

AJIS REPORT

AMERICAN JEWISH IDENTITY SURVEY

2001

**EGON MAYER, BARRY KOSMIN
and ARIELA KEYSAR**

Center for Jewish Studies

**THE GRADUATE CENTER OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
365 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10016 (212) 817-1950**

**THE GRADUATE CENTER
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK**

**AMERICAN
JEWISH IDENTITY SURVEY
2001**

AJIS REPORT

AN EXPLORATION IN THE DEMOGRAPHY AND OUTLOOK OF A PEOPLE

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS
PROFESSOR EGON MAYER & PROFESSOR BARRY A. KOSMIN

STUDY DIRECTOR
DR. ARIELA KEYSAR

FEBRUARY 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF EXHIBITS	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	5
INTRODUCTION	7
METHODOLOGY: AJIS 2001 AND NJPS 1990	10
FINDINGS	15
DEMOGRAPHY OF HOUSEHOLDS	15
DEMOGRAPHY OF POPULATION	16
- Jewish Identity Constructs	17
- Jews by Religion (JBR)	18
- Jews of No Religion (JNR)	19
- Core Jewish Population	19
- Jews of Other Religions (JOR)	20
- Jewish Origins Population	21
- Halakhic Adult Population	22
- Total American Jewish Population	24
- Social Profile of Sub-Populations	25
- Geography of America's Jews	27
- Demography and Identity	29
DIMENSIONS OF IDENTITY	
RELIGIOUS OUTLOOK, BELIEFS AND AFFILIATION	31
- The Concept of Outlook	33
- Synagogue Affiliation	43
- Jewish Organizational Affiliation	45
- Jewish Friendship Network	46
- Israel	47
CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS (by Felix Posen)	49
APPENDIX	50
(AVAILABLE IN ELECTRONIC VERSION AT WWW.GC.CUNY.EDU/STUDIES/STUDIES_INDEX.HTM)	
A. Methodology (by Dale Kulp)	
B. Questionnaires	

LIST OF EXHIBITS

1. Typology of Jewish Identity Constructs
2. Adult Population Classified as Jewish by Four Selection Criteria
3. Core Jewish Population, 1990 - 2001
4. Jewish and Jewish Origins Population, 1990-2001
5. Parentage of America's Jewish Adults, 2001
6. Total American Jewish & Kindred Population, 1990-2001
7. Socio-Demographic Profile of Adult Jewish Identity Types, 2001
8. Map of Continental USA Divide Into Four Regions
9. Regional Distribution of Core Jewish Population, 1990-2001
10. Outlook of Jews-by-religion and Adherents of Selected Other Religious Groups
11. Belief that God Performs Miracles: Jews by religion and Adherents of Selected Other Religious Groups
12. Belief Indicators by Type of Jewish Classification
13. Beliefs About God By Position Along Religious-Secular Continuum
14. Identification With Branches of Judaism Among Jewish-by-religion Adults
15. Affiliation With Temple, Synagogue or Congregation
16. Synagogue Affiliation by Religious-Secular Continuum
17. JCC & Other Organizational Affiliation by Religious-Secular Continuum
18. Jewish Friendship Network by Religious-Secular Continuum
19. Visiting and Attitude Toward Israel by Religious-Secular Continuum

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Although the present study is the independent work of the authors whose names appear above, the research carried out for this study would not have been possible without the years of selfless dedication to the social scientific study of American Jewry by the National Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC) of the United Jewish Communities (UJC) -- formerly Council of Jewish Federations (CJF). It is that group of professional social scientists who established over the course of nearly twenty years the key principles of Jewish demographic research, which forms the methodological backbone of this study.

For more than ten years, from the mid-1980s on, that scientific body was chaired by Professor Sidney Goldstein of Brown University, who guided its scientific deliberations together with its Vice-Chairman, Dr. Joseph Waksberg (Westat Corp.). We, as all others who have carried out social scientific studies of the American Jewish population in the past two decades, shall remain in their debt always.

Indirectly, the study was also made possible by the foresight of Mr. Mandell ('Bill') Berman of Detroit, whose generosity and vision helped establish the North American Jewish Data Bank at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. Bill provided the leadership in creating an archive to compile the various social scientific surveys of the American Jewish population carried out in the 1970s and '80s, which resulted in the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey. For more than a decade that survey has been the cornerstone of Jewish demographic research. Because the present study is principally a replication of the 1990 NJPS, it obviously has been structured in virtually all respects on the model established by that seminal work.

The ICR research team provided matchless professional service, further enhancing the fine reputation for quality research they had established in carrying out NJPS 1990.

Finally, we wish to publicly express our appreciation to Mr. Felix Posen and the Posen Foundation, without whose continued interest and generous support this study would not have been possible.

AMERICAN

JEWISH IDENTITY SURVEY, 2001

Egon Mayer, Barry A. Kosmin
and Ariela Keysar

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Nearly 4% of America's 105 million residential households have at least one member who is Jewish by religion or is of Jewish parentage or upbringing or considers himself/herself Jewish.

The number of such households has increased since 1990 from about 3.2 million to about 3.9 million

The number of persons living in a household that has at least one member who is Jewish-by-religion or parentage or upbringing or considers himself/herself Jewish has increased since 1990 from about 8 million to nearly 10 million.

About 5.5 million American adults are Jewish by religion or of Jewish parentage or upbringing or consider themselves Jewish.

About 3.6 million American adults (or just 65% of the 5.5 million total) have a Jewish mother.

More than 1.5 million American adults have only one Jewish parent.

The number of persons who regard themselves as Jewish by religion or say they are of Jewish parentage or upbringing but have no religion (the "core Jewish" population) has declined from about 5.5 million in 1990 to about 5.3 million in 2001.

The number of persons who are either currently Jewish or of Jewish origins has increased from about 6.8 million in 1990 to nearly 7.7 million in 2001.

The majority (73%) of America's adults who are Jewish by religion or of Jewish parentage or upbringing but say they have no religion believe that God exists. But nearly half of this population regards itself as secular or somewhat secular in outlook.

About one million American households report affiliation with a Jewish congregation (synagogue, temple, or an independent *havurah*). That number represents an increase of some 15% over the 880,000 households reporting congregational affiliation in 1990.

About 44% of America's adults who are Jewish by religion or say they are of Jewish parentage or upbringing report membership in a Jewish congregation (synagogue, temple, or an independent *havurah*).

The Reform branch of Judaism is the largest in terms of the number of adult adherents: about 1.1 million or 30% of America's Jewish-by-religion adults or adults of Jewish parentage or upbringing identify with it.

The other branches of Judaism in size order are: Conservative Judaism with about 940,000 adult adherents (24% of the total), Orthodox Judaism with about 300,000 adult adherents (8% of the total), Secular Humanist Judaism with about 40,000 adherents and Reconstructionist Judaism with about 35,000 adherents (about 1% each).

Nearly one million American adults who are Jewish by religion or are of Jewish parentage or upbringing but say they have no religion are affiliated with some non-congregational Jewish community organization such as a Jewish community center or a Jewish fraternal organization.

Nearly a third of America's adults who are Jewish by religion or say they are of Jewish parentage or upbringing but have no religion have visited Israel. That figure represents a modest increase from the roughly 28% reporting visiting Israel in 1990.

Nearly 60% of adults who are Jewish by religion are married; of those who report being Jewish parentage or upbringing but of no religion, just 45% are married. More of the later group is likely to be separated or divorced or living in a non-marital couple relationship (cohabiting).

Of all adults married since 1990, who say they are Jewish by religion or of Jewish parentage or upbringing, just 40% are married to a spouse who is also of Jewish origins; 51% are married to a spouse who is not of Jewish origins and an additional 9% are married to a spouse who is a convert to Judaism.

Of all cohabiting adults who say they are Jewish by religion or of Jewish parentage or upbringing, 81% are living with a partner who is not of Jewish origins.

AMERICAN

JEWISH IDENTITY SURVEY, 2001

Egon Mayer, Barry A. Kosmin
and Ariela Keysar

INTRODUCTION

America's Jews are divided, perhaps as never before, over a question that would surprise most other Americans who are not familiar with the Jewish heritage or the Jewish community in any way. That question is, quite simply: "Who is Jewish?" At a more subtle level, the questions asked are, "What does 'Jewish' mean?" and "Who gets to decide?" or "How are those who call themselves 'Jewish' or are labeled as such by others signify that identity or social status to themselves and others?"

This report addresses who is Jewish in America today and what that means with respect to adherence to Judaism. What segments of the population adhere to Judaism as the basis of their religious identification, and what segments describe themselves as being of Jewish parentage or upbringing (origins) without any explicit adherence to Judaism as a religion? What is the relative size of those different segments of the over-all American Jewish population? Put somewhat differently, the study addresses the tri-fold question: What do Jews believe? To what do Jews belong? And how do Jews behave? Each of these questions is explored with respect to how its answers help define the contours of Jewish identification and the Jewish population in the United States today.

Exploration of those questions is animated here by a broad observation that has emerged from a recent study of American religious identification.¹ Vast numbers of Americans who regard themselves as Jewish or who are of Jewish parentage and upbringing simply have no faith in the conventional religious sense of that term. They adhere to an identity that is rooted in an ancient faith. But their claim to that identity implies little or no commitment to its religious roots.

That fact and the questions it raises have wide ranging ramifications for a broad network of religious, educational and social service organizations that collectively comprise the organized Jewish community in the United States. Because that community, as all ethnic and religious communities in the United States, is voluntary in nature, its members determine the criteria on the basis of which they include or exclude fellow members; get to decide from whom they seek support so as to sustain the community, and get to decide upon whom and for what purposes they expend the resources and voluntary associations they share in common. Who is defined in and who is defined out matters greatly. So do the criteria on the basis of which such definitions are made.

¹ Barry Kosmin, Egon Mayer and Ariela Keysar, *American Religious Identification Survey, 2001* (New York: The Graduate Center of the City University of New York).

I ITEM: More Jews than most other Americans respond "None," when asked "What is your religion, if any?"

I ITEM: More Jews than members of most other American religious groups think of themselves as "secular" rather than as "religious."

I ITEM: Fewer Jews than members of most other American religious groups belong to a temple, synagogue or any other religious institution.

I ITEM: Fewer Jews than members of most other American religious groups agree with the essential proposition of religious belief that "God exists."

Of course, each of these items hinges on a term that itself begs for definition: that is the term "Jews." The first section of this report explores the demographic implications of different definitions of the term. Each of the above items hinges as well on the degree to which group adherence is synonymous with religious belief, practice and affiliation. Those aspects of Jewish identity will be explored in the second half of this report

The U.S. Constitution guarantees the right² of each and every American to form a community with others around ideals, practices or concerns they share in common. Those universally treasured freedoms also make it possible for individuals to lay claim to highly nuanced and distinctive notions of personal identity. Therein lies the paradoxical nature of American Jewish identification. Individuals may form communities that in turn may set their own criteria for membership, particularly with regard to religion. Yet, individuals retain the inalienable right to claim and proclaim whatever personal identification they wish.

In view of Americans' Constitutionally guaranteed rights, the decennial U.S. Census has declined to ask people about their religious beliefs and/or memberships or lack thereof. Therefore, questions about the size and composition of the Jewish population have been left to be answered by voluntary effort.

The present study constitutes one such effort. It has deployed the dispassionate tools of modern social science to address the aforementioned questions, which are often thought to be the province of rabbis, theologians or communal politicians. Any effort to gauge the contours of the American Jewish population must begin with the realization that there are simply no universally agreed upon standards as to who is to be counted within the relevant target population.

Much attention has focused in the past several years upon internal divisions in the Jewish community over matters of religious practice and communal policy. Books such as that of Jack Wertheimer, *A People Divided: Judaism in Contemporary America* (1993) or that of Samuel G. Freedman, *Jew vs. Jew: The Struggle for the Soul of American Jewry* (2000) have thoroughly laid to rest the notion that America's Jews are homogeneous when it comes to faith, religious practice or belonging. Whether the issue is the role of women in the rabbinate, or public financing of religious education or more esoteric questions such as

² The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

rabbinic officiation at interfaith weddings or the construction of an *eruv* (a symbolic enclosure of public space for Sabbath observers), students of American Jewry have demonstrated time and again that Jews are a fractious lot when it comes to matters of belief or its institutional embodiment in the life of synagogues and other Jewish communal institutions. The community is no less divided on questions of personal status within the community.

Traditional Jewish law (*halakhah*), based on thousands of years of Jewish texts, has established presumptive personal Jewish status on the basis of matrilineal descent or formal conversion according to strict religious standards. However, that body of law and custom is widely ignored by the great majority of America's Jews in virtually all facets of their lives. The largest branch of American Judaism, the Reform movement, as well as such smaller movements as the Reconstructionist and the Secular Humanist, formally abandoned the matrilineal standards of Jewish status assignment decades ago and have radically altered as well the criteria for conversion to Judaism. Indeed, one of the key findings of the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS 1990) was that a substantial number of individuals declared themselves as "Jewish" or were so described by their spouses or parents even in the absence of a genealogical basis to such a claim or lack of formal conversion. Partly as a result of such findings in the 1990 study, the term "Jews by choice" has come to displace "converts" in the contemporary lexicon of Jewish demography.

One of the salient findings of this study is that there is a large and growing population of American Jewish adults who are without religious faith. They adhere to no creed nor choose to affiliate with any religious community. These are the seculars, the 'unchurched,' or in the present case the 'unsynagogued.' While this fact may be lamented widely within the organized Jewish community, it in fact reflects a much broader trend in American religious life. The recent *American Religious Identification Survey, 2001*, which serves as a companion to the present study, found more than 29 million adults who say they have no religion in 2001, up from just a little more than 14 million in 1990.³ This fact has particular relevance to the study of America's Jews since adults of Jewish parentage who claim no religion constitute more than 3.8% of all American adults without religion, while adults claiming Judaism as their religion constitute just 1.6% of all American adults who claim a religion.

Since the mid-1960s, when the Harvard theologian Harvey Cox's best selling *The Secular City*⁴ ushered in a brief era of academic interest in "secularization," American religion has been widely perceived as leaning toward the more literal, fundamental, and spiritual. Particularly since the election in 1976 of President Jimmy Carter, a self-avowed Born Again Christian, America has gone through a period of religious re-awakening. The academic debate about whether America was becoming a more or less secular society left the Jewish community untouched.

During the very period of that debate, the most notable change to in American Jewish life has been the radical transformation of the American Jewish family through interfaith marriage. As a series of studies since the National Jewish Population Study of 1970 has shown, the incidence of interfaith marriage among American Jews had increased several

³ The questions that produced these results varied slightly from 1990 to 2001. In the earlier survey the question was, "What is your religion?" In the later survey the question was, "What is your religion, if any?"

⁴ Harvey Cox, *The Secular City* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1965)

times over, from less than 10% prior to 1960 to about 50% by 1990. Concern about the impact of intermarriage upon the Jewish future has entirely overshadowed secularism as an independent source of change in most studies of American Jewry. It is at least in part as a reaction to the rather one-dimensional focus of the past decade that this study looks more directly at questions of religious belief and worldview among America's Jews.

METHODOLOGY: AJIS 2001 & NJPS 1990

In order to address the key questions of the study on the basis of scientific observation, we carried out a national survey of the American residential adult population⁵, the second such study to be carried out by this research team since 1990, with a special focus on those who describe themselves as Jewish when asked about their religious adherence or who might be reasonably labeled Jewish by virtue of their family of origins.

The survey on which the findings are based was carried out on behalf of the investigators by the ICR Survey Research Group (Media, Pa.) between February and May, 2001. Approximately 3,000 telephone interviews were conducted with adult respondents from randomly selected households over the course of 17 weeks. The survey was designed to replicate both in methodology and in substance a survey carried out by the same company in 1990, which was then called the National Jewish Population Survey.⁶

This study, as the one it replicates from 1990, has had as its first and foremost goal to determine the definition of the term "Jew" or "Jewish" and then to ascertain the size and basic demographic characteristics of the American Jewish population. Because this survey is a replication of one carried out just over ten years ago it also seeks to explore significant patterns of change over time in those demographic characteristics.

Following a research model that was designed by a team of eminent demographers and sociologists for the 1990 NJPS,⁷ the current survey also utilized a sample drawn from a universe of American residential households containing at least one person who identified himself or herself as currently or previously Jewish, or of Jewish parentage. In keeping with

⁵ By population we refer here to the residential population, not including those who are living in institutional settings such as military, hospitals, nursing homes or prisons. See Appendix A for more detailed methodological discussion.

⁶ The National Jewish Population Survey of 1990 was sponsored by the Council of Jewish Federations. That survey was directed by Dr. Barry A. Kosmin, one of the co-principal investigators of the current survey. Then as now, Dr. Ariela Keysar was the Senior Analyst. That study was carried out in cooperation with the Mandell Berman Institute-North American Jewish Data Bank at the Graduate School of the City University of New York.

⁷ The survey methodology of NJPS1990 was designed by a National Technical Advisory Committee headed by Professor Sidney Goldstein (Brown University) and Mr. Joseph Waksberg (WESTAT Corp.). More than a dozen other demographers, sociologists and social planners participated in NTAC designing the methodology and content of that study. ⁷ For more details on the methodology and findings of the screening phase of NJPS 1990, see Sidney Goldstein and Barry A. Kosmin, "Religious and Ethnic Self-Identification in the United States 1989-90: A Case Study of The Jewish Population," *Ethnic Groups* v 9 (1992) pp. 219-245; also Sidney Goldstein, "Profile of American Jewry: Insights from the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey," *American Jewish Yearbook 1992*; Joseph Waksberg, "The Methodology of the National Jewish Population Survey," in Sidney and Alice Goldstein, *Jews on the Move: Implications for Jewish Identity* (Albany, NY., SUNY Press, 1996)

the voluntary nature of religious and/or ethnic identification, the current survey as its predecessor, depended entirely on the decision of an individual adult to respond to a series of four qualifying questions on the basis of which the researchers could fit them into the appropriate category of whether or not the individual and/or his/her household could be labeled "Jewish."

The sample for the current study, as was the case for NJPS1990, was obtained by means of random-digit-dialing(RDD). All interviews were conducted in English. Out of all successful contacts, a total of 50,238 respondents agreed to be interviewed.⁸

A series of screening questions at the outset of each interview was used to determine that out of all households interviewed, a total of 1,668 or 3.3% qualified to be included in a survey of American Jewish households. Respondents from the selected households constitute the unweighted sample for this study. The screening questions used to determine whether a household would be included in the sample were as follows:

What is your religion, if any?⁹ [For respondents who were married, cohabiting with a partner or formerly married, the question was repeated with reference to the person's husband/wife or partner]. In those instances where the response was something other than Jewish – the majority of cases – the following was asked...

Do you or does anyone else in your household have a Jewish mother or a Jewish father? In those instances where the answer to this question was negative – the majority of cases – the following was asked ...

Were you or anyone else in your household raised Jewish? In those instances where the answer to this question was negative – the majority of cases – the following was asked ...

Do you or anyone else in your household consider himself or herself to be Jewish?


The sample for the current survey included all households in which an adult respondent indicated that either he/she was Jewish, or someone else in the household was Jewish when asked their religion, or someone in the household had a Jewish mother or a Jewish father, or someone in the household was raised Jewish, or someone in the household considered themselves Jewish for some other reason.

These selection criteria have yielded a typology of qualifying sample households that is visualized below for easy description.

⁸ A fuller report of the interviews with all households is to be found in our report on *American Religious Identification Survey 2001*.

⁹ The addition of the clause, "if any" was a slight modification from 1990. It was inserted in the current survey to avoid any implication by the question that a respondent had to have a religion. This change may well have contributed to the increase in the number of those indicating "no religion" in the current survey over the 1990 survey.

EXHIBIT 1



The five-part typology in Exhibit 1 above is virtually identical to that used to classify qualifying respondents and households in NJPS1990, though there are a few slight modifications to simplify analysis. NJPS 1990 used eight categories to classify respondents and children.¹⁰ These were:

- (a) **BJR**: Born Jews who indicated their religion as Judaism,
 - (b) **JBC**: Jews by Choice (people who indicated they were not born and/or raised as Jews but at the time of the survey regarded their religion as Judaism,
 - (c) **JBR**: Jews by Religion (the combination of a + b above),
-
- (d) **JNR**: Jews who report having no religion,
 - (e) **JCO**: Respondents who were born and/or raised as Jews but who reported their religion as something other than Judaism,
 - (f) **JOR**: Respondents who report Jewish parentage but who also indicate they were raised from birth in another religion,
 - (g) **JCOR**: Children under 18 who are reported to have at least one Jewish parent but who are raised from birth in another religion, and
 - (h) **GA**: Non-Jewish adults whose households may have qualified because there was a child who had a Jewish parent.

¹⁰ See *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey* (New York: Council of Jewish Federations, 1991), pp. 4-5. Hereafter referred to as *Highlights*.

Exhibit 1 does not include a separate classification for children of Jewish parents who are being raised in another religion (JCOR). The above figure also conflates the two categories of NJPS 1990 (JCO and JOR) that sought to identify persons of Jewish origins who now profess another religion. These two categories are treated separately in those analyses where such separate treatment is warranted, such as in the case of measuring the incidence of intermarriage. In the above exhibit the JOR category is intended to encompass both. The exhibit does differentiate Jews by Choice (JBC) and Jews by religion presumed to be of Jewish origins (JBR). However, both those categories are treated as just JBR for most analytic purposes. The 1990 NJPS differentiated JBCs from BJR -- persons of Jewish religion who were born to Jewish parents -- and used the JBR designation as a way of speaking about the two together.

The current survey sought, as did NJPS 1990, to spread the widest possible net in sampling so as to provide an opportunity for respondents to indicate in what way if any they might be Jewish themselves or whether another member of their household might be Jewish in some way. This study did not arrogate to itself the right to define who is Jewish by some *a priori* cultural or religious standard. Rather, it tried to detect by means of the four screening questions whether or not any members of the household would regard themselves as having some connection to either the Jewish religion, a Jewish family or the Jewish people, either on the basis of current identification or on the basis of ancestry, or both.

This approach to constructing a sample of the American Jewish population recognizes the two critical features of Jewish identification, which stem from both ancient sources and the modern condition of Jews in a free and open society. That is, that the condition of “Jewishness” can be the result either of descent or consent, family of origins or faith, and as a matter of fact is often an amalgam of both.

Although the current survey sought to replicate NJPS 1990 in most methodological respects, several important differences must be indicated at the outset. We have already pointed out the slight modification in the opening question, which added the clause, “...if any,” to the formulation, “What is your religion?” That change might be at least part of the explanation for the fact that in the current survey a smaller number of respondents indicated their religion as Jewish than was found in 1990. Of course, it is also likely that fewer American adults identify with Judaism as their religion in 2001 than they did in 1990 – a change independent of the slight change in wording of our questionnaire.

Both the current sample and that of NJPS 1990 are based on omnibus surveys.¹¹ NJPS1990 had the benefit of a substantially larger sampling of the population than the present survey. Over the course of year, 125,813 randomly selected Americans were screened to determine the Jewish qualification of their household in 1990. In the current survey, due mainly to budget and time considerations, just over 50,000 American households were screened. However, other innovations allowed for greater efficiencies than were possible in 1990.

¹¹ Two simultaneous omnibus surveys were administered by ICR-International Communications Research Corp. (Media, Pa.). Each contacted several thousand randomly dialed households each week during the study period and administered a variety of consumer-related questions. Our questions came at the end those series of questions. See Methodological Appendix.

In 1990, NJPS was carried out in three stages. The first stage involved the screening of households only in order to identify a sample of qualifying Jewish households. That first stage identified 5,139 qualifying Jewish households, or 4% of the total households screened. At a second stage, the initially qualifying households were re-screened to enlist their cooperation with a much longer survey designed specifically for them. What is commonly known as the NJPS 1990 survey was in reality that third stage of the screening and interviewing process. That final stage yielded a total of 2,441 completed interviews. Thus, even though our initial screening used a sample that was less than half the size of its 1990 predecessor, it resulted in a final sample that is only one-third smaller (1,668 vs. 2,441).

In the current study, a single-stage approach was used. Our interviews were also kept much shorter than was the case in 1990. Because the administration of our survey instrument, including the screening questions, required no more than seven minutes on average, it was possible to carry out the AJIS in a single-stage interview. That modification from the multi-stage approach of NJPS 1990 greatly minimized sample erosion. Refusal to the specifically Jewish portion of the survey was a little over two percent.

One of the ways in which our interviews were kept brief is that respondents were not asked to provide detailed information about each and every member of the household. Most of the information asked for, with but a few exceptions, pertained either to the respondent or to the entire household.

FINDINGS

DEMOGRAPHY OF HOUSEHOLDS

Among the 50,282 households across the continental United States where a respondent was interviewed, 1,668 qualified as “Jewish” and eligible for the AJIS interview by means of a positive answer to one of the four screening criteria set out earlier. For purposes of clarity, it should be reiterated that the classification of households and respondents followed a somewhat complex set of decision rules. It must also be kept in mind that all information was obtained from one individual respondent in each household, who was furnishing information both about himself/herself and also about other members of the household. A respondent qualified for the present survey either on the basis of religion or of parentage/upbringing if he or she indicated either Judaism as their religious preference or that they were of Jewish parentage and/or upbringing and/or considered themselves Jewish.

When the household weighting system (for details see Methodological Appendix) is applied to these 1,668 households, a national estimate of the total number of households in the continental USA can be extrapolated. Thus, we estimate that there are 3,760,000 households containing at least one person of Jewish background or current Jewish identity. This amounts to 3.6 percent of the 104 million American households. Using the same selection criteria and weighting system, in 1990 the comparative figure was 3,186,000 households. This figure then represented 3.5 percent of 92 million American households. So there has been a slight increase in the proportion of American households, but a substantial net increase, of 574,000, in the actual number of households containing somebody currently Jewish or of Jewish background.

In 1990 the average household size was nearly 2.6 persons, which extrapolated to a total population of 8,100,000 persons residing in qualifying “Jewish” households (excluding the institutionalized population). The average household size in 2001 was 2.6 persons, which extrapolates to a total population of 9,740,000 (excluding the institutionalized population). The number of Americans living in a household where at least one person is of Jewish background or current Jewish identity has increased by 1.6 million over the last decade. Thus the number of households increased by 18 percent and the number of persons in these qualifying households rose by 20 percent in the period 1990-2001.

To place these figures in perspective, according to the U.S. Census there were 281,421,906 people living in the fifty states of the United States on April 1, 2000. A decade earlier the U.S. Census reported 248,709,873 people living in the fifty states. The number of Americans has increased by some 13% in the decade between the two censuses.

The population figure amounting to nearly 10 million people far exceeds the widely accepted size of the American Jewish population – commonly estimated at 5.5 – 6 million. Nor is it suggested here that the larger figure is in any way an estimate of the size of the “Jewish” population. As we shall see, that population figure reflects social as much as biological processes of growth. Indeed, the social process of inter-faith and inter-ethnic marriage is the main driving force of the risen population figure. The corollary of this is that

a great many among this enlarged population are of another religion and may not identify themselves as Jewish at all, though they are related to somebody of Jewish parentage and/or upbringing. Yet many have distinctive Jewish surnames and so are likely to be regarded as Jews. Nonetheless, it appears that in the majority of American households in which there is at least one person who adheres to Judaism as a religion, or is of Jewish parentage, upbringing or self-identification, the basis of most of the members' Jewishness is not religion.

The absence of anchorage in religion among so many people who otherwise regard themselves linked at least in part to Jewish parents and/or Jewish upbringing and/or Jewish self-identification, poses a possibly unprecedented challenge for understanding the nature of Jewish community in America. The quest for such understanding is at the heart of this report. In order to do this we must turn our attention from households to the actual people who live in them, especially to adults who identify as Jewish by religion or who describe their parentage or upbringing as Jewish even if they do not identify with the Jewish religion.

DEMOGRAPHY OF POPULATION

The population numbers that will be described below must be treated with some caution since they are all estimates. They are at best indicative of trends and proportions rather than precise projections. Thus, the AJIS figures have been rounded off to the nearest ten thousand so as not to give a false impression of greater precision than such a survey permits. All survey data involve random error and in the cases reported below there are also complex weighting schemes (for details see Methodological Appendix). Although the range of the statistical error in many cases is small, even a 2 or 3 percent range of error may mean hundreds of thousands of people. Baseline numbers may not sum to the same total in all exhibits due to the rounding off of figures. Again, we remind the reader that these are estimates not exact projections.

It should be recalled as well that the AJIS questionnaire, on which the present study is based, sought to identify Jewish adults on the basis of religion, parentage or upbringing by means of the following screening questions:

What is your religion, if any? If the person did NOT reply "Jewish" they were asked...

Do you or does anyone else in your household have a Jewish mother or a Jewish father (and is that yourself or someone else in the house or both?) If the answer to this question was negative then the next question was...

Were you or anyone else in your household raised Jewish (and was that yourself or someone else in the house or both?) If the answer to this question was negative then the final screening question was ...

Do you or does anyone else in your household consider themselves Jewish?

By this sequenced, four-question screening methodology the survey was able to identify the following distribution of Jewish types of respondents. The nature of the survey process means the population statistics on individuals, in contrast to that for household data, are drawn from 1,215 cases where respondents themselves qualified as “Jewish” during the screening sequence described above. In the remaining 453 households the respondents were non-Jewish members, so the household qualified for inclusion in the survey because someone other than the respondent was Jewish of Jewish parentage.

EXHIBIT 2

Adult Population Classified as Jewish By Four Selection Criteria

(Unweighted sample and weighted population estimate)

	n	%	N	%
Religion	618	51	2,800,000	51
Parentage (not religion)	528	43	2,200,000	40
Upbringing (not parent/religion)	28	2	164,000	3
Considering Self Jewish only	41	4	203,000	4
(institutionalized estimate)			110,000	2
TOTAL	1,215	100	5,497,000	100

NOTE: Each successive criterion excluded the others. People who indicated their religion as “Jewish” or “Judaism” were later asked about their parentage; people who indicated that one or more of their parents was Jewish or that they were raised Jewish were not further asked if they actually considered themselves Jewish.

JEWISH IDENTITY CONSTRUCTS

The four-part segmentation reflected in Exhibit 2 underscores that where religion and ethnicity are not officially established – within the context of a voluntary society like the United States and other western, democratic and pluralistic societies – the simple act of counting the Jewish population involves a negotiation between the social scientist and his/her subject. The population under study here is not defined by any set of geographic or genealogical boundaries. At least in present-day America, it is defined by social-psychological boundaries, largely of its own making. The discovery of the social boundaries is determined as much by the questions asked as by the subjective meaning associated with those questions on the part of the respondent. As with the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) the plan of this study was to spread the widest possible net and provide for as many people as possible to reveal whatever was Jewish about their identity or background.

Neither this survey nor any other can provide the ultimate definition of who or what is a Jew, nor can it establish the fixed boundaries of the American Jewish community. It merely records and collates the answers freely given by a representative sampling of the public to the particular questions that were asked. Furthermore, no respondent was asked to document any claim or answer. In fact the typologies used reflect a key feature of Jewishness in America, namely that it is an amalgam of ethnicity and religion and the fact that this society allows for choice about one’s religio-ethnic identity.

Such implicit negotiation produces a variety of persons who might be called “Jewish” either by themselves or by those who wish to study them for different purposes. However, we already have a model for describing and analyzing these findings and that is the widely popular 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS 1990). This model created a set of Jewish “identity groups” based on a number of acronyms as set forth in Exhibit 1. These identity groups are the result of combining the qualifying criteria as given in Exhibit 2 and the current religious identity self-definitions provided by the respondents themselves to the original ARIS question. This situation reflects the social reality whereby for most of Jewish history “Jewishness” and membership of the Jewish people has been acknowledged as being tied up with an amalgam of elements based upon religio-cultural and familial-ancestry ties.

In order to estimate the size of the child population under 18 years of age, none of whom were interviewed, we classified the children present in the surveyed households according to how the respondent said the children are raised. This allowed us to accurately assign children to three religious categories – Judaism – No Religion – Other religions. In those cases where there was missing data on how the children were being raised, as well as “don’t knows” or refusals, they were assigned to the identity group of the adult respondent if s/he was Jewish or to JCOR if the respondent was a Gentile.

In NJPS 1990 and AJIS 2001, in effect three religious identity groups were defined – persons whose religion is Judaism, persons of Jewish background who subscribe to no religion, and persons of Jewish background who subscribe to “other religious groups” (i.e. groups whose religion is other than Judaism). This process in turn allowed us to create a set of three nested populations – a “core Jewish” population – people of Jewish background and descent who adhere to no religion other than Judaism – and two other variants (i.e. people who are of Jewish descent but now adhere to another religion, and people who are related by marriage to persons of Jewish descent). In the aggregate, these three nested population sum to a total a population of nearly 10 million residing in qualifying “Jewish” households, which we described above. Each of the component sub-populations are described and enumerated below.

JEWS BY RELIGION (JBR)

This population construct is the easiest to designate and explain. It results directly from the national screening of the whole U.S. adult population and consists of those who self-identify as “Jewish” or answered “Judaism” when asked their religion in NSRI 1990 or ARIS 2001. This population consists of two sub-groups: the BJRs – persons born to and/or raised by Jewish parents and currently Jewish by religion, and JBCs – the Jews by choice – persons whose origins by parentage and/or upbringing are not Jewish, but who converted to or adhere to Judaism. In ARIS 2001 the latter respondents were identified by a question that asked if the respondent had ever switched or changed their religion. Interestingly, as Exhibit 3 shows, the number of adult Jews by choice found by both surveys is almost identical – around 175,000 persons.

The weighted total number of adults who were JBRs in 1990 was 3,137,000 but fell to 2,831,000 in 2001. Thus, the directly comparable figures show a decline in this population of nearly 300,000 adult persons or 8 percent. The final 1990 NJPS numbers reproduced in Exhibit 3 result from an upward adjustment after Stage 3 of NJPS 1990 to allow for

immigration and other changes over the much longer data collection period of over a year. Using this figure of 3,539,000 suggests an even greater loss among the JBR population since then. The JBR child population appears to have fallen from 855,000 to 700,000, a decrease of 18 percent.

JEWS OF NO RELIGION (JNR)

This category consists of persons of Jewish parentage/upbringing who report they have “no religion”, or replied atheist, agnostic, secular or humanist. In addition, those qualified Jewish respondents who reported being of Jewish parentage and/or upbringing but replied “don’t know” or refused the religion item, were included in this category since they, too, reported no current religious preference. As is shown in Exhibit 3 below, the size of this sub-population among adults was 813,000 in 1990, but has grown to 1,120,000 in the intervening eleven years, an increase of about 38%. Putting children into the analysis, the size of the JNR population has grown from 1,120,000 in 1990 to 1,710,000 in 2001, an increase of nearly 53%.

THE CORE JEWISH POPULATION

Since 1990, social scientists studying America’s Jews have adopted the designation “core Jewish” population to refer to those whom most Jewish communal bodies accept without qualification as potential members of their communities. This analytical model was first used in Canada where there respondents can self-identify as “Jewish” on both the ethnicity and religion schedules. The 1991 Canadian National Census enumerated 318,070 Jews on the basis of the religion question and 369,56 on the basis of ethnicity; but only 281,680 persons on the basis of both. The protocol adopted there was to exclude persons of Jewish background who designated a non-Jewish religious group as their religion but to include ‘non-religious’ Jews as part of the accepted community. In effect, that practice followed the European historical precedent whereby Jews who were *laique* or *konfessionlos* were accepted as members of the community and treated more favorably and quite differently by Jewish authorities from those who converted out or became baptized Christians.¹²

Given the two elements of Jewishness -- religion and ancestry – it is analytically useful to suggest that those persons who (a) identify with both aspects of the group’s social ties or (b) identify with the groups’ ancestry and have chosen no other religion, comprise the “core” group in the population. That designation has also tended to be a good predictor, in terms of empirical evidence, of social ties to the Jewish community as we shall show in section 2.

¹² For the case of Canada see Barry A. Kosmin, "A religious question in the British Census," *Patterns of Prejudice*, v. 32, n. 2 (1998), p. 45. All religious communities in Europe were and in some places still are legally chartered corporate entities, with authority granted by the state to determine group membership. In Denmark and Germany, for example, the state grants authority to the corporate Jewish community retain a portion of individuals’ taxes for communal services. Whom the corporate community counts as a member determines the group’s tax base. Obviously, the same person cannot be claimed by two different religious entities.

EXHIBIT 3

Core Jewish Population 1990 & 2001

Code	Jewish Identity Category	1990		2001	
	ADULTS	Number	%	Number	%
BJR	Jewish Parent: Religion Judaism	3,365,000 <i>(3,137,000)</i>	61	2,760,000	52
JBC	No Jewish Parent: Religion Judaism	174,000	3	170,000	3
JNR	Jewish Parent: No Religion	813,000	15	1,120,000	21
	CHILDREN (under age 18)				
JBR <i>(Includes JBC)</i>	Jew by Religion	856,000	16	700,000	13
JNR	Jew No Religion	307,000	5	590,000	11
TOTAL	ALL AGES	5,515,000	100	5,340,000	100

The “core Jewish” population has diminished over the past decade, due in large measure to the decline in the “Jews by religion” sub-population. The “Jews by choice” sub-population has largely remained constant. The number of Jews of “no religion” has grown considerably both in absolute terms and as a proportion of the total “core Jewish” population. This growth is due to both the secularizing trends that are particularly significant among American Jews, which will be described in the next section, and to social forces arising from the high rate of inter-faith marriages, which was highlighted by the 1990 NJPS. The latter trend has produced a large cohort of young adults who are children of intermarriages. In a great many of those marriages the neutral or default option as to how the parents raised their offspring was to choose no faith tradition. In fact, NJPS 1990 found that more children from intermarried homes were being raised in ‘no religion’ than in Judaism (30 percent vs. 25 percent).¹³

Whatever the actual cause may be for the rise in the numbers of those with no religion, there is clear evidence that there is a secularizing process under way where by the “Jews by religion” component of the “core Jewish” population has fallen from 80 percent in 1990 to 68 percent in 2001. At the same time, the JNR or “no religion” component has increased from 20 percent to 32 percent during this period

JEWES OF OTHER RELIGIONS (JOR/JCOR)

This population, consisting of those who are of Jewish parentage and/or upbringing or consider themselves Jewish, but who presently adhere to another religion, are designated as JOR. In 2001 they were estimated to number over 2.3 million persons of all ages. This is a mixed population in a number of ways. It contains the children as well as grandchildren of “core Jews.” It consists largely of persons who had intermarried parents, possibly intermarried grandparents, and who were raised in the religious tradition of the non-Jewish

¹³ Ariela Keysar, Barry A. Kosmin and Jeffrey Scheckner, *The Next Generation: Jewish Children and Adolescents*, (New York: SUNY Press, 2000), p. 49.

parent. It also contains a small proportion of people who had two Jewish parents and were born and raised as “core Jews,” but have switched to a non-Jewish religious group. Thus the “other religions” reported include the whole gamut from Catholic, Baptist, Episcopalian to Messianic Jews as well as other religions such as Buddhism, Wicca, Scientology and Unitarianism. In Exhibit 4 we also distinguish between adults, who were all respondents and able to self-identify, and their children under 18 years of age, who were not respondents and are located in this identity groups as a result of their parents’ responses.

It is important to enumerate this population, as knowing the size of the “penumbra” allows us to place the “core” in perspective and to measure the magnitude of assimilation. Exhibit 4 indicates there has been rapid growth in the number of adults who fall into the JOR category since 1990. This is due mainly to the high rate of intermarriage that has been a feature of American Jewry since 1970. NJPS 1990 discovered that a plurality of 45 percent of the children from mixed (“core Jewish” and Gentile parent) homes was being raised in a religion other than Judaism.¹⁴ The JCOR child population appears to have increased less spectacularly since 1990 -- probably because both marriage and fertility rates fell among Jews of all identity groups during the 1990s. In addition growth in the numbers of JCORs might be expected to level off considering that AJIS has reported elsewhere that the intermarriage rate during recent years has not changed from that of the late 1980s (52 percent vs. 51 percent).

THE JEWISH ORIGINS POPULATION

Ignoring the distinction between “core” and “periphery” segments of the population, one can also speak of a population that is of Jewish descent. This population of Jewish descent or to use an older term ‘Jewish extraction’ is estimated to have increased from 6.8 to 7.7 million persons between 1990 and 2001. It is enumerated for a variety of reasons. It provides a demographic barometer based on indicators of descent in contrast with that based on indicators of consent such as religious identification. However, when we enumerate Jews we are not just dealing with questions of pure demography or even sociology. The Jewish-origins population is that segment of the American population which has blood or close kinship ties to other Jews. However, such ties may also have social consequences whether in the form of discriminatory incidents on the one hand or in the form of kinship bonds that entail family get-togethers on the other. This segment Americans is one kind of a “population at risk”¹⁵ – that is a group sharing minimal common characteristics that distinguish them from the rest of American society. In the present case this population includes both those who are currently self-identified as Jewish-by-religion and those who are Jewish merely by parentage or upbringing.

¹⁴ Keysar, et al, *ibid.* 49.

¹⁵ As used here, the concept of “population at risk” is drawn from actuarial science. It refers to a group whose shared characteristics make it likely that they will have certain common life course experiences, either adverse or favorable.

EXHIBIT 4

Jewish & Jewish Origins Population 1990 & 2001

Code	Jewish Identity Category	1990		2001	
		Number	%	Number	%
JBR/JNR	Core Jews (all ages)	5,515,000	81	5,340,000	69
JOR	Adults of Jewish Parentage: Other Religions	625,000	9	1,470,000	19
JCOR	Children of Jewish Parentage: Other Religions	707,000	10	880,000	12
TOTAL	Jewish & Jewish Origins Population	6,847,000	100	7,690,000	100

It is important to remember that political anti-Semitism in the West throughout the twentieth century was based on biology or descent – scientific racism – rather than religious prejudice as such. Genocide against Jews was rationalized on the basis of supposedly detrimental biological, inherited characteristics of the Jew and it used a “racial” classification to define its victims not a religious one. It is still the case that Jewish communal defense organizations feel morally bound to defend so-called “half Jews”. Since many JORs bear “Jewish” surnames, they may continue to be regarded as “Jewish” by others. Moreover, because religion is not the only basis for Jewish identification, some JORs also self-define as “Jewish.” Given the recent advances in genetics, knowledge of the size of the biological population set out in Exhibit 4 also has scientific merit and possibly medical consequences as we learn more about the role of genetics in health and disease.

THE ‘HALAKHIC’ ADULT JEWISH POPULATION

Since the time of the Prophet Nehemiah and the return of Jewish exiles from Babylonia, Jewish law or *halakhah* has defined an individual’s status as a Jew solely through the maternal line. A person born to a Jewish mother was presumptively Jewish. (We shall ignore the issue of conversion here and thus the need to deal with the halakhic status of the JBC population) The definition based on *halakhah* is still adhered to by the Orthodox and Conservative branches of Judaism in the US, as well as by Israel’s Ministry of the Interior (for citizenship but not immigration purposes –see below). The Reform, Reconstructionist and Secular-Humanist branches of Judaism have abandoned the halakhic criterion and fully accept individuals as presumptively Jewish if either parent is Jewish and the individual was raised as a Jew with no adherence to another religion.

Because a halakhic definition of who is Jewish is relevant for important segments of American Jewry, particularly for marriage purposes, the exhibit that follows describes how many adults from each Jewish identity type population meet such a definition. The AJIS questionnaire included a specific and detailed parentage question directed to all qualifying respondents (in addition to the non-specific parentage option in the screening process). Respondents were asked if both parents were Jewish and if not, whether it was their mother or father that was Jewish. It must be emphasized that no proof was asked for and no respondent was asked about the halakhic status of any converts in their ancestry’s maternal line.

The findings in Exhibit 5 are new information since NJPS 1990 included parentage only as a module question for a small segment of the study sample and the results were never reported. The percentages in the “halakhically Jewish” category represent the proportion of each sub-population that reported Jewish ancestry in the maternal line.

EXHIBIT 5

Parentage of America’s Jewish Adults 2001

AJIS 2001	JBR	JNR	JOR
	N= 2,930,000	N= 1,120,000	N= 1,470,000
Jewish Parentage	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Both Parents	78	37	7
Mother only	6	21	27
<i>Halakhically Jewish</i>	(84)	(58)	(34)
Father only	3	25	28
Neither, Refusal, DK	13	17	37
TOTAL	100	100	100

Total Adult Population with a Jewish mother = 3,610,000

How should we interpret the finding that 84 percent of JBR Jews are “halakhically Jewish?” Any analysis of these figures has to bear in mind both methodological and conceptual issues. Who are the remaining 16 percent? First, 5 percent of the JBR respondents refused to answer this question either because of ideological or privacy objections. Second, the JBR population contains as we have seen above a considerable number of Jews by choice and we assume adoptees. Obviously, none of these persons had Jewish birth parents.

Caveats notwithstanding, a clear pattern emerges in Exhibit 5. JBRs are much more likely to be halakhically Jewish than JNRs, who in turn are more likely to be halakhically Jewish than JORs. These data also confirm that the majority of the JOR and the JNR populations are indeed the children of intermarried parents. It is perhaps surprising to learn that more than one-third of the JOR population, close to half a million people, could be Jewish using halakhic criteria (this would include those who switched out of their Jewish religion). Since 7 percent of JORs have two Jewish parents, we can confirm that there has been considerable switching from out of the “core Jewish” population to other religions as well in recent decades. The JOR statistics on parentage also provide an indication of the size of the recent demographic losses among American Jews that we can attribute to intermarriages and the institutional failure to attract these potential members to Judaism. The fact that more JORs are found in the residual category row suggests that there are more grandchildren of “core Jews” among JORs than among the JNRs.

The total number of Jewish adults defined on a matrilineal or halakhic basis is 3.6 million, a figure which is about 10 percent smaller than that defined as the “core Jewish” adult population in Exhibit 3. However, the gender of the Jewish parent does seem to affect the identity group distribution.

Looking at the same figures from the vantage point of solo Jewish parentage, there are about 808,000 adults whose only Jewish parent is their mother and 780,000 adults whose only Jewish parent is their father. Among the former, 22% reported their religion as Jewish and another 29% indicated “no religion.” Among the latter only 11% reported their religion as Jewish or Judaism and 36% indicated “no religion.” Nearly half among the former and slightly more than half among the latter report adherence to a religion other than Judaism. Just 5% of those with two Jewish parents report adherence to a religion other than Judaism.

THE TOTAL AMERICAN JEWISH POPULATION

Now that the various Jewish identity group populations have been defined and enumerated we can bring all these estimates together in one table. Exhibit 5 compares the structure of the American Jewish population in terms of its widest definitional reach in 1990 and 2001. We now also add a new category, GA. This designates persons who have no Jewish background or descent but reside in a household with someone who is within the 7.7 million Jewish ethnic origin/ancestry population. In so doing we return to the total national population numbers of nearly 10 million first established from the household count.

This total population can be envisaged as a large kinship network. It is the maximum number of Americans who can be said to have some family or kinship connection to Jews. This total may be of little practical consequence to Jewish religious and communal bodies. Nonetheless, there may be a number of theoretical reasons to count this population as such. In the American context, this population may well have distinct political, cultural and consumer interests, which distinguish it from the wider US population. As we have noted earlier, within a variety of historic or scientific contexts, this population could well be thought of as a “population at risk.” This population is also a meaningful entity in the context of the State of Israel’s Law of Return as amended in 1970.

That law provides the possibility of unrestricted immigration into Israel for those we have categorized as “core Jewish” -- along with their spouses, children and grandchildren as well as those descendants’ immediate families. It is that law which has required the State of Israel in recent decades to grant automatic citizenship to hundreds of thousands of refugees from the former Soviet Union or Ethiopia, countries that have supplied so many recent *olim* (immigrants) to the national home of the Jewish people. The exhibit below estimates the population numbers for America’s “Jews” and their immediate kin if they were counted on the same basis.

EXHIBIT 6

Total American Jewish & Kindred Population 1990-2001

(Weighted Data)

CODE	JEWISH IDENTITY CATEGORY	NJPS 1990		AJIS 2001	
		Number	Cum. Pct.	Number	Cum. Pct.
	ADULT POPULATION				
BJR	Jewish Parentage & Jewish Religion	3,365,000	41	2,760,000	28
JBC	Not Jewish Parentage, But of Jewish Religion	174,000		170,000	
JBR	Jewish by Religion (Regardless of Parentage)	3,539,000	43	2,930,000	30
JNR	Jewish Parentage & No Religion	813,000		1,120,000	
	ADULT CORE JEWISH POPULATION	4,352,000	53	4,050,000	41
JOR	Jewish Parentage & Other Religion	625,000		1,465,000	
	TOTAL ADULT JEWISH ORIGIN+JEWISH POPULATION	4,977,000	61	5,515,000	56
	CHILD POPULATION				
JBR	Core Jewish Parent's Religion Judaism	856,000		700,000	
JNR	Core Jewish Parent of No Religion	307,000		590,000	
JCOR	Core Jewish or Jewish Ancestry Parent of Other Religion	700,000		880,000	
	TOTAL JEWISH ORIGIN+JEWISH CHILDREN	1,863,000	83	2,170,000	78
GA	Non-Jewish Adults in HHs with Core Jewish & Jewish Origin Pop	1,350,000		2,165,000	
	TOTAL PERSONS IN QUALIFYING JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS	8,200,000	100	9,850,000	100

NOTE: In 1990, 100,000 was added to the estimate of the total adult Jewish population (JBR) to take into account those living in non-residential households such as nursing homes, dormitories, prison, the military or in hospitals. In addition the 1990 NSRI Adult JBR population of 3,137,000 was adjusted upwards by another 128,000 after Stage 3 of NJPS. In 2001, 110,000 was added to the estimate to account for institutionalized population and those un-enumerated in Alaska and Hawaii.

SOCIAL PROFILE OF SUB-POPULATIONS

In order to better understand the changing balance of the various Jewish identity type populations, we have sought insight into their socio-demographic composition. As we have seen earlier from the proportion of children under 18 years in each category, each sub-population has rather different adult age structures. In Exhibit 7 we set forth a variety of social indicators, which were collected during the ARIS data collection process. These social characteristics indicate that, indeed, the three major sub-populations are distinct entities. However, these are descriptions of the outcomes of complex social dynamics and one must be careful about drawing any conclusions concerning the relationship between Jewish identity types and other social attributes.

For instance, when comparing the educational attainment or income of JBRs and JORs, we cannot assume that adherence to Judaism produces more college graduates or higher incomes among its adherents than other religious groups, nor can we assume that persons with high incomes and a college education are more attracted to Judaism. These outcomes are mediated through many variables and social processes.

Moreover, it is important to remember that most people do not live in isolation. Particularly those who live in family households are part of a complex structure. Certainly, not all JBRs or JNRs reside in homogeneous households. The recent high rates of inter religious and inter-ethnic marriages mean that significant proportions in all three identity type populations reside in mixed households, particularly with non-Jewish (GA) partners. These partners not only influence our respondents' Jewish identity type decisions but they also influence social indicators such as combined household income and the choice of region of residence.

EXHIBIT 7

Socio-Demographic Profile of Adult Jewish Identity Types

Social Characteristics	JBR –Jews by Religion	JNR-Jews of No Religion	JOR-Jews of Other Religions
<i>Number of adults</i>	2,930,000	1,120,000	1,470,000
<i>Proportion of Male /Female</i>	49/51	52/48	45/55
<i>Median Age</i>	51 years	44 years	42 years
<i>Percent Married</i>	59	45	59
<i>Percent of Married With Jewish Spouse</i>	77	16	Not Applicable
<i>Percent College graduates</i>	58	57	36
<i>Percent F-T Employed P-T</i>	49 13	56 13	63 13
<i>Percent Registered Voters</i>	85	76	85
<i>Percent Democrat v. Republican</i>	55 13	41 13	28 40
<i>Percent own their home</i>	77	67	69
<i>Median annual Households Inc</i>	\$72,000	\$58,000	\$54,000
Region of Residence			
<i>Percent in Northeast</i>	43	26	20
<i>Percent in South</i>	26	31	36
<i>Percent in Midwest</i>	10	9	13
<i>Percent in West</i>	21	34	31

Exhibit 7 describes each of the key segments of the Jewish and Jewish-origins population with respect to a wide variety of social characteristics. It underscores a number of ways in which these sub-populations are distinct from one another. Jews-by-religion (JBRs) are clearly older, likely to live in smaller households and are likely to be financially better off than the other two sub-populations. The majority are married, and in the great majority of cases they are married to another Jewish person. They are also concentrated in the Northeastern part of the United States and politically most likely to be Democrats.

Jews of no religion are likely to be younger than JBRs, more likely to live in the Western United States, and more likely to be politically independent. They are less likely than JBRs to be married, and if married, are most likely to be married to someone not Jewish. They are about as likely as JBRs to be college graduates, though their income is likely to be smaller.

As expected, JORs are sociologically the most different from JBRs. They are also younger than the other two groups; they are far less educated than either previous group and less well off economically. They are more likely to be Republicans and more likely than the other two groups to live in the South.

Findings concerning the social characteristics of the “core Jewish” population have consistently underscored its distinctiveness with respect to the age structure and educational attainment of its adults. Particularly Jews-by-religion comprise a significantly older population. More than twice as many of this group are seventy years of age or older than is characteristic of the rest of America's adults. Those who are of Jewish parentage or upbringing, but of another religion, are much younger than Jews by religion. That fact suggests that the growth of this segment of the population is a relatively recent development - - most likely the product of the growth of interfaith marriages in the past several decades.

GEOGRAPHY OF AMERICA’S JEWS

The final item of demography explored in this section of the report is the geographic distribution of households in which one finds either persons who are Jewish-by-religion or persons of Jewish parentage or upbringing. As is well known, the American Jewish population has been historically concentrated in the Northeastern part of the United States. Indeed, its acculturation in America can probably be charted – though such undertaking is beyond the scope of this report – along a line that would describe the progressive dispersal of the Jews throughout the entire U.S.


The decline in the number of the JBR population is probably among the most significant finding of AJIS 2001. Some of the explanation of this phenomenon is the continuing high incidence of interfaith marriage among Jewish young adults and their parents since the end of the 1960s. However, many commentators believe changes in Jewish patterns of residence that involve dispersal and the break-up of Jewish neighborhoods is also a contributory factor. Goldstein and Goldstein (1996)¹⁶ have stressed the importance of migration as a factor in the loosening of Jewish religious and communal ties. This happens when Jews migrate out of the large cities to suburban and ex-urban areas, but even more significantly when they migrate regionally. Therefore, the final two exhibits in this section of the report look at the regional distribution of the “core Jewish” population with respect to the four major regions of the United States.

¹⁶Sidney Goldstein and Alice Goldstein, *Jews on the Move: Implications for Jewish Identity* (Albany, NY.: State University of New York Press, 1996).

EXHIBIT 8

Map of Continental USA Divided Into Four Regions

(Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics)



As is clear from the map, each of the four regions includes states with large as well as small populations. Given the size the sample that serves as the basis for this study, the larger states are more reliably represented than the smaller ones. Therefore, the exhibit that follows provides estimates of the distribution of the Jewish population for each region, but not for each state within the regions.

Movement from the institutionally complete, i.e. well-organized and structured Jewish communities of the Northeast to the “sunbelt” is thought to be particularly eroding of Jewish ties. The AJIS findings for the “core Jewish” population in Exhibit 9 show that this regional migration trend continued through the 1990s. Whereas in the 1970s and 1980s Jewish migration was more often to the West, that trend has now slowed and the net movement is from the Northeast to the South. The South does not just mean Florida but anywhere south of the Mason-Dixon line and there has been considerable Jewish migration to the Washington, D.C. area, Georgia and Texas.

EXHIBIT 9

Regional Distribution of the Core Jewish Population 1990 & 2001

REGION	NJPS 1990	AJIS 2001
<i>Northeast</i>	44	38
<i>South</i>	22	27
<i>Midwest</i>	11	12
<i>West</i>	23	23
TOTAL	100	100

DEMOGRAPHY AND IDENTITY

The classification scheme we have used to describe the Jewish population reflects the acknowledgment on the part of social scientists of the widely accepted modes of status assignment within the Jewish community itself. In the language of social science, such assignment is both *ascriptive* and *achieved*. One can be born into the “Jewish family,” but one can also join the Jewish people. Thus, Jewishness is widely considered to be a product of *descent* and/or *consent*. But, in a voluntaristic society both criteria depend on a subjective decision by the individual. Except for purely heuristic purposes, no one can be assigned a religious and/or ethnic identity they reject.

Since fixing the social boundaries of the Jewish population is very much an ideologically based decision, it is necessary to recognize that the size and structure of the American Jewish population is inevitably an issue for legitimate debate. In replicating the methodology and analytical framework of NJPS 1990, AJIS has offered the possibility to measure changes among these Jewish sub-populations. As a result it provides useful insights into the nuances of social and demographic changes during the 1990s.

In the new millennium, the so-called core Jewish population is both smaller in size and as a fraction of the American population than it was just a decade earlier. Time series data show that the population referred to as “core Jewish” in the 1990 NJPS consisted of approximately five and half million people including adults and children and constituted about 2.2% of the total U.S. population. In 2001 this population, surveyed using the same methodology and calculated using same definitions, had fallen to 5.3 millions and less than 2% of the U.S. population. In contrast the expanded Jewish ethnic origin population, including individuals who did not necessarily consider themselves currently Jewish by religion nor subscribe to any other religious group but were Jewish by descent has grown. It consisted of less than seven million people and constituted 2.7% of the total U.S. population in 1990 but to more than seven and a half million persons by 2001 and a little over 2.7% of

the total U.S. population. On the other hand, the expanded Jewish population has grown considerably as has the total population in Jewish households.

Perhaps most significant is the apparent growth of Jewish identity types outside of the Jewish by religion category. The number of adults and children in the “Jews of no religion” category has grown considerably and the growth was nearly equal to the loss of adherents to Judaism. These numbers suggest that of the total core or effective Jewish adult population, 27% have no religion. While most of these people undoubtedly consider themselves Jewish (as there is very little denial of Jewish ancestry among contemporary American Jewish adults), their Jewishness is apt to be more *ascriptive* than *achieved*. Another significantly enlarged group is those adults who are (self-)reportedly of Jewish parentage or upbringing but now profess a religion other than Judaism. Their number has increased more than 100% from 625,000 in 1990 to more than 1.4 million in the current survey.

The socio-demographic profile of the main Jewish identity type populations has shown that they differ considerably on many key indicators such as age, education, economic status and region of residence. To this information we must also add the parentage data shown in Exhibit 5, which suggest that these populations differ in their Jewish attachments due to the varying patterns of intermarriage in their families.

It might be thought that the identity group populations are a largely artificial creation without communal significance, but in fact they are a social reality and even of personal relevance. In the fluid and diverse society of contemporary America individuals move in and out of groups, social networks, beliefs, organizational memberships and personal relationships, including marriages. Parents can chart the movement of their children through these identity groups. We can envisage on the individual level that at certain periods in the life cycle – particularly in their college years -- a young adult could move quite quickly between the population categories. A Jew by religion (JBR) at high school could easily decide to become a Jew of no religion (JNR) on the campus and then begin a spiritual journey that takes them into Buddhism or a Hindu ashram so that they in effect enter the Jew of other religion (JOR) category. A friendship or relationship with another person, such as marriage may well lead them back to the JBR category if their new spouse follows Judaism, but they could also be influenced to enter the JNR population. The tables above record the aggregate result of hundreds of thousands of such individual identity changes and spiritual journeys. Choices and decisions as to the nature of individuals’ ties to Judaism and the Jewish people are being made constantly. What AJIS and NJPS have recorded in effect are two still photographs, for 1990 and 2001, showing the result of a myriad of permanent or temporary positions with regard to Jewish attachment but we must remember that in reality this is a continuously unfolding movie with a cast of millions.

In the analytic section below, we report on several indicators that help describe the religious ideas, affiliations and associations held by adults who describe themselves as Jewish by religion or of Jewish parentage or upbringing. Because this report is principally interested in religious beliefs, outlook and possibly related affiliations, all statistical generalizations from now on will refer to adults, persons who are at least 18 years of age, unless otherwise noted in a particular exhibit. Thus the remainder of the present study focuses

primarily upon adults who acknowledge themselves to be either JBR/JBCs (2,930,000) or JNRs (1,120,000) for an effective “core Jewish” adult population estimated to number 4,050,000 persons.

FINDINGS

DIMENSIONS OF IDENTITY: RELIGIOUS OUTLOOK, BELIEFS AND AFFILIATION

The study of America’s Jews over the past several decades has been filtered largely through the lens of one organizing construct, the concept of identity. The uses of this construct are far too varied and numerous to review here. Dashefsky and Shapiro (1974) have offered a useful review of the dimensions and significance of the concept. One of the most consistent applications of the concept of identity in the study of American Jewry has been as a tool to differentiate segments of the Jewish population in more or less binary categories with respect to their more intense or less intense connectedness or engagement or bondedness to Judaism, the Jewish people, Jewish institutions, Jewish values, or Jewish culture.

It is interesting to contemplate the reason such binary differentiation has become so appealing in the study of America’s Jews in recent decades. But that question cannot be addressed here. However, it is important to recall, if only for the purpose of tracing the history of ideas, that for the first half of the twentieth century, the concept of identity was virtually absent from social scientific studies of American Jewry.

Historically, definitions of identity were always important in the context of halakhic questions about personal status. Absent concerns about *halakhah* or about the political rights of individuals, “Jewish identity” is merely one of a number of possible concepts by means of which human beings can be classified, grouped, and examined in meaningful categories. Particularly in an environment where individuals may hold multiple notions of self, and hold membership in multiple, non-continuous 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 cyberspaces, 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.

Prior to the relatively recent fascination with questions about “Jewish identity,” the population studied under the Jewish rubric was presumed to be known by its genealogy, history or ecology, and the principal differentiating construct through which its variations were to be understood was the concept of generations. All sorts of diversity within the U.S. Jewish population, from residential patterns to socio-economic attainment, from social integration to theology and religious affiliation, were understood as a function of the social distance the individual had traversed from the moment of immigration to the time of study. Thus, the typical distinctions between the “first generation,” the “second generation,” the

“third generation,” and so forth were thought to be the principal vectors along which much of American Jewish life was to be rendered comprehensible.

There is no clear record in the annals of the social scientific study of American Jewry of any collective decision to abandon the concept of generations as a useful interpretive construct. But, for all intents and purposes, by the end of the 1960s it was abandoned on a wholesale basis. Marshall Sklare and associates’ watershed studies of a mid-western Jewish community known as the “Lakeville Studies” are probably as good a benchmark as any to fix the moment in the history of the social scientific study of American Jewry when the concept of identity advanced to the foreground. The title of the first volume of those famous studies, *Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier* (written by Marshall Sklare and Joseph Greenblum, 1967), served as well as any collective proclamation to those [of us] who entered the field in the later half of the 1960s: the concept of generations was *passé* and the concept of identity was “in.” While the concept of generations had neatly linked Jews to their history, its usefulness as an interpretive construct became increasingly attenuated by that history, as fewer and fewer of America’s Jews were anything but American-born children of American-born parents.

The emergence of the post-war baby-boom generation as the demographic fulcrum of the population served as a powerful stimulus to the development of a new interpretive schema for understanding variations in American Jewish life. The growing historical amnesia of this demographic segment coupled with its idiosyncratic attachments to diverse Jewish institutions, practices, bits of history, ideology and above all psycho-emotional bonds to family made the concept of identity a most useful metric along which to measure degrees of Jewish identity.

The concept also had appeal to [Jewish] social scientists who seemed to want to affirm a kernel of uniformity at the heart of an immense amount of diversity that kept cropping up in empirical studies of America’s Jews. As with the concept of generations, the concept of identity allowed the widest array of the population to remain anchored to some indivisible principle of unity alluded to by the concept itself. However much the diversity might be among America’s Jews, so long as they could be said to possess a “Jewish identity” one could presume the existence of an ineluctable bond setting the group apart from all others.

Do Jews actually have something called a “Jewish identity?” Did they have something called “generational status?” Well, they do and they did to the extent that social scientists were able to fit such theoretical constructs around the messy nuances of shared experience.

The point of this brief excursion into the recent history of ideas about the American Jewish experience is to suggest that the dominant constructs which have shaped our thinking about America’s Jews have left out something of potential importance to our understanding of the subject at hand. What’s been left out in most instances is the subjective self-understanding of Jews: what Jews think about each other, what they think about Judaism, about religion in general, and what they think of the central institutions of the Jewish community. Although the concept of identity would appear to be more responsive to subjectivity than is the concept of generations, in its application it has been used as an objective instrument with which to differentiate those possessing greater or lesser amounts of

Jewish identity, as if such differentiations actually corresponded to something concrete and real in people themselves.

Since it is widely assumed that identity is acquired and sustained through processes and structures of identification, social scientists working with the concept have willy-nilly utilized indicators of identification (e.g. the performance of *mitzvoth*, participation in and affiliation with Jewish communal institutions, and conformity with Jewish cultural and religious norms in general) as measures of the strength of Jewish identity – which itself can hardly be observed. The problem with this mode of measurement of something as elusive as identity is that the measures often produce anomalies. People who might have strong psychological attachment to their personal sense of Jewishness can and do score low on behavioral or objective measures of identification. Moreover, in recent years, with the growing incidence of intermarriage in the American Jewish population, there have been at least some instances of people scoring fairly high on measures of Jewish identification even if they happen not to be Jewish.

How else would one describe a Hebrew-reading, generous philanthropist to Jewish causes, who attends synagogue services weekly with his wife and day-school-attending children, but as someone with a “strong Jewish identity” -- if only the person were not a non-practicing Catholic. And how else would one describe an successful leader of a rock band, with several pierced body parts, who emigrated from Israel to the U.S. as a child and his only serious attachment to his heritage is a deep commitment to using his music to raise money for orphaned children in various war-torn parts of the world, but as someone with a “weak Jewish identity.” But, this person has never forgotten the meaning of *tzedakah*. Of course, in both these examples it becomes readily apparent that the concept of “strong” and “weak” as applied to identity and, indeed, the very notion of identity can quickly become anomalous, failing to capture important aspects of human attachment or disconnectedness. Recent studies by Bethamie Horowitz (*Connections and Journeys*) and by Steven Cohen and Arnie Eisen (*The Jew Within*) have begun to come to grips with the growing anomalies of the concept. These studies have had to make sense of increasingly lumpy data, which suggest that people lay claim to Jewish ideas, images, experiences and even institutional affiliation and participation in often highly idiosyncratic patterns that defy the kind of linear or holistic interpretation that the concept of “Jewish identity” would imply.

But, as we have learned many years ago from historian of science, Thomas Kuhn,¹⁷ anomalies point to the presence of dominant paradigms that often serve as blinders to possible sources of new knowledge. We contend here that the prevailing use of “Jewish identity” has served as such. As a concept through which much of American Jewish life has been viewed in recent years, it has prevented attention to other conceptual frameworks with which the behavior and attitudes of people answering to the label “Jewish” in one form or another might be profitably studied. Indeed, the very group in which “Jewish identity” may be studied is itself a matter of contention.

¹⁷ *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962)
www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/Kuhnsnap.html

THE CONCEPT OF OUTLOOK

Quite apart from the foregoing critique, the positive contribution we seek to make to the understanding of the contemporary American Jewish experience is the introduction of the concept of “outlook.” Its use here represents an attempt to apply in practical research the concept German phenomenologists have referred to as *weltanschauung* (sometimes defined as worldview or world-outlook).¹⁸ Introduced into American sociology through the work of Alfred Schutz and his students, Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, the concept of *weltanschauung* was meant to resolve one of the fundamental paradoxes of social science: *how to construct objective statements about what is essentially a subjective realm of experience*. That paradox is all the more resistant to resolution when the subjective states social scientists are trying to describe include (as they nearly always do) ideological positions or value-laden behavior about which the social scientist himself/herself can hardly claim neutrality.

To address that paradox, those following in the intellectual footsteps of the phenomenologists have sought interpretive concepts that are clearly rooted in the language and worldview of the people whose ideas and behavior are to be interpreted. Thus, the task of the social scientist is to trace the chain of meaning by which groups of individuals link their thoughts to deeds, their deeds to social relationships or associations, and their associations to institutions, which in turn reinforce the entire chain.

The concept of “outlook” appears to us to be particularly well suited to describe the broad orientation of people to ideas they treat as plausible and to the very criteria by which they bestow plausibility. The value of this concept is that it is drawn directly from the ordinary experience of the everyday life of people and employs a metric or method of measurement that emerges directly from the language of that experience.

In the present instance we employ “outlook” both as a useful interpretive tool as well as a term that is readily understood by ordinary people in daily discourse about their own lives. The concept easily lends itself to binary distinctions because people often differentiate themselves that way as for example: optimistic and pessimistic, liberal and conservative, or worldly and provincial.

We introduce yet another obvious binary distinction that has a great deal of common-sense meaning as well as utility, but which has been surprisingly absent from scholarly discourse about modern American Jews. That is the distinction between those who describe their outlook as “religious” and those who describe their outlook as “secular.” Though people, including Jewish adults, will often describe themselves as “religious” or as “secular” in ordinary discourse about their views of life, that distinction is hardly found in any of the voluminous literature of the past several decades dealing with Jewish identity. Perhaps because this distinction has not been much used, it has also not had the invidious connotations in differentiating segments of the Jewish population from one another.

¹⁸ Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality* (New York: Doubleday Anchor Book, 1966, 1967). P. 15 "The sociology of knowledge must first of all concern itself with what people 'know' as 'reality' in their everyday non- or pre-theoretical lives."

Since the end of the nineteenth century, there has been a growing recognition among students of religion that the theologies and institutions embodying religion have been transformed by the process of secularization. Max Weber described secularization as the “disenchantment of the world” – a characterization of the process of rationalization he adopted from the poet Friedrich Schiller.¹⁹ By this process Weber sought to capture the psychic and cultural transformation in which magical elements of thought and symbolism are progressively displaced by empiricism and rationality. Harvey Cox (*The Secular City*, 1966) described secularization as “the deliverance of man ‘first from religious and then from metaphysical control over his reasons and his language’...the dispelling of all closed worldviews, the breaking of all supernatural myths and sacred symbols.” On the wider societal level, Peter Berger defined secularization as “the process by which sectors of society are removed from the domination of religious institutions and symbols.”²⁰

It is now widely recognized that the process of secularization is dialectic: the more that hearts and minds become “disenchanted,” the more institutions that have specialized in the promotion of the “enchantment” process lose plausibility and authority. The more such institutions lose plausibility and authority, the less the psycho-emotional processes of “enchantment” are inculcated in the hearts and minds of individuals.

How far the process of secularization has progressed in different societies since the end of the nineteenth century, whether the process is unidirectional or not, and what its consequences are for social and political organization and human welfare, is the subject of ongoing debate among sociologists and theologians as well as politicians and social planners. Our more limited concern here is to discern the extent to which this process has taken hold within the Jewish population and in what manner it might be expressed.

It is the contention here that the degree of secularism in the outlooks of America’s Jews is an important source of differentiation in the U.S. Jewish population, yet it is not so subtle as to require deep, long qualitative interviews or life-course studies. People could be asked quite directly to describe whether they think their outlook is mostly religious or mostly secular. Their replies to such a question yield a distribution of answers that readily appear to be associated with a whole host of other indicators of opinion, belief, affiliation, association, and practice as well as demographic attributes.

The value of studying people’s “outlook” as a means by which to differentiate various segments of the population is that it allows the social scientist to step out of the circular logic of the identification-identity paradigm. The concept allows one to view the “objective” facets of behavior associated with affiliation and identification as the consequence of *meaningful intentionality*. To say that someone is “secular” or “religious” is at once both respectful of their own subjective perceptions about the universe and also makes no unwarranted inferences about the strength or weakness of their psychic attachment to their heritage, their ancestry or their group loyalty – as the concept of “Jewish identity” implicitly does. It thus

¹⁹ Hans Gerth & C. Wright Mills, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 51.

²⁰ Peter L. Berger, *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of A Sociological Theory of Religion*, (New York: Doubleday, 1967), p.107.

allows social scientists to characterize the subjective state of mind of the observed population without imposing a possibly invidious construct like *identity*.

The current survey, as did NJPS 1990, has made a clear distinction between the religious affirmations, beliefs, affiliations and practices of Jews and their identity claims as members of a people. However, the current survey went one step further than NJPS 1990 in allowing respondents to differentiate themselves in terms of self-perceived degrees of “religiousness.” Perhaps even more importantly, the current survey unlike NJPS 1990 provided for a direct comparison between Jewish respondents and respondents of other religions with respect to a major dimension of “religiousness.”

Beyond the question of adherence (“*What is your religion, if any?*”), the first question bearing on religious orientation asked respondents to place themselves along a continuum of positions in response to the following: “*When it comes to your outlook, do you regard yourself as: (a) religious, (b) somewhat religious, (c) somewhat secular, or (d) secular?*” This question was also asked of a large, representative sample of American adults who are neither Jewish by religion nor of Jewish parentage or upbringing. Therefore, the current survey has made it possible to place the religious outlook of Jewish adults or adults of Jewish parentage or upbringing in the wider context of American patterns, as shown below.

EXHIBIT 10

Outlook of Jews-by-religion and Adherents of Selected Other Religious Groups

<<<<<<< OUTLOOK SCALE >>>>>>>

RELIGIOUS GROUP	Secular	Somewhat Secular	Somewhat Religious	Religious	TOTAL
Assemblies of God	0	3	20	72	1,106,000
Churches of Christ	0	3	30	65	2,603,000
Methodist	1	5	51	42	14,150,000
Mormon	2	7	21	68	2,787,000
7 th Day Adventist	3	4	19	73	724,000
Baptist	3	4	37	54	33,830,000
Lutheran	3	7	48	41	9,580,000
UCC/Congregationalist	4	5	55	34	1,378,000
Jehovah's Witnesses	5	3	18	73	1,331,000
Catholic	6	7	50	33	50,873,000
Episcopalian	7	8	52	32	3,451,000
Buddhist	7	15	46	24	1,082,000
Muslim	9	9	49	32	1,104,000
Jews-by-religion	27	17	42	11	2,831,000
No religion (non-Jews)	40	13	28	8	29,481,000
US TOTAL ADULTS	10	6	38	37	208,000,000

Exhibit 10 highlights several important points about the religious outlook of America's Jews. First, with the exception of those professing no religion, Jews are the most likely to describe their outlook as "secular" or "somewhat secular" among all major religious groups. This exhibit shows that more than 40% of America's Jewish adults (who identify as Jewish-by-religion) describe their outlook as "secular" or "somewhat secular." That figure increases significantly when the parameters of the Jewish population are defined to include those who see themselves as having no religion but describe themselves as being of Jewish parentage or Jewish upbringing. Among those of Jewish ancestry who identified with no religion, 70% said they were secular or somewhat secular. By contrast, among those of Jewish ancestry who now profess another religion, just 22% and 16% respectively indicated their outlook as "secular" or "somewhat secular." Among American adults in general, the figure was 16%.

In addition to the question of outlook, survey respondents were asked about their belief in God, belief in miracles, prayer, and the general benefit of a belief in God. The replies are statistically summarized in exhibits below. Inasmuch as the great majority of Americans, be they Jewish or not, profess a belief in the existence of God, our analysis probed to see whether there is any difference in the intensity or quality of that belief. The survey asked of respondents whether they agree (strongly or somewhat) or disagree (strongly or somewhat) with the proposition: *God performs miracles.*

EXHIBIT 11

<p style="margin: 0;">Belief that God Performs Miracles: Jews-by-religion and Adherents of Selected Other Religious Groups</p>
--

<<<<<<< BELIEF SCALE >>>>>>>

RELIGIOUS GROUP	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly	TOTAL
Assemblies of God	0	1	1	98	1,106,000
Churches of Christ	5	2	15	77	2,603,000
Methodist	2	4	18	74	14,150,000
Mormon	1	3	7	88	2,787,000
7 th Day Adventist	0	1	1	98	724,000
Baptist	1	1	8	90	33,830,000
Lutheran	2	5	22	69	9,580,000
UCC/Congregationalist	0	13	31	54	1,378,000
Jehovah's Witnesses	5	4	13	74	1,331,000
Catholic	1	4	22	71	50,873,000
Episcopalian	3	6	28	59	3,451,000
Buddhist	9	11	40	41	1,082,000
Muslim	3	6	14	72	1,104,000
Jews-by-religion	11	17	31	36	2,831,000
No religion (non-Jews)	7	11	31	47	29,481,000
US TOTAL ADULTS	2	4	18	73	208,000,000

Since the question about “*God performs miracles*” was asked only of those who agreed (either strongly or somewhat) that “*God exists*,” the pattern of answers in Exhibit 11 is especially instructive. It underscores, yet again, that Jews who are adherents of Judaism are nevertheless quite different in their religious worldview from other believers. More than a fourth of Jewish adult believers disagree (somewhat or strongly) that “*God performs miracles*.” As we shall see below, adults of Jewish parentage or upbringing who do not adhere to any religion are far more likely to disagree with the statement, “*God exists*,” and *a fortiori* with the statement, “*God performs miracles*.”

EXHIBIT 12

Belief Indicators by Type of Jewish Identification

		Qualifying Adults			
		JBR	JNR	JOR	TOTAL
N=		2,930,000	1,120,000	1,470,000	5,520,000
Religious Orientation Indicators		%	%	%	%
<i>“Do you agree or disagree that God exists?”</i>					
		5	17	3	7
Disagree strongly		9	6	1	7
Disagree somewhat		23	29	14	22
Agree somewhat		54	35	80	56
Agree strongly		9	13	2	8
DK/RF (not determined) A					
<i>“Do you agree or disagree that ‘God helps me?’”</i>		NOTE: This was asked only of those who agreed that “God exist.”			
		15	32	2	16
Disagree strongly		15	10	6	13
Disagree somewhat		25	20	13	21
Agree somewhat		34	20	76	41
Agree strongly		10	18	3	9
DK/RF (not determined) B					
<i>“Do you agree or disagree that ‘God performs miracles?’”</i>		NOTE: This was asked only of those who agreed that “God exist.”			
		11	11		7
Disagree strongly		17	21	8	15
Disagree somewhat		31	28	14	25
Agree somewhat		36	28	76	48
Agree strongly		5	12	2	5
DK/RF (not determined) C					
<i>“Do you agree or disagree that ‘God hears prayers?’”</i>		NOTE: This was asked only of those who agreed that “God exist.”			
		10	13		8
Disagree strongly		13	10	4	10
Disagree somewhat		27	39	12	24
Agree somewhat		44	25	82	53
Agree strongly		5	13	2	5
DK/RF (not determined) D					

**EXHIBIT 12,
Cont'd**

<i>“Over the course of your life, have you become more or less of a believer in God or the Divine?”</i>	Qualifying Adults			
	JBR	JNR	JOR	TOTAL
More	38	30	74	44
Less	19	26	8	18
No Change	37	33	16	32
DK/RF (not determined) E	6	11	2	6

Taken together as well as individually, the five panels (A-E) of Exhibit 12 provide further depth and validation to the over-all outlook questions summarized in Exhibits 10 and 11. About 14% of respondents who identified themselves as Jewish by religion could be classified as atheists or agnostics. Among those who indicated Jewish parentage and/or upbringing, but who profess no religion, about 26% can be characterized as atheist or agnostic. In other words, about 623,000 adults out of a total of the approximately 4 million who comprise what has been called the “core Jewish” adult population (about 17%) hold beliefs that can be described as atheist or agnostic – those who might be described as the “hard-core seculars.” Such a state of non-belief is found in about 1% of all American non-Jewish adults.

It is further instructive to note that a substantial minority of those who profess a belief in God nevertheless do not believe that God performs miracles or that God helps them. About 30% of those who identify their religion as Judaism and profess a belief in God disagree somewhat or strongly with the proposition that “*God helps me.*” Among those who are of Jewish parentage or upbringing but say they have no religion – though they profess a belief in God – about 47% disagree somewhat or strongly with the proposition.

The data on outlook and beliefs underscore the point that America’s Jews differ quite a bit on the fundamentals of religious faith. The data further underscore the point that secularism and unbelief are nearly as varied as the more conventional divisions among the main branches of Judaism.

Exhibit 13 below summarizes the pattern of relationship between one’s position along the religious-secular continuum and whether one agrees (“somewhat” or “strongly”) with the four statements of belief outlined above.

EXHIBIT 13

Beliefs About God By Position Along the Religious-Secular Continuum (Percent Who Agree “Somewhat” or “Strongly” With Each Belief)

<<<<<OUTLOOK CONTINUUM>>>>>>

BELIEFS	Religious	Somewhat Religious	Uncertain/ DK/Refused	Somewhat Secular	Secular
God exists	94	90	50	78	53
God helps me	86	71	33	53	31
God perform miracles	92	68	72	60	46
God hears prayers	90	76	73	55	55
BASE TOTALs	340,000	1,300,000	180,000	580,000	1,300,000

NOTE: Totals include only JBR and JNR categories; each cell is of 100%. E.g. 94% of those who described themselves as “religious” agreed either “strongly or “somewhat” with the proposition: “*God exists,*” while just 53% of those describing themselves as “secular” do so.

Exhibit 13 suggests a notable if not perfect association between how people describe their outlook along the spectrum of “secular-religious” and what they affirm about God-beliefs. Among those who describe their outlook as “religious” or “somewhat religious,” 90-94% agree (strongly or somewhat) with the proposition: *God exists*. By contrast, among those who describe their outlook as “secular,” just 53% agree (strongly or somewhat) with the proposition about God’s existence. The other indicators of God-beliefs similarly differentiate between those who describe their outlook as religious and as secular.

Parenthetically, it is worth noting here that there is a casual and widely presumed association in the general literature about American Jews between secularism and assimilation into American society. Yet, the data on religious beliefs among American non-Jews would suggest that, in fact, secularism and especially atheism are far from normative in American society at large. As such, secular Jews could hardly be said to be assimilating into American culture. Quite the contrary: their distinctive pattern of secularism and non-belief may well set them apart.

Looking at the four God-belief statements as basis of predicting outlook lends specificity to the differences between the secular and the religious. Of all who agreed (strongly or somewhat) with the proposition: *God exists*, just 19% described their outlook as secular and 14% as somewhat secular. By contrast, 62% described themselves as religious or somewhat religious.

At the other end of the spectrum, of all those who disagreed (strongly or somewhat) with the proposition: *God exists*, 71% described themselves as secular and another 11% as somewhat secular; just 16% described themselves as religious or somewhat religious.

This exercise in statistical association underscores the validity of ordinary discourse about such matters in the common-sense language of everyday life. When people describe themselves as “secular” or “somewhat secular,” they apparently do hold beliefs with respect to God that are quite different from those who describe themselves as “religious” or “somewhat religious.” These designations are not simply *ad hoc* figures of speech. Indeed,

about 43% of those who describe their religion as Jewish when asked: *What is your religion, if any*, nonetheless describe themselves as secular or somewhat secular.

What that figure suggests is that identifying one’s self with a religion does not preclude thinking of that identification in secular terms. As such, it appears that a secular outlook and its associated beliefs or lack thereof, as held by many Jews, are not synonymous with a lack of Jewish identification. Rather, outlook and beliefs are distinct components along with identification of a stock of knowledge and a well-spring of affinities that link individuals to larger social entities from a family to a community to a people.

On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that the association between God-beliefs and outlook is not perfect. There appears to be some overlap between a self-described secular outlook and an affirmation of God’s existence. Conversely a self-defined religious outlook does not preclude rejection of a belief in God’s existence among a small minority.

It remains to be seen below what is the association between one’s position along the religious-secular continuum and the more objective indicators of Jewish communal affiliation.

Exhibit 14 looks at how America’s Jewish adults identify with the organized denominations of the Jewish community, broken down by their position along the religious-secular continuum.

EXHIBIT 14

Identification With Branch of Judaism and the Religious-Secular Continuum

(Percent of Each Branch that is “Religious” or “Secular”)

<<<<<OUTLOOK CONTINUUM>>>>>>>>

BRANCH OF JUDAISM	Religious	Somewhat Religious	Uncertain/DK/Refused	Somewhat Secular	Secular	TOTAL Percent
Secular Humanist*		14		19	67	100
Reconstructionist*		20		65	15	100
Orthodox	56	28	2	2	12	100
Conservative	7	54	4	14	21	100
Reform	7	43	2	18	30	100
Just Jewish	7	20	13	22	38	100

NOTE: categories provided by respondents in reply to: “*What branch of Judaism do you identify with, if any?*” Total includes **JBR adults in residential households only**.

* These categories are based on very small samples, making generalizations difficult.

Exhibit 14 calls attention to a number of interesting insights. First, it suggests that those with a “secular” or “somewhat secular” outlook are to be found in each of the key branches of American Judaism. About 30% of the total in the above exhibit characterize their outlook as “secular.” Despite the small sample, one would expect the majority of those who identify with the Secular Humanist branch of Judaism describe themselves as

secular. By contrast, the majority of those identifying with the Orthodox branch of Judaism describe themselves as “religious.” Interestingly, nearly half of those who identify with the Reform branch describe themselves as “secular” or “somewhat secular,” as do more than a third of those who identify with the Conservative branch of Judaism.

It should be emphasized that the figures in the exhibit above pertain only to adults who described their religious identity as Jewish. These figures should not be read as a direct measure of the actual membership of the branches of Judaism that are described in the exhibit. First, the exhibit does not include the children of these adults. Moreover, the survey did not inquire of adults of Jewish parentage and upbringing who said they have no religion whether they identify with any of these branches. Inconsistent as it may seem, there are people who say they have no religion, yet might nevertheless identify with one or another of these branches of Judaism, possibly for reasons that have nothing to do with religion. As we have seen in earlier exhibits that deal with outlook and beliefs, people are prone to considerable ambiguity and inconsistency.

The above exhibit also should not be taken as an indication of the type of synagogue, temple, or congregation that America’s Jews affiliate with. As will be shown below, that is an entirely different matter.

SYNAGOGUE AFFILIATION

Because affiliation with a religious congregation is generally regarded as a family or household attribute, the exhibit below describes the distribution of affiliation on the basis of households. For comparison purposes, the households have been grouped according to the Jewish classification of the respondent.

EXHIBIT 15

Affiliation With Temple, Synagogue or Congregation

	Qualifying Households by Respondent Type				
	JBR	JNR	JOR	GA	TOTAL
N=	1,547,000	600,000	705,000	908,000	3,760,000
	%	%	%	%	%
Affiliated	50	12	7	12	26
Not Affiliated	46	81	90	80	68
DK/RF (undetermined)	4	7	3	8	6
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100

NOTE: The category “GA” in this exhibit refers to households in which the respondent was neither Jewish by religion nor of Jewish parentage or upbringing, but someone else was Jewish.

As shown in Exhibit 15, half the households that contain at least one adult who reports his/her religion as Jewish are affiliated with a synagogue. Other types of households where at least one adult is of Jewish parentage or upbringing, but does not identify with the Jewish religion, are much less likely to be affiliated. Taking just the JBR and JNR categories, which comprise the so-called core Jewish population of NJPS 1990, it appears that about 40% of those households report affiliation with a synagogue. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that among the two other categories (JOR and Other – which include households where the respondent is not Jewish but someone else is, 11-12% also report synagogue affiliation.

In sum, about 26% of all the households included under the broad umbrella of this survey report indicate affiliation with a synagogue, temple, congregation or *havurah* – yielding a total of just over one million households. It is useful to recall here that NJPS 1990 reported a total of 880,000 affiliated households.²¹ Therefore, the number of American Jewish households affiliated with a Jewish congregation of some sort appears to have grown by about 15% during the course of the past decade. To be sure, the number of “qualifying Jewish households” grew by nearly 22% during the same period – though that growth includes a great increase in the number of households in which no one is currently Jewish but only of Jewish parentage or upbringing as well as households in which adults are cohabiting without marriage. Both those household patterns generally run counter to synagogue affiliation.

The exhibit that follows examines the relationship between household synagogue affiliation and respondents' outlook as measured by the religious-secular continuum. For obvious reasons, only respondents who indicated they are either JBRs or JNRs are included in the analysis.

EXHIBIT 16
Synagogue Affiliation by the Religious-Secular Continuum

<<<<<<OUTLOOK CONTINUUM>>>>>>

SYNAGOGUE AFFILIATED	Religious	Somewhat Religious	Uncertain/DK/Refused	Somewhat Secular	Secular	TOTAL Number
YES	16	49	4	14	17	1,600,000
NO	5	23	7	16	49	2,100,000
No Answer/DK/Ref	4	60	11	8	17	200,000
TOTAL Percent	10	35	5	15	35	3,900,000

NOTE: categories provided by respondents in reply to: “*Is anyone in your household affiliated with a synagogue or temple?*” [Total N = JBR/JNR adults in residential households]

²¹ See *Highlights*, p. 37

The findings in Exhibit 16 confirm, yet again, the substantial difference between the secular and the religious. Most Jewish adults or adults of Jewish parentage or upbringing who are not synagogue members are apt to have a “secular” or “somewhat secular” outlook. However, it is also interesting to note that nearly a third of those who report synagogue membership in their household also describe their outlook as secular or somewhat secular.

The presence of those with a secular outlook within a congregational setting suggests that synagogues fulfill a function at least for some people that is not strictly speaking “religious.” At the same time, the fact that just 20% of those who describe their outlook as “secular” (and 40% of those who describe their outlook as “somewhat secular”) report an affiliation with a synagogue suggests that most secular Jews probably lack institutional anchorage in the Jewish community. By contrast with the “secular” and the “somewhat secular,” about 70% of those who describe their outlook as “religious” and 62% of those who describe their outlook as “somewhat religious” report synagogue affiliation. That pattern extends to non-synagogue Jewish institutions as well.

JEWISH ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION

Besides inquiring about synagogue membership, our study inquired as well into membership in such “non-religious” communal institutions as a Jewish community center (JCC) or other fraternal or social organizations. As the exhibit below demonstrates, those who are members of a “non-religious” Jewish community organization are nevertheless more likely to describe their outlook as “religious” or “somewhat religious.” Those who are not members of such organizations are more apt to describe themselves as “secular” or “somewhat secular.”

EXHIBIT 17

JCC & Other Organizational Affiliation by the Religious-Secular Continuum

(Weighted Data)

<<<<<<OUTLOOK CONTINUUM>>>>>>

AFFILIATED WITH A JCC ETC.	Religious	Somewhat Religious	Uncertain/DK/Refused	Somewhat Secular	Secular	TOTAL Number
YES	17	45	4	17	18	990,000
NO	8	31	6	15	41	2,770,000
No Answer/DK/Ref						200,000
TOTAL Percent	10	35	5	15	35	3,960,000

NOTE: categories provided by respondents in reply to: “Is anyone in your household affiliated with a Jewish community center or some other Jewish community organization?” [Total N = JBR/JNR adults in residential households]

Looking at these same findings from the perspective of the “secular” and the “religious” sub-populations (not shown above), more than three times as many of those describing their outlook as “religious” (43%) report membership in a Jewish community center or some other Jewish community organization as those who describe their outlook as “secular” (13%).

In short, it appears that a “secular” outlook is associated with a relatively low level of affiliation with the organized Jewish community in general. Indeed, our survey suggests that those who are “secular” or “somewhat secular” are also likely to have proportionally fewer Jewish friends than those who describe their outlook as “religious” or “somewhat religious.”

JEWISH FRIENDSHIP NETWORK

To be sure, friendship networks are likely to be related to one’s affiliation with voluntary community organizations. Those who are members of a synagogue or a Jewish community center are more apt to make friends there. Nonetheless, the relative difference in the Jewish density of the friendship networks of the “seculars” and the “religious” suggests that these two broad segments of the American Jewish population inhabit different social universes. That difference may have far-reaching implications for the future of the American Jewish community.

EXHIBIT 18

Jewish Friendship Network by the Religious-Secular Continuum

(Weighted Data)

<<<<<<OUTLOOK CONTINUUM>>>>>>

PROPORTION OF FRIENDS JEWISH?	Religious	Somewhat Religious	Uncertain/DK/Refused	Somewhat Secular	Secular
All or most	45	28	16	22	15
About half	16	33	17	25	25
Some	22	23	15	23	35
None	11	14	22	24	23
D/K or Ref	6	2	30	6	2
TOTAL Number	400,000	1,360,000	300,000	600,000	1,300,000

NOTE: categories provided by respondents in reply to: “What proportion of your closest friends would you say are Jewish?” [Total N = JBR/JNR adults in residential households]

These findings are particularly significant in a larger historical context. NJPS 1990 reported that 45% of those who were Jewish-by-religion described their friendship network as “all or mostly Jewish.”²² In our current survey, just 20% of those who are Jewish-by-religion describe their friendship network as “all or mostly” Jewish. Thus, it appears that there is a general trend for Jews to have a less densely Jewish friendship

²² See *Highlights*, p. 35

network than was the case a decade ago. Indeed, as shown in the exhibit above, only among those who describe their outlook as “religious” does one find 45% who have a friendship network that is “all or mostly” Jewish.

ISRAEL

One of the most significant ways in which Jews have expressed their solidarity is through their commitment to and involvement with the State of Israel. Indeed, it might be argued that because Israel is essentially a secular state, whose founding was inspired by the secular ideology of Zionism, it has served as a unifying symbol for Jews throughout the world. This survey, as NJPS 1990, sought to explore the extent to which American Jews continue to identify with or remain committed to Israel.

Our survey explored these issues by means of two questions: one pertaining to visits to Israel, the other pertaining to emotional attachment to Israel.

EXHIBIT 19

Visiting and Attitude Toward Israel by the Religious-Secular Continuum
(Percent)

<<<<<<<OUTLOOK CONTINUUM>>>>>>>>

ISRAEL	Religious	Somewhat Religious	Uncertain/ DK/Refused	Somewhat Secular	Secular
VISITED					
Yes	47	41	29	26	23
No	51	54	41	69	74
Uncertain/DK/Refused	2	5	30	5	3
FEELING ATTACHED					
Not attached	14	29	31	40	55
Somewhat attached	21	42	23	39	25
Very attached	58	23	12	15	15
Uncertain/DK/Refused	7	6	34	6	5
TOTAL N for each Q	400,000	1,360,000	300,000	600,000	1,300,000

NOTE: [Total N = JBR/JNR adults in residential households]

Surprisingly, there is nearly a linear relationship between where American Jews locate themselves on the religious-secular spectrum with respect to their outlook and their attachment to Israel. Those who are more religious are more likely to have visited and are more emotionally attached to Israel; the more secular are less likely to have visited and are less emotionally attached to Israel. Twice as many of those who describe themselves as “religious” have visited Israel than those who describe themselves as “secular” (47%

compared with 23%). Similarly, more than three times as many of those who describe themselves as “religious” say they are “very attached” to Israel as compared with those who describe themselves as “secular” (58% compared with 15%).

The reason there appears to be such a consistent disconnection between secularism and Israel is obviously a lot more difficult to understand than the disconnection between secularism and affiliation with Jewish communal institutions. But, the facts are plain enough to warrant a serious search for the underlying mechanisms that appear to weaken the social bonds that link Jews to one another among those whose outlook is secular or somewhat secular.

However, historical context is once again an important framework in which the above findings must be viewed. NJPS 1990 reported 31% of those who described themselves as Jewish-by-religion and 11% of Jews who did not identify with Judaism as a religion had visited Israel at least once.²³ Our current survey found that more than 38% of Jews-by-religion have visited Israel at least once as had 17% of those who describe themselves as of Jewish parentage or upbringing but not of the Jewish religion. It appears, whatever its ideological significance might be, Israel has become a travel destination for an increasing proportion of America’s Jews. However, that fact does not appear to bear any direct relationship to the relative distribution of the secular and the religious among America’s Jews.

²³ See *Highlights*, p. 35

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

BY FELIX POSEN

This study of American Jewish identity began with a quest to describe the contours of the American Jewish population and the meaning that religion might hold for them. The data presented has illuminated that quest and has provided significant comparisons with which to delineate the size and shape of the population of interests here.

The two key questions were addressed by this study:

- What are the changes in the composition of American Jewry since the landmark 1990 National Jewish Population Survey, and
- How do America's Jews define themselves with respect to a continuum of beliefs ranging from religious to secular, and

The answers to these questions unfolding from this study will have a profound effect on what American Jewry decides to do during the coming decades in shaping its own self-definition and creating suitable educational initiatives to secure its future. In the light of a clear trend toward continuing secularism, every Jewish communal institution and every Jewish educational effort must grapple with the widespread skepticism among large segments of the Jewish populace toward religious ideas, ideals and institutions. The fact that secular Jews appear to outnumber any of the religious branches of American Judaism compels a search for alternative sources of group identity and solidarity that must be found within the culture, civilization and history of Jewry in addition to the sources of tradition and faith. Those sources must be mined and cultivated in educational programs that are offered to all segments of American Jewry regardless of their religious affiliation.

The findings of this survey suggest that the time is long overdue when those who do not identify with the main religious streams of Judaism (Reform, Reconstructionist, Conservative, Orthodox) can be dismissed as "just Jewish." The organized Jewish community must seek to understand in greater depth and respond with greater creativity, sensitivity and a wider array of educational opportunities to those whose Jewishness has often been dismissed as virtually an empty vessel.

Secularism is a serious source of conviction for some Jews, as well as a serious existential condition for a great many more. For some it is a source of a wonderfully rich and creative life; a fount of science, literature, humanistic learning and political conviction. For others, it is a source of dissatisfaction with prevailing religious ideas and institutions. Whatever its functions, secularism in Jewish life must be appreciated and supported as a potent source of identification and motivation. As such, it must be utilized by the organized Jewish community for all the positive opportunities it affords. A secular Judaism needs to reclaim its patrimony and learn to take charge of the levers of communal education so as to assure the creative engagement of future generations of modern American Jews.

APPENDIX A

THE METHODOLOGY OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH IDENTITY SURVEY 2001

**DALE KULP
PRESIDENT & CEO
MARKETING SYSTEMS GROUP, INC.**

INTRODUCTION

The American Jewish Identity Survey 2001 (AJIS 2001) is a methodological twin of the American Religious Identification Survey (ARIS 2001). The methodology of both was designed to replicate, as closely as possible, that of the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) sponsored by the Council of Jewish Federation (CJF) and its adjunct effort, the National Survey of Religious Identification. Wherever appropriate, reference will be made to the similarities and differences between the current effort and the effort of ten years ago.

The informational scope of this effort was much more restricted than the 1990 NJPS. The survey instruments for the current surveys were much more limited and were divided into three major sections:

- A series of questions dealing with the religious identification/preference of the respondent and spouse, if any, with a question series to determine whether this was a Jewish household (HH) and whether that was by religion, parentage or whether they considered themselves to be Jewish.
- A section asked of non-Jewish households dealing with secularity, beliefs and changes in religious preference/affiliation.
- A more comprehensive series of questions asked of respondents in Jewish HHs dealing with various aspects of current Jewish religious activities, including: synagogue membership, branch of Judaism, community involvement, etc. (Note: these questions also included those asked of non-Jewish HHs in second section.

In total, over 50,000 respondents were interviewed over a span of approximately four (4) months. The sample was based on a series of national RDD (random digit dialing) surveys conducted through ICR – International Communications Research as part of the EXCEL and ACCESS national telephone omnibus services. The data from each of the approximately fifty (50) independent surveys were aggregated and weighted to reflect current estimates of the US adult population by age, gender, race/ethnicity, education and geographic components of the 48 contiguous States.

As the reader will note, the data resulting from the survey instruments can be examined within the context of households or individual members (population) or both. Consequently, the data sets contain weighting factors developed for each unit of analysis and for making projections to each on a national or other basis.

SAMPLE DESIGN

As mentioned previously, these studies were conducted as part of established, ongoing national telephone omnibus programs. The inherent nature of commercial omnibus surveys provides both advantages and disadvantages from the perspective of preferred survey research practices. Omnibus surveys provide a means of reaching and interviewing extremely large household samples in relatively short periods of time while taking advantage of the shared nature of the high costs of survey research. The economic advantage is offset somewhat by the exigencies of the periodic nature of these surveys; the relatively short field periods and the need for minimal geographic sample stratification and controls necessary to insure minimum sample sizes among population subgroups within those strata, tend to depress response rates somewhat.

A brief description of each of these omnibus services will aid in understanding these issues:

- EXCEL is the research industry's largest telephone omnibus service and has been in continuous operation for over fifteen (15) years. (NOTE: EXCEL served as the Phase I survey vehicle for the 1990 NJPS; as such over 125,000 HHs were screened to identify Jewish HHs which were then re-contacted and administered the full NJPS interview.) EXCEL surveys are fielded at least twice each week, with each survey having a minimum of 1,000 interviews. Approximately one-half of these are Male and one-half Female. The sample employs basic geographic stratification at the Census Division level, with target sample sizes allocated proportionately. Although there is some flexibility in terms of final sample size, it is necessary to adhere fairly closely to the established targets of 50% Male/Female within geographic stratum. Respondents are randomly designated using the Last Birthday Selection Method. The RDD sample utilized is provided by GENESYS Sampling Systems. The field period for each survey is five (5) days – one wave of EXCEL runs Tuesday through Sunday each week, the other Friday through Tuesday, so both include weekends and the call rule is an original plus four attempts.
- ACCESS has a more restricted set of question topics than does the more general and varied nature of EXCEL. ACCESS was designed as primarily an omnibus vehicle focusing on residential telecommunications, entertainment and technology issues. Both are national in representation, although ACCESS targets only about 1,000 completed interviews per week. The other major difference between the two omnibus surveys is in the execution of data collection. ACCESS is an ongoing survey as opposed to periodic, with flexible daily and more rigid weekly sample size targets identical to those of EXCEL. The everyday, ongoing nature of the data collection provides the ability to utilize a single large replicated sample, with additional replicates added as required. Sample stratification and respondent selection procedures are handled identically. Similarly, the RDD sample is supplied by GENESYS Sampling Systems.

In summary, both of the telephone omnibus programs utilize National RDD samples. They were both designed by the same research group and are operated and overseen by ICR personnel. Moreover, EXCEL was the vehicle used in the 1990 NJPS and GENESYS also provided the sample in that survey effort. In addition, the demographic battery embedded within the two omnibus surveys are virtually identical and both incorporate questions to

determine the number of voice lines each residence maintains in order to develop probability of selection adjustments to individual sample records.

The underlying RDD samples used in both omnibus programs are provided by GENESYS Sampling Systems. These *epsem* (equal probability selection mechanism) RDD samples are designed using the latest list assisted methods and are identical to those used almost exclusively by governmental (e.g., the Census Bureau and CDC), social science and academic researchers. The GENESYS RDD sample frame is completely redefined and rebuilt every quarter and incorporates a precisely defined, extremely fine implicit stratification that underlies every individual sample selection, thus minimizing sample variance. The sample frame for each survey was defined as two-digit working blocks in residential exchanges (NPA-NXXs) containing two or more listed telephone households.

SURVEY COMPONENTS AND DATA COLLECTION

The survey and data collection efforts included three distinct phases which corresponded to the gathering of information for distinct sub-samples and questionnaire segments:

- 1) The overall effort was fielded from 2 February 2000 through 7 June 2000. During this five (5) month period a total of 34,295 interviews were conducted in the EXCEL omnibus and 15,987 were conducted through ACCESS. All respondents were screened to determine their religious affiliation, the affiliation of their spouse if any, and as to whether or not anyone else in the HH was Jewish by religion or whether they considered themselves Jewish. All the identified Jewish HHs (n= 1714) were asked a full battery of questions.
- 2) Between 19 April and 7 June, the **Comparative Belief/Secularity** (CB/S) questions were asked of a total of 14,155 non-Catholics.
- 3) From 19 April to 16 May the same Comparative component was administered to 2043 self-identified Catholic respondents.

The individual sub-samples and corresponding questionnaire segments were designed in such a manner as they can be combined in a straightforward manner. The sample of Catholic respondents is a representative subset of all those asked the CB/S questions and the sub-sample asked the CB/S questions is representative of the entire sample. The following section describes the process of combining these samples and the manner in which each subset is can be used analytically.

WEIGHTING AND ESTIMATION

As in many surveys designed to fulfill multiple objectives, the research team finds it necessary to make a series of trade-offs. In this case, there were two critical components of the research design. The first, was the overall sample of Religious Affiliation and the sub-sample of Jewish HHs identified as part of that overall screening process. The second, was the sample of respondents to whom the CB/S questions were administered, which was comprised of a sub-sample of Catholics, with all other respondents being sampled at 100%.

This was actually a very straightforward design with the corresponding weighting and estimation being carried out in a few simple steps.

The initial phase of the process dealt with the entire sample of 50,282 respondents. One of the primary objectives of this survey was to provide estimates of the population by religious affiliation. Consequently it was deemed desirable to reduce the role of geographic variation in these estimates, as many adherents to specific religions are highly concentrated geographically. To accomplish this the data set was post-stratified into the following geographic components:

- l The largest 77 MSAs/PMSAs by central city and non-central city – this resulted in a total of 153 county defined strata (Note: Nassau-Suffolk PMSA contains no central city).
- l The remainder of individual States not included in the above MSAs/PMSA – 48 strata.

For each of the 201 geographic strata, estimates of demographic distributions were then derived from CLARITAS for the following categories: (1) Age within Sex, (2) Race/Ethnicity, (3) and HH income. In addition, estimates of Total HHs and the population 18+ were also secured for each of the geographic strata.

An initial HH weight for each respondent was computed based on the number of voice lines serving their household. This weight is actually the inverse of the number of phone lines as it adjusts for the greater probability of selection households with two, three or more phone lines have, relative to a HH with just one line. (One can easily envision that a sample of random telephone numbers will result in twice the number of households with two lines as one would reasonably expect, as this class has twice the probability of selection.)

A second weight, corresponding to the selection of the adult member is then computed: a household with one adult has weight of 1.0; two adults, 2.0 and so on.

With these initial weights computed, the interviews were segregated into the 201 post-strata and a sample balancing (i.e., raking) routine was initiated within each stratum. This is an iterative process that utilizes the marginal distributions of each of the demographic variables and the corresponding weighted sample variable categories to compute a series of adjustment factors, which successively bring the sample and population demographic distributions into close alignment. The final step in this process is the calculation of simple expansion factors to bring the weighted sample totals within each of the 201 strata to the Total HH and Population 18+ estimates derived previously. Following this process each respondent record contains two weights: one for Household estimates, the other for estimates of the Adult Population.

The next phase in the weighting process involved adjusting for the sub-sampling of all respondents for the CB/S comparative study. One simple alternative here would have been to simply treat these sub-samples as an independent survey, and replicate the weighting process used for the full survey. Although straightforward given that the process and procedures were already in place, the result would have produced estimates of religious group totals and demographic distributions at variance with the total sample. Although the Comparative Study sample was a random subset of the larger, it would have also been subject

to sampling variance. It was decided that this was a complication that should be avoided if possible.

It was decided that a better approach would be to use the larger sample to produce estimates to which the sub-sample could then be adjusted; this would also enable one to treat the Catholic sub-sample directly. The full sample and the CB/S sub-sample were post-stratified into seventeen (17) groups based on religious affiliation as determined in the questionnaire. These strata included the largest religious groups individually (Baptist, Catholic, Lutheran, etc) as well as categories corresponding to None, Refused, etc. Based on the total sample, weighted estimates of Household and Population totals for each religion stratum were created as well as distributions of age, gender, income, race/ethnicity, census region and metropolitan status.

These estimates as well as the CB/S sub-samples were used as input to a similar sample balancing routine as used for the full sample. However, in this case, the input weight for each record corresponded to that resultant weight developed during the full sample weighting process. The process was repeated for each of the seventeen strata created based on religious affiliation. As noted above, the post stratification process treated the Catholic sub-sample directly and independently, correcting for the intended under-sampling.

The final data record for each respondent includes Population and Household weights in the full sample file. For those included in the smaller CB/S comparative study, the data file also includes a set of Household and Population weights developed to produce estimates of Totals and distributions. It should be noted here that all identified Jewish HHs received the CB/S questions. Consequently, they were excluded from this second weighting process. For reference purposes the approximate relative sampling rates for the CB/S study are as follows: Jewish HHs, 100%; non-catholic HHs, 40%; and Catholic HHs, 20%.

USE OF THE WEIGHTING FACTORS.

The correct application of household and population weights can oftentimes be confusing. The choice of one or the other may be determined by the question or variable under consideration, or by the analytic intent. Just a few guidelines and examples may be instructive.

The Population weights produce estimates of people - specifically, people over 18 years of age. In the CB/S comparative study a question is asked to determine the length time respondents have been married. Using the Population Weight will produce an estimate of the number of people married for any given length of time. However, this is not the same as the number of couples, which would be produced by using the HH weight.

Similarly, the number of adults with a specific religious affiliation can be computed by applying the Population Weight. However, there are theoretical problems with using the Household Weight in combination with religious affiliation because that is a respondent variable. Using the Household Weight in this case would be the equivalent of classifying a household based solely on the gender of the respondent and ignoring the fact that HHs can be mixed religions as most contain both males and females.

Demographics present similar difficulties. Income is a household level variable and intuitively one would use the HH Weight to produce a distribution of HH incomes. But one could use the Population Weight to show the distribution of adults with certain HH incomes. These will not be the same because HH income is not perfectly correlated with HH size.

Classifying the sample into subgroups by using a HH level variable (e.g., number of children) does not mean that one then needs to use the HH weight to examine religious affiliation. By using the Population Weight one could then produce estimates of the religious affiliation of adults in HHs with None, One, Two, etc., numbers of children.

In summary, it is critical to explore the relationship between the context of the variable, or variable being used and the resultant base one produces with a given weight.

SURVEY ERRORS

Surveys are subject to a wide variety of errors. Some of these are related to the sampling process itself and the inherent variation one expects from the process of selecting samples of households at random – two samples are never identical, but one can predict the distribution of expected differences one can reasonably expect.

Other errors are of a non-sampling nature: limitations in the sampling frame, non-response biases, etc. These are generally more difficult to quantify since the difference due to non-response, for example, is only directly quantifiable if one has interviewed the non-respondents.

During the weighting and estimation phase one attempts to incorporate and compensate for biases in the sample selection and data collection phases. In some cases, this is fairly straightforward as in the case of HHs with multiple telephone lines – those with fewer lines are under represented relative to those with more lines. Of course, this does not directly address the issue as to whether the proportions of single line, two-line, etc., HHs in the resultant weighted sample are the exact proportion as exist in the general population. In other words, there may be bias because in the data collection process we had more difficulty reaching HHs with a single voice line.

One would expect the weighting and estimation process to compensate for both sampling and non-sampling errors and that is the objective under the assumption that there is no systematic biases introduced by either set of errors. The difference one finds in a sample distribution from what one might expect – say the number of interviews completed in a given State can be a result of either sampling error or non-sampling errors. One can easily correct for this variation from the expected, but to the extent that the shortfall is due to a failure to complete interviews among a distinct subgroup within the State there is the risk of a potential bias in the overall results.

We have taken care here to insure that the final weighted sample is accurately proportioned across critical geographic and demographic variables, but the risk of response and other biases can not be fully reflected in a simple estimate of sampling variability.

SAMPLING VARIABILITY

All sample surveys are subject to sampling errors. Samples always differ from what one would expect if one had measured the entire population. The size of that error is a function of both the sample design and the ultimate sample size. The size of this error is also influenced by the specific weighting process and variation in resultant weights designed to compensate for the non-sampling errors such as non-response.

In addition, we have two samples here: one of approximately 50,000 and one about 17,000. The accompanying standard error tables provide estimates of the sample variability for each data set along with instructions on constructing confidence intervals based on the estimate and the size of the subgroup being examined. These estimates were computed from the weighted sample itself using a balanced replication routine (BRR) across a number of survey variables. Any such table of standard errors is a compromise and an estimate since each survey variable theoretically has its own specific error of measurement and variability.

By examining a range of variables however, one is able to produce an average error, which is then utilized to produce the accompanying table.

n=17,000														
	n=													
1% or 99%		1.26	0.89	0.73	0.63	0.57	0.40	0.25	0.18	0.13	0.10	0.10		
5% or 95%		2.77	1.96	1.60	1.38	1.24	0.88	0.55	0.39	0.28	0.23	0.21		
10 or 90%		3.81	2.69	2.20	1.91	1.70	1.20	0.76	0.54	0.38	0.31	0.29		
20% or 80%		5.08	3.59	2.93	2.54	2.27	1.61	1.02	0.72	0.51	0.41	0.39		
30% or 70%		5.82	4.12	3.36	2.91	2.60	1.84	1.16	0.82	0.58	0.48	0.45		
40% or 60%		6.22	4.40	3.59	3.11	2.78	1.97	1.24	0.88	0.62	0.51	0.48		
50%		6.35	4.49	3.67	3.18	2.84	2.01	1.27	0.90	0.64	0.52	0.49		
n = 50,000														
	n =	100	200	300	400	500	1000	2500	5000	10000	15000	25000	35000	50000
1% or 99%		1.22	0.86	0.70	0.61	0.54	0.38	0.24	0.17	0.12	0.10	0.08	0.06	0.05
5% or 95%		2.66	1.88	1.54	1.33	1.19	0.84	0.53	0.38	0.27	0.22	0.17	0.14	0.12
10 or 90%		3.67	2.59	2.12	1.83	1.64	1.16	0.73	0.52	0.37	0.30	0.23	0.20	0.16
20% or 80%		4.89	3.46	2.82	2.44	2.19	1.55	0.98	0.69	0.49	0.40	0.31	0.26	0.22
30% or 70%		5.60	3.96	3.23	2.80	2.50	1.77	1.12	0.79	0.56	0.46	0.35	0.30	0.25
40% or 60%		5.99	4.23	3.46	2.99	2.68	1.89	1.20	0.85	0.60	0.49	0.38	0.32	0.27
50%		6.11	4.32	3.53	3.05	2.73	1.93	1.22	0.86	0.61	0.50	0.39	0.33	0.27

NOTE: The standard errors in the above tables are expressed as percentage values. If one were looking for the standard error of a survey estimate of 10% with a base size of 5,000, the standard error from the full, 50,000 sample is 0.52%, or 10% +/- 0.52%. From the 17,000 subsample the standard error is 0.54%.

A 95% Confidence interval can be constructed by multiplying the standard error by 1.96; construct a 90% interval by multiplying by 1.645; and 80%, by 1.282. So, a 95% confidence interval for the 10% estimate would be 10% +/- or approximately 9% to 11%.

APPENDIX B

THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questionnaire was administered as a telephone interview within the context of the omnibus survey described above. It was used both to screen the general population in search of qualifying households and to interview respondents from qualifying households.



605 West State Street
Media, Pennsylvania 19063-2620

Job # Q807
Date: February 8, 2001

I N I N T E R N A T I O N A L C O M M U N I C A T I O N S R E S E A R C H

SECULAR INSERT

Now, I have a few questions on another subject.

- JQ-1 What is your religion, if any? (DO NOT READ LIST)
(IF NECESSARY "Whatever religious group you identify with")
- | | |
|---|---|
| 01 Jewish/Judaism | 24 Mennonite |
| 02 Jewish and another religion (Specify_____) | 25 Methodist/Wesleyan |
| 03 Messianic Jew (Jews for Jesus) | 26 Mormon/Latter Day Saints |
| 04 Catholic | 27 Muslim/Islam |
| 05 Protestant | 28 Nazarene |
| 06 Assemblies of God | 29 Pentecostal/Charismatics |
| 07 Baha'i | 30 Presbyterian |
| 08 Baptist | 31 Reformed/Dutch Reform |
| 44 Southern Baptist | 32 Russian Orthodox |
| 45 American Baptist | 33 Scientology |
| 09 Brethren | 34 Seventh Day Adventist |
| 10 Buddhist | 35 Shintoist |
| 11 Christian | 36 Taoist |
| 12 Christian Science | 37 Unitarian |
| 13 Church of God | 38 United Church of Christ/
Congregational |
| 14 Churches of Christ & Christian Churches | 39 Secular |
| 15 Disciples of Christ | 40 Humanist |
| 16 Episcopalian | 41 Ethical culture |
| 17 Evangelical/Born Again Christian | 42 Agnostic |
| 18 Friends/Quaker | 43 Atheist |
| 19 Greek Orthodox | 97 Other religion (SPECIFY)_____ |
| 20 Hindu | NN None |
| 21 Holiness/Holy | RR Refused |
| 22 Jehovah's Witness | |
| 23 Lutheran | |

(ASK IF JQ-1=05)

JQ-1a Which denomination is that? (DO NOT READ)

- 01 Assemblies of God
- 02 Baptist
 - 20 Southern Baptist
 - 21 American Baptist
- 03 Reformed/Dutch Reform
- 04 Brethren
- 05 Church of God
- 06 Churches of Christ & Christian Churches
- 07 Disciples of Christ
- 08 Episcopalian
- 09 Evangelical/Born Again Christian
- 10 Friends/Quaker
- 11 Holiness/Holy
- 12 Lutheran
- 13 Mennonite
- 14 Methodist/Wesleyan
- 15 Nazarene
- 16 Pentecostal/Charismatics
- 17 Presbyterian
- 18 Seventh Day Adventist
- 19 United Church of Christ/ Congregational
- 97 Other (Specify)_____
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

(ASK IF JQ-1=11)

JQ1c Which denomination is that?

- 1 Answer giver_____
- 2 None/Just Christian
- D Don't know
- R Refused

(ASK IF DEM-3=2,3,4,6)

JQ-2 What is your (spouse's/partner's/former spouse) religion, if any (DO NOT READ LIST)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 01 Jewish/Judaism | 24 Mennonite |
| 02 Jewish and another religion (Specify_____) | 25 Methodist/Wesleyan |
| 03 Messianic Jew (Jews for Jesus) | 26 Mormon/Latter Day Saints |
| 04 Catholic | 27 Muslim/Islam |
| 05 Protestant | 28 Nazarene |
| 06 Assemblies of God | 29 Pentecostal/Charismatics |
| 07 Baha'i | 30 Presbyterian |
| 08 Baptist | 31 Reformed/Dutch Reform |
| 44 Southern Baptist | 32 Russian Orthodox |
| 45 American Baptist | 33 Scientology |
| 09 Brethren | 34 Seventh Day Adventist |
| 10 Buddhist | 35 Shintoist |
| 11 Christian | 36 Taoist |
| 12 Christian Science | 37 Unitarian |
| 13 Church of God | 38 United Church of Christ/
Congregational |
| 14 Churches of Christ & Christian Churches | 39 Secular |
| 15 Disciples of Christ | 40 Humanist |
| 16 Episcopalian | 41 Ethical culture |
| 17 Evangelical/Born Again Christian | 42 Agnostic |
| 18 Friends/Quaker | 43 Atheist |
| 19 Greek Orthodox | 97 Other religion (SPECIFY)_____ |
| 20 Hindu | NN None |
| 21 Holiness/Holy | RR Refused |
| 22 Jehovah's Witness | |
| 23 Lutheran | |

(ASK IF JQ-2=05)

JQ-2a Which denomination is that? (DO NOT READ)

- 01 Assemblies of God
- 02 Baptist
 - 20 Southern Baptist
 - 21 American Baptist
- 03 Reformed/Dutch Reform
- 04 Brethren
- 05 Church of God
- 06 Churches of Christ & Christian Churches
- 07 Disciples of Christ
- 08 Episcopalian
- 09 Evangelical/Born Again Christian
- 10 Friends/Quaker
- 11 Holiness/Holy
- 12 Lutheran
- 13 Mennonite
- 14 Methodist/Wesleyan
- 15 Nazarene
- 16 Pentecostal/Charismatics
- 17 Presbyterian
- 18 Seventh Day Adventist
- 19 United Church of Christ/ Congregational
- 97 Other (Specify)_____
- 98 Don't know
- 99 Refused

(ASK IF JQ-2=11)

JQ2c Which denomination is that?

- 1 Answer giver_____
- 2 None/Just Christian
- D Don't know
- R Refused

(IF JQ-1=1 OR 2 OR JQ-2=1 OR 2 SKIP TO SE-1)

JQ-3 Do you or does anyone else in your household have a Jewish mother or a Jewish father?

- | | | |
|---|--------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Yes | ASK JQ-4 |
| 2 | No | SKIP TO JQ-5 |
| 3 | Partly/half Jewish | ASK JQ-4 |
| D | Don't know | SKIP TO JQ-5 |
| R | Refused | SKIP TO JQ-5 |

(ASK IF JQ-3=1 or 3)

JQ-4 Is it you, yourself, someone else in your household, or both you and someone else in your household that has a Jewish mother or father?

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | Respondent only |
| 2 | Other household member only |
| 3 | Both respondent and other household member |
| D | Don't know |
| R | Refused |

(CODE AS JEWISH HOUSEHOLD, SKIP TO SE-18)

JQ-5 Were you, or anyone else in your household raised as Jewish?

- | | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| 1 | Yes | ASK JQ-6 |
| 2 | No | SKIP TO JQ-7 |
| 3 | Partly/both Jewish
and other/part of my childhood | ASK JQ-6 |
| D | Don't know | SKIP TO JQ-7 |
| R | Refused | SKIP TO JQ-7 |

(ASK IF JQ-5=1or 3)

JQ-6 Is it you, yourself, or someone else in your household, or both you and someone else in your household that was raised Jewish?

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | Respondent only |
| 2 | Other household member only |
| 3 | Both respondent and other household member |
| D | Don't know |
| R | Refused |

(CODE AS JEWISH HOUSEHOLD, SKIP TO SE-18)

JQ-7 Do you, or anyone else in your household consider himself/herself to be Jewish?

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | Yes |
| 2 | No |
| 3 | (VOLUNTEERED) Partly/both Jewish and other |
| D | Don't know |
| R | Refused |

(ASK IF YES IN JQ-7)

JQ-8 Is it just you yourself, someone else in your household, or both you and someone else in your household that consider himself/herself to be Jewish?

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | Respondent only |
| 2 | Other household member only |
| 3 | Both respondent and other household member |
| D | Don't know |
| R | Refused |

(IF JQ-1= 01,02 OR JQ-2=01,02 OR JQ3=1,3 OR JQ-5=1,3 OR JQ-7=1 CODE AS JEWISH HOUSEHOLD)

(ASK ALL JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS)

SE-18 What proportion of your closest friends would you say are Jewish? (READ LIST)
(IF NECESSARY: People of Jewish Background)

- 5 All or almost all
- 4 Most
- 3 About half
- 2 Some
- 1 Almost none, or none
- D (DO NOT READ) Don't know
- R (DO NOT READ) Refused

(ASK JEWISH MALES ONLY WHERE (JQ-1 =1 OR 2) OR (JQ-4=1) OR (JQ-6=1))

SE-28 Did you have a Bar Mitzvah when you were a boy?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- D Don't know
- R Refused

(ASK JEWISH FEMALES AGE 18-60 WHERE (JQ-1 =1 OR 2) OR (JQ-4=1) OR (JQ-6=1))

SE-29 Did you have a Bat (Bas)Mitzvah when you were a girl?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- D Don't know
- R Refused

SE-1 When it comes to your outlook, do you regard yourself as:
(READ LIST) (IF NECESSARY: Secular means non-religious)

(ALTERNATE ORDER 5,4,3,2, AND 2,3,4,5)

- 5 Religious
- 4 Somewhat religious
- 3 Somewhat secular, or
- 2 Secular
- 1 (DO NOT READ) I am a little of both (religious and secular)
- D (DO NOT READ) Don't know
- R (DO NOT READ) Refused

SE-3 Do you agree or disagree with the following statements
(READ STATEMENT) (GET ANSWER, THEN ASK: "Do you agree/disagree somewhat or strongly.")

- 4 Agree strongly
- 3 Agree somewhat
- 2 Disagree somewhat
- 1 Disagree strongly
- D Don't know
- R Refused

(ASK b AND c OF WHERE a=4,3)

- a. God exists
- b. God performs miracles
- c. God hears prayers
- d. God helps me

SE-4 Over the course of your life, have you become more or less of a believer in God or the Divine?

- 1 More
- 2 Less
- 3 No change SKIP TO SE-6
- D Don't know SKIP TO SE-6
- R Refused SKIP TO SE-6

(ASK IF SE-4 =1,2)

SE-5 Was the change in your belief associated with any change in your life, such as birth of a child, death in the family, marriage, or other event (READ LIST AGAIN IF NECESSARY TO CLARIFY)

- 1 Birth of a child
- 2 Death in the family/someone you know
- 3 Marriage
- 4 (DO NOT READ) No particular event
- 5 (DO NOT READ) Divorce
- 6 (DO NOT READ) Illness
- 7 Other event (Specify) _____
- D (DO NOT READ) Don't know
- R (DO NOT READ) Refused

SE-6 Earlier you said you were (INSERT ANSWER FROM JQ-1)
Have you ever changed your religious preference?

- 1 Yes ASK SE-7
- 2 No SKIP TO SE-9
- D Don't know SKIP TO SE-9
- R Refused SKIP TO SE-9

(ASK IF SE-6=1)

SE-7 Was the change in religious preference associated with any change in your life, such as birth of a child, death in the family, marriage, or other event? (READ LIST AGAIN IF NECESSARY TO CLARIFY)

- 1 Birth of a child
- 2 Death in the family/someone you know
- 3 Marriage
- 4 (DO NOT READ) No particular event
- 5 (DO NOT READ) Divorce
- 6 (DO NOT READ) Illness
- 7 Other event (Specify)_____
- D (DO NOT READ) Don't know
- R (DO NOT READ) Refused

(ASK IF SE-6=1)

SE-8 What was your religious preference, if any, before you changed?
(DO NOT READ LIST)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 01 Jewish/Judaism | 24 Mennonite |
| 44 Cultural/Secular/Non-religious | 25 Methodist/Wesleyan |
| 45 Humanistic | 26 Mormon/Latter Day Saints |
| 46 Orthodox | 27 Muslim/Islam |
| 47 Conservative | 28 Nazarene |
| 48 Reform | 29 Pentecostal/Charismatics |
| 49 Reconstructionist | 30 Presbyterian |
| 02 Jewish and another religion (Specify_____) | 31 Reformed/Dutch Reform |
| 03 Messianic Jew (Jews for Jesus) | 32 Russian Orthodox |
| 04 Catholic | 33 Scientology |
| 05 Protestant | 34 Seventh Day Adventist |
| 06 Assemblies of God | 35 Shintoist |
| 07 Baha'i | 36 Taoist |
| 08 Baptist | 37 Unitarian |
| 50 Southern Baptist | 38 United Church of Christ/
Congregational |
| 51 American Baptist | 39 Secular |
| 09 Brethren | 40 Humanist |
| 10 Buddhist | 41 Ethical culture |
| 11 Christian | 42 Agnostic |
| 12 Christian Science | 43 Atheist |
| 13 Church of God | 97 Other religion (SPECIFY)_____ |
| 14 Churches of Christ & Christian Churches | NN None |
| 15 Disciples of Christ | RR Refused |
| 16 Episcopalian | |
| 17 Evangelical/Born Again Christian | |
| 18 Friends/Quaker | |
| 19 Greek Orthodox | |
| 20 Hindu | |
| 21 Holiness/Holy | |
| 22 Jehovah's Witness | |
| 23 Lutheran | |

SE-8a - DELETED

(ASK IF RESPONDENT IS JEWISH; JQ-1 FROM SCREENING QUESTIONNAIRE EQUALS CODE 1 OR CODE 2)

SE-9 What branch of Judaism do you identify with, if any?
(DO NOT READ LIST, ENTER AS MANY AS APPLY)

- 01 Cultural/Secular/Non-religious
- 02 Humanistic
- 03 Orthodox
- 04 Conservative
- 05 Reform
- 06 Reconstructionist
- 07 Just Jewish
- 08 Non-Orthodox
- 09 Zionist
- 10 Non-participating
- NN None
- 97 Other (SPECIFY)_____
- DD Don't know
- RR Refused

(ASK IF RESPONDENT IS NOT JEWISH; JQ-1 FROM SCREENING QUESTIONNAIRE DOES NOT EQUAL CODE 01 OR CODE 02)

SE-10 What branch of Judaism does your family/household identify with, if any (DO NOT READ LIST, ENTER AS MANY AS APPLY)

- 01 Cultural/Secular/Non-religious
- 02 Humanistic
- 03 Orthodox
- 04 Conservative
- 05 Reform
- 06 Reconstructionist
- 07 Just Jewish
- 08 Non-Orthodox
- 09 Zionist
- 10 Non-participating
- 97 Other (SPECIFY)_____
- NN None
- DD Don't know
- RR Refused

SE-11 DELETED

(ASK ONLY IF JEWISH WHERE JQ-1=1 OR 2)

SE-12 Do you regard being Jewish for yourself primarily as being part of (INSERT ITEM)?

- 1 Yes
 - 2 No
 - D Don't know
 - R Refused
-
- a. A religious heritage
 - b. A cultural heritage
 - c. An ethnic group
 - d. A racial group
 - e. A people

SE-16 Is anyone in your household currently a member of the following? (READ LIST)

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- D Don't know
- R Refused

(SCRAMBLE)

- a. A synagogue or temple
- b. An independent Havurah (ha vu RAH)
- c. JCC or a Jewish organization (IF NECESSARY:
like Hadassah (ha DA sah) or B'nai Brit (B nay brit))

(ASK ONLY IF JEWISH WHERE JQ-1=1 OR 2)

SE-17 Do you agree or disagree with the following statements. The first/next statement is (READ STATEMENT) (GET ANSWER, THEN ASK: "Do you agree/disagree somewhat or strongly)

- 4 Agree strongly
- 3 Agree somewhat
- 2 Disagree somewhat
- 1 Disagree strongly
- D (DO NOT READ) Don't know
- R (DO NOT READ) Refused

(SCRAMBLE)

- a. I look at the entire Jewish community as my extended family
- b. I relate as easily to non-Jews as to Jews
- c. I feel a special responsibility to help Jews in need around the world

(ASK ONLY THOSE WHO HAVE CHILDREN)

SE-33 Are your children being or going to be raised as Jews?

- 1 Yes SKIP TO SE-19
- 2 No CONTINUE
- D Don't know SKIP TO SE-19
- R Refused SKIP TO SE-19

SE-34 Are they being or going to be raised...
(READ LIST, ACCEPT ONLY ONE MENTION)

- 01 Jewish and something else
- 02 Christian
- 03 Some other religion
- 04 With no religious identification
- 05 Secular, or
- 06 To choose a religious identification for themselves when they grow up
- DD (DO NOT READ) Don't know
- RR (DO NOT READ) Refused

SE-19 How important is it to you, that any grandchildren you have or may have be Jewish? Is it (READ LIST) (IF ANSWER 5,6 OR 7 DO NOT PROBE)

- 4 Very important
- 3 Somewhat important
- 2 Not very important, or
- 1 Not at all important
- 5 (DO NOT READ) I am not going to have children
- 6 (DO NOT READ) I will never/I don't expect to have grandchildren
- 7 (DO NOT READ) They/The grandchildren are Jewish
- N (DO NOT READ) Not sure
- D (DO NOT READ) Don't know
- R (DO NOT READ) Refused

(ASK ONLY IF DEM-3=2,3,4,5,6 AND RESPONDENT 40+ YEARS OF AGE)

SE-19A Do you have any intermarried children?

(IF NECESSARY: Children who are married to somebody with a different religion)

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 (DO NOT READ) Child/Children are not married
- 4 (DO NOT READ) Child/Children are married to somebody with no religion
- 5 (DO NOT READ) I/We do not have children
- D Don't know
- R Refused

(ASK FOR RESPONDENTS OR SPOUSES WHO QUALIFIED AS JEWISH BY RELIGION IN THE SCREENING QUESTIONNAIRE; JQ-1 or JQ-2EQUALS A CODE 01 OR CODE 02)

SE-25 Was your mother or father born Jewish?
(DO NOT READ)

- 1 Yes, only my mother
- 2 Yes, only my father
- 3 Yes, both my mother and father
- 4 No, neither my mother nor my father
- 5 My mother/father half/partly Jewish
- 6 My mother is Jewish but father is half Jewish
- 7 My father is Jewish but mother is half Jewish
- D Don't know
- R Refused

(ASK IF DEM-3=2,3,4,6, AND JQ-1 OR JQ-2 EQUALS A CODE 01 OR CODE 02)

SE-26 Was your (spouse's/partner's/former spouse)mother or father born Jewish?
(DO NOT READ)

- 1 Yes, only HIS/HER mother
- 2 Yes, only HIS/HER father
- 3 Yes, both HIS/HER mother and father
- 4 No, neither HIS/HER mother nor HIS/HER father
- 5 HIS/HER mother/father half/partly Jewish
- 6 Mother is Jewish but father is half Jewish
- 7 Father is Jewish but mother is half Jewish
- D Don't know
- R Refused

(ASK IF DEM-3=2,3,4)

(DO NOT ASK IF BOTH RESPONDENT AND SPOUSE/PARTNER ARE JEWISH WHERE((JQ-1=1 OR 2) OR (J-4=1) AND SPOUSE/PARTNER IS QUALIFIED AS JEWISH ((JQ-2 = 1 OR 2)

SE-27 Do you consider you and your (partner/spouse) to (be/have been) an
(intermarried/interfaith) couple?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- D Don't know
- R Refused

(ASK SE-20 AND SE-21 ONLY INTERFAITH COUPLES-

IF RESPONDENT IS JEWISH BY RELIGION OR BORN JEWISH ((JQ-1=1 OR 2) OR (J-4=1) AND SPOUSE/PARTNER NOT QUALIFIED AS JEWISH AT ALL ((JQ-2 NEQ 1 OR 2)

OR IF [SPOUSE/PARTNER IS JEWISH BY RELIGION OR BORN JEWISH ((JQ-2=1 OR 2) OR JQ-4 =-2,3 OR JQ-6=2,3 OR JQ-8=2,3) AND RESPONDENT IS NOT JEWISH (JQ-1) NEQ 1 OR 2) OR JQ-4 NEQ 1 OR 3 OR JQ-6 NEQ 1 OR 3 OR JQ-8 NEQ 1 OR 3]) OR IF SE 27=1

SE-20 Do you feel that (you/your) (spouse/partner) (were/was) ever encouraged to become Jewish?(IF NECESSARY: from your Jewish relatives or the Jewish community)

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Somewhat
- D Don't know
- R Refused

SE-21 Do you feel that (you/your) (spouse/partner) (were/was) ever encouraged to raise your children Jewish? (IF NECESSARY: from your Jewish relatives or the Jewish community)

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Somewhat
- 4 Don't have any children
- D Don't know
- R Refused

(ASK IF SE-16a =1 AND SE-16b =1; THOSE AFFILIATED WITH SYNAGOGUE/HAVURAH)

SE-22 Is your (synagogue/temple/havurah(ha vu RAH)) affiliated with any branch of Judaism?

- 1 Yes CONTINUE
- 2 No SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE SE-24
- D Don't know SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE SE-24
- R Refused SKIP TO INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE SE-24

(ASK IF SE-16a=1 AND IF SE-22=1)

SE-23a Which branch of Judaism is this synagogue, or temple affiliated?
(DO NOT READ LIST)

- 01 Just Jewish
- 02 Secular/Humanistic
- 03 Orthodox
- 04 Conservative
- 05 Reform
- 06 Reconstructionist
- 07 Not affiliated
- 97 Other (Specify)_____
- DD Don't know
- RR Refused

(ASK IF SE-16b=1 AND IF SE-22=1)

SE-23b Which branch of Judaism is this Havurah affiliated?
(DO NOT READ LIST)

- 01 Just Jewish
- 02 Secular/Humanistic
- 03 Orthodox
- 04 Conservative
- 05 Reform
- 06 Reconstructionist
- 07 Not affiliated
- 97 Other (Specify)_____
- DD Don't know
- RR Refused

(ASK IF SE-16a DOES NOT=1 AND SE-16b DOES NOT =1 THOSE NOT AFFILIATED WITH SYNAGOGUE/HAVURAH)

SE-24 What is your reason for NOT joining a synagogue, a temple, or havurah (ha vu RAH)?
(DO NOT READ LIST) (ALLOW FOR MULTIPLE MENTIONS)

- 01 My child/ren are too young
- 02 My child/ren have completed their Bar/Bat Mitzvah OR have grown up
- 03 My spouse does not want to go
- 04 I do not believe in God/I do not feel comfortable in a synagogue/don't believe the prayers/don't believe in organized religion
- 05 We are an interfaith family/I am not Jewish/Kids are raised in another religion/We belong to a church
- 06 I had a bad experience in a synagogue/bad experience with a rabbi
- 07 It is too expensive
- 08 I am single/not married
- 97 Other (SPECIFY)_____
- DD Don't know
- RR Refused

(ASK IF DEM-3 EQUALS A CODE 3,4)

SE-31 In what year did you get married?
(INTERVIEWER NOTE: CURRENT MARRIAGE ONLY)

_____Enter Year

- DD Don't remember
- RR Refused

(ASK IF SE-31 EQUALS DD, OR RR)

SE-32 How long have you been married?

_____Enter number of years

- LL Less than one year
- DD Don't remember
- RR Refused

(ASK IF SE-9 OR SE-10 IS NOT A CODE 02)

SE-35 Have you ever heard of Secular or Humanistic Judaism?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 (VOL) No, but I would like to know about it
- D Don't know
- R Refused

SE-36 Have you ever been to Israel?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- D Don't Remember
- R Refused

SE-37 How emotionally attached are you to Israel? Are you (READ LIST)

- 4 Very
- 3 Somewhat
- 2 Not very, or
- 1 Not at all attached
- D Don't Know
- R Refused

SE-2 DELETED