NJPS 2000/01: A VEHICLE FOR EXPLORING SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND SOCIAL DYNAMICS IN THE JEWISH POPULATION
A Research Note

Vivian Klaff

Frank L. Mott

ABSTRACT

The American Jewish population has undergone considerable demographic and sociological change in the past few decades. The 2000-01 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS), a nationally representative sample of about 4,500 American Jews, represents a data collection effort uniquely appropriate for examining the structure and dynamics of the population and sub-groups within the national Jewish community.

This is not an analytical paper in the traditional sense, but rather presents an overview of the organization, research design, sampling design, definitional constructs of defining the Jewish population, questionnaire content, and methodological issues of the NJPS project. In addition, we present an outline of some preliminary research that has been carried out and offer some suggestions as to the utility of the data in a variety of disciplines and content areas. This paper carefully points to the flexibility of the data set for defining the Jewish population in a variety of ways, and the usefulness of the data for academic researchers and community institutions. The data file is in the public domain and is available for use by all who are interested in exploring the contemporary American Jewish population.

INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

NJPS 2000-01 is a national random sample of the American Jewish population that is available for exploring a wide range of issues relating to the contemporary national Jewish population. The sample size is more then twice as large as that of its predecessor, the 1990 NJPS. In addition to the traditional demographic and socio-economic variables needed to develop a profile of a population, the data set contains a wide range of variables that deal with both religious and ethnic components of being Jewishly connected. The data set represents a vehicle for exploring research, programmatic and policy considerations to assist in understanding the needs and interests of American Jewry. The depth of infor-

mation available in conjunction with the substantial sample size will enable researchers with a diversity of interests to examine a range of mainstream social science research topics across several disciplines. The objective of this research note is to detail the content of this data set, its strengths as well as limitations, and to highlight a variety of research topics that can be explored utilizing this unique data collection effort. This paper is not an analytical analysis of the data, but it does utilize research already conducted to illustrate the utility of the data.

Historical Overview

Although the history of Jewish immigration and the process of integration into American society have been documented in countless ways in print and visual media, until the early 1970s the profile of this population and its socio-demographic characteristics on a national level have been extracted from sketchy data, collected and reported by local and regional institutions in various American Jewish Yearbooks. In 1971, a national study was conducted (Lazerwitz, 1973:47-62; Massarik, 1973:27-45) that received very little attention and minimal analysis. In 1990, the Council of Jewish Federations (CJF) carried out a national survey of the Jewish population that received considerable attention, with particular focus on issues of intermarriage, Jewish identity, and the population's continuity (Kosmin and Goldstein *et.al*., 1991). This study motivated Jewish institutions, both religious and secular, to examine a wide variety of community programs and to frame policies in reaction to the perceived direction of population trends. As time went by, many felt that updated information about these and other trends was needed given the sense that the Jewish population was very likely undergoing dramatic demographic changes. These changes could have major consequences for program and policy development, as well as our understanding of the Jewish status quo. The 1990 study has been used to research a variety of social trends and policy issues (e.g. Goldstein, 1993; Goldstein and Goldstein, 1996; Hartman and Hartman, 1996) and provided data used in a multitude of lectures, articles, Jewish communal documents and conference presentations.

In 1996, as a follow-up to the NJPS 1990, CJF established the infrastructure for a new survey, NJPS 2000-01. The National Technical Advisory Committee (NTAC), a committee of 18 professional researchers and community planners, worked with CJF leadership to develop the project, and a research director was hired to head the project. Following an open-bidding process, in early 1999 Audits and Surveys Worldwide of New York was hired to conduct the fieldwork. The survey fieldwork was scheduled to begin in early 2000, but due in part to the reorganization of CJF into a larger Jewish communal umbrella organization, United Jewish Communities (UJC), the fieldwork was delayed. The

interviewing ultimately began in August 2000 and was completed in August 2001.

Objectives

This paper is not a traditional research paper, but rather synthesizes the NJPS data-collection and evaluation process. It provides readers who may be interested in using these data with background information about the study and a brief history leading up to the data release. We describe the data collection process, highlight content issues as well as caveats, and point to strengths and weaknesses of the data collection that could affect how users might approach the data set. Related to this, we emphasize the eclectic nature of the data set that permits researchers to utilize the data in many different ways to address empirical or theoretical issues consistent with diverse orientations. Finally, we suggest a variety of exploratory topics and place them in analytic context by providing some examples of the type of analyses that could be (and in some instances already have been) explored with the data.

The NJPS was designed (a) to carry out a national random survey of the Jewish population of the United States; (b) to be a follow up to the 1990 study, taking into consideration what was learned and making adjustments for new trends and conditions in the population, and (c) to develop a data set that could be used by Jewish communal institutions and by both the Jewish and non-Jewish social science research community to analyze the Jewish population in the context of the American population.

The primary aims of this data collection effort were (a) to obtain reliable estimates of the size and demographic characteristics of the Jewish population and its denominational and demographic sub-groups; (b) to provide the community with a religious, social and demographic profile of the Jewish population and to examine issues related to identity and continuity of the Jewish community, and (c) to be responsive to the research and policy needs of a wide range of constituencies in the Jewish organizational world.

Rationale for the Survey

Conducting a random national survey to enumerate and describe the Jewish population is inherently complex. First, for the Jewish population there is the definitional problem of determining who is a Jew. As will be noted later in this paper, about one quarter of those who identified themselves as Jews in NJPS 2000-01 stated that Judaism was not their religion. Second, even if we were only concerned with identifying a population that self identified as Jews in the context of a general classification of religious groups, there are general problems related to collecting data on religion.

The US Census and the entire Federal data collection systems are not permitted to collect information on the specific religious identification of respondents. In addition, national surveys with religious content typically have too few cases to study smaller religious groups like the Jews. For example, in the General Social Survey conducted yearly by the University of Chicago and used to analyze Protestants (as a group) and Catholics, the 2000 file included only 63 respondents who identified as Jews. This is hardly enough to estimate the size of the population, let alone examine the characteristics of this subpopulation.

Additionally, even if data on the size, demographic composition, and distribution of the Jewish population could be determined from other sources, there are divergent opinions about definitions of inclusion and exclusion. In the past, being Jewish largely was a matter of ascription, a matter of birth rather than choice. But in the 21st century a key concern that faces researchers, community leaders, Jewish institutions, and even individuals is how one defines who is a Jew. Clearly, definitions vary widely, ranging from definitions by birth, dual Jewish parentage, a Jewish mother, or a Jewish father, and these definitions often are made independent of how respondents self identify. For example, Orthodox Judaism considers persons to be Jewish only if they have a *halachically* identified Jewish mother, while Reform Judaism accepts a much broader characterization. *Halacha*, literally translated as "path" or "way," represents the traditional system of Jewish law as derived from the Pentateuch (around 1312 BCE) and codified by the rabbis in the Mishna (compiled around 200 CE) and the Babylonian Talmud (compiled around 500 CE). To further confuse the issue, categorization according to measures of ritual could result in some messianic Jews falling higher on the scale of religiosity than some halachic Jews who do not practice any form of Judaism.

With all this in mind, it was decided to cast the net as wide as possible and allow potential analysts of the NJPS data to determine their own classification of the sample according to their preferred definitions. A substantial contextual contribution of this study when compared to the 1990 project is the addition to the traditional questions about religion of a considerable number of questions that deal with being Jewish from an ethnic and a cultural perspective.

As a consequence of this approach, any research based on the dataset should clearly report what definition of Jewish the researcher is using. The content of this survey casts the definitional net of being Jewish very broadly. Users may consider the definition of religion as broadly or narrowly as they desire, whether approaching specific definitions from the religious, cultural or ethnic perspective or some combination of the three. The data set includes a wide range of attitudinal and behavioral characteristics for both respondents and their family units

both at present and at earlier lifecycle points. This gives planners and researchers the opportunity to examine alternative ways of expressing a person's Jewish connection. Using the different definitions, organizational leaders can assess potential clients for Jewish institutions and make decisions about allocation of resources available to the community.

PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Following the research design developed by the research department of CJF and the National Technical Advisory Committee, the decision was made that respondents would be interviewed on initial contact or shortly thereafter if the selected respondent was not immediately available. Upon reaching a respondent who was eligible for inclusion in the study, the interviewers selected a random Jewish person from the adults in the household and either interviewed the person immediately or arranged for a time convenient to the selected person. This design differed from the 1990 study, in which a marketing survey retained the phone numbers of those respondents from an existing survey and then re-contacted them at a later time. The procedure used in the 2000-01 study avoided potential sample selection bias that could be related to the more general introductory lead-in statements that were linked with the objectives of a marketing survey. This switch to what generally is considered a preferable interviewing procedure also unavoidably raised survey costs.

The 2000-01 survey design employed a Random Digit Dialing (RDD) procedure in all 50 states of the United States plus the District of Columbia to contact a national random probability sample of all telephone households. In order to track progress, the sample was divided into 22 distinct replicates. Each replicate was a completely representative sample of both the Jewish and the U.S. population, the latter being necessary to calculate the representation of the Jewish population as a proportion of the total U.S. population. The Jewish population is only about 2% of the total population, so in order to reduce the cost of the project, areas that were estimated to have more dense Jewish settlement were over-sampled, and areas with lower density were under-sampled. Telephone numbers were divided into seven strata based upon the estimated density of the Jewish population. This stratification system was based on estimates of the population included in the 1999 edition of the American Jewish Yearbook (AJYB). The sample was further stratified by metropolitan/non-metropolitan and county area of residence. Weighting procedures were used in the data preparation stage to compensate for the difference in sampling rates by strata. In hindsight, the decision to use the AJYB for the over-sampling design probably was less then optimal because the AJYB estimates were based on a variety of collection systems including community studies that were not always consis-

tent with each other or with the 1990 NJPS methodology. This resulted in the need to extend the interviewing period to reach the desired number of households.

Once data collection was complete, a weighting procedure was implemented to adjust for the unequal probability of selection into the sample; the number of household telephone lines; the stratum in which the household was located; the number of qualified adults in the household from whom the respondent was randomly selected; and differential non-response rates. The proportion of Jewish households and Jews was determined from the survey screening process and applied to U.S. Census data on households and populations to estimate the total number of Jewish adults, children, and households. Post-stratification adjustments to the NJPS sample were also implemented by using Census data on geography, age, gender and household size.

Sampling and Screening Issues: Sample Size and Composition
A key aim of national surveys is to obtain a reliable estimate of the size and characteristics of the overall population as well as sub-groups within the population. In addition, consideration of the internal relationships between characteristics of the overall population and sub-groups within the population can yield a more comprehensive understanding of the structure and dynamics of the Jewish population. Therefore, sample size and selection procedures were core topics for discussion. A decision was made to double the size of the 1990 NJPS sample. A larger number of respondents would allow researchers to explore many issues in greater depth than previously possible. Doubling the overall sample size doubled the number of interviews for smaller sub-groups, which ultimately results in more accurate estimates of subgroups' frequency in the population and increases the credibility of research findings.

Because the Jewish population is relatively rare, many telephone dialings were needed to obtain the requisite number of completed Jewish interviews. In the fieldwork, 1.3 million randomly selected telephone numbers were used; about 5 million phone calls were made to these numbers, and about 177,000 responding households were screened for possible inclusion. Ultimately 9,175 households were interviewed. Of these, 5,148 households represent the NJPS data file. The additional 4,027 respondents representing non-Jewish households, the National Sample of Religion and Ethnicity (NSRE), were interviewed with a much shorter questionnaire. The NSRE data were also used in the procedure to calculate the proportion of the U.S. population that is Jewish.

The definition of "Who is a Jew" is inherently complex due to a lack of consensus regarding group identification. The basic question was, "Who is eligible for the sample and who is to be interviewed?" For

example, a considerable number of individuals state they are Jewish but also state that they do not see Judaism as their religion. A rigorous sample allocation code system (SAC) was developed for use by interviewers to qualify and classify respondents. This set of allocation codes permit researchers to define who should be included in the study as broadly or narrowly as they desire; it also enables researchers studying issues related to intermarriage, internal migration, denominational affiliation, etc., to explore the impact of alternate definitions on the size and composition of the population sub-group.

The fieldwork involved using a "screener," a short questionnaire designed to qualify households and people in these households as respondents. The sample allocation system, presented in Table 1, consisted of 19 categories used by the interviewers to select respondents according to their responses to a series of screener questions. The initial screener was conducted to determine if the household qualified for either the NJPS survey or the NSRE survey. A household qualified for the Jewish sample if one or more adults identified in some way as Jewish based on the four questions enumerated below. The respondent was then classified in one of the categories in the SAC code by the interviewer. Interviewers received extensive training on the nuances of the SAC scheme in addition to their other training.

Using the 19 categories, the interviewers were instructed to use three interview schedules. At a later stage, categories 8-11 were subdivided into two parts (a and b), to be discussed below. The first schedule was for Jewish respondents who fit categories 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, and 16 in the SAC codes (see Table 1). The strategy used by the interviewers was that in households where one adult qualified as being Jewish, that person was selected for a full NJPS interview. In households with two or more qualified adult Jews, one was randomly selected for a full NJPS interview. A second schedule was for persons identified as PJBs (Persons of Jewish Background) who fit categories 3, 5, 9, 11, 15, and 17 in the SAC codes (see Table 1). In those households designated in the screener as PJB (having no adult Jews, but at least one adult PJB), a random sub-sample was selected for an interview and one qualified PJB adult (if more than one adult in household) was randomly selected from among all qualified PJB adults in the household. The third schedule was for non-Jewish respondents who were part of the National Survey of Religion and Ethnicity. (NSRE), represented in categories 12, 13, 18, and 19 in the SAC codes (see Table 1). Again, one qualified adult was randomly selected from among all qualified adults in the household.

In addition, criteria were developed to instruct interviewers on whom to interview in situations where there were persons within a household who conformed to different codes in the SAC scheme. In households with different configurations of Jewish, PJB and NSRE

Table 1

NJPS/NSRE 2000-01 Sample Allocation Codes, Coding Scheme,
Interview Type and UJC Jewishness Classification

Sample Allocation Codes (ISAC, RSAC)	Current Religion (SQ01, Q010)	Jewish mother and/or father (SQ05, Q011A and Q011B)	Raised Jewish (SQ06, Q012A)	Consider Self Jewish (SQ07, Q015)	Interview Type (SOURCE)	UJC Jewishness Classification (J1 through J6)	Unweighted N
1	Jewish	-	-	-	Jewish	Jewish	3,767
2	Jewish + other	Y	-	Y	Jewish	Jewish	14
3	Jewish + other	Y	-	N	PJB	Jewish-connected	5
4	Jewish + other	N	Y	Y	Jewish	Jewish	1
5	Jewish + other	N	Y	N	PJB	Jewish-connected	0
6	Jewish + other	N	N	Y	Jewish	Jewish	2
7	Jewish + other	N	N	N	PJB	Non-Jewish	20
8a	Other: theologically compatible	Y	-	Y	Jewish	Jewish-connected	72
8b	Other: not theologically compatible	Y	-	Y	Jewish	Non-Jewish	253
9a	Other: theologically compatible	Y	-	N	PJB	Jewish-connected	66
9b	Other: not theologically compatible	Y	-	N	PJB	Non-Jewish	319
10a	Other: theologically compatible	N	Y	Y	Jewish	Jewish-connected	1
10b	Other: not theologically compatible	N	Y	Y	Jewish	Non-Jewish	11
11a	Other: theologically compatible	N	Y	N	PJB	Jewish-connected	2

Table 1

NJPS/NSRE 2000-01 Sample Allocation Codes, Coding Scheme,
Interview Type and UJC Jewishness Classification *(cont.)*

Sample Allocation Codes (ISAC, RSAC)	Current Religion (SQ01, Q010)	Jewish mother and/or father (SQ05, Q011A and Q011B)	Raised Jewish (SQ06, Q012A)	Consider Self Jewish (SQ07, Q015)	Interview Type (SOURCE)	UJC Jewishness Classification (J1 through J6)	Unweighted N
11b	Other: not theologically compatible	N	Y	N	PJB	Non-Jewish	22
12	Other	N	N	Y	NSRE	Non-Jewish	36
13	Other	N	N	N	NSRE	Non-Jewish	3,404
14	None	Y	-	Y	Jewish	Jewish	360
15	None	Y	-	N	PJB	Jewish-connected	220
16	None	N	Y	Y	Jewish	Jewish	3
17	None	N	Y	N	PJB	Jewish-connected	10
18	None	N	N	Y	NSRE	Non-Jewish	2
19	None	N	N	N	NSRE	Non-Jewish	585
Total							9,175

members, or where there were intermarried couples, the interviewers were provided with a specific set of instructions as to how to proceed in selecting a respondent. These decisions were based on prior determination of the proportion of a group that needed to be interviewed in order to reach the required final number of households in the study. For example, the sampling design dictated that all Jewish households were to be interviewed, but only a specific proportion of PJBs and non-Jews. The decisions on whether to interview someone in the PJB or non-Jewish group were made on a continuing basis using a random selection algorithm to make sure that the appropriate number and percentage of PJBs and non-Jews were interviewed. These instructions were conveyed to the interviewers on a regular basis. For example, the plan was to obtain information from about 4,000 non-Jewish households, and therefore interviewers were instructed to select only a certain proportion of non-Jewish households reached. The appropriate representation of each of these groups in the population later was calculated by means of the weighting algorithm.

The decision on whom to interview reflects the view that there are many ways to define the Jewish population, based on religious, ethnic and purely subjective or ideological definitions. Upon reaching someone by phone, a screener asked four questions about the initial contact person and all other adults in the household:

What is your (other adult's) religion, if any?

Do you (does other adult) have a Jewish mother or Jewish father?

Were you (was other adult) raised Jewish?

Do you (does other adult) consider yourself (him/herself) Jewish for any reason?

In 1990, if the person interviewed did not identify himself or herself as Jewish, the next question asked was whether the respondent or someone else in the household considered themselves to be Jewish. If the answer was affirmative, the household was included in the study. In 2000, it was decided to ask about heritage (parents) and socialization (raised) before the question on considering oneself Jewish, as this provided more information and allowed an expanded definition of being Jewish. In addition, the term "if any" was added to the 2000-01 version of the first question in order to allow for people who did not self identify with a religion but may have considered it necessary to offer a religion had the "if any" option not been mentioned. A pre-test conducted with a random selec-

tion of respondents suggested that there was no meaningful difference in the way people self identified due to this change in wording between 1990 and 2000. The addition of an additional question asking respondents whether they currently consider themselves to be Jewish, independent of how they self identified in the previous questions, allowed for a further clarification of the way the population views self identification. If the answer to any of the screener questions was yes, the household qualified.

Once a household was deemed eligible for inclusion in the sample, a random selection procedure (described above) was used to select one qualified adult (age 18 or greater) respondent for each household (where more than one adult was enumerated). This respondent was then re-screened and again assigned to one of 19 categories, based on the sample allocation code noted above. Based on the 19 categories used in the original classification, the UJC and NTAC researchers re-classified the respondents into three summary categories for analytical purposes and to allow a comparison with the 1990 identity constructs. The key difference was splitting categories 8, 9, 10, and 11 in Table 1 into an "a" part, designating a compatible religion, and a "b" part, designating a non-compatible religion. This split was carried out by UJC subsequent to the sampling data-collection phase in order to develop a measure comparable with the definition of "core Jewish" used in the 1990 NJPS study. Non-compatible refers to the religious self-identification of a respondent who belongs to another monotheistic religion, the majority of cases being either Catholicism or one of the Protestant denominations. A compatible religion would be one where there is no theological or historical conflict with Judaism, such as Buddhism or Unitarian Universalism. This reclassification was added as a variable to the data file. This way, a person working with the data can use the UJC classification or construct any specific identity code to conform to the needs of the particular analysis. The three summary categories are:

J1: *Jewish respondents* – (a) Current religion is Judaism; or (b) has Jewish background (born or raised Jewish), has no religion and considers self to be Jewish or (c) current religion is Judaism, but also has another non-monotheistic current religion. The categories in Table 1 included in this J1 set are 1, 2, 4, 6, 14, and 16.

J2: *Jewishly Connected Persons* – (a) Has some Jewish background (born or raised Jewish) and belongs to a non-monotheistic religion, but still considers self to be Jewish, or (b) has some Jewish background (born or raised Jewish) and belongs to a non-monotheistic religion but does not consider self to be

Jewish. The respondents in J2 fit the 1990 definition of Jewish when the "consider self Jewish" question was not asked. The categories in Table 1 included in this J2 set are 3, 5, 8a, 9a, 10a, 11a, 15, and 17.

J3: *Persons of Jewish Background* (PJBs) – Has some Jewish background (born or raised Jewish) and belongs to another monotheistic religion, and may or may not currently consider self to be Jewish. The categories in Table 1 included in this J3 set are 7, 8b, 9b, 10b, and 11b.

Combining the J1 group with the J2 group enables researchers to approximately reconstruct the Jewish "core" population as it had been identified in the 1990 NJPS (Kosmin, Goldstein *et.al*., 1991). As one can see from this classification of the population, the American Jewish population increasingly is a community with a multifaceted background. It is in the internal relationships derived from the questionnaire that researchers will be able to evaluate the dynamics of this process of change and adaptation.

METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS RELATED TO DATA COLLECTION

The research design for this project was developed over an extended period of time and reviewed on a continuing basis by NTAC in consultation with the UJC research department. Methodological issues related to the data collection aspect of the study can be divided into two components. Problems associated with the process of data collection, and results of the data collection.

Non-Retention of Data and "Skip-Pattern Errors" During the Interviewing Process

The problem of greatest concern resulted from a programming error in which a small number of records for respondents who were screened, but for whom an interview was not completed, were not retained in the survey company's computer system. This had implications for the weighting of the data and the estimates of the population. However, replicates where this screener data were retained were available, and all of the replicates were independent samples, so imputation procedures applied to the remaining replicates were used to rectify this problem. NJPS researchers conducted a number of sensitivity tests to determine whether missing screener cases impacted the data quality. As stated in the UJC summary of methodological issues, the results indicated that although the alternative scenarios tested could affect the total number of Jews, they did not affect descriptions of the characteristics of Jews

based on percentages. The issue of over- or under-representation of the Jewish population will be discussed below.

A number of additional technical errors involved inappropriate programming of skip- patterns in the questionnaire. This has an impact on one's ability to fully utilize a limited number of variables in the survey. The list of questions with insufficient data have been compiled and are available on the UJC website (www.ujc.org). In addition, because the survey, which was supposed to end in 2000, ran over into 2001 and some of the code categories referencing events in 2001 were inadvertently not added to the questionnaire, a small number of cases for selected events were assigned inappropriate year codes or else left not coded. An example of this is that births to women in 2001 are not appropriately coded; consequently, births in 2001 were inadvertently assigned to 2000 (or possibly earlier). This has no impact on cumulative fertility as of the survey date, but it makes it more difficult to estimate spacing patterns or total fertility rates for recent years.

Response Rates and the Appropriate Representation of Sub-Groups
In any attempt to survey a population, the first task is to see to it that the sample is randomly selected. This involves ensuring that all members of the appropriate population have a known chance of being selected for the sample. This was accomplished in the NJPS project for everybody except for those Jews without a land-line telephone. This is a problem common to most contemporary surveys, as there is no full list of all cell phone numbers from which to select a sample. Data for year 2000 suggest that about 3% to 4% of persons were using cell phones as their only home phone. While in the future this could have an impact on selectivity, there is no data currently available to suggest what impact this had on the NJPS results. Whereas some evidence suggests that people drop their land line to save money, one could hypothesize that due to the higher socio-economic status of the Jewish population, a smaller proportion would do so.

A second task is to determine that a sufficient proportion of those households contacted did in fact respond to the survey. No survey ever achieves a 100% response rate. The response rate, defined as the percentage of households—including those of unknown eligibility—that fully cooperated with NJPS 2000-01, was reported as 28%. We must emphasize that this low completion rate is a significant problem only if Jews and non-Jews completed interviews at different rates or if certain kinds of Jews were more or less likely to respond then others. NJPS also consciously over-sampled the New York City metropolitan area, which regularly has the lowest response rates in any national survey. The NJPS response rate is low by conventional survey standards as defined by the American Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR). This

could lead to a misestimate of the Jewish population. On the one hand, there are those who suggest that as a result of the low response rate, and the likelihood that some Jews would deny they were Jews when contacted, the Jewish population was undercounted. Some believe the problem stemmed from the way the screener questions were asked; others say an undercount could have resulted from the possibility that Jews had a different propensity than non-Jews to respond to the survey. On the other hand, there is the possibility that no undercount exists and that there may even have been an overcount. There is no infallible method of testing this proposition. Nevertheless, there are data that speak to this issue.

It has been suggested by some that NJPS 2000-01 may have undercounted the Jewish population because the Jewish population is well above average in its educational attainment, and better-educated respondents may be somewhat less likely to respond to a telephone interview. One way to partially clarify whether this actually occurred is to compare the educational distribution for the complete NJPS plus NSRE survey (which is assumed, when weighted, to approximate the complete non-institutional U.S. adult population) with the educational distribution for the non-institutional segment of the 2000 decennial U.S. Census. Theoretically, these two should be identical.

Because years of schooling is only available in the U.S. Census (April 2000) for individuals age 25 and over, the comparison we made was between the NJPS-NSRE populations and the U.S. Census' non-institutional population ages 25 and over. For further comparative purposes, we include estimates from the March 2000 Current Population Non-institutional population age 25 and over. The following Table includes the Census, CPS and joined NJPS-NSRE distributions.

It may be seen that counter to the original premise, the NJPS-NSRE education distribution for the U.S. non-institutional population age 25 and over actually is a *better*-educated population than is the comparable decennial U.S. Census or CPS population, with a substantially smaller percentage in the less-than-high school category, and a substantially greater percentage in the college-degree category. It may be that the U.S. Census, which relies heavily on follow-up interviews, was better able to complete interviews with individuals without telephones, who tend to be less educated. This suggests an over-count of better educated in the Jewish sample with a possible concomitant over-estimate of the Jewish population. If the proportionate overrepresentation of better educated in our overall sample was paralleled by a comparable over-count in our Jewish plus PJB population, very approximately, it could have resulted in a Jewish over-count of about 2%, or approximately 100,000 if the percentage is applied to the original 5.2 million total estimate.

TABLE 2

**Percent Distribution of Persons Aged 25 and Over, by
Years of Schooling Completed
(non-institutionalized population)**

Source	Less than High School	High School Diploma	Some College, No Degree	College Degree	Advanced Degree	Total
CPS March 2000	15.9%	33.1%	25.4%	17.0%	8.6%	100.0%
Census April 2000	18.4%	29.6%	27.0%	16.0%	9.0%	100.0%
NSRE + NJPS	10.9%	31.7%	25.1%	25.3%	7.0%	100.0%

CPS: Current Population Survey, 2000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census)

Census 2000: Decennial U.S. Census

NSRE/NJPS: National Survey of Religion and Ethnicity and National Jewish Population Survey, 2000-01

As part of the methodological check on the data, there was an examination of potential problems raised by the non-retention of screener data and whether the less-than-desired response rate had a greater-than-normal impact on the representation of sub-groups in the sample of respondents. In order to clarify these issues, a number of follow-up "triangulation" studies were conducted by the UJC Research Department and members of NTAC. The process of triangulation implies examining other data sets or other independent information about a particular sub-group to determine if similar distributions are obtained. Initial assessments indicated that sub-groups such as the Orthodox, Russian-speaking immigrants, Israeli immigrants, students, and the elderly were appropriately represented. Methodological evaluations by UJC and NTAC researchers, available on UJC's website, present some examples of these triangulation studies.

In order to test the national representative integrity of the NJPS project, the joint NSRE and NJPS data was compared to two contemporary projects carried out by independent researchers. The percentage of respondents of similar religious denominations in three surveys, the American Survey of Religious Identification (ARIS) (Kosmin et al, 2001), the General Social Survey (GSS 2000) and the National Survey of Religion and Ethnicity (NSRE) were compared. The ARIS study used an omnibus design similar to the 1990 NJPS, with a sample size of about 50,000, the GSS is a national sample of about 1,500, and the NSRE was a national survey of about 4,100 persons. For the purposes of

calculating the religious composition of the U.S. population, the appropriate weighted sample from NJPS was incorporated into the NSRE sample. The resulting convergence of religious affiliations across the three surveys (in Table 3) suggests that even after taking into consideration the different methodologies, definitions, and base populations, the resulting sample distributions are quite comparable. While it is still possible that the total Jewish population is statistically off due to the relatively small size of the population, we can have confidence in the measurement of religious identification of the U.S. population in the NJPS project.

Table 3

Religious Self-Identification Based on Three National Studies

Category	NSRE/ NJPS 2000-01	GSS 2000	ARIS 2001
Christian	78%	81%	81%
Catholic	26	24	26
Selected Protestant	33	37	32
Baptist	18	20	17
Methodist	7	9	7
Presbyterian	3	3	3
Lutheran	5	5	5
Other Protestant or Christian	19	17	23
Jewish	2	2	1
Other Religions	7	3	3
No Religion	13	14	15

NSRR/NJPS: National Survey of Religion and Ethnicity, 2000-01 and National Jewish Population Survey, 2000-01

GSS: General Social Survey, 2000 (University of Chicago

ARIS: American Religious Identification Survey, 2001 (CUNY)

External Evaluation

As a result of the problems of the loss of a small number of screener records and a relatively low response rate, and their resulting potential impact on population parameters and statistical representation, it was appropriate to conduct both an internal and external review of the data. In addition to a series of internal checks conducted by NTAC and UJC's

research department, UJC appointed an outside academic to undertake a methodological review. After a brief investigation, he recommended that an external review committee be established to examine the study. This review committee, chaired by Mark Shulman, former president of the American Association of Public Opinion Research, evaluated all aspects of the study. The committee noted that the methods and data of the NJPS had undergone a high degree of scrutiny—far more than for most surveys. The Shulman review (available online at www.jewishdatabank.org) highlighted certain issues as problematic and suggested that these problems may have produced an underestimate of the Jewish population. The review notes, however, that, "These issues will likely have little impact on the analysis of relationships *between* variables in this dataset. Analysis of these relationships will provide valuable insights into the relationships between the varying backgrounds of Jews, their beliefs, religious practice, and the role of religion in family life" (Shulman, 2003).

As a generalization, subject to several caveats noted throughout this paper, it was generally agreed by the committee that the quality of the data set met professional standards. Once the final NJPS 2000-01 report was issued in September of 2003, the data set was released into the public domain and many researchers and community organizations now are analyzing the data. Because of the complexity of the data set, researchers using the data should be aware of the study's technical and methodological problems. A study documentation has been prepared by UJC and is widely available (UJC, 2003b).

GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE CONSIDERATIONS

The 1990 NJPS used modules, and thus for many questions, such as philanthropy and identity issues, only about one-third of the sample was asked these questions. This made it possible to ask a greater number of questions, but the resulting sample sizes often were too small for reliable subgroup analysis. In 2000, this module approach was not utilized. However, for reasons of cost the sample was divided into respondents who should be asked all the questions and those who would not be asked questions believed not relevant to their particular situation. PJB respondents were administered a short-form questionnaire consisting of a subset of approximately 40% of the questions administered to "Jewish" respondents. The PJB questionnaire excluded many but not all questions on Jewish topics.

Of the total NJPS sample, 93% of those who were defined either as Jewish or connected with Judaism were asked the entire questionnaire. Analysts who make the decision to study the Jewish population broadly defined (both "strongly" and "weakly" connected) therefore will not be able to use some questions for all respondents.

The depth and breadth of the information available in this survey, in conjunction with the relatively large national sample, enable researchers to explore effectively a wide range of topics. This includes basic research on a full range of topics that are mainstream in a number of social science disciplines, as well as more programmatic- and policy-oriented subjects that would meet the needs of many Jewish institutional, religious, and social-service agencies. As might be expected, the NJPS 2000-01 data collection was not designed to provide depth and breadth of information on all religious and non-religious topical areas.

The questionnaire collected information on the demographic background of all respondents and all family members. More detailed information was obtained for the respondent and a randomly selected child in the households with children, in order to generalize about both the child and adult Jewish populations. The questions were directed toward behaviors and attitudes—past, present, and, in some cases, future—in a variety of substantive areas. Some of these questionnaire items are highlighted in the examples to follow. The questionnaire and related documentation are available online at www.jewishdatabank.org and www.ujc.org. The highest priorities in this time-constrained, religion-focused survey were the religious/ethnic-linked data elements. Thus, it is an extremely strong data set for exploring Jewish family life and attitudes and behaviors related to lifecycle events. The information about non-Jewish behaviors and attributes relating to the respondent's childhood is quite limited.

Because of the more limited life course data on non-Jewish topics, research that explores connections over the life course, with a particular emphasis on causal interpretations, will be more constrained. Much of this reflects a conscious tradeoff about what could be included in a telephone survey of reasonable length, some 35 to 40 minutes. These tradeoffs reflected an informal process that involved a balancing of the needs of UJC, other Jewish institutions, and the larger research community, all with important priorities. Aside from the obvious criterion of including content for exploring the many dimensions of the Jewish population, several other factors came into play. First, every effort was made to maintain comparability with 1990, except where doing so would have resulted in repeating an inadequate question. In some instances, this resulted in difficult compromises. Additionally, as noted above, for reasons of cost, time, and maintaining cooperation with all respondents, a decision was made to refrain from asking all of the religion-related questions of the modest subset of respondents (7%) who self-defined as loosely connected to the Jewish population. The next two sections highlight general topical areas at the core of this survey.

Non-Jewish Data Items

The data base includes variables of a general demographic nature, including age and sex structure, marital status, economic welfare, residential mobility and migration, educational attainment, current household structure, current relationships, dating, and fertility. There also is information about current employment status (including occupation and industry), earnings, and household income and assets. All these can be used in concert with one another to build cross-sectional or cross-generational profiles of the structure and dynamics of the population or subgroups within the population. There also is information about the health status of selected individuals, the need for social support services, and contributions to non-Jewish charities. Using the above inputs, one can develop profiles for the American Jewish community as of 2001 from a secular perspective and make a number of comparisons with the larger contemporary U.S. population. This data set can also provide the necessary estimates for providing basic comparisons with the Jewish population in 1990. The data, which are cross-sectional, are of much more limited value for providing a *longitudinal* or lifecycle context for comparison with the large number of Jewish events that have occurred over the lifetime of this population. This is the nature of a cross-sectional study.

From a family perspective, the data set also includes information about the schooling, prior residential status, place of birth, and dates of residence in other countries of both the parent and grandparent generation. For the same generation as the respondent, there is a variety of information about family structure, education, ethnicity, place of birth, employment, earnings, and philanthropic work and contributions. There is sufficient detail to contrast spouses and partners along a number of dimensions, although the depth of the spouse/partner information is more limited than for the respondent.

Jewish Data Items

The depth and breadth of the variables in the data file related to both religious and ethnically oriented information is considerable, both for contemporary behaviors, attributes, and attitudes, and for retrospectively collected behavioral information covering the respondent's lifespan (as well as for spouses and children, though these are of a more limited nature). Subject to recall error or any conscious "re-creation" of history, these inputs allow a researcher, subject to various caveats, to infer some causal connections over the life course. There are a variety of religious variables available from the respondent's childhood, adolescence, early adulthood, and the present. In the following paragraphs, we give some examples of this lifecycle perspective. NJPS asked the respondent about early Jewish schooling and camp experiences, Jewish

family life at ages 10 or 11,denominational attachment and ritual obser-
vances, trips to Israel, networking and dating with Jewish friends, and
college Jewish social and educational experiences. Thus, it is possible to
piece together a fairly coherent gestalt picture of a respondent's connec-
tions with Judaism in his or her early decades of life. For the adult years,
from a behavioral perspective, there is information about denomination,
synagogue membership and attendance, and a variety of ritual activities,
as well as also information about religious identification, intermarriage,
Jewish dating, marriage, divorce, membership in organizations such as a
JCC, Jewish friendship networks, organization affiliations and dona-
tions, and related activities. Thus, particularly for younger adults, one
may paint a vivid mosaic of Jewish continuity or discontinuity for Jews
from different secular and religious backgrounds and orientations. An
additional asset is the availability of considerable information about
how the children of these respondents are being raised from a Jewish
perspective. For the "index child," a randomly selected child who lives
in the respondent's household, a considerable body of information about
schooling, ritual activities, and other Jewish social activities is avail-
able, permitting direct links and robust interpretations regarding the
intergenerational transmission of Jewish behaviors.

A major strength of the data rests on the extensive availability of
contemporary attitudes about many Jewish issues for a full cross-section
of the adult Jewish population. The data can be used to inform the Jew-
ish programmatic, policy-oriented, and research world about how con-
temporary Jews feel about a wide range of issues. In addition, these
attitudes can be readily linked with the full spectrum of secular and reli-
gious antecedents available, potentially enabling clarification of what
factors in one's Jewish background best predicts contemporary feelings
about denominational and ritual beliefs and observance, the meaning of
religion and Judaism, or connection to Israel and God, to name just a
few. Also, a cross-sectional examination of current Jewish attitudes and
behaviors can provide important insights into what distinguishes Jewish
population subgroups. An important innovation in the 2000 question-
naire, based on criticism of the 1990 study, was the inclusion of a con-
siderable number of questions referencing the more ethnic or non-
ritualistic connections to being Jewish. This allows researchers to exam-
ine the context of Jewish identity from a number of theoretical and
empirical perspectives.

**KEY FINDINGS/ THEMES HIGHLIGHTING THE UTILITY OF
THE DATA**

The potential range of studies possible with this data set is considerable.
We highlight selected research areas where this data set has a compara-
tive advantage over others and provide a few early results indicative of

the data's unique strengths. Unambiguously, NJPS 2000-01 represents the best data collection effort available for exploring the behaviors and attitudes of the contemporary U.S. Jewish population in some depth. The research opportunities for using these data are diverse and include not only explorations of the contemporary Jewish community, but also comparative research with other appropriate non-Jewish populations. Additionally, use of the 1990 NJPS allows for some careful comparisons with the American Jewish population a decade earlier. Finally, it is likely that many researchers who are interested in exploring topics connecting religious and non-religious issues, albeit not necessarily Judaism per se, may find this data set of considerable value for complementary research that focuses on cross-religious similarities or differences.

Trends and Levels of Basic Demographic and Socio-economic Events

From a demographic perspective, the contemporary Jewish population is unique in a number of ways. Compared to the overall population, the Jewish population is somewhat older, wealthier, better educated, more likely to delay marriage, and modestly less likely to bear children. Many of these factors are linked together and reflect a unique historical heritage. Jewish family socialization and religious values are at the core of much of the above. Immigration patterns in the 20th century in conjunction with low fertility rates have resulted in a relatively aging population. Many recent and contemporary secular forces, and, to a lesser extent, religious dimensions, are at play here. Some of these issues can be explored effectively with this data set. For example, contemporary Jewish fertility levels can be examined fairly carefully from the perspective of the religious and secular antecedents, to the extent that factors like educational attainment and selected Jewish indicators are proxies for fundamental secular and non-secular factors. This can be done, for instance, by examining connections between a number of events, such as the pace and level of marriage and childbearing both within as well as across time. Utilizing both the 1990 and 2000-01 data sets, one can explore the extent to which the pace of marriage and childbearing may be connected in different ways with religious and secular antecedents. Additionally, the greater depth of earlier-in-life explanatory variables available in the 2000-01 NJPS, in conjunction with the larger sample, permit a more careful exploration of lifecycle connections than had been possible with earlier data sets. In the following sections, we suggest a variety of research topics that can be addressed with this data set.

Fertility-Related Issues

Preliminary work suggests that contemporary Jewish fertility levels are probably moderately below replacement levels and perhaps moderately below the levels for all U.S. white women (Hurst and Mott, 2004). Additionally, there is some evidence that younger (25-34-year old) Jewish women in 2000 may well complete their childbearing with somewhat (but not excessively) lower fertility than was true for their similarly aged counterparts in 1990. This is based partly on approximate comparisons of fertility progression by those ages for women in 1990 and 2000, as well as a comparison of children ever born for 25-34-year-old Jewish women with those 35-44 years old in 2000-01. This analysis shows the importance of both religious and non-religious factors as determinants of fertility, and the findings strongly suggest that if Jewish women had the same educational mix as their non-Jewish white counterparts they might well bear significantly *more* children than the non-Jewish population. Fertility issues, as well as many other topics, can perhaps be most effectively addressed by utilizing the 2000-01 data in conjunction with the 1990 data, making age-specific cohort comparisons.

The impact of denominational identification is a critical variable in attempting to understand fertility. From a religious perspective, independent of education or other measurable non-religious factors, there is an important religious-fertility connection. More traditional women, particularly those who identify with the Orthodox denomination, typically have fertility well above the rest of the Jewish population at both younger and older ages. Indeed, by ages 35 to 44 this population has had more than twice as many children, about 3.7 per women, compared with about 1.7 for the full spectrum of Jewish women. This general finding masks the fact that within each denominational group, the better educated have fewer children than those who are less educated. However, given the substantial proportion of the Jewish population that is highly educated, and the modest proportion that is Orthodox, this nets out to an overall modest anti-natalist effect.

Fertility; Jewish and Non-Jewish Connections

Another important research area relates more generally to connections between a respondent's earlier life events and other key adult outcomes, both of a secular and religious nature. In one ongoing project (Hurst and Mott, 2004a) researchers are attempting to sort out connections between earlier life behaviors, scholastic achievement, and economic family success. Preliminary results from this research suggest several important within- and cross-generational connections that vary in basic respects by the gender of the respondent. First, whereas both parents having a college degree powerfully predicts respondents college completion or grad-

uate education regardless of gender, maternal education by itself has no independent predictive value for either male or female children. In contrast, paternal education has predictive value for all children, but more so for daughters than for sons. From a religious perspective, independent of parental education, Orthodox men and women are the least likely to attain a college degree.

There is also a strong positive connection between obtaining a college degree and household income for men and women. However, graduate education only has a significant connection with household income for men. This is consistent with the notion that graduate fields of study for women have been disproportionately in lower paying occupational areas. As an additional generalization, traditional religious linkages in some instances predict higher incomes for men whereas non-traditional orientations are more closely (but not always) connected with higher household incomes for women

Jewish Mobility and Jewish Connectedness

In recent years, it has become clear that the diversity of Jewish identities is increasing. Differences exist in how Jews manifest their connections to the community (Freedman, 2000). Results from the 1990 NJPS pointed to a relationship between the increased level of mobility in recent decades and decreased involvement in the Jewish community. Whereas in the 1960s about two-thirds (65%) of the Jewish population lived in the Northeast, by 2000 this had declined to around two-fifths (42%). The uses of internal migration data from NJPS 2000-01 are being examined to revisit the hypothesis that residential dispersion is associated with a weakening identification within the Jewish community. The combination of data on mobility and behavioral and attitudinal Jewish identity variables will allow for some clarification about how respondents living in different parts of the country, defined in a number of ways, are different on a number of variables testing group identity and consciousness and whether identity and changing affiliation to family and community are influenced by movement. This type of analysis also has implications for the way communities utilize resources to resocialize migrants who have a need to reconnect with community, which ties in with the general sociological literature on social networking and community organization (Klaff, 2004b).

Politics, Religion and Religiosity

The NJPS 2000 data set includes a sequence of items that ask the respondent about his/her formal political affiliation, conservative-liberal orientation, attendance at political functions, and whether he/she is registered to vote. This set of questions permits one to explore the connections between political orientations, formal religious connection, and a

wide range of secular and non-secular concomitants. It also permits exploration of connections between political involvement and a variety of linked issues, such as patterning of charitable contributions and involvement in social and religious organizational and institutional activities. Also, explorations of how political orientation for this nationally representative Jewish population is linked with a wide range of religious and socio-political attitudes are possible.

The Religion Factor: Within and Cross-Generational Explanations for Change

The above suggested some (but obviously not all) areas for research, which essentially connects Jewish and non-Jewish priors with subsequent social and demographic outcomes. We now shift to suggestions of possible research agendas that can more directly be addressed with this data set. At the core of these research topics is the overriding loose hypothesis that many of the contemporary Jewish issues of interest and concern can only be appropriately considered within the context of a Jewish family history, and that these issues in many instances cannot be easily separated from the normative values of the larger society. An earlier section briefly highlighted the enormous breadth and depth of information available about the attributes, behaviors, and attitudes of these Jewish respondents and their families. The focus here is on several research areas to highlight the wide range of religiously oriented research possibilities.

1. Intermarriage: Levels, Trends, and Interpretations

The issue of intermarriage is a major concern to many individuals and institutions in the Jewish community. There are many perspectives on this topic. In reality, the intermarriage issue cannot be easily separated from how one defines the Jewish population, because levels of intermarriage are intimately linked with variations in this definition. A major strength of this data set is that researchers can choose to define the Jewish population widely or narrowly, depending on one's intellectual, theological, or programmatic orientation. Subject to this caveat, the data can be utilized to explore not only levels and trends (in comparison with 1990) in intermarriage, but—of perhaps even greater significance—they can consider the personal, familial, and even geographic traits of those who do and do not (a) marry someone who is Jewish, (b) marry someone who is not Jewish but converts (either before or after the marriage point), and (c) marry someone who does not convert. From a programmatic perspective, defining these different groups according to their secular and religious orientations may provide critical insights into more or less effective mechanisms for encouraging conversion. This would reflect both a greater sensitivity to which population subsets might be more amenable to intermarriage and raising children Jewish on

the basis of current attitudes and prior behaviors. In a cost-constrained world, information of this kind may help provide rationales about where to focus limited resources, and what programmatic approaches may be the most effective.

2. Defining Jewish Connections

NJPS 2000-01 includes a vast amount of information about the many ways Jews define themselves religiously and ethnically. This includes but is not limited to denominational attachment; ritual obser-vance; involvement with synagogues, schools, or other institutions; social networks; feelings and involvement with Israel; and/or connec-tions of a more ethnic or cultural nature. Any or all of these may interact in different ways with an individual's personal feelings or connections with the Bible or a deity. The data set includes a wide range of informa-tion about the respondent's feelings and behaviors in connection with these and other religious dimensions. These factors are also critical for helping understand whom one might marry, how one is raising one's children, and how one is interacting with the larger Jewish community. Obviously, these many cornerstones of Jewish identity are not indepen-dent from each other, and some are more interactive than others. At the core of needed research is the increased understanding of how and why many of these factors are or are not intimately connected, and how these factors, individually or jointly, are important predictors of mainstream Jewish identity. More than anything else, evaluations of this kind will help us more fully understand the considerable heterogeneity of the Jewish population today. An understanding of this intricate religious mosaic is essential to understanding almost all the processes connecting Jews with each other and the larger society.

3. What is a Jew? From the Secular to the Haredi

A key finding in recent studies of the American Jewish community has been the diversity of self-identification on both religious and ethnic dimensions. The classical "religious" connotation of what it means to be Jewish has increasingly morphed into the distinction between religion and ethnicity. For the Jewish population, the difference between reli-gious membership and preference is sociologically meaningful in terms of the denominational organizational breakdown. There are three princi-pal groups—Orthodox, Conservative and Reform—that differ in their theological connections to Judaism, and a fourth group that identifies as being Jewish but whose members do not report Judaism as their reli-gion. This latter group, often referred to as secular or non-affiliated, is critical because about one-quarter of the "Jewish population" identifies with being Jewish but does not identify with any of the three major denominations. Respondents can be classified as having a preference for Orthodox, Conservative, Reform or non-affiliated, and the same classi-fication can be used for membership.

It is thus possible to classify each respondent according to the following typology:

1) Membership and preference with denomination X, 2) Member of denomination X, but preference for another denomination; 3) Member of a denomination, but has no denominational preference and 4) Preference for denomination X, but member of another denomination. As an example, 76% of the weighted sample identified themselves as having a preference for one of the denominations, but only 45% claimed membership of one of the denominational synagogues, with the remaining 55% being denominationally non-members. Data from NJPS 2000-01 can be used to study the relationships between the religion-ethnicity continuum in American society and to analyze the behavioral and attitudinal dynamics of denominational membership and denominational preference (Klaff, 2004a).

4. Intergenerational Transmission of Religious Values

At the core of Jewish continuity is the issue of transmitting religious, ethnic, or cultural values across the generations. This issue has been touched upon peripherally in several of the above sections. The NJPS data can address this issue more comprehensively than other available data. Of course, as noted above, how one defines Judaism and Jewish values is arguable—and is frequently argued about! The data set has limited information about the parents of the respondents, considerable information about the respondents and their immediate family, and a reasonable amount of information about how the non-adult children of the respondents are being raised. Some of this latter information is direct in that it describes child behaviors. Some is indirect and requires inferences about child raising to be based on a variety of respondent and family behaviors and attitudes. Important insights can be gained by contrasting what parents with different Jewish and secular orientations define as "raising children Jewish." This can inform a variety of Jewish educational and institutional agendas. One of the critical issues facing the community is the impact of intermarriage on future generations. Preliminary research suggests that intermarriage actually can impact on Jewish population size in more then one way. For example, for Jewish women aged 35-44 in the NJPS, women who are intermarried not only are substantially more likely to say they are raising their children not Jewish, but additionally have fewer children then their intra-married counterparts (Hurst and Mott, 2004). In this age range, which is approaching the end of the childbearing years, women married to a Jewish man have had 2.37 children, of whom 99% are being raised Jewish. In contrast, their intermarried counterparts have had 1.9 children, of

whom only 57% are being raised Jewish. This nets out to a major difference in the average number of children being raised Jewish in the groups: 2.35 compared with 1.08. There is a rich store of information in the NJPS to re-examine these issues of intermarriage, cultural continuity, and generational connection.

5. Size of the American Jewish Population

One of the issues of key concern to be obtained from the NJPS 2000-01 project was to estimate the size of the Jewish population. Using an approximate definition of the Core Jewish definition used in 1990 to estimate a Jewish population of 5.5 million, the NJPS 2000-01 reported a Jewish population of about 5.2 million. The population estimate certainly could be higher or lower by a small percentage, (where the 95% confidence interval is only plus/minus 140,000). A population such as American Jews can change in two ways. From a purely demographic perspective, the size of the population is determined by fertility (addition by births), mortality (subtraction by deaths) and migration (the net result of immigrants less emigrants).

The level of fertility is closely linked with an interactive combination of factors, including greater contraceptive use, later age at marriage, larger numbers remaining single, and increased female participation in the labor force. Each of these factors is associated with lower fertility among Jewish women. NJPS 2000-01 indicates that the current birth rate among Jewish women is somewhat below the rate required to replace a population in the long run. For example, 52% of all Jewish women aged 30-34 have no children, compared to 27% of white women in the general population. On average, Jewish women aged 35-44, nearing the end of their childbearing years, have had about 1.7 children, compared with 1.87 children for their white non-Jewish counterparts (Hurst and Mott, 2004). Also, from a demographic perspective, this average older age for Jewish childbearing is consistent with a longer average generation between mother and child, thus lowering long-term fertility for the Jewish population.

While no hard evidence is available, on an age-specific basis it is likely that Jewish mortality is lower then for the overall U.S. population, reflecting Jews' higher average socio-economic status and probable better access to health care. However, the Jewish population is significantly older, and this is undoubtedly linked with a somewhat higher overall level of Jewish mortality. For example, the median age of the Jewish population is currently about 41 years, compared to 35 years for the total U.S. white population.

The migration situation is somewhat more complex. During the last two decades, relatively large numbers of Jews from Russia and the former Soviet republics immigrated to the United States, reaching an estimated peak of 46,000 per year in 1992 and then declining to about

16,000 annually by 1997. It is not unreasonable to suggest that with some exceptions, the Jewish *net* migration on an annual basis may fall below 10,000 in the near future. In sum, while researchers can disagree about specific levels and rates, the results of the above patterns are suggestive of a gradually declining Jewish population.

The second critical dimension that impacts the size of the Jewish population are those factors that are directly connected with movements into or out of the religion. As just noted, Jewish women 35-44 have had about 1.7 children on average. As the prior section indicates, taking into account the fact that not all Jewish married women are raising their children Jewish, the overall 35-44 age estimate declines to about 1.5 Jewish children. That is well below the 2.1 children needed to ensure replacement of the population.

Married women who indicate they are not raising their children Jewish are more likely to be intermarried and have a weaker identification with the religion. For example, as highlighted above, in research currently under way (Hurst and Mott, ongoing), we find that women ages 35 to 44 who are currently married within the religion have more children than do currently intermarried women and are more likely to raise their children Jewish.

Intermarriage clearly is at the core of this social phenomenon. Using a standard definition of intermarriage, the 1990 intermarriage rate for couples marrying between 1985 and 1990 was estimated at 43%, and this has increased to 47% for those marrying between 1995 and 2000 (UJC 2003a: 16-17). While this is not a large increase, and despite the claim that intermarriages bring some new members into the community rather than only losing members, the evidence on both behavioral and attitudinal characteristics point to a differential in Jewish identification for intermarried families compared to in-married families. Other variables contributing to potential dynamics of Jewish connection are internal migration—movement out of the Northeast to areas in the South and West—weakening the network base for the new migrants; denominational switching—a movement from the ideological center to the periphery and particularly to the non-affiliated (secular) form of identification; the changing role of the family—where secular institutions are taking over many of the socialization roles of the family; attitudes toward Israel—where religious and political views impact on transnational identity and where evidence suggests a general weakening of the unequivocal acceptance of Israel; methods of communication, including the use of the internet and other media in making connections; and very generally an assimilative move among upwardly mobile younger Jews to become part of the increasingly diverse ethnic and religious character of American society.

Subject, of course, to the caveat that current trends continue (always an open question), we hypothesize a likely continuing modest decline in the years ahead in the size of the Jewish population as typically defined. Based on the assumption that the 5.5 million Jews enumerated in the 1990 study (Kosmin and Goldstein, 1991) was a reasonably accurate representation of the Jewish population, then the 2000-01 figure may well be modestly lower and somewhere between 5.5 and 5.2 million. Finally, the results of the American Religious Identification Survey (ARIS) using a methodology more similar to the NJPS 1990 procedure than the NJPS 2000-01 procedure, has concluded that the Jewish population was 5.2 million. This estimate is not statistically significantly different from the NJPS 2000-01 estimate.

CONCLUSION

The suggestions for possible research we have made are just a few of many possibilities. A number of basic statistics already have entered the mainstream, many of which are included in the UJC summary report (UJC, 2003a). These include but are not limited to overall population estimates, age structure, regional variation, and a variety of additional demographic and socioeconomic statistics, as well as a religious overview of the population. Many people are currently working on research, program, and policy papers related to NJPS 2000-01. The 1990 data set permits longitudinal comparisons to be made on a limited number of topics. Additionally, since the 1990 and 2000-01 surveys were carried out approximately at the same time as the decennial U.S. Census, it is also possible to explore the extent to which and how the U.S. Jewish population is converging toward or diverging from the overall U.S. population.

The creation of a complex questionnaire and data collection effort such as NJPS 2000-01 is, at best, a difficult process. It involves a lengthy process that inherently is quite subjective in the construction of the questionnaire and highly technical in the design and implementation of the fieldwork. This data set will provide essential inputs and outcomes for mainstream Jewish research for years to come. Many groups and individuals have provided input into the process and into the negotiations of what the final product should look like. This diverse input has assured that the data needed for a wide range of policy-oriented, programmatic, and research-oriented analyses will be available.

REFERENCES

Freedman, Samuel G. 2000. *Jew vs. Jew: The Struggle for the Soul of American Jewry*. New York, NY,: Simon and Schuster.

General Social Survey. 2000. Data file for the year 2000 survey of the American Population. National Opinion Research Center, Chicago: University of Chicago.

Goldstein, S. 1993. "Profile of American Jewry: Insights from the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey." Occasional Paper No. 6. (May) New York, NY: Council of Jewish Federations.

Goldstein, S., and A. Goldstein.. 1996. *Jews on the Move*. Albany, New York: SUNY.

Hartman, M., and H. Hartman. 1996. *Gender Equality and American Jews*. Albany, New York: SUNY.

Hurst, D. and F. Mott. 2004a. "Secular Outcomes and the Importance of Intergenerational Investments of Human and Social Forms of Capital: 'Does Religiosity Make a Difference.'" Work under way, with preliminary results presented at 2004 annual meetings of the Population Association of America. Forthcoming in *Sociology of Religion*. 2005.

Hurst, D and F. Mott. 2004b. "Why is Jewish Fertility so Low? Secular and Non-Secular Influences." Currently submitted for publication consideration.

Klaff, V. 2004. "Residential Location and Social Structure of the Jewish Population: A Smallest Space Analysis." Paper presented at the Eastern Sociological Society meeting, New York.

Klaff, V. 2005. "Denominational Membership and Self-Identity among American Jews: Continuity through Religion or through Ethnicity." *Sociology of Religion* (Forthcoming).

Kosmin, B, S. Goldstein *et.al*. 1991. *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*. New York, NY: Council of Jewish Federations.

Kosmin, B, E. Mayer, and A. Keysar. 2001. *American Religious Identification Survey*. The Graduate School, CUNY, New York.

Lazerwitz, B. 1973. "The National Jewish Population Survey Sample Design" in *Papers in Jewish Demography, 1970.* Jewish Population Studies Series, pp.47-62. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University.

Massarik, F. 1973. "The United States National Jewish Population Study: A note on concept and reality" in *Papers in Jewish Demography, 1970.* Jewish Population Studies Series, pp.27-45. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University.

Mayer, E., B. Kosmin, and A. Keysar. 2001. *American Jewish Identity Survey 2001.* New York: The Center for Cultural Judaism.

Shulman, M. 2003. "National Jewish Population Survey 2000-2001," *Study Review Memo.* New York, NY: United Jewish Communities.

United Jewish Communities. 2003a. *Strength, Challenge, and Diversity in the American Jewish Population.* Research Report. New York, NY: United Jewish Communities.

United Jewish Communities. 2003b. "National Jewish Population Survey/ National Survey of Religion and Ethnicity 2000-01," Study Documentation. New York, NY.