Surveying the Jewish Population

in the United States

Part 1:

Population Estimate

Part 2:

Methodological Issues & Challenges

2   0   0   3

Gary Tobin, Ph.D.
Sid Groeneman, Ph.D.

Institute for Jewish
& Community Research
San Francisco, California

Surveying the Jewish Population

in the United States

Part 1:

Population Estimate

Part 2:

Methodological Issues & Challenges

2 0 0 3

Gary Tobin, Ph.D.

Sid Groeneman, Ph.D.

Institute for Jewish

& Community Research

3198 Fulton Street

San Francisco, California 94118

415.386.2604

415.386.2060 Fax

GATobin@JewishReseach.org

www.JewishResearch.org

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Foreword:
Our survey finds that the Jewish presence
in the United States is understated

Counting Jews, whether for demographic research or for communal policy planning, is a difficult task. Ours is a highly dispersed community. Once you leave the major metropolitan areas, locating Jewish respondents is a needle-in-a-haystack endeavor. Even in communities with more Jews, the population is more scattered than in previous generations. Jews live among non-Jews, especially in places like San Francisco, or the ex-urban fringes in any city.

Our recently completed research[1] is a sociological assessment, not a religious one. Our estimate of 6.0 million Jews includes the same categories included in other population estimates: those who say Judaism is their religion; also those who had a Jewish background (parent or upbringing). We did *not* include Jews for Jesus. We did, however, count children who are being raised primarily as Jews, even when they are being raised in mixed households practicing Judaism and another religion.[2]

Unlike other studies, we also include those who view themselves as ethnically or culturally Jewish (in response to an explicit question asking about this) AND specify no other current religion. Many American Jews think of themselves more in ethnic and cultural terms than in religious ones, and may be more comfortable talking about that aspect of their identity. Experience teaches us that many Jews say: "I am not a religious Jew or a practicing Jew. But I feel Jewish. I am a cultural Jew." Our survey found many such people.

Our projection includes an expanded number of Jews whom we believe fall outside the universe reached by random-digit-dialing plus a small increment to account for recent former Soviet Union Jews who are missed because of language difficulties.

We also believe that we found additional Jews by asking about ethnicity and other "warm-up" topics *before* addressing religion. This sequence seemed to make respondents feel more comfortable, as opposed to plunging into the more sensitive area of religion. (The survey is reprinted in Appendix A.)

The difficulty in estimating the Jewish population is compounded by the fact that some Jews do not want to be found. When receiving an unexpected telephone call from a stranger wanting to know if their parents were Jewish or not, many will simply hang up the phone or even lie about their identity or background. To substantiate this widely suspected but undocumented claim, we conducted some methodological tests. These tests suggest that there are many Jews that other studies have been missing. We also uncovered evidence that some non-Jews answer the screening questions in ways that lead them to be classified as Jews ("false positives"). We *suspect* that there are fewer false positives than Jews who are not counted, possibly enough of a difference to cause a 5-10% undercount of the Jewish population. But, to support reliable quantification, more work needs to be done on this important issue that holds promise for improving population projections. This supplemental research, based on a separate, shorter

---

[1] Described in Part 1.
[2] The original estimate of 6.7 million has been revised downward.

surveys of (a) households where at least one resident adult was presumed to be Jewish and (b) randomly selected households in the same areas, is described in Appendix B.

There were also other important findings in our 2001-02 survey. Beyond the 6.0 million Jews, we found a nearly equal population of some 6.7 million adults who are not Jewish but who have a connection to Judaism or the Jewish community. Some are married to Jews and feel identified with the community. Others volunteer a sense of affinity based on intellectual or emotional identification with Jews and Judaism. The largest group, some 4.2 million, consists of adults in the United States who have a Jewish grandparent or great-grandparent or more distant Jewish ancestor. Adding these 6.7 million to our estimated 4.4 million adult Jews gives us a total of more than 11.4 million American adults who are Jewish or have a connection to being Jewish (12.7 million people in all counting Jewish children).

These numbers strengthen the argument of those who advocate more vigorous outreach to potential converts. If the Jewish community were to lower its severe ideological, emotional and structural barriers to conversion — barriers that it claims it does not have — it might find a ready audience of people open to the message of Judaism. Simply taken as is, however, our numbers represent a substantial sociological Jewish and Jewishly connected presence in American life.

Perceptions of stability and growth or decline can lead to self-fulfilling prophesies, in either direction. A community that is seen to be vibrant is likely to retain its members and attract others. On the other hand, a community that ages without replacing its numbers and attracting people from outside is likely to fulfill the image of being in decline. Communities that believe they are in decline can abandon institutions, cut services and plan for a more limited future, which in turn is defined through limited vision of what might be. Communities that plan for growth can often achieve that goal by promoting it.

There is great significance in the existence of a sizeable non-Jewish population that is close to the Jewish community in various senses. They might not fast on Yom Kippur, but they could be expected, for example, to vote instinctively against a political candidate they see as anti-Semitic — that is, threatening to themselves or to the community with which they have a connection.

These papers attempt to encapsulate the conceptual and methodological issues and decisions that Jewish population research confronts. We draw heavily on the lessons learned from our experience designing, executing, and analyzing the 2001-02 Survey of Heritage and Religious Identification. Part 1 presents a Jewish population estimate that is based on this survey along with the methodology and procedures employed. Part 2 is a broad-ranging review of the current issues facing the field that, we believe, offers a some new ideas.

Part 1:

Population Estimate

1. Objectives

Part 1 presents a population estimate and documents the methodology used in the Institute for Jewish & Community Research's survey of "Heritage and Religious Identification" (HARI) developed and carried out to provide a database for estimating the Jewish population and addressing other research objectives. A total of 10,204 adults were interviewed using random-digit-dialing procedures (RDD) during the second half of 2001 and the first half of 2002.[3] Survey interviewing was conducted by Market Facts, Inc.[4] Survey design, overall management, data processing, analysis and estimation were provided by institute for Jewish & Community Research staff and consultants, with assistance from Market Facts.

A project designed to estimate the number of Jews in the United States confronts a series of challenges and decisions – in <u>conceptualization</u> (Who is Jewish? How should children in mixed-religion households be counted?); in survey <u>instrument development</u> (What questions should be asked to find out who is Jewish?); in <u>sampling</u> (Which households and individuals should be chosen and contacted for interviewing?); in <u>data collection procedures</u> (How is the sample to be contacted? What procedures will improve the response rate?); in <u>data analysis</u> (How much and what kind of information is needed to count someone as Jewish?); and in <u>statistical estimation</u> (How are the data to be weighted? What techniques should be used in extrapolating from sample to population?); and how to deal with the not-easily-counted Jews who do not live in households and with certain segments of the Jewish population suspected of being underrepresented in conventional surveys due to denial of Jewish identity? While these issues cover the main challenges, they do not exhaust the list.

The balance of the Part 1 is organized into the following sections:

2. The Jewish population in the United States and its components

3. Estimating "Connected non-Jews" and those of "Jewish heritage"

4. Description of the survey methodology

5.   Technical description of the weighting, sampling error, statistical estimation procedures and adjustments

Appendix B provides a detailed description of the methodological surveys used to estimate whether specific Jewish population segments and Jews in general are under-counted in RDD telephone surveys.

---

[3] Exact field dates are provided below.
[4] Market Facts has changed its name and is now Synovate.

2. The Jewish Population in the United States and Its Components

The estimated size of the Jewish population is **6.002 million** (see Table 1). This figure counts the following subgroups:

Adults (persons 18 years and older):

- Those who say their current religion is Jewish/Judaism including those who also specify other religions but NOT including Messianic Jews;

- Persons who say they were raised Jewish or have a Jewish parent or formerly practiced Judaism AND who specify no current religion (none/atheist/agnostic); and

- Persons who say their ethnic/cultural group is Jewish AND who specify no current religion (none/atheist/agnostic).

(The questions used to identify Jews are provided in Section 3.2.3 of Part 2.)

Children (persons younger than 18):

- Children in households where at least one adult specifies Jewish/Judaism as their current religion and the respondent reports that the children are being raised Jewish at least in part.

In addition, the total Jewish-population estimate includes two additional components: (1) to account for Jews outside of the survey's sampling frame -- those living in Alaska, Hawaii, and non-households such as military barracks, college/university group housing, hospitals and nursing homes (institutional population) – and (2) an adjustment for a documented undercount of recent emigrants from the former Soviet Union (FSU). These two components of the estimate are independent of the HARI survey.

The total Jewish population thus equals:

$\sum$ (Jewish adults + Jewish children + AK/HI/institutional population + FSU emigrant undercount)

Table 1 presents national Jewish population estimates as of 2002:

Table 1: Jewish Population in the United States
(in thousands)

Jewish religion and no other religion	2,437
Jewish religion plus some other religion	238
Practices Judaism as another religion (no current religion specified)	33
Total Jewish/Judaism mentioned as one's religion	2,708
Jewish by parentage only (no current religion specified)	984
Raised Jewish or formerly Jewish (no current religion specified)	350
Jewish by parentage and ethnicity only (no current religion specified)	84
Jewish by ethnicity only	293
Total Jewish adults (before AK/HI/institutional and recent FSU emigrant adjustments)	4,419
Religiously Jewish households (1 or more adults specifies Jewish/Judaism as their current religion)	2,198
Total children (under 18) in religiously Jewish households	1,548
Children being raised exclusively Jewish	1,187
Children being raised partly Jewish	179
Total Jewish children (before AK/HI/institutional and recent FSU emigrant adjustments)	1,366
Total Jews (before AK/HI/institutional and recent FSU emigrant adjustments)	5,786
Increment for recent FSU emigrant undercount*	66
Increment for Alaska/Hawaii/institutional populations**	150
Total Jews ***	**6,002**

* Details pertaining to this estimate are described in Section 5.3 (Part 1) and Appendix B .
** This represents a non survey-based estimate to account for Jews living outside the survey universe, described in Section 5.4.
*** Factoring in estimates of the number of children in the AK/HI/institutional adjustment produces estimates of 4,631,000 total Jewish adults and 1,371,000 total Jewish children.

None of the estimated figures in Table 1 includes an increment to account for likely non-disclosure of Jewish identity among some individuals. Supplemental methodological research, described in section 5.6 (Part 1) and in Appendix B, presents evidence of survey underestimation due to the tendency of some Jews to fail to reveal Jewish identity or background. This research is based on a separate, shorter survey conducted by the Institute, in which at least one resident adult in each household contacted was presumed to be Jewish. Although that test does not support precise quantification of this source of survey undercount, it suggests that some degree of "Jewish denial" exists, that further work is needed to better estimate its magnitude, and that surveys that do not account for the phenomenon might understate the size of the Jewish population by 5%-10%. The Table 1 total and components should, therefore, be regarded as conservative estimates.

3. Connected Non-Jews and Persons of Jewish Heritage

This research establishes two additional broad categories, neither of which is included in the Jewish population in the United States estimate presented in the preceding section: "Connected Non-Jews" and persons of "Jewish Heritage."

3.1 Connected Non-Jews

Connected non-Jews have some current connection to being Jewish (and, in many cases, to other Jews) – either through psychological identification or via personal history or proximate familial relationship. In many instances, connected non-Jews may be knowledgeable about Judaism and Jewish life, might experience or practice it occasionally or sporadically, or might have done so in the past. They can be thought of as a second, surrounding tier positioned socially or psychologically close to the Jewish population. As such, connected non-Jews represent natural allies on matters of concern to the Jewish community as well as targets for recruitment to greater programmatic, organizational, and spiritual involvement – which, in some cases, can lead to conversion or formal affiliation.

Connected non-Jews consist of the following subgroups:

▪ Adults who practice Judaism as a secondary religion; that is, after mentioning some other church or faith as their current religion, also answer "Judaism" or "Jewish" in response to whether they currently practice any other religion or attend any other church;"

▪ Adults who were raised Jewish, have/had a Jewish parent, or formerly practiced Judaism AND who now practice a religion other than Judaism;

▪ Adults who claim "Jewish" as their ethnic/cultural group and practice a religion other than Judaism; and

▪ Adults with some other current religion (or none) whose spouse's or partner's current religion or ethnicity is Jewish/Judaism.

There are approximately **2.5 million** connected non-Jews (adults) in the United States.

Table 2 breaks out the connected non-Jews into their components:

Table 2: The Connected Non-Jewish Population and Components (adults)	
(The subcategories overlap; the Total row is net.)	
Practices Judaism as a secondary religion	199,000
Raised Jewish, Jewish parent, or formerly Jewish AND practices religion other than Judaism	1,105,000
Ethnically/culturally Jewish AND practices religion other than Judaism	769,000
Spouse/partner with Jewish identity	695,000
TOTAL: Connected Non-Jewish adults (net)	**2,487,000**

3.2 Persons of Jewish Heritage

A second segment of interest but not part of the Jewish population are persons of Jewish heritage. The Jewish heritage population consists of non-connected non-Jewish adults who report having a grandparent or more distant ancestor who was Jewish. There are approximately **4.2 million** adults of Jewish heritage in the United States.

Persons of Jewish heritage form a third circular layer, socially and psychologically further from the center of Jewish life in the United States. While less proximate to "things Jewish" than connected non-Jews, persons of Jewish heritage might also be allied with Jews on issues of common interest and, like connected non-Jews, might support Jewish causes or be involved in certain aspects of Jewish life. In some cases, they might be candidates for full-fledged return to their ancestral roots.

The three broad groupings – Jews, connected non-Jews, and adults of Jewish heritage – are combined in Table 3:

Table 3: Jews, Connected Non-Jewish Adults, and Adults of Jewish Heritage

Jewish adults and children	6,002,000
Connected Non-Jewish adults	2,487,000
Adults of Jewish Heritage	4,246,000
Total: Jews + Connected Non-Jewish adults + Jewish Heritage adults	12,735,000*

* Subtracting out the estimated number of Jewish children (1,371,000) produces a total ADULT Jewish/Connected/Heritage population of 11,364,000.

3.3 Participation in Jewish Events and Ceremonies

Table 4 shows that these population segments form a continuum of participation in terms of their responses to the question:

Have you attended any Jewish events or ceremonies <u>in the past two years,</u> including Passover Seders, Jewish weddings, Bar/Bat Mitzvahs, or other Jewish religious or cultural events?

Table 4:
Participated in a Jewish Event or Ceremony in the Past 2 Years (%)

Jews	72
Connected Non-Jews	42
Jewish Heritage	18
All other	8

Comparing the four primary segments reveals, as predicted by this conceptual typology, that Jews are more likely to have participated in such an activity than connected non-Jews, who, in turn, are more likely to have participated than persons of Jewish heritage, who, in turn, are more likely to have participated than everyone else.

Although there remains a lot of work to be done to demonstrate the usefulness of this typology, this simple analysis serves as initial validation of the progressive proximity to the center of Jewish life of the respective segments.

4. Description of the Institute's HARI Survey Methodology

4.1 Sample Size, Field Dates, Management and Quality Control

Estimates of the Jewish population in the United States, connected non-Jews, and persons of Jewish heritage are based on a national RDD survey of "Heritage and Religious Identification" (HARI) conducted in two phases during 2001-02. Interviewing for Part 1 took place from July 3 through November 7, 2001 (n_1=5,100 interviews); Part II was carried out during March 4 through June 11, 2002 (n_2=5,104 interviews). The survey thus consists of 10,204 interviews in all. The four-month interval between the two field periods was used to digest results from Part I, review project resources and contractual issues, determine final sample size, and make minor changes in the survey instrument.

Interviews took an average of fewer than nine minutes to complete. All survey interviewing and data processing was performed by Market Facts, Inc., using experienced interviewing staff who were given customized training for this work. A half-week pretest of 50 interviews was conducted at the beginning. Interviews took place from a centralized location under the continuous supervision of telephone interviewing center management and supervisory staff. Interviews in progress were periodically monitored as a quality control tool. (The HARI Survey questionnaire is reproduced as Appendix A.)

Working closely with Institute for Jewish & Community Research staff, a senior survey consultant experienced in Jewish population research and a co-author of this paper (Groeneman) provided an independent layer of management via participation in the briefing and pretest, several sessions of monitoring in mid-survey, review of progress reports, and oversight of the coding and survey data file preparation.

4.2 Survey Content and Approach to Gaining Cooperation

In addition to generating data that would allow estimation of the Jewish population in the United States, the HARI survey also had other objectives, including profiling the population in the United States in terms of ethnic/cultural group identification and examining the phenomena of religion switching and practicing multiple religions. As a result, most of the survey items dealt with ethno-cultural group identification or with religious identification, background, and practice of self and family.

Considerable time and effort was dedicated in the design phase to concerns about survey nonresponse, especially to dealing with noncooperation stemming from suspicions about the survey's motives and specific reluctance to answer questions about religion – regarded by some as a private or personal topic. With assistance from Dr. Roger Tourangeau, one of the leading specialists in question wording and instrument development from the Joint Program in Survey Methodology (Universities of Maryland and Michigan), the Institute for Jewish & Community Research's HARI survey team adopted an innovative approach to minimizing this problem. They attempted to engage the respondent at the very beginning of the interview in a conversation the respondent would find appealing.[5]

---

[5] Specifically, the interviewers began by asking nonstructured questions about the respondents' grandparents – how well they knew the grandparents when the respondent was a child, where the grandparents lived, experiences or recollections they remember most vividly, and so forth. The intent was not to record these answers for later

4.3 Survey Implementation

At each household contacted, using the "most recent birthday method," one adult was randomly selected to be the respondent. No substitutions were allowed. The data collection regimen called for making at least 10 contact attempts, (not counting busy signals) before sample replacement on each telephone number dialed, that is, an initial dialing plus at least nine call-backs. Successive call-backs were carefully scheduled on different days of the week and at different times of day to improve the chances of reaching a respondent. Telephone numbers that had to be replaced were not substituted until at least two or three weeks or more had elapsed between the first and last dialing, to minimize the amount of "dead sample" due to persons being away from home and unavailable to be interviewed for extended periods. Altogether, 23% of the interviews were completed on dialing 7 or higher, and one-tenth of all interviews were completed on dialing 10 or higher.

Persons reached but refusing the interview or hanging up immediately were re-contacted – generally after 10-14 days – and "refusal conversions" were attempted. Exceptions were made in the case of adamant, angry or abusive answerers, who were *not* re-contacted. Altogether, 631 of the survey interviews resulted from refusal conversions.

These extensive procedures were implemented to improve the survey's response rate. There are many ways of calculating response rate and the closely associated cooperation rate. Cooperation rate refers to the proportion of eligible respondents reached who ultimately were interviewed in the survey, that is, who did not refuse or terminate before completion. Counting in the denominator all refusers, immediate hang-ups, and Caller-ID blocked dialings, who were reached a second time for a conversion attempt, the cooperation rate was 52%. Counting *all* refusers and hang-ups, including those households not reached a second time for an attempted conversion, the cooperation rate was 41%. Using AAPOR's RR3 formula, the overall response rate, which includes in the denominator eligibles not reached as well as noncooperators, was 29%. As most observers know, telephone survey response rates in the United States have been plummeting.[6]

The rigorous survey procedures implemented in the HARI survey paid dividends in reaching Jewish respondents (Table 5), as the percentage of Jews reached and interviewed after many callbacks was greater than on earlier dialings[7]:

---

analysis, but instead, to put the respondent at ease, build rapport, and make the questions sound interesting to motivate the respondent to continue with the interview. Following the opening conversational section, the questioning then led quite naturally to more structured items about whether the grandparents were native-born or what country they came from, grandparents' ethnic and religious background – answers that were recorded – and then to similar questions about the respondent and the more immediate family, that is, to the main survey content. The approach seemed to work.

[6] According to the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR), the average RDD survey response rate is now about 11%. CMOR's response rate tracking program results are reported at: www.mra-net.org/resources/respondent_cooperation/coop_rates_avg.cfm .

[7] Although this relationship is not statistically significant in the formal sense, the Jewish population estimate would be meaningfully different if the survey had been limited to 3 (or 6) attempts.

Table 5: Jewish/Non-Jewish Interviews (%) by Call Number (unweighted)				
Call Number:	1-3	4-6	7-9	10+
Non-Jewish	97.7	97.4	97.1	97.0
Jewish	2.3	2.6	2.9	3.0
	100%	100%	100%	100%

5. Technical Documentation

5.1 Data Weighting

Two sets of weights were calculated and used in this research: person weights and household weights. In some analyses – those that estimate attributes or beliefs or practices of individual persons – it is correct to adjust the data through weighting to reflect the adult population in the United States using the person weights. Most of the statistical estimation focuses on total adults and uses person weights. Estimation of children in Jewish households required household-level analysis, and the household weights are applied for those estimates.

The **person weight** consists of two component subweights, which are multiplied to produce a person weight for each respondent. The first component, called *the initial weight* (or preweight), is the product of the number of adults in the household (1, 2, 3, or 4+) and the reciprocal of the number of telephone lines (1, 2+ separate phone numbers) in the household used for voice calls:

Initial person weight = # of HH adults x (1 / # of telephone lines)

The purpose of the initial weight is to "equalize" the probability of selection – to adjust for the fact that in RDD surveys with random respondent selection some individuals are less likely to be chosen as respondents because of a higher-than-average number of adults in their household or because of a lower-than-average number of phone numbers for receiving voice calls.

The second part of the person weight provides a *post-stratification adjustment*; that is, it corrects for the differential nonresponse across demographic categories that affects virtually all surveys. The post-stratification component incorporates four factors:

- age (18-34, 35-44, 45-64, 65+),
- race (black, other/multiple),
- geographic division of place of residence (9 census divisions), and
- gender by education (less than high school graduate, high school graduate, some college, 4-year college graduate or more).

Population distributions for these factors are taken from the Census Bureau's 2001 Current Population Survey (CPS) for persons 18 and older residing in continental households in the United States.

This second component of the person weight was derived through an iterative process that takes as its input population in the United States distributions of the four factors as targets and follows an algorithm that converges on a set of cell weights in a way that minimizes the variance across weights. This standard procedure is sometimes called marginal (or rim) weighting. The person weight for respondent, then, is:

Person Weight$_i$ = initial person weight$_i$ x post-stratification person weight$_i$

The **household weight** employs an initial weight based on the number of telephone lines and multiplies it by a post-stratification household-level component that adjusts for household size (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6+ persons in the household) and number of households in each geographic division (nine U.S. Census divisions). The post-stratification component is also arrived at through the marginal weighting procedure. Household figures for the continental United States are also taken from the 2001 CPS survey. Like the person weight, the household weight for household i is the product of the two components:

Household Weight$_i$ = initial HH weight$_i$ x post-stratification HH weight$_i$

5.1.1 Probable Impact of Education in the Weighting

Including education in the weighting is customary and proper in most national RDD surveys to adjust for possible differential nonresponse by socio-economic status. For this reason, it was chosen as one component of the person weights. Failure to include education (or some alternative SES factor) would risk producing a sample biased toward individuals with higher socio-economic status – which would likely result in overestimating the number of Jews. In this survey, however, including education as a factor in the person weights probably results in an UNDER-estimate of Jewish adults because: (1) non-English-speaking persons, who have decidedly fewer years of school than others, were not interviewed; (2) the distribution of education for the entire country – including non-English speakers -- was used as input in the weights;[8] and (3) Jews in the United States tend to have far higher-than-average levels of education. As a result, it is plausible that Jewish respondents are being "weighted down" more than they should be, resulting in an underestimate of Jewish adults.[9]

5.2 Estimation Procedures

Population estimates were arrived at in five steps:

1. Estimation of the preliminary number[10] of Jewish adults,

---

[8] When the research was completed, up-to-date target levels of education in the United States were NOT available for the English-speaking population only. These would range higher than the distribution for the entire nation, and Jewish respondents would not be down-weighted as much.

[9] At the same time, education was NOT incorporated into the household weights – both for theoretical and practical reasons. Using household-level weights without some socio-economic status component such as education – household income was deemed too problematic to be an effective substitute – might have the opposite effect of *over*-estimating the number of Jewish households and, therefore, the number of Jewish children. Despite these considerations, no superior option could be formulated. The research team determined that the weighting plan adopted produced the best possible sample and population estimates given the limitations of the information available.

[10] Preliminary means before the adjustments in steps 4-5.

2. Estimation of the number of Jewish households,
3. Estimation of the number of Jewish persons under 18 years of age,
4. Incrementing the estimated number of undercounted Jews from the FSU, and
5. Incrementing by the number of Jews falling outside the survey universe.

5.2.1. Jewish Adults

The preliminary number of Jewish adults was determined by identifying respondents who met one or more of the conditions specified above:

- Those who say their current religion is Jewish/Judaism (or Jewish/Judaism along with some other religion as part of a multiple response);

- Persons who say they were raised Jewish or have a Jewish parent or formerly practiced Judaism and who specify no current religion; and

- Persons who say their ethnic/cultural group is Jewish and who specify no current religion.[11]

The <u>preliminary number of Jewish adults</u> was, then, a simple extrapolation using ratio estimation:

Jewish adults$_{prelim}$ = (weighted number of Jewish respondents in sample[12] / total sample) x adults in continental United States

= (222.5 / 10,204) x 202,674,574 = **4,419,000 Jewish adults**

5.2.2 Jewish Households

Arriving at the number of Jewish children – the number of Jewish persons under 18 – required first estimating the number of Jewish households. It was decided that a "Jewish household" would be a household where either the respondent or the respondent's spouse/partner (if any) specifies their current religion as Judaism or Jewish:

Jewish households = (weighted number of Jewish HHs in sample[13] / total sample) x households in continental United States

= (211.8 / 10,204) x 105,877,003 = **2,198,000 Jewish households**
[before population increments and adjustments explained below]

5.2.3 Jewish Persons Under Age 18

Jewish children (under 18) were defined as persons living in Jewish households where at least one adult specified Judaism as their current religion and the respondent – in most cases, a parent – indicated that the children are being raised Jewish (or Jewish and something else). In 76.7% of Jewish households, the children were being raised exclusively Jewish; in 11.6%,

---

[11] Included in "no current religion" are those specifying humanism, ethical culture, or "all religions."
[12] Person weights were applied in this estimate.
[13] Household weights were applied in this estimate.

Jewish and something else; in the remaining 11.7% of Jewish households, the children were not being raised Jewish.

The total number of children residing in Jewish households was computed as the product of the mean number of persons under 18 in Jewish households (.704) times the number of Jewish households. Thus, the total number of Jews under 18 is estimated by the following equation:

$$\text{Jewish persons under } 18_{prelim} = \text{Jewish households} \times \text{average number of persons under 18/household} = 2{,}198{,}000 \times .704 = 1{,}547{,}608$$

Of these children, 76.7% = 1,187,000 (rounded to the nearest thousand) are being raised exclusively Jewish, and 11.6% = 179,000 are being raised Jewish and something else:

> Children being raised exclusively Jewish. 1,187,000
> Children being raised Jewish plus something else. . . . .<u>179,000</u>

Estimated total children being raised at least partly Jewish: **1,366,000**
[before increments and adjustments explained below]

5.3 Increment for Undercount of Recent Émigrés from the Former Soviet Union

Demographers working on the latest National Jewish Population Study (2000-01) estimate the current population of Jewish adults who emigrated to the United States from the former Soviet Union since 1970 to be 244,000.[14] Because the HARI survey did not contain questions about country of origin and year of emigration, it is impossible to know how many FSU Jews are included in the obtained sample. If those Jews are under-represented in the HARI survey sample (and, thus, in the population projection), as is almost certainly the case, it is impossible to know by how much without further information.

Anticipating that FSU Jews (as well as several other population segments – the Orthodox, Israeli Jews living in the United States, and young adults) would be systematically underrepresented in our demographic survey, as many researchers suspect they are in others, the Institute for Jewish & Community Research conducted a smaller-scale "methodological survey" that included known FSU Jewish households to determine if and how much these segments are underestimated. This separate research is fully described in Appendix B.

Analysis of the methodological survey data indicated that FSU Jews are much less likely than other Jews to participate in the survey due to insufficient ability to communicate well enough in English to carry out the interview.[15] Therefore, an adjustment to the total Jewish population estimate was developed to account for these missed Jews.

---

[14] United Jewish Communities Research Department, "Jews from the Former Soviet Union: Reconciling Estimates from the National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01 and the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society," unpublished paper; January 21, 2003. This report does not break out separately the number of Jewish children in these FSU Jewish households.

[15] Like the HARI survey, the methodological survey conducted interviews only in English. FSU households contacts were nearly eight times as likely as other Jewish households to result in a "Language/Communications Difficulty" noninterview disposition.

The method of calculating the undercount was as follows:

1. All but 3.5% of the "language/communication difficulty" sample dispositions were reallocated proportionately across the other possible contact outcomes: (a) Refusals, hang-ups, and terminates; (b) Unavailable to be interviewed during field period; and (c) Completed interviews. (The reallocated percentage of language/communication difficulty dispositions was set at 3.5% to equal the HARI survey percentage of language/communication difficulty dispositions in the general population.)
2. The additional percentage of FSU Jews that would have been estimated had the degree of language difficulty been the same as in the general population was then calculated as the ratio: (number of completed interviews in the reallocated distribution) / (number of completed interviews in the original distribution). This ratio was 1.37, or 37% additional FSU Jews, using the reallocated distribution.
3. The number of FSU Jews projected using unadjusted HARI data is thus: 244,000/1.37 = 178,000 (rounded to the nearest thousand).
4. Therefore, the adjustment applied to account for the underestimate of FSU Jews because of language was 244,000 (NJPS estimate) minus 178,000 (HARI estimate based on English language interviews only) = +66,000.[16]

5.4 Increment for AK/HI/institutional (Jews Outside the RDD Sampling Frame)

The HARI survey was not designed to identify or estimate Jews residing outside the 48 states plus the District of Columbia or those not living in households, that is, who reside in institutional settings such as college dormitories, nursing homes, military barracks, prisons, and other housing not easily reached through conventional RDD telephone survey methodology. In the absence of other reliable data, the Institute for Jewish & Community Research uses 150,000 as the estimate of the Hawaii/Alaska/institutional Jewish population.

This figure is based on the following sub-estimates:

- Hawaii – 10,000 (Web site discussions of the Jewish population);
- Alaska – 3,000 (1995 Brandeis University survey);
- Military- 17,000 (Jewish Chaplaincy estimate);
- Prisons - 10,000 (Jewish prison advocacy group estimate);
- Nursing homes - 25,000 (conservative guesstimate); and
- College dormitories – 85,000.

The dormitory calculation is based on the following estimates and assumptions:

1. There are approximately 1.371 million Jewish children less than 18 years old (counting an additional 5,000 in Hawaii + Alaska + institutionalized added to the 1.366 million in Table 1);

---

[16] This calculation is conservative in that it uses the 244,000 NJPS estimate of adults, and thus does not include children. At the time this report was completed, the NJPS had not released an estimate of the number of children of FSU Jewish adults. Because of likely differences in age and religious identification between FSU Jews and other Jews, it would be hazardous to derive an estimate of the number of Jewish children in these families.

2. Dividing by 18 yields 76,167 born, on average, in each of 18 one-year age cohorts;

3. Assuming that (a) the 18- and 19- year-old cohorts will be about the same size; (b) mainly freshmen and sophomores (18-19-year-olds) live in dormitories, equating to 2 of the 18 age cohorts; (3) 80% of Jews of this age attend college; and (4) 70% of the freshmen and sophomores live in dorms;

4. Thus: 76,167 x 2 x .80 x .70 = 85,000 (rounded to the nearest thousand).

Summing these individual component estimates – Hawaii and Alaska, military, prisons, nursing homes, and college dormitories -- yields an additional 150,000 Jewish individuals who are outside the survey universe.

5.5 Sampling Error of Estimates

The estimator for the total number of Jews is a complex calculation requiring the following factors:

- The estimator for the Jewish adult population, and
- The estimator for the under-18 Jewish population

The estimator for the Jewish adult population is an expansion estimator taking the sample proportion of Jews and expanding by the total adult population size. The sample proportion is calculated using the sample weights described in Section 5.1.

The estimator for the Under-18 Jewish population is the product of the average number of Jewish children per Jewish household and the estimated number of Jewish households. The estimator for the total Jewish population can be written as:

$$\hat{T} = \hat{T}_{adult\ Jews} + \hat{T}_{Jews\ Under\ 18} = N_{US}\ \hat{P}_{adult\ Jews} + \hat{N}_{Jewish\ households}\ \bar{C}_{Jewish\ households}$$

where $P_{adults\ Jews}$ is the estimated proportion of adult Jews in the United States, N_{US} is the adult population in the United States, "N-hat"$_{Jewish\ households}$ is the estimated number of Jewish households in the United States, and "C-bar"$_{Jewish\ households}$ is the average number of Jewish children per Jewish household.

The standard error of this estimator is difficult to estimate directly. The variance of this estimator is the variance of the sum of two estimators that are correlated. For instance, the proportion of adult Jews is correlated with the estimated number of Jewish households. In addition, the second term is the product of two estimators, and its sampling variance requires an algebraic expansion to account for the product of two random variables that are correlated.

Although it is possible to calculate the standard error, we chose to estimate it using replication methods. By taking random subsamples from the 10,204 respondents and estimating the total for each subsample, we can determine the variability of the estimator and take into account the sample weights without specifying each component of the variance.

Using this replication approach, the estimated standard error for the total Jews in the United States population is approximately 399,000. The sampling error at 95 percent confidence for this estimate is, therefore: ± 1.96 x 399,000 =   ±798,000. This leads to a confidence interval for the total population estimate (6,002,000) of: 5,204,000 – 6,800,000. This estimate takes into account the variability introduced by the sampling weights and the complex form of the estimator.

5.6 Non-Disclosure of Jewish Identity/Background

Along with other researchers in the field of Jewish demography, the originators of this study suspect that some proportion of Jews will not admit Jewish identify, parentage, or origin when asked by an unknown interviewer in random-sample telephone surveys – or will disproportionately refuse to participate in the survey. To test this theory and estimate the number of Jews who might be missed for this reason, lists of recent donors and of past donors and prospects (nearly all of whom were presumed Jewish) were obtained from four local Jewish Federations that compile and maintain such lists for the purpose of fund-raising. In a separate, side survey Institute for Jewish & Community Research conducted in the spring of 2002 to estimate the undercount stemming from this expected occurrence, samples from these Federation-supplied lists were contacted and an identical series of screening questions administered as those used in the 2000-01 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) to identify and classify Jews. This survey was conducted in parallel with the similar surveys of the special population segments (including the survey of FSU Jews referred to above in section 5.3).

The results from this methodological survey suggest that a nontrivial number of Jews fail to reveal Jewish identity/parentage/background – that is, to give answers that would result in someone in the household being counted as Jewish. The magnitude of this undercount appears to be in the range of 5%-10%. Because of the small samples of unknown representativeness and validity used in the methodological test – and because a parallel RDD test survey in the same areas revealed counter-balancing evidence of false positive responses (non-Jews respondent to the screening questions as though they were Jews) -- no additional statistical adjustment of the Jewish population estimate was made. Further testing is necessary to confirm the results and warrant reliable quantification. Nevertheless, the initial findings hint that the true number of Jews in the United States might be higher than projected due to non-disclosure. (Further details of the test can be found in Appendix B.)

Part 2:

Methodological Issues & Challenges

1. Introduction and Objectives

The latest National Jewish Population Study (NJPS 2000-2001, administered by the United Jewish Communities) has been enmeshed in controversy from the time the National Technical Advisory Committee first met to hammer out a plan, through the extra months of survey interviewing, and continuing on in the aftermath of the survey over the problematic release of the results. Given the diverse interests that have a stake in the research, the many difficult decisions involved in doing such a complex study, and the long list of problems that can arise, perhaps this should not be surprising. This paper is not about the politics or process of the multimillion-dollar 2000 NJPS and its questionable methodology. It is about the choices and difficulties faced in conducting Jewish population research – both national and local studies – and how these studies might be improved.

Many of the ideas presented here originated during the course of planning, fielding, and analyzing data from the 2001-02 national survey of Heritage and Religious Identification (HARI) sponsored by the Institute for Jewish & Community Research. The HARI sample consists of 10,204 random-digit-dial interviews across the continental United States, and focuses on religious and ethnic identification, religious affiliation and practice. In the process of identifying Jewish respondents, the interview was designed to capture the same dimensions as the NJPS screening questions (though not worded in the same way) as well as additional questions and probes used to determine if the standard screening questions might be missing some Jews. What we learned from the HARI survey – and from elements of the survey's methodology that we believe hold promise in future Jewish population surveys -- are described in later sections.[17]

A study designed to estimate and describe the Jewish population confronts a host of challenges and decisions – in conceptualization (Who is Jewish? How should children in mixed-religion households be counted?); in sampling (Which households and individuals should be chosen and contacted for interviewing?); in screening (What questions should be asked to find out who is Jewish?); in data collection mode and procedures (How is the sample to be contacted? What procedures will improve the response rate?); in questionnaire development (What topics should be addressed? How are the questions best phrased and sequenced to elicit the desired information and maximize response accuracy?); in data analysis (How much and what kind of information is needed to count someone as Jewish?); and in statistical estimation (How are the data to be weighted? What techniques should be used in extrapolating from sample to population?); and how to deal with the not-easily-counted Jews who do not live in households and with certain segments of the Jewish population suspected of being underrepresented in conventional surveys due to unwillingness to disclose Jewish identity or other reasons? While these issues cover the main challenges, they do not exhaust the list.

---

[17] A critical component of the method used to estimate the U.S. Jewish population using HARI data was a smaller "side survey" developed and carried out to estimate the extent to which Jews might be under- (or, possibly, over-) represented in RDD telephone studies due to differential contact, cooperation, and/or disclosure of Jewish status. The results are presented in Appendix **B**.

For anyone who has wrestled with these issues, it is easy to throw up one's hands in despair and conclude that the task is too daunting to pursue, even with a generous research budget. The purpose of Part 2 is a sober, comprehensive analysis of the challenges facing Jewish population research at the beginning of the 21st century. In the process, we point out conventional approaches that have been applied in past efforts and suggest some new options that we think hold promise.

Apart from the practical application of Jewish population research in program planning and fund-raising, the Jewish community has a long tradition of sociological curiosity and self-examination. We fully expect that the need and interest in obtaining reliable data on the Jewish population will persist. We hope that this assessment of the methodology of conducting the requisite research will encourage others to further innovation and experimentation, following the effort that we introduce in this paper – to continue applying the best tools and minds to the challenges confronted in Jewish demography. In the end, despite the difficulties, we believe, along with most informed observers, that imperfect data are better than no data at all – and that we have not reached the point where the best research results are too flawed to be of value.

The next section presents a critical assessment of the current status of Jewish population research and issues a challenge to Jewish demographers, population research funders, and research consumers to commit to methodological improvement.

2. Methodological Issues

The methodological issues that need systematic study and analysis are listed below. This research paper touches on some of them, but more exhaustive research is essential.

1. Who is "Jewish?" Who should be included in the count of Jews is perhaps the most difficult issue. Individuals who have two Jewish parents may say they have no religion when asked about their current religious identification. Should they be counted? Some individuals are practicing more than one religion, e.g., Judaism and Buddhism or Judaism and Christianity. Should they be included? Some Jews do not have Jewish parents; and when asked about their religion, say "none" but list their ethnicity as Jewish. Should they be counted? What if these same individuals are practicing Christians, but consider themselves ethnic Jews? The permutations are seemingly infinite; and in each survey of Jews, there are hundreds of variations on religion, ethnicity, parentage, and ancestry. These decisions are sociological, cultural and religious. Currently, there are no standards for counting who is in and who is out in the Jewish population. This is especially true for those who are crossing religious boundaries by practicing more than one religion, saying they have no religion, or saying they have a different religion or ethnicity.

2. Screening questions. Different screeners need to be tested systematically. These include direct questions about religion, or detailed questions about ethnicity, questions about ancestry, language, order of questions, and other variables. Without effectively testing screening questions, we do not know which are the best questions that will (a) capture all dimensions of Jewish classification and (b) achieve a high and equivalent response rate among Jews and non-Jews. The types of screening questions have been fairly limited.

Experimentation with screeners can greatly advance the field of Jewish demographic research. We suspect that most screeners in Jewish demographic research, including the NJPS, are too frontal and therefore likely to discourage participants.

3. <u>Testing different sampling approaches</u>. Much more systematic testing needs to be done on the potential biases and usability of various sampling techniques, including distinctive Jewish names, random-digit dialing, and list samples. While there has been some exploration done on this issue, there are very few recent examinations of the differences between these sampling techniques, and how to best use dual- or multiple-frame samples. Currently, unnecessary dollars are being expended on the use of single-frame samples. The 2000 National Jewish Population Study is the best example. It relied exclusively on a stratified, random-digit dialing sample, when the use of distinctive Jewish names or list samples to supplement the random-digit-dialing might have been a better choice.

4. <u>Mode of data collection</u>. The same kinds of questions apply to the use of telephone, mail, or Internet surveys. Internet and mail samples may be able to supplement random-digit dialing telephone samples. At this point, Internet surveys are not likely to produce a random sample of Jews (fewer elderly, for example). Little testing has been done on the use of these different technologies; but, as the use of the Internet expands, it may be used to supplement telephone interviews.

5. <u>Survey sponsor</u>. The question of the auspices of Jewish demographic research also needs to be systematically explored. Are higher response rates forthcoming from certain groups of Jews if the study is sponsored by a Jewish organization? Are other groups of Jews less likely to respond under the same circumstances? Do secular institutions such as universities help the response rate? Tests should be done with the same screeners, utilizing different auspices to see if there are any differentials in the overall response rate, but also by different subgroups of Jews.

6. <u>Normative responses</u>. We also need to conduct tests concerning normative responses for socially desirable behavior, such as belonging to a synagogue or giving to a Jewish philanthropy. These questions need to be asked in different ways with samples of known members, donors, etc. Currently, few such tests are run in Jewish demographic research. We do know that a surprisingly large number of respondents misreport past charitable contributions when asked in a survey. Analysis of such data must begin to account for normative responses.

The credibility of a local demographic study can be severely impacted when, for example, the amount that respondents report giving is far less than actual contributions received. Much more work needs to be done on normative responses or perhaps confused responses, but this also indicates that data from other sources need to be taken into account in this kind of research. This would include whether or not individuals belong to a congregation, how often they attend synagogue, the amounts they contribute, whether or not they belong to Jewish organizations, whether or not they had a Jewish education, and other kinds of data that are subject to normative responses of social desirability. This would require not only the use of additional sources, but also developing a series of questions within the questionnaire or questions repeated at different times, to provide validity checks. This is rarely done in Jewish demographic research, given the length of the survey and the need to economize. Yet, it would be better through some methodological testing to begin to approach these issues.

7. <u>Reports about other household members' Jewish attributes/behavior</u>.   The reliability of the data depends, in part, on who in the household is the respondent. For example, when asking questions about philanthropic behavior, one respondent may be more knowledgeable than the other. The same may be said for a synagogue affiliation, type of Jewish education, etc. Certainly, asking one spouse about the Jewish education of the other spouse or the genealogical information about one's partner can be problematic.

8. <u>Length of the survey</u>. Survey professionals regard the maximum effective length of a telephone survey to be about 20-25 minutes. Yet, many demographic surveys of Jews run considerably longer. What is the quality of the data in the second half of the survey compared to the first? To what extent does quality deteriorate due to fatigue, boredom, or the need to move on to competing commitments?

9. <u>Differential Jewish participation by demographic/geographic characteristics</u>. Are certain groups of Jews less likely than others to participate in Jewish demographic research? This might involve higher or lower rates for those over the age of 65, 75, or 85, for example; or those under the age of 25, particularly those in college. Are less affiliated Jews, or Jews with more tenuous identities, less likely to participate in the survey than someone who is highly involved in his or her synagogue?

Similarly, are there differential rates based on region? Are Jews in the West less likely to participate in a survey about religion or ethnicity than Jews in the Northeast, for example? Could this differential be a function of different regional cultures, or is the demographic makeup by region effective? For example, rates of intermarriage, mobility, and disaffiliation are higher in the West than they are in the Northeast. Given these demographic characteristics, one might expect that the participation rates would be lower in the West than in the Northeast. This question too needs systematic exploration.

10. <u>Nondisclosure and differential survey participation</u>. What proportion of Jews, if any, say that they are not Jewish when asked about their religion? The reasons for not doing so can include simply not wanting to participate in the survey, mistrust of strangers asking questions about religion in general, and specifically to Jews, and fears of anti-Semitism. Given the past and recurrent anti-Semitic attitudes and behaviors of the larger society, Jews might be generally suspicious about the purposes and motives of the interviewer asking about whether one is Jewish or not. Under these circumstances, they might not disclose their religion, ethnicity, or background, in effect, denying that they are Jewish.

In the 1990 highlights of the National Jewish Population Study published by the Council of Jewish Federations, Joseph Waksberg, one of the pre-eminent experts in survey research, acknowledged the existence of nondisclosure of Jewish identity/heritage and adjusted the 1990 study weights by 8% to account for the unreported Jews.[18] There is also other evidence, going back to tests done in local demographic studies in Washington D.C. and Baltimore, that indicate that the nondisclosure rate is far from trivial.

---

[18] Council of Jewish Federations, *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey* (1991), p. 38. But the larger problem that study encountered was the large number of households originally screened as Jewish that later, in the detailed follow-up interview, turned out not to be. This is the problem of "false positive" classifications discussed in section 3.2.4.

The potential for denial of Jewish identity/background rings true for most Jews as a function of common sense. This is especially true in times of rising anti-Semitism, where individuals may be uncomfortable revealing their religious or ethnic identity over the telephone. It is also common sense that those who are the least affiliated and identified as Jews would be more reluctant to state their Jewish identity than others who are active and eager to talk about their participation in Jewish life. Our companion methodological survey indicated that the nondisclosure rate might be in the range of 5%-10%. Because this research was an initial, modest test and contained ambiguities, we chose not to statistically adjust the population estimate at this time. But the preliminary evidence is highly suggestive. More research on this important issue is warranted as well as on the opposite problem of non-Jews who answer the screening questions in ways that lead to their being erroneously classified as Jewish (the problem of "false positives").

A related matter is the question of possible differential rates of survey participation of Jews and non-Jews. Even before respondents are asked whether or not they are Jewish, they must decide whether or not to participate at all answering any questions. Are Jews more likely to say, "No thank you," hang up the phone, and refuse to participate as soon as the questions turn to religion or ethnicity? Are they more likely to participate because they find the issues of ethnicity and religion more interesting than other groups? Although our methodological test found no difference in participation rate, this issue too requires further validation before we can issue any conclusions with confidence.

These questions are constantly being discussed informally among colleagues, through technical advisory committees to the National Jewish Population Studies and on an ad hoc basis as each local demographic study or national study is completed. They lack rigorous scientific study and there currently is no group of scholars setting standards; therefore, the field remains essentially stuck where it was 20 years ago. This paper begins to discuss some of these issues and hopes to enrich the debate. Yet, it is clear that this area of Jewish sociological research needs a great deal of help.

The best thing that could happen to the field is to expend the necessary intellectual and financial resources to construct a series of methodological studies to more fully answer these questions. Furthermore, it would be best if a group of scholars could come up with standard definitions of who to include in the Jewish population, or, at least, to define the parameters of exclusion and inclusion so that other scholars and the lay public truly understand the definitions being utilized. This menu is a prescription for further inquiry. This paper is a first attempt to explore some, but not all, of these issues. We hope that further research will emerge in the areas outlined above and discussed in the body of this paper.

3. Problems and Options in Jewish Population Research

This core section details the questions and challenges – most of them listed in the previous section – that Jewish population research confronts today. Many of them are not new, though some have become more serious problems than they were 35 years ago, when the first systematic survey-based studies were conducted. In reviewing these issues, we draw upon data and lessons from our 2001-02 survey of Heritage and Religious Identification.

3.1 Data Collection and Sampling

<u>To survey or not to survey?</u>

Scientific surveys, especially random-digit-dial surveys and variations, have been used as the method of choice in Jewish population research since at least as early as 1970. Telephone survey research in general was making great strides at that time – spurred on by advances in sampling and computer-assisted interviewing (CATI) – and rapidly becoming the paradigm for most types of serious surveys being conducted.

Generally, population research has two primary objectives. The two imply different – in some ways, competing – design considerations and are sometimes confused:

- to estimate population size
- to describe population characteristics

Neither objective can be satisfactorily addressed without using a survey. Describing a population's characteristics (e.g., attributes, beliefs, attitudes, behavior) is impossible in the absence of completing interviews[19] with a relatively large (and presumably representative) sample of that population – that is, without a survey – a point that is usually self-evident but sometimes glossed over in naive efforts to identify other, nonsurvey approaches. Deciding whether or not to use a survey to estimate the population's *size* is only slightly more debatable. Virtually all serious researchers understand and accept the principle that other methods that might be used to estimate the number of Jews are seriously flawed:

<u>Synagogue membership/attendance</u> - Unless only Jews who affiliate with a synagogue/temple (or who attend regardless of membership) are counted, this method does not work. Most reject counting as Jewish only members or attendees.

<u>Members or patrons of other Jewish organizations, subscribers to periodicals, or consumers of other Jewish products/service</u> - The same objection applies here. As with synagogue membership, this approach misses nonmembers, nonpatrons and/or nonsubscribers who are Jewish. Not all Jews fall into these categories, especially those with weak identities who are relatively assimilated.

<u>Persons with distinctive Jewish surnames (DJN method)</u>[20] – Even if an accurate count of persons with Jewish surnames could be made (unlikely), this method misses the large number of Jews with names not distinctively Jewish, Jewish women who married a non-Jew and took that surname, and converts to Judaism.

<u>(For local population surveys:) Persons living in specified geographic parts of the community</u> – When Jews lived in *shtetls* or ghettos, this method might have worked. Fortunately, it no longer applies.

---

[19] We use the term "interview" to refer to both interactive questioning, as in an in-person or telephone interview, and to data collected through completion of some self-administered form (e.g., through a mail or Internet survey).
[20] This method was popularized in the early 1980s. See Harold S. Himmelfarb, R. Michael Loar, and Susan H. Mott, "Sampling by Ethnic Surnames: The Case of American Jews," *Public Opinion Quarterly 47* (Summer, 1983), 247-260. The method is now generally discredited except, possibly, in specialized applications.

Unless supplemented by more rigorous methods, none of these approaches are reliable ways to conduct demographic research intended to support population estimates.

RDD Surveys vs. Other Types

A more relevant choice is deciding to use: (A) a strictly executed random-digit-dial survey, in which all household phone numbers (directory-listed or not) have an equal chance of being selected into the sample, (B) other survey designs such as sampling from member or subscriber lists, or (C) some combination of the two types ("dual frame" or "multi-frame").

Option B can be ruled out as inferior because likely sample biases cause such samples to be unrepresentative of the broader population. The objection is the same as previously mentioned: Some Jews are missed if list sources are used. List-based samples are bound to be unrepresentative of key Jewish-relevant characteristics, so estimates of population characteristics are also bound to be inaccurate.

If cost were no object, Option A would be the clear choice. Technically speaking, it is the unchallenged "gold standard" because it involves the fewest assumptions in population estimates. Because cost considerations are rarely irrelevant, however, dual and multiframe designs are commonly used. Without delving into the statistical details, the task in a dual or multiframe design becomes blending the population estimates achieved from each sampling frame (the RDD frame and each list-based frame) – that is, from each separate survey – in proper proportions that mirror the overall Jewish population.[21]

One might usefully view dual- and multiframe sampling designs (vs. straight RDD) as a compromise allocation of research project resources, in that it generates more interviews with Jewish respondents per dollar – but at a sacrifice in the number of RDD screenings to identify Jews and, thus, the ability to accurately estimate Jewish population size.

The increasing difficulty of conducting successful RDD surveys

Most survey professionals believe that telephone survey response rates among broad-based populations have been in decline for several decades. Textbook standards specifying minimally "acceptable" response rates of 70%-75% have become unachievable – except in the most specialized of circumstances. In many RDD applications, completing interviews with even half of the starting sample has become quite rare.[22] The trend toward declining response seems to

---

[21] Seymour Sudman, Monroe G. Sirken, and Charles D. Cowan, "Sampling Rare and Elusive Populations," *Science* Vol. 240 (May 20, 1988), pp. 991-996. See also, H.O. Harley, "Multiple Frame Methodology and Selected Applications," *The Indian Journal of Statistics* Vol. 36, Series C (1974).

[22] A 1995 multifirm, collaborative survey organized by the Council for Marketing and Opinion Research (CMOR) to study the problem and benchmark current experience achieved a *cooperation rate* of 42% -- which means that 58% of the households contacted refused the interview. This outcome reflects a 15-minute interview using no incentive (a typical application). The *overall* response rate was not reported but was obviously lower. Compared with earlier results, the trend has clearly been downward. The latest average RDD survey cooperation rate reported in CMOR's benchmarking study is 14%; the average response rate is 11%, which includes many commercial marketing research surveys with nonrigorous designs.)

apply even in the most rigorously executed and generously funded government surveys.[23] The reasons are all too familiar:

- the proliferation of surveys, especially those that are poorly constructed, overly long, or deal with trivial topics;

- the growth in telemarketing – both legitimate efforts as well as deceptive solicitations disguised as research and "push polls" (political campaign propaganda posing as research); adding to the public's annoyance with telemarketing are recent innovations involving automated "predictive dialers" and recorded messages; legitimate research surveys are frequently confused with telemarketing – to the detriment of survey response rates -- though many individuals do not care to draw a distinction, objecting to both equally;

- growth in the use of answering machines and other "gate-keeper" technology such as Caller ID, TeleZapper, and similar devices, along with the popularization of "Do not call" registries designed to exclude certain categories of telemarketers;

- growth in the use of cell phones and beepers, which have a similar effect when they displace conventional telephone technology because such phone numbers are typically not included in RDD survey sample frames;

- what some observers believe is a decline in civic participation, social trust, confidence in institutions, and related orientations – causing avoidance of contact with unfamiliar callers and other "strangers;"[24] and

- increasing demands on people's time.

The cumulative impact of these problems have led some in the research industry to search for alternatives to RDD surveys. Thus far, however, no suitable replacement paradigm has emerged, though some new approaches show promise for selected applications.

<u>Do these barriers have a differential impact on Jews?</u>

Although it is necessary to interview non-Jews as well as Jews in Jewish population studies (non-Jews at least through a series of religion screening questions in order to develop the information necessary to make population size estimates), the population description objective in most Jewish population research requires longer interviews with several hundred or more Jewish respondents per local survey and several *thousand* typically in national population surveys. Do the factors cited above that impede RDD surveys affect Jews to a greater or lesser extent than non-Jews?

We see no reason to believe that Jews are any less impacted than non-Jews by these developments. Arguments that can be made supporting higher survey response by Jews – such

---

[23] Robert M. Groves and Mick P. Couper, *Non-Response in Household Interview Surveys*, John Wiley & Sons: New York (1998).
[24] Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone,* New York: Simon & Schuster (2000).

as above average levels of education and civic participation – are at least counter-balanced by arguments maintaining the opposite – greater access to gatekeeper technology (because of higher average incomes), busier lives resulting from demanding professional occupations, greater involvement in discretionary activities (such as volunteer organizations), and being heavily urbanized residentially. Jews might not be any more difficult than non-Jews to reach and interview, but it is unlikely that the task is easier with Jews. This is one of several important areas for methodological research that merits attention. (Our own work on this question, presented in Section 3.3 of Part 2, provides some initial data.)

The Special Constraints of RDD Jewish Population Surveys

Complicating the response rate challenge are the special requirements of Jewish population surveys:

- asking about one's religious affiliation, background, and beliefs – These are topics regarded as personal and private by some respondents; it can be a sensitive area for survey questioning, which can generate refusals to answer, disrupt rapport, and sometimes cause premature termination of the interview;

- the need to ask such questions in the survey screening, positioned at or near the beginning of the interview, before the interviewer has had a chance to build trust;

- suspicions that the survey might be a temporary disguise for the caller's true objective of religious proselytizing or fund-raising; and

- the fact that Jewish population surveys have historically employed lengthy sets of questions, often requiring 30-45 minutes or longer of a respondent's time.[25]

One could make a case that most of these obstacles impinge more on identifying and successfully interviewing Jewish respondents than non-Jews, as Jews have historically been special targets of religious conversion and anti-Semitic bigotry – and, in recent times, of aggressive fund-raising appeals. If correct, then population estimates based on the conventional screening procedures might contain a downward bias against Jews, typically leading to undercounts because of how the survey is structured. That is, asking about religious identity and background upfront at the outset of the interview – set up that way for efficiency[26] – might not be the optimal sequence.

---

[25] Although lengthy interviews are not an absolute requirement in Jewish population surveys, there are usually many worthy topics to address. Also, there is typically a strong pressure to squeeze in as many questions as possible with Jewish respondents given the great difficulty and expense of identifying them in the RDD screening.

[26] This is so because tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of screenings are administered in the typical survey in order to identify and gain the cooperation of enough Jews to be interviewed. Saving even 1 or 2 minutes per screening translates into considerable savings in research dollars.

<u>The All-Important Opening and Introduction of the Interview</u>

Recognizing the obstacles facing RDD Jewish population surveys, the Institute for Jewish & Community Research anticipated difficulties eliciting respondent cooperation in its survey of "Heritage and Religious Identification" and devoted considerable time and effort to try to minimize it. Special attention was given to dealing with suspicions about the survey's motives and specific reluctance to answer questions about religion. The survey used an innovative approach, attempting to engage the respondent at the very beginning of the interview in a conversation that the respondent would find appealing.

Specifically, as originally noted in Part 1, interviewers in the HARI survey began by asking nonstructured questions about the respondent's grandparents – how well they knew the grandparents when the respondent was a child, where the grandparents lived, experiences or recollections they remember most vividly, and so forth. The intent was not to record these answers for later analysis, but instead, to put the respondent at ease, build rapport, and make the questions sound interesting to motivate the respondent to continue with the interview. Following the opening conversational section, the questioning then led quite naturally to more structured items about whether the grandparents were native-born or what country they came from, grandparents' ethnic and religious background – answers that *were* recorded – and then to similar questions about the respondent and the more immediate family, the main survey content. The approach seemed to work. The survey interviewers especially liked this device.[27]

This particular technique of engaging respondent in a brief unstructured conversation about their grandparents is not necessarily the only effective method for gaining the trust and cooperation of respondents. Variations of it – and, possibly, entirely different approaches – might work as well or better. The important point is to pay special attention to the opening in the screening interviews to techniques which can improve survey response. Time and budget permitting, pilot testing several alternative scripts is almost always worthwhile.

Even before any questioning can begin, the interviewers must say a few words about why they are calling. As every survey researcher knows, the introductory script can be critical to the cooperation rate and ultimate success of the survey. Proven procedures include:

- Keep the introduction brief;

- Convey the benefits of the survey and importance of participation;

- Reassure that the call is not for sales or solicitation and that responses will be kept private (only disclosed in statistical summaries along with thousands of others); this does not have to be read routinely but can be kept in reserve and used only if needed to try to overcome resistance;

- If asked, be prepared to answer that the survey has authoritative sponsorship;

- Describe the topic as engaging;[28] and

- Set a convenient call-back time if the selected respondent is unable or unavailable at the time of the call.

---

[27] The survey cooperation and response rates are presented and reviewed in section 4.3 of Part 1.

[28] The HARI survey described the survey as "…an important study of families and their cultural heritage."

A New Data Collection Option: Internet Surveys

Given the growing obstacles facing RDD surveys described above, we should actively investigate alternatives. For many types of research, the Internet offers exciting new possibilities for survey data collection. The last few years has witnessed tremendous growth in the conduct and acceptance of surveys conducted over the Internet, either through simple e-mail delivery and return or, with much greater potential, at World Wide Web sites. Leading experts in the field of survey research have begun experimenting with this exciting new technology and have authored "how-to-do-it" textbooks.[29]

It is time that Jewish population researchers begin experimenting with Internet data collection as a supplement – if not a replacement – for RDD telephone surveys. While currently there are several major obstacles to regarding Internet surveys as a replacement technology (far from complete Internet access by the population, absence of a general sampling frame are perhaps the two most significant), there are, nevertheless, several important functions that Internet data collection could provide:

- as an optional method of participation for those who are unable or do not wish to be interviewed by telephone (especially Jewish respondents who are so costly to identify through randomized contacting);

- as a means of interviewing younger respondents, who are notoriously difficult to reach in conventional household-sample telephone surveys;

- as a possible way of collecting information from Jews in certain types of institutions (such as nursing homes, colleges, those living overseas, some segments of the military, and perhaps prisons);

- as a tool for obtaining supplemental information that cannot be collected in a 30-40 – minute telephone interview – or that cannot be collected without sacrificing other, higher-priority questioning;

- as a tool for conducting methodological experiments, such as comparing characteristics of Jews and non-Jews – both as an end in itself and, also, to develop statistical information for making more precise adjustments of RDD survey results.

Besides providing an alternative means of collecting the same information as other modes, Web surveys can sometimes provide substantial advantages over conventional methods in reducing the four main types of error:

---

[29] See, for example, Don A. Dillman, *Mail and Internet Surveys,* 2nd edition; John Wiley & Sons: New York (2000); Mick P. Couper, Michael W. Traugott, and Mark J. Lamias, "Web Survey Design" *Public Opinion Quarterly 65* (Summer, 2001), 230-253; and Roger Tourangeau, Lance J. Rips, and Kenneth Rasinski, *The Psychology of Survey Response,* New York: Cambridge University Press (2000).

- Sampling error – by reducing the cost/case and allowing larger final samples for the same budget; cost savings from use of Internet surveys can be enormous compared to other methods;

- Coverage error – by reaching some types of respondents who are difficult or impossible to reach using other methods such as telephone;

- Nonresponse error – in mixed-mode designs – where non-respondents in the first stage are followed up by other means (mail, face-to-face, and/or via e-mail), making available the option of responding via the Internet can improve the survey response rate; it also affords respondents the opportunity to complete the survey at their convenience, and in stages if necessary, rather than having to complete the interview when contacted by the interviewer or both having to schedule call-back appointments;

- Measurement error – some types of questions – especially those involving potentially sensitive topics or subject to eliciting socially desirable or politically correct responses (charitable contributions, for instance) – are better asked noninteractively, that is, by having the respondent read the questions and record the answers in the absence of an interviewer, which can provide a greater sense of privacy or anonymity.[30]

The latest Web survey tools also offer the ability to use graphics, color, sound, and animation, which can be beneficial in asking certain types of questions (Examples: recall of fund-raising campaign advertising or awareness of various products/services).

Speed (time the survey is in the field) is another significant advantage of Web surveys. Compared with the time required for telephone survey data collection – typically measured in 1-3 months for local surveys and up to a year or longer for a national Jewish population survey – the time required to collect completed interviews in an Internet survey can range from a few days to a few weeks at most.[31]

Internet survey data collection is not yet ready to replace RDD in Jewish population research – certainly not for the purpose of estimating population *size* – but it is a rapidly emerging approach that merits attention and trial as a supplement to conventional telephone survey methods.

3.2 Conceptualization and Measurement Issues

As if sampling and data collection issues weren't sufficiently complicating, the next set of problems addressed is even thornier. Before setting out to count Jews, one must first decide whom to count, that is, who is Jewish and how do we determine this from answers to survey questioning?

---

[30] Roger Tourangeau, Lance J. Rips, and Kenneth Rasinski, *The Psychology of Survey Response* Cambridge University Press (New York, 2000), pp. 278-288.

[31] This timing advantage would apply only in uni-modal designs – when the Internet is the only method being used to collect the survey data – and not when the Internet is used as a supplement.

3.2.1 Classification Decisions

Imagine, if you will, a hypothetical spectrum of "Jewishness." At one end – think of the left side of a continuum – are affiliated, observant Jews with an unquestioned singular Jewish identity, regular observance, and descended from Jewish parents. There is little doubt that they should be counted as Jewish in population estimates. Then, at the right end are the great majority of Americans who have no Jewish affiliation, belief, behavior, heritage, or identity (neither religious nor ethno/cultural). Many, though certainly not all, of them are practicing Christians or follow some other faith, these individuals should NOT be counted as Jewish.

Moving one step leftward from this right end of the spectrum, we find those who have one Jewish connection – a distant relative, or perhaps they "experimented" briefly with Judaism as a young adult but abandoned it. Count as Jewish? Most observers would answer, probably not.

Next, moving another step leftward – toward the "definitely Jewish" end of the spectrum – we encounter individuals about whom the classification decision becomes increasingly ambiguous: those with a Jewish mother but not raised Jewish and no Jewish identity; those with a Jewish father and who maintain a modest self-identity as Jewish; those who were raised Jewish, practiced Judaism for a time as adults, but who now regard themselves as secular and abjure all "organized religion;" those of Christian parentage who now occasionally attend synagogue but who haven't formally converted; those of mixed marriage who practice Judaism AND another religion; persons who completely ignore (or actively oppose) religious Judaism but nevertheless enjoy some of the ethnic aspects of Judaism and regard themselves as belonging to "the Jewish people." As these examples illustrate, the possibilities between the end-points of the spectrum are endless. The difficulty of conceptualizing "Jewish" for the purpose of demographic classification is apparent.

Accepting this kind of conceptualization implies that research should replace, or at least supplement, dichotomous decisions (some are "in," others are "out") with classifying individuals on some sort of spectrum of "Jewishness." Of course, reaching agreement on such a procedure within the Jewish community would be divisive and ultimately impossible. The Orthodox would have one set of standards; other ideological segments would prefer different criteria – depending on their respective concept of what it means to be "Jewish."

But, in fact, a similar form of classification is already being used in the 1990 NJPS in their six-fold typology:

- BJR – born Jews, religion Judaism
- JNR – born Jews with no religion
- JBC – Jews by choice

- JOR – adults of Jewish parentage with other religion
- JCO - Born/raised Jewish, converted out
- JCOR – children under 18 being raised with other religion

The first three categories together make up what is called the "core Jewish population," the population "...which most Jewish communal agencies seek as their clientele."[32]

Adding further complexity, these six groups are combined in various ways to form additional groupings:

- JBC – Jewish descent population (all the Core except the JBC)
- JBR – Jews by religion (includes the BJR and JBC)
- Total Population – includes all in any of the above overlapping categories[33] plus gentile adults (GA) living in households where some identify as religiously or ethnically Jewish.

For better or worse, the counting of Jews has already, perhaps inevitably, moved beyond binary decisions and, involves considerable subclassification. The difference between the existing classification and the linear spectrum idea is the following: The latter more explicitly acknowledges that all except those at the right end of the spectrum have some stronger or weaker claim to a classification of "Jewish": Those to the left are more reliably/consistently/legitimately classifiable as Jewish, while those nearer right are less so. In the existing set of labeled categories, no such ordinal structure is explicit, although it is implied.

By suggesting the use of such a spectrum for classification, no value judgment is intended, though admittedly, it would be hard to prevent some readers from inferring valuation. While far from any widely acceptable resolution, this complex issue at the very center of Jewish demography, merits serious discussion.

3.2.2 Approaches Used to Define Who is "Jewish"

Various approaches have been used by official religious authorities within Judaism:

Law/bloodline (Halachic position) – The most traditional method of determining "who is a Jew?" is by reference to rabbinic doctrine: One who's birth-mother is legitimately Jewish is automatically considered Jewish, barring official out-conversion to another religion. This position is, of course, still supported by Orthodox Jews. Depending on one's level of piety, observance, communal participation, contributions, etc., Halachic Jews might be regarded by some as "good Jews" or "bad Jews," but they are counted as Jews nonetheless. Jews-by-choice who undergo official conversion *to* Judaism are also counted.

Paternal status – Reform Jewish institutions also count as Jews those who have a Jewish father.

Other approaches have been adopted by sociologists and lay Jewish leadership at various times:

---

[32] "Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey," a publication of the Council of Jewish Federations (1991), p. 4. A glimpse at some of the preliminary reports based on the 2000-01 NJPS indicate that the authors might be planning to change the 1990 categorization, though not departing from the basic approach.
[33] Adding to the confusion, this Total group is alternatively referred to as the "Total Population" and the "Total Jewish Population," even though it contains some gentiles, "Highlights," p.6.

<u>Behavior</u> and, less commonly, beliefs – Although clerically unsupported, some have based their classification rules on minimum levels of Jewish ritual behavior based on responses to questions about lighting candles on Friday night, attending Passover seders, observance of Kashrut or Shabbat, participation in holiday services, and other practices.

<u>Standard method used in current Jewish demographic research</u> – This is the approach used in Jewish population studies in recent decades. Persons who say either that (1) their religion is Judaism, (2) they have/had a Jewish parent, (3) they were raised Jewish, or (4) they consider themselves Jewish in some other way are all included in the main count. (To be counted as part of the Core Jewish Population by virtue of #2-4, one must not claim any religion (other than Judaism). It is important to recognize that the Standard Current Method represents a combination of multiple criteria – current religion, parentage, upbringing, and self-identification – any one of which results in being counted as Jewish.

Each of these approaches has its drawbacks. The Halachic approach can encounter ambiguity over determining authentic bloodline. More significantly, it is not accepted sufficiently inclusive by large segments of the Jewish community, and similarly with paternal status. The behavior/belief and the respondent reporting components of the Standard Current Method suffer from potential measurement unreliability and from instability – two essentially different problems that are sometimes difficult to untangle.[34]

The problem of measurement unreliability can arise when operational questions used in surveys can elicit different, sometimes contradictory, responses at different times – despite no change in the underlying behavior/identity being measured. In other words, the questions, or the rules and procedures used to administer them, are flawed. Instability occurs when the status of what is being measured actually changes from time$_1$ to time$_2$. This is quite easy to imagine for behavioral indicators of Jewishness (observing Shabbat, keeping Kosher, participation in holiday rituals, etc.). Behavior and beliefs can vary significantly over time, especially as one moves through different life-cycle stages.

Somewhat more difficult to accept, instability can also affect religious and/or ethnic identification – which is not always a 100% stable attribute. Especially for heavily assimilated Jews with weak Jewish connections, identity can vacillate. Depending on when they are asked the question, they might answer "Jewish" at times and some other identity or no particular religious/ethnic identity at other another time.[35]

There is anecdotal evidence for this: At times when being Jewish can be a source of pride – such as after the IDF Entebbe Raid, Israel's success in the Six-Day War, or during the campaign of a popular political candidate (such as Senator Joe Lieberman) – the number of people declaring themselves Jewish appears to increase. At other times, such as periods of heightened anti-Semitic activity – and some would argue, also during news coverage of criminal or

---

[34] These approaches, of course, are rejected out of hand by the Orthodox and other traditionalists.
[35] For evidence of an analogous phenomenon, one of the authors of this paper (Groeneman) conducted a two-stage national survey study of Hispanics for public television in the early 1990s. In the first survey, Hispanics were identified through RDD screening; in the second stage, those identified as Hispanic in the first stage were recontacted and the same screening question was re-asked. Thirty percent in the second survey did not identify a second time as Hispanic.

unethical behavior involving high-profile Jews – the number admitting Jewish identity can decline.

As religious and ethnic identity itself becomes ever more a matter of voluntary choice in our open and individualistic American society, changes – whether seriously considered or ephemeral -- are less sanctioned by in-group norms and, therefore, made easier and more common.[36] We agree with Mayer and Kosmin on this major point:

> Particularly in an environment where individuals may hold multiple notions of self, and hold membership in multiple, noncontinuous communities and associations, establishing any fixed notions of identity is problematic. One of the hallmarks of contemporary American society in particular is that individuals can lay claim to a variety of identities, like so many "screen names" in cyberspace, with varying degrees of commitment to each. The relative salience of these diverse identities can fluctuate within the psychic economy of the individual as a result of evolving circumstances. In such an environment, it becomes difficult to speak of anyone's identity as a permanent fixture of the self.[37]

Thus, classification based on one's identity as reported in a survey can be problematic.

These choices and problems are challenging, though not intractable. Despite its recognized flaws, we favor a modified version of the Standard Current Method used in recent Jewish population studies, in part, because the practice is unlikely to be replaced soon as the dominant approach, but also to maintain some degree of continuity in method. Nevertheless, the current method can benefit from fine-tuning.

3.2.3 A Suggested Classification Model

The following four questions are the standard screening (i.e., classification) questions used in recent Jewish population surveys including the 2001 NJPS:

1. What is your religion, if any?
2. Do (Did) you have a Jewish mother or a Jewish father?
3. Were you raised Jewish?
4. Do you consider yourself Jewish for any reason? (IF YES: In what ways do you consider yourself Jewish?)

An affirmative response to any of these questions results in the respondent being provisionally counted as Jewish. This has been the standard approach.

Revised Screening/Classification Questions

We prefer a somewhat different set of questions for the purpose of classification, similar to what was used in the 2001-02 Institute for Jewish & Community Research Survey of Heritage and Religious Identification:

---

[36] See, for example, Sylvia Barack Fishman, "The Changing American Jewish Family Faces the 1990s," p. 73 in Roberta Rosenberg Farber and Chaim I. Waxman, editors, *Jews in America: A Contemporary Reader*, Brandeis University Press (Hanover, N.H.; 1999).

[37] Egon Mayer and Barry A. Kosmin, "American Jewish Identity Survey 2001," p. 31.

To ascertain the religion(s) in which the respondent was raised:

1. Were you raised Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, in some other religion, in more than one religion or in none?

    1a. (ASK IF PROTESTANT OR EVANGELICAL:) What is that church or denomination?

    1b. (ASK IF OTHER RELIGION:) What religion would that be? (ACCEPT MULTIPLE)

    1c. (ASK IF MORE THAN ONE RELIGION:) Which would those be?

To ascertain if respondent's current religion is Jewish (or Jewish + some other):

2. Sometimes people choose different religions at different times in their lives. Do you NOW consider yourself (RELIGION FROM Q.1 SERIES) (IF NO, READ: Do you NOW consider yourself Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, some other religion, more than one religion, or none?)
(IF MULTIPLE RELIGIONS, DK, REFUSED, OR NO RELIGIONS IN Q.1 SERIES:) Sometimes people choose different religions at different times in their lives. Do you NOW consider yourself Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, some other religion, more than one religion, or none?

    2a. (ASK IF PROTESTANT OR EVANGELICAL:) What is that church or denomination?

    2b. (ASK IF OTHER RELIGION:) What religion would that be? (ACCEPT MULTIPLE)

    2c. (ASK IF MORE THAN ONE RELIGION:) Which would those be?

3. (ASK IF ANY RELIGION IN Q.2 SERIES:) Is there any other religion that you currently practice or church that you currently attend?

To ascertain if respondent's parents' religion is Jewish (or Jewish + some other):

4. Would your mother's religion be the same as yours, or different?

4a. (ASK IF NOT SAME:) What is/was your mother's religion?

5. Would your father's religion be the same as yours, or different?

5a. (ASK IF NOT SAME:) What is/was your father's religion?

To determine if respondent ever practiced Judaism in the past:

6. (IF ANY RELIGION MENTIONED IN Q.2 SERIES:) Did you ever practice a different religion or regularly attend a church of a different religion or denomination other than the one(s) you've already mentioned? OR:
(IF NO RELIGION MENTIONED IN Q.2 SERIES, ASK:) Did you ever practice ANY religion?

To determine if respondent identifies as ethnically or culturally Jewish:

7. Some people view themselves as having an ethnic or cultural group or identity. Would you describe yourself, for example, as (CATI PROGRAM INSERTS TWO EUROPEAN ETHNIC GROUPS RANDOMIZED FROM AMONG THESE GROUPS: Italian, Russian, French, Dutch, Greek, Scottish, Polish, Swedish, Irish, and German), Chinese, Latino, African American, Jewish, part of some OTHER ethnic or cultural group, or as *some combination of groups?* (PROBE: Would you include any OTHER ethnic or cultural groups in the way you see yourself?)

What are the similarities and essential differences of this set compared to the standard questions, and what are the implications of substituting this new set?

33

Similarities:

- Retaining the parentage criterion, both sets seek to determine if the respondent has/had a Jewish parent.

- Retaining the upbringing criterion, both sets seek to determine whether the respondent was raised Jewish.

- Retaining the religious identity criterion, both sets seek to determine if the respondent's current religion is Jewish.

- And, allowing for other (nonreligious) forms of psychological connectedness with Judaism (including "peoplehood" or culture), both sets seek to determine if the respondent identifies as Jewish in some other way.

Differences:

- Religion raised: The standard question refers to a singular religion – asks if raised Jewish (though accepts multiple responses when volunteered). The recommended set explicitly invites mention of multiple religions. Also, the first part of the recommended question asks specifically about "Jewish" (among other primary choices – Catholic, Protestant, Muslim, other, multiple, and none). In this regard, the recommended questions seem more natural and possibly less leading than "What is your religion, if any?"

- Current religion: The standard question refers to a singular religion – asks if Jewish (though accepts multiple responses when volunteered). The recommended procedure asks if the respondent's current religion is the same or different from the religion of origin, and if different, asks specifically about "Jewish" (among other primary choices – Catholic, Protestant, Muslim, other, multiple, and none).

  The "softer" wording of the recommended question, we believe, makes it easier for some respondents who have, in fact, changed their religious identity to answer honestly.

  The recommended set attempts to capture the specific religion, if "other" or "Protestant."

  The recommended set also contains a follow-up probe for those specifying a current religion: Is there any other religion that you currently practice or church that you currently attend? [38]

- Parents' religion: The standard question asks if "Jewish" and requires a yes or no answer. The recommended question asks about religion indirectly, by inquiring if each

---

[38] We do NOT recommend counting persons mentioning "Jewish" or "Judaism" only in response to the "Any other religion?" question (Q.3 above). After examining the pattern of other answers given by those respondents, we concluded that most of these persons are regarding Judaism as a *secondary* religion in their life, with some other religion being more "top-of-mind" and, by inference, taking precedence. It seemed inadvisable to count as Jews individuals whose psychological connection is mainly as an afterthought.

parent's religion is the same or different than respondent's (and, if different, to specify which).

- Other forms of Jewish identification: The recommended question asks specifically about perceived ethnic/cultural group as another way of identifying as Jewish. The standard question does not mention ethnicity or culture. This might be the more significant contrast between the two sets of questions in terms of identifying additional Jews.

- Formerly practiced Judaism: The recommended new question is not included in the standard set.

Counting Rule: *A respondent is classified as Jewish based on an affirmative response (Jewish or Judaism) to the Current Religion question, OR to any one of the other questions (Jewish upbringing, Jewish parentage, Jewish ethnicity, formerly practiced Judaism) as long as the respondent specifies no current religion.*

What are the likely implications of the changes for counting Jews?

1. The new set of questions will almost certainly uncover more individuals who were raised in, and/or who currently practice or identify with, more than one religion (including Judaism plus another) by making it easier for such people to mention two or more religions by acknowledging that this is an acceptable response.[39]

   The HARI survey estimates that 240,000 adults in households in the continental United States currently practice Judaism AND some other religion. This represents almost 9% of the total number who specify Judaism as their current religion (alone or in combination with another religion).

2. By asking specifically about "ethnic or cultural group," the new question is allowing an explicitly nonreligious form of Jewish identification. There is little doubt that some people who consider themselves Jewish have no religious identity and might, in fact, be missed in the standard set of screening questions.[40]

   The HARI survey estimates that there are 290,000 Jewish-by-ethnicity-only adults living in households in the continental United States, that is, those who are classified as Jewish solely by responding "Jewish" to the new ethnicity question and to none of the other screening questions (and who select no current religion). This represents almost 7% of the total number classified as Jewish by any criteria – religion, parentage, upbringing, ethnicity, or former practice (as specified in the Counting Rule).

---

[39] Whether or not it is *correct* to count as Jewish someone who also practices some other religion is a separate issue over which reasonable people will differ. The typical approach is to break out in a separate count those who practice / identify with multiple religions – and allow different users of the research to choose whether or not to combine them. It is unclear how the NJPS handled volunteered multiple religion answers.

[40] It is possible that question 4 in the standard set – "Do you consider yourself Jewish for any other reason?" – will pick up some ethnic-only Jews, but it not likely that all of them will answer affirmatively to that vague question. It is also unclear at this time how the NJPS counts those who only "...consider themselves Jewish in some other way" (their analogous screening question). In the 1990 study, it appears they were *not* counted in the Core, though they might be included in the Total.

3. The new question asking whether the respondent *formerly* practiced Judaism is similar to the question about the religion in which the respondent was raised: It will capture some small number of additional Jews (not classifiable as Jewish by any other criterion) who were practicing or identifying Jews at one time in the past, but since – and currently – have abandoned Judaism and practice no religion. To be consistent, it seems to us, these individuals should not have a different status than those who were raised Jewish and no longer practice or identify with any religion. In other words, if the raised-Jewish segment is counted, this group should be too.

The HARI survey estimates that there are 60,000 such individuals in households in the continental United States. They represent about 1.4% of the total number of Jewish adults.

4. By following up to get the specific religion or denomination among those who say "other" or "Protestant," this approach will identify some respondents who answer "humanist," "ethical culture," agnostic," "atheist" or other nonreligions. This will result in some additional individuals being counted as Jews (by ethnicity, parentage, upbringing, or former practice) by ruling out that they claim some non-Jewish religion.

5. One practical implication of adopting the recommended set of questions in preference to the standard set is greater cost. Because the former are more detailed, it will take more time to administer them. Individual users will need to evaluate the trade-off.

In summary, the standard set of screening/identification questions used in recent Jewish population surveys might result in undercounts by overlooking multireligion Jews, ethnic-only Jews, and those who formerly practiced Judaism (though not raised Jewish or born to Jewish parents) but have since abandoned all religious identity. While it is not possible to provide an exact estimate of how many persons this cumulatively represents,[41] calculations based on the HARI survey data suggest that it could represent as many as 600,000 or more adults in the United States.[42]

---

[41] This is primarily because we do not yet know (1) how many multireligion people are being captured through use of the standard 2001 NJPS screening questions and (2) how many ethnic-only Jews are picked up in standard Q.4 – Any other ways in which you consider yourself Jewish?

[42] The HARI study suggests two new classifications of non-Jews who might, under some circumstances, be added to a broader construct (a "Jewish-linked" population). In the first category are 2.5 million "Connected Non-Jews," consisting of adults in the following subgroups:
  - Adults who practice Judaism as a secondary religion; that is, after mentioning some other church or faith as their current religion, also answer "Judaism" or "Jewish" in response to whether they currently practice any other religion or attend any other church;
  - Adults who were raised Jewish, have/had a Jewish parent, or formerly practiced Judaism AND who now practice a religion other than Judaism;
  - Adults who claim "Jewish" as their ethnic/cultural group and practice a religion other than Judaism; and
  - Adults with some other current religion (or none) whose spouse's or partner's current religion or ethnicity is Jewish/Judaism.
In the second category are 4.2 million non-Jewish non-Connected "Persons of Jewish Heritage," consisting of adults who report having a grandparent or more distant ancestor who was Jewish.

3.2.4 Invalid Reports and Classifications: False Positives and False Negatives

A "false positive" is a survey response that would ordinarily (in the absence of deeper investigation) result in an erroneous classification of that respondent as Jewish. This is a not-well-addressed issue. The likelihood of a non-Jewish respondent answering in a way that results in a classification of "Jewish" (a false positive) is probably not as high as a truly Jewish respondent answering in a way that results in a classification of "not Jewish" (false negative). However, because there are so many more non-Jews than Jews in the United States (roughly 50 times as many) – as well as in nearly all local communities -- the raw number of false positive responses in a Jewish population survey can easily overwhelm the number of false negatives, that is, Jews who fail to identify themselves as Jewish – the "Jewish denial" problem referred to earlier. This imbalance can produce an overestimate of the Jewish population. Because these vexing problems (affecting population estimates in opposite directions) are different in nature, we take them up separately.

<u>Erroneous Classification of Non-Jewish Respondents as Jewish (False Positives)</u>

We need to first consider why this problem can occur, that is, why someone who is not Jewish (by the standards of Jewish population research) would give responses indicating that they ARE Jewish.

Several possibilities spring to mind: The first is labeling confusion. Some respondents might regard themselves as Jewish (or have "Jews" or "Jewish" in the name of their non-Jewish religion) – but really practice a non-Jewish faith. "Jews for Jesus" or messianic Jews are the most common example – a group that is really a Christian sect. Also, some African Americans regard themselves as Jews and identify with the people of Israel. Second, some respondents with no current religious identity themselves might mistakenly *think* they had a parent who was Jewish. A third cause is outright fabrication. One wonders why anyone would lie in an anonymous telephone survey, but it does happen.[43] Fourth, there are inadvertent mistaken responses due to misunderstanding (or mishearing) the question. Recording errors by the interviewer are a fifth cause of false positive classifications. False positive classifications can be difficult to weed out and, in ambiguous cases, involve unreliable subjective judgments.

False positive classification errors due to misunderstanding or misrecording. These latter two causes can usually be identified when follow-up interviews are administered to those presumed to be Jewish by the screening questions – which typically are attempted in Jewish population surveys. These full-length interviews typically include many questions that would make sense only to ask of Jewish respondents, that is, which would be illogical to ask of non-Jews. Thus, false positive misclassification would normally be readily apparent at the beginning of such interviews, when the topic is introduced or the respondent is rescreened, or, at worst, in the midst of the follow-up interview. Interviews should be alerted to this possibility and prepared to politely terminate the interview in such instances. However, when follow-up interviews with presumed Jews are either not attempted, refused, or not completed these false positives will not be caught. When such mistaken classifications are discovered, the screening data must be corrected.

---

[43] Some on the political fringes have adopted an anti-polling, or anti-public opinion ideology, overtly counseling the public to lie in surveys as a tactical device to discredit/destroy their legitimacy.

Other sources of false positive misclassification can be more difficult to identify. *Outright lying to the interviewer*, if done cleverly and with a minimal knowledge of Judaism, is probably impossible to detect. Fortunately, lying is unlikely to be a major contributor to the false positive problem.

Mistaken belief that a parent is/was Jewish is another possible cause of erroneous classification as Jewish. Although also probably not prevalent, it can occur for respondents whose parent or parents died young or with whom the respondent has been out of touch. Confusion can also result from intermixing adoptive parents with birth parents, or who had a parent who converted to Judaism later in life. The best strategy to avoid such erroneous claims is to request that the respondent not guess if not certain about the parents' "Jewish status."

That leaves *respondent confusion or disagreement over the meaning of "Jewish"* as the remaining – and likely the most common – cause of mistaken counting of non-Jews as Jews. This source of mistaken Jewish classification can be minimized through formulating a clear set of classification decision rules, especially rules that eliminate messianic Jews and all others specifying a current religion other than Judaism – regardless of responses to the other screening questions. Clearly, "Messianic Jew," "Jews for Jesus," and any synonymous designations should be explicitly included among the interviewers' list of religion precodes. The presurvey training should also carefully address the distinction.

While there is no foolproof solution to the problem of false positives, we advise developing a comprehensive list of categories and training interviewers in their use (by pointing out subtle distinctions, alternative names, and approaches to clarifying ambiguous responses). Responses that the interviewer is uncertain how to code should be completely recorded and left for coding specialists to classify after the interview. This recommendation applies to all religion answers – not just to responses that might be coded as "Jewish." Some responses reveal philosophical positions or other "nonreligions" (such as "Humanism" or "Ethical Culture") which might result in the respondent being classified as Jewish based on responses to the background or ethnicity questions.[44]

Community surveys that find significantly higher than expected numbers of Jews should be alerted to re-examine their data and procedures, and to be on the lookout for evidence of false positives.

Intentional Nondisclosure of Jewish Identity/Background (False Negatives)

When speaking to an unknown survey interviewer, some Jews might not be willing to divulge that they are Jewish or have Jewish parentage or origin. This can occur because of lingering perceived anti-Semitism or other reasons such as feeling ashamed to admit to being Jewish, fear of being accused of dual loyalty, privacy concerns, unwanted solicitations, and/or conflicting identities. To the extent that Jews fail to answer accurately in population surveys

---

[44] Implied in the much of the foregoing discussion is the need to ask and accurately record the respondent's religious identity and background (not just whether Jewish, another religion, or none). The process of recording and classifying religion responses can be error-prone because some religions/denominations have names that are very similar to others (Church of God, Worldwide Church of God), they have alternative/multiple names (e.g., Mormons and LDS-Latter Day Saints), or in abbreviated versions are sometimes used in common conversation. Distinguishing properly between Baptist and Southern Baptist illustrates at least two of these confounding conditions. All of this can result in recording errors by interviewers and/or coding errors by coders.

that they are Jews, all else being equal they will be undercounted relative to non-Jews. Jews who fail to disclose their Jewish identity, parentage, upbringing, or past practice – the opposite of false positive misclassification – will contribute to UNDER-estimating the Jewish population.

Nondisclosure of Jewish identity/heritage – some refer to this research problem as "Jewish denial" – must be discussed as part of the broader possibility of differential Jewish vs. non-Jewish survey participation. This is so because Jews who prefer to not divulge that they are Jews or have Jewish background can respond in two ways: (1) by giving false answers to the interviewer's questions or (2) by refusing to answer one or more of the screening questions or terminating the interview entirely. Therefore, it is not enough to determine how many known Jews respond inaccurately in the survey; one must also know how many decide not to participate, that is, how many refuse the key questions or refuse the interview. Also, the research also needs to examine how many are contacted in the first place relative to non-Jews, as differences in the rate of contact can also affect population estimates.

The next section presents our thinking on this as well as results from a methodological test conducted in conjunction with the HARI survey. The test represents a first-time attempt to address this matter systematically. To the extent that Jews are contacted in surveys, choose to participate, and/or disclose their Jewishness at different rates than non-Jews are contacted, choose to participate, and disclose their non-Jewishness, population estimates can be distorted.

3.3 The Interrelated Issues of Differential Survey Participation and Correct Disclosure of Religious Identity

This section initiates discussion of an interrelated set of issues that, to our knowledge, has not been explicitly taken up in the writing and analysis of Jewish population research. Yet, it is an important discussion because ignoring it can result in biased estimates.

To introduce this set of potential problems, it can be helpful to review the basic assumptions underlying the standard estimation model used in RDD population studies:

1. All telephone households in the target geographic area have an equal probability of being selected into the sample (and dialed) = equivalent SAMPLING PROBABILITY [P(s)];
2. Each household in the starting sample has an equal chance of being contacted and each adult in selected households reached has an equal probability of being chosen as the survey respondent = equivalent CONTACT PROBABILITY [P(c)];
3. Each selected adult contacted is equally likely to participate in the survey -- that is, to be interviewed = equivalent PARTICIPATION PROBABILITY [P(p)];

and, unique to Jewish population estimation studies:

4. The probability that a Jewish respondent answers in a way that results in a classification of "Jewish" must equal the probability that a non-Jewish respondent answers in a way that results in a classification of "not Jewish" = CORRECT DISCLOSURE PROBABILITY [P(cd)].

More precisely, to produce unbiased estimates, the product of the four probabilities for Jews must equal the product of the four probabilities for non-Jews:

$$[P(s) * P(c) * P(p) * P(cd)]_{\text{Jewish}} = [P(s) * P(c) * P(p) * P(cd)]_{\text{Non-Jewish}}$$

This model can be reduced and simplified somewhat. Given the sophistication and reliability of current-day RDD survey sampling methods, the P(s) term can effectively be taken as equal for all households, regardless of characteristics, and, assuming customary randomized within-household respondent selection,[45] it can justifiably be combined with the P(c) term for simplification -- both formal and verbal[46] – and dropped out of the model:

$$[P(s) * P(c) \rightarrow P(c)]_{\text{Jewish}} = \text{the probability of a Jew being contacted; and}$$

$$[P(s) * P(c) \rightarrow P(c)]_{\text{non-Jewish}} = \text{the probability of a non-Jew being contacted}$$

The simplified equation thus becomes:

$$[P(c) * P(p) * P(cd)]_{\text{Jewish subsample}} = [P(c) * P(p) * P(cd)]_{\text{non-Jewish subsample}}$$

A comprehensive answer to the question of estimation bias requires that all six terms in the model be known, at least with a reasonable degree of accuracy. Otherwise, the products cannot be calculated and the amount of bias, if any, cannot be determined.

For a Jewish population estimate in an RDD survey to be unbiased:

> *The product of the probabilities of contact, participation, and correct disclosure of Jewish status for Jews in the population must equal the product of the probabilities of contact, participation, and correct disclosure of non-Jewish status for non-Jews in the population.*

Under experimental conditions, this is a testable proposition. In fact, the authors of this paper tested it in a separate Institute for Jewish & Community Research survey carried out in conjunction with the Survey of Heritage and Religious Identification. The test procedures, results and conclusions about whether Jews in general are underrepresented are contained in Appendix B.[47]

3.4 Potentially Undercounted Jewish Population Segments

The Jewish community – nationally and in many local areas – is socially diverse, and includes certain subgroups that, for different reasons, are difficult to reach and interview. Four segments that are most often mentioned as potentially undercounted as a result of being disproportionately excluded from RDD surveys are:

---

[45] The next- (or last-) birthday method is the most common way of randomly selecting a respondent in a household.
[46] This avoids the verbal awkwardness and potential resulting confusion of having to talk about "households containing one or more Jews" and "households containing no Jews," and refocuses the model on persons.
[47] This methodological survey was designed to also generate evidence of possible estimation bias of special segments of Jews generally thought to be undercounted: recent immigrants from the former Soviet Union, Israelis living in the United States, and Orthodox Jews. The results from the segments analysis are presented in the next section.

- Orthodox and ultra-Orthodox Jews;
- Israelis living in the United States;
- Recent immigrants from Russia and other states of the former Soviet Union (FSU) who arrived in the United States in the last quarter century;
- Jewish adults in the youngest age categories.

As difficult as it is to estimate the total population with reasonable accuracy, it is even more challenging to project the size of these smaller subgroups.

<u>Orthodox Jews</u>

Some believe Orthodox Jews are more suspicious than others of calls from unknown interviewers and, thus, less likely to participate in RDD surveys. The alleged reluctance to be interviewed can be exacerbated when the questioning leads off with personal items about religious identity – possibly due to heightened sensitivity to anti-Semitism or proselytizing attempts among the Orthodox.

<u>The methodological experiment found no evidence that the Orthodox are under-represented in Jewish population surveys.</u> In fact, once reached by telephone in the mock survey, a separate sample of known Orthodox Jews were just as likely to participate as a comparison group of "mainstream" Jews. And, although they were reached less often then the mainstream Jews (after an equivalent number of contact attempts), they were more likely to disclose Jewish identity/background in their answers to the screening questions than were the mainstream group. In terms of population projections based on their representation in the final survey sample – Orthodox Jews' greater willingness to answer that they are Jewish more than counterbalanced their lower likelihood of being contacted.

If the experiment is valid, it implies that the Orthodox might be slightly over- rather than underrepresented in Jewish population surveys and estimates. This outcome awaits confirmation by additional studies before a firm conclusion is warranted.

<u>Israelis in the United States for More Than a Short Visit</u>

Although reliable statistics are unavailable, some students of Jewish demography believe that hundreds of thousands of Israelis, concentrated in New York and Los Angeles, are now living in the United States. They might be in the United States temporarily for a few years or on a more "permanent" basis. Some Israelis are here legally, others are not.

Such Israelis are also thought to be undercounted in standard-method population surveys, either because they are more likely than other Jews to opt out of such surveys entirely or because they are less willing to disclose Jewish identity when asked. In both cases, some Israelis, like Russians, might have normative constraints about publicly discussing their religion.

The methodological experiment referred to above also included a sample of known Israelis. <u>The results of the test indicate no differential estimation of Israelis</u> – that they are neither undercounted or overcounted in RDD population surveys. Compared to the sample of mainstream Jews, the sample of Israelis were only slightly less likely to be contacted; they

were equally likely to participate in the survey, once contacted; and they were slightly more likely to disclose Jewish identity in response to the screening questions. These three sources of potential survey bias net out to zero, that is, to the conclusion that Israelis in the United States are unlikely to be either overestimated or underestimated in survey-based population estimates.

Recent Immigrants from the FSU

Neither does anyone have reliable data on the number of former Soviet Union Jews who arrived in the United States since the last wave began in 1973. The Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, the major resettlement agency, helped resettle approximately 400,000 alone during that period.[48] A report based on the 2000-01 NJPS estimates the number of FSU Jewish immigrants living in the United States to be 289,000. This number includes some unspecified (probably unknown) number of persons Jewish background who would not be counted as Jewish under NJPS's or our counting rules.

The suspected underrepresentation of recent FSU immigrants in Jewish population studies are thought to result from their unwillingness to participate in surveys (cultural unfamiliarity with surveys, misunderstanding the intent of population surveys), reluctance to disclose religious or ethnic identity/background to an unknown interviewer, and language barriers (despite efforts in some surveys to interview in Russian, which are only partly successful).

The Institute for Jewish & Community Research's methodological experiment tested the undercount hypothesis with a sample of known FSU Jews, just as it did with the Israelis and Orthodox. This time, analysis of the results found empirical evidence of undercount: Although the sample of recent FSU émigrés were equally likely to be contacted by the test survey's interviewers, they were less likely to participate in the interview than the sample of mainstream Jews, and also less likely to disclose that they or someone in their household is Jewish.

Although precise quantification of the undercount *based on this combination of factors* was not computed, we estimated that 66,000 FSU Jews were likely missed in the HARI survey due to inability to communicate well enough in English to carry out a telephone interview.[49]

Young Jewish Adults (18-24 or 18-29)

The reasons for the expected undercount of this segment are different than for the first three discussed above. Young adults are difficult to reach and interview in all household-based surveys because (1) they often reside in institutional housing not included in RDD sampling frames (e.g., college dorms), (2) they are often not at home and available to be interviewed, and, in the case of list-based samples, (3) they are mobile and change address frequently. Compounding these problems and contributing to the believed undercount in another way, young adults of Jewish background often have weaker and vacilating Jewish

---

[48] Harvey Paretsky, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, private communication. He points out, however, that not all of those resettled were Jewish Halachically or, possibly, by any other definition.
[49] This is described in Part 1, section 5.3.

identities, so that when they are asked the standard screening questions, they might be less likely to respond in ways that would result in their being classified as Jewish.[50]

We estimate that there are approximately 85,000 Jewish college students living in institutional housing, most of whom would be automatically excluded from RDD sampling frames and, thus, not projected in survey-based estimates of the Jewish population.[51]

3.5 Need for More Rigorous and Creative Questions to Measure Other Factual Parameters (Contributions, Volunteering, Membership, etc.)

The previous discussion has covered conceptualization, measurement, and accurate estimation of Jewish identity/background. Yet population size is only one objective of Jewish demography, albeit an important one. Other issues include determining the extent and characteristics of contributors to charities and volunteering one's time in causes and organizations (both Jewish and other), as well as other "factual" questions like synagogue affiliation, religious service attendance, and participation in ritual and holiday practices.

These questions appear, on the surface, to be relatively straightforward – relatively simple to formulate in a way that will elicit accurate responses. Yet, this isn't always as easy as it might appear, as demonstrated by this finding from the Institute for Jewish & Community Research's methodology survey, about past-year contributions to the local Jewish federated fund-raising effort:

Reported Contributions to 2001 Local Federated Campaign
(Combined Federation supplied samples from Minneapolis,
Houston, San Jose, and Miami)

	Donor List (n=324)	Non-Donor List (n=231)
Yes	87%	34%
No	8%	59%
Don't know	5%	7%

These data illustrate the risk of taking even so-called "factual" question survey responses at face value. In the sample of past-year donors, 8% incorrectly remembered whether they had made a contribution (and another 5% could not remember if they did or did not make a contribution). Among the nondonor sample, 7% could not remember either way, and more than *one-third* answered incorrectly. Even allowing for some degree of misclassification of

---

[50] There is yet another reason: Given the current politically charged climate on some college campuses and elsewhere, being Jewish might be less "popular" now (and more difficult to admit) due to prevailing anti-Israelism, heightened anti-Semitism, or some mix of the two.

[51] It is unlikely that many of the college students living away from home are, in fact, included in parent interviews. For example, the NJPS instruction states: "Please do not count anyone who lives away from your household most of the time, and can be reached at his or her own telephone number." Parents are very unlikely to be aware that institutional phone numbers are largely excluded from RDD survey sampling frames. It has been suggested that some in this group might be included in parent interviews when "all adults in the household" are being enumerated.

donor and nondonor sample households that might have occurred, the error rate, particularly among the nondonors, is alarmingly high.

There are three potential causes of such inaccurate responses. First, it is possible that someone else in the household made a contribution, and the respondent was simply unaware of it ("No" answers among the donor sample households), or that some of the nondonor sample respondents mistakenly *thought* that someone else in the household had made a contribution ("Yes" answers among the nondonor sample households). In survey methodology, this source of inaccuracy is attributed to "surrogate reporting."

In some other cases, it is likely that the respondent misremembered making a contribution, possibly confusing it with some other charitable contribution or with a contribution made in a previous year. Can someone always distinguish between the Jewish Federation, the Jewish National Fund, and the Jewish Community Center? This highlights the difficulty of accurate recall of past behavior ("memory failure"), especially when the behavior in question is relatively distant or nonsalient.

The third source or error – probably applying to some of the "Yes" answers among the nondonors – results from the tendency to give a "socially desirable" response to avoid a sense of embarrassment from admitting that the respondent did not, in fact, behave in accordance with social norms by making a contribution.

Although there is no way to eliminate all of these sources of inaccuracy, several procedures can mitigate the problem. With regard to the surrogate reporting problem, it is generally considered advisable to instruct respondents to say they are not sure, if they do not feel confident about the accuracy of their answer. It is better to increase item nonresponse (missing data) than to elicit an erroneous response. An even better approach is to have the respondent check with others in the household before answering, although in most interactive surveys this is usually not feasible.

To the extent that the problem of accurate recall of past events or behavior is a function of forward "telescoping" – believing that the behavior occurred more recently than in actuality – one effective technique to minimize such errors is to clarify the reference period of the question (in this case, the past 12 months) by mentioning the name of the month 12 months before ("since last MONTH") and, possibly, mentioning some major activity or event that occurred 12 months earlier that helps "bound" the reference period, thus aiding the respondent's memory. Another approach that can sometimes be applied is to refer to the context in which the behavior probably occurred. In this example, if most fund-raising occurred during a Sunday "phone-a-thon," the interviewer can refer to that activity to help jog memory.[52] Once again, respondents should be advised to not guess, if not sure whether they did or did not contribute.

The third source of error, social desirability, can be lessened by making it easy for the respondent to answer honestly (by removing the psychological threat). This is typically done by prefacing the question (in this illustration, the contributions question) with words such as: "Some people contribute to Federation campaigns, and others aren't able to, or contribute in

---

[52] Tourangeau, op cit, Chapter 3 and passim.

other ways..." Another way to lessen socially desirable responses is altering the mode of survey data collection from interviewing to self-administration such as via a mail or Internet survey. [53] This, of course, is often not practical.

Dedicating adequate resources to the questionnaire development phase of the study, including serious pretesting, will usually go a long way toward reducing measurement error and improving the validity and reliability of the data. Crafting optimal questions and interviewing procedures is central to the success of any survey – at least as important as careful sampling and analysis. Jewish population surveys are no exception. Researchers and sponsors should insist on greater rigor and creativity than has marked past efforts. Especially when hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions, are being spent, there is no excuse not to adopt state-of-the-art methods.

3.6 Weighting the Data

<u>A Description of the Weighting</u>

As is customary and proper in sample surveys where projections are made to the larger population, the data are typically adjusted to improve the accuracy of estimates. It is common to weight the data to adjust to equalize the probability of respondent selection and to better reflect various demographic characteristics of the population (post-stratification).

The weighting adjustment for probability of selection takes account of (1) the number of eligible persons in the household who might be selected as the respondent (typically all adults), (2) the number of different telephone numbers that can reach someone in the household, and (3) any differences in the chances of selecting a telephone number due to the use of disproportionate sample stratification. Respondents in two-adult households are weighted twice as much as in single-adult households (because they have one-half the chance of being selected), those in three-adult households are weighted three times as much, etc. Respondents in double telephone line households are weighted one-half as much as those in single-line households (because they have twice the chance of being selected), those in three-line households are weighted one-third as much, etc.[54] Information on the number of eligible persons and the number of phone lines for voice calls are readily obtained in the interview; the relative likelihood of phone number selection will be part of the sample design. It is a straightforward arithmetic operation to combine the three elements in a way that reflects the probability of selection of each survey respondent. The result is sometimes called the "preweight."

This form of weighting should generally be applied to both the screening data (to estimate population size) and the subset of typically longer interviews with the subsample of identified Jews. Post-stratification weights, described in the next paragraph, will also be applied to the screening data but usually NOT to the longer interviews with the Jewish subsample because weighting targets for computing these weights will generally not be available.[55]

---

[53] Tourangeau, Chapter 9.

[54] Sometimes, caps are used (e.g., 3+ adults, 2+ phone lines) to avoid extreme weights, which can unwisely inflate sampling variances.

[55] It is usually precisely because these attributes are unknown that the survey is being done. There might be exceptions: a follow-up smaller-sample survey, for example, might use the Jewish population parameters estimated

The post-stratification weighting on demographic/geographic factors adjusts for inevitable differences in rates of survey response – that sample elements with certain types of characteristics will be easier to reach and interview than others. The specific factors used are discretionary, but typically include gender, age group, region (such as county or ZIP code for local surveys; block of states in national surveys), some socio-economic measure (usually education level), and sometimes race. Statistical algorithms are readily available that estimate cell-based targets for the multiple demographic factors – in other words, for example, the correct proportion of females 45-64 in the Northeast region who are college graduates.

The composite weight for each respondent, then, is the product of the preweight and the post-stratification weight.

A Cautionary Note About Weighting

As noted in section 5.1 of Part 1, the national Heritage and Religious Identification study encountered a dilemma in the decision to use education in the weighting. Because that survey conducted interviews only in English, non-English-speaking respondents (mostly Spanish-only respondents) – who tend to have much lower than average education – were excluded from the survey. By restricting the survey universe to those who speak English well enough to be interviewed – about 95% of adults in the United States – the weighting targets should, ideally, also be based on this delimited population. Unfortunately, data on that circumscribed population were not available from the Census Bureau. So the decision became whether to use general population weights for education or no education weights at all.

The choice was not of minor consequence as it would have a substantial impact on the Jewish population estimate because the education level of Jews in the United States is much higher than average. Including the non-English group in the weighting target calculation results in down-weighting Jews more than if the non-English group could have been EXcluded in the targets. After some debate, it was decided that excluding education as a weighting factor in the person weights would distort the estimate more (in the opposite direction) than by choosing to use education as a weighting factor, so it WAS included in the weighting plan, following the widely accepted procedure in national surveys of the general population.[56] This decision probably has the effect of producing a slightly more conservative (lower) estimate of the adult Jewish population.

The lesson is that data-weighting decisions, like other methodological choices in Jewish population studies, are often not trivial. Like other elements of the research design that can affect accuracy, the weighting plan must be carefully considered.

Apropos to this example, the latest NJPS estimates were based on a weighting plan that did NOT include education. This is not to claim necessarily that that choice was unwise –

---

in the earlier survey as weighting targets. In such cases, other weighting factors, such as synagogue affiliation, might also be considered.

[56] Of course, it would have been preferable (though costly) to interview in Spanish and possibly other languages, thus adding enough lower-education respondents in the final sample to avoid this problem – the unwarranted down-weighting of Jews.

there might have been good reasons why education was not included as a factor in the NJPS weighting plan – only that readers need to be aware of each study's underlying methodology and the effects that design/analysis choices can have on study estimates and conclusions.

4. The Future of Jewish Population Research

The state of the field of Jewish population research has been somewhat static now for at least 20 years. The critical issues were identified long ago, as described by Calvin Goldscheider in his article "Including Non-Jews in Jewish Community Samples: Substitute and Methodological Issues":

> …Questions of how to obtain a representative sample of Jews, what information to include in the survey, and how the data should be analyzed, have been critical. Issues of sample design, per se, have rarely been discussed at the local level and the central considerations have revolved around cost and efficiency. Scientific, academic, and analytic concerns have rarely been in the forefront of survey sample issues in Jewish community studies."[57]

The same can be said for survey research of the Jewish community at the national level. While the 1990 and 2000 national Jewish population studies conducted by the Council of Jewish Federations and the United Jewish Communities utilized technical advisory committees (volunteer groups of scholars and practitioners) struggling with a host of methodological issues, the challenges have essentially remained unaltered. These include using representative samples, developing effective survey instruments, cost and quality of data collection, screening questions to identify the Jewish population, addressing questions of normative responses for socially desirable answers in certain questions, possible differential rates of participation of Jews versus the general population, willingness to disclose one's religion and ethnicity in a random telephone survey, and accurate analysis and estimation using the survey data.

All of these problems were also identified in Cohen, Woocher, and Phillips' *Perspectives in Jewish Population Research,* in 1984.[58] It is worth noting that no serious volume on Jewish population research methodology has been published in America in the nearly 20 ensuing years. Furthermore, regular conferences, roundtables, and other rigorous scholarly exchanges concerning Jewish population research in the United States are rare.

Yet, Jewish population research continues on both the national and communal levels. The national Jewish population studies encompass millions of dollars. At the local level, individual communities undertake demographic studies on a regular basis. In any particular year, four or five communities are engaged in demographic research. There are also a variety of marketing studies, select planning studies, and so on, all that rely on the methodological expertise in Jewish population research. This area of Jewish communal life, therefore, encompasses thousands of volunteer hours, professional time, and millions of dollars each year.

---

[57] Calvin Goldscheider, "Including Non-Jews in Jewish Community Samples: Substitute and Methodological Issues," *Perspectives in Jewish Population Research*; Steven M. Cohen, Jonathan S. Woocher and Bruce A. Phillips, eds., Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1984. p. 107.
[58] Ibid.

The collection of data is vitally important. It informs the kind of planning decisions that are made on both the micro and macro levels day in and day out, within Jewish organizations and institutions. What we know about the Jewish community can help refine or even define the self-image of the Jewish community. Is it growing or declining? Are Jews more or less involved in Jewish life? Is being Jewish something important to individual Jews? These, and myriad other questions, can be answered through demographic research that can influence the Jewish psyche. The demographic information also informs the non-Jewish world about the Jewish community. The same questions that affect the psyche of Jews may also affect those in social, political, and all societal realms, about the Jewish community as a whole. The research is important. Therefore, it behooves the Jewish community to produce the best possible research.

This endeavor is not easy. Jews represent 2%-3% of the population. Finding them through standard random sample telephone research is difficult and expensive. Questions about religion are not included in the U.S. Census, requiring independent research about the Jewish community. Even if the U.S. Census did include a question about religion, which would provide some basic demographic data, it still would not provide attitudinal and behavioral data about the internal workings of the Jewish community. Nor would it encompass nonreligious Jews who, nevertheless, profess a strong ethnic or cultural identity.

On the whole, it is safe to say that doing Jewish demographic research is difficult and becoming more so. This is partly a function of the increasing reluctance of individuals to cooperate in telephone surveys – mainly a result of being inundated with telemarketing calls. Indeed, the intrusiveness of telemarketing has led to the Federal Trade Commission's recent establishment of the national "Do not call" registry, allowing households to opt out of receiving calls from certain types of telemarketers. It is not clear yet whether such measures will improve the ability to do telephone research (by cutting down on unwanted sales calls) or, on the contrary, will make it harder because of the pervasive confusion of legitimate research surveys with telemarketing.

Other methodologies have been used in the past, and can still be used to supplement random-digit-dial samples. These include the use of distinctive Jewish names and organizational lists. These are not random samples, and are not likely representative of the Jewish community. Research has shown that list samples can be biased in terms of having more highly identified Jews, for example. Yet, we know that such samples can be used to augment true random samples using carefully developed multiple-frame designs. It may be that telephone samples gathered through random digit dialing may also be augmented through Internet survey technology in the future.

The sampling issues can be so difficult that even very expensive, multiyear projects can go awry. The *2000 National Jewish Population Study*, at least in its initial data release of 2002, seemed to have undercounted Jews in the Western United States, Israelis, Jews from the former Soviet Union, and perhaps other groups as well. Was the undercount due to the nature of the screening questions asked? Was the sampling design inherently flawed? Did the low rates of cooperation compromise the study? All of these factors that plagued the NJPS are worth studying, gaining a clear picture of what went wrong with this most extensive, and expensive, attempt at a national study of Jews.

One of the key issues in Jewish population research is who to include in the count. Such decisions go far beyond methodological concerns. Given the obvious political ramifications, the question is a serious one. Another issue is ideological: By counting individuals, one may be indicating a more inclusive community; and by discounting certain people, one may be signifying a more exclusive community. If individuals are not counted as a Jew, then they find themselves on one side of the wall rather than the other. Not counting someone is a way of keeping them out.

The issue is also religious — one of boundaries and law. Rabbis and social scientists may have very different views about whom to include when counting Jews, and even this division is not clear-cut. Some rabbis may agree with certain social scientists, and other rabbis may agree with other social scientists in establishing the definition of who is a Jew. All religious groups have rules for inclusion and exclusion, and all groups have some form of boundary maintenance. But the boundaries move, and the rules change. Who is in and who is out may be practical decisions in real life, and are played out through Jewish population research.

Yet, our research shows that Jewish identity, participation, and belonging take place along a continuum—more a palette of colors, as opposed to black and white that are easily distinguishable. Examples of the many possible variations were provided above. Just as the "who is a Jew" issue can rend the Jewish community vis-à-vis an issue such as patrilineal descent, or between Israel and the United States on who is legally a convert, so too do these questions plague Jewish population research. Ultimately, the decisions to these questions are completely interpretive and flow from either stated or unstated ideologies. But there is no clear-cut definition of who is a Jew in Jewish demographic research. If the enterprise is to remain a science – standardized and replicable – detailed classification rules need to be developed and applied consistently.

The fluidity of religious identity among Jews is part of the pattern of religion in the United States as a whole. It is important to keep the study of Jewish religiosity and ethnicity is this context. Jews are not unique; they are a reflection of greater societal trends. Increasingly, it is difficult to cleanly categorize Americans by religion, ethnicity, or even race. Great debates are raging about who to count and who not to count as African Americans, for example. In some ways, the melting pot is a big one, and lots of identities are more difficult to pigeonhole.

Our goal is to improve the quality of survey research in the Jewish community at all levels. Given the profound implications of the research in a multitude of realms, the highest quality research is essential. This paper hardly purports to be the definitive last word on how to conduct Jewish population research. Our goal is more modest -- to reinvigorate scholarly discussions on how to best conduct this research and encourage other methodological testing to advance the field.

In the process, we also hope to add to the understanding of ethnic and religious fluidity in America. Jews are a microcosm of the ethnic blending and complications of religious life that affect other groups as well. We seek to enhance understanding of the interaction of ethnicity and religion in America, and to the issues of denominational switching, interfaith households, and the practice of multiple religions. All of these were uncovered in our study of Jews. We hope our work can inform research about religion and ethnicity more generally.

Appendix A:

Heritage, Ancestry, and Religious Identification Survey

Hello my name is _____, I'm calling on behalf of researchers at the University of Michigan and other organizations. Your household has been selected for an important study of families and their cultural heritage. May I please speak with the adult 18 or older in your household who had the most recent birthday – would that be you? **(WHEN DESIGNATED RESPONDENT IS REACHED, RE-INTRODUCE. IF DESIGNATED RESPONDENT UNAVAILABLE, ARRANGE CALL BACK.)**

[**IF NECESSARY:** Your household was selected at random. No one will try to sell you anything or re-contact you later as a result of this survey. Your answers to these questions will be combined with those from other randomly selected persons and will be confidential and your identity private.]

(BEFORE BEGINNING, MARK RESPONDENT'S GENDER. ASK IF NECESSARY)

    1   Male
    2   Female

[ENGAGE RESPONDENT IN A MINUTE OR SO OF SEMI-STRUCTURED CONVERSATION TO BUILD RAPPORT. DO NOT NEED TO RECORD ANSWERS TO OPEN ENDS "A" AND "B":]

A. I'd like to start by asking about your grandparents… Did you have a chance to get to know them when you were growing up?

    1   Yes **-> Go to Q.B2**
    2   No **-> Go to Q.B1**
    8   Don't know **-> Go to Q.B1**
    9   Refused **-> Go to Q.B1**

(IF NO – DID NOT KNOW ANY GRANDPARENTS:) B1. Did you hear any stories about any of your grandparents, that is, about what they were like? (**PROBE, IF NECESSARY:** What do you remember most from what you heard?) **Go To Q.C1 AGAIN DO NOT RECORD OPEN ENDS.**

(IF YES:) B2. In a few words, what do you most remember from your childhood about the grandparent you knew best? (**PROBE IF NECESSARY:** What stands out in your memory about that grandparent?)

(ASK ALL:) C1. Was your father's father born in the United States?

    1   Yes **-> Go to Q.D1**
    2   No **-> Continue**
    8   Don't know **-> Go to Q.D1**
    9   Refused **-> Go to Q.D1**

C2. What country was he born in? [**SEE COUNTRY-OF-ORIGIN CODE LIST IN APPENDIX**]

D1. What about your father's mother, was she born in the United States (too)?

    1   Yes **-> Go to Q.E1**
    2   No **-> Continue**

8	Don't know	**-> Go to Q.E1**
9	Refused	**-> Go to Q.E1**

D2. What country was she born in? [**SEE COUNTRY-OF-ORIGIN CODE LIST IN APPENDIX**]

E1. And your mother's father? (**READ IF NECESSARY:** Was he born in the United States?)

1	Yes	**-> Go to Q.F1**
2	No	**-> Continue**
8	Don't know	**-> Go to Q.F1**
9	Refused	**-> Go to Q.F1**

E2. What country was he born in? [**SEE COUNTRY-OF-ORIGIN CODE LIST IN APPENDIX**]

F1. Lastly, was your mother's mother born in the United States?

1	Yes	**-> Go to Q.1**
2	No	**-> Continue**
8	Don't know	**-> Go to Q.1**
9	Refused	**-> Go to Q.1**

F2. What country was she born in? [**SEE COUNTRY-OF-ORIGIN CODE LIST IN APPENDIX**]

1. Now I'd like to ask some questions about YOU. Some people view themselves as having an ethnic or cultural group or identity. Would you describe yourself for example as Irish, German (Note: the two European ethnic groups were randomized from among these groups: Italian, Russian, French, Dutch, Greek, Scottish, Polish, Swedish, Irish, and German)[59], Chinese, Latino, African-American, Jewish, part of some OTHER ethnic or cultural group, or as *some combination of groups?* (**PROBE IN ALL CASES:** Would you include any OTHER ethnic or cultural groups in the way you see yourself?) **(ACCEPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES. CODE ANY RESPONSE ENDING IN "-AMERICAN" IN RESPECTIVE CATEGORY.)**

ETHNICITY CODE LIST

01	African-American
02	Afro-American
03	Agnostic
04	Alaskan Native
05	Aleut
06	American
07	American Indian
08	American Indian tribe (any)
09	Arabic
10	Armenian
11	Atheist

---

[59] Rotating the European ethnic groups began September 18, 2001. Before then, only Irish and German were used. Same change for Q. 1a, Q.1b and Q.3

12	Belgian
13	Black
14	British
15	Buddhist
16	Canadian
17	Catholic
18	Chinese
19	Christian
20	Creole
21	Croatian
22	Croatian/Slovenian
23	Cuban
24	Czech
25	Danish
26	Dinka
27	Dominican
28	Dutch
29	Egyptian
30	English
31	Eskimo
32	Filipino
33	Finnish
34	French
35	French Creole
36	French-Canadian
37	German
38	Greek
39	Gypsy
40	Haitian
41	Hindu
42	Hispanic
43	Hungarian
44	Hutu
45	Indian (Asian – not American)
46	Iranian
47	Iraqi
48	Irish
49	Islamic
50	Israeli
51	Italian
52	Jamaican
53	Japanese
54	Jewish
55	Korean
56	Laotian
57	Latino
58	Lebanese
59	Lithuanian
60	Mexican
61	Native American
62	Nigerian
63	Norwegian
64	Palestinian

65	Persian
66	Polish
67	Portuguese
68	Puerto Rican
69	Roma
70	Roma/gypsy
71	Russian
72	Samoan
73	Scotch-Irish
74	Scottish
75	Serbian
76	Sikhs
77	Slavic
78	Slovakian
79	Slovenian
80	South African
81	Spanish
83	Swedish
84	Swiss
85	Syrian
86	Ugandan
87	Ukrainian
88	Vietnamese
89	Welsh
110	Other write-in _____
111	None / No ethnic or cultural group
112	Combination/Multi
113	European
114	Asian
115	Scandinavian
116	Caucasian
117	Other mentions
198	Don't know
199	Refused

1a. How would your father describe his ethnic or cultural group? (**IF NECESSARY READ:**) for example, as Irish, German, (Note: the two European ethnic groups were randomized from among these groups: Italian, Russian, French, Dutch, Greek, Scottish, Polish, Swedish, Irish, and German) Chinese, Latino, African-American, Jewish, part of some OTHER ethnic or cultural group, or as some combination of groups (**PROBE IN ALL CASES:** Would your father include any OTHER ethnic or cultural groups in the way he would see himself?) (**ACCEPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES. CODE ANY RESPONSE ENDING IN "-AMERICAN" IN RESPECTIVE CATEGORY.)**

[**SEE ETHNICITY CODE LIST IN Q.1**]

1b. How would your mother describe her ethnic or cultural group? (**IF NECESSARY READ:**) for example, as Irish, German, (Note: the two European ethnic groups were randomized from among these groups: Italian, Russian, French, Dutch, Greek, Scottish, Polish, Swedish, Irish, and German) Chinese, Latino, African-American, Jewish, part of some OTHER ethnic or cultural group, or as *some combination of groups* (**PROBE IN ALL CASES:** Would your mother include any OTHER ethnic or cultural groups in the way she would see herself.) (**ACCEPT MULTIPLE RESPONSES. CODE ANY RESPONSE ENDING IN "-AMERICAN" IN RESPECTIVE CATEGORY.)**

54

[**SEE ETHNICITY CODE LIST IN Q.1**]

2. Are you currently married, divorced, widowed, living with a partner, or single?

> 1   Married (Separated)
> 2   Divorced
> 3   Widowed
> 4   Living with a partner
> 5   Single
> 9   Refused

> 2a. How many people, including yourself, live in your household at the present time?

> 1   One
> 2   Two
> 3   Three
> 4   Four
> 5   Five
> 6   Six
> 7   Seven
> 8   Eight or more
> 9   Refused

(IF DK/REF, ASK Q.2b.)

(IF ONE TO Q.2a, SKIP TO Q.3.)

2b. How many people in your household are less than 18 years old? _____

> 99   Refused

3. (**IF MARRIED OR LIVING WITH PARTNER IN Q.2:**) How would your husband/wife/partner describe his/her ethnic or cultural group; (**IF NECESSARY READ:** for example, as Irish, German (Note: the two European ethnic groups were randomized from among these groups: Italian, Russian, French, Dutch, Greek, Scottish, Polish, Swedish, Irish, and German), Chinese, Hispanic or Latino, African-American, Jewish, part of some OTHER ethnic or cultural group, or as *some combination of groups* (**PROBE IN ALL CASES:** Would he/she include any *other* groups in the description?) (**MARK ALL CATEGORIES MENTIONED. CODE ANY RESPONSE ENDING IN "-AMERICAN" IN RESPECTIVE CATEGORY.)**

[**SEE ETHNICITY CODE LIST IN Q.1**]

The next few questions are about possible connections you might have – close or distant – with various ethnic or cultural traditions…

4. (**ASK IF ETHNIC BACKGROUND NOT NATIVE-AMERICAN OR JEWISH - Q.1, Q.1A or Q.1B**)
    Were any of your grandparents, great grandparents, or earlier ancestors *in your direct family line* on your mother's or father's side <u>American Indian</u>?

> 1   Yes
> 2   No
> 8   Don't know
> 9   Refused

5. (**ASK IF ETHNIC BACKGROUND NOT HISPANIC/LATINO OR JEWISH - Q.1, Q.1A or Q.1B**)
What about Hispanic of Latino? (**READ IF NECESSARY**: Were any of your grandparents, great grandparents, or earlier ancestors *in your direct family line* on your mother's or father's side <u>Hispanic or Latino</u>?)

    1   Yes
    2   No
    8   Don't know
    9   Refused

6. (**ASK IF ETHNIC BACKGROUND NOT JEWISH - Q.1, Q.1A or Q.1B**) Were any of them Jewish?
(**READ IF NECESSARY:** Were any of your grandparents, great grandparents, or earlier ancestors *in your direct family line* on your mother's or father's side <u>Jewish</u>?)

    1   Yes
    2   No
    8   Don't know
    9   Refused

7. Thinking about the religious backgrounds of your grandparents...

[**INTERVIEWER NOTE**: <u>All</u> multiple mentions should be specified under code 6 (such as Catholic and Lutheran). Use pre-coded list (and specify for code 5 "Other religion") only if single mention**.
INTERVIEWER NOTE:** Don't keep asking for religion if respondent says everyone is the same religion, listen and record answer if already given, instead of insisting on reading the question.]

    a.   First your <u>father's father</u>: Was he Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, some other religion, no religion, or more than one religion? (**ACCEPT ONE CODE.**)

            1   Catholic
            2   Protestant
            3   Jewish
            4   Muslim/Islam/Mohammedan
            5   Other religion; SPECIFY: _____
            6   More than one religion ALL RELIGIONS SHOULD BE LISTED AS OTHER
                     SPECIFIES. SPECIFY ALL: _____
            7   No religion/None/Atheist/Agnostic
            8   Evangelical
            9   Don't know/Refused

[**INTERVIEWER NOTE:** <u>All</u> multiple mentions should be specified under code 6 (such as Catholic and Lutheran). Use pre-coded list (and specify for code 5 "Other religion") only if single mention.
INTERVIEWER NOTE: Don't keep asking for religion if respondent says everyone is the same religion, listen and record answer if already given, instead of insisting on reading the question.]

    b.   What about your <u>father's mother</u>: Was she Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, some other religion, no religion, or more than one religion? (**ACCEPT ONE CODE.**) *[The list of religions presented in "b" should begin with the answer given in "a."]*
            1   Catholic
            2   Protestant
            3   Jewish
            4   Muslim/Islam/Mohammedan

5	Other religion; SPECIFY: _____
6	More than one religion ALL RELIGIONS SHOULD BE LISTED AS OTHER SPECIFIES. SPECIFY ALL: _____
7	No religion/None/Atheist/Agnostic
8	Evangelical
9	Don't know/Refused

[**INTERVIEWER NOTE:** All multiple mentions should be specified under code 6 (such as Catholic and Lutheran). Use pre-coded list (and specify for code 5 "Other religion") only if single mention.
INTERVIEWER NOTE: Don't keep asking for religion if respondent says everyone is the same religion, listen and record answer if already given, instead of insisting on reading the question.]

   c. How about your: <u>mother's father</u>: Was he Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, some other religion, no religion, or more than one religion? (**ACCEPT ONE CODE.**) *[The list of religions presented in "c" should begin with the answer given in" b."]*

1	Catholic
2	Protestant
3	Jewish
4	Muslim/Islam/Mohammedan
5	Other religion; SPECIFY: _____
6	More than one religion ALL RELIGIONS SHOULD BE LISTED AS OTHER SPECIFIES. SPECIFY ALL: _____
7	No religion/None/Atheist/Agnostic
8	Evangelical
9	Don't know/Refused

[**INTERVIEWER NOTE:** All multiple mentions should be specified under code 6 (such as Catholic and Lutheran). Use pre-coded list (and specify for code 5 "Other religion") only if single mention.
INTERVIEWER NOTE: Don't keep asking for religion if respondent says everyone is the same religion, listen and record answer if already given, instead of insisting on reading the question.]

   d. And your <u>mother's mother</u>? Was she Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, some other religion, no religion, or more than one religion? (**MARK ANSWER(S) UNDER COLUMN "d" IN TABLE BELOW. ACCEPT ONE CODE.**) *[The list of religions presented in "d" should begin with the answer given in "c."]*

1	Catholic
2	Protestant
3	Jewish
4	Muslim/Islam/Mohammedan
5	Other religion; SPECIFY: _____
6	More than one religion ALL RELIGIONS SHOULD BE LISTED AS OTHER SPECIFIES. SPECIFY ALL: _____
7	No religion/None/Atheist/Agnostic
8	Evangelical
9	Don't know/refused

8. (**IF SAME ANSWER (CODES 1-4) GIVEN IN Q.7a-d, ASK:**) What about yourself -- were you raised (**INSERT ANSWER GIVEN**)? (**IF NO OR IF NOT SAME ANSWER (CODES 1-4) GIVEN IN Q.7a-d, CONTINUE:** What about yourself, were you raised Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, in some other religion, in more than one religion or in none?

(**IF DIFFERENT ANSWERS GIVEN IN Q.7a-d, ASK:**) What about yourself, were you raised Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, in some other religion, or in none?

1	Catholic	→	**GO TO Q. 9**
2	Protestant	→	**GO TO Q.8a**
3	Jewish	→	**GO TO Q.9**
4	Muslim	→	**GO TO Q.9**
5	Other religion	→	**GO TO Q.8b**
6	More than one religion; **SPECIFY ALL HERE (IF ANSWER INCLUDES PROTESTANT/EVANGELICAL, BE SURE TO PROBE FOR SPECIFIC DENOMINATION/CHURCH):**	→	**GO TO Q.8d.**
7	No religion/None/Atheist/Agnostic	→	**GO TO Q.9**
8	Evangelical	→	**GO TO Q.8a**
9	Don't know/Refused	→	**GO TO Q.9**

8a. (**ASK IF PROTESTANT OR EVANGELICAL:**) What is that church or denomination? (**PROBE FOR SPECIFICITY**)

[**SEE RELIGION CODE LIST IN Q.8b**]

SKIP TO Q.9.

8b. (**ASK IF OTHER RELIGION:**) What religion would that be?

51 African Methodist Episcopal (A.M.E.)/Methodist Episcopal Zion
 45 Agnostic
 40 American Indian (Native American) religion
 55 Apostolic
  6 Assemblies of God/Calvary Temple or Calvary Church
 46 Atheist
  7 Baha'i
  8 Baptist (except Southern Baptist, see #47 below)
 70 Believer/Believes in God/deist
 65 Bible church
  9 Brethren
 10 Buddhist
  4 Catholic/Roman Catholic
 11 Christian (PROBE: "Which church or denomination is that?")
 31 Christian Reformed/Dutch Reform (All other "Reformed", see #58)
 12 Christian Science
 13 Church of God
 14 Churches of Christ and Christian Churches
 49 Confucianism
 15 Disciples of Christ
 16 Episcopalian/Anglican/Church of England/English
 44 Ethical Culture
 17 Evangelical/Born Again Christian (PROBE: "Which church or denomination is that?")
 18 Friends/Quakers
 62 Full-Gospel/Four-Square Gospel/Other Gospel
 42 Fundamentalist (PROBE: "Which church is that?")
 19 Greek/Russian/Eastern/other Orthodox
 20 Hindu

21 Holiness/Holy
66 Holy Roller
43 Humanist
48 Jainism/Jain (sometimes misspelled as "Shain" or something similar)
22 Jehovah's Witness
  2 Jewish and another religion (PROBE: "What other religion is that?")
  1 Jewish/Judaism
23 Lutheran (any Lutheran)
54 Masons/Masonic Lodge
24 Mennonite/Amish
  3 Messianic Jew (e.g., Jews for Jesus)
25 Methodist (Note: Wesleyan = 50; A.M.E. = 51)
57 Moravian church
26 Mormon/Latter Day Saints
71 Multiple or many religions (not specified)/All religions
27 Muslim/Islam/Mohammedan
28 Nazarene
41 Non-denominational / Interdenominational/Community Church/Unaffiliated
58 Other "Reformed" churches (other than Dutch Reform - see #31)
63 Paganism
29 Pentecostal/Charismatics/Church of God (but not "Worldwide Church of God")/Vineyard Fellowship
30 Presbyterian/Church of Scotland/Scottish
  5 Protestant (PROBE: "Which church or denomination is that?")
64 Religious Science
52 Salvation Army
53 Santeria/voodoo
60 Satanism/Satin Worship/Devil Worship
33 Scientology
34 Seventh Day Adventist
61 Shamanism
35 Shintoist/Shinto
39 Sikh
47 Southern Baptist
56 Spiritual(ist)
36 Taoist/Daoism
37 Unitarian/Universalist
38 United Church of Christ/Congregationalist
67 Wee Kirk/Wee Free Church
50 Wesleyan
59 Wiccan / Wicca
72 Other religion (SPECIFY)*
73 None/No religion/Secular
98 Don't know
99 Refused

8d. (**ASK IF MORE THAN ONE RELIGION IN Q.8)** Which would those be? _____

8e. (**INTERVIEWER NOTE: Is the answer given in 8d Protestant or Evangelical?)**

    1   Yes   **-> 8e1.** What is that Protestant/Evangelical church or denomination? _____
    2   No   **-> Go to Q.9**

9. (**ASK IF Q.8=1,2,3,4,5,8)** Sometimes people choose different religions at different times in their lives. Do you NOW consider yourself **(RELIGION FROM Q.8, Q.8a, or Q.8b) (IF NO, READ:** Do you NOW consider yourself Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, some other religion, more than one religion, or none?) **(INTERVIEWER NOTE:** IF RESPONDENT GIVES INSERTED RESPONSE AS AN ANSWER, RECORD AS CODE 9, "SAME AS Q.8 SERIES") (**ASK IF Q.8=6,7,DK, REF)** Sometimes people choose different religions at different times in their lives. Do you NOW consider yourself Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, some other religion, more than one religion, or none? **(ACCEPT ONE CODE.)**

1	Catholic	→	**GO TO Q.9e**
2	Protestant	→	**GO TO Q.9a**
3	Jewish	→	**GO TO Q.9c**
4	Muslim/Islam/Mohammedan	→	**GO TO Q.9e**
5	Other religion	→	**GO TO Q.9b**
6	More than one religion; **SPECIFY ALL HERE (IF ANSWER INCLUDES PROTESTANT/EVANGELICAL, BE SURE TO PROBE FOR SPECIFIC DENOMINATION/CHURCH):** →		**GO TO Q.9d**
7	No religion/None/Atheist/Agnostic → **GO TO Q.9e1 THEN TO Q.9f1**[60]		
8	Evangelical	→	**GO TO Q.9a**
9	Same as Q.8 series	→	**GO TO Q.9e**
DK	Don't know	→	**GO TO Q.9e1 THEN TO Q.9f1**[61]
REF	Refused	→	**GO TO Q.9e1 THEN TO Q.9f1**[62]

9a. (**ASK IF PROTESTANT OR EVANGELICAL:**) What is that church or denomination? (**PROBE FOR SPECIFICITY**)
> [**SEE RELIGION CODE LIST IN Q.8b**]

SKIP TO Q.9e.

9b. (**ASK IF OTHER RELIGION:**) What religion would that be? **(ACCEPT MULTIPLES.)**
> [**SEE RELIGION CODE LIST IN Q.8b**]

9c. (ASK IF JEWISH IN Q.9 OR Q.9b:) Would that be Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, Reconstructionist, or ethnically or culturally Jewish? (INTERVIEWER NOTE: If respondent mentions code 5 AND ALSO any codes 1-4, mark only the code 1-4 given – not also code 5.)

1	Orthodox
2	Conservative
3	Reform
4	Reconstructionist
5	Ethnically or culturally Jewish/Just Jewish
6	Other
8	Don't know
9	Refused

---

[60] Change in skip pattern made February 22, 2002 after 5100 interviews and before calling resumed for the additional 5104 interviews. Previous pattern said "go to Q. 11".

[61] Change in skip pattern made February 22, 2002 after 5100 interviews and before calling resumed for the additional 5104 interviews. Previous pattern said "go to Q. 10".

[62] Change in skip pattern made February 22, 2002 after 5100 interviews and before calling resumed for the additional 5104 interviews. Previous pattern said "go to Q. 10".

9d. (**ASK IF MORE THAN ONE RELIGION IN Q.9**:) Which would those be? _____

9d1. (**INTERVIEWER NOTE: Is the religion mentioned in Q.9d Jewish?)**

  1 Yes **-> Go to Q.9d2**
  2 No **-> Go to Q.9d3**

9d2. For Jewish, would that be Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, Reconstructionist, or ethnically or culturally Jewish

  1 Orthodox
  2 Conservative
  3 Reform
  4 Reconstructionist
  5 Ethnically or culturally Jewish/Just Jewish
  6 Other
  8 Don't know
  9 Refused

9d3. (**INTERVIEWER NOTE: Is the answer given in 9d Protestant or Evangelical?)**

  1 Yes **->** 9d4. What is that Protestant/Evangelical church or denomination? ____
  2 No **-> Go to Q.9e**

9e. Would your mother's religion be the same as yours, or different?

  1 Yes **-> Go to Q.9f**
  2 No **-> Go to Q.9e1**
  8 Don't know **-> Go to Q.9f**
  9 Refused **-> Go to Q.9f**

9e1. What is (was) your mother's religion? **(INTERVIEWER NOTE**: Read "was" only if respondent mention parent is deceased. Record current or last religion practiced.**)**

  [**SEE RELIGION CODE LIST IN Q.8b**]

9f. Would your father's religion be the same as yours, or different?

  1 Yes **-> Go to Q.10**
  2 No **-> Go to Q.9f1**
  8 Don' know **-> Go to Q.10**
  9 Refused **-> Go to Q.10**

9f1. What is (was) your father's religion? **(INTERVIEWER NOTE**: Read "was" only if respondent mention parent is deceased. Record current or last religion practiced.**)**

  [**SEE RELIGION CODE LIST IN Q.8b**]

10. (**ASK IF ANY RELIGION IN Q.9**:) Is there any <u>other</u> religion that you currently practice or church that you currently attend? **(INTERVIEWER NOTE:** IF NECESSARY READ …We mean a church of a different religion or denomination, not just a different church building or institution of the same religion located in a different neighborhood.)

1   Yes → 10a. What would that be? (**PROBE:** Any others?)
2   No
8   Don't know
9   Refused

[**SEE RELIGION CODE LIST IN Q.8b.**]

10b. (**ASK ALL EXCEPT THOSE WHO SAY "NONE" IN Q.9:**) How strong of an attachment do you feel to your current religion(s)? In answering, use a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 stands for "not at all attached" and 10 stands for "very strongly attached."

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Not at all Attached   Very Strongly Attached

98   Don't know
99   Refused

11. (**IF MARRIED OR LIVING WITH PARTNER:**) Some couples have different religions. Is your husband/wife/partner (**INSERT RELIGION[S] (CODES 1-4) MENTIONED IN Q.9**)? (**IF R ANSWERS "NO," ASK NEXT SENTENCE OMITTING RELIGION MENTIONED IN Q.9.**) (**IF DON'T KNOW, REFUSED OR ANOTHER ANSWER GIVEN IN Q.9:**) Is your husband/wife/partner Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, more than one religion, some other religion, or none? (**ACCEPT ONE CODE.**)

1   Catholic   **->**   **GO TO Q.12**
2   Protestant   **->**   **GO TO Q.11a**
3   Jewish   **->**   **GO TO Q.11c**
4   Muslim/Islam/Mohammedan   **->**   **GO TO Q.12**
5   Other religion   **->**   **GO TO Q.11b**
6   More than one religion; **SPECIFY ALL HERE (IF ANSWER INCLUDES PROTESTANT/EVANGELICAL, BE SURE TO PROBE FOR SPECIFIC DENOMINATION/CHURCH)**: _____ **->**   **GO TO Q.11d**
7   No religion/None/Atheist/Agnostic   **->**   **GO TO Q.12**
8   Evangelical   **->**   **GO TO Q.11a**
9   Don't know/Refused   **->**   **GO TO Q.12**

11a. (**ASK IF PROTESTANT OR EVANGELICAL:**) What is that church or denomination? (**PROBE FOR SPECIFICITY**)

[**SEE RELIGION CODE LIST IN Q.8b**]

SKIP TO Q.12.

11b. (**ASK IF OTHER RELIGION:**) What religion would that be?

[**SEE RELIGION CODE LIST IN Q.8b.**]

11c. (**ASK IF JEWISH IN Q.11 OR Q.11B:**) Would that be Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, Reconstructionist, or ethnically or culturally Jewish? (INTERVIEWER NOTE: If respondent mentions code 5 AND ALSO any codes 1-4, mark only the code 1-4 given – not also code 5.)

       1   Orthodox
       2   Conservative
       3   Reform
       4   Reconstructionist
       5   Ethnically or culturally Jewish/Just Jewish
       6   Other
       8   Don't know
       9   Refused

SKIP TO Q.12.

11d. (**ASK IF MORE THAN ONE RELIGION IN Q.11**:) Which would those be? _____

11d1. **(INTERVIEWER NOTE Is the religion mentioned in Q.9d Jewish?)**

       1   Yes   **-> Go to Q.11d2**
       2   No   **-> Go to Q.11d3**

11d2. For Jewish, would that be Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, Reconstructionist, or ethnically or culturally Jewish

       1   Orthodox
       2   Conservative
       3   Reform
       4   Reconstructionist
       5   Ethnically or culturally Jewish/Just Jewish
       6   Other
       8   Don't know
       9   Refused

11d3. **(INTERVIEWER NOTE: Is the answer given in Q.9d Protestant or Evangelical?)**

       1   Yes   **->** 11d4. What is that Protestant/Evangelical church or denomination?
       2   No   **-> Go to Q.12**

12. (**ASK IF ANY RELIGION IN Q.11**:) Is there any <u>other</u> religion that he/she/your partner currently practices or church that he/she/your partner currently attends? **(INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF NECESSARY READ:** We mean a church of a different religion or denomination, not just a different church building or institution of the same religion located in a different neighborhood.) (**PROBE:** Any others?)

       1   No
       2   Yes   ➔ 12a. What would that be?
       8   Don't Know
       9   Refused
     [**SEE RELIGION CODE LIST IN Q.8b.**]

IF Q.2a = 1 THEN SKIP TO Q.13.

IF NOT CODE 1 (MARRIED) OR 4 (LIVING WITH PARTNER) AT Q.2 THEN SKIP TO Q.13.

IF Q.2b ONE OR GREATER AND RELIGION OF RESPONDENT (Q.9) AND SPOUSE/PARTNER (Q.11) DIFFER THEN ASK:

12b. Earlier you mentioned that **[INSERT NUMBER IN HOUSEHOLD < 18 AT Q.2b]** members of your household are children or teen-agers. **[IF 1 IN Q.2b]** Is he or she **[IF MORE THAN 1 IN Q.2b]:** Are they being raised in your religion, in your *husband's/wife's/partner's* religion, in both religions, in no religion or something else?

1	All in respondent's religion
2	All in spouse's religion
3	In both
4	In no religion
5	Something else
6	Children being raised differently from each other (VOLUNTEERED-DO NOT READ)
8	Don't know
9	Refused

12c. **(ASK IF "SOMETHING ELSE":)** In what religion (is) are (the child or teenager) they being raised? **(RECORD COMPLETE ANSWER. IF CHILDREN BEING RAISED DIFFERENTLY FROM ONE ANOTHER, RECORD ANSWER IN RESPONSE FIELDS IMMEDIATELY BELOW).**

[**SEE RELIGION CODE LIST IN Q.8b**]

12d. **(IF CHILDREN BEING RAISED DIFFERENTLY FROM EACH OTHER IN TERMS OF RELIGION, ASK ABOUT EACH ONE:)**

What about the oldest son or daughter under 18 — is he or she being raised in your religion, in your husband's/wife's/partner's religion, in both religions, in another religion, or in no religion?

1	All in respondent's religion
2	All in spouse's/partner's religion
3	In both
4	In another religion
5	In no religion
9	Refused

What about the next oldest?

What about the next oldest? etc.

13. (**IF ANY RELIGION MENTIONED IN Q.9:**) Did you ever practice a <u>different</u> religion or regularly attend a church of a different religion or denomination other than the one(s) you've already mentioned?

   (**IF NO RELIGION MENTIONED IN Q.9, ASK:**) Did you ever practice ANY religion?

1	Yes	
2	No	**→ GO TO Q.15**

64

14. What religion was that? (**PROBE:** Any others?)

1	Catholic	→	**GO TO Q.15**
2	Protestant	→	**GO TO Q.14a**
3	Jewish	→	**GO TO Q.15**
4	Muslim/Islam/Mohammedan	→	**GO TO Q.15**
5	Other religion	→	**GO TO Q.14b**
6	More than one religion; **SPECIFY ALL RESPONSES (IF ANSWERS INCLUDE PROTESTANT/EVANGELICAL, PROBE AND RECORD THE SPECIFIC CHURCH OR DENOMINATION ONLY):** _____ →		**GO TO Q.15**
7	No religion/None/Atheist/Agnostic	→	**GO TO Q.15**
8	Evangelical	→	**GO TO Q.14a**
9	Don't know/Refused	→	**GO TO Q.15**

14a. (**ASK IF PROTESTANT OR EVANGELICAL:**) What is that church or denomination? (**PROBE FOR SPECIFICITY**)

[**SEE RELIGION CODE LIST IN Q.8b.**]

14b. (**ASK IF OTHER RELIGION:**) What religion would that be?

[**SEE RELIGION CODE LIST IN Q.8b.**]

15. (**ASK IF SOME RELIGION MENTIONED IN Q.9:**) Some people change their religion over the course of their lives. Do you think you will definitely, probably, probably not, or definitely not change to another religion sometime in the future? (**ADD IF NECESSARY:** This question is for research only; your answer will remain private.)

(**ASK IF NO RELIGION IN Q.9:**) You mentioned that you currently have no religious preference. Some people make changes at different times in their lives. Do you think you will definitely, probably, probably not, or definitely not take up a religion sometime in the future? (**ADD IF NECESSARY**: This question is for research only; your answer will remain private.)

1	Definitely		
2	Probably		
3	Probably not	→	**GO TO Q.18**
4	Definitely not	→	**GO TO Q.18**
8	Don't know		
9	Refused	→	**GO TO Q.18**

16. If you were to make a change, what religion might you switch to? (**PROBE:** Any others?)

[**SEE RELIGION CODE LIST IN Q.8b.**]

[NOTE: THERE IN NO Q.17]

Next I'd like to change the focus slightly...

18. **(ASK ALL:)** Not counting weddings or funerals, when, if ever, was the last time you attended religious services – within the last week, in the last month, in the last year, more than one year ago, or never?

    1   Within the last week
    2   In the last month
    3   In the last year
    4   More than 1 year ago   → **GO TO Q.20**
    5   Never   → **GO TO Q.20**
    8   Don't know   → **GO TO Q.20**
    9   Refused   → **GO TO Q.20**

19. How often do you usually attend religious services – every week, almost every week, once or twice a month, about 6-10 times a year, a few times a year, or less often than that?

    1   Every week (or more often than once a week)
    2   Almost every week
    3   Once or twice a month
    4   About 6-10 times a year
    5   A few times a year
    6   Less often than that
    8   Don't know
    9   Refused
    10

20. (**ASK ALL EXCEPT THOSE WHO SAY "NONE" IN Q.9:**) Are you a <u>member</u> of a church or parish, synagogue, or other religious or spiritual congregation?

    1   Yes
    2   No
    8   Don't know
    9   Refused

21. (**ASK IF ANY RELIGION MENTIONED IN Q.9:**) Are you involved in your religious community (**IF JEWISH IN Q.1 OR Q.9)**: Are you involved in the Jewish community) in any other ways, such as volunteering, board or committee membership, studying, or cultural events?"

    1   Yes
    2   No
    8   Don't know
    9   Refused

22[63]. **(IF 1 OR MORE IN Q.2B AND IF JEWISH IN Q.1, Q.3, Q.9, OR Q.11).** Are you raising your children to be Jewish? (**IF NECESSARY**: The question asked earlier (Q.12b) specifically mentioned religion. This question refers to possible other aspects of being Jewish – not just religious belief and practice.)

    1   Yes
    2   Some but not all of the children
    3   Primarily/mostly Jewish, but also something else
    4   Partly Jewish but also equally something else/Equally Jewish and something else

---

[63] Q. 22 and Q.22a were added February 22, 2002 after 5100 interviews and before calling resumed for the additional 4900 interviews.

5	Primarily something else but also partly Jewish
6	No (something else mentioned)
7	No (and no other religion mentioned/or religion rejected)
8	Don't know
9	Refused

22a. **(ASK IF Q.22 = CODE '2')** How many of your children are you raising to be Jewish?
_____ (RECORD ANY COMMENTS FOR POSSIBLE LATER RE-CODING.)

23. (**ASK ALL:**) Have you attended any JEWISH events or ceremonies <u>in the past two years</u> including Passover seders (SAY-ders), Jewish weddings, Bar/Bat Mitzvahs, or other Jewish religious or cultural events?

1	Yes
2	No
8	Don't know / Can't remember
9	Refused

Now, I have just a few final questions to help us classify your answers…

[NOTE: There is no Q.G1 or Q.G2]

G3. What is the highest level of education you completed?

1	Grade school or less
2	Some high school (not completed)
3	Completed high school/HS grad (or GED)
4	Some college (less than 4 years)
5	Completed 4 years of college
6	Graduate or Post-graduate degree
9	Refused

G4. What is your age as of your last birthday?

1	18-24
2	25-34
3	35-44
4	45-54
5	55-64
6	65-74
7	75 or older
9	Refused

[NOTE: There is no Q.G5]

G6. Which of the following best describes your race – white, black or African American, Asian, or some other race? (**IF MORE THAN ONE RACE, ASK:** Which would those be?) (**IF OTHER, ASK:** What race would that be?) (**MARK ALL ANSWERS GIVEN.**)

      1   White
      2   Black or African-American
      3   Asian or Pacific Islander
      4   American Indian / Alaskan Native
      5   More than one race; SPECIFY: _____
      6   Other; SPECIFY: _____
      98   DK   Don't know **→ GO TO Q.G7**
      99   Ref   Refused **→ GO TO Q.G7**

G6a. **(ASK IF MORE THAN 1 PERSON IN HH:)** Do any members of your household have a different race?

      1   Yes
      2   No   **→GO TO Q.G7**
      8   Don't know   **→GO TO Q.G7**
      8   Refused**→GO TO Q.G7**

G6b. Which family members in your household have a different race? **(MARK ALL MENTIONS. PROBE:** What other family members in your household have a different race?)

Spouse/partner **→** 6b1. What is *his/her* race? _____
Child #1   **→** 6b2. What is the oldest child's race? _____
Child #2   **→** 6b3. What is the next oldest child's race? _____
Child #3   **→** 6b4. What is the next oldest child's race? _____
Child #4   **→** 6b5. What is the next oldest child's race? _____
Child #5   **→** 6b6. What is the next oldest child's race? _____
Child #6   **→** 6b7. What is the next oldest child's race? _____
Child #7   **→** 6b8. What is that child's race? _____
Child #8   **→** 6b9. What is that child's race? _____
Child #9   **→** 6b10 What is that child's race? _____
Child #10   **→** 6b11. What is that child's race? _____
Other relative in HH   **→** 6b12. What is that person's race? _____
Other relative in HH   **→** 6b13. What is that person's race? _____
Don't know
Refused

G7. I'm going to read a series of income groups. Please stop me when I read the group which describes your total household income from all sources in 2001 before taxes…

     1   Under $15,000
     2       $15,000 to less than $30,000
     3       $30,000 to less than $50,000
     4       $50,000 to less than $75,000
     5       $75,000 to less than $100,000
     6       $100,000 or more
     8   Don't know
     9   Refused

G8. Not including cell phones, how many different telephone numbers do you have at the address where you are now? **(INTERVIEWER NOTE: Do not include phone lines that are dedicated to fax machines or computer modems.)**

     1   One
     2   Two
     3   Three or more
     8   Don't know
     9   Refused

Your answers have been helpful. Thank you very much for participating in this survey!

(ADD IF JEWISH AT Q.1, Q.3, Q.9, OR Q.11): Your answers have been extremely helpful. If we have some additional research questions, would it be OK if we re-contacted you in the future? [IF RESPONDENT HESITATES OR SAYS NO, ADD: We won't be contacting you for at least a month.])

Appendix B:

**Exploratory Tests to Determine Whether Jews are Under-Counted
or Over-Counted in Jewish Population Surveys**

<u>Introduction: Objectives of the Test</u>

To address the issue of estimation bias resulting from differential contact, participation, and/or disclosure rates – among population segments suspected of being under-represented as well as among Jews in general -- empirical tests were devised. They were limited in scope and is intended to serve as an example of the type of testing that needs to be expanded and refined. The results should be taken as suggestive and far from definitive.

In conjunction with the HARI survey, a set of "side surveys" were conducted by the Institute for Jewish & Community Research during the first half of 2002 to examine several assumptions underlying Jewish population estimation. The specific objectives were to test (1) whether each of four segments of the Jewish community in the United States is under or overcounted relative to all Jews in random sample telephone surveys designed to estimate population size; and (2) whether the total Jewish population is correctly estimated in RDD (random-digit-dialing) population surveys. The test compares survey contact rates, participation rates, and rates of disclosure of Jewish identity –- the propensity of Jewish respondents to tell an unknown survey interviewer that they and other members of their household are Jewish (or are of Jewish parentage or origin). The test results are intended to help determine whether there is systematic undercounting of Jews in population surveys that use this approach and whether a postsurvey adjustment in the current Institute for Jewish & Community Research total survey estimate is warranted.

The four specific Jewish population groups suspected of being underestimated are:

- Religiously Orthodox,
- Israelis living in the United States
- Recent émigrés from Russia and the former Soviet Union (FSU) – "Russians"
- Young Jewish adults.[64]

There are three reasons why these groups and/or Jews in general might be under-estimated in research based on RDD population surveys:

1. <u>Differential rate of contact</u> – the segments or Jews in general might be harder to reach by telephone compared to their respective counterparts;

2. <u>Differential rate of survey cooperation</u> – the segments or Jews in general might be more likely to refuse to participate than their counterparts when contacted in a telephone survey;

---

[64] Although a survey with young Jewish adults was carried out, the results were deemed too problematic and not valid. So the discussion will be limited to the Orthodox, Israelis, Russians, and Jews in general ("mainstream Jews").

3. <u>Failure to disclose Jewish identity</u> – the segments or Jews in general might not be willing to divulge that they are Jewish or have Jewish parentage or origin (because of lingering perceived anti-Semitism and other reasons such as feeling ashamed to admit to being Jewish, fear of being accused of dual loyalty, privacy concerns, and/or conflicting identities).[65]

To the extent that any of the Jewish population segments differ in these propensities, population estimates will be biased toward or against some segments of Jews relative to others. To the extent that Jews in general differ in these propensities relative to non-Jews, they will be under- or overcounted relative to non-Jews.[66]

The product of the three rates (= the number disclosing Jewish identity divided by the starting sample) *is the key statistic to be compared across Jewish segments.* For the Jews vs. non-Jews test, the ideal comparison is analogous: the percent of the Jewish starting sample disclosing Jewish identify vs. the percent of the non-Jewish starting sample answering in ways that result in their being classified as *non*-Jewish. (This is further elaborated below.)

Attempting to answer these perplexing questions in a single study is an ambitious objective. The Institute for Jewish & Community Research acknowledges that this initial test study was not successful in every respect, most notably, in the attempt to compare completion rates of the Jewish (listed) and non-Jewish (RDD) samples. Rather than presenting the results as definitive, we regard this work as a (hopefully provocative) starting point for discussion and further research. In presenting the research, we point out weaknesses and possible improvements for future methodological research that we hope will follow from this beginning.

<u>The Survey Samples and Implementation</u>

The sample listings (telephone numbers) of "<u>mainstream Jews</u>" were provided by four local Jewish Federations (Miami, Houston, Minneapolis, and San Jose) – partly recent donors to their federated campaigns and partly listings of prospects that they compile and maintain. These samples, in aggregation, are taken for the purpose of this preliminary test to represent Jews in the United States.

The sample of <u>Orthodox Jews</u> was a combination of telephone numbers of likely Jewish names taken from the Borough Park, N.Y. telephone directory; from families that sent their children to one of three Orthodox Jewish Summer camps; from an Orthodox Congregation in West Orange, N.J.; and from a Baltimore-area directory of Orthodox synagogue members.

The sample of <u>Russian Jews</u> was a combination of telephone numbers of known Russian émigrés living in metropolitan New York and Los Angeles, and from a larger list provided by the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS).

---

[65] Jewish status was determined using the same set of "screening questions" as used in the 2001-02 NJPS and in many local population surveys to identify Jews and estimate the population size.
[66] Unless there is some counter tendency for non-Jews to misreport that they are Jewish. Note: For non-Jewish respondents, it is correct disclosure of *non*-Jewishness that is the third relevant comparison.

The sample of <u>Israelis</u> living in the United States was a combination of telephone numbers of known Israelis living in metropolitan Los Angeles (supplied by various organizations) supplemented by a longer list supplied by the Israeli Consulate.

These sample sources were selected for their known characteristics. They serve as the basis for our experimental design to test differences between known members of the specific subpopulations. The sample sources are not exhaustive lists of each group, and they are not used for estimating population totals. As in any experiment, they are useful in examining differences between groups.

The test survey also used a <u>random-digit-dialing (RDD) sample</u> drawn in roughly equal numbers from the four local communities. The RDD sample was assumed to be almost entirely non-Jewish (no more than a few percent Jewish, although a bit higher in metro Miami). To achieve a comprehensive and conclusive analysis of the population estimation issue, this parallel RDD sample was added in the hope of comparing contact rates, participation rates, and responses to the Jewish screening questions with the those respective rates obtained in the survey of "mainstream Jews."

The goals of this methodological test were to (1) complete at least 200 interviews with each of the three special population segments – Orthodox, Russians, and Israelis – and 200 interviews with sample supplied by each of the local Jewish federations, divided equally between recent donors and recent nondonors to each respective federated fund-raising campaign; and (2) make at least 650 contacts per segment in the process of completing each set of 200 interviews for the 3 special populations and at least 1,300 contacts in the process of completing the "mainstream Jew" interviews using sample listings supplied by the local federations. (A successful contact occurs when an adult at a residence – not a business address – answers the interviewer's dialing.) The research team felt that the resulting data would be adequate for addressing the key questions related to possible survey underestimation, described above.

It is important to note that the above goals were not quotas, rather, expected minimums that would be achieved in the course of thorough working of the starting samples. Making many contact attempts on all telephone numbers in the samples before replacement was critical to the validity of the tests, as they require determining how many contacts could be made as well as how many of those contacted would cooperate by agreeing to the interview, and of those interviewed, how many would disclose that they are Jewish (or, for non-Jews, *not* Jewish). So, it was important that the samples be worked completely and equivalently across groups.

Of the sample telephone numbers still "live" at the end of the interviewing – the numbers that had not reached a final disposition – 89% of the listed sample (the special Jewish segments and the Federation-supplied donors and prospects) and 85% of the RDD sample received 9 or more call attempts not including busy signals.

Are Special Populations Under-represented in RDD Surveys Relative to Other Jews?

The first set of findings presented (Tables B.1 to B.3) compare each special population group (Orthodox, Russians, and Israelis) vs. "mainstream Jews" to determine if there is evidence of systematic under- (or, conceivably, over-) representation in population estimates based on telephone survey data.

Orthodox Jews

Table B.1
Sample Dispositions and Disclosure of Jewish Identity:
Orthodox vs. Mainstream Jews

	Orthodox	Mainstream*
TOTAL SAMPLE DIALED	**1,196**	**1,193**
CONTACTS (total)	**939 (79%)**	**787 (66%)**
Completed interviews	309 (33%)	270 (34%)
Jewish identity disclosed	293 (95%)	224 (83%)
Jewish identity NOT disclosed	16 (5%)	46 (17%)
Language/communication difficulty	25	31
Terminated in mid-interview	27	28
Initial refusal or hung up phone	578	458
NONCONTACTS (total)	**158 (13%)**	**285 (24%)**
Unavailable to be interviewed	6	8
No answer after 10+ attempts	152	271
Call ID block / Privacy Manager	0	6
BAD PHONE NUMBERS IDENTIFIED (total)	**99 (8%)**	**121 (10%)**
Business number	29	47
Disconnected	47	49
Fax/Modem	23	25

* Recent donors to Federation campaigns were weighted to represent 25% of the Jewish population.

Table B.1 shows that the Orthodox are:

- More likely than mainstream Jews (i.e., Jews in general) to be contacted given equivalent effort made to telephone their household,
- About equally likely to participate in the survey when contacted, and
- More likely to disclose that someone in the household is Jewish.

Combining the 3 rates – which is equivalent to dividing the number of identified Jews by the starting sample – produces the following probabilities of identifying a household adult as Jewish when the household phone number appears in the starting sample:

If Orthodox:	293/1,196 = .245
If Jewish in general:	224/1,193 = .188

Conclusion: There is no evidence supporting the hypothesis that Orthodox Jews are underrepresented in population estimates. If anything, this analysis suggests that the Orthodox might be slightly *over*-represented relative to non-Orthodox Jews.[67]

Recent Russian Jewish Émigrés

Table B.2
Sample Dispositions and Disclosure of Jewish Identity:
Recent Russian Jewish Émigrés in the United States vs. Mainstream Jews

	Russians	Mainstream*
TOTAL SAMPLE DIALED	**1,189**	**1,193**
CONTACTS (total)	**799 (67%)**	**787 (66%)**
Completed interviews	142 (18%)	270 (34%)
Jewish identity disclosed	96 (68%)	224 (83%)
Jewish identity not disclosed	46 (32%)	46 (17%)
Language/communication difficulty	235	31
Terminated in mid-interview	17	28
Initial refusal or hung up phone	405	458
NONCONTACTS (total)	**259 (22%)**	**285 (24%)**
Unavailable to be interviewed	3	8
No answer after 10+ attempts	256	271
Call ID block / Privacy Manager	0	6
BAD PHONE NUMBERS IDENTIFIED (total)	**131 (11%)**	**121 (10%)**
Business number	41	47
Disconnected	72	49
Fax/Modem	18	25

* Recent donors to Federation campaigns were weighted to represent 25% of the Jewish population.

Table B.2 shows that recent Russian Jewish émigrés are:

- About equally likely to be contacted, compared to mainstream Jews,
- Less likely to participate in the survey when contacted,[68] and
- Less likely to disclose that someone in the household is Jewish.

Again, combining the 3 rates in the Russian Jew vs. Mainstream Jew comparison produces the following probabilities of identifying a household adult as Jewish when the household phone number appears in the starting sample:

---

[67] If "bad" phone numbers are removed from the denominator, the resulting proportions become: 293/1,097 = .267 (Orthodox) and 224/1,072 = .209 (Mainstream) – about the same amount of difference in the same direction as in the calculation that included all phone numbers.

[68] The Russian participation rate would no doubt increase if survey interviewing was also conducted in Russian (not only English). This, in turn, would likely increase the number who identify as Jewish (or who have Jewish origin or parentage), and thus lessen the difference between Russian émigrés and Jews in general.

If Russian: 96/1,189 = .081
If Jewish in general: 224/1,193 = .188

Conclusion: There is evidence here (both differential participation and differential disclosure rate) to support the hypothesis that Russian Jewish emigrants in the United States are underrepresented in population estimates.[69] The statistical adjustment to the population estimate is described in Part 1, section 5.3.[70]

Israelis Living in the United States

Table B.3
Sample Dispositions and Disclosure of Jewish Identity:
Israelis Living in the United States vs. Mainstream Jews

	Israelis	Mainstream*
TOTAL SAMPLE DIALED	**1,154**	**1,193**
CONTACTS (total)	**700 (61%)**	**787 (66%)**
Completed interviews	240 (34%)	270 (34%)
Jewish identity disclosed	214 (89%)	224 (83%)
Jewish identity not disclosed	25 (10%)	46 (17%)
Language/communication difficulty	19	31
Terminated in mid-interview	23	28
Initial refusal or hung up phone	418	458
NONCONTACTS (total)	**293 (25%)**	**285 (24%)**
Unavailable to be interviewed	5	8
No answer after 10+ attempts	287	271
Call ID block / Privacy Manager	1	6
BAD PHONE NUMBERS IDENTIFIED (total)	**161 (14%)**	**121 (10%)**
Business number	109	47
Disconnected	25	49
Fax/Modem	27	25

* Recent donors to Federation campaigns were weighted to represent 25% of the Jewish population.

Table B.3 shows that Israelis living in the United States are:

- Slightly less likely to be contacted, compared to Mainstream Jews,
- Equally likely to participate in the survey when contacted, and
- Slightly more likely to disclose that someone in the household is Jewish.

---

[69] If "bad" phone numbers are removed from the denominator, the resulting proportions become: 96/1,058 = .090 (Russian) and 224/1,072 = .209 (Mainstream) – approximately the same level of contrast as in the calculation that included bad numbers.
[70] This adjustment is based on a more limited rationale than implied in these calculations. (See also Part II below and section 5.6 in the report.)

Combining the 3 rates in the Israeli vs. Mainstream Jew comparison produces these probabilities of identifying a household adult as Jewish when the household phone number appears in the starting sample:

If Israeli: 214/1,154 = .185
If Jewish in general: 224/1,193 = .188

Conclusion: The evidence on Israelis is counterbalancing: Their greater tendency to disclose Jewish identity compensates, approximately, for the fact that they are less likely to be contacted. Overall, there is no evidence to indicate that Israelis are either under- or over-represented in estimates based on telephone survey data. [71]

Are Jews in general underrepresented in estimates based on RDD surveys?

This second major objective that the study attempts to address is important because valid test results here can serve as the basis for statistical adjustment of the *total* Jewish population estimate. The results for objective #1 reported to this point are pertinent to within-population analysis by revealing how much the segments are disproportionately represented relative to Jews *not* in the segment. Those data can be used, for example, to increase the estimate of the number of Russian Jews while correspondingly decreasing the estimate of the number of non-Russian Jews, but they cannot in the present study provide a basis for changing the size of the total Jewish population.

A comprehensive answer to the question of whether Jews are undercounted relative to non-Jews in population surveys requires incorporating similar data on survey contacts, participation, and responses to the set of Jewish screening questions *among the general population,* 97%-98% of whom are non-Jewish. As also discussed in Part 2, the critical statistical-operational questions are:

> (A) What is the probability in a survey sample that a telephone number corresponding to the residence of a "true" Jewish adult will result in a completed interview where that adult is identified as Jewish? AND
>
> (B) What is the probability in a survey sample that a telephone number corresponding to the residence where there are no Jewish adults will result in a completed interview where no adults are identified as Jewish?[72]
>
> If A − B = 0, then there is no bias – no undercount or overcount.
> If B > A, then Jews are underestimated.
> If A > B, then Jews are overestimated.

Table B.4 presents outcome data on the mainstream Jewish sample and a comparison sample drawn randomly from the same four local communities as the Federation-provided "known Jewish" samples: Miami, Houston, Minneapolis, and San Jose.

---

[71] If "bad" phone numbers are removed from the denominator, the resulting proportions become: 214/993 = .216 (Israeli) and 224/1,072 (Mainstream) = .209 – still no significant difference.
[72] These statements and the subsequent arithmetic logic are precise with regard to estimates of "households containing any Jewish adults." To apply to total population counts, the logic requires modification to take into account the average number of Jews identified per household.

Table B.4
Sample Dispositions and Responses to Jewish Screening Questions:
"Mainstream Jews" vs. RDD in Matched Locations
(Miami, Houston, San Jose, Minneapolis)

	Mainstream*	RDD**
TOTAL SAMPLE DIALED	**1193**	5048 **Corrected to 5036**[73]
CONTACTS (total)	**787 (66%)**	**1631 corrected to 1619 (32.1%)**
Completed interviews	270 (34.3%)	565 corrected to 553 (34.9%)
Jewish identity correctly disclosed	224 (83.0%)	32 (5.7%) revised to 20 (3.5%)
No Jewish identity disclosed (No one in HH Jewish)	46 (17.0%)	533 (94.3%) corrected to 545 (97.8%)
Language/communication difficulty	31	280
Terminated in mid-interview	28	30
Initial refusal or hung up phone	458	756
NONCONTACTS (total)	**285 (24%)**	**2644 (53%)**
Unavailable to be interviewed	8	180
No answer after 10+ attempts	271	2456
Call ID block / Privacy Manager	6	8
BAD PHONE NUMBERS IDENTIFIED (total)	**121 (10%)**	**773(15%)**
Business number	47	178
Disconnected	49	235
Fax/Modem	25	360

* Recent donors to Federation campaigns were weighted to represent 25% of the Jewish population.
** Combined (unweighted) across the 4 local areas. Each community produced approximately the same number of completed interviews.

The data in the table indicate the following:

- The contact rate is more than twice as high for the "known Jewish" sample: 66% vs. 32%.
- Given contact, the survey cooperation (participation) rate is virtually the same in both samples: 34.3% ("known Jewish") vs. 34.6% ("known non-Jewish).
- The Jewish disclosure rate in the "known Jewish" sample is 83%; the non-Jewish disclosure rate in the "known non Jewish" sample *appears to be* 94.3%, leaving 5.7% as "incorrect disclosure."
- As noted, some in the RDD comparison sample *are* likely to be Jewish, we estimate 3.5%. Therefore, approximately 5.7% - 3.5% = 2.2% of those

---

[73] This corrects for the unrealistically high Jewish identification rate in the combined RDD sample (32/565 = 5.7%). No doubt, some of these – but unlikely more than about 20 (3.5%) – are truly households with Jewish adults correctly classified. So, we lowered the number of RDD sample households with identified Jews to 3.5% (20 of 565), regarding the remaining 12 (32-20) as "false positives" incorrectly classified as Jewish. Correspondingly, we reduced by 12 the Total RDD Sample Dialed to produce a more likely number of starting sample households with no Jews (corrected base).

- responses (12 of the 565) must be false positives, and 97.8% then represent correct disclosure of non-Jewish identity.
- Then, the *corrected* contact, participation, and correct disclosure rates in the "known non-Jewish" sample, become, respectively: 1619/5036 (12 subtracted from the numerator and denominator of the numbers in the table) = 32.1%; 553/1619 (12 again subtracted from the numerator and denominator) = 34.9%; and 533/545 (12 added to the denominator) = 97.8%.
- So, given participation, the non-Jewish disclosure rate in the "known non-Jewish" sample is higher than the Jewish disclosure rate in the "known Jewish" sample: 97.8% vs. 83.0%.

The products of the three rates (after adjusting the percentages in the "known not Jewish" group to account for the likely number of Jews in the RDD sample) are:

	Contact		Partic.		Disclosure		
"Known Jewish"..........................	66.0	x	34.3	x	83.0	=	18.8%
"Known Non-Jewish"..................	32.1	x	34.9	x	97.8	=	11.0%

Because A > B (the probability of a Jewish adult in a survey sample being contacted, surveyed, and counted as Jewish is higher than the probability of a non-Jewish adult being contacted, surveyed, and counted as NOT Jewish), without further examination this analysis would lead to the conclusion that Jews are *over*-estimated in random-digit-dial surveys.[74]

However, **this comparison is flawed and the conclusion is invalid.** The problem lies in the noncomparability of the two Contact Rates. It was only after completing the survey, when the sample dispositions were carefully examined, that the mistake was fully evident: It was *incorrect* to compare Federation-supplied, listed sample contact rates with RDD sample contact rates.

Although we believe the formula logic to be a correct representation of the question of estimation bias, the *input* to the formulas is misleading because the characteristics of the two starting samples being compared are not comparable in a way that produces a fair experiment. The source of the problem is nonequivalence of RDD and listed samples in the likelihood of contact – also evidenced indirectly by the different number of bad phone numbers in the two samples (50% higher in the RDD sample) – quite apart from any differences in contact rate that characterize Jewish versus non-Jewish households due to possible attribute differences between the two populations.[75]

---

[74] This would be true even if the calculations are slightly "off" due to incorrectly estimating the number of Jews in the RDD comparison sample.

[75] As we came to realize after the fact, an RDD sample is fundamentally different than a listed sample. A listed sample may have nonworking numbers due to inaccurate transcription, people moving or dying, but an RDD sample has telephone numbers that have never been assigned, lines dedicated to nonvoice purposes such as fax machines and computers, business numbers plus disconnected numbers. The table shows the percentage of contacts in the listed (presumed Jewish) sample to be more than twice that of the random-digit-dial sample (due largely to far more "no answers" in the latter), and the percent of completed interviews in the RDD sample relative to the Total Sample Dialed is only half the number in the Jewish sample. Filtering out the basic differences between the listed and RDD samples was not possible.

<u>Similar Participation Rates Given Contact</u>

Although the attempt at a comprehensive answer to the question of whether Jews are undercounted in RDD population surveys by using the model described earlier turned out to be unsuccessful, other useful evidence was obtained in the process. The very similar numbers in the third row of data in Table 4 (percentage of completed interviews) indicate that, given contact by the survey interviewer, households with Jewish members are equally likely to participate in the interview as households with no Jewish members, as demonstrated by a comparison of the cooperation rates in the "known Jewish" and "known non Jewish" (RDD) samples, respectively. We believe this comparison to be legitimate and offer comforting evidence – though far from conclusive proof – that this potential source of bias, if it exists at all, is probably minimal. *In other words, it appears that the likelihood of participating in a Jewish population survey given contact is no different for Jews and non-Jews.*[76] Clearly, more research is needed to confirm this tentative conclusion.

<u>Differential Disclosure Rates Given Participation</u>

Another provocative finding from the experiment relates to the so-called "Jewish denial" problem – the issue that originally motivated this methodological exploration. Seventeen percent of the Federation – supplied sample that completed the interview gave answers that resulted in their being classified as "not Jewish." This would seem to constitute prima facie evidence of failure to disclose Jewish identity/background on the part of a sizable fraction of Jews.

On the other hand, there were also some "false positive" answers given by presumed non-Jews – estimated to be about 2.2% of the 565 completed interviews (12 respondents) – the number in excess of the ballparked percentage of Jews in these four communities and nationally. Thus, the *net* underreporting of Jewish identity is roughly 15% (17%-2.2%). **If the Jewish and non-Jewish populations were of equal size**, this outcome, all else being equal, would lead to the conclusion that there is a 15% undercount of Jews.

However, in the real world, the "net" mis-estimation from the balancing of these two opposite forms of misclassification is very different because Jews are a small minority in most communities. Using figures from our test where 3.5% of the residents are believed to be Jewish, 96.5% of the screening interviews would be with non-Jews: .965 x .022= 2.12% of the total screenings would yield false positive classifications of "Jewish." Correspondingly, 3.5% of the total screenings would be with Jewish respondents, and .035 x .17 = 0.59% of the total screenings would yield false negative classifications of non-Jewish. The net result would be: 2.12% - 0.59% = 1.53% *too many* Jews in the population estimate.

What lessons can be drawn from this analysis of false negatives vs. false positives? First, if the numbers are even approximately correct, it indicates that it takes relatively few false positive Jewish classifications to balance, or perhaps more likely, prevail over the number of false negatives in terms of the net population estimate. In other words, in most communities where Jews are far outnumbered (that is, in virtually all of them), there would seem to be more risk of overestimating the number of Jews than under-estimating it: *For the population*

---

[76] Or, more precisely, the likelihood of participation is no different for someone residing in a household containing someone who is Jewish, compared to someone residing in a household containing no Jews.

to be underestimated, Jews (nationally as well as in most community surveys) would have to be about 50 times more likely to deny Jewish identity than non-Jews to give a response that erroneously results in their being classified as Jewish.

Secondly, if the numbers in the experiment are an approximately correct reflection of what the outcome would be in most communities, the net impact (false positives – false negatives, estimated to be 1.5% of the total area population in this crude example) seems rather small. However, when estimating a population as small as the Jewish population (2-3% in many places), plus or minus that amount of difference would add or subtract a very large proportion of Jews to the total. The not new implication: *When projecting a small population (such as the Jewish population in most places), a small number of misclassifications (in either direction) can make a big difference in the total estimate.*

Thirdly, this is a murky area that defies accurate quantification because it is difficult to be confident about some, if not many, of the false negative and false positive classifications. The false positives problem was already thoroughly discussed in section 3.2.4 of Part 2, where we described how some, though not all, such misclassifications can be identified and revised in standard population studies that proceed to conduct full-length interviews with those presumed to be Jewish (but not in the test surveys conducted here).

As for the false negatives estimate, there are at least three reasons to believe that 17% nondisclosure rate figure found in the experiment is inaccurate – probably too high:

- Reissued telephone numbers. Experience indicates that Jewish Federation lists maintained for fund-raising are not always 100% Jewish – if for no other reason than because people change their telephone service, resulting in some phone numbers being recycled, that is, assigned to other households (with a high likelihood of the reassigned households being non-Jewish). This is more true of the prospect lists than the recent donor lists, though prospects make up about three-quarters of the Jewish population. This is the main reason. A secondary cause is:

- Mixed (Jewish-non-Jewish) households. The donor (or prospect) on the list might be Jewish, but the spouse or other adult who was interviewed might NOT be Jewish. To minimize this problem, the experiment asked the screening questions about all adult members of the household (not just the respondent), as is typically the case in Jewish population studies. And, the false negatives estimate was based on the number of households where no one is Jewish. Nevertheless, reports about others – indirect responses – are notoriously less reliable than reports about oneself. This would apply especially with respect to the screening questions about Jewish upbringing or parents, and to those with weak and unstable Jewish identity.

- Some households on the prospects list might have been entirely non-Jewish in makeup at the outset.

Need for Further Methodological Studies

Although this first attempt at a comprehensive analysis of estimation bias in Jewish population studies turned out to be flawed, it is presented here as a suggested prototype of the kind of analysis that is needed with improved test and comparison samples.

Future experiments need to use samples that are more nearly equivalent to facilitate a valid comparison of contact rates. A better plan would use some non-Jewish *listed* sample as the comparison group, for example, to use telephone numbers of contributors and prospects in some federated non-Jewish fund-raising campaign, or to take known Jewish and non-Jewish members of the same organizations as the test and comparison group samples. Another approach might be to use samples of previously identified Jewish and non-Jewish households taken from earlier RDD surveys where the identification questions were short and unobtrusive, and re-survey them again later using the full set of Jewish screening questions early in the interview, creating a context where the objective is more explicit (similar to conventional Jewish population survey questioning). No approach will provide a "perfect" solution to the problem, but each would be superior to the faulty contact rate comparison in this initial experiment.

Concluding Thoughts about the Problem of Jewish Denial in Population Surveys

Although this exploratory test has not proven the point, our instincts tell us that, even allowing for the large imbalance in the numbers of Jews and non-Jews, there is more denial than mistaken classifications of "Jewish." We believe that further methodological studies using improved designs will show that the population estimate generated from the HARI Survey data is too low by 5-10%. It is the task of future research to answer these this vexing issue that continues to plague population studies.

Dr. Gary A. Tobin

Dr. Gary A. Tobin is the president of the Institute for Jewish & Community Research in San Francisco. He is also director of the Leonard and Madlyn Abramson Program in Jewish Policy Research at the University of Judaism in Los Angeles. He earned his Ph.D. in City and Regional Planning from the University of California, Berkeley. He was the director for eleven years of the Maurice and Marilyn Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University. Prior to joining Brandeis, Dr. Tobin spent eleven years on faculty at Washington University, St. Louis.

Dr. Tobin has worked extensively in the areas of patterns of racial segregation in schools and housing. He is the editor of two volumes about the effects of the racial schism in America, *What Happened to the Urban Crisis?* and *Divided Neighborhoods*. He worked for many years for the NAACP Legal Defense Fund as an expert on patterns of racial segregation.

Dr. Tobin has been a consultant in planning, demography, and philanthropy with hundreds of non-profits, including federations, synagogues, Jewish community centers, foundations and others.

Gary Tobin is the author of numerous books, articles, and planning reports on a broad range of subjects about the Jewish community. He has published widely in the areas of Jewish organizational planning, foundations, and philanthropy. His books include *Jewish Perceptions of Antisemitism*, *Rabbis Talk About Intermarriage* and *Opening The Gates: How Proactive Conversion Can Revitalize The Jewish Community.* Dr. Tobin is now completing a book entitled, *Anti-Israelism & Anti-Semitism in America's Educational Systems*. He is currently involved in research concerning, philanthropy, racial and ethnic diversity in the Jewish community, and anti-Semitism.

Gary and his wife Diane reside in San Francisco. They have six children, Adam, 33; Amy, 29; Sarah, 27, Aryeh, 24; Mia, 21 and Jonah, 6.

Sid Groeneman

Sid Groeneman is a Senior Research Associate at the Institute for Jewish & Community Research and head of Groeneman Research & Consulting, an independent survey/marketing research practice in Bethesda, Maryland (www.groeneman.com)(sid.grc@verizon.net).

Prior to launching his own firm in 2000, he was a survey project manager with the Washington DC office of Market Facts, where he directed more than 120 research studies for government agencies, corporate clients, and non-profit organizations.

His main areas of interest and expertise are public opinion, consumer research, and survey methodology. He received his Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Minnesota.

The Institute for Jewish & Community Research, San Francisco
Dr. Gary A. Tobin, *President*

Mission
The Institute for Jewish & Community Research, San Francisco, is an independent research institute devoted to the study of contemporary American Jewish life. The Institute serves as a national and international think tank providing social science and policy research to the Jewish community, philanthropic organizations, and the general community as well. We are committed to making the results of our research efforts available through publications, conferences, seminars, and networking with decision-makers.

We identify, design and develop initiatives that will promote the well being of Jewish communities locally, nationally, and internationally. We work closely with policy makers in both the Jewish and general community so that action can be taken on our findings and recommendations.

The Institute has no political agenda or institutional affiliation. Consequently, it approaches issues of critical importance to the Jewish community from a pragmatic perspective.

The work of the Institute can be classified into three areas:

1) The growth and vitality of Jewish Peoplehood
We provide innovative research that addresses the demographic challenges of the Jewish community. This includes helping the Jewish community to be more open and welcoming, changing institutional cultures, organizational restructuring and investing in programs that help build participation in Jewish life.

2) The Defense of the Jewish Community
Our research informs the development of comprehensive strategies to confront anti-Semitism and anti-Israelism in America and abroad. The Institute is an essential part of the coalition of organizations that defend the Jewish community.

3) Philanthropy
Our work includes studies of foundations, major gifts, and other areas of both general and Jewish philanthropy. The Jewish community requires accurate and in-depth information about Jewish giving patterns.