

Similarities and Dissimilarities in National and Community Surveys: The Case of American Jews

Uzi Rebhun

The last few decades have witnessed significant progress in the study of American Jewish demography. Two representative national surveys were undertaken at the initiative of the Council of Jewish Federations (Kosmin et al, 1991; Massarik and Chenkin, 1973), other national samples were developed by individual groups and scholars (Cohen, 1983; 1987), and dozens of communities conducted local surveys covering more than three fourths of the total American Jewish population (Phillips, 1993; Tobin, 1989). Several communities have already conducted their second, third or fourth round of data collection (e.g. Boston, Los Angeles, New York). Largely due to the activities of the North American Jewish Data Bank (NAJDB), the National Technical Advisory Committee on Population Studies (NTAC), and several scientific conferences devoted to Jewish population studies (Cohen, Woocher and Phillips, 1984; Winter and Levin, 1984), the more recent studies reveal vast methodological improvement in the designing of samples and questionnaires.

The need for local and national surveys is a consequence of the objective and subjective limitations of each of these data sources. Local surveys are not undertaken simultaneously; due to the dynamic situation of the Jewish community, aggregation of data that were collected a few years apart into a national profile cannot show the overall characteristics of U.S. Jewry at any given time, nor can it show real intercommunity variations. The findings would be biased towards the particular stages of demographic and social transition in which a specific survey caught the surveyed population (Goldstein, 1988). Nor is there any single Jewish community whose characteristics can be used to generalize about a wider regional or countrywide community; previous research has shown that despite common trends, American Jews are a heterogeneous population spread along an extended continuum of demographic, socioeconomic and identificational behaviors (Tobin, 1989).

Internal migration is a key variable effecting the characteristics of the communities of both origin and destination as well as the national distribution. Most individual local surveys provide no information on the people who left — their numbers, where they went or whether they intend to return. On the other hand, a

national survey that does not exceed a few thousand cases cannot provide insights into individual localities except perhaps the very largest, such as New York or Los Angeles (Goldstein, 1988).

Local and national data must be collected separately. An in-depth evaluation of the sociodemographic and identificational processes of an individual community or, in turn, of the national Jewish community, requires at least three types of comparisons (DellaPergola, 1984; Friedman, 1984; Goldstein, 1988; Levin, 1984):

- a) *Follow-up or longitudinal comparison*: most demographic, socioeconomic and identificational characteristics are not static but rather they evolve over time. Such dynamics result, among other things, from the open and competitive nature of American society and the freedom and equality that American Jews enjoy;
- b) *Intercommunity comparison*: each community must provide a context within which it can measure and understand its own exceptionality in relation to other Jewish communities, whether of different or similar size and regional location. Likewise, a comprehensive evaluation of the national situation requires insights into intercommunity variations which can only partially be gained from a national sample.
- c) *Comparison between national and local surveys*: a well designed national study would provide a standard against which local communities can measure their own population and structure. It can also provide some clues to the directions of changes which a local community may anticipate as indicated by the nation-wide developments.

This study concerns itself with such a three-fold comparison. It reports on two independent empirical research-works on American Jews. In the first study, combined data from local surveys of the Jewish communities in Los Angeles County (1979), Greater Philadelphia (1983) and Greater Boston (1985) allowed for inter-community comparisons as well as analysis of the aggregate population of three large-size Jewish communities around 1980. In the second study nation-wide data from the 1970/71 and 1990 National Jewish Population Surveys (NJPS) were merged and compared. Both researches examined the mutual relationship of migration behaviors and patterns of Jewish identification. Hence, viewed together, these two studies allow a further comparison to be made between local and national studies.

Attention here is first directed to similarities and dissimilarities between the various surveys in regard to major methodological aspects of sample design, design of the questionnaire and interviewing methods. This is followed by a comparative examination of demographic characteristics, namely lifetime migration, and selected Jewish identificational variables, namely religious and communal involvement. Finally, I shall examine how the migration-identification relationship changed

between 1970/71 and 1990 on the national level, how this relationship differs among local communities, and how it differs between the local and national scenes.

Methodological Comparisons

Sampling Designs

A crucial decision to be taken at an early stage of planning a survey is how to sample the population. The researcher must choose between a pure probability sample in which every Jewish household in the surveyed area has an equal chance of selection, and a list sample of households known or supposed, a-priori, to be Jewish; the latter may either be membership lists of Jewish institutions, e.g. federation, synagogues, or Jewish organizations, or can be formed according to Distinctive Jewish Names compiled from city directories, telephone books or any other sources accessible to computer technology (Massarik, 1966). Due to the relatively small proportion of Jews among the general population (varying between 2%–3% on the national level to 5%–7% in the large local communities discussed here), a true probability sample with an adequate number of cases would require a large number of contacts, making the study very expensive. By contrast, a list sample has the disadvantage of excluding unlisted Jewish households; such a list would be biased towards the more committed segments of the population who are strongly identified with the organized Jewish community, locally or nationally, as well as toward those who are unmarried (Lazerwitz, 1984).

Table 1 summarizes the major methodological procedures that were applied in the 1970/71 NJPS, the 1990 NJPS and in the communal surveys of Los Angeles County, Greater Philadelphia and Greater Boston. Among the five Jewish surveys examined, three exclusively used probability samples of all households in the community (1990 NJPS, Los Angeles and Philadelphia), while two combined area probability with some kind of list sample (1970/71 NJPS and Boston). Adjustments were made in the two latter surveys to combine the different subgroups of persons directly associated with the Jewish community and the more marginal Jews.

Further, the 1970/71 NJPS is exceptional in that the data collection was conducted personally in face-to-face interviews, while interviews in the other four surveys were made by telephone. Some of the differences in response rates might be due to the different strategies of personal versus telephone interviews with the latter resulting in somewhat higher rates of nonresponse (particularly among elderly and foreign-born persons).

TABLE 1. SYNOPSIS OF MAJOR METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SURVEYS

	National Surveys			Community Surveys	
	1970/71 NIPS ^a	1990 NIPS ^b	1979 Los Angeles County ^c	1983 Greater Philadelphia ^d	1985 Greater Boston
1. Area covered	The entire U.S.	The entire U.S.	The sampling area of L.A. County was all inclusive, with the exception of predominantly black areas in South central L.A. It also included those sections of Ventura County that are contiguous to and from a Jewish extension of the West Valley.	Included the Philadelphia, Montgomery, Bucks and Delaware counties.	Included all cities and towns in the 1980 Boston SMSA, plus additional areas covered by the CJP of Greater Boston, mainly Brockton Metropolitan area.
2. Sampling procedure	A combination of area probability sample, selected by contacting many thousands of households on a door-to door basis, and list sample of contacting households known to be Jewish.	Random Digit Dialed (RDD) telephone interviews, which is a probability sample of all the U.S. Respondents in Alaska and Hawaii were obtained from list samples.	RDD from all households in the sample area.	A two stage probability design of simple random sample, and stratified area samples, aiming to identify neighborhoods with varying concentration of Jewish households.	A combination of RDD of all households in the sampling area, and a sample selection of all telephone numbers from lists maintained by CJP by means of RDD.

<p>3. Data Collection</p>	<p>According to reliable estimates of the Jewish population, the U.S. was divided into 39 strata. Each stratum was further divided into a number of primary sampling units (psu). Area probability samples were selected within each psu and integrated with local federation lists. Face-to-face interviews in respondents' homes provided the data for the study.</p>	<p>Utilizing a single-stage sample of telephone numbers within known residential working banks. Telephone exchanges were ordered according to census geographic units for geographic stratification.</p>	<p>L.A. was divided into five major areas. Areas with low Jewish density were oversampled according to the distribution of residential telephone numbers by prefix.</p>	<p>First, a simple random sample was conducted in which all working telephone numbers had an equal probability of inclusion. The second stage used supplementary stratified area samples targeted at identifiable neighborhood areas with varying concentration of Jewish households. Telephone exchanges which covered predesignated geographic communities and those which yielded relatively large numbers of Jewish households were over-sampled.</p>
<p>4. Definition of "Jewish Household"</p>	<p>If one or more household member was born Jewish, regarded self Jewish, or had a Jewish-born father and/or mother.</p>	<p>If a person living in the household was Jewish, considered self Jewish, was raised Jewish or had a Jewish father/mother.</p>	<p>Regarded self Jewish (as part of the in-depth interview, respondents were asked to state whether raised Jewish, and whether had a Jewish father/mother).</p>	<p>Regarded self Jewish or raised Jewish</p>
<p>5. Sample size</p>	<p>7,179 households, Total Jewish households estimated at 1,950,000; and Jewish population at 5,420,000 (1 household unit in 272)</p>	<p>2,441 households. Total Jewish households estimated at 3,186,000; and Jewish population at 5,515,000 (1 household unit in 1370)^f</p>	<p>800 households of approximately 220,116 Jewish households. Jewish population is estimated at 503,000. (1 household unit in 629)</p>	<p>1,446 households of approximately 100,000 Jewish households. Jewish population is estimated at 228,000. (1 household unit in 69)</p>

TABLE 1. SYNOPSIS OF MAJOR METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SURVEYS (CONT.)

	National Surveys		Community Surveys	
	1970/71 NJPS ^a	1990 NJPS ^b	1979 Los Angeles County ^c	1983 Greater Philadelphia ^d
6. Unit of information	All household members.	Questions on major socio-demographic characteristics referred to respondent and other members of the household. Further, respondents were randomly classified in one of three groups, each being asked on different area of Jewish identity, social services or philanthropy	Similar questions referred to the respondent and spouse. Information on institutional membership, e.g. synagogue or Jewish clubs, was collected for all household members.	Basic socio-demographic questions, including age, sex, education, occupation and marital status referred to all household members. Others, on geographic mobility and organizational membership, were directed only to respondents.
7. Response rate	An overall response rate of 79%; 82% for the sample obtained from federation lists, and 78% for those sample housing units from the area sample.	Approximately 55% in the screening phase. Of all households identified as Jews, 49% resulted in completed interviews (15% refused to participate, in 13% of the cases it was impossible to contact any household member, and 18% failed to requalify, the remainder of the non-response cases were found as non-household or ineligible units, or were classified as unused interviews.	An overall response rate of 82%.	An overall response rate of 73% (ranging from 69% to 75% according to telephone versus in-person interviews, and according to list sample versus area probability).

8. Weighting procedure

Takes into account the disproportional design of marginal Jews and those directly associated with the Jewish community, as well as for the different probability of household to be included because of cut-off of outlying rural areas or areas with no known Jewish population.

The weighting procedure first ensured that key demographic characteristics of the screened households coincide with most current estimates of the same characteristics produced by the Bureau of the Census. Second, a weighting factor was applied to adjust for non cooperating households, for those who failed to requalify, who were not at home when interviewer telephoned, and for households without telephone or with multiple lines. Additional weighting made the weighted totals of completed questionnaires in each phase comport with major characteristics of Jewish households at an earlier phase.

Appropriate weighting scheme was adopted to correct geographic bias due to over-sampling of certain areas; and prefix bias caused by the fact that prefixes with more residences had a greater chance of inclusion in the sample

Weighting for interviews of the first phase takes into consideration the ratio of number of households contacted to the number of households in each county, household size and the number of telephone numbers. For interviews of the second phase, the weighting considers household size, number of telephone numbers and the degree to which strata were over-sampled.

A weighting factor was applied to take into account the different probabilities of inclusion of those addresses that appear on the CJP list versus those not on the list.

- a. Lazerwitz, 1973; 1974; 1978.
- b. Waksberg, 1996
- c. Phillips, 1984; 1986.
- d. Yancey and Goldstein, 1984.
- e. Israel, 1987.
- f. Half a million of these households contained no "core" Jew (Goldstein and Goldstein, 1996). The overall survey sample fraction was calculated on the basis of households with at least one "core" Jew.

Another basic decision that needs to be made concerns who is to be regarded as Jewish, and how the target population within the interviewed households should be defined. The high rates of intermarriage recently characterizing American Jews, the different religious identities given to children of mixed couples, and the increasing numbers of people converting to and from Judaism suggest the use of broad criteria of classification when collecting information, namely the inclusion of individuals with any direct or indirect, past or present attachment to Judaism. A rich data set on the "enlarged" Jewish population (Schmelz and DellaPergola, 1991) will allow inclusion of certain persons for some analyses, along with exclusion for other purposes (Goldstein, 1989). In this regard, the five sample surveys examined here are highly comparable in that they used similar criteria of self-definition to determine inclusion of Jewish persons/households. Additional information on previous self's or parents' orientation to Judaism is provided in the screening phase of both the 1970/71 and 1990 NJPS and the Boston study, and in the in-depth interviews of the Los Angeles and Philadelphia studies.

Differences exist regarding household members for whom information was collected. The 1970/71 NJPS asked a similar set of questions for all household members; by contrast, data collection in the Los Angeles study covered the respondent and spouse, while in Greater Boston only the respondents themselves were covered. In other surveys i.e., Greater Philadelphia, and to some extent also the 1990 NJPS, information on selected sociodemographic and identificational characteristics was collected for all household members while other questions on Jewish behaviors and attitudes were directed solely to the respondents. These differences may create inconsistencies when comparison is made between two or more communities; this is especially true for any comparison involving the 1970/71 NJPS in which respondents were the household heads with a significant excess of males over females (approximately 85% versus 15%). Any comparisons limited to respondents therefore provide results which, for the 1970/71 Jewish population, are biased towards sociodemographic and identificational characteristics of males.

Table 1 also provides insights on the sample size (both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all Jewish households in the surveyed area), response rate, and a brief description of the weighting procedures. While the number of cases hardly effects simple cross-classification analysis, it does effect significance tests as well as results derived from multivariate analysis. To avoid such biases in inter-community or follow-up comparisons, we applied a supplementary "proportional weighting factor" (PWF) aimed at increasing/decreasing the number of cases in the relevant surveys to comply with the actual differentials in Jewish population size. The PWF should equally effect each of the cases in a given survey file. For example, the sample in Los Angeles County was half the size of each of the samples of Greater Philadelphia and Greater Boston, while in reality Los Angeles Jewry is twice as large as each of the latter communities. For purposes of multivariate analysis of an integrated data file of the three local communities, I calculated a PWF for Los Angeles which increased the sample to twice the number of cases in Philadelphia and Boston. Likewise, in comparing the 1970/71 NJPS with the 1990 NJPS I

diminished the number of cases of the former to reflect the actual differentials between the two Jewish populations. If the investigation focuses on a certain subgroup among the sampled population (e.g. native-born), both the numerators and denominators for calculating PWF should reflect the actual size of the specific subgroup. Overall, when $x_1 \dots x_n$ samples are given, the proportion of a specific sample within the total cases of all samples should be:

$$x_{i\text{pro}} = \frac{X_i}{\sum X_1 \dots X_n} * 100$$

where X_i is the actual number of Jews in the community.

Questionnaire

The design of a questionnaire reflects the areas which are to be investigated, and the relative importance that the survey's planners attribute to the different topics seen in the amount of time and space devoted to each of them (Cohen, 1984; Lazerwitz, 1984). Among the planners themselves there are those who would argue in favor of collecting more information on the use of, and satisfaction about social services, while others would emphasize the importance of sociodemographic and identificational characteristics. Moreover, among the latter there might be different opinions about priorities to be given to different areas e.g., migration, economic characteristics, family characteristics, etc. Both the length of questionnaire and the wording of questions largely depend on the strategy of data collection whether by telephone, face-to-face interview or a mail-back questionnaire. As mentioned earlier, with the exception of the 1970/71 NJPS, in all other surveys data collection was conducted by telephone.

Table 2 presents a list of 55 variables which were included in both the 1970/71 and 1990 NJPS. The list encompasses a wide array of demographic, social and economic characteristics and of specific Jewish behaviors. Whereas it largely overlaps with the list introduced in Tobin and Lipsman's compendium (Tobin and Lipsman, 1984), the list given here includes more geographic variables and more Jewish identification and ritual observances. On the other hand, special issues which appear in the compendium but were not relevant to our research works, such as antisemitism, were omitted. The considerable amount of standard information obtained from the two national surveys — some after thorough efforts of adjustment — serves as a promising starting point for follow-up research on the American Jewish population in the last two decades. For some variables, there is also a satisfactory capability for inter-community comparison and for comparison between local communities and the national community. This applies mainly to the demographic variables as all five surveys covered key sociodemographic questions on age, sex, household size, marital status, education, occupation, labor force, and income.

TABLE 2. VARIABLES IN NATIONAL AND LOCAL JEWISH SURVEYS

	National Surveys		Local Surveys		
	1970/71 NJPS	1990 NJPS	1979 L.A.	1983 Phila- delphia	1985 Boston
<i>Sociodemographic Variables</i>					
Age	X	X	X	X	X
Sex	X	X	X	X	X
Household size	X	X	X	X	X
Marital status	X	X	X	X	X
No. of marriages	X	X	X	X	X
Secular education	X	X	X	X	X
Occupation	X	X	X	X	X
Type of employment	X	X	X	X	X
Household income	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Jewish Origin Variables</i>					
Current religion	X	X	X	X	X
Religion at birth	X	X	X		
Religion raised	X	X		X	X
Conversion	X	X	X	X	
Parents' religion(s)	X	X	X	X	X
Spouse's religion	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Geographic Variables</i>					
Place of birth	X	X	X	X	X
Year came to U.S.	X	X		X	X
Mother's place of birth	X	X	X	X	
Father's place of birth	X	X	X	X	
No. grandparents born in U.S.	X	X	X		
State of current residence	X	X			
Zip code of current residence	X	X	X	X	X
Country size	X	X			
Year moved to current city	X	X	X	X	X
Year moved to current address	X	X	X	X	
Status of previous residence	X	X		X	
Previous State of residence	X	X	X		
5 years mobility status	X	X			X
State lived 5 years ago	X	X			
Home ownership	X	X	X	X	X
Moving plans	X	X	X	X	X
Status of future migration	X	X	X		X
State/Country moved to	X	X	X	X	X
Spend 2 months away	X	X			
State/Country spend away	X	X			

TABLE 2. VARIABLES IN NATIONAL AND LOCAL JEWISH SURVEYS (CONT.)

	National Surveys		Local Surveys		
	1970/71 NJPS	1990 NJPS	1979 L.A.	1983 Phila- delphia	1985 Boston
<i>Jewish Identification Variables</i>					
Jewish denomination	X	X	X	X	X
Synagogue membership	X	X	X	X	X
Importance of being Jewish	X	X			
Bar/Bat Mitzvah	X	X		X	
Type of Jewish education	X	X		X	X
Light candles on Friday	X	X			
Buy kosher meat	X	X			X
Use separate dishes	X	X		X	X
Fast on Yom Kippur	X	X		X	X
Religious service attendance	X	X		X	X
Attend Seder	X	X		X	X
Light Hanukkah candles	X	X		X	X
General organizational membership	X	X	X		
Jewish organizational membership	X	X	X	X	X
Subscribe to Jewish periodicals	X	X	X	X	
Visited Israel	X	X		X	
Plan to visit Israel	X	X			
Jewish friends	X	X	X	X	X
Jewish neighborhood	X	X	X		
Contribution to Jewish Charities	X	X	X	X	X

An attempt to compare patterns of geographic mobility encounters several obstacles. The data from all five surveys provide adequate basis for comparison of lifetime migration through questions on place of birth and place of current residence. However, only the national studies and the Greater Boston study requested place of residence five years prior to the survey. Hence, neither five-year mobility nor repeat movement can be comprehensively compared. Further, information on five-year migration status for Greater Boston omits the name of the state of origin of the migrants. As far as future mobility is concerned, all surveys indicate the likelihood of moving, but in-depth comparison is limited since the Greater Philadelphia study didn't ask for likely destination.

Some limitations also exist for comparing patterns of Jewish identification. As Table 2 shows, only five Jewish identificational variables were included in the two national and three communal surveys: current denomination, synagogue membership, membership in Jewish organizations, proportion of Jewish friends, and philanthropy. While the two national surveys yielded 21 comparable identification variables, only 8 of them were included in the Los Angeles County study, 14 in the Greater Philadelphia study and 12 in the Greater Boston study.

It should be noted that comparisons quite often required preliminary adjustments and regrouping of categories of variables. This operation involved four types of adjustment, the easiest being a change of value labels to a uniform format. Another type of adjustment was the merger of two, or even three, variables in a certain survey in order to gather information which in another survey was covered by a single question. For example, in the 1970/71 NJPS a single question on place of birth provided both the specific state of birth for native born Jews and the country of birth for the foreign borns. The same information in the 1990 NJPS was collected using a separate question on country of birth followed by a question directed only to native borns on the specific state of birth. Likewise, the earlier national study asked whether a person was married, and for the non-married an additional question was asked as to whether the person was divorced, separated or widowed. All this information was collected in the 1990 NJPS by a single question on marital status.

In bringing variables to a common format, we sometimes had to ignore detailed information. Although not discussed in this article, the variable on visits to Israel demonstrates this type of adjustment. The 1970/71 NJPS dichotomized those who did not visit Israel and those who did, while in the 1990 NJPS the latter were listed according to the number of visits; hence, we had to regroup into a single category all persons in the 1990 study who visited Israel. Another type of adjustment was carried out when the labels describing the intensity of Jewishness were not uniform. Such was the case with the question on the proportion of friends who are Jews. Both the 1970/71 and 1990 NJPS distinguished between those with none, few, some, most, or all/almost all Jewish friends. Each of the community surveys adopted a slightly different classification. The division in the Los Angeles survey was between none, almost none, some, most, or all; in Philadelphia between none, just a few, less than half, half, about half, nearly all or all; and in Boston between most friends not Jews, half Jews, most Jews, or all Jews. Several tests, including crosstabulations with other identificational variables, provided the basis for regrouping of categories to maximize inter-survey comparison.

Substantive Comparisons

Lifetime Migration

Despite various limitations, the data sets do provide for sufficient and adequate comparability. Attention is first directed to levels of lifetime migration among the total American Jewish population. The findings in the upper part of Table 3 point to a substantial increase in the tendency of Jews to move between states: while in 1970/71, 29.1% of all native born adults (aged 18 and over) lived outside of their state of birth, this was true for 52.3% of their counterparts in 1990. This recent figure suggests that every second adult Jew in the U.S. today lives in a state other than that in which he or she was born.

TABLE 3. LIFETIME MIGRATION STATUS, BY AGE — JEWS AGED 18 AND OVER (PERCENTAGE)

Age	Lifetime Migration Status					Different State/area of U.S. born
	Total	(N)	Same State/area ^a	Different State/area ^a	Foreign Born	
<i>1970/71 NJPS^b</i>						
Total	100.0	(12,605)	56.9	23.3	19.8	29.1
18-24	100.0	(2,143)	79.0	13.8	7.2	14.9
25-44	100.0	(3,718)	65.5	26.6	7.9	28.9
45-64	100.0	(4,578)	52.3	29.3	18.4	35.9
65+	100.0	(2,166)	25.9	17.3	56.8	40.1
<i>1990 NJPS^c</i>						
Total	100.0	(1961)	43.6	47.7	8.7	52.3
18-24	100.0	(140)	54.2	38.9	6.9	41.5
25-44	100.0	(941)	42.0	50.9	7.2	54.8
45-64	100.0	(432)	45.4	47.0	7.6	50.9
65+	100.0	(448)	39.7	46.7	13.6	54.0
<i>1979 Los Angeles^c</i>						
Total	100.0	(800)	17.1	60.4	22.5	77.9
18-24	100.0	(60)	49.0	38.9	12.1	44.4
25-44	100.0	(347)	25.1	59.8	15.1	70.4
45-64	100.0	(276)	7.2	73.7	19.1	91.1
65+	100.0	(117)	0.9	41.0	58.1	97.8
<i>1983 Philadelphia^c</i>						
Total	100.0	(1,389)	67.0	23.0	9.9	25.6
18-24	100.0	(85)	47.1	49.4	3.5	51.2
25-44	100.0	(532)	68.1	25.9	6.0	27.6
45-64	100.0	(479)	73.3	18.8	7.9	20.4
65+	100.0	(293)	60.8	17.1	22.1	21.9
<i>1985 Boston^c</i>						
Total	100.0	(1,382)	49.7	41.0	9.3	43.7
18-24	100.0	(125)	37.6	56.8	5.6	60.2
25-44	100.0	(649)	40.7	52.7	6.6	56.4
45-64	100.0	(379)	65.2	27.0	7.8	29.3
65+	100.0	(229)	55.9	22.7	21.4	28.9

a. For national surveys 'same state' for local surveys 'same area'. It should be noted that immigration to the local communities often reflects a meaningful geographic distance. Of those who were identified as migrants, as many as 97% in Los Angeles County and 90% in Greater Boston were interstate migrants (the data of the greater Philadelphia study do not distinguish between persons born outside of the Greater Philadelphia area within Pennsylvania and those who moved from other States).

b. All household members aged 18 and over.

c. Respondents only.

While the act of migration is more characteristic of young adults than older persons — despite the selective movement among the latter around retirement age — the opportunity to participate in lifetime migration increases with age (Lee, 1966). Thus, the supposedly lower percentage of young persons having migrated should gradually increase among the older segments of the population. The findings from the 1970/71 study largely coincide with this assumption: 14.9% of U.S. born Jews aged 18–24 were living outside their state of birth, against 28.9% of the 25–44 age group, 35.9% among age group 45–64, and 40.1% among the elderly (65 and over). By 1990, the age-lifetime migration relationship had weakened somewhat; a substantial increase occurred between ages 18–24 and 25–44 after which the level remained beyond half of the population with only slight fluctuations between age groups. This pattern suggests that for the Jewish population of 1990, a strong propensity to migrate already existed early in the life cycle which was probably associated with acquiring academic education and the subsequent move into the job market.

Considerable variation was found between the Jewish communities of Los Angeles, Philadelphia and Boston in relation to lifetime migration status (Table 3). The findings show a higher proportion of migrants in Los Angeles of over three-fourths, as compared to approximately one-fourth in Philadelphia and less than half in Boston. Moreover, the direction of change in the percentage of lifetime migrants across the age cohorts differs from one community to another. In Los Angeles, a relatively recent area of massive Jewish settlement, the percentage of migrants sharply increased from 44.4% among the youngest to almost all those above the age of 65. By contrast, in Philadelphia and in Boston the rate of migration reached a peak at the youngest age cohort after which it declined. To a large extent, this reflects the very particular character of Philadelphia and Boston as leading academic centers which attract many young adults. The high rate of immigrants at ages 25–44 in Boston is most likely associated with the accelerated economic development and the wide range of high-technology industries which operate as a holding factor for many of the alumni, at least as a first experience of professional work. Boston is also likely to attract many graduates of universities from other parts of the United States.

A comparative examination of all five sets of data shows that no single community can adequately represent the national profile; there are real differences between the mobility profiles of each community and the national scene. This is true for the overall lifetime migration rate as well as for specific age groups. The time gap between the local and national surveys calls for further caution. However, had the local surveys been carried out closer to 1970/71, or to 1990, I still doubt that we would see data significantly closer to the NJPS results.

Jewish Identification

In the past, Jewish identity was strongly anchored in religious behavior, ritual observance, and traditional Orthodox identification with "...detailed patterns of prescribed actions and fixed roles" (Medding, Tobin, Fishman and Rimor, 1992.

p.16). Jewish identity was multifaceted (Goldstein and Goldscheider, 1968; Lenski, 1963), and the collective boundaries and group membership were rigidly defined.

Secularization and acculturation, as well as the weakening role of religion as a formative factor, have significantly transformed Jewish cultural behavior in contemporary American society. As they became more "Americanized", Jews also became less religious; they "view[ed] religion as less central in their lives, and mold[ed] their religious observances to fit in with the dominant American culture" (Goldscheider, 1986. p. 151). Traditional religious expression remained essential for some Jews, but for the vast majority Jewishness today is a combination of secular and cultural elements that include home-centered rituals, social connections, community involvement and both interpersonal and institutional contacts with Israel.

In this study, I juxtapose four indicators of Jewish identification which encompass both religious and social dimensions, and are assumed to represent different strategies for ensuring Jewish vitality and continuity. These indicators are:

- a) *Ideological orientation*, as expressed by denominational preference. This self-definition is not necessarily formalized by ideological affiliation. A distinction was made here between Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and Other, the latter including Jews who lack any ideological orientation;
- b) *Synagogue/temple membership*, as a proxy for religiosity. This variable distinguishes between those who reported synagogue membership and those who did not;
- c) *Jewish charitable donations*. Established and organized fundraising is evidence of cohesion and a well integrated Jewish community. Conversely, not giving suggests loose bonds between individuals and the community (Cohen, 1980). Those who donated to Jewish causes during the twelve months prior to the (specific) survey were distinguished from those who did not;
- d) *Jewish friendship networks*. Individuals were classified according to the proportion (all, most, some, none) of their (closest) friends who were Jews.

The ideological preferences of the total American Jewish population and those of the three local communities are reported in Table 4. In 1990, 5.8% of American Jewish adults identified as Orthodox showing a significant decline to about half the level of 1970/71. Conservative Jews also experienced a substantial decrease from 43.9% to 34%. As opposed to the data of the 1970/71 NJPS, the relative majority (36.8%) of Jews in 1990 defined themselves as Reform. Perhaps the most salient and meaningful change is the sharp increase in the percentage of Jews who did not identify with any of the major denominations from 12.9% to 23.4%. Generally, the direction of change was similar among all age groups.

TABLE 4. SELECTED INDICATORS OF JEWISH IDENTIFICATION, BY AGE — NATIVE BORN JEWS AGED 18 AND OVER (PERCENTAGE)

Number of Cases		Denomination				Synagogue	Jewish	Jewish Friends			
		Orth.	Cons.	Reform	Other	Member-ship Yes	Charity Yes	All	Most	Some	None
<i>1970/71 NJPS</i>											
Total	12497	10.8	43.9	32.4	12.9	48.2	41.9	29.6	45.4	24.7	0.3
18-24	2099	7.5	44.9	32.8	14.8	50.4	36.5	27.1	45.1	27.7	0.1
25-44	3738	5.6	41.5	37.6	15.3	44.5	36.0	24.2	46.2	29.4	0.2
45-64	4581	10.4	46.7	31.0	11.9	52.1	46.1	30.6	45.8	23.1	0.5
65+	2079	24.0	41.4	25.7	8.9	44.6	49.1	40.4	42.6	16.7	0.3
<i>1990 NJPS</i>											
Total	1897	5.8	34.0	36.8	23.4	32.7	34.4	11.9	27.0	53.5	7.6
18-24	128	7.6	31.9	26.3	34.2	39.0	15.4	4.9	26.2	56.9	12.0
25-44	913	4.3	28.9	41.2	25.6	26.7	22.3	7.1	20.4	63.5	9.0
45-64	420	4.1	33.9	38.2	23.8	36.6	41.6	14.5	29.6	49.9	6.0
65+	436	10.3	45.7	29.2	14.8	39.7	58.6	21.4	38.9	34.8	4.9
<i>1979 Los Angeles</i>											
Total	762	5.7	30.8	31.8	31.7	25.3	63.4	26.7	36.0	27.3	10.0
18-24	56	1.6	19.4	31.8	47.2	18.6	34.7	12.6	29.4	41.9	16.1
25-44	329	3.5	27.6	37.6	31.3	24.1	51.4	16.8	36.0	36.1	11.1
45-64	266	3.6	34.3	34.3	27.8	27.7	80.3	34.0	39.7	16.9	9.4
65+	111	17.9	27.1	32.0	23.0	26.8	65.7	45.8	29.6	17.9	6.7
<i>1983 Philadelphia</i>											
Total	970	4.3	41.8	24.9	29.0	44.2	83.4	13.9	52.1	26.0	8.0
18-24	43	1.2	23.5	27.1	48.2	37.6	62.8	2.4	30.6	51.7	15.3
25-44	411	2.6	34.5	28.4	34.5	43.3	75.7	5.5	48.2	35.7	10.6
45-64	345	2.9	47.4	24.0	25.7	46.6	92.8	14.6	59.1	21.1	5.2
65+	173	10.6	51.0	19.2	19.2	43.7	88.4	31.5	54.0	9.0	5.5
<i>1985 Boston</i>											
Total	1292	5.2	36.5	41.3	17.0	47.1	95.8	6.7	44.6	35.2	13.5
18-24	118	1.7	39.0	37.3	22.0	47.2	90.8	3.2	25.6	40.8	30.4
24-44	627	3.2	30.8	45.0	21.0	34.2	95.4	2.3	37.3	43.5	16.9
45-64	353	4.5	42.7	41.6	11.2	59.6	97.5	7.9	55.6	28.8	7.7
65+	194	13.4	40.9	33.2	12.5	62.4	96.9	18.3	57.0	20.0	4.7

a. Minimum number of cases

Significant differences appeared between Los Angeles, Philadelphia and Boston. In 1979, Los Angeles' Jewry was characterized by a nearly balanced distribution among Conservative, Reform and Other with each group constituting 31%–32% of the local Jewish population. By contrast, in Philadelphia the majority of the Jews identified as Conservatives (41.8%) with the Reform constituting one-fourth. Los Angeles and Philadelphia did not differ greatly from each other in the percentage of

Orthodox Jews, at one end of the ideological spectrum, and of Other, on the other end. Boston Jews were more heavily oriented toward Reform, and overall included a smaller share of Jews not identified with one of the major ideological movements. Substantial inter-community variations obtained among the different age groups. Dissimilarities existed not only between local communities; salient differences were found between local ideological profiles and those of the national Jewish population.

Parallel to the shift in their ideological orientation, American Jews also experienced a decline in synagogue membership: from approximately half in 1970/71 to one-third in 1990. This trend was observed among all age groups (Table 4). As for the individual communities, a quarter of Los Angeles Jews held membership in a synagogue, half the proportion of the national level of 1970/71, and seven percent lower than the proportion of the national community in 1990. The proportion of synagogue membership in Philadelphia and Boston resembled that of the total American Jewish population of 1970/71. The inference is that Philadelphia and Boston Jews were comparatively slower at weakening formal ties to Jewish religious institutions.

When comparing the philanthropic patterns of different Jewish populations and across age groups, it is important to note that previous research found that personal income does not effect the act of giving but only the amount given (Cohen, 1980). The findings reported in Table 4 show that 41.9% of the 1970/71 Jewish population contributed to Jewish causes in the twelve months prior to the survey. By 1990, this level had declined to 34.4%. These national profiles differed greatly from some of the major local communities in which the propensity to contribute varied from 63.4% in Los Angeles to an almost universal level of 95.8% in Boston. Likewise, the various Jewish populations differed in their philanthropic behavior by age; whereas among the national population, the rate gradually increased from lower to higher age, in Los Angeles and Philadelphia the proportion of contributors increased up to the age group 45-64 after which a decline was observed. In Boston, beyond the age of 25 the level of charitable giving remained fairly stable. These findings suggest that philanthropic giving is largely associated with stages in the life-cycle, reaching a peak among the more aged population. The Jewish population of Greater Boston is exceptional in that also young Jews appeared to be highly committed to the financial well-being of their own community and of the wider Jewish institutional system.

The intensity of informal interaction among Jews in the U.S. weakened substantially, as is seen in the proportion of Jewish friends. The percentage of those Jews who reported that all of their closest friends were Jews declined from 29.6% in 1970/71 to 11.9% in 1990, and those most of whose friends were Jews declined from 45.4% to 27%. Likewise, by 1990 there was a relatively large proportion of Jews with no Jewish friends at all. These trends, which characterized all age groups, were probably associated with the increasing tendency to acquire an academic education which exposes young Jews to a non-Jewish environment of intense social activity, to more frequent passages from self-employed to employee, and to the

increase in rates of mixed-marriage. Further, each community had its specific characteristics and differences from the national profile. In Los Angeles, the distribution between the various proportions of Jewish friends was more balanced while in Philadelphia and Boston, for the overwhelming majority most or some friends were Jews. From this point of view, Los Angeles was more similar to the national profile in 1970/71, while Philadelphia and Boston more closely resembled the national profile of 1990. Part of the explanation for the stronger social networks among Los Angeles Jewry may be hidden in the high numbers of new migrants, both internal and international, for whom the organized Jewish community or Jewish individuals are a major vehicle of absorption in the new place of residence.

Migration-Identification Relationships

Table 5 reports on the proportion of Jews living in their place of birth according to different patterns of Jewish behavior. As to the relationships between migration and ideological orientation, the findings from the 1970/71 NJPS show a substantial drop in the proportion living in their native state among the Reform as compared to the Conservative. With only one minor exception, all Orthodox and Conservative age cohorts had higher percentages of natives than did the Reform and nondenominational Jews, who were more likely to be migrants from outside their current state of residence. By 1990, only the Orthodox maintained relatively high levels of geographic stability with slightly more than 70%, regardless of age, reporting they were born in their current state of residence. The proportion dropped significantly with negligible variations between the Conservative, the Reform and the nonaffiliated. Likewise, while in 1970/71 among all age groups the nonaffiliated were less likely to be natives of the state of residence than the Conservatives, by 1990 we observe the opposite: with the exception of ages 45–64, the nonaffiliated displayed a higher proportion of native born than the Conservatives.

An attempt to examine inter-community variations was limited by the fact that there were too few cases of Orthodox Jews within many of the age groups. Nevertheless, the available data point to a different relationship between lifetime migration and denomination in each of the three communities. The percentages of those who always lived in Los Angeles were higher among the nondenominational than among the Orthodox, Conservative or Reform Jews; this was true both for the total Jewish adults as well as for each age group separately (with the exception of ages 45–64). In Boston, the nondenominational displayed the lowest percentages of state natives.

Because synagogue/temple membership is strongly connected to the local scene, both the direction and extent of any change in its relation with migration status over the last twenty years is very meaningful. While in 1970/71, within each age group, the percentage of state natives was higher among those reporting non-membership, in 1990 the opposite was apparent: geographic stability was positively correlated with synagogue or temple affiliation. A higher percentage of natives among synagogue members was also evident among the Jewish populations of Los Angeles

TABLE 5. PERCENTAGE LIVING IN STATE/AREA OF BIRTH BY JEWISH IDENTIFICATION, AND BY AGE — NATIVE BORN JEWS AGED 18 AND OVER

Age	Denomination				Synagogue Membership		Jewish Charity		Jewish Friends			
	Orth.	Cons.	Reform	Other	Yes	No	Yes	No	All	Most	Some	None
<i>1970-71 NJPS^a</i>												
Total	75.6	74.6	63.4	65.0	66.2	71.9	68.9	68.6	69.8	63.6	60.6	47.9
18-24	86.4	87.2	83.9	83.2	83.8	86.1	84.7	84.9	86.8	81.1	84.0	(x)
25-44	69.8	78.3	67.8	61.5	69.3	72.7	71.4	70.7	72.3	67.0	60.7	(x)
45-64	78.8	66.8	53.5	56.9	58.7	65.4	61.3	61.1	63.1	55.0	51.3	24.0
65+	62.6	67.3	44.4	63.6	48.5	63.9	60.3	53.6	53.7	51.5	38.4	(x)
<i>1990 NJPS^b</i>												
Total	71.9	45.7	45.9	43.6	52.7	43.7	48.5	44.7	51.5	53.2	44.3	41.6
18-24	(x)	55.6	62.6	62.5	61.9	55.5	63.6	55.2	(x)	58.8	62.0	52.3
25-44	73.2	42.7	44.4	44.2	51.3	43.1	46.1	45.0	48.6	55.9	42.3	42.0
45-64	74.8	57.4	49.4	29.0	53.4	45.1	54.1	40.4	49.3	62.0	45.7	33.1
65+	71.2	38.6	41.3	50.1	51.0	39.8	44.8	41.2	53.7	41.6	42.0	40.9
<i>1979 Los Angeles^b</i>												
Total	13.2	18.5	21.5	26.0	23.9	21.2	18.7	26.8	15.0	23.0	22.8	28.6
18-24	(x)	54.3	53.4	61.8	62.2	54.8	42.9	63.0	52.9	64.5	50.5	55.9
25-44	24.1	31.1	27.5	31.0	32.3	28.2	32.3	27.2	29.2	32.2	26.5	31.3
45-64	(x)	6.3	11.2	7.5	12.6	7.4	9.5	7.0	11.5	8.2	3.5	16.4
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.8	2.7	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	(x)
<i>1983 Philadelphia^b</i>												
Total	69.2	79.0	72.8	69.7	73.7	75.0	74.9	67.1	78.9	79.2	67.6	62.3
18-24	(x)	40.0	47.8	55.3	54.8	45.1	46.2	53.3	(x)	52.0	41.2	53.9
25-44	(x)	78.4	71.8	67.9	71.9	72.8	71.8	65.6	76.2	78.3	67.8	63.2
45-64	(x)	81.0	81.9	75.0	76.6	82.3	80.1	79.2	79.7	81.6	76.6	66.7
65+	80.0	83.2	67.3	75.6	77.8	78.2	75.2	70.6	78.8	81.1	73.7	(x)
<i>1985 Boston^b</i>												
Total	61.2	61.7	56.9	32.8	62.4	48.1	55.2	39.2	71.2	60.6	46.7	52.6
18-24	(x)	47.8	41.5	29.2	46.4	33.8	42.2	27.3	(x)	48.3	33.3	43.2
25-44	42.9	46.9	48.4	27.6	51.5	39.5	43.5	40.4	(x)	46.3	39.7	47.6
45-64	93.3	76.8	69.1	37.5	71.8	69.0	72.2	(x)	84.0	73.3	61.2	81.5
65+	47.3	76.0	75.0	63.2	73.2	67.6	71.4	(x)	73.9	69.9	79.4	(x)

* Fewer than 10 cases.

a. All household members aged 18+.

b. Respondents only.

and Boston. Conversely, the type of relationship between lifetime migration status and synagogue/temple membership for Jews in Philadelphia more closely resembled that of the national Jewish population in 1970/71, although with somewhat marginal differentiations between movers and non-movers.

To the extent that philanthropic giving is another indicator of community attachment and integration, it is not at all surprising, and quite supportive of our previous observations, that while in 1970/71 givers and non-givers had similar percentages of state natives, by 1990 there were clearly more state natives among those who gave. In most age groups, migration was associated with a weaker tendency to contribute to Jewish charities also among the Jewish communities of Los Angeles, Philadelphia and Boston.

Finally, we look at the relationship between migration status and the proportion of close friends who are Jews. For 1970/71, low percentages of native born are associated with smaller proportions of Jewish friends. This is true both for the total population and for each age group separately. That migration is associated with disruption of informal Jewish networks is supported by the data from the 1990 study: although the patterns are not very consistent, those with fewer Jewish friends tend less to be natives of their current state of residence. The Jewish community of Boston provides some clues to variations that exist between the local and national scenes. Based on the 1985 study, the findings for the middle ages of 25–44 and 45–64 show higher percentages of local born among those with no Jewish friends as compared to those in social circles mostly consisting of Jews.

Summary and Conclusions

Despite our success in creating a uniform data set from five independently conducted Jewish surveys, several methodological differences exist in the definition of the target population, the sampling design, and the wording of questions. It is difficult to assess the extent to which the results are biased due to different methodologies. Moreover, in the inter-community comparisons, the time gaps between local surveys may have influenced the findings. Nevertheless, I believe that the results reflect real differences in behavioral patterns of the Jewish populations discussed here. Over the last twenty years (1970–1990), American Jews experienced rapid sociodemographic and identificational changes. The intensity of these processes varied from place to place; the unique history and circumstances of each locale led to significant differences between the respective Jewish communities.

We have here focused on the relatively narrow topics of lifetime migration and Jewish identification, and on their mutual relationships. Since geographic mobility is often a response to wider sociodemographic and economic trends, the unique level of migration of each population is likely to reflect differences in education, occupation, income, marital status, etc. Similarly, the social and cultural behavior of Jews is influenced by processes evolving throughout American society. Although these relationships are more difficult to quantify, between 1970 and 1990 America

changed enormously overall, and different areas experienced different kinds of change.

Although not presented here, a series of multivariate analyses shows that the particular community of residence is statistically significant as an explanatory variable of the variations in Jewish identification, after controlling for key sociodemographic variables (Rebhun, 1992). For the national Jewish population, a multivariate analysis of a merged file of the 1970/71 and 1990 studies suggests that "time" plays a leading role in the changing demographic and identificational patterns of American Jews (Rebhun, 1997). "Time" reflects modernization, and pervasive political and sociocultural changes on the macro level. "Time" is not a one-step passage from one date to another, such as 1970 to 1990; rather, it operates in a continuum, it is beyond control, and its influences are seen in the total American population as well as among sub-groups who wish to integrate into the societal mainstream.

This paper was first presented soon after the 1990 NJPS data were released; its publication is concurrent with the preparations for the next national survey of American Jews, to be conducted in the year 2000. Recognizing the importance of follow-up and comparisons over time, the 2000 NJPS should be based on a "core" questionnaire in which basic demographic, socioeconomic and identificational variables are included in the same format as in 1990. By this I refer both to the wording of the questions and their labels. Further, since a national survey does not permit insights into local communities, apart from a few large Jewish concentrations, it would be useful if communities planning to undertake their own studies would adapt the "core" questionnaire of the national survey, and attempt to collect their data as closely as possible to the year 2000 thus allowing for better comparisons and increasing the overall value of both the national and the local profiles.

Scientific research on Jewish demography and sociology is relevant to the community at large. Empirical quantitative findings form the basis for any planning of communal services or policy making. Updated and truly comparable information would enhance the evaluation of recent activities, and help to clarify the direction toward which the American Jewish community is moving — whether toward more cohesion and vitality, or the contrary.

Acknowledgements

This paper is largely based on my M.A. thesis and Ph.D. dissertation. I wish to thank Sergio DellaPergola under whose supervision these projects were carried out. The North American Jewish Data Bank in New York provided me with the data files of the national and community surveys. Judith Even edited an early draft of this paper, and Benny Anderman and Zvi Richter assisted in computer programming. The research was financially supported by the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture.

References

- Cohen, S.M. (1980). "Trends in Jewish Philanthropy." *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 80. pp. 29-51.
- _____. (1983). "The 1981-82 National Survey of American Jews." *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 83. pp. 89-100.
- _____. (1984). "An Annotated Inventory of Questions for Local Jewish Population Studies." In: Cohen, S.M., Woocher, J.S. and Phillips, B.A., eds. *Perspectives in Jewish Population Research*. Westview, Boulder, Colorado. pp. 167-211.
- _____. (1987). *Ties and Tensions: The 1986 Survey of American Jewish Attitudes Towards Israel and Israelis*. American Jewish Committee, New York.
- Cohen, S.M., Woocher, J.S. and Phillips, B.A. eds. (1984). *Perspectives in Jewish Population Research*. Westview, Boulder, Colorado.
- DellaPergola, S. (1984). "Population Data - A Global Perspective." In: Winter, J.A. and Levin, L.I., eds. *Colloquium on Jewish Population Studies*, Vol. 2. Council of Jewish Federations, New York. pp. 22-30.
- Friedman, P.B. (1984). "Comparability From The Users' Perspective." In: Winter, J.A. and Levin, L.I., eds. *Colloquium on Jewish Population Studies*, Vol. 2. Council of Jewish Federations, New York. pp. 7-8.
- Goldscheider, C. (1986). *Jewish Continuity and Change: Emerging Patterns in America*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Goldstein, S. (1988). *A National Jewish Population Study: Why and How*. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Jerusalem. (Occasional Paper 1988-04).
- _____. (1989). "American Jewish Demography: Inconsistencies that Challenge." In: Schmelz, U.O and DellaPergola, S., eds. *Papers in Jewish Demography 1985*. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Jerusalem. pp. 23-42 (Jewish Population Studies, no. 19).
- Goldstein, S. and Goldscheider, C. (1968). *Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Israel, S. (1987). *Boston's Jewish Community: The 1985 CJP Demographic Study*. Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston.
- Kosmin, B.A., Goldstein, S., Waksberg, J., Lerer, N., Keysar A. and Scheckner, J. (1991). *Highlights of the CJP 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*. Council of Jewish Federations, New York.
- Lazerwitz, B. (1973). *The Sample Design of the National Jewish Population Survey*. Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, New York.
- _____. (1974). *Sampling Error and Statistical Inferences for the National Jewish Population Survey*. Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, New York.
- _____. (1978). "An Estimate of a Rare Population Group: The U.S. Jewish Population." *Demography*, Vol. 15. pp. 389-394.

- _____. (1984). "Some Comments Upon Standardizing Jewish Community Surveys." In: Winter, J.A. and Levin, L.I., eds. *Colloquium on Jewish Population Studies*, Vol. 2. Council of Jewish Federations, New York. p. 9.
- Lee, E.V. (1966). "A Theory of Migration." *Demography*, Vol. 3. pp. 47-57.
- Lenski, G. (1963). *The Religious Factor*. Doubleday, New York.
- Levin, L.I. (1984). "Intercommunity Comparisons: The Users' Perspective." In: Winter, J.A. and Levin, L.I., eds. *Colloquium on Jewish Population Studies*, Vol. 2. Council of Jewish Federations, New York. p. 10.
- Massarik, F. (1966). "New Approach to the Study of American Jews." *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 13. pp. 181-190.
- Massarik, F. and Chenkin, A. (1973). "United States National Jewish Population Study: A First Report." *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 73. pp. 264-306.
- Medding, P.Y., Tobin, G.A., Fishman, S.B. and Rimor, M. (1992). "Jewish Identity in Conversionary and Mixed Marriage." *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 92. pp. 3-76.
- Phillips, B.A. (1984). "Sampling Strategies in Jewish Community Studies." In: Cohen, S.M., Woocher, J.S. and Phillips, B.A. eds. *Perspectives in Jewish Population Research*. Westview, Boulder, Colorado. pp. 67-79.
- _____. (1986). "Los Angeles Jewry: A Demographic Portrait." *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 86. pp. 126-195.
- _____. (1993). "Regional Differences Among American Jews." In: Schmelz, U.O. and DellaPergola, S., eds. *Papers in Jewish Demography 1989*. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Jerusalem. pp. 104-112 (Jewish Population Studies, no. 25).
- Rebhun, U. (1992). "The Community of Residence as an Explanatory Variable of Jewish Identification in the United States." *Yahadut Zemanenu: A Research Annual*, Vol. 8. pp. 301-336 (in Hebrew).
- _____. (1997). *Geographic Mobility and Religioethnic Identification among American Jews 1970-1990*. Ph.D. Dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Jerusalem (in Hebrew).
- Schmelz, U.O. and DellaPergola, S. (1991). "World Jewish Population, 1991." *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 91. pp. 441-465.
- Tobin, G.A. and Lipsman, J.A. (1984). "A Compendium of Jewish Demographic Studies." In: Cohen, S.M., Woocher, J.S. and Phillips, B.A. eds. *Perspectives in Jewish Population Research*. Westview, Boulder, Colorado. pp. 137-166.
- Tobin, G.A. (1989). "A Sociodemographic Profile of Jews in the United States in the 1980s." In: Schmelz, U.O. and DellaPergola, S., eds. *Papers in Jewish Demography 1985*. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Jerusalem, pp. 43-65 (Jewish Population Studies, no. 19).
- Waksberg, J. (1996). "The Methodology of the National Jewish Population Survey." In: Goldstein, S. and Goldstein, A. *Jews on the Move: Implications for Jewish Identity*. SUNY Press, New York. pp. 333-359.
- Winter, J.A. and Levin, L.I., eds. (1984). *Colloquium on Jewish Population Studies*, Vols. 1 and 2. Council of Jewish Federations, New York.

Yancey, W.L. and Goldstein, I. (1984). *The Jewish Population of the Greater Philadelphia Area*. Federation of Jewish Agencies of Greater Philadelphia.