	4	3	2	1	0
(ii)The new South Africa has benefited me	58-5	4	3	2	1	0
(iii)The new South Africa has benefited the Jewish community	59-5	4	3	2	1	0
(iv)The quality of my life in South Africa will improve over the next five years	60-5	4	3	2	1	0

Q.11a) Would you say that since the new South Africa began in 1994, the overall situation in South Africa has : improved substantially, improved slightly, deteriorated slightly, deteriorated substantially or remained the same?

Improved substantially	61-5
Improved slightly	4
Deteriorated slightly	3
Deteriorated substantially	2
Remained the same	1
DK/No answer	0

Q.11.b) And would you say that since the new South Africa began in 1994, the overall situation for the Jewish community in South Africa has : improved substantially, improved slightly, deteriorated slightly, deteriorated substantially or remained the same?

Improved substantially	62-5
Improved slightly	4
Deteriorated slightly	3
Deteriorated substantially	2
Remained the same	1
DK/No answer	0

Q.12a) Since January 1982, did you ever leave South Africa with the intention of settling in another country?

Yes	63-1	→ CONTINUE
No	2	→ GO TO Q13

Q.12b) IF YES:

(i) In what year was that? (IF MORE THAN ONCE, RECORD ONLY LAST OCCASION)

YEAR _____ 64-65

--	--

(ii) To which country did you go?

Sub-Saharan Africa (including Zimbabwe, Zambia, Zaire)	66-2
United Kingdom	3
Germany	4
Eastern Europe (including former Soviet Union, Poland)	5
Other Europe	6
Israel	7
Canada	8
New Zealand	9
United States	67-1
Australia	2
Other country (specify)	

--	--	--	--

PART 1

(iii) Were you still living inMENTION COUNTRY WENT TO Q.12b) (ii) ...before you returned to South Africa?

Yes	68-1
No	2

(iv) In what year did you return to South Africa? YEAR: _____

69-70

--	--

(v) Why did you leave South Africa MENTION YEAR LEFT (Q.12b)(i)? What made you decide to go? DO **NOT** PROMPT. RECORD ACCURATELY IN APPROPRIATE CATEGORY/CATEGORIES ONLY. IF CATEGORIES UNSUITABLE, RECORD IN DETAIL UNDER "OTHER(SPECIFY)"

Parents/other family members were going so had no choice / choice not made by me	71-1
To be with family already settled there	2
To be with friends	3
Personal safety concerns	4
Worries about future of South Africa	5
Education of children	6
Career move	7
Affirmative action	8
Quality of health services	9
Financial / To improve finances	72-1
Economy / Economic situation here	2
To live in Israel / to feel at home in Israel	3
No strong Jewish community here / dwindling Jewish community / to be in a Jewish / bigger Jewish community	4
Other (Specify) _____ _____ _____	
DK / No answer	9

(vi) Why did you return to South Africa? What made you decide to come back? DO **NOT** PROMPT. RECORD ACCURATELY BELOW IN APPROPRIATE CATEGORY(IES). IF CATEGORIES UNSUITABLE, RECORD IN DETAIL UNDER "OTHER (SPECIFY)"

To be back with family	73-1
Family problems made it necessary for me to be back here	2
To be back with friends	3
Love of South Africa	4
Roots here / settled here / place of birth / familiarity / used to it / it is my home	5
Standard of living better here	6
Difficult to manage there financially	7
Career / Business better for me here than there / could not find suitable job / occupation there	8
Health/Mobility problems so had to come back	9
Climate better here	74-1
Education of children better here	2
Other (Specify) _____ _____ _____	
DK / No answer	9

80-1

ASK ALL :
 Q.13a) Do you think it is very likely, somewhat likely or not at all likely that you will move from this address within the next three years?

Very likely	5-3
Somewhat likely	2
Not at all likely	1
Don't know / no answer	0

ASK ALL :
 Q.13b) If you were to move in the next three years, do you think it would be to another address in this city, elsewhere in South Africa or to another country?

To an address in this city	6-1
Elsewhere in South Africa	2
To another country	3
Don't know / No answer	4

ASK ALL :
 Q.13c) If you were to move elsewhere in this city, which suburb would you be most likely to move to?

SUBURB _____

--	--	--

7-9

Q.13d) ASK ALL: If you were to move elsewhere in South Africa, which city would you be most likely to move to?

CITY _____

--	--	--

10-12

Q.14 ASK ALL :
 a) If you were to move to another country, which country would you be most likely to move to? RECORD BELOW
 b) And which country would be your second choice? RECORD BELOW
 c) And your third choice? RECORD BELOW

	Q14a) Most likely	Q14b) Second Choice	Q14c) Third Choice
Israel	13-1	15-1	17-1
United Kingdom	2	2	2
Germany	3	3	3
Eastern Europe (including former Soviet Union, Poland, Lithuania)	4	4	4
Other Europe	5	5	5
Sub-Saharan Africa (including Zimbabwe, Zambia, Zaire)	6	6	6
Canada	7	7	7
New Zealand	8	8	8
United States	9	9	9
Australia	14-1	16-1	18-1
Other country (Specify) _____			
DK / First/Second/Third choice	9	9	9

Q.15 Thinking of the next five years which of the alternatives on this card comes closest to what applies to you **HAND CARD H.**

Very likely that will continue living in South Africa	19-4	→ GO TO Q16
Fairly likely that will continue living in South Africa	3	→ GO TO Q16
Fairly likely that will leave South Africa to live elsewhere	2	→ GO TO Q17
Very likely that will leave South Africa to live elsewhere	1	→ GO TO Q17
DK / No answer	0	→ Skip to note which follows Q17b)

PART 2

Q.16 IF VERY/ FAIRLY LIKELY TO CONTINUE LIVING IN SOUTH AFRICA :

(a) You say that you are likely to remain living in South Africa in the next five years. What would you say are your three most important reasons for staying? RECORD BELOW. DO NOT PROMPT.

	Mentioned First	Mentioned Second	Mentioned Third
To stay close to family	20-1	23-1	26-1
To stay close to friends	2	2	2
Love of South Africa	3	3	3
To play an active role in the future of the New South Africa	4	4	4
Financial restrictions on emigration e.g. currency control	5	5	5
Career / Business	6	6	6
Health / Mobility problems	7	7	7
Poor Rand exchange rate means could not afford to live overseas and/or would have to drop standard of living	8	8	8
Skills/ability/business/occupation not suited/not easily transferable	9	9	9
Too old to start new life/career elsewhere	21-1	24-1	27-1
Education of children/children still being educated still at school	2	2	2
Financial security / have income here / financially stable here	3	3	3
Climate	4	4	4
Roots here/settled here/place of birth/familiarity/used to it/its my home	5	5	5
Other (Specify) _____ _____ _____ _____			
Don't know / no first /no second/no third mention	9	9	9

Q.16 b) What, if anything, would make you decide to leave this country i.e. what would make you feel that you no longer want to live in South Africa? RECORD BELOW. DO NOT PROMPT. MULTI-MENTIONS POSSIBLE.

If other members of my family left / or wanted to leave South Africa / to be with family	29-1
If good friends / main friends left / to be with friends	2
Personal safety concerns / if were to become more physically dangerous in South Africa than it is at present	3
If crime were to increase / if crime were to reach levels feel cannot live with	4
If quality of life in South Africa deteriorates substantially	5
Economy / if economic situation in South Africa deteriorated	6
If government and/or legislation makes it difficult for Jews in South Africa	7
If government and/or legislation becomes difficult for me to live with/accept	8
If standard of education dropped / if it became difficult to educate children the way they should be educated	9
The standard of Jewish education / if it became difficult to provide children with suitable Jewish education	30-1
Career move / if good career opportunity arose elsewhere	2
If good financial opportunity arose elsewhere	3
Affirmative action	4
Action of health services / if quality of health services deteriorated	5
If Jewish community dwindles too much here	6
Other (specify) _____ _____	
Don't know / No answer	9

SKIP TO NOTE WHICH FOLLOWS Q17b)

PART 2

Q.17 IF VERY/FAIRLY LIKELY TO LEAVE SOUTH AFRICA :

(a) You say that you are likely to leave South Africa to live in another country during the next five years. What would you say are your three most important reasons for leaving? RECORD BELOW. DO NOT PROMPT.

	First Mention	Second Mention	Third Mention
To be with family	32-1	34-1	36-1
To be with friends	2	2	2
Personal safety concerns	3	3	3
Worries about future of South Africa	4	4	4
Education of children	5	5	5
Standard / quality of <u>Jewish</u> education	6	6	6
Career move	7	7	7
Affirmative action	8	8	8
Quality of health services	9	9	9
Financial/improved finances	33-1	35-1	37-1
To live in Israel / feel at home in Israel	2	2	2
Economy/economic situation	3	3	3
No strong Jewish community/dwindling Jewish community/to be in a Jewish/bigger Jewish community	4	4	4
Other (Specify) _____ _____ _____ _____			
Don't know / No first/No second/No third mention	9	9	9

CONTINUE WITH Q17b)

Q.17 b) You say that during the next five years you are likely to leave South Africa to live in another country. Do you see yourself permanently living in another country or do you think that long-term you may come back to live in South Africa? RECORD RESPONSE.

Permanently in another country	38-1
Long term may come back to live in South Africa	2
DK/No answer	3

SEE NOTE BELOW

THIS NOTE APPLIES FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

CHECK Q.14:

IF ISRAEL IS NOT MENTIONED AT ALL (1st/ 2nd/ 3rd) IN Q.14 THEN CONTINUE TO Q.18.

IF ISRAEL IS MENTIONED AT ALL (1st/ 2nd/ 3rd) IN Q.14 THEN SKIP TO Q.19.

PART 2

Q.18 IF ISRAEL **NOT MENTIONED AT ALL** IN Q.14 ASK : You did not mention Israel as one of the top three countries you would consider moving to. What would you say are your three most important reasons for not choosing Israel as one of the countries you would consider moving to if you were to move to another country? DO NOT PROMPT. RECORD BELOW.

	First Mention	Second Mention	Third Mention
Family elsewhere/want to be with family who live elsewhere not Israel	39-1	41-1	43-1
Friends elsewhere/want to be with friends living elsewhere not Israel	2	2	2
Like the lifestyle in other country/countries more	3	3	3
Personal safety concerns in Israel	4	4	4
Economy better in other country(ies) financially easier to live in other countries	5	5	5
Career/business more likely to be successful elsewhere/skills/occupation more suited to other country/countries	6	6	6
Difficult to get jobs in Israel	7	7	7
Would have to drop standard of living if went to Israel	8	8	8
Want to go to an English speaking country	9	9	9
Can relate better to the people in other country(ies)/find it difficult to relate to Israelis	40-1	42-1	44-1
Other (Specify) _____ _____ _____ _____			
Don't know / No answer / No 1 st /No 2 nd / No 3 rd mention	9	9	9

GO TO Q.19

Q.19 a) Please think about South Africa at present, purely according to your own judgment how would you rate it as regards DEAL WITH EACH FACTOR IN TURN. You may choose your answer from this card SHOW **CARD I**. RECORD RESPONSES IN TABULATION BELOW.

b) Now think about Israel,. Purely according to your own judgment how would you rate it as regards DEAL WITH EACH FACTOR IN TURN. Choose your answer from this card SHOW **CARD I**. RECORD RESPONSES IN TABULATION BELOW.

	Very good	Fairly good	Neither good nor poor	Fairly poor	Very poor	DK/no answer		Very good	Fairly good	Neither good nor poor	Fairly poor	Very poor	DK/no answer
a) SOUTH AFRICA							b) ISRAEL						
Economic situation	45-5	4	3	2	1	0	Economic Situation	51-5	4	3	2	1	0
Personal safety	46-5	4	3	2	1	0	Personal safety	52-5	4	3	2	1	0
Political situation	47-5	4	3	2	1	0	Political situation	53-5	4	3	2	1	0
Health care provision	48-5	4	3	2	1	0	Health care provision	54-5	4	3	2	1	0
Education system	49-5	4	3	2	1	0	Education system	55-5	4	3	2	1	0
Personal family and friendship network	50-5	4	3	2	1	0	Personal family and friends living there	56-5	4	3	2	1	0

ASK ALL:

- Q.20a) We are going to talk about issues relating to Israel. Do you have any close friends or relatives living in Israel? RECORD IN TABULATION BELOW.
- Q.20b) Have you ever visited Israel? RECORD BELOW, THEN : IF "NO" SKIP TO Q.21. IF "YES" GO TO Q20c).
- Q.20c) IF YES IN Q.20b) : Thinking only of the last 10 years, how many times, if at all, have you been to Israel in the past 10 years?

	Q.20a)	Q.20b)	Q.20c)
	FRIENDS / RELATIVES IN ISRAEL	EVER VISITED	NUMBER OF TIMES IN THE PAST 10 YEARS
Yes	57-1	58-1	
No	2	2	

59-61

ASK ALL

- Q.21.a) Whether or not you visit, what type of attachment (or otherwise) do you feel towards Israel? Please tell me according to this card. **HAND CARD J**

Strong attachment	62-1
Moderate attachment	2
No special attachment	3
Negative feelings towards Israel	4
Don't know/no answer	5

- Q.21.b) Considering present developments in the Middle East, do you feel that Israel should give up some territory in exchange for credible guarantees of peace?

Yes	63-1
No	2
Don't know/no answer	3

- Q.22.a) Generally speaking do you think there is more racial prejudice in South Africa now than there was 5 years ago, less or about the same amount?

More	64-1
Less	2
Same	3
DK/No answer	4

- Q.22b) Do you think there is more anti-Semitism in South Africa now than there was 5 years ago, less or about the same amount?

More	65-1
Less	2
Same	3
DK/No answer	4

- Q.22c) Thinking about anti-Zionism, do you think there is more anti-Zionism in South Africa now than there was 5 years ago, less or about the same amount?

More	66-1
Less	2
Same	3
DK/No answer	4

- Q.22d) Thinking now of your own experience, please tell me which, if any, of the forms of anti-Semitism on this list you have experienced personally in the past 5 years or so? **HAND CARD K**

Been called a Jew in a derogatory way	67-1
Refused membership of a club	2
You (or your child) not allowed a place at a school or college because of a Jewish quota	3
Refused employment	4
Business contracts or orders refused	5
Picked on (victimized) at work	6
Actually heard someone making derogatory remarks about Jews generally	7
Other (specify)	8
None	9

68-

Q.23 Do you believe READ EACH IN TURN AND RECORD RESPONSE

	Major Problem	Minor Problem	Not a Problem	DK/No Answer
(i) that at present in South Africa, anti-semitism is a major problem, a minor problem or not a problem at all?	69-1	2	3	4
(ii) that at present in the world generally, anti-semitism is a major problem, a minor problem or not a problem at all?	70-1	2	3	4
(iii) that at present in South Africa, anti-Zionism is a major problem, a minor problem or not a problem at all?	71-1	2	3	4
(iv) that at present in the world generally, anti-Zionism is a major problem, a minor problem or not a problem at all	72-1	2	3	4

Q.24a) Which groups, if any, pose the greatest threat to Jews in South Africa? NO PROMPT, BUT RECORD BELOW

Muslims	73-1
Afrikaners	2
Israelis	3
Blacks	4
Jews	5
Coloureds	6
Indians	7
Arabs	8
Hamas	9
Pagad	74-1
Other (Specify)	2
None	3
Don't know/no answer	4

--	--

Q.24.b) Would you say that READ EACH STATEMENT IN TURN AND RECORD ANSWER FOR EACH.

	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	NEVER	DK/NO ANSWER
(i) The South African government allows religious freedom for Jews : always, sometimes or never?	75-1	2	3	4
(ii) The South African government's attitude to Israel is: always fair, sometimes fair, or never fair?	76-1	2	3	4
(iii) Thinking of the South African media (i.e. press, TV and radio), their attitude to Israel is: always fair, sometimes fair or never fair?	77-1	2	3	4
(iv) The South African government is hostile towards Jews : always, sometimes, or never?	78-1	2	3	4

80-2

Q.25a) Would you say you feel more South African than Jewish, more Jewish than South African, or both equally?

More South African than Jewish	5-1
More Jewish than South African	2
Equally South African and Jewish	3
DK/No answer	4

Q.25b) If you were to be born all over again, would you want to be born Jewish?

Yes	6-1
No	2
DK/No answer	3

PART 3

Q.26 This section is concerned with your personal beliefs and your attitudes towards, Judaism and the organized Jewish community. People's experience and opinions of Jewish matters are extremely varied and you may find that some questions are more relevant to your situation than are others. Some people are far more conscious of being Jewish than are others. Bearing in mind that this question is NOT concerned with your level of observance. Which of the following best describes your feelings. **HAND CARD L. ONE ANSWER ONLY**

Although I was born Jewish, I do not think of myself as being Jewish in any way	7-1
I am aware of my Jewishness, but I do not think about it very often	2
I feel quite strongly Jewish, but I am equally conscious of other aspects of my life	3
I feel extremely conscious of being Jewish and it is very important to me	4
None of these	5

Q.27 Which one of the following comes closest to describing your feelings about the Bible (Torah) **HAND CARD M**

The Torah is the actual word of God	8-1
The Torah is the inspired word of God but not everything should be taken literally, word for word	2
The Torah is an ancient book of history and moral precepts recorded by man	3
DK/No answer	4

Q.28 In terms of Jewish religious practice, which one of the following best describes your position? **HAND CARD N**

Non-practising (i.e. Secular) Jew	9-1
Just Jewish	2
Reform / Progressive Jew	3
"Traditional" (not strictly Orthodox)	4
Strictly Orthodox (e.g. would not turn on a light on Sabbath)	5
Don't know / no answer	6

Q.29 To help us understand better what this means say whether you observe any of the following practices or rituals.

a) Are candles lit in your home on Friday night? IF "YES" ESTABLISH: Always or sometimes?

Always	10-1
Sometimes	2
No/never	3

b) At Passover do you attend a Seder meal, irrespective of whether it be at home or elsewhere? If "YES" ESTABLISH: Every year, most years or some years?

Every year	11-1
Most years	2
Some years	3
No/never	4

Q.30a) What kind of meat, if any, is bought for your home? Please tell me according to this card. **HAND CARD O**

None (vegetarian)	12-1
Only meat from a Kosher butcher	2
From an ordinary (non-Kosher) butcher, but not pork or bacon	3
From an ordinary (non-Kosher) butcher including pork and bacon	4
Sometimes from a Kosher butcher and sometimes from a non-Kosher butcher but not pork or bacon	5
Sometimes from a Kosher butcher and sometimes from a non-Kosher butcher including pork and bacon	6

**IF ONLY MEAT FROM "KOSHER BUTCHER" ASK Q30b)
IF OTHER RESPONSE SKIP TO Q31**

Q30b) ASK ALL WHO HAVE "ONLY KOSHER MEAT" AT HOME :You have only Kosher meat at home, do you separate it from milk products (i.e. as regards cooking, serving etc.)?

Yes	13-1
No	2

GO TO Q.31

PART 3

ASK ALL:

Q.31 Some personal religious practices are now listed. Please indicate whether you do any of the following :
READ EACH IN TURN AND RING IF "YES"

Fast on Yom Kippur	14-1
On Friday night usually participate in Sabbath dinner with family or friends	2
Refrain from work on the Jewish New Year	3
Refrain from driving or travelling on Sabbath	4
Eat out only in Kosher restaurants	5
Have refrained from writing exams during Jewish holidays (or would refrain if the situation arose)	6

Q.32a) Excluding weddings, Barmitzvahs or Batmitzvahs, how often have you attended a synagogue service in the past year?

Not at all	15-1
Once or twice	2
Three to five times	3
Six to ten times	4
About once a month	5
Most Sabbaths or more often	6

Q.32b) Here is a list of different types of synagogues. Please use the appropriate letter codes to answer the following questions. HAND **CARD P** WITH LETTER CODES. READ EACH QUESTION BELOW AND RECORD LETTER CODE ANSWER. **NOTE: IF MORE THAN ONE SYNAGOGUE TYPE PER CATEGORY MENTIONED, PUT "1" and "2" TO INDICATE ORDER.**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
	Traditional Orthodox	Sephardi	Lubavitch	Chabad	Ohr Somayach	Conservative	Reform/ Progressive	None/Not Applicabl	DK/ no answer
(i) Which type of synagogue/s (if any) did your parents belong to when you were growing up?	16-1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(ii) Which type of synagogue/s (if any) do you belong to now?	17-1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(iii) Which type of synagogue/s (if any) do you attend?	18-1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(iv) Other than the one(s) you belong to or attend, which other type of synagogue on this list, if any, do you think you might like to try attending in the future?	19-1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(v) Which of the types of synagogue on this list, if any, do you think will show the greatest increase in membership in the future?	20-1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(vi) Which of the types of synagogue on this list, if any, do you think will show the greatest decrease in membership in the future?	21-1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

IF (IN Q.2) MARRIED, SKIP TO Q.33d)

IF (IN Q.2) SINGLE/UNMARRIED/DIVORCED/SEPARATED/WIDOWED CONTINUE WITH Q.33a), b) AND c).

Q.33 IF (IN Q.2) SINGLE/UNMARRIED, SEPARATED, DIVORCED, WIDOWED :

a) Which one of the following statements do you think applies. SHOW **CARD Q**:

The Jewish community makes a major attempt to help Jewish single or unattached people meet each other	22-1
The Jewish community does make some attempt to help Jewish single or unattached people meet each other	2
The Jewish community does not really attempt to help Jewish single or unattached people meet each other	3
The Jewish community makes no attempt at all to help Jewish single or unattached people meet each other	4

CONTINUE TO Q33 b)

b) Irrespective of whether or not you are looking for a partner, how important is it to you that your partner is Jewish? (WHEN RESPONDS PROBE TO DETERMINE WHICH ONE OF FOLLOWING CATEGORIES APPLIES): Very important, important, of minor importance, completely unimportant.

Very important	23-4
Important	3
Of minor importance	2
Completely unimportant	1
DK/No answer	0

c) Do you as a READ AS APPROPRIATE Single/unmarried/divorced/widowed/separated person feel adequately supported by the Jewish community structure? IF YES: Would you say: always, often, sometimes? RECORD WHICHEVER OF FOLLOWING CATEGORIES APPLIES:
Yes always, yes often, yes sometimes, no/never

Yes, always	24-1
Yes, often	2
Yes, sometimes	3
No/Never	4
DK/No answer	5

GO TO Q.33d)

ASK ALL

d) Which, if any, of the following would you personally require more of from the Jewish community than you have at present? You may mention as many or as few as you wish. HAND **CARD R**. PROBE: Anything else?

Emotional Support	25-1
Financial Assistance	2
Meals/Assistance with Meals	3
Medical Assistance	4
Organised Activities / Outings	5
Personal Safety Assistance	6
Social/Friendship Gatherings	7
Transport/Assistance with Transport	8
Other (specify)	
None of these	9
Don't know / No answer	0

IF SINGLE/UNMARRIED AND NOT LIVING WITH A PARTNER (Q.2) SKIP TO Q.34.

IF MARRIED/LIVING WITH A PARTNER (SEE Q.2) ASK Q.33e) (i)

IF DIVORCED/SEPARATED (SEE Q.2) ASK Q.33e) (ii)

IF WIDOWED (SEE Q.2) ASK Q.33e) (iii)

PART 3

Q.33e) (i) IF MARRIED/LIVING WITH A PARTNER : Does the person you are married to/living with consider himself/herself to be Jewish or non-Jewish?

Jewish	26-1
Non-Jewish	2

GO TO Q.34

(ii) IF DIVORCED/SEPARATED : Does the person you are divorced/separated from consider himself/herself to be Jewish or non-Jewish?

Jewish	27-1
Non-Jewish	2

(iii) IF WIDOWED (Q.2): Did the person you were married to consider himself/herself to be Jewish or non-Jewish?

Jewish	28-1
Non-Jewish	2

GO TO Q.34

ASK ALL:

Q.34 To what extent do you feel the Jewish community provides appropriate support and facilities for the following groups i.e. for each group I read to you please tell me if you think the Jewish community provides them with excellent services, adequate services or poor services? DEAL WITH EACH GROUP IN TURN.

	Excellent Services	Adequate Services	Poor Services	DK/No answer
(i) People with physical disabilities	29-1	2	1	0
(ii) People who are mentally ill i.e. of normal intellectual ability but mentally ill	30-1	2	1	0
(iii) People who are intellectually disabled	31-1	2	1	0
(iv) Elderly people	32-1	2	1	0
(v) Financially disadvantaged people	33-1	2	1	0
(vi) Pre-primary school children	34-1	2	1	0

Q.35 I am going to read some statements to you about beliefs and experiences. For each one please tell me according to this card SHOW **CARD G** how much you agree or disagree with the statement. READ AND RECORD FOR EACH STATEMENT IN TURN.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/No Answer
I find it very difficult to express myself spiritually in a Synagogue	35-5	4	3	2	1	0
The Jewish people have a special relationship with God	36-5	4	3	2	1	0
A Jew should marry someone who is also Jewish	37-5	4	3	2	1	0
An unbreakable bond unites Jews all over the world	38-5	4	3	2	1	0
The universe came about by chance	39-5	4	3	2	1	0
It is important that Jews survive as a people	40-5	4	3	2	1	0
IF IN Q.2 ANSWERED MARRIED/DIVORCED/SEPARATED/ WIDOWED AND SAID "Jewish" Q.33e): It is purely by chance that I married a Jew	41-5	4	3	2	1	0
Praying to God can help overcome personal problems	42-5	4	3	2	1	0
When it comes to a crisis, Jews can only depend on other Jews	43-5	4	3	2	1	0
Having a Jewish partner is only important if you intend to have children	44-5	4	3	2	1	0
The Holocaust should be included in the core of young people's Jewish identity	45-5	4	3	2	1	0

PART 3

Q.36 There is a great deal of discussion nowadays about the future of South African Jewry. I will read some of the opinions to you. Please say to what extent you agree or disagree with each one. **HAND CARD G. READ EACH STATEMENT IN TURN.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/No Answer
There will still be a substantial Jewish community in South Africa in 20 years	46-5	4	3	2	1	0
The only long term future for Jews is in Israel	47-5	4	3	2	1	0
Only the Orthodox section of the community will survive as recognizably Jewish	48-5	4	3	2	1	0
The South African Jewish community is an ageing community	49-5	4	3	2	1	0
It is likely that most Jews under the age of 30 years do not see a future for themselves in South Africa	50-5	4	3	2	1	0

Q.37 Tell me according to this card how much you agree or disagree with each statement I read to you **HAND CARD G.**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	DK/No Answer
Crime is a problem in South Africa	51-5	4	3	2	1	0
Personal safety is a problem in South Africa	52-5	4	3	2	1	0
There are always teething problems when a new government takes over so all things considered, things will work out well in South Africa	53-5	4	3	2	1	0
The government should do more for the people of South Africa	54-5	4	3	2	1	0
The South African economy is improving	55-5	4	3	2	1	0
Corruption is a problem in South Africa	56-5	4	3	2	1	0
I would rather stay in South Africa with the problems I know than in another country which has its problems too	57-5	4	3	2	1	0
Affirmative action is a good idea	58-5	4	3	2	1	0
I personally have suffered because of affirmative action	59-5	4	3	2	1	0

Q.38a) Which one of the following alternatives on this card applies to you? **HAND CARD S.**

Born Jewish	60-1
Converted to Judaism before the age of 13 years (e.g. with parent converting)	2
Converted to Judaism between 13 and 17 years of age	3
Converted to Judaism at 18 years or older	4

IF BORN JEWISH GO TO Q.39. IF "CONVERTED" GO TO Q.38b)

b) IF CONVERTED: Did you convert Reform or Orthodox?

Converted Reform	61-1
Converted Orthodox	2
DK/No answer	3

ASK ALL:

Q.39a) Did you ever attend a Jewish/Zionist youth movement (e.g. Habonim Dror, Bnei Akiva, Betar, Netzer/Maganim)?

Yes	62-1
No	2

IF "NO" SKIP TO Q.40

b) IF YES: In total for how long did you attend Jewish/Zionist youth clubs or movements (Habonim Dror, Bnei Akiva, Betar, Netzer/Maganim)? **RECORD IN APPROPRIATE CATEGORY BELOW :**

1 Year or less	63-1
2 to 3 Years	2
4 to 5 Years	3
6 to 7 Years	4
8 to 9 Years	5
10 Years or more	6
DK/No answer	7

- c) What is the name of the Jewish/Zionist youth movement which you were most involved with?

NOTE: THIS REFERS TO THEIR OWN INVOLVEMENT, NOT INVOLVEMENT THROUGH THEIR CHILDREN

Habonim Dror	64-1
Bnei Akiva	2
Betar	3
Netzer/Maganim	4
Bnei Zion	5
Other (Specify) :	6
DK/Do not remember name	7

IF IN Q.4b) HAS NO CHILDREN in categories iv) – vii) (i.e. PRIMARY/MIDDLE/HIGH/OUT OF SCHOOL BUT UNDER 22 YRS) SKIP TO Q.41.

- Q.40 ASK THOSE WHO (IN Q.4) **HAVE** CHILD/CHILDREN IN PRIMARY/MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL OR OUT OF SCHOOL BUT UNDER 22 YRS (i.e. HAVE CHILDREN IN CATEGORIES (iv) – (vii) IN Q.4b) :

- a) Thinking of your child/children who (READ AS APPROPRIATE) Are in primary school/middle school/high school/out of school but under 22 years of age:

- (i) Do or did any of them ever attend Jewish or Zionist youth movements (e.g. Habonim Dror, Bnei Akiva, Betar, Netzer/Maganim?) RECORD BELOW.
- (ii) Do or did any of them ever attend Jewish or Zionist youth movements (e.g. Habonim Dror, Bnei Akiva, Betar, Netzer/Maganim) for at least three years? RECORD BELOW.
- (ii) Do any of them attend Jewish or Zionist youth movements at present (e.g. Habonim Dror, Bnei Akiva, Betar, Netzer/Maganim?) RECORD BELOW

	YES	NO	DK/NO ANSWER
(i) Ever attend	65-1	2	3
(ii) Attend for at least 3 years	66-1	2	3
(iii) Attend at present	67-1	2	3

**IF "YES" TO ANY OF THE ABOVE GO TO Q.40b)
IF "NO" TO ALL SKIP TO Q.41**

- b) Thinking of all your children under 22 years of age, which Jewish or Zionist youth movement or movements do or did your child or children mainly attend?

MULTI-MENTION POSSIBLE.

Habonim Dror	68-1
Bnei Akiva	2
Betar	3
Metzer/Maganim	4
Bnei Zion	5
Other (Specify) :	
DK/No Answer	9

ASK ALL (IRRESPECTIVE OF WHETHER HAVE CHILDREN OR NOT):

- Q.41a) If you were to send a child to a Jewish or Zionist youth movement tomorrow, which one would you choose for your child? ONE MENTION ONLY

Habonim Dror	69-1
Bnei Akiva	2
Betar	3
Netzer/Maganim	4
Bnei Zion	5
Other (Specify) :	
DK/No Answer	9

PART 3

c) Please say whether or not you personally participated in any of the following. READ EACH IN TURN AND RECORD RESPONSE.

	YES	NO		YES	NO
(i) Barmitzvah/Batmitzvah (i.e. Did you have one?)	70-1	9	(ix) Studying Kabala	71-1	9
(ii) Machaneh	2	9	(x) Going on Jewish Heritage Trips e.g. to Poland, Russia, Lithuania	2	9
(iii) Israel experience <u>during</u> school going age	3	9	(x) Surfing Jewish websites	3	9
(iv) Yeshiva or seminary in Israel <u>after</u> leaving school	4	9	(xi) Jewish internet dating sites	4	9
(v) Other <u>post matric</u> programme in Israel	5	9	(x) Jewish Adult Education courses	5	9
(vi) Yeshiva in South Africa <u>after</u> leaving school	6	9	(x) Listening to Jewish music	6	9
(vii) SAUJS e.g. SAUJS meetings, social gatherings, etc.	7	9			
(viii) YAD e.g. YAD meetings, social gatherings, etc.	8	9			

ASK ALL :

Q.42 How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the role of formal Jewish education. Tell me according to this scale. SHOW **CARD G**. DEAL WITH EACH STATEMENT IN TURN AND RECORD ANSWER FOR EACH

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK/NO ANSWER
(i) Jewish education insulates children from the reality of the world around them	72-5	4	3	2	1	0
(ii) It is important that all Jewish children attend some form of formal Jewish education	73-5	4	3	2	1	0
(iii) The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater the knowledge about Judaism	74-5	4	3	2	1	0
(iv) The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the stronger the Jewish identity	75-5	4	3	2	1	0
(v) The greater the number of years spent attending Jewish education classes the greater commitment there is to a Jewish life in adulthood	76-5	4	3	2	1	0

Q.43a) When we say Jewish, we mean Jewish irrespective of whether Jewish by birth or Jewish by conversion. Bearing this in mind, which one of the following statements applies to you? READ ALL STATEMENTS AND RECORD WHICH ONE APPLIES.

Both your parents were Jewish	77-1
Only your mother was Jewish	2
Only your father was Jewish	3
Neither of your parents was Jewish	4
Don't know/No answer	5

ASK ALL:

Q.43b) Which one of the alternatives on this card SHOW **CARD T** describes the kind of Jewish upbringing you had as a child?

Non-practising Jewish (i.e. secular)	78-1
Just Jewish	2
Reform/Progressive	3
Traditional (not strictly Orthodox)	4
Strictly Orthodox (e.g. would not turn on a light on Sabbath)	5
Not raised in a Jewish family	6

PART 4

Q.44a) We are going to talk about Jewish organizations in South Africa i.e. Jewish communal organizations, institutions, societies, religious organizations etc. Some Jewish people are involved with such organizations and some are not. Some are members of such organizations, some show some interest in them but are not members and some are not involved with such organizations at all, which ONE of the following applies to you? **HAND CARD U**. Mention the letter next to the statement which applies to you personally. **RECORD WHICH ONE APPLIES.**

J	I am a member of some Jewish communal or religious organizations and I participate in related activities	5-1
K	I am a member of some Jewish communal or religious organizations but I do not participate much in related activities	2
L	Although I am not a member of any Jewish communal or religious organizations, I do sometimes participate in events organized by them or facilities they provide	3
M	I am not a member of any Jewish communal or religious organizations and do not participate in events organized by them or facilities they provide	4

**IF CHOOSES "J" or "K" SKIP TO Q.44c)
IF CHOOSES "L" or "M" ASK Q.44b)**

Q.44b) IF "NOT A MEMBER" (i.e. CHOSE "L" or "M" ABOVE) :
What would you say your reasons are for not being a member of any Jewish organizations?
DO NOT PROMPT. RECORD BELOW. IF ANSWER NOT LISTED SPECIFY IN "OTHER (SPECIFY)".

Time constraints / I am too busy	6-1
Financial reasons / Cannot afford it	2
Never had the opportunity to become a member / never been approached to become a member	3
Lack of interest in Jewish organizations	4
I have got other interests / these organizations do not offer what interests me	5
Do not like the people involved in the organizations	6
The people in the organizations are too cliquy/not welcoming	7
Other (Specify) _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	
Don't know/No answer	9

ASK ALL: **PART 4**
 Q.44c) Which, if any, of the organizations on this list have you ever heard of? SHOW **CARD V**. RECORD EACH "EVER HEARD OF" IN TABULATION BELOW.

Q.44d) Think only about the present. Which, if any, of these organizations, are you personally a member of, benefiting from, contributing to or involved with in any way **at present**? SHOW **CARD V**. RECORD RESPONSES IN TABULATION BELOW. CANNOT MENTION AN ORGANISATION NOT ALREADY MENTIONED Q.44c).

		Q.44c) Ever Heard	Q.44d) Involved with at present
(i)	B'nai B'rith	7-1	11-1
(ii)	Beth Din	2	2
(iii)	Beyachad Library	3	3
(iv)	Bnoth Zion Association	4	4
(v)	Chevra Kadisha (Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society)	5	5
(vi)	CSO (Community Security Organisation)	6	6
(vii)	Gitlin Library	7	7
(viii)	Hebrew Order of David (HOD)	8	8
(ix)	Holocaust Centre	9	9
(x)	Israel Centre	8-1	12-1
(xi)	Israel United Appeal (IUA) – United Communal Fund (UCF)	2	2
(xii)	Jewish National Fund of South Africa (JNF)	3	3
(xiii)	Jewish Women's Benevolent Society	4	4
(xiv)	Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research	5	5
(xv)	MA-Afrika Tikkun	6	6
(xvi)	Maccabi SA	7	7
(xvii)	Magen David Adom (MDA)	8	8
(xviii)	Nechama	9	9
(xix)	ORT – South Africa	9-1	13-1
(xx)	South Africa-Israel Chamber of Commerce (SAICC)	2	2
(xxi)	South African Board of Jewish Education (SABJE)	3	3
(xxii)	South African Jewish Board of Deputies (SAJBD)	4	4
(xxiii)	South African Jewish Museum	5	5
(xxiv)	South African Union for Progressive Judaism (SAUPJ)	6	6
(xxv)	South African Union of Jewish Students (SAUJS)	7	7
(xxvi)	South African Zionist Federation (SAZF) (called Western Province Zionist Council in Cape Town and Kwa-Zulu Natal Zionist Council in Durban)	8	8
(xxvii)	Staff Wise Recruitment Consultants	9	9
(xxviii)	Union of Jewish Women of South Africa (UJW)	10-1	14-1
(xxix)	Union of Orthodox Synagogues of South Africa (UOS)	2	2
(xxx)	United Sisterhood	3	3
(xxxi)	Women's Zionist Organisation of South Africa (WIZO)	4	4
	NONE/ None of the organisations	9	9

INTERVIEWER NOTE:

- ON THE NEXT PAGE THERE IS A SHORT LIST OF ORGANISATIONS. IN THE COLUMN MARKED "TRANSFER INFO (EVER HEARD)", TICK EACH ORGANISATION "EVER HEARD OF" (FROM Q44c).
- THEN CHECK THE LEFT HAND SIDE OF THE SHORTLIST.THERE IS AN **X** ON THE LEFT SIDE OF ONE ORGANISATION. THE POSITION OF THE **X** DIFFERS FROM QUESTIONNAIRE TO QUESTIONNAIRE. IT HAS BEEN POSITIONED METHODICALLY TO ENSURE THAT ALL ORGANISATIONS HAVE AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY OF BEING DEALT WITH. THAT **X** IS YOUR STARTING POINT FOR SELECTING **THREE** ORGANISATIONS WHICH YOU WILL BE ASKING ABOUT IN Q45a) and Q45b). **DO NOT DEVIATE FROM THE SELECTION INSTRUCTIONS YOU WILL BE GIVEN.**
- IN THE COLUMN "THREE SELECTED", **RING THE THREE YOU WILL BE ASKING ABOUT IN Q45a AND b.**

PART 4

		TRANSFER INFO (EVER HEARD)	THREE SELECTED
(ii)	Beth Din		15-1
(v)	Chevra Kadisha (Jewish Helping Hand and Burial Society)		2
(vi)	CSO (Community Security Organisation)		3
(xi)	Israel United Appeal (IUA) – United Communal Fund (UCF)		4
(xv)	MA-Afrika Tikkun		5
(xix)	ORT - South Africa		6
(xxi)	South African Board of Jewish Education (SABJE)		7
(xxii)	South African Jewish Board of Deputies (SAJBD)		8
(xxiv)	South African Union for Progressive Judaism (SAUPJ)		9
(xxv)	South African Union of Jewish Students (SAUJS)		16-1
(xxvi)	South African Zionist Federation (SAZF) (called Western Province Zionist Council in Cape Town and Kwa-Zulu Natal Zionist Council in Durban)		2
(xxviii)	Union of Jewish Women of South Africa (UJW)		3
(xxix)	Union of Orthodox Synagogues of South Africa (UOS)		4
(xxx)	Women's Zionist Organisation of South Africa (WIZO)		5

Q45a) 1st	NAME OF <u>FIRST</u> ORGANISATION DEALING WITH:	
------------------	---	--

17-18

Please think about..... MENTION FIRST ORGANISATION DEALING WITH What do you think its function is i.e. what does it set out to do? PROBE FULLY e.g. Please explain? What do you mean by that? Anything else? etc.

19-21

Q45a) 2nd	NAME OF <u>SECOND</u> ORGANISATION DEALING WITH:	
------------------	--	--

22-23

Now please think about..... MENTION SECOND ORGANISATION DEALING WITH What do you think its function is i.e. what does it set out to do? PROBE FULLY e.g. Please explain? What do you mean by that? Anything else? etc.

24-26

Q45a) 3rd	NAME OF <u>THIRD</u> ORGANISATION DEALING WITH:	
------------------	---	--

27-28

Now think about MENTION THIRD ORGANISATION DEALING WITH what do you think its function is i.e. what does it set out to do? PROBE FULLY e.g. Please explain? What do you mean by that? Anything else? etc.

29-31

PART 4

Q.45b) 1st	NAME OF <u>FIRST</u> ORGANISATION DEALING WITH:	
-------------------	---	--

32-33

Considering everything you know about MENTION FIRST ORGANISATION NAME to what extent would you say that it seems to fulfill its functions as stated on this card. Would you say it seems to fulfill the stated functions : very well, fairly well, not really well or not well at all? HAND VERSION OF **CARD X** WHICH DESCRIBES THAT ORGANISATION. RECORD RESPONSE BELOW.

Very well	34-4
Fairly well	3
Not really well	2
Not well at all	1
Don't know / no answer	Y

35-36

Q.45b) 2nd	NAME OF <u>SECOND</u> ORGANISATION DEALING WITH:	
-------------------	--	--

Considering everything you know about ... MENTION SECOND ORGANISATION to what extent would you say that it seems to fulfill its functions as stated on this card. Would you say it seems to fulfill the stated functions : very well, fairly well, not really well, or not well at all? HAND VERSION OF **CARD X** WHICH DESCRIBES THAT ORGANISATION. RECORD RESPONSE BELOW.

Very well	37-4
Fairly well	3
Not really well	2
Not well at all	1
Don't know / no answer	Y

38-39

Q.45b) 3rd	NAME OF <u>THIRD</u> ORGANISATION DEALING WITH:	
-------------------	---	--

Considering everything you know about ... MENTION THIRD ORGANISATION to what extent would you say that it seems to fulfill its functions as stated on this card. Would you say it seems to fulfill the stated functions : very well, fairly well, not really well, or not well at all? HAND VERSION OF **CARD X** WHICH DESCRIBES THAT ORGANISATION. RECORD RESPONSE BELOW.

Very well	40-4
Fairly well	3
Not really well	2
Not well at all	1
Don't know / no answer	Y

Q.46a) Are you currently in paid employment i.e. irrespective of whether you are self-employed or work for someone else?

YES	41-1	→ CONTINUE TO Q.46b)
NO	2	→ SKIP TO Q.46c)

Q.46b) IF 'YES' IN Q.46a):
 (i) Do you work full-time or part-time? RECORD BELOW
 (ii) Are you an employee or self-employed? RECORD BELOW

Q.46b) (i)		Q.46b) (ii)	
FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME		EMPLOYEE OR SELF-EMPLOYED	
FULL	PART	EMPLOYEE	SELF-EMPLOYED
42-1	2	43-1	2

GO TO Q.47

PART 4

Q.46c) IF "NO" IN Q.46a) : If you are not in paid employment, which one of the following applies to you : full-time housewife/husband and/or mother/father, student, unemployed but seeking work, retired, other? IF "OTHER", ASK TO SPECIFY.

Full-time housewife/husband, mother/father	44-1
Student	2
Unemployed and seeking work	3
Retired	4
Other (specify) :	5
Refused	6
Do not know/no answer	7

Q.47 **ASK ALL:** If you are now or have ever been in paid employment, please give your main occupation. DESCRIBE OCCUPATION IN FULL **AS INSTRUCTED**. (EXAMPLES OF UNACCEPTABLE/VAGUE ANSWERS: "IN MOTOR GAME", "BANKER", "CLERK", "IN MEDICAL FIELD", " IN BUSINESS" ETC.)

OCCUPATION _____ **45-46**

--	--

IF NEVER WORKED:TICK

--

OFFICE USE ONLY: OVERCODE ABOVE INTO JOB CATEGORIES:

PROFESSIONAL	MANAGERIAL	SEMI-PROFESSIONAL	SALES PERSON	TECHNICAL/ARTISAN	CLERICAL	MANUAL
47-1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q.48 Are you covered by a medical aid scheme and/or hospital plan?

YES	48-1
NO	2

Q.49 What is the highest level of education which you reached? (ONE ANSWER ONLY)

IF NO MATRIC	Some high school	49-1
	Diploma/certificate (e.g. technical/other)	2
	Other (specify)	3
IF HAS MATRIC	Matric	4
	Diploma/certificate (e.g. technical/other) but <u>not</u> at Technikon or University	5
	Technikon diploma/degree	6
	Bachelor's degree at University	7
	Honours degree at University	8
	Masters degree at University	9
	Doctorate	50-1
Other (specify)	2	

Q.50 Including your mother tongue, please indicate which languages you speak fluently.

English	51-1
Afrikaans	2
Hebrew	3
Yiddish	4
African language (e.g. Zulu, Sotho, Xhosa, etc.)	5
Other (specify)	6

Q.51 Thinking about this residence you are living in, which of these categories applies READ ALL CATEGORIES AND RECORD WHICH ONE APPLIES. DO NOT READ DK/NO ANSWER.

(i) It is <u>owned</u> by you or your spouse	52-1
(ii) It is <u>owned</u> by someone else living in your household	2
(iii) It is <u>owned</u> by a family member <u>not</u> living in this household	3
(iv) It is <u>rented not owned</u> by you or your spouse or other household/family members	4

80-4

AT END OF INTERVIEW THANK RESPONDENT FOR HIS/HER TIME, CO-OPERATION AND USEFULCONTRIBUTION TO THE BANK OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT SOUTH AFRICAN JEWRY



JEWISH SURVEY 2005
INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWERS

This survey is being conducted for the Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies at the University of Cape Town. As you will see when you read the questionnaire, the survey covers a wide range of issues and is designed to monitor attitudes, needs, trends, behaviour patterns and communal issues. The information gathered will facilitate assessment of the current and potential nature of the Jewish community in South Africa and will provide useful data for communal planning and also academic purposes.

We look forward to working with you and hope that you will enjoy participating in this project. It is imperative that everyone who does any interviewing for this survey follows the guidelines set out below. Even if you have done interviewing before, read it all anyway since everyone who works on this project should do so in the right frame of mind and should understand the importance of what is being done.

- **The initial Contact Interview in this survey must be telephonic in Cape Town, Pretoria and Durban BUT in Johannesburg the initial contact must be attempted at the physical address.**
The Main Interview in this survey must always be conducted as a personal, face-to-face interview (i.e. in Jhb, Pta, CT and Dbn).
- **Full instructions will be given with regard to sample selection when we go through the actual interview later on in this briefing.**
- **You as an interviewer are vitally important in that it is up to you to obtain information from respondents and to record it accurately.** However, as important as you are, you must bear in mind that:
- **The most important people are the respondents and what they have to tell us** i.e. the respondents are the people you will be interviewing. We require accurate, unbiased recording of what they say to you in response to the questions. Whether you agree with what they say or not, we want their responses not yours. We will be relying on your ability, honesty and skill as regards eliciting the information required.
- **At all times the respondent should feel and understand how important his/her responses are to us. Your approach must be warm and open but structured and firm where necessary.**
- **At all times you must keep your opinions to yourself.** The respondent must never know how you would have answered the question. Your approach must be neutral/unbiased and you must establish rapport with each respondent, irrespective of what you think of that person or the person's attitudes, opinions etc. The respondents should feel comfortable with you and they should feel that they can answer accurately and honestly without being judged by you in any way.

- **Do not talk about yourself nor about your expertise relating to the survey or the topics within it.** Do not think that it will help to establish rapport if you talk about your ability or qualifications. This kind of conversation can affect the quality of the responses e.g. if you put yourself forward as very qualified, knowledgeable and/or involved in Jewish affairs, research or anything else which can impact on the survey, you will not achieve the results we require since: some respondents will be intimidated by this approach and not answer accurately or in full; some respondents will try and impress you and also not give an accurate answer; some will be antagonised by youand so on. Even if some are not affected by you talking about yourself we cannot allow you to take a chance of introducing unnecessary bias into the results. *When you do an interview, just be a person respectfully geared towards establishing a free and comfortable atmosphere for your respondent to express himself/herself freely.*
- **Furthermore, do not speculate as to the objectives of the survey or what you think of it or any of the questions. Such discussions will introduce bias into the results and instead of doing good will actually be doing harm.** You can tell the respondents the truth which is that this survey is being conducted for the Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies at the University of Cape Town. It covers a wide range of issues and the information gathered will facilitate assessment of the current and potential nature of the Jewish community in South Africa and will provide useful data for communal planning and also academic purposes.
- **When you introduce yourself use your first name and surname, not any formal titles.**
- **Do not interview the respondent in the presence of other people.** The respondent must be alone with you. If others are present there is the danger that you will get a group opinion on some issues. Even if others in the room do not talk or interrupt, the respondent may be inhibited in some way from giving his/her honest opinion on some issues.
- **Do not allow the respondent to handle or read the questionnaire or any of the questions i.e. neither before, during or after the interview.** When interviewing, sit in such a way as to ensure that from the start there is no way that they can see anything written on the questionnaire or anything you are writing. If you suddenly had to move the questionnaire away during the interview it would hinder the rapport you establish with the respondent. The reason for this is that we are looking for spontaneous responses and we have carefully planned the order in which we will be asking the questions. If the respondent even glances at the questionnaire this could reveal some of the possible answers or follow-up questions. This can affect their responses thus introducing heavy bias. Remember that at all times we are looking for spontaneous, “real” responses and we are relying on you to elicit these from the respondents in a relaxed but highly structured way.

- **This obviously also means that under no circumstances are the respondents allowed to fill in answers themselves whether it be on the contact questionnaire or the main questionnaire.** Occasionally one comes across a respondent who says: “Leave the questionnaire with me and I will fill it in”. This can never be allowed under any circumstances e.g. even if a respondent were to say to you that he/she is a community leader and/or knowledgeable about or involved with the survey in some way.
- **What respondents tell you must be kept confidential.** You will be assuring them about the confidentiality relating to our usage of the data. This also means that whatever transpires during the interview must be kept confidential from your side as well. Do not discuss with your family or friends what respondents conveyed to you. And obviously do not tell a respondent what other respondents have said/answered to any of the questions.
- **The instructions relating to the sample and respondent selection must be rigidly adhered to at all times.** It is essential that the sample of respondents be representative of Jewish people in the city you are working in. This will be one of the following: Johannesburg, Pretoria, Cape Town or Durban. We have worked hard to ensure that the sample design yields a sample which is representative. If you do not follow instructions the results of the survey will be severely affected.
- **Under no circumstances can there be any interviewing (or even attempts to contact people for interviewing purposes) on Friday night, Saturday or any Jewish holiday.**
- **The questions must be read verbatim and the instructions relating to each question must be carefully followed. This includes showing every card as instructed, where and when relevant.** Do not change the question into your own words. Do not presume that you have a better way of phrasing any of the questions. Each question has been carefully worded to achieve specific objectives. Furthermore, some of the questions have been used in past surveys (i.e. local and international) and for comparative purposes, it is imperative that exactly the same wording is used.
- **Note that when showing the appropriate cards to the respondents for some of the questions (as instructed) you may occasionally encounter a person who cannot read (e.g. because of poor eyesight or some other reason). You must still hand the person the relevant card and then read all the alternatives on the card to them.**
- **The questions must be dealt with in the exact order in which they appear on the questionnaire.**

- **If, while you are interviewing, you find that some respondents do not answer the questions directly and/or veer off in another direction, bring them back to the question.** e.g. say “that is interesting we can come back to it later. Going back to the question.....”and then read the question to them again. At the end of the interview you can let them talk briefly about the issues they were trying to discuss earlier but don’t let them go on for too long as you may want to move on to the next interview or to whatever else you have to do.
- **The “DK/No answer” or “don’t know /no answer” codes should be used as little as possible i.e. they can only be used once you have really tried to get an answer from the respondent and you have established that it is a genuine “don’t know”. You will have to deal with the fact that some respondents are easier to interview than others** i.e. the interview flows more easily from question to question and they make every attempt to answer accurately and in full. You will find that a few respondents tend to be “Don’t know” types. Sometimes they are embarrassed to answer (e.g. because they don’t feel knowledgeable about that particular subject, because they don’t understand the question or because the particular topic of that question might not interest them). The quick, easy, superficial “don’t know” response is not acceptable but don’t just say that to them. Find a way of making them comfortable and willing to respond e.g. using whichever one or more of the following is appropriate: (i) repeat the question again and clearly; (ii) say “ I know it is a bit difficult to answer but just think about it again (iii) say “ even if you are not 100% sure about what you want to answer please try and I will make a note alongside it saying how you feel about it”.....and so on. Make the additional notes as promised. As you interview you will learn to distinguish between real “don’t know” replies where you have to try harder to get a response and those “don’t knows” which come from people who are just hesitant and/or don’t quite understand the question etc.
- **In fact, wherever appropriate, additional notes should be made on the questionnaire** e.g. sometimes the respondents’ answers do not fit into categories listed on the questionnaire **or** sometimes you will be in doubt as to whether the answer fits in or not. Be aware that we want the correct response and not merely something which is pushed into a category like a square peg into a round hole. We do not want skewed results. If the response does not fit into a category, write the response alongside the question and we will classify it or create a new code if necessary.
- **If a respondent makes any particular remarks which you are going to note on your questionnaire, don’t feel that you must censor what they say.** Record what they say using the words they use.
- **Write legibly at all times.**

- **There are different types of question on the questionnaire i.e.**
 - **Some are closed questions where the answer is one (or sometimes more) of specific alternatives** e.g.
 - “Are you a South African citizen?”. Can only be “Yes” or “No”.
 - Extent to which agrees with a particular issue (when checked according to alternatives shown on an agree/disagree card) can only be one of the following: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree
 - **Some are open-ended questions where respondents’ verbatim responses must be recorded and where probing will often be needed to ensure that the respondent has expressed himself/herself fully** e.g.
 - There is a question on what the perceived function is of a particular Jewish organisation. The respondent should mention whatever comes to mind in response to that question and the interviewer must record the responses verbatim. Probing will be needed to ensure that the respondent gives as full a response as possible. It is, for example, not adequate to say “they do work for the Jewish community”. After such a response you would have to use probing questions such as: “What type of work is it that they do for the Jewish community? “ Please explain?” What do you mean by that?” “What specifically do they do?”and so on. Also, once you have one response to an open-ended question the respondent may actually have another thought in mind as well, so after you have an answer ask: “What else comes to mind about what they do”....and so on. As you can see these are probing questions NOT prompting questions. The probing questions do not give any ideas or clues as to the answer. The probing questions only encourage respondents to think about everything they think or know in response to the question. **THROUGHOUT THE INTERVIEW BE VERY CAREFUL (FOR QUESTIONS WHERE PROBING IS NEEDED) TO ENSURE THAT YOU ONLY PROBE AND DO NOT PROMPT.**
 - **Some questions fall between the two. These questions are basically open-ended but to assist you with recording the answers we have put in some possible pre-coded answers. You should however not force the answers the respondents give you into the precoded list. If the answer does not have exactly the same meaning as the answer on the precoded list then it is preferable for you to specify it under “other (specify)” and we will give it an appropriate code.**
- **If you start working on the survey and find it is more difficult than you thought, please do not give up too easily.** It gets much easier as you go along and get into it! However, should you decide that this is not for you, do not hesitate to tell us and make sure that you return all questionnaires, sets of

cards and any other survey material promptly since we need them for other people to work with.

- **Ideally before you leave the respondent, you should be sure that you have asked all required questions and filled in all responses accurately and legibly.** Before handing in the interviews to us you must check through the form to ensure that you have not omitted anything. Should you find that there is something which you omitted, do not presume that you know what the respondent would have said. You must contact your respondent again (e.g. by phone), ask the required question(s) and record the answer(s). This is the only time that any question on the main questionnaire can be answered on the phone i.e. for correction/omissions after you get home and notice that it is necessary to recontact the respondent.
- **Before you hand in your completed interview forms to us, please check through them.**
- **Try to leave the respondent with the feeling that he/she has taken part in an interesting, worthwhile experience and thank him/her for participating and providing useful data.**
- **Having said all that, we greatly appreciate your desire to be involved in this survey. We hope that you enjoy working on the survey and that you understand that the instructions above are geared towards assisting you and ensuring that your interviews will be of the high standard required for this important study. Thank you. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any queries or problems. We will give you our names and contact numbers according to the city you are working in.**