National Jewish Population Survey 1990

The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey [NJPS] was conducted by Dr. Barry Kosmin, Research Director for the Council of Jewish Federations [CJF; now United Jewish Communities or UJC] and Director of the Berman Institute at the CUNY Graduate School. Fieldwork was completed by ICR Survey Research Group of Media, PA, and Dale Kulp, President, Marketing Systems Group/GENESYS, Fort Washington, PA served as the statistical consultant. Telephone interviews were conducted from late Spring, 1990 through Summer, 1990.

SAMPLING STAGES

The sampling was done in three stages. **Stage I** began about a year prior to the survey in April, 1989 to determine recruit and qualifying households. During this stage, four screening questions were included in ICR's bi-weekly, random general market Excel omnibus telephone surveys. Households obtained through random digit dialing [RDD] were asked the following four screening questions:

1) What is your religion? If not Jewish, then…
2) Do you or anyone else in the household consider themselves to be Jewish? If no, then…
3) Were you or anyone else in the household raised Jewish? If no, then…
4) Do you or anyone else in the household have a Jewish parent?

Information obtained in Stage 1 of the data collection contained data on the religious preference of 125,813 randomly selected Americans and the Jewish status of their households. It was initially determined that 5,146 of the households included at least one person for whom the answer to any of the four screening questions was "yes" and who was, therefore, considered "Jewish" or "Jewishly affiliated" for the purposes of the survey. The data collected in Stage 1 were analyzed as the National Survey of Religious Identification [NSRI]. Based on these data, Drs. Barry Kosmin and Seymour Lachman published: *One Nation Under God*.

Stage II of the data collection served as an "inventory" phase. Attempts were made to recontact households, requalify potential respondents, and solicit participation in the 1990 NJPS. During this inventory phase, many potential respondents dropped out of the survey due to changes in household composition or were disqualified upon further review by the research team.

Stage III was the final interviewing stage, which resulted in 2,441 completed interviews with qualified respondents via RDD from Stage II. The data reported in the 1990 NJPS are drawn from these households. From Stage I it was estimated that the household weights built into the 1990 NJPS data files project that the 2441 interviews represent about 3.2 million <u>households</u> nationally with at least one Jewish member. A detailed explanation of the methodology can be found in the article by Barry Kosmin, Nava Lerer, Ariela Keysar, and Dale Kulp entitled, *Challenges in Locating and Qualifying A Rare*

Population by RDD Telephone Sampling- The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey.
This article is at the end of this document as Appendix I. Appendix II (*Sample Design of the 1990 NJPS* by Joseph Waksberg) contains detailed information on the sampling framework and the accuracy of the sample used for NJPS 1990.

QUESTIONNAIRE

The structure of the questionnaire in Stage III [the main survey on which the 1990 NJPS data are based] is complicated. Information was collected about every member of the household and several types of questions were asked to ascertain this information. There are: 1) identical questions about each member in the household including the respondent, 2) questions about the respondent only, and 3) questions about the household that were answered by the respondent [such as Jewish rituals].

In addition, three modules were each answered by about a third of the respondents. Module 1 focused on Jewish Identity, Module 2 examined Philanthropic Attitudes and Behaviors, and Module 3 focused on Service Needs. Respondents in each module were randomly selected after they met criteria to answer a module. Users should refer to the document in Appendix III entitled, *The Data Layout for the 1990 Survey* for a detailed explanation of the layout of the data.

Thus, the study contains personal information on about 6,514 persons in the 2,441 surveyed households. Using statistical weighting procedures, it was determined that the households in the 1990 NJPS survey represent about 8.1 million persons, some of whom are not Jewish, reflecting the heterogeneous composition of the households in the sample.

DATA LAYOUT

The data are grouped together in the order that they were asked on the questionnaire. Member #1's -the respondent- responses to the questions asked of everyone in the household are found first, followed by the answers to questions about all of members of the household, followed by Member #1's responses to questions asked of the respondent only, followed by the modules. New variables that were created are found at the very end of the data set.[1]

In 1999 several variables were recoded into new variables with meaningful categories. For example, q13a asks in what year member #1 came to the United States. This question was answered by entering the last two digits of the year that the respondent came here. Question RQ13a is question 13a recoded into the categories: 1) Before 1920, 2) 1920-29, 3) 1930-39, etc. The frequencies for both the original variables as well as the created

---

[1] The electronic frequencies that accompany this document are patterned after the original frequencies found in *The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey Users Guide* (the Red Handbook), published in 1991 by the North American Jewish Data Bank, a partnership between the Council of Jewish Federations and The Center for Jewish Studies, CUNY Graduate Center. While frequencies for most of the questionnaire are contained here, it is important to note that the responses are those of Member #1; the frequencies for all other members of the household are not included.

categorical variables can be found in the electronic version, which was patterned after those found in the Red Handbook, The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey Users Guide. In the SPSS file the recoded variable is located directly after the original question in the data set and begins with the letter "r" (for recode). This file structure is slightly different from the files issued on NJPS 1990 in earlier years.

CORE JEWS

Because of the nature of the screener questions, it is possible, for example that a household could be interviewed for this study even if they were practicing Catholics as long as someone in the household was born to a Jewish parent. Therefore, the sample was divided into categories to differentiate between Core Jews, and those that are somehow attached to Judaism but not in a meaningful way. Questions 18, 19, and 20 were used to create the Core Jew categories for the vast majority of the sample. The Jewishness of each household member is accessible through the JA, JB, JC, JD, JE, JF, JG, JH, JI, JJ, JK and JL variables. Specifically, JA refers to the Jewishness of Member #1, JB to the Jewishness of Member #2, etc. Each of the JA-JL variables has 5 categories: Currently Jewish, Was Jewish, Ethnic-Secular Jew, Gentile, Consider Themselves Jewish but Other Religion, and Jew by Choice. The Core Jews are those that fall into categories 1, 3, or 5: those that are currently Jewish, are ethnic-secular Jews, or are Jews by choice. The JA-JL variables are found near the end of the data set because they are created variables and not part of the original questionnaire.

WEIGHTS

YOU WILL WANT TO READ THIS SECTION CAREFULLY BEFORE ANALYZING DATA.

Weights should be used to analyze the data so that the results will provide projected estimates of the US population in each category shown in the analysis. There are weights for the main survey and for each module separately, giving us a total of 8 weights. For the main survey, there are **two basic types of weights: household [hhwgt] and population [popwgt].** The nature of the researcher's question determines what weights should be used.

The household weight is used when the researcher wishes to project or estimate data to the number of households with Jewish members nationally. If, for example, one was to use the household weight for Q94 (does anyone in the household light candles on Friday night?) the total projected number of households is 3,185,820 which is represented by 318,582 in the data file. The population weight is used if the researcher wishes to estimate the number of people nationally. If, for example, one was to use the population weight for Q105 (in the past 12 months has member #1 volunteered for a Jewish organization) the total projected number of people is 6,083,030 which is represented by 608,303 in the data file. The researchers for the 1990 NJPS made a decision to use household weights when the question was asked of all or several members of the

household, while population weights were used when the question was asked of the respondent only.

As these are projection weights, constructing confidence intervals or using tests of statistical significance with these weights will generate excess statistical power, meaning that relationships that are, in fact, not statistically significant appear to be so. To return weights that sum to the sample size, simply divide the weight variable by its mean.

Researchers may disagree over when to use population and household weights because the assumptions that we make about them can sometimes be problematic. For example, the NJPS 1990 researchers used the population weight to analyze Q62 (own or rent your home). Their reasoning was that this question was asked only of the respondent and their guidelines state that one should use population weights with "respondent only" questions. When we use the population weight with Q62 the results show that 4,150,940 Jewish people own their homes, which is approximately 68% of the population. However, one could make the argument that this question should be analyzed using the household weight because using the population weight inflates the projected number of Jews by including spouses and children (who may or may not be Jewish). When we analyze this question using the household weight, the results show that 2,074,150 households own their homes, or about 65% of the population. The NJPS 1990 researchers point out that percentage distribution is still valid with the use of either weight, but the percentages could be vastly different because they are simply a reflection of the frequencies. In this particular illustration, the small discrepancy between the percentages when using the population and household weights is not that serious. Nonetheless, caution should be exercised and a good deal of thought should go into deciding which weights to use when analyzing this data.

In addition, **there are also population and household weights for each of the three modules, resulting in 6 additional weights [popm1wgt, popm2wgt, popm3wgt, hhm1wgt, hhm2wgt, and hhm3wgt].** The same considerations ought to be taken into account when using the different module weights as when using weights for the main survey. The module weights were constructed so that they represent all eligible households regardless of whether or not all eligible households were asked the module questions. A detailed explanation (with examples) of how and when to used the weights can be found in Appendix IV in two articles entitled, *Using Weights for Analytical Purposes* and *Balancing the Sample: Using Weights with NJPS.*

Any question about which weights were used by the 1990 NJPS researchers may be resolved by checking the weighted frequencies. The weight used is noted in parenthesis next to the variable, providing the researcher with a way to check his or her work. **In 1999, the modifiers m1, m2, and m3, indicating modules 1, 2 and 3, were added to each variable name to make these distinctions easier for the user. Appendix V includes a summary guide to the questionnaire indicating which questions were asked of whom. This guide should also be helpful in determining how the 1990 NJPS researchers weighed the data.**

EXAMPES AND A WORD OF CAUTION:

Let us give an example of when would be an appropriate time to use each kind of weight: Question 18a asks the first member of the household to state their current religion. Because this question was asked of all members of the household, and is not part of a module, the household weight [hhwgt] should be utilized when computing frequencies. When the household weight is used, the frequency breakdowns for Q18a are as follows:

Q18a: Member #1, Current Religion (Household Weight)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Jewish	1	207,455	65.1	65.1	65.1
Catholic	2	15,924	5.0	5.0	70.1
Protestant	3	17,451	5.5	5.5	75.6
Other	4	36,825	11.6	11.6	87.2
None	5	39,624	12.4	12.4	99.6
Don't Know*	8	770	.2	.2	99.8
Refused*	9	514	.2	.2	100.0
	Total	318,582	100	100	

*Note: For some variables, missing data may be blank, not coded as an "8" or a "9."

First, one should note that even though the SPSS printout shows that 207,455 households consider themselves to be Jewish, when interpreting what this table means this number should be multiplied by 10, giving us 2,074,550 Jewish households. This is the case for all raw frequencies computed in SPSS.

This table shows us that approximately 65% of the respondents interviewed considered themselves to be Jewish, 5% Catholic, 5.5% Protestant, about 12% were another religion and about 12% do not consider themselves to practice a religion in their household.

If a researcher was interested in knowing how often the respondent attended any type of synagogue, temple, or organized Jewish religious service, then Q92 would need to be analyzed using the population weight [popwgt]. This question is asked of the respondent only and is not part of any module. The frequency results are as follows:

Q92: Frequency of Respondent Synagogue Attendance (Population weight)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Not at all	1	155,148	25.5	30.8	30.8
Once, twice a year	2	73,024	12.0	14.5	45.2
Special occasions	3	39,184	6.4	7.8	53.0
High Holidays	4	47,018	7.7	9.3	62.3
Few times a year	5	87,400	14.4	17.3	79.7

Once a month	6	38,199	6.3	7.6	87.2
Few times a month	7	21,606	3.6	4.3	91.5
Once a week	8	30,212	5.0	6.0	97.5
Few times a week	9	12,517	2.1	2.5	100.0
System Missing		103,995	17.1		
	Total	608,303	100	100	

Researchers should again note that the projected estimate of the total number of Jews is 6,083,030 (represented in SPSS by 608,303) and even though this question was asked of respondents only, this number is inflated by the population weight because it includes spouses and children, who may or may not be Jewish.

This table shows us that about 30% of Jewish persons in the United States never attend the synagogue. About 15% go once or twice a year and about 8% go on special occasions. The cumulative percent column tells us that almost 80% of Jewish persons go to the synagogue a few times a year or less.

To analyze data with Q71b, How liberal or conservative do you consider yourself politically? a researcher would use the population weight because this question was only asked of the respondent. However, this question is found in module 1 [Q71bm1] so the population weight for module 1 [popm1wgt] should be used. The frequencies below show the breakdowns when this weight is used:

Q71bm1 How consider self on political scale [population weight module1]:

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very Liberal	1	64,340	10.8	11.4	11.4
Liberal	2	194,900	32.7	34.6	46.1
Middle of the Road	3	185,534	30.9	32.8	78.9
Conservative	4	103,195	17.3	18.3	97.2
Very Conservative	5	15,800	2.6	2.8	100.0
System Missing		33,744	5.7		
	Total	596,513	100	100	

This table shows us that a middle of the road to liberal political ideology account for about 79% of Jewish persons in the United States.

If a researcher were interested in knowing if, in households with singles, those people are interested in programs for singles, QS26m3 should be analyzed. This question is found in

module 3 and is asked of the household, therefore the household weight for module 3 [hhm3wgt] should be used. The frequencies for this analysis are as follows:
QS26m3: Interested in programs for singles [household weight for module 3]

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	1	28,414	8.9	26.3	26.3
No	2	71,827	22.5	66.5	92.7
Don't know	8	7,845	2.5	7.3	100.0
Missing		210,754	66.1		
	Total	318,844	100		

This table shows us that of the Jewish households with single persons in them, only about a quarter (26.3%) of those respondents are interested in programs for singles.

In the original 1990 NJPS Users Guide, the following caution was included: **Even with the distinctions noted above, caution must be exercised.** For example, in the case of questions 37-41, dealing with expected and planned children, household weights should be used and multiplied by the number of women aged 18-44 in the household. The frequencies for these variables are not found in the enclosed frequency packet.

Another example relates to analyzing the questions on Jewish education: If only question 72 (for example) is analyzed, then the 1990 NJPS researchers used the population weight. However, if one was interested in looking at all the members of the household (question 72 plus question 77), the 1990 researchers would use the combined data with the household weights. The frequencies for questions 77-83 on Jewish Education are not included in the enclosed frequency packet.

Also, questions Q116g1-j8 are not included in the frequency packet.

PUBLICATIONS

A report was issued in 1991: *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*, authored by: Dr. Barry Kosmin [Former CJF Research Director at the Berman Institute, CUNY Graduate Center], Dr. Sidney Goldstein [Population Studies and Training Center, Brown University], Mr. Joseph Waksberg [Westat, Inc.], Dr. Nava Lerer [Berman Institute, CUNY Graduate School], Dr. Ariella Keysar [Berman Institute, CUNY Graduate School], and Mr. Jeffrey Scheckner [CJF Research Consultant]. The report is approximately 39 pages, not including the questionnaire. Links to these highlights can be found at the Data Bank's website: http://www.jewishdatabank.org. An extensive bibliography of publications from the 1990 NJPS can be searched by subject at this website as well.

Data Files.

The Jewish Data Bank NJPS 1990 data files are SPSS portable format.

1. **njps_1990_data_hh.por** is the SPSS portable file with 2,441 cases and 915 variables. This file contains 8 weight variables [hhwgt, popwgt, hhm1wgt, hhm2wgt, hhm3wgt, popm1wgt, popm2wgt, popm3wgt]. Caution should be used when determining which weight to use. Note that this file includes some constructed variables which we do not have any further information about.

2. **njps_1990_data_pp.por** is the SPSS portable file which treats every household member as a separate case (similar to NJPS 1970-71). It contains 6,514 cases and 352 variables. While it contains the full range of weight variables **only household weights should be used.** Note that this file includes some constructed variables which we do not have any further information about.

3. **njps_1990_notes.pdf** is the basic study and data file description.

4. Codebook frequency files for the household file have also been electronically stored**. njps_1990_codes_weighted.pdf** contains the SPSS weighted frequencies reformatted into a PDF. The appropriate weights were used with the appropriate questions so that researchers can check their work. **njps_1990_codes_unweighted.pdf** contains the unweighted frequencies from the household file, also reformatted into a "Word" document.

Appendix I

Challenges in Locating and Qualifying a Rare Population by RDD Telephone Sampling –
The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey

By

Barry A. Kosmin[*], Nava Lerer*, Ariela Keysar*, and Dale Kulp**

Introduction

This paper is an attempt to evaluate research design and question order issues which relate to both sampling and qualifying problems associated with rare populations; in this case contemporary American Jews. The need for such a survey is essentially practical. Firstly, there exists in the U.S. a large and complex Jewish voluntary sector with an infrastructure of philanthropic, religious, educational, welfare, health and recreational agencies. Secondly, the U.S. Census has never recorded the religious or ethnic affiliations of the Jewish population (Goldstein and Kosmin, 1991) who are the clientele for these services. There is thus a need for census type data which describe the demographic and geographic characteristics of potential clients.

Sampling Problems

The difficulties of locating and designing a nationally representative sample of a rare population are numerous. First, the population is relatively small, and is spread throughout the country. Thus, there are resource issues related to attaining a sufficiently large sample for statistically reliable results for sub-groups such as Midwesterners, the elderly, or immigrants. The issue of sample size becomes even more critical if multi-variate analyses are envisaged.

Second, in social research on minority groups the problematic issue of self reporting and self identification rises once the investigators decide not to utilize a face to face interview but rather a remote method such as telephone interviewing.

Third, non-cooperative, hostility, or unwillingness to give a positive response to the question: Are you Jewish? was anticipated due to the fear of anti-Semitism. One way of

[*] The authors are attached to the Berman Institute, Graduate Center, City Univerisity of New York
** President, Marketing Systems Group, Philadelphia, PA
--

"attacking" this problem was by assuring the sensitivity of the questionnaire; primarily through careful positioning of the questions, and by giving a lot of attention to the introduction to the interview.

Fourth, one must realize that in contemporary Western societies Jewishness has both an ethnic/cultural dimension as well as a religious dimension. Therefore, an open ended question: What is your religion? does not always accomplish the objective of qualifying the entire spectrum of American Jews. Instead it may elicit responses such as "none" or "humanist" from the target population.

Fifth, the level of cooperation and accuracy falls when an interviewer asks one person to testify as to the beliefs, attitudes or identity of another person in the household. "False negatives" cannot normally be rectified but follow-up qualification is desirable to minimize errors arising from "false positives."

Sixth, cost factors associated with distance inhibit ideal research designs. In the case of NJPS, costs forced us to design a special sampling frame and procedure in order to include Jews in Hawaii and Alaska.

Survey response and cooperation rates are not only affected by negative societal forces. There are positive forces which nevertheless create some ambiguity and difficulties in locating, or identifying our target population. There are people who mis-identify themselves as Jewish. We have already pointed to the fact that one is dealing here with subjective identity issues. The one must anticipate the possible problem of too broad a definition, or public interpretation of the meaning of being a Jew in the U.S. today. This issue expands the potential for false positives. It too influenced our approach to question order procedures for qualifying our target population.

<center>Procedures for Qualifying the Target Population</center>

The nature of Jewish identity in the modern U.S. is known to be especially fluid in relation to the lifecycle of individuals. Therefore, the broadest possible definition was adopted in order to identify the target population. A non-prescriptive approach was built into the eligibility criteria which allowed respondents to self-define or classify themselves along the religious and/or ethnic dimensions in a set order. Any household was eligible if the randomly selected adult respondent answered "Jewish" to the question, "What is your religion?" To this group were added households where the respondent, on behalf of him/herself or somebody else in the household answered "yes" to any of the following questions:

"Do you consider yourself Jewish?"
"Were you raised Jewish?"
"Do you have a Jewish parent?"

The highest level of qualification was noted but the plan was to try and qualify, where possible, two persons in each interviewed household. It should be noted that four

qualifying questions were addressed to the respondent; and only three to other members of the household. We decided for empirical and philosophical reasons not to ask people to report on the beliefs of others.

This, the answers to the religious question were recorded only for the respondents. We assumed the likelihood of false positives were limited here to coding errors. The other three questions were addressed to all household members which introduces the possibility of inaccuracy in reporting due to lack of knowledge of other members' backgrounds. The first and fourth questions on religion and parentage appeared to be factual. A subjective element could be postulated regarding what was meant by "raised." This possibility increased for the second question. The question, "Do you consider yourself Jewish?" was aimed at qualifying the non-religious, secular/ethnic/cultural Jewish population. It was the only qualifying question which was essentially attitudinal or value laden rather than factual. Its vagueness was regarded as a strength in this context since the overall objective was to spread a wide net of qualification.

<center>Research Design</center>

The overall research design incorporated a pre-test and a multi-stage survey over a period of 15 months: an initial screening phase lasting 62 weeks, a re-contact phase, and a final in-depth survey of 2,500 households. In April 1989 the Council of Jewish Federations, the national organization of the Jewish voluntary sector, commissioned the ICR Survey Research Group of Media, PA to begin collecting data in the multi-stage telephone survey utilizing their twice weekly national omnibus survey, EXCEL. It should be noted that data were collected only for the civilian non-institutional population in telephone households.

The first stage involved sampling over 125,000 households using the GENESYS random digit dialing (RDD) system. One thousand households were contacted in each of 125 successive rounds over the period of April 1989 to July 1990. An adult respondent was chosen in each household using the last birthday as the method of selection. The procedure allowed for equal probability of Jewish households to be selected from every state (except Alaska and Hawaii). Representation of Alaska and Hawaii was incorporated into the national sample in the third stage of the survey. Five thousand, one hundred thirty-nine households containing one of more "qualified" Jews were identified by the first screening phase.

Only 2.3 percent of the respondents refused to reply to the question regarding religion. It is probably important to state here that a data sharing arrangement was built into the first stage screenings. The responses to the question on religious identification from 113,000 of these screenings, as well as the associated socio-demographic variables from EXCEL formed the data base for the Graduate Center of the City University of New York's National Survey of Religious Identification.

Beginning six weeks after the first stage had started, in June 1989, qualified Jewish households were re-contacted. The goal of this phase was to minimize losses due to

attrition of the sample between the initial screening and the in-depth Jewish survey planned for the early summer of 1990. In this second stage, a household roster as well as the first names were recorded. The aim was to find out the qualification of each member in the household, since the in-depth survey required a randomly selected adult Jewish respondent. This household roster was necessary in cases where the EXCEL respondent was not the Jewish person in the household. The household structure and the names of all members were necessary so we could trace them for the final survey. Respondents were also asked if their household was likely to move during the next year, and for a contact address in this eventuality. In effect, a panel was created.

The National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) data base consists primarily of the in-depth household survey conducted in the third stage. Two thousand, five hundred of the previously screened households were interviewed during the 10-week period between May-July 1990, using an extensive questionnaire which included socio-demographic and economic questions alongside a wide array of attitudinal and behavioral characteristics related to the Jewish identity and practice of all household members.

<p align="center">Fieldwork Results</p>

EXCEL

The response rate to the initial EXCEL screener interview, used to identify potential Jewish households, averaged 47 percent. This is lower than most social surveys find acceptable. Such response rates are inevitable in commercial omnibus surveys given the need for each independent sample to be completed in a few days- five in the case of EXCEL. The concern over the effect of non-response on the statistics is not so much on the size of the non-response since this is adjusted for in the weighting, but on the possibility that non-respondents were different from respondents. Variations in the response rates by geography, age, sex, race, and educational attainment were adjusted for in the weighting. This still left the possibility that Jews and non-Jews responded at different rates.

To test whether this bias was present to a significant extent, the telephone numbers of approximately 10,000 completed screening interviews and an equal number of non-respondents (refusals) were matched against telephone listings to obtain the household names. The percentage of each group having distinctive Jewish surnames was then calculated: the percentage for the completed cases was 1.38 percent and for the non-respondents it was 1.29. The difference between the two is well within the bounds of sampling error. Although distinctive Jewish surnames identify only a minority of all Jews, this test does provide strong support for the view that non-response did not have an important impact on the reliability of the coverage, and estimate of the Jewish population totals.

Points of Qualification

The disposition of the sample at the end of the third stage is presented in Table 1. The top row shows that almost half of the 5,139 qualified "Jewish" households have a random respondent whose religion is Jewish. More than a third of these same households consist of one or more persons who consider themselves to be Jewish; and 13 percent have Jewish parents.

The first column indicates that 2,639 households were re-screened and qualified at least once after the initial screening phase. The "consider" proportion of households dropped by more than 10 percent in subsequent screenings. Whereas, the "consider" category accounted for 35 percent of EXCEL qualifiers it supplied 58 percent of the non-qualifiers during re-screening.

Table 1: Disposition by Degree of "Jewishness"

	Total	Religion	Consider	Raised	Parents
Total	5139	2400	1819	264	656
1st Stage	100.0	46.7	35.4	5.1	12.8
Re-Qualified	2639	1619	643	118	259
Stage 3	100.0	61.3	24.4	4.5	9.8
Refused	670	317	238	34	81
Stage3	100.0	47.3	35.5	5.1	12.1
Non-Qualifiers	1054	175	611	73	195
	100.0	16.6	58.0	6.9	18.5
Other	776	289	327	39	121
	100.0	37.2	42.1	5.0	15.6

Over 20 percent of first stage qualifiers, 1,054 households, failed to re-qualify. Requalification problems can be expected due to changes in household composition over time, marital dissolution, mortality, or migration. However, it is doubtful that normal societal changes alone can explain this high level of failure to re-qualify.

Early on in the process the "consider" question in the first screening was found to be qualifying a much wider segment of the American public than had been expected. It gained positive responses from a range of philo-Semites and persons who had an affinity with Jews or Jewishness, strong believers in Judeo-Christian civilization, and some fundamentalist Christians.

Most of the "consider" respondents also reported a Christian denomination to the first screening question. By comparison, as shown in Table 2, people who have Jewish parents, or were raised Jewish are likely to have "no religion" or be "Humanist" or "Agnostic." Those "raised Jewish" were more likely to refuse to answer the religion question. Further, there is an unexpectedly large proportion of Baptist, Methodist, and Pentecostal among the "consider" group. This was reflected in a high percentage of black

respondents (18%) who "consider themselves Jewish" compared with only 2 percent qualified by religion.

Table 2: Current Religion by Point of Jewish Qualification
Base: Non-Qualifiers from Screening Phase

Current Religion	Consider themselves Jewish	Raised Jewish	Jewish Parents
Jewish	-	-	-
None	14.7	27.2	23.8
Refused	3.6	7.8	1.8
Humanist/Agnostic	2.0	7.8	3.9
Buddhist	0.7	0.7	1.8
Hindu	0.6	-	1.3
Moslem	0.7	2.1	-
Other Non-Christian	0.3	-	0.1
Christian	7.7	5.0	6.9
Catholic	25.2	14.9	23.3
Baptist	13.6	5.7	8.4
Methodist	4.3	2.8	5.1
Lutheran	1.6	3.5	2.0
Presbyterian	1.6	2.8	1.8
Episcopalian	1.3	0.7	2.8
Pentecostal	3.8	-	1.0
Unitarian	1.0	0.7	2.6
Other Protestant	17.3	17.8	15.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Obviously our error was to place the "consider" question too early in the set of options. The empirical evidence suggests that it should have been the last of our four questions, thus serving as a residual option. It is worth noting that the national nature of the survey contributed to this problem. The pretests were concentrated in urban areas of dense and known Jewish settlement in the Northeast and California and no hint was given of the magnitude of the "consider" phenomenon. The "consider" issue arose only once the survey was underway, and when RDD calls were made to a national probability sample which included rural Southern and Midwest households.

The widening of our net offset the negative forces mentioned earlier. However, the researchers were faced with additional cost factors and complications during the analysis once a broad qualification of the Jewish population was introduced. For some purposes the wide net was of vital theoretical importance.

We assume on the basis of socio-demographic characteristics that most non-qualifiers in stages 2 and 3 were false positives. The non-qualifiers had half the rate of college graduates of qualifiers (25%), and they were also 50 percent more Southern (31%), more

rural (22%), and poorer (32.7k p.a.). In addition, 22 percent of the non-qualifiers were from Minority groups.

However, there is an alternative explanation namely that Non-qualifiers in stage 3 were really refusals to participate in the survey. To find out, a test similar to that on refusals in stage 1 was carried out for the non-qualified households. The telephone numbers for the 5,139 households who were reported as Jewish in the screening interview were matched against telephone listings, and those with Distinctive Jewish Names (DJN) were identified. In households that reported themselves as Jewish in the detailed interviews, 16.8 percent had distinctive Jewish names. The rates were slightly smaller for refusals (13.9 percent) and for those who could not be contacted (10.9 percent). However, the percentage was only 2.9 percent for households who were reported as not Jewish in the detailed interview. It is of course possible that DJN households are less reticent than others in acknowledging to a telephone interviewer the fact that they are Jewish, the but evidence that under-reporting did occur, but not to a serious extent. An adjustment in the weights of about 8 percent was made to account for the underreporting in the estimates of the total number of Jews. Since third stage questionnaire information was not obtained for them, the statistics on characteristics of Jews may be subject to small biases if the Jewish non qualifiers are very different from those who responded.

Beyond methodological issues the four qualification groups can be distinguished on a number of socio-demographic variables. This finding which is relevant to market as well as social research is dealt with in detail elsewhere (Goldstein and Kosmin, 1991). The four Jewish groups were found to vary widely in terms of age, sex ratio, household income, educational attainment, and geographical distribution, but to be uniform with regard to marital and employment status and to a lesser extent household size.

The "false positive" cases

We raised the issue of false positives earlier in this paper. The issue of the overall enthusiastic respondent is generally neglected in the literature on surveys. A close examination of the cases in the third stage of the survey showed that in 118 households none of the members were currently, born, or raised in the Jewish religion. Moreover, they all stated their current religion, their religion of birth, and the religion in which they were raised as Catholic, Protestant, or another non-Jewish faith. These households were scrutinized carefully on a case by case basis. First, the screening and re-qualification data were checked for evidence of Jewish parentage. Second, salient Jewish cultural background variables like Jewish education, ethno-religious rituals such as celebrating Passover, and attitudes toward being Jewish and social networks were checked. We were left, however, with 62 cases we had to classify as non-Jewish, given the evidence from over 120 questions, and even allowing for our "wide net" for qualification.

Among the 62 problematic households, two described their current religion as Jewish in the first screening stage. However, in stage 3 none of the household members were Jewish not did they have Jewish backgrounds. It is clear that these two households were

not the same households as in the screening. Yet, they persisted through another screening and a half hour interview on Jewish topics.

Among the other 60 cases, were 54 households which had qualified through the "questionable" consider category. In 29 of the cases, at lest two people in the household "considered themselves Jewish." In 25 more, only the respondent considered him/herself Jewish, 4 of these cases were one person households and 3 had another member qualified by Jewish parentage. Among the last 6 households respondents reported that other people in the household considered themselves Jewish. In one of these households another member of the household was reported as being raised Jewish, and in another household a member of the household was reported as having Jewish parentage.

Once again, changes in household composition could account for some of these cases, but the majority of persistent false positives require an alternative explanation. Whether the answer relies in the powerful resonance of the term "Jewish" to some people in this society or whether there exists a small corps of 'survey freaks" determined at all costs to complete questionnaires remains an open question. One conclusion to be drawn from this paper is that regardless how much care and attention is given to locating and qualifying a target population, perfection is unattainable with human respondents.

Reference:

Goldstein, S. & Kosmin, B. (1991). Religious and ethnic self-identification in the United States 1989-90: A case study of the Jewish population. Paper presented at the PAA annual meeting in Washington, DC.

Appendix II

Sample Design of the 1990 NJPS

By
Joseph Waksberg,
Vice Chairman, National Technical Advisory Committee on Jewish Population Studies

<u>Sample Selection</u>

The telephone numbers selected for the NJPS were based on random digit dialing [RDD], and are a probability sample of all possible telephone numbers in the U.S. The sampling procedure is one frequently used by knowledgeable survey organizations, and is generally referred to as the Mitofsky-Waksberg design. It involves selecting exchanges and listed "seed" numbers within them, deleting the last two digits, and randomly generating two digits to replace them. This procedure provides samples that are unbiased and in which all telephone numbers have the same chance of selection. Since the random digit aspect allows for the inclusion of unlisted and unpublished numbers, it protects the samples from "listing bias" – the unrepresentativeness of telephone samples that can occur if the distinctive households whose telephone numbers are unlisted and unpublished are excluded from the sample. The RDD sample is referred to as the "screening sample." It consists of 125,813 households that were asked whether any household member was Jewish. All qualified Jewish households were followed up with requests for the detailed interviews.

It should be noted that data were collected only for the civilian population living in households. No information was obtained for the institutional and other nonhousehold population. The survey thus excluded those in prisons, hospitals, nursing homes, hotels, religious institutions and in military barracks. Estimates of the number of Jews in such places were added to the survey results for the estimate of the total number of Jews in the U.S. However, their characteristics are not reflected in the breakdowns of the totals by age, sex, etc.

<u>Weighting Procedures</u>

After the survey information was collected and processed, each respondent was assigned a weight. When the weights are used in tabulations of the survey data, the results will automatically provide estimates of the U.S. population in each category shown in the tabulations.

The weighting method insured that key demographic characteristics of the adult population of the total weighted sample of the 125,813 responding households matched the most current estimates of these demographic characteristics provided by the Census Bureau. The weighting procedure automatically adjusted for noncooperating households, as well as for those not at home when the interviewer telephoned and for households who did not have telephone or who had multiple lines.

Accuracy of Data

<u>Nonsampling Error</u>

All population surveys are subject to the possibility of errors arising from sampling, nonresponse, and respondents providing the wrong information, and the NJPS is no exception. The response rate to the initial screener interview, used to identify potential Jewish households, was approximately 50 percent. This is lower than most surveys concerned about quality strive to achieve. (The response rate was essentially caused by the contractor's need for each set of sample cases assigned for interview to be completed in a few days. This made follow-up of most not-at-homes impractical.) The concern over the effect of nonresponse on the statistics is not so much on the size of the nonresponse since this is adjusted for in the weighting, but on the possibility that nonrespondents are different from respondents. Variations by response rates by geography, age, sex, race, and educational attainment were adjusted for in the weighting. This still left the possibility that Jews and non-Jews responded at different rates.

To test whether this occurred at an important level, the telephone numbers of approximately 10,000 completed interviews and for about 10,000 nonrespondents were matched against telephone listings to obtain the household names, and the percentage of each group having distinctive Jewish names was calculated. The percentage for the completed cases was 1.38 percent and for the nonrespondents was 1.29. The difference between the two is well within the bounds of sampling error. Although distinctive Jewish names account for a minority of all Jews, this test does provide strong support for the view that nonresponse did not have an important impact on the reliability of count of the Jewish population.

In regard to errors in reporting whether a person is Jewish, previous studies indicate that the errors are in the direction of understating the count of the Jewish population, although the size of the understatement does not seem to be very large. A particular concern in the NJPS was the fairly large number of cases where respondents in households reporting the presence of one or more Jews in the screening operation, reversed themselves in the detailed interview. Of all households reported as having Jews in the screener, 18 percent were reported as nonqualified in the detailed interview. There was a possibility that this was a hidden form of refusal, rather than errors in the original classification of the household or else changes in household membership.

A test similar to the one on refusals was carried out for the nonqualified households. The telephone numbers for the 5,146 households who were reported as Jewish in the

screening interview were matched against telephone listings, and those with distinctive Jewish names (DJN) were identified. In households that reported that reported themselves as Jewish in the detailed interviews, 16.8 percent had DJN's. The rates were slightly smaller for refusals (13.9 percent) and for those who could not be contacted (10.9 percent). However, the percentage was only 2.9 percent for households who were reported as not Jewish in the detailed interview. It is, of course, possible that DJN households are less reticent than others in acknowledging to a telephone interviewer the fact they are Jewish, but is that underreporting did occur, but not to a very serious extent. An adjustment in the weights of about 8 percent was made to account for the underreported Jews in the estimates of the total number of Jews. Since questionnaire information was not obtained for them, the statistics on characteristics of Jews may be subject to small biases if the Jewish nonqualifiers are very different from those who responded.

As mentioned earlier, other studies have reported that there is some understatement of reporting of Jewish heritage in interview surveys. No adjustments for this were made since firm data on the likely size of the understatement does not exist. As a result, the estimate of the size of the Jewish population is probably somewhat on the low side.

Sample Variability

All sample surveys are subject to sampling error arising from the fact that the results may differ from what would have been obtained if the whole population had been interviewed. The size of the sampling error of an estimate depends on the number of interviews and the sample design. For estimates of the number of Jewish households, the sample size is 125,813 screened households. As a result, it is very likely (the chances are about 95%) that the number of Jewish households is within a range of plus or minus 3 percent around the estimate shown in this report. For estimates of the Jewish population, the range is slightly higher since sampling variability will affect both the estimate of the number of Jewish households and of the average number of Jews in those households. The 95 percent range is plus or minus 3.5 percent. These ranges are the limits within which the results of repeated sampling in the same time period could be expected to vary 95 percent of the time, assuming the same sampling procedure, the same interviewers, and the same questionnaire.

For statistics on the percentage distribution of Jews according to various categories, the sampling errors will be largely determined by whether the percentages refer to statistics of households, statistics on personal characteristics for which data were only obtained for the respondent in each household, and personal characteristics obtained for all household members in the sample households. For the first two of these types of statistics, the sample size is the number of households, or 2441. For items obtained for all household members, the sample size is 6514. The standard errors of percentages applying to the entire Jewish population can be approximated by taking the square root of $p(1-p)/n$ where p is the estimated percentage and n is the sample size, that is, either 2441 or 6514, depending on the type of statistic. For percentages of segments of the Jewish population e.g., females, Jews by Choice, persons 65 years and over, etc.) the standard error is

approximately the square root of p(1-p)/Rn where R is the proportion of Jews in the segment for which percentages are computed.

Some examples of the size of the sampling errors may be illuminating. When percentages of all Jewish households are calculated, the relevant value of n is 2441. The largest standard error occurs for the 50 percent statistic. The maximum standard error for statistics on all households is then equal to 1 percent. The 95 percentage range includes 2 standard errors, or 2 percent. The 50 percent statistics can then be interpreted as a range from 48 to 52 percent. Analyses of subgroups of households will have higher standard errors, for example, when a 20 percent segment of the population is being studied (e.g., Jewish households in California) the maximum standard error will be about 2.3 percent, and the 95 percent range on a 50 percent item will be plus or minus 4.6 percent.

Similarly, the maximum standard error for population statistics for which data were collected for all household members, is ordinarily about 0.6 percent. The 95 percent confidence limits are plus or minus 1.2 percent. However, it should be noted that when the statistics are on items for which household members are likely to have similar characteristics (e.g., the percentage of Jews who belong to Conservative congregations), the appropriate sample size may be closer to the number of households. Such items may be more appropriately considered household than population characteristics from the point of view of calculation of sampling errors.

Appendix III

The Data Layout for the 1990 Survey

The structure of the questionnaire in Stage 3 (the main survey which focuses only on the Jewish population), is quite complicated. There are identical questions about each member in the household including the respondent (household roster), questions only about only the respondent, questions about the household that only the respondent answers such as Jewish rituals, and 3 modules which are each answered by about a third of the respondents.

The data were delivered by ICR in a format which fitted their programming needs and structure, but made things somewhat complicated for the SPSSX program. ICR put the first 4 adults (age 18+) in the first 4 records. Then they put 4 children in the next 4 records and then, in the next 4 records either the rest of the household members or members whose age was unknown. This means records 1-4 were adults, 5-8 were children, 9-12 the rest of the household. Thus, in a household with 2 adults and 2 children, the 2 adults would be in records 1 and 2 and the children in records 5 and 6; while a household with 5 adults will have records 1-4 for the first 4 adults and record 9 for the 5th adult. The main drawback of this method (which we were not aware of until all the data were collected) is that members in the 9th-12th records were asked only the first 11 questions. When the questionnaire has an instruction to "ask only the first 8 members," only members in records 1-8 were asked those questions. In some cases (not many) there were only 3 members in the household and the 3rd member was thrown to record 9 because their age was not specified. This member was not asked questions beyond number 11.

All questions which were identical for all household members were placed in the same columns on separate records. The only problematic variables were the Jewish education questions which were asked separately for the respondent (questions 72, 74, and 76) and the rest of the household members (questions 77, 78, and 79). Each household member has only one record which means that there are more than 80 columns per record. There are no blank lines for households with less than the maximum number of people. The SPSSX program deals with the household as a unit by grouping members according to household (HH), ID takes care of the unequal number of records. Finally, the information which is unique to the respondent required 3 more records for each respondent. 1- contains the questions that all respondents were asked, 2-modules 1 and 2, and 3-module 3.

This data set is handled by SPSSX using "File Type Grouped." The program groups the household members by household members and person numbers. Thus, each

household serves as a unit of analysis. The household members are identified by the household ID (HHID), and then within the household, each record has a unique case code which is a combination of the numbers of household members and the number of records per member. The variable which identifies members is called MEM (for members). The respondent has 4 MEM numbers (011 in which information is identical to the rest of the household members, and 012, 013, and 014, which are questions answered only by the respondent.) The rest of the household members have the record number + 1 since they have only one record per member. In addition to the MEM variable which identified cases as entered by ICR, question 4 in the questionnaire identified the respondent plus relationships of the rest of the household members with the respondent.

The maximum number of household members was 10. However, since the way ICR organized the data set did not require that all records would be consecutively filled, the maximum number of records for household members is 12. It is possible by having 8 adults or 8 children in the household as well as having household members whose age was unknown and were therefore pushed to the 9th and 12th records.

For example, if there are 10 people in household 1 (2 adults and 8 children) the data will have the following layout:

HHID (4 columns)   MEM(person + records, 3 columns)
0001   011
0001   021
0001   051
0001   061
0001   071
0001   081
0001   091
0001   101
0001   111
0001   121
0001   012 (questions answered by R)
0001   013 (Modules 1 & 2)
0001   014 (Module 3)

While a household with only one person has only the information related to the respondent.

0002   011
0002   012
0002   013
0002   014

The variable names for the questions which were identical for all household members consists of the question number + a letter from a to l which identified the household member. For example, the variable name for question 3 (SEX) is Q3a for the

respondent, Q3e for the first child under 18, and Q3i for the first person in the 9th record (either the 5th adult, the 5th child, or a member whose age is unknown). A few questions had a letter following the question number in the original questionnaire. For example, question 12 asked about the country in which the household member was born and was labeled as Q12a, Q12b, Q12c…Q12h (it was asked of 8 household members). The questions following question 12 which asked which state in the US was the person born was originally called question 12a. In such a case, the variable names were Q12a1 for the first household member (the respondent), and Q12a8 for the 8th household member.

With the help of the grouping program we could create new variables which will contain information from all household members. The variables we created were the Jewishness of the household in terms of 3 household types (HHJEW- entirely Jewish, mixed, and no core Jews), and the Jewishness of the household members (JA, JB, JC, JD, JE, JF, JG, JH, JI, JJ, JK, JL). **The creation of the Jewishness of household members variables used information available in Stage 3 (questions 18, 19 and 20), but in some cases the researchers had to return to the previous screening and inventory stages.** This information was used for the respondent only (JA variable). The only purpose of using the information from previous stages was to find more about the Jewish background of the respondent, mainly Jewish parents. The variable JCAT consists of cases which were determined as having Jewish background in the previous stages.

Appendix IV

Using the Weights for Analytical Purposes

We have two basic types of weights – population and household. There are weights for the main survey and for each module separately. This gives a choice of 8 weights. Researchers must distinguish between questions that were asked for the respondent only versus those questions that were asked for all household members, or for household members 18+, etc.

Basically, when using respondent only questions, for example questions 84-93, the population weights should be used. Alternatively, when questions were asked for all or several members in the household the household weights should be used.

This involves some assumptions. Let us take for example a household with 5 adults: asking: asking about 4 adults only when there are actually 5, we assume that those 4 members represent the fifth member as well, namely the fifth person has on the average the same characteristics as the 4 persons whose information was recorded.

Still there are some questions where caution ought to be taken. Let us look at the case of questions 37-41: dealing with expected and planned children, household weights should be used and multiplied by the number of women age 18-44 in the household.

Another case in question is about Jewish education: If only question 72 (for example) is analyzed then the population weight should be used; yet if we want to look at all the members in the household the researcher should use the combined data (namely q. 72 plus q. 77) with the household weights.

We would like to remind the data users that each module (1-3) has both population and household weights, thus similar considerations and steps ought to be taken when using the different module weights. For example, in questions 119a-119i module 1 population weights should be used. However in question 123a module 2 household weight should be used.

The weighted frequency results which are supplied use the appropriate weights according to Dale Kulp of MSG, the project statistician. The figures either sum up to the number of households or total adults in the population. These frequencies should be used for researchers to check their work against in an effort to ensure that appropriate weights are being used.

The individual (people) file provided is based upon the household roster. Therefore, when working with it the household weights should be used.

Balancing the Sample: Using Weights with NJPS

By
Ariela Keysar

The weighting process in the 1990 NJPS was based on demographic and socioeconomic factors, not on Jewish factors. Therefore, it is correct to apply population weights to "respondent only" questions for demographic and socioeconomic variables but we must be careful with cultural variables. When we use population weights to extrapolate a Jewish factor, for example fasting on Yom Kippur, we get an error by inflating the number of single people in the population, or those married to non-Jews. We have to remember that the percentage distribution is still valid, yet the total number of people is problematic (in our example the number of people fasting on Yom Kippur).

However, the household roster questions can be used with the household weights to estimate total number of people, because we are taking into account all the members in the household (Jews and non-Jews).

Let us take as an example a question raised by Chaim Waxman: "What set of weights to use when looking at respondent's fasting on Yom Kippur by household income?" Here we have an example of both a respondent only question and a household indicator in one analyses. The suggested solution is to use population weights because we are looking at people's behavior by their household income. Following the above warning, the total number of people is not going to correspond with the total number of Jewish population, while the percentage distribution is valid.

Generally, it is recommended to use unweighted data for multi-variate analyses. HOWEVER, MANY RESARCHERS DO MULTI-VARIATE ANALYSES WITH WEIGHTED DATA, BUT THEY ARE CAREFUL NOT TO TEST FOR SIGNIFICANCE WITH WEIGHTED DATA. Again, the solution to this problem is to divide the weight variable by its mean, which returns a new weight variable summing to the number of cases.

Appendix V

CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey

SUMMARY GUIDE TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE-
Helpful in determining which weights to use

VARIABLE	QUESTION #	ASKED OF:
Demographics		
Sex, Age	3, 5	All
Relationship to Respondent	4	All
Level of Education	6-11	All
Place of Birth	12-12a	All
Income	128	Household
Voter Registration	71-71a	R only
Political Leaning (m1)	71b	R only
Grown Children not in household (m1)	116e-116g	40+ Respondents with children 21+ Not living at home
Jewish Parentage (m1)	119i	R only
Generational Status		
Year came to US and citizenship	13-14	All not born US
Parents' Country of Birth	15-16	All 18+
# Grandparents Born US	17	All 18+
Intermarriage		
Current Religion	18	All
Religion Born/Raised	19-20	All
Formal Conversion	21-22	All not born Jewish
Religion Previous Spouse	30	All married 2+ times and divorced or widowed
Jewish identification of spouse of grown children not in household (m1)	116i	Respondent 40+ with children 21+ not living at home

Attitude to Intermarriage	120-121	R only
Marital Status		
Marital Status	23	All 18+
VARIABLE	**QUESTION #**	**ASKED OF:**
Year and month of current marriage	24	All except never married
Number of marriages	25	All except never married
Year last marriage ended	26	All divorced, widowed or married 2+ times
Year and month first marriage began/ended	27-28	All divorced, widowed or married 2+ times
Marital status at the end of first marriage	29	All formerly married/All remarried
Type of divorce	31	All divorced at least one time
Grown children not in household (m1)	116i	40+ respondent with children 21+ not living at home
Fertility		
Children from prior marriage of respondent or spouse and custody	32-33b	All formerly married or remarried
Number of biological children and date of birth of first and last child	34-36	All women 18+
Expected number of children	37-38	Female 18-44 who is R or R's wife
Adoption	39-41	Female 18-44 who is R or R's wife
Disability	42-44	All
Employment Status		
Employment Status	45-45a	All 18+
Number hours per work week	46	All 18+
Year last worked	47	All 18+ not working
Occupation and industry type	48-49	All 18+ working
Self employ, family business?	50	All 18+ working
Private business/non-profit	51	All 18+ working
Migration/Geography		

Year migrated to city/current address	52-53	All 18+
Where moved from	54-60	All 18+ except born in current city
Zip of current residence	61	R only
Own/Rent	62	R only
VARIABLE	**QUESTION #**	**ASKED OF:**
Likelihood of moving/if so, where	63-66	R only
Snowbird and where	67-70	R only
Jewish Education		
Number of years received Jewish ed., if any	72, 76	R only
Number of years received Jewish ed., if any	77-78	Rest of household
Type of Jewish education	73	R only
Currently receiving Jewish education and type	79-80	Children 16-18
Bar/Bat Mitzvah	75	R only
Adult Jewish education	76	R only
Adult Jewish education	81	Rest of household 18+
Jewish youth group/camp	81a	Children under 18
Expect to enroll child in Jewish education and reason	82-83	Children under 18 not enrolled
Jewish Identity/Synagogue Membership		
Orthodox, Conservative, Reform	84-85	R only
Denomination of household	87	Household
Denomination of respondent's parents (m1)	85a	R only
Synagogue membership now	88	Household
Synagogue membership ever	90	R not currently member
Type of Synagogue (Denomination)	89	Household
Jewish ethnicity	86	R only
Church membership	91	All in mixed households
Feelings about Bible/*Torah* (m1)	104a	R only
Jewish identity of children not in household (m1)	116h	40+ respondents with children 21+ who do not live at home

Meaning of being a Jew (m1)	119a-119e, 199h	R only
Anti-Semitism (m1)	119f-119g	R only

VARIABLE	QUESTION #	ASKED OF:
Ritual Practice		
Frequency of synagogue attend	92	R only
Church attendance	93	R only in mixed households
Shabbat candles	94	Household
Seder	95	Household
Kosher meat	96	Household
Separate dishes	97	Household
Chanukah candles	98	Household
Christmas tree	99	Household
Celebrate Purim	100	Household
Celebrate Israel Independence Day	101	Household
Fast on Yom Kippur	102	R only
Handle money on Shabbat	103	R only
Fast on Fast of Esther	104	R does not handle $
Other Jewish Connections		
JCC/YMHA membership/participation (m1)	99a-99b	Household
Number hours volunteer for Jewish and non-Jewish orgs	105-108	R only
Belong to non-Jewish orgs	109-110	R only
Jewish organization	111	R only
Serve on board of Jewish or non-Jewish org (m1)	111a-111b	R only
Paid Jewish subscriptions	112	R only
Family, friends living in Israel	113	R only
Been to Israel	114-115	R only
Been to Israel	116	Household members age 6-25
Plans to visit Israel (m1)	116b	Household
Visits and attachment to Israel (m1)	116a, 116c-d	R only
Friends and neighborhood Jewish	117-119	R only

VARIABLE	QUESTION #	ASKED OF:
Philanthropy		
Amount given to Jewish Charity	122-123	Household
Dues to Jewish org (m2)	123a	Household
Amt given to Federation	124-125	Household
Amt given to non-Jewish Charity	126-127	Household
Best approach to solicitation (m2)	127a	R only
Factors in decision to give (m2)	127b, 127f	R only
Provisions for charity in will (m2)	127c-127e	R only
Percentage income for charity (m2)	127g	R only
Political contributions (m2)	127h	Household
Service Needs		
Need for/use of services (m3)	S1-S9	Household
Type of agency used and satisfaction (m3)	S10-S14	Household
Elderly/Disabled services (m3)	S15-S19	Household with elderly
Type of agency and satisfaction (m3)	S20-S23	Household with elderly
Singles service needs (m3)	S24-S27	Households with singles

Note: m1, m2, m3 indicate Modules 1 (Jewish Identity), Module 2 (Philanthropy) and Module 3 (Service Needs).