

NATIONAL JEWISH POPULATION STUDY

Work Paper A, 1968*

Procedural and Technical Status, NJPS

This work paper summarizes recent developments in plans for the U.S. National Jewish Population Study, primarily procedural and technical matters, August 1, - December 31, 1967.

I. Pre-tests and Pilot Studies

Three communities now are engaged in Jewish population studies, or have recently concluded field work. One additional community recently authorized a new study.

(1) In Flint, Michigan, a Jewish community of approximately 3000, field work is now in the late stages. Using a master list, relatively good response has been obtained in brief telephone interviews, ranging in length from five to ten minutes. Response to a mail questionnaire appears to be near 80%, though final tabulations are not complete. Home interviews now are continuing.

(2) In Baltimore, a major effort was made to make use of telephone interviews. Here, preliminary results suggest that the outcome is less satisfactory than that in Flint.

(3) The (Oakland) Alameda and Contra Costa Counties study, now preparing for field work, makes systematic comparisons among several data collection methodologies. These will include the following:

- A. Mail
- B. Mail plus telephone follow-up
- C. Telephone
- D. Mail with personal interview follow-up
- E. Personal interview

Three different schedules will be employed, taking into account the particular limitations of the data collection procedure. These schedules are identified as follows:

- A. "Brief schedule": containing a small number of questions primarily on demographic and objective characteristics.
- B. "Basic schedule": including more extended inquiries, including aspects of Jewish identity and attitudes.
- C. "Detailed schedule": including considerably more probing and complex inquiries and open-end attitude questions.

The "brief schedule" will be used in the mail and mail-plus-telephone-follow-up procedures; the brief plus basic schedules will be employed in the mail-plus-personal interview follow-up procedure, and the entire schedule, including the brief, basic and detailed schedule components will be utilized in the personal interview procedure.

(4) The newly-authorized study will be initiated in Columbus, Ohio, estimated Jewish Population 10,000, in the near future. Further pre-tests designs are possible for this locality.

The use of volunteers has been considered in some community studies, and implemented in several, with mixed results.

The following represents tentative current thinking with respect to data collection procedures, to be tested further by analyses resulting from pilot studies noted above:

A. The national study will utilize a variety of data collection techniques.

B. Self-enumeration and self-administered response to attitude questions may prove feasible for inquires as those included in the brief and basic schedules.

C. Mail and telephone approaches may be appropriate for certain sub-samples (isolated respondents in low density areas, etc.) with personal follow-up used as required, to assure coverage.

D. Personal interviews are advisable when the detailed schedule, in addition to the brief and basic schedule is to be administered. (These interviews would, therefore, include inquires of a more deeply probing and subtle nature than would be elicited by self-enumeration, mail or telephone).

II. Sample Design

As a general guideline, the national study intends to rely importantly on a variety of stratifications in its sample design. The following are tentative and illustrative:

A. Stratification by estimated Jewish Community Size

Estimates of the American Jewish Year Book, 1967, whatever their limitations, provide the following distribution, as basis for an initial stratification:

See Table 1, Page 3

TABLE (1)

Estimated Jewish Population, American Jewish Yearbook, 1967

Estim. Jewish Popul. Range	Estimated Total: J. persons	No. of 'Communities'	% of U.S. J. Popul.
Up To 1,000	133,355	(436)	2.31
1,000 to 4,999	313,350	(142)	5.43
5,000 to 9,999	207,150	(28)	3.59
10,000 to 49,999	688,315	(40)	11.94
50,000 to 99,999	553,000	(7)	9.60
100,000 + up	3,865,000	(7)	67.09
<hr/>			
Grand Total =	5,760,170	(660)	100.00

Stratification at this stage may proceed in accordance with the following divisions; (Proportion of communities to be included in study is shown in parantheses):

1. New York Metropolitan area (all parts included)
 2. Other Jewish communities, 100,000 and over
- (all)
3. Jewish communities, 50,000 to 99,999 (or alternatively, 40,000-99,999), (probably all)
 4. Jewish communities, 10,000 to 49,999 (or alternatively, 10,000-39,999), (perhaps one of two)
 5. Jewish communities, 1,000 to 9,999 (perhaps one of eight, or one of ten)
 6. Jewish communities, reporting some Jewish population, but less than 1,000 (possibly one of 15 or one of 20)
 7. Communities, probably defined on a county basis, reporting no Jewish population, (perhaps a total of 40 or 50 counties, though this number is purely a guess at this point).

Distinctive Jewish names estimates, as those used in the Los Angeles studies, based on the relative constancy of the ratio of 35 specific DJNs, may provide some revisions in Jewish community size estimates for purposes of initial stratification, (see Table 2), and will be useful for intra-community stratification purposes.

It would appear from Table 2 that the DJN method correlates well with other estimates, except in a few instances, where, as suggested by other information (such as in Orange County, Calif.) larger discrepancies cast doubt on the validity of the original estimate. At any rate, such discrepancies, including the serious one for Nassau County, New York, may be taken into account in the sample design. (The utility of the DJN method for intra-community stratification was investigated in my recent article in the Jewish Journal of Sociology)

B. Stratification by Intra-Community Jewish Population Density

For large and medium sized Jewish communities (possibly for strata: Jewish population 100,000 and up, and 50,000 to 99,999, or perhaps also including communities in the 10,000 to 49,999 range): stratification on the basis of the DJN method for sub-areas within communities, distinguishing.

1. Highest Jewish density areas, possibly 50% and up.
2. High Jewish density areas, (Jewish population densities of perhaps 25-49.9%)

TABLE (2)

Comparison of Distinctive Jewish Names, Jewish Population Estimates and Estimates Given in the 1966 Jewish Yearbook

<u>Area</u>	<u>DJNs Counted</u>	<u>Assumed J. Household Size</u>	<u>Total Jewish Population Per Yearbook</u>	<u>Total Jewish Pop. DJN Estin</u>
Lancaster, Pa.	84	3.1	2,000	2,083
Albuquerque, N.M.	114	3.6	3,000	3,203
Indianapolis, Ind.	486	3.0	8,500	11,184
Orange County, Calif.	598	4.0	30,000	19,136
Providence, R.I.	977	3.2	22,300	25,211
Milwaukee, Wisc.	1,067	3.2	27,135	27,515
Cincinnati, Ohio	1,208	3.2	27,500	30,924
Cleveland, Ohio	<u>2,983</u>	3.2	<u>85,000</u>	<u>76,364</u>
<u>SUBTOTAL</u>	<u>7,497</u>		<u>205,435</u>	<u>195,500</u>
Chicago, Ill	13,949	2.8	276,055	312,457
New York, N.Y.	75,046	3.2	1,836,000	1,921,167
Nassau County, N.Y.	10,470	3.4	372,000	283,084
Suffolk County, N.Y.	<u>1,625</u>	3.4	<u>42,000</u>	<u>44,200</u>
<u>SUBTOTAL</u>	<u>101,090</u>		<u>2,526,055</u>	<u>2,559,208</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>108,587</u>		<u>2,731,490</u>	<u>2,754,708</u>

*As the "names counted" only gives one name per household, by multiplying this figure by 4 (assuming this is the average household size), we get the number of people represented by this count.

3. Moderate Jewish density areas, (Jewish population densities 15-24.9%)
4. Low Jewish density areas, (Jewish population densities 5-14.9%)
5. Sparse Jewish population areas, (Jewish population densities less than 5%)

In most instances clusters, with pre-listing of households, may be considered in the relatively high density areas, however defined numerically. Further, master lists of Jewish households would be used as appropriate.

C. Stratification By "Likelihood of Jewishness"

For households selected on an area probability basis (rather than by master list), following pre-listing, it becomes possible for knowledgeable experts to judge whether the respondent (or household) at a given address is likely to be Jewish. Ratings may be made dichotomously: "probably Jewish" vs. "probably not Jewish"; or on a four-step basis: "almost certainly Jewish", "probably Jewish", "probably not Jewish", and "almost certainly not Jewish". Differential sampling ratios may be applied, based on the rating. For instance, for the later four categories, the ratios may be of the respective order of 100%, 80%, 40%, and 20%.

D. Use of master lists of Jewish households

The uncritical use of master lists in Jewish population studies United States would result in important biases. Most U.S. master lists derive primarily from Jewish community fund-raising campaigns. Though non-givers and new prospects may be included, the typical bias is in the direction of higher social-economic status. Supplementation of these lists by names from social service and relief rolls normally adds few cases of opposite bias, while certain "hidden" Jewish populations (Jewish aged living in Jewish low-density areas or in rooming houses, Jews who wish to deny their origins, intermarried households, etc.) are likely to be under-represented. In spite of these limitations, it becomes necessary to use lists under certain conditions; these include the following:

- A. In areas of sparse Jewish population concentration, when area probability sampling is economically not feasible.
- B. In situations where the coverage of the lists is demonstrably complete or nearly complete, (in small communities where all Jews, including new arrivals and the marginally identified are likely to be generally known).
- C. In situations when the list, though not complete, has been demonstrated (as by a pilot study) to be presumably representative of the total Jewish population, (as in cases in which a preliminary inquiry shows that no

material bias exists between responses derived from list respondents and those chosen on an area probability basis).

In the national study it is likely that lists will need to be used as follows: (1) in relatively large Jewish communities for low-density and sparse Jewish population sub-areas and (2) in most small communities.

Efforts will need to be made to augment the lists, as necessary, and/or to assess the nature of the biases likely to be introduced by selective factors inherent in the list itself.

The Israel Emergency Fund, which brought forth community campaign givers that previously had remained hidden, may add to the degree of representativeness of available lists, though it will not eliminate economic and certain other possible biases.

To summarize current thinking with respect to sample design:

- A. The sample will be multi-stage, employing a variety of stratifications, as guided by considerations noted above.
- B. The sample will be eclectic rather than pure: guided by consistent attention to desirable representativeness, it necessarily will need to draw on master lists, particularly in Jewish low-density areas, as well as on area probability selection.

III. Respondent Selection and Call-Backs

While the matter has not been discussed in detail, present thinking does not contemplate random respondent selection as typical procedure. Rather, it is intended that any eligible respondent will qualify (with eligibility probably defined as 18 and up). It may be advisable to provide for a sub-sample within the overall sample design for which random respondent selection would be instituted. This may be desirable especially with respect to attitude questions.

Concerning call-backs, particularly in the personal interview phase, a minimum of the initial contact plus three return calls are intended.

IV. Nature of Field Force

Paid interviewers, especially for personal interviews, will be employed in most instances. Use of paid personnel is particularly necessary in large urban areas. On a highly selective basis, with appropriate safe-guards to assure follow-through, and with the expectation that paid personnel may be required to follow-up after the volunteers have been fully utilized, volunteers may be employed. This may be in order in relatively small communities, where the means of social control are relatively more effective, and in exceptional instances in large communities when disciplined and available groups of volunteers (as members of certain organizations) may be readily available. However,

it is our present belief that paid personnel, trained by the national study staff, will constitute the major part of the field force.

In some instances, resources of national survey organizations may be utilized, especially in parts of the country where such capabilities are available and where Jewish population densities are low.

V. Interview Schedule and Related Forms

Content of the interview schedule is illustrated by the enclosed draft copy of the Oakland (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties) schedule. As mentioned, items shown therein will be categorized into three groups: brief, basic and detailed. One or more of these questions sub-sets will be employed in different sub-samples.

At present, no further refinements of the interview schedule for national study have been agreed by the technical advisory committee. It is agreed, however, that considerable attention will be paid to the topic of Jewish identity and to attitudes relating to Jewishness. Further methodological work on the topic of Jewish identity has been undertaken in the course of recent studies in Chicago; these data will be available in the near future and will aid national study schedule design in the area of Jewish identity.

VI. Financing

At its October meeting the technical advisory committee concluded that a budget of no less than \$425,000 and more likely of \$450,000 would be required. Further efforts now are under way to assure availability of the supplemental funds. Additional sums are expected from a number of Jewish federations and from a small number of private donors. Further, tie-ins with national organizations, possibly with the Anti-Defamation League and with the American Jewish Committee may provide supplemental resources.

VII. Timetable

It is now projected that necessary fund-raising will be concluded by late spring 1968. In the meantime, study design and sample development are proceeding. Field work is now tentatively scheduled to begin in late 1968. Probably a minimum of 4-5 months will be required to complete field work, including call-backs and follow-up in various parts of the country.

Specific publications plans have been discussed in general terms only by the technical advisory committee. It is contemplated that brief nation-wide summaries will be prepared soon upon completion of the study, to be followed by more detailed reports, focusing on different parts of the country, age groups and the like, as well as on technical issues. Presumably the initial reports will be available no later than 1970.

VIII. Follow-up Studies and Continuing Research Design

The technical advisory committee agrees that the national Jewish population study must be kept up-to-date on an occasional basis, and that it must be followed by specific studies on special topics. The national study will establish the necessary frame work, and thought will be given later to specific steps required to implement a continuing study and follow-up approach.

Supplementary Notes to National Jewish Population

Study Work Paper A. (February 1968)

In connection with stratification by estimated Jewish population, page 3, Table (1):

It was noted that we may define two additional strata.

(1) Communities with less-than-100 estimated Jewish population, as known to the United Jewish Appeal, and

(2) Counties and communities not covered by any of the American Jewish Yearbook estimates, nor by UJA figures, constituting a stratum of geographic units that may be presumed to contain very small, if any, Jewish populations.

Concerning possible clusters sampling, page 5: It was emphasized that this remains an open question at present. Ultimately, sampling decisions may be guided by other alternatives, - simple random sampling, intensive use of augmented master lists, etc.

In this connection, (also page 5, item D):

It was agreed that the combined use of master lists and area probability sampling will be advisable.

Further to this point, page 6, item B, should read:

"the sample design will be guided by consistent attention to representativeness, and will draw on master lists, particularly in Jewish low-density areas, augmenting these lists as required, and on area probability sampling procedures.

In connection with respondent and call backs, page 6, item III,

Eric Axelrod indicated that he would favor random respondent selection.