

# Being Jewish: An Approach to Conceptualization and Operationalization\*

ARNOLD DASHEFSKY

THE conceptualization and operationalization of "Jewish identity" in sociological, social psychological, and psychological research<sup>1</sup> have been rooted primarily in the theoretical orientations (when one is present) of the field theory of Lewin and his disciples<sup>2</sup> and the psychoanalytic theory of Erikson and others.<sup>3</sup> The symbolic interactionist approach, however, has largely been ignored as the theoretical basis for such an investigation. This paper utilizes the latter perspective as a basis to develop some distinctions in conceptualization — and subsequently a procedure for measuring a specific aspect — of being Jewish: distinctive Jewish self-conception.

## A TAXONOMY OF "JEWISHNESS"

There is a lack of clarity in the literature in which a variety of terms have appeared highlighting alternative approaches to the study of being Jewish, e. g., identity, group identity, group identification, consciousness, self-consciousness, identification, self-identification, and self-conception. All

\* This research was made possible by grants from the National Foundation for Jewish Culture, the Family Study Center of the University of Minnesota, and the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, whose assistance is gratefully acknowledged. This paper is a revision of one presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, New York, October 23, 1970. The data presented herein are derived from the author's doctoral dissertation, *Social Interaction and Jewish Self-Conception: A Two Generation Analysis in the St. Paul Community*, University of Minnesota, 1969. The author wishes to thank Howard M. Shapiro and Don McTavish for their valuable suggestions in the course of carrying out this study.

<sup>1</sup> A bibliographic review of the literature is provided by N. Fainstein and S. Feder, *Bibliographies on Jewish Identity*, Mimeo, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1966). A conceptual analysis is carried out by I. Brodsky, "Jewish Identity and Jewish Identification," *Journal of Jewish Communal Service*, 44 (Spring, 1968), pp. 254-259.

<sup>2</sup> See K. Lewin, "Psycho-Sociological Problems of a Minority Group," *Resolving Social Conflicts*, New York (Harper, 1948), pp. 145-158; M. R. Yarrow, "Personality Development and Minority Group Membership," in M. Sklare, ed., *The Jews*, Glencoe, Ill. (The Free Press, 1958), pp. 451-474; L. O. Brenner, *Hostility and Jewish Group Identification*, Unpublished Doctoral Treatise, Boston University (1960); R. Segalman, *Self-Hatred Among Jews: A Test of the Lewinian Hypothesis of Marginality of Jewish Leadership*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, New York University, 1966.

<sup>3</sup> See E. H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society*, 2nd ed., New York (W. W. Norton, 1963), pp. 281, 354-355; I. D. Rinder, "Polarities in Jewish Identification: The Personality of Ideological Extremity," in Sklare, ed., *op. cit.*, pp. 493-502; J. Adelson, "A Study of Minority Group Authoritarianism," in Sklare, ed., *op. cit.*, pp. 475-492.

of these have been subsumed under the notion of "Jewishness"; but this term is, in fact, not very useful because of its popular abuse; hence, the usage "being Jewish" is preferred both to the former and to "Jewish identity," which is restricted to the following specific sense.

The work of Wheelis<sup>4</sup> and Erikson<sup>5</sup> on identity provides the basis for the conceptualization of *Jewish identity* which lies at the core of the psyche. It involves a persistent inner sameness and a coherent sense of oneself as a Jew that makes life meaningful. Based on such a definition the usage of the term group identity is nothing more than a reification of the concept group, similar to the notion of the collective mind. Thus, what is meant by Jewish group identity is the concept of *Jewish group identification*. The usage of group identification by Rose and Rose<sup>6</sup> suggests that Jewish group identification involves the recognition and positive evaluation of membership in the Jewish group. As such it is closely related to morale and solidarity. Two variant usages of the previous concept are provided by Ben-Yehuda's discussion of the curriculum of the Israeli public schools:<sup>7</sup> Jewish consciousness, which involves a Jew's awareness of the existence of the Jewish people, past and present, at home and abroad; and Jewish self-consciousness, which refers to the individual Jew's awareness of his being a part of this people and the recognition of his implication with the fate of other Jews. The analysis of the concept of identification by Foote<sup>8</sup> and Lindesmith and Strauss<sup>9</sup> suggests that *Jewish identification* deals with the process of the individual Jew's belongingness and linkage in a physical and symbolic sense to other Jews in Jewish groups. Thus, the occasional usage of the term self-identification is contradictory. Finally, Kinch<sup>10</sup> and Kuhn and McPartland<sup>11</sup> in their work on self-conception have provided the basis for the definition of *Jewish self-conception* as the individual's organization of attitudes about himself as a Jew.

This taxonomy serves to make some useful distinctions among the various concepts usually referred to in the study of being Jewish. Essentially what

<sup>4</sup> A. Wheelis, *The Quest for Identity*, New York (W. W. Norton, 1958), p. 19.

<sup>5</sup> E. H. Erikson, *op. cit.*, pp. 261-262; E. H. Erikson, "The Problem of Ego Identity," M. P. Stein, A. J. Vidich, and D. M. White, eds., *Identity and Anxiety*, Glencoe, Ill. (The Free Press, 1960), p. 38, originally published in *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 4, 1 (1956), pp. 58-121.

<sup>6</sup> A. M. Rose and C. B. Rose, eds., *Minority Problems*, New York (Harper and Row, 1965), p. 247; A. M. Rose and C. B. Rose, *Sociology: The Study of Human Relations*, 3rd ed., New York (Alfred A. Knopf, 1969), p. 589.

<sup>7</sup> B. Ben-Yehuda, *Lamahuta Shel Hatodaa Hayehudit*, Tel Aviv (1966), pp. 5-6.

<sup>8</sup> N. Foote, "Identification as the Basis for a Theory of Motivation," *American Sociological Review*, 16, 1 (February, 1951), pp. 17, 21.

<sup>9</sup> A. R. Lindesmith and A. L. Strauss, *Social Psychology*, 3rd ed., New York (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), pp. 345-346.

<sup>10</sup> J. W. Kinch, "A Formalized Theory of the Self-Concept," *American Journal of Sociology*, 68, 4 (January, 1963), p. 481.

<sup>11</sup> M. H. Kuhn and T. S. McPartland, "An Empirical Investigation of Self-Attitudes," *American Sociological Review*, 19, 1 (February, 1954), p. 68.

emerges are four conceptually distinct but interrelated components, each answering a different question: 1) Jewish identity: "What does it mean to you to be a Jew?" 2) Jewish group identification: "How do you evaluate your membership in the Jewish group?" 3) Jewish identification: "What kinds of Jewish organizations and/or social groups do you belong to?" 4) Jewish self-conception: "How do you answer the question 'Who am I' as a Jew?"

Closer examination indicates that while Jewish identification is overtly a behavioral dimension, the other concepts are not: Jewish identity is linked to the study of personality; Jewish group identification involves inquiry into group cohesiveness and group boundaries particularly as developed in field theory; and Jewish self-conception deals with research in self-attitudes particularly as developed in symbolic interactionism.

### THE CASE OF JEWISH SELF-CONCEPTION

The major relevant assumption in the symbolic interactionist approach (exemplified by Cooley, Mead, Goffman, and Strauss)<sup>12</sup> is that self-conceptions arise through social interaction and in turn shape behavior. In this orientation self-conception is sometimes used interchangeably with identity.<sup>13</sup>

While there has been much research and speculation on the topic of "Jewish identity," not much is to be found on the matter of Jewish self-conceptions. Sklare and Vosk<sup>14</sup> examined, at least in part, the contemporary Jewish self-image in a study of the Riverton (pseudonym for an Eastern city about the size of Albany) Jewish community primarily emphasizing descriptive characteristics with no clearly defined theoretical formulation. The major relevant finding, however, was that Jewish self-conceptions were described mostly in religious terms, and much more so among adolescents than their parents.

In a more recent study Sklare and Greenblum<sup>15</sup> analyzed the Jewish community of Lakeville (pseudonym for a suburb of a midwestern metropolis with a population of about 25,000, one-third Jews). The most pertinent aspect dealt with the image of the good Jew<sup>16</sup> in Lakeville, which was de-

<sup>12</sup> The most pertinent work of each is as follows: C. H. Cooley, *Human Nature and the Social Order*, New York (Scribner's, 1902); G. H. Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society*, Chicago (University of Chicago Press, 1934); E. Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Garden City, N. Y. (Doubleday, 1959); A. L. Strauss, *Mirrors and Masks: The Search for Identity*, Glencoe, Ill. (The Free Press, 1959).

<sup>13</sup> For instance, "personal identity" and "self-conception" are used interchangeably by T. Shibusani, *Society and Personality*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J. (Prentice Hall, 1961), pp. 213-248.

<sup>14</sup> M. Sklare and M. Vosk, *The Riverton Study*, New York (American Jewish Committee, 1962).

<sup>15</sup> M. Sklare and J. Greenblum, *Jewish Identity on the Suburban Frontier*, New York (Basic Books, 1967).

<sup>16</sup> Another study, which used this approach and was conducted in the Baltimore Jewish community, is *As We See Ourselves*, New York (American Jewish Committee, 1964).

scribed in a manner devoid of distinctiveness from other Americans. While Lakeville Jews were less distinctively Jewish in thought, they did have distinctive patterns of behavior. Most important was the conclusion that the maintenance of these distinctive patterns of behavior will be weakened by the less distinctively Jewish conceptions of self. This proposition, which is consonant with the notion that self-conception shapes interaction, points out the significance of the concept of Jewish self-conception within the more general study of being Jewish. As Shibusani has observed: "It is important to get at what a man believes himself to be, for much of what he does depends upon these beliefs and prerogatives that follow logically from such a definition."<sup>17</sup>

The notion of distinctiveness refers to the particularistic and exclusive attributes of being Jewish, in contrast to the universal ones. As Sklare and Greenblum<sup>18</sup> have observed, there are three well-established models: religious, nationalistic, and cultural. These models stand in contrast to such non-distinctive ways of being Jewish which might emphasize attributes like moral excellence, humanitarianism, or personal success.

On the basis of Steinberg's distinction of these three motifs in Judaism,<sup>19</sup> the three models of distinctive Jewish self-conception may be defined as follows: The *religious* type emphasizes a Jewish self-image associated particularly with ritual observance but may include faith and ethics. The *nationalistic* type stresses a Jewish self-image associated with a sense of kinship to the Jewish people or with Israel as the physical or spiritual center of world Jewry. The *cultural* model in a sense represents a residual category including those aspects of culture, apart from religion and nationalism. Here the Jewish self-image would be associated with linguistic, intellectual, or esthetic characteristics: emphasizing Yiddish or Hebrew, Jewish art or music, or Jewish knowledge. The more distinctive the Jewish self-conception, the more the individual will view himself in these terms with a good deal of overlap among the three models.

These latter models spring from Jewish sources, in which terms only Jews can see themselves. The previously mentioned models of moral excellence, humanitarianism, or personal success may spring from Jewish sources; but they may be shared by non-Jews as well. Thus, distinctive Jewish self-conception may be defined as the individual's organization of attitudes about himself that are exclusively and particularly Jewish including religious, nationalistic, and cultural components.

<sup>17</sup> Shibusani, *op. cit.*, p. 222.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Sklare and Greenblum, *op. cit.*, pp. 323-327.

<sup>19</sup> M. Steinberg, *A Partisan Guide to the Jewish Problem*, Indianapolis (Bobbs-Merrill, 1945), pp. 145-153.

### THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SCALE OF DISTINCTIVE JEWISH SELF-CONCEPTION (DJS)

A number of scales exist that purport to measure various aspects of Jewish identity. Segalman<sup>20</sup> has described over twenty different ones, but most of them measured Jewish identification. There were no scales available that measured aspects of Jewish self-conception. Fein<sup>21</sup> has suggested several ways to probe Jewish identity: unstructured interviews, a set of 12-24 identity sketches, and the use of a Q sort designed to yield a portrait of the whole person on the basis of his selection of a number of statements. In the Lakeville study Sklare and Greenblum<sup>22</sup> utilized an inventory of beliefs and practices, which the respondent was to rate as to whether he considered each item "essential" to being "a good Jew," "desirable but not essential," or "makes no difference" in being "a good Jew."

While the techniques suggested by Fein and Sklare and Greenblum would be useful in probing distinctive Jewish self-conception, they are not suitable for use with large numbers of individuals responding to a questionnaire. In order to develop such a scale of distinctive Jewish self-conception, a set of items was devised based on a structured type of Twenty Statements Test (TST), which was developed by Kuhn and McPartland.<sup>23</sup> In the TST the subject is requested to fill in twenty numbered blanks with twenty answers to the question "Who am I." Responses to the TST include both consensual statements (which refer to conventional group categories) and subconsensual statements (which refer to groups or attributes that require further interpretation by the respondent). Twenty items of the subconsensual variety were included in the first form of the DJS scale. Each item was prefaced by the statement "I am a Jew who" and was rated on a 4-point Likert scale: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree. The direction of the weights, which ranged from one to four, depended on the particular item. The items were selected to represent the three well-established models of distinctive Jewish self-conception: religious, nationalistic, and cultural.

The validity of the scale was established through the use of known groups. The original twenty item version was distributed to two groups of Jewish males. Each group of individuals was known to be more or less identified with the Jewish community and thought to possess a high or low measure of distinctive Jewish self-conception. Each known group included subgroups of students and faculty for the purpose of introducing some variability according to age. There were 24 cases in the group thought to have a high

<sup>20</sup> R. Segalman, "Jewish Identity Scales: A Report," *Jewish Social Studies*, 29, 2 (April, 1967), pp. 92-111.

<sup>21</sup> L. J. Fein, *Studying Jewish Identity: Observations*, Mimeo, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1966), pp. 33-36.

<sup>22</sup> Sklare and Greenblum, *op. cit.*, pp. 321-322.

<sup>23</sup> Kuhn and McPartland, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

measure of distinctive Jewish self-conception, including 15 students active in the Hillel Foundation of the University of Minnesota and other Jewish organizations and 9 instructors in the Talmud Torah of Minneapolis. There were 30 cases in the group thought to have a low measure of distinctive Jewish self-conception, including 16 students active in a University of Minnesota fraternity and 14 instructors at the University, all of whom were thought to be most removed from active participation in Jewish life.<sup>24</sup>

On the basis of the factor analysis of the known groups three of the original twenty items were eliminated.<sup>25</sup> The difference in the mean scores (using the 17 acceptable items included in Table 1) of these two groups was large and statistically significant.<sup>26</sup> Thus, the individuals were drawn from different populations: one with a high measure and the other with a low measure of distinctive Jewish self-conception.

The 17-item scale with a range of scores from 17 to 68 was tested with 32 usable cases. This test was carried out in Minneapolis and included 23 Jewish males aged 22-29 and 9 of their fathers, who were selected through a network of personal associates of the researcher, and who in turn selected some of their associates.

A third test was carried out in St. Paul and included 183 Jewish males aged 22-29 and 119 of their fathers. The different system of selection of the test populations greatly reduced the possibility of individuals appearing more than once despite the contiguity of Minneapolis and St. Paul.

The actual listing of all the members of the population from which the St. Paul respondents came was constructed primarily through the examination of available lists of synagogues and other Jewish organizations. The cooperation of veteran members of the community and the publicizing of the project in the local press also aided this effort. Despite the bias particularly towards synagogue affiliation 18 percent of the younger generation (and 3 percent of the older generation) did not belong to a synagogue.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Rabbi L. Milgrom, director of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation at the University of Minnesota, was very helpful in suggesting individuals for these two groups.

<sup>25</sup> The items that were eliminated included "feels that Judaism has the same value as any other religion," "feels that Yiddish is a language of the past," and "thinks that Jewish music is beautiful."

<sup>26</sup>  $t = 9.41$ ,  $p < .0005$  (one-tailed test),  $df = 52$ .

<sup>27</sup> An independent check on the potential number of individuals within the younger generation was performed by consulting high school records (which stated religious affiliation) corresponding to six of the eight age cohorts. These lists, however, could not serve as a basis for selection of the subjects because the data on religious affiliation was confidential. Accounting for the generally acknowledged high out-migration of young Jewish men from St. Paul the estimated range (275-400) included the actual number on the list of younger men (286). Of the total of 302 cases 183 out of 286 (64%) of the younger men and 119 out of 191 (63%) of the older men replied to a mail questionnaire. In addition, some men probably never received the questionnaire in the mail; hence, the proportion of respondents to those who actually received the questionnaire was actually higher than stated above. An examination of available data for the non-respondents indicated that there were no significant differences

In each instance a one-factor solution appeared as the best solution. Table 1 presents the one-factor solution for the three tests. In the case of the first test approximately 75 percent of the variance for the principal factor loading matrix with four factors was explained by the first factor. Similarly in the second test about 65 percent of the variance for the same solution was explained by the first factor. In the third test approximately 70 percent of the variance for the same solution was explained by the first factor. In each of the three tests the rotated four-factor solutions suggested the possibility of subfactors (e. g., religious, nationalistic, cultural, and general), but there was no stability present in comparing the solutions. A potentially nationalistic factor appeared in one instance with items 1, 11, and 16 and in another instance as 1, 8, 9, and 14. A potentially religious (or ritualistic) factor appeared once with just items 12 and 17 and in another case with items 10, 12, 13 and a confounding item 16. A potentially cultural factor appeared with items 2, 5, 15 and confounding items 8 and 13 and in another case with items 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

One probable reason the factor structure remained unstable and did not permit subfactoring was because there was an insufficient number of items.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, the composition of the test populations varied. In the first test the individuals who were selected were clearly differentiated into two known groups. These individuals were more certain and more extreme in their self-conceptions and perceived the various items as more clearly related to each other. The average correlation for the 17 items with  $N = 54$  was .42. In the second test the individuals, who were selected through a network of personal associates of the researcher, represented a fairly homogeneous group; but they were probably less certain and less extreme in their self-conceptions. The average correlation for the 17 items with  $N = 32$  was .34. Finally, in the third test the individuals were rather heterogeneous, representing populations of younger and older men. The average correlation with  $N = 302$  was .28.

#### DISTINCTIVE JEWISH SELF-CONCEPTION AND ITS CORRELATES

The successful construction of the DJS scale permits investigation of both the determinants<sup>29</sup> and the consequences of distinctive Jewish self-

---

between them and the respondents with respect to synagogue affiliation and residence among the older generation. Similarly, in the younger generation there was no significant difference with respect to occupation.

<sup>28</sup> F. N. Kerlinger has described the one-factor solution and has suggested that the addition of other items might well yield other factors. F. N. Kerlinger, *Foundations of Behavioral Research*, New York (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), p. 671.

<sup>29</sup> A discussion of the determinants of distinctive Jewish self-conception (including components of interaction and Jewish and secular education) is found in A. Dashefsky, "Inter-

conception through statistical measures of relationship and association. Since in the third test population measures were also obtained on such behavioral characteristics as synagogue attendance, Jewish organizational involvement, and synagogue membership, it is possible to observe the relationship between DJS and these variables.

While the relationship between interaction and self-conception includes an element of interdependence throughout the various stages of the life cycle, once the individual has passed through adolescence, as Erikson<sup>30</sup> and Shibutani<sup>31</sup> have observed, self-conceptions are more stable. Hence, it is a more likely assumption that in adulthood distinctive Jewish self-conception will be a determinant of such attributes as synagogue attendance,<sup>32</sup> Jewish organizational involvement,<sup>33</sup> and synagogue membership. (This is not to say that there is no interactive effect, but longitudinal data would be needed to assess the extent of it.)

It was possible to observe these relationships within two generations. There was a significant difference between the scores of the younger generation of sons and the older generation of fathers with respect to distinctive Jewish self-conception.<sup>34</sup> The mean scale score for the former was 44.4 and for the latter, 48.4. This significant difference was anticipated given the greater assimilation and secularization of succeeding generations of Jewish Americans.

Those individuals in both generations who scored higher on DJS were likely to attend synagogue services more frequently during the year than those who scored lower.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, there was a significant relationship in both generations between DJS and Jewish organizational involvement. Among both sons<sup>36</sup> and fathers<sup>37</sup> those individuals who scored higher on DJS were more likely to have a high amount of Jewish organizational involvement than a low amount.

Tables 2 and 3 indicate that there was a significant relationship in both

actions and Identity: The Jewish Case," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Washington, D. C., August 31, 1970.

<sup>30</sup> Erikson, "Ego Identity," p. 47.

<sup>31</sup> Shibutani, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

<sup>32</sup> Synagogue attendance was measured in terms of the following responses: never, High Holidays only, occasionally, weekly or daily.

<sup>33</sup> Jewish organizational involvement was measured by asking the respondent to rate his participation in Jewish organizations both specified and unspecified as infrequent, occasional, regular, or as an office holder. The lack of refinement of this measure necessitated collapsing the scores into a low and high category.

<sup>34</sup>  $t = 5.28$ ,  $p < .001$  (one-tailed test),  $df = 300$ . Hubert M. Blalock explains in *Social Statistics*, New York (McGraw Hill, 1960), p. 149, that when the degrees of freedom are greater than 120, the normal table is to be used.

<sup>35</sup> Fathers:  $\gamma = .54$ ,  $p < .001$ ; sons:  $\gamma = .49$ ,  $p < .001$ .

<sup>36</sup> Chi square = 19.9,  $p < .001$  (one-tailed test),  $df = 3$ ,  $C = .31$ .

<sup>37</sup> Chi square = 6.07,  $p = .05$  (one-tailed test),  $df = 3$ ,  $C = .22$ .



generations between DJS (which was divided into quartiles separate for each generation) and synagogue membership. Table 2 shows that among the younger men as the level of DJS increased, the proportion of Conservative members increased, non-members decreased, and Reform members stayed about the same. Table 3 shows that among the older men as the level of DJS increased the proportion of Conservative members increased and the proportion of Reform members decreased. For both younger and older men, however, the proportion of Conservative men in the lowest quartile of DJS was not small (42 percent and 41 percent respectively). While this indicates that Reform members (and non-members in the younger generation) were not exclusively associated with scoring low on DJS, they were noticeably absent from the high cell with 20 percent in the younger generation (10 percent for non-members) and only 7 percent in the older generation.

Generational comparison of the influence of DJS on synagogue membership is difficult because of the presence of non-members in the younger generation and the different values of DJS associated with the quartile division. The presence of these non-members, however, who tended to have lower scores on DJS, occurred coincidentally with a general weakening of distinctive Jewish self-conception in comparison to the older men. Nevertheless, in both generations scoring higher on the DJS scale was likely to be associated with more frequent synagogue attendance, greater Jewish organizational involvement, and belonging to a Conservative synagogue.

The generational comparison of scores on the DJS scale parallels on a social psychological level the historical, structural, and cultural analyses which suggest that the younger generation of Jews is more secularized and assimilated. Moreover, the positive association of DJS with synagogue attendance and Jewish organizational involvement and the significant relationship between DJS and synagogue membership in both generations indicate that this scale may be used to predict such behavioral attributes. In general, these findings point to the utility of the DJS scale as an instrument in the measurement of being Jewish.

### CONCLUSIONS

This paper has attempted to clarify some of the conceptual differences implicit in the taxonomy of terms on being Jewish and then proceeded to operationalize one aspect of the Jewish self-image. The result was a scale measuring distinctive Jewish self-conception (DJS).

Beyond the analysis made here further research indicating the relationship between distinctive Jewish self-conception and other dependent and independent variables is needed. Moreover, the subfactoring of the DJS scale into religious, nationalistic, and cultural factors is possible with the addition of more items.

Furthermore, it would be useful to observe how the relationships of the four main components of being Jewish (Jewish identity, Jewish group identification, Jewish identification, and Jewish self-conception) may vary according to key independent and dependent variables and how these relationships might vary in diaspora communities as well as in Israel.

Finally, the present approach may provide a basis for the comparative study of distinctive religious or ethnic self-conceptions among other groups through the development of additional structured forms of the Twenty Statements Test.

TABLE 1. ROTATED FACTOR MATRICES WITH ONE FACTOR FOR THREE TEST POPULATIONS

| Items*  | Test 1** |                | Test 2*** |                | Test 3**** |                |
|---|----------|----------------|-----------|----------------|------------|----------------|
|   | Loading  | h <sup>2</sup> | Loading   | h <sup>2</sup> | Loading    | h <sup>2</sup> |
| I AM A JEW WHO . . .  |          |                |           |                |            |                |
| 1. Thinks Israel should be supported . . . . .                                      | .526     | .277           | -.444     | .197           | -.497      | .247           |
| 2. Knows Jewish history and culture . . . . .                                       | .543     | .295           | -.540     | .292           | -.448      | .220           |
| 3. Feels that keeping Kasher is irrelevant in today's world . . . . .               | .720     | .519           | -.682     | .465           | -.335      | .112           |
| 4. Feels a closeness to the Hebrew language . . . . .                               | .797     | .635           | -.743     | .552           | -.683      | .466           |
| 5. Appreciates Jewish literature . . . . .  | .663     | .440           | -.354     | .125           | -.563      | .317           |
| 6. Thinks it is important to know the fundamentals of Judaism . . . . .             | .712     | .507           | -.658     | .433           | -.500      | .250           |
| 7. Thinks it is important to have a local Jewish newspaper . . . . .                | .779     | .607           | -.605     | .365           | -.598      | .357           |
| 8. Is considering (or has considered) living in Israel . . . . .                    | .766     | .587           | -.657     | .432           | -.426      | .182           |
| 9. Thinks it is important that Israel remain a Jewish state . . . . .               | .547     | .299           | -.599     | .359           | -.618      | .382           |
| 10. Feels that synagogue services are unsatisfying                                  | .480     | .231           | -.314     | .099           | -.341      | .116           |
| 11. Feels a close kinship to the Jewish people throughout the world . . . . .       | .582     | .338           | -.672     | .451           | -.637      | .406           |
| 12. Thinks it is important to fast on Yom Kippur . . . . .                          | .776     | .602           | -.770     | .593           | -.577      | .333           |
| 13. Thinks there are many books more important than the Bible . . . . .             | .721     | .521           | -.520     | .270           | -.481      | .204           |
| 14. Feels a strong desire to visit Israel before visiting other countries . . . . . | .703     | .494           | -.833     | .694           | -.724      | .525           |
| 15. Would feel a loss if there were no Jewish magazines . . . . .                   | .746     | .557           | -.593     | .352           | -.540      | .292           |
| 16. Feels that Israel is the spiritual homeland of the Jewish people . . . . .      | .607     | .369           | -.566     | .320           | -.633      | .400           |
| 17. Feels that Torah is the revealed word of God . . . . .                          | .555     | .308           | -.646     | .417           | -.548      | .300           |

\* All items were weighted strongly agree=4, agree=3, disagree=2, strongly disagree=1 except for items 3, 10, and 13 in which cases the weights are arranged in ascending order yielding a range of possible scores from 17 to 68.

Note: The reliability of this scale was equal to .87 obtained by use of the Kuder-Richardson formula (21). See G. Frederick Kuder and Marion W. Richardson, *Psychometrika*, 2 (1937), pp. 151-160.

\*\* Students and teachers. N=54. Administered December, 1968.

\*\*\* Sons and fathers (Minneapolis). N=32. Administered January, 1969.

\*\*\*\* Sons and fathers (St. Paul). N=302. Administered March, 1969.

TABLE 2. SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP BY DJS (YOUNGER GENERATION)

| Synagogue Membership | DJS (quartiles)  |                  |                  |                  |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                      | Low              | Medium Low       | Medium High      | High             |
| Conservative         | 42%              | 62%              | 73%              | 70%              |
| Reform               | 25%              | 19%              | 16%              | 20%              |
| Non-Member           | 33%              | 19%              | 11%              | 10%              |
| Total                | 100%<br>(N = 48) | 100%<br>(N = 42) | 100%<br>(N = 44) | 100%<br>(N = 40) |

Chi square = 13.7,  $p < .05$  (one-tailed),  $df = 6$ .

$c = .27$ .

Note: There was an insufficient number of Orthodox cases for statistical analysis.

TABLE 3. SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP BY DJS (OLDER GENERATION)

| Synagogue Membership | DJS (quartiles)  |                  |                  |                  |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                      | Low              | Medium Low       | Medium High      | High             |
| Conservative         | 41%              | 69%              | 76%              | 93%              |
| Reform               | 59%              | 31%              | 24%              | 7%               |
| Total                | 100%<br>(N = 27) | 100%<br>(N = 26) | 100%<br>(N = 29) | 100%<br>(N = 28) |

Chi square = 18.4,  $p < .0005$  (one-tailed),  $df = 3$ .

$c = .38$ .

Note: There was an insufficient number of Orthodox and non-member cases for statistical analysis.