

The Relationship of Jewish Community Contexts and Jewish Identity: A 22-Community Study

Harriet Hartman · Ira M. Sheskin

Received: 12 July 2011 / Accepted: 2 August 2012 / Published online: 30 September 2012
© Springer Science + Business Media B.V. 2012

Abstract This paper explores the manner in which Jewish community contexts relate to Jewish identity. We employ the Decade 2000 Data Set that contains almost 20,000 randomly selected Jewish households from 22 American Jewish communities interviewed from 2000 to 2010. Because of the large sample size, and its incorporation of community infrastructure data, this research also is able to examine various influences on Jewish identity that have not been definitively addressed in previous research, including the manner in which characteristics of Jewish community infrastructure are related to individuals' Jewish identity. The Decade 2000 Data Set used for the analysis is described and some of the methodological considerations involved in its use are presented. Jewish identity is conceptualized as multidimensional, and a factor analysis results in four Jewish identity factors: a communal religious factor, a private religious factor, a broader ethnic factor, and a local ethnic factor. Multiple regressions for each of the Jewish identity factors are related to Jewish community characteristics; more commonly researched individual-level variables (Jewish background and connections, family status, socioeconomic status, demographic/geographic characteristics); and survey-level variables (such as size of sample and year of study) are also controlled. Surprisingly, except for the local ethnic factor, Jewish community characteristics have little relationship to

H. Hartman (✉)
Department of Sociology, Rowan University, 1181 Robinson Building,
201 Mullica Hill Road, Glassboro, NJ 08028, USA
e-mail: hartman@rowan.edu

I. M. Sheskin
Department of Geography and Regional Studies, University of Miami,
217 Ferre Building, PO Box 248067, Coral Gables, FL 33124, USA
e-mail: isheskin@miami.edu

I. M. Sheskin
Jewish Demography Project of the Sue and Leonard Miller Center for Contemporary Judaic Studies,
University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL 33124, USA

individual Jewish identity. The contributions to a “sociology of Jewish place” and suggestions for further research are also discussed.

Keywords Jewish identity · Community context · Local Jewish community studies

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to explore the extent to which Jewish community contexts are related to Jewish identity. We employ the Decade 2000 Data Set, which contains almost 20,000 randomly selected Jewish households from 22 American Jewish communities interviewed from 2000 to 2010. Because of the large sample size, this research also is able to examine various influences on Jewish identity that have not been definitively addressed in previous research. Because we are introducing indicators of community context, we are able to test the extent to which individual-level characteristics retain their previously found relationships with the various Jewish identity factors, even when community context is controlled. And because we control for individual-level indicators, we are able to discern the net effect of community-level characteristics on individual Jewish identity.

The bulk of the research on Jewish identity has focused on the relationship between Jewish identity and individual-level variables, and Cohen and Eisen (2000, pp. 183–184), in *The Jew Within: Self, Family, and Community in America* conclude:

More and more, the meaning of Judaism in America transpires within the self. American Jews have drawn the activity and significance of their group identity into the subjectivity of the individual, the activities of the family, and the few institutions (primarily the synagogue) which are seen as extensions of this intimate sphere.

They suggest that American Jews see themselves as autonomous individual choosers from a vast array of Jewish expressions of identity, few of which are dictated by their community of residence, as was the case for generations in Europe. Highly educated as a population, their virtual community has undoubtedly expanded even more since Cohen and Eisen’s (2000) study, increasing the options ever more beyond the scope of the individual community. More recently, Rebhun (2011) found that the Jewish identity of migrant individuals was only minimally impacted. He suggests that this reflects both the greater dispersion of American Jews across the country, as well as an increasing role of the virtual community in promoting integration of Jews into their Jewish communities.

However, little systematic research has been completed on the manner in which community context might be related to individual Jewish identity. The limited previous research suggests that community context may not only impact Jewish identity directly but also indirectly by modifying the relationships of individual-level characteristics with Jewish identity. We therefore believe it important to consider both communal context and individual-level characteristics in their relationship to individual Jewish identity. One of the questions addressed is whether

the communal context reduces the impact of individual-level characteristics on Jewish identity, and vice versa.

Community contexts comprise settings for social relationships, services, and policies which are expected to be related to both religious and ethnic identity. Regnerus et al. (2004) refined the concept of contextual effects on adolescent religiosity as encompassing both microcontexts (e.g., friends, family, schoolmates) and ecological influences. Benson et al. (2003) tested the influence of one such ecological characteristic, the proportion of religious adherents in a community, but found that it has minimal impact on adolescent spirituality. Roehlhepartan et al. (2011) reviewed research that shows that interpersonal contexts (family, peers) and social-structural contexts (institutions such as schools, youth organizations, and religious facilities; culture; and place) as well as life-course events, are all related to the development of spirituality. By extension, one would expect contextual effects on Jewish identity development to include all these kinds of influences as well. While the role of microcontexts from the perspective of the individual has received considerable empirical attention, the role of social-structural contexts has been the focus of much less research.

Previous research has established differences in Jewish infrastructure across communities (e.g., Dollinger 2000; Sheskin 2001), as well as variations in religious identity and practices (both Jewish and non-Jewish) across regions or communities (e.g., Graham 1983; Kosmin and Keysar 2006; Phillips 1993; Sheskin 2001, 2005a; Silk and Walsh 2008; Smith et al. 1998; Stump 2008). One of the relevant sources of variation is size of the Jewish population. Christaller (1933) postulated that a critical mass (or threshold size of a population) was required to establish various communal structures. Extending this to a Jewish context implies that a minimum Jewish population is necessary to support institutions such as synagogues, Jewish community centers, Jewish schools, kosher shopping facilities, and other community organizations, all of which are expected to facilitate practices which reinforce Jewish identity. Cohen (1983, p. 108) suggested that Jewish communities could be characterized by: (1) residents' aggregate characteristics (such as age, social class, and family life cycle); (2) maturity of their Jewish institutions; (3) density of their Jewish populations; and (4) proximity to major Jewish communities and central institutions. Family-oriented communities, established Jewish institutions, dense Jewish populations, and proximity to Jewish institutions were expected to facilitate expressions of Jewish identity.

In relating communal characteristics to Jewish identity, Rabinowitz et al. (1992) found that Jewish community population size was related negatively to attendance at religious services, but positively to ethnic Jewish identity. They hypothesized that a critical mass was needed for religious involvement to decline and ethnic engagement to increase. The intimacy, solidarity, visibility, and coherence of small Jewish communities (Weissbach 2005) are unlikely to support many major Jewish institutions or provide a large enough local Jewish marriage market to preclude significant intermarriage (Cohen 1983, pp. 108–109), which might undermine expressions of Jewish identity.¹ Cohen (1983, Chap. 5) found weaker communal

¹ However, the majority of Jewish youth attend college away from home (Kadushin and Tighe 2008), and the rise of online dating services may mitigate the need for a local Jewish marriage market.

affiliation in communities with a high Jewish population turnover, while Goldstein and Goldstein (1996) found that communities with high percentages of recent migrants are likely to have a youthful population in the early stages of family development, implying a ritually less observant population.

Some of the community context involves the relationship between Jews and non-Jews in the population, as Horowitz (1999) noted (e.g., the proportion of Jews in the population, not just their size; the proportion of intermarried). Studying Christian population practices across national settings, Kelley and De Graaf (1997) found that a higher proportion of religious as opposed to secular population augments the level of orthodox Christian beliefs in a country. Lazerwitz and Tabory (2002) showed how being a religious majority, as opposed to a minority in terms of religion, enhances Jewish religiosity in a country, even among the non-religious. Presumably such effects on Jewish identity would be even stronger when considered on a regional or more local level. Although in almost all American communities (and in none of the communities in the Decade 2000 Data Set), Jews are not the majority, their proportion does vary, as will be shown below.

As mentioned above, previous research has established that individual religio-ethnic identity varies by demographic (such as age, gender, household structure, and immigration status) and socioeconomic characteristics (such as education, income, and occupation) generally (e.g., Christiano et al. 2007; Demerath 1965; McCloud 2007) and specifically among Jews (e.g., Ament 2004; Hartman and Hartman 2009; Rieger 2004). Certainly intersections exist between the impact of geography and community context on the one hand and demographics and socioeconomic status on the other. After all, communities vary in their socioeconomic status. Much of the research on geography and community context has not sufficiently controlled for individual-level characteristics to determine whether an effect of the communal infrastructure exists beyond the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of a community's population. At the same time, the research on individual-level characteristics rarely considers the effect of "place." The work of the "Religion by Region" project at Trinity College suggests that "place" indeed affects the manner in which religion is expressed, as well as its salience for public (and conceivably for private) life, and touches on some of the different expressions of public Jewish life in various regions of the United States (this project is summarized in Silk and Walsh 2008); however the comparisons of Jewish communities are broad and not detailed to the level of specific communities.

Earlier studies of contextual effects on Jewish identity suffer from smaller samples than ours, often in one particular community (e.g., Cohen's 1983 Boston research). At the time of his study, Cohen suggested that "only a prodigious research effort with detailed historical and contemporary data on dozens of Jewish communities across the United States could even hope to tackle the task properly" (Cohen 1983, p. 109). Our data set enables us to approach Cohen's vision by using local Jewish community studies containing much of this information.

We next present our three hypotheses (and seven sub-hypotheses) regarding the impact of community context on Jewish identity, describe the data set and methods employed, discuss the results of our analysis in relation to the hypotheses, and make suggestions for further research. Note that in our hypotheses we at times distinguish

between four types of Jewish identity: communal religious identity, private religious identity, broader ethnic identity, and local community integration. These are derived from our factor analysis of the indicators of Jewish identity common to the 22 community studies in our analysis. The method of deriving these four factors and their meaning will be described in greater detail below. Note also that while most of our hypotheses are written in terms of the community context impacting individual identity, we do not really have the data to test causal relationships. The hypotheses are written in terms of the direction of impact that makes the most sense to us.

Hypotheses Related to Jewish Community Infrastructure/Context

Hypothesis 1: Individual Jewish identity is related to the nature of the Jewish infrastructure/context and population where an individual resides. More specifically:

Hypothesis 1a: The size of the Jewish community will impact Jewish identity; larger Jewish communities will act to strengthen ethnic identity, while smaller Jewish communities will exhibit stronger religious identity. Because larger Jewish populations can support more Jewish infrastructure and more Jewish programming (e.g., synagogues, kosher food outlets, Jewish agencies, and Jewish educational and cultural programs) and can allow more of a “community feeling” to develop, we expect that in larger Jewish communities, more interaction exists among Jews, more opportunities exist to express local ethnic identity, and stronger Jewish identification is manifested. This is both because the broader community sees a larger number of Jews and identifies them as such and because internally more Jews exist with whom to interact. This is supported by previous research from Rabinowitz et al. (1992).

On the other hand, Rabinowitz et al. (1992) found that smaller Jewish communities exhibited stronger religious identity than larger ones. Smith (2003) suggests that social marginalization (as would happen with a “threatened” minority) results in greater separation from the dominant (non-Jewish) establishment, which would thus strengthen individual Jewish identity. A further possibility is that in large Jewish communities, many people see that Jewish institutions are operating without their help. In smaller Jewish communities, those same individuals might come to the fore, believing that if they do not step forward, no one else will. Such an argument has been validated with regard to smaller congregational groups in religious congregations more generally (Dougherty and Whitehead 2011). It should be noted, however, that using data from NJPS 1990, Sheskin (1991) found that Jewish religious and ethnic identity was strongest in medium-size Jewish communities.

Hypothesis 1b: A higher percent Jewish in a community will be related to stronger Jewish identity. As with *number of Jews*, it is expected that a higher percentage of Jews in a community results in greater visibility and more identification as such by others, and hence strengthens Jewish identity. Note that the influence of this variable may interact with the religious or ethnic character of the broader community (discussed below).

Hypothesis 1c: Stable Jewish communities will be characterized by stronger Jewish identity. That stability is related to Jewish identity is supported by the work of Goldstein and Goldstein (1996) on the migration patterns of American Jews. They found what they termed “traditional holding power”: more stable communities tended to be more traditional and more observant (or it could be that more observant communities tended to be more stable). Earlier work by Goldstein (1981, 1990, 1991) found that: (1) high levels of geographic mobility may break down the ties of individuals to a community and its local institutions, thus undermining Jewish identification; and (2) participation of immigrants may never reach the level of the locally born population. Cohen’s (1983) work also found that communities with a high Jewish population turnover tended to have fewer Jewish communal affiliations. Goldscheider (1986) contradicted Goldstein and Cohen, suggesting that new migrants may expand existing networks and even create new ones in a relatively short time and may create networks that substitute for the formal Jewish community. More recently, Rebhun (2011) suggested that the effect of Jews’ migration patterns on Jewish identity and group commitment has diminished, as the extent and scope of their mobility has dispersed Jews throughout the United States, and the Internet has afforded quicker anticipatory socialization and adaptation to the new environment. We expected that stable or increasing synagogue membership would be associated with stronger Jewish identity, especially religious identity. Decreasing synagogue membership might reflect more turnover of the population and would imply waning interest in Jewish communal associations, so we anticipated it to have a negative relationship with strength of Jewish identity.

Hypothesis 1d: Jewish populations that are clustered in one part of a metropolitan area, rather than being geographically dispersed throughout that metropolitan area, will exhibit stronger Jewish identity. In addition to the reasoning presented under Hypothesis 2 below as to why stronger levels of Jewish identity exist in areas of greater Jewish population density, geographic clustering also results in a Jewish community that is more easily served by Jewish institutions. If a Jewish community is concentrated in one location it is easier for communal institutions such as synagogues, Jewish day schools, and JCCs to provide services. A Jewish community is more likely to be able to support Jewish retail activity, such as kosher restaurants and Judaica stores, if a large percentage of the community lives within a short distance of such establishments. Residentially based social services, such as home-delivered meals, are also more efficiently operated within a community that is geographically concentrated.

Hypothesis 1e: Jewish communities with a higher percentage of married couples who are intermarried will be characterized by individuals with weaker Jewish identity. Intermarried Jews typically have weaker Jewish identities (Cohen 2006), either as precedent to their intermarriage or as a result of investment in social capital bridging between Jews and non-Jews, rather than social capital bonding within the Jewish group (Phillips and Fishman 2006). We expect this to have an impact on the interpersonal climate in the community, especially where the percentage of intermarried is higher.

Hypothesis 2: The more developed the Jewish institutions in a community, the stronger the individual Jewish identity. More specifically:

Hypothesis 2a: The total number of synagogues in a community will act to strengthen Jewish identity, and specifically, the greater the number of Orthodox synagogues in a community, the stronger the religious identity. A greater *number of synagogues* in a community indicates that a variety of worship and congregational options exist in the community, and that households probably, on average, live geographically closer to a synagogue. Because most synagogues provide both religious and secular (or ethnic) communal activities in addition to religious services, a greater number of synagogues provide more opportunities to participate in Jewish-sponsored events.

In addition to offering a wider variety of places of worship, particularly for the Orthodox, the *number of Orthodox synagogues* is likely to be indicative of the existence of other institutions catering to an Orthodox lifestyle, such as kosher food establishments, *mikva'ot* (ritual baths), and *eruvim* (ritual enclosures). Orthodox synagogues are investments in social and cultural “bonding” capital which integrates the Orthodox community. A strong Orthodox infrastructure supports the lifestyle necessary for the indicators forming our private religious factor (keeping kosher inside and outside the home, lighting Friday night candles, attending synagogue services) (Table 3).

Hypothesis 2b: A larger Jewish Federation annual campaign per household will act to strengthen Jewish identity, especially on the local level. The *size of the Jewish Federation annual campaign* per Jewish household is reflective of the existence of a significant local Jewish infrastructure, even though in most communities a substantial portion (30–40 %) of the Jewish Federation annual campaign is used for needs nationally, in Israel, and around the world rather than for local programming and infrastructure.² The success of the annual campaign is indicative of the sophistication and organization of a Jewish community as well as its level of affluence. In addition, a more successful annual campaign generally implies the existence of stronger Jewish agencies that can provide more services and programs for the Jewish community, thereby enhancing Jewish identity further.

Hypothesis 3: The strength of the relationship between individual-level variables and individual Jewish identity will be impacted by community context. Stump (2008) found that strength of belief has the greatest influence on religious participation in the Pacific and New England regions, and the least effect in the East, South Central, and Mountain regions. He found fewer regional differences for the influence of socioeconomic status and demographic variables on religious service attendance. He did, however, find a significant effect of socioeconomic status and demographic variables on Protestant attendance in the South, reflecting the general importance of religion in that region, and possibly supporting the expectation that higher-status individuals actively support and participate in religious institutions at higher rates. More recently, Putnam and Campbell (2010) found that income did not have an independent effect on

² Personal communication from Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz, Director, Research and Analysis, Jewish Federations of North America, March 4, 2011.

religiosity, once gender, race, ethnicity, size of place, and region were controlled. Controlling for region, therefore, may also clarify the relationship between the individual-level variables we use (described below) and Jewish identity.

Data

The 1971, 1990, and 2000–2001 National Jewish Population Surveys (NJPS 1971, NJPS 1990, NJPS 2000–2001) provide the largest national samples of Jews in single surveys (Kosmin et al. 1991; Kotler-Berkowitz et al. 2003; Massarik and Chenkin 1973). However, these studies are quite limited for the purpose of studying variations among local Jewish communities (Sheskin 2005b). None of the three NJPSs was designed to produce data at the local Jewish community level, and NJPS 2000–2001 was designed only to produce accurate data for the four major census regions. Further, the latest NJPS was conducted over a decade ago, and while much can still be gleaned from it, Jewish identity in its various expressions may have changed over the past decade. The North American Jewish Data Bank (www.jewishdatabank.org) has collected more than 200 local Jewish Federation-sponsored Jewish community studies, which offer greater potential for studying the manner in which Jewish identity varies for different types of individuals by community context.

There are two methods that may be used to facilitate comparisons of community studies. One is to analyze each community separately and to compile the results in an aggregated “meta-analysis” (Cooper and Patall 2009), an approach that allows for determining whether the same results (e.g., the relationship between age and Jewish identity or the relationship between education and Jewish identity) are found in different communal contexts. It works best when relatively simple findings are compared and the data (e.g., question wording, response categories, indicators, sampling methods, and data collection methodology) have been standardized for comparability.³ One disadvantage of meta-analysis of this type is that it does not enable analysis of population subgroups for which the sample size in any given community sample is too small.

An alternative and often preferable approach, when the data and resources allow, is to aggregate the individual data sets into a single data set, a technique variously termed “individual participant data” (Cooper and Patall 2009; Riley et al. 2010) or “integrative data analysis” (Curran and Hussong 2009), and conduct analyses on the aggregated individual level, while controlling for multiple levels of variation (e.g., community level, individual level, and survey level). Curran et al. (2008, p. 365) suggest that:

The strategy of pooling data drawn from separate investigations holds many benefits, including increased statistical power, greater sample heterogeneity in

³ Meta-analysis has been conducted by Saxe (2010) and Tighe et al. (2010) to estimate US Jewish population size. They do not include local Jewish community studies as they do not represent all of the United States geographically.

important subject demographics, the broader psychometric assessment of constructs, and the ability to estimate a variety of models that would not be possible within any single data set.

However, integrative data analysis also has drawbacks, including the challenge of standardizing measurement for construct development and the effort needed to standardize the questions asked and the response categories. For reasons elaborated below, we were able to use integrative data analysis as the primary approach for the current study.

Of the 36 local community studies completed from 2000 to 2010, all but six were conducted by one of two researchers (Ira M. Sheskin; Jacob B. Ukeles/Ron Miller). This analysis uses the 22 data sets collected by Ira M. Sheskin as the principal investigator since the completion of NJPS 2000–2001, which comprise the Decade 2000 Data Set. This limitation had a number of significant advantages. First, the questionnaire used in each of these local Jewish community studies was basically the same, with minimal variation from community to community in almost all basic measures of Jewish identity.⁴ The survey research literature indicates that even small changes in question wording or in the sequence in which questions are asked in a survey can have a significant impact upon survey results (Bradburn et al. 2004), so this was an important advantage. Second, and of major import, Sheskin had already compiled all 22 studies into a single *meta-data* file, having performed the preliminary comparisons of the questionnaires and eliminating (for the most part) variation by standardizing response categories. It should be noted that this preparation is extremely time-consuming and is mentioned as a major drawback for doing this kind of integrative data analysis (Cooper and Patall 2009; Curran et al. 2008). Third, numerous comparisons of community contexts were already available. In the latest community study (Middlesex) included in the Decade 2000 Data Set, comparison tables for almost 200 questions were included in the study report (Sheskin 2009). This greatly facilitated an understanding of the range of variation involved and types of communal comparisons possible with the Decade 2000 Data Set. Fourth, Sheskin used the same basic methodology for determining the survey sample (usually a combination of RDD [random digit dialing] and DJN [Distinctive Jewish Names] techniques) for each study. Note, however, the variation in proportion of the sample determined by RDD and DJN methods (Table 1).⁵ Fifth, the same procedure was used to select a respondent from the household to interview (any cooperative adult, Jewish or not, who answered the telephone in a Jewish household). In each study respondents were

⁴ Differences exist among questionnaires as deemed necessary by local leadership in each community.

⁵ In 17 of the 22 communities, for budgetary reasons, the RDD survey was supplemented by calling households with one of over 200 Distinctive Jewish Names (DJN) listed in the most recent computerized local telephone directory (Sheskin 1998). In the Twin Cities (Sheskin 2005c), Russian Jewish first names were also used. Since the RDD sample is more representative than the DJN sample, appropriate weighting factors were applied to the DJN sample to adjust for the demographic bias of using DJNs. With these weighting factors applied, no statistically significant differences are seen between the RDD and DJN samples on any of the key variables, such as age and income. Note that in one community (Jacksonville) sampling also was done from the Jewish Federation mailing list.

Table 1 Attributes of community studies in the Decade 2000 Data Set

Community	Year of field work	Sample size	Number of Jewish households	Sampling fraction ^a (%)	Percent of sample		Cooperation rate for RDD sample (%)	
					RDD	DJN	Screeener	Survey
Atlantic County	2004	624	10,000	6.2	32	68	90	96
Bergen	2001	1,003	28,400	3.5	100	0	90	84
Detroit	2005	1,274	30,000	4.2	32	68	64	67
Hartford	2000	763	14,800	5.2	28	72	95	95
Jacksonville ^b	2002	601	6,700	9.0	35	38	94	98
Las Vegas	2005	1,197	42,000	2.9	33	67	49	64
Lehigh Valley	2007	537	4,000	13.4	40	60	89	96
Miami	2004	1,808	54,000	3.3	100	0	90	86
Middlesex	2008	1,076	24,000	4.5	44	56	88	90
Minneapolis	2004	746	13,850	5.4	28	72	89	94
New Haven	2010	833	11,000	7.6	36	64	83	94
Portland	2007	421	4,300	9.8	36	64	85	95
Rhode Island	2002	829	9,550	8.7	37	63	93	91
San Antonio	2007	675	4,500	15.0	43	57	87	92
St. Paul	2004	494	5,150	9.6	41	59	89	94
Sarasota	2005	616	8,800	7.0	31	69	95	93
South Palm Beach	2005	1,511	73,000	2.1	100	0	87	92
Tidewater	2001	628	5,400	11.6	29	71	97	99
Tucson	2002	805	13,400	6.0	37	63	95	93
Washington, DC	2003	1,201	110,000	1.1	33	67	80	91
West Palm Beach	2005	1,534	69,000	2.2	100	0	87	92
Westport	2000	624	5,000	12.5	32	68	94	80
Total		19,800	546,850	3.5	55	44	85	88

^a The percentage of households in the community completing the survey

^b 27 % of surveys were completed with households on the Federation mailing list

pursued intensively⁶ until a high cooperation rate was achieved. Sixth, all 22 community studies used the same definition of a Jewish person. A Jewish person was defined as any person who currently considers himself/herself Jewish (or who is identified as such by the respondent) or who was born Jewish or raised Jewish and has not formally converted to another religion and does not regularly attend religious services of another religion (irrespective of formal conversion). A Jewish household was defined as any household containing a Jewish person.

⁶ With the exception of Detroit, Las Vegas, and Washington, telephone numbers were dialed at least four times to determine eligibility for the sample and then to participate in the survey itself. Again, with the exception of Detroit, Las Vegas, and Washington, an interviewing staff that was primarily or entirely Jewish was used to facilitate cooperation and questionnaires were completed using paper and pencil. For Detroit, Las Vegas, and Washington, Social Science Research Solutions (Media, PA), while using mostly non-Jewish interviewers, used Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing and 8–10 call backs.

Nevertheless, variability exists among the studies. Some questions had to be eliminated from our analysis because they were not asked in all communities or had been altered significantly from study to study. In terms of the samples, while most were derived from a combination of RDD and DJN techniques, they varied in the percentage of the sample that each sampling technique provided, and in Jacksonville, in addition to RDD and DJN samples, a sample was drawn from the Jewish Federation mailing list. Further, the studies varied in their cooperation rates, ranging from 49 to 97 % for the screener (which determined eligibility for the survey) and from 64 to 99 % for the survey itself. Further, the studies were conducted over 10 years, which may affect the results.

Table 1 presents the communities included in the Decade 2000 Data Set, the year of each study, the sample size, the percentage of the sample contributed by RDD and DJN techniques, and the screener and survey cooperation rates. Some of the variables in Table 1 were added as a final level of analysis (as survey-level characteristics) in the multiple regression analyses below, to see to what extent, if any, they contribute to the variation in Jewish identity once other sources of variation have been eliminated. (Because of multicollinearity issues, only a selection of these variables could be included in the multiple regressions.) For more detail on the methodology of each local Jewish community study included in the Decade 2000 Data Set, see Chap. 2 of the *Main Report* for each study. All *Main Reports* are available at www.jewishdatabank.org.

Finally, note that while the 22 community studies included do not form a national probability sample, the 19,800 interviews do randomly represent almost 547,000 Jewish households containing 1,247,000 persons, of whom about 1,081,000 are Jewish.

In summary, while challenges do exist in comparing the results among the Jewish communities and in combining the 22 separate studies into one, we have every confidence that the Decade 2000 Data Set represents a significant resource for the social scientific study of American Jews. The lack of such a data set for comparative analysis has meant that, until now, only a very limited number of studies have utilized local Jewish community studies for the types of analysis undertaken here (e.g., Phillips 1993; Rebhun 1995; Sheskin 2001, 2010a, b).

Methods

We chose to use multivariate analysis for most of this study because of the large number of variables to be analyzed and their multiple inter-correlations. The large sample size ($n = 19,800$) also made this possible and desirable.

First, we begin with a factor analysis of Jewish identity indicators. Factor analysis allows us to combine multiple indicators of Jewish identity that are highly inter-correlated with one another into a smaller number (in this case, four) of factors (or composite variables). Such exploratory factor analysis does not presuppose a structure for the dimensions of Jewish identity (that is, it does not “expect” a religious or an ethnic dimension and select variables for them accordingly), but rather allows the user to interpret the structure that the relationships between the variables themselves present. That the results correspond to dimensions found in

prior studies, using different samples (as seen below), validates both prior theoretical assumptions and the factor analysis itself.

Second, we employ four multiple regression models to explain variations in the four Jewish identity factors resulting from the factor analysis. Our main contribution is the inclusion of community-level characteristics related to the Jewish community's infrastructure for which our hypotheses are presented above. We also controlled for individual-level variables including Jewish background/connection variables, family status, socioeconomic status, demographic/geographic variables, and survey-level characteristics, to determine whether differences in survey methodology and the year of the survey can explain differences in the findings. The use of survey-level characteristics also allows us to determine the net effect of each of the other levels of variables when survey characteristics are controlled.

Note that our selection of independent variables for the regression analyses was guided by three considerations: (1) variables measured in all of the 22 community studies; (2) findings or discussion in previous research that indicated a potential relationship with the dependent variables; (3) collinearity statistics, which limited the inclusion of variables that were highly inter-correlated with each other.⁷

Note also that while we have made the Jewish identity factors the dependent variables, we do not necessarily posit causality—people with certain types of Jewish identity may seek communities with certain infrastructures, and/or a community's infrastructure may influence certain aspects of Jewish identity. The present data do not enable us to disentangle these possibilities.

Indicators

Independent Variables

Community-Level Indicators

The indicators of community context are a mixture of aggregate individual-level data (e.g., number of intermarried couples), institutional-level data (e.g., number of synagogues and size of Jewish Federation annual campaign per household) and broader population data (e.g., size of the broader population, proportion of Jews in the broader population, and proportion in the broader population with no professed religion). Indicators of a Jewish community's infrastructure included in this analysis derive from both the telephone survey and the Jewish Institutions Survey conducted in each community and reported in the *Main Report* for each community (available at www.jewishdatabank.org).⁸ In addition, Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz of the Research Department of the Jewish Federations of North America provided recent annual campaign data for each community (also reproduced in Sheskin 2011). Table 2 presents the variables that we use to indicate Jewish community

⁷ Using roughly the criteria that the tolerance level should exceed .1 and the VIF not exceed 10.

⁸ In each community, a "Jewish Institutions Survey" was administered to local synagogues, the Jewish Community Center(s), the Jewish day schools(s), and the Jewish Federation collecting data on memberships, enrollments, and the Jewish Federation annual campaign.

Table 2 Jewish community infrastructure by community of study

Community	Number of		Percent Jewish	Percent of Jewish households in top 3 zip codes	2009 Jewish Federation annual campaign		Number of synagogues		20 % Increase or decrease in synagogue membership ^a	% of married couples who are intermarried
	Jews	Jewish households			Amount	Per Jewish house-hold	All	Orthodox		
Atlantic County	20,400	10,000	5.3	55	\$790,000	\$79	8	2	No	26
Bergen	71,700	28,400	8.1	34	\$10,345,000	\$364	54	24	Increase	17
Detroit	72,000	30,000	1.8	36	\$31,671,000	\$1,056	48	25	Increase	16
Hartford	32,800	14,800	3.8	37	\$4,976,000	\$335	30	8	Decrease	23
Jacksonville	13,000	6,700	1.1	37	\$2,439,000	\$364	8	2	Decrease	44
Las Vegas	67,500	42,000	3.8	19	\$1,900,000	\$45	18	2	Decrease	48
Lehigh Valley	8,050	4,000	1.3	50	\$2,288,000	\$572	9	3	Increase	36
Miami	113,300	54,000	4.7	43	\$21,744,000	\$403	68	39	No	16
Middlesex	52,040	24,000	6.8	66	\$2,287,000	\$95	26	11	No	14
Minneapolis	29,300	13,850	2.6	35	\$13,257,000	\$957	14	4	Increase	33
New Haven	23,000	11,000	3.4	25	\$3,028,000	\$263	27	12	No	34
Portland	8,350	4,300	1.7	33	\$436,000	\$101	13	5	Increase	61
Rhode Island	18,750	9,550	1.8	39	\$3,405,000	\$357	16	6	Increase	34
San Antonio	9,170	4,500	0.6	36	\$1,917,000	\$426	8	2	Increase	37
St. Paul	10,940	5,150	1.2	52	\$2,416,000	\$514	6	2	Increase	39
Sarasota	15,500	8,800	2.6	35	\$2,394,000	\$272	10	1	No	20
S Palm Beach	131,300	73,000	39.8	54	\$16,400,000	\$225	36	13	No	9
Tidewater	10,950	5,400	1.1	33	\$4,456,000	\$825	12	2	Decrease	43
Tucson	22,400	13,400	2.6	33	\$3,450,000	\$257	11	3	Decrease	46
Washington DC	215,600	110,000	5.1	13	\$23,200,000	\$211	91	21	No	41
W Palm Beach	124,250	69,000	12.2	57	\$19,027,000	\$276	39	11	Decrease	16

Table 2 continued

Community	Number of		Percent Jewish	Percent of Jewish households in top 3 zip codes	2009 Jewish Federation annual campaign		Number of synagogues		20 % Increase or decrease in synagogue membership ^a	% of married couples who are intermarried
	Jews	Jewish house-holds			Amount	Per Jewish house-hold	All	Orthodox		
Westport	11,140	5,000	8.5	66	\$871,000	\$174	8	2	Decrease	33
Average	68,393	34,837	7.3	41	\$10,555,000	\$371	32	12		27
Total	1,081,440	546,850			\$1,696,735	\$316				

^a In the past 5–10 years, depending on the community (available in Chap. 7 in each community study *Main Report*) available at www.jewishdatabank.org

characteristics. While other variables are available for describing Jewish community characteristics, not all could be included because of multicollinearity in the multiple regression analysis. More details on these variables can be found in Hartman and Sheskin (2011).

Size of Jewish Community The *number of Jews* and the *number of Jewish households* in a community can both be used to measure Jewish community size. These numbers were generally estimated from the first 10,000 RDD telephone numbers used in each survey, using a standard methodology applied in many Jewish community studies. If, for example, the 10,000 RDD telephone numbers yield responses from 4,000 households and 400 of these households are Jewish, 10 % (400/4,000) of households can be estimated to be Jewish.

The *number of Jews* for the 22 Jewish communities included in this analysis ranges from about 8,000 Jews in Lehigh Valley to over 215,000 Jews in Washington, DC. The *number of Jewish households* varies from 4,000 households in the Lehigh Valley to 110,000 households in Washington, DC. Number of Jewish households (rather than population size or the log of population size) was selected for use in the four multiple regression models.

The *percent Jewish* for the 22 Jewish communities was calculated using the above estimate for size of Jewish community, divided by the estimated number of households in the geographic area provided by the US Census (www.census.gov). For the 22 Jewish communities included in this analysis, percent Jewish varies from less than 1 % in San Antonio to nearly 40 % in South Palm Beach, although most communities have values below 10 %.

Stability of Jewish Population Two variables were considered as indicators of the stability of a Jewish community⁹: *whether synagogue membership had (1) increased or (2) decreased by more than 20 % over the past 5–10 years*, based on data from each study's Jewish Institutions Survey. (In most communities, the data were available for the past 10 years, but in some communities only a five-year or seven-year change was available.) Of the 22 communities, nine show increased synagogue membership, six show decreased membership, and six show no significant change.

Density of Jewish Population Each respondent was asked their zip code. In each community, the percentage of all Jewish households who live in the three zip code areas containing the greatest percentage of Jewish households was calculated. *The percentage of households in the top three zip codes* for the 22 Jewish communities included in this analysis varies from 13 % in Washington DC to 66 % in Middlesex and Westport.

Number of Orthodox Synagogues The Jewish Institutions Survey in each community provided these data. The number of Orthodox synagogues for the 22 Jewish communities included in this analysis ranges from one in Sarasota to 25 in Detroit. Note that we also analyzed the impact of the total number of synagogues in the area, but it was too highly correlated with the size of Jewish population and the size of Jewish Federation annual campaign to include in the four regression analyses.

⁹ Two other variables measuring the percentage of the Jewish households living in the community for 0–4 years and the percentage of Jewish households living in the community for 20 or more years, were considered for analysis, but multicollinearity prevented us from using these variables in the four regression models.

Size of Jewish Federation Annual Campaign We have employed the amounts from the latest (2009) Jewish Federation annual campaign data¹⁰ for each community (also reproduced in Sheskin 2011), rather than the amount of the annual campaign from the year of each community study, so as to minimize fluctuations due to variations in the general economic climate over the decade. By dividing by the number of Jewish households, we have in effect standardized the comparison, so that the size of the annual campaign is not simply reflective of the size of the community but rather the mobilization of resources from each Jewish household (on average). The size of the 2009 Jewish Federation annual campaign for the 22 Jewish communities varies from \$436,000 in Portland (ME) to \$31,671,000 in Detroit; per household the amount varies from \$79 in Atlantic County to \$1,066 in Detroit.

The percentage of married couples who are intermarried for the 22 Jewish communities varies from 9 % in South Palm Beach to 61 % in Portland (ME). An intermarriage was defined as a marriage in which one spouse was born Jewish and currently considers himself/herself Jewish and the other spouse was not born Jewish and does not currently consider himself/herself Jewish.

Dependent Variables: Jewish Identity Indicators

Ethnic or religious identity is usually considered part of an individual's self-concept in terms of group belonging and the value and emotional significance attached to it (Rebhun 2004). Local Jewish community studies do not usually query an individual's self-concept, but rather ask about several behavioral expressions of that identity. Therefore, our indicators of Jewish identity primarily represent behavioral practices or inclinations and expressions of Jewish identity in various ways, rather than notions of Jewish identity itself. Since many studies of Jewish identity conflate the self-concept and religious/ethnic practices or their value, using such indicators to indicate Jewish identity is not unusual. Starting from the premise that Jewish identity is multidimensional, and desiring to determine what dimensions of Jewish identity were expressed in this population (rather than a priori assuming what the construct of Jewish identity is and selecting indicators to reflect that construct), we performed a principal components factor analysis with Varimax rotation of the 17 variables expressing Jewish identity that were common to all 22 communities. The first column of Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations of all indicators used in the factor analysis.

Four factors emerged from the factor analysis of the 17 Jewish identity variables for all 22 communities combined (Table 3). Note that factor loadings of 0.45 or higher were considered when naming each factor. The four factors combined account for 57 % of the variance in the original 17 variables. In the following description of Table 3, the numbers in parentheses are factor loadings.

¹⁰ Provided by Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz of the Research Department of the Jewish Federations of North America.

Table 3 Jewish identity factors: Loadings from principal components analysis with Varimax rotation

Jewish identity indicator	Mean (standard deviation)	Jewish identity factors			
		Religious identity Communal religious factor (ceremony)	Ethnic identity		Religious identity Private religious factor (ritual)
		Broader ethnic factor	Local ethnic factor		
Light Chanukah candles*	1.67 (1.07)	.828			
Participate in a Passover seder*	1.63 (1.00)	.782			
Mezuzah on front door of home	1.26 (.44)	.615			
Attend synagogue services**	5.36 (1.79)	.523			
Synagogue member	.38 (.48)	.496			
Visit to Israel	.53 (.50)		.683		
Jewish organization member	.31 (.46)		.657		
Donated to local Jewish Federation in the past year	1.48 (.50)		.587		
Emotional attachment to Israel***	2.35 (.95)		.583		
Donated to a Jewish charity other than Jewish Federation in the past year	.46 (.50)		.572		
Familiar with the local Jewish Federation****	2.13 (.77)			.780	
Familiar with Jewish Family Service****	2.32 (.76)			.772	
At least somewhat familiar with at least one local Jewish agency	.80 (.40)			.754	
Participated in or attended a program at, or sponsored by, the local Jewish Community Center in the past year	.31 (.46)			.489	
Keep kosher outside the home	.07 (.26)				.879
Keep kosher in the home	.14 (.35)				.865
Light Friday night candles*	3.06 (1.12)				.584
% of variance explained		15.2	14.4	14.1	13.3

(1) All variables, except as noted with asterisks, are yes/no responses (1 = yes; 0 = no). (2) Attended synagogue services, emotional attachment to Israel, familiar with local Jewish Federation, familiar with Jewish Family Service, at least somewhat familiar with at least on local Jewish agency, and keep kosher outside home are respondent only questions. All other questions are “anyone in the household.” (3) Loadings of .45 or less are not reported

*1 = always, 2 = usually, 3 = sometimes, 4 = never

**1 = several times per week, 2 = weekly, 3 = a few times per month, 4 = about once per month, 5 = a few times per year, 6 = high holidays only, 7 = never except special occasions, 8 = never

***1 = extremely, 2 = very, 3 = somewhat, 4 = not at all emotionally attached

****1 = very familiar, 2 = somewhat familiar, 3 = not at all familiar

Factor 1 (Communal Religious Factor or “Ceremony”) reflects the religious identity of American Jews and includes the more common religious practices observed by many American Jews: lighting Chanukah candles (.828), participating in a Passover seder (.782), mezuzah on the front door (.615), attending synagogue services (.523), and synagogue membership (.496). This factor accounts for 15 % of the variance in the original 17 variables.

For the most part, the variables loading highly on Factor 1 are those which Alexander (1987, p. 124) referred to as “ceremony,” and “affirming membership in the social and cosmological order.” Sklare (1971) noted that these practices are generally compatible with American society in that they can be redefined in modern non-supra-mundane terms, do not demand social isolation or a unique lifestyle, provide a “Jewish” alternative when such is needed in the broader American religious scene, and are performed annually or infrequently. Hartman and Hartman (1996a, b, 2009) found a similar factor in their analyses of NJPS 1990, NJPS 2000–2001, and the 1991 New York Jewish Population Study.

This factor represents Jewish religious capital. Putnam (2000) distinguishes between *bonding* social capital, which is an investment in social networks of homogeneous groups of people, and *bridging* social capital, which is an investment in social networks of heterogeneous groups. Some of the variables that load highly on it may represent participation in activities with heterogeneous groups of Jews and even non-Jews (e.g., participating in a Passover seder and attending synagogue services), so this Communal Religious Factor may represent some degree of bridging capital as opposed to the more inward directed bonding capital which characterizes the Private Religious Factor (“Ritual”) (Factor 4 below). See Beyerlein and Hipp (2006) on the bridging effects of congregational involvement.

Factor 2 (Broader Ethnic Factor or “Klal Yisrael”) reflects the ethnic identity of American Jews: visits to Israel (.683), Jewish organization membership (.657), donation to the local Jewish Federation in the past year (.587), emotional attachment to Israel (.583), and donations to Jewish charities other than the local Jewish Federation in the past year (.572). This factor accounts for 14 % of the variance in the original 17 variables.

These variables include some of those more commonly associated with ethnic identity identified by Cohen (1983): attachment to Israel and attachment to non-synagogue Jewish institutions. An additional variable, namely donations to Jewish charities other than the Jewish Federation in the past year, which Cohen did not include in his ethnic dimension, loaded highly on this factor. Such donations do indicate an investment in Jewish social and cultural capital and, thus, can be viewed as part of ethnic identity.

Factor 3 (Local Ethnic Factor) reflects the ethnic identity of American Jews in terms of integration into the local community as regards non-religious or non-synagogue Jewish institutions: familiarity with the local Jewish Federation (.780), familiarity with the local Jewish Family Service (.772), being at least somewhat familiar with at least one local Jewish agency (.754), and participating in or attending any program at, or sponsored by, the local Jewish Community Center in the past year (.489). Note that only Jewish institutions common to all communities

were included in this factor. This factor accounts for 14 % of the variance in the original 17 variables.

Factor 4 (Private Religious Factor or “Ritual”) reflects the religious identity of American Jews, including variables related to “personal rituals” that reveal stricter, daily, and personal commitment to ritual: keeping kosher outside the home (.879), keeping kosher inside the home (.865), and lighting Friday night candles (.584). Hartman and Hartman (2009) found a similar factor in their analyses of NJPS 1990 and NJPS 2000–2001 and the 1991 New York Jewish Population Survey. Note that it represents religious capital that would bond together similarly observant Jews (“bonding” religious capital).

To validate the structure of Jewish identity found in the Total Factor Analysis (TFA) just described, factor analyses were run separately for each of the 22 communities. The same 17 variables were employed and a four-factor solution requested. The percentage of variation explained by the four-factor solution ranges from 52 to 60 %, meaning this factor analysis is acceptable in each community and the percentage of variance explained in each of the separate factor analyses is quite similar to the total (57 %). Some of the variation by community included:

- (a) The order of the dimensions, indicating that certain types of Jewish identity are more central in some communities than others. For example, in Bergen County, Detroit, Miami, and Middlesex, the most prominent factor (i.e., the factor explaining the most variation in these variables) was the private religious factor rather than the communal religious factor, reflecting the higher percentage of Orthodox in these communities. However, since the four factors in the TFA contribute roughly equal portions to the 57 % total variance explained, these variations in order are of interest but do not invalidate the use of the TFA.
- (b) In the TFA, synagogue membership (which can function both religiously and ethnically) loads more highly on the communal religious factor (.496) than on the broader ethnic factor (.352). The same pattern is found in most of the communities. However, in a few, synagogue membership loads more highly on the broader ethnic factor; in some instances, it also loads highly on the private religious factor or the local ethnic factor. Likewise, in the TFA, attending synagogue services (which is important for ritual observance) loads more highly on the communal religious factor (.523) than the private religious factor (.450). These variations reflect, of course, the multifaceted functions of synagogues (Wertheimer 2005), as well as the extent to which synagogues can vary across communities. In communities in which the communal religious factor is dominant, synagogue service attendance loads higher on this factor, while in communities where the private religious factor is dominant, synagogue service attendance loads more highly on that factor.
- (c) In the TFA, lighting Friday night candles loads more highly on the private religious factor (.584) than on the communal religious factor (.437). However, in some communities, it loads more highly on the communal religious factor than on the private religious factor. We believe this finding suggests that lighting Friday night candles may be more normative in some communities and less of a private ritual than in other communities.

- (d) In the TFA, donated to the local Jewish Federation in the past year loads more highly on the broader ethnic factor (.587) than on the local ethnic factor (.313). In some communities (e.g., Lehigh Valley, Minneapolis, St. Paul, and San Antonio), it loads more highly on the local ethnic factor than on the broader ethnic factor. In these communities, donations may be directed more to the local community than nationally and to Israel, or may reflect more about integration into the local community than commitment to the broader Jewish peoplehood.

Further analyses of these geographic variations are reserved for future research. We concluded that the similarities in the structure between the individual communities and the total sample were strong enough to warrant using the TFA for the total sample.

Control Variables

The means and standard deviations of all independent variables are presented in Table 4.

Individual-Level Variables

We controlled for four types of individual-level variables that were found to be related to Jewish identity in previous studies. In some cases (e.g., length of residence vs. population stability), they enable us to determine whether it is the individual-level variable or the community characteristic that influences individual Jewish identity. Variables related to the individual are examined in four different groups: (1) Jewish background and connections, (2) family status, (3) socioeconomic status, and (4) demographic/geographic variables.¹¹

Jewish Background and Connections Variables Denominational groups (whether self-identified or affiliated) differ in: (1) the extent to which adherents see religion as a dominant influence on daily behaviors, (2) their emphasis on religious and/or ethnic identity, and (3) the extent to which they value exposure and involvement in the broader (non-exclusively) Jewish world or universalism (Hartman and Hartman 2001). Thus, including denominational self-identification in the multiple regression models controls for this source of considerable variation in Jewish identity, so that findings related to other variables are net of this effect.

Jewish denominational self-identification is measured by responses to the question, “Do you consider yourself Orthodox, Conservative, Reconstructionist, Reform, or Just Jewish?” Because of the small number of Reconstructionist individuals (about 1 % of the sample), they were combined with Reform for the purposes of the analysis. In our sample, about 5 % self-identified as Orthodox, 31 % as Conservative, 33 % as Reform or Reconstructionist, and 32 % as Just Jewish. In contrast, in NJPS 2000–2001, 8 % self-identified as Orthodox, 25 % as Conservative, 37 % as Reform or Reconstructionist, and 30 % as Just Jewish (Sheskin

¹¹ Detailed hypotheses for each individual-level variable are presented in a more in-depth report on this research project available at www.jewishdatabank.org.

Table 4 Means and standard deviations of independent variables used in the analysis

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation	<i>N</i>
Community level—Jewish community infrastructure/context			
Number of Jewish households	33,834.50	30,173.10	19,800
Percent Jewish	.07	.10	19,800
% Jewish households in top three zips	.40	.14	19,800
Annual campaign per Jewish household (in dollars)	366.50	269.71	19,800
Number of Orthodox synagogues	12.15	11.36	19,800
Increasing synagogue membership (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.34	.47	19,800
Decreasing synagogue membership (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.27	.44	19,800
% of married couples intermarried in the community	26.55	14.41	19,800
Individual level—Jewish background/connection			
Orthodox (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.05	.22	19,800
Conservative (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.31	.46	19,800
Reform/reconstructionist (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.34	.47	19,800
Jewish day school (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.09	.29	17,817
Supplemental Jewish school (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.66	.47	17,817
Jewish overnight camp (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.37	.78	15,979
Jewish youth group (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.50	.87	19,800
Hillel (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.33	1.00	15,982
Household with Jewish children (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.21	.41	19,800
Resides in densest Jewish area (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.40	.49	19,800
Intermarried (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.17	.37	17,970
Individual level—Family status			
Currently married (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.66	.47	19,787
Single, never married (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.10	.29	19,787
Ever divorced (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.19	.40	19,787
Number of children age 0–12	.30	.75	19,800
Household size	2.41	1.31	19,800
Individual level—Socioeconomic status			
Highest degree attained (1 = HS or less; 2 = some college; 3 = undergrad degree; 4 = M.A.; 5 = Ph.D., professional degree)	2.88	1.18	19,772
Currently employed (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.49	.50	18,793
Household income (1 = under \$100,000; 0 = \$100,000+)	.43	.50	18,786
Housing value (101 = under \$50,000; 102 = \$50–100,000; 103 = \$101–150,000; 104 = \$151–250,000; 105 = \$251–500,000; 106 = \$501–1,000,000; 109 = >\$1 million)	104.72	1.52	10,258
Individual level—Demography/geography			
Gender (1 = male; 0 = female)	.41	.49	19,800
Age	59.47	17.08	19,797
Foreign born (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.11	.31	19,618

Table 4 continued

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation	N
Length of residence (1 = 0–4 years; 2 = 5–9 years; 3 = 10–19 years; 4 = 20+ years)	3.17	1.05	19,800
Intent to move (1 = yes; 0 = no)	.05	.23	19,800
Survey level			
Survey cooperation rate	84.34	19.84	19,800
Sample size	1,011.89	494.27	19,800
Year of field work	2004	2.46	19,800

2011, Chap. 6). Although our sample somewhat under-represents the Orthodox compared to NJPS 2000–2001 (mostly because New York is not one of the 22 communities), the sample size of Orthodox Jews is still about 1,000.

We had several indicators of Jewish experiences as a child or young adult, including *attendance at a Jewish day school*, *attendance at a Jewish supplementary school*, *attendance at a Jewish overnight camp*, *regular participation in a Jewish youth group as a teenager*, and *regular participation in Hillel while in college*. The relationships between Jewish education, both formal and informal, and adult Jewish behaviors such as ritual observance, synagogue membership, involvement in Jewish organizations, in-marriage, and opposition to children's intermarriage are well established (e.g., Baker and Ukeles 1994; Bock 1977; Bubis and Marks 1975; Cnaan 1993; Cohen 1995, 2000, 2007; Cohen and Ganapol 1998; Cohen and Kotler-Berkowitz 2004; Cohen et al. 2011; Dashefsky and Lebson 2002; Fishman and Goldstein 1993; Goldstein 1993; Hartman and Hartman 2003; Himmelfarb 1974; Horowitz 2001; Keysar and Kosmin 2001, 2005; Schiff and Schneider 1994; Sheskin 1997, 2009, 2010c; Waxman 2003).

The high percentage of intermarried couples (about 30 %) and respondents who identify as “Just Jewish” (about 30 %; not necessarily the same 30 %) raises the question of whether their children are being raised Jewish. Respondents were therefore explicitly asked *whether the children in their household were being raised Jewish*. Including this variable allows us to determine whether raising children Jewish has an effect on Jewish identity (or reflects Jewish identity) over and above whether the respondent is intermarried or identifies with a particular denomination. Because having Jewish children often brings families into contact with other Jewish families, whether for Jewish education or participation in synagogues or the Jewish Community Center, we expect that having Jewish children will be associated with stronger Jewish identity. (Of course, it could also be that those with stronger Jewish identity are more likely to raise their children Jewish. With the current data set, this cannot be deconstructed.)

As mentioned above, denser concentrations of Jews are usually associated with a more developed Jewish infrastructure. However, not everyone in a community lives in the areas of densest Jewish population. We therefore coded each respondent as to whether they *lived in one of the three zip code areas with the greatest number of Jewish households in the community*. We expect that those living in the densest

Jewish areas have heightened opportunities to interact with the Jewish community, which will reinforce commitment to the community and reflect or result in stronger Jewish identity.

Also as previously mentioned, *intermarriage* to a non-Jew presupposes at least some investment of time and energy in “bridging” social and ethnic capital between Jews and non-Jews (as opposed to “bonding” capital within the Jewish community). Cohen (2006) has shown the divergence in Jewish identity and practice between the intermarried and the in-married. As a result, we expect intermarriage to be associated with weaker Jewish identity in all respects, especially when other variables are held constant, and it was therefore introduced as a control variable.

Family Status Variables *Marital status* and *household structure* have been related to the strength of Jewish identity. Because Judaism is constructed around family ritual, and Jewish communal events are often organized around family participation, especially inclusive of school-age (or younger) children (Cohen and Ritterband 1988), being married reinforces Jewish identity, particularly in its communal expressions. Previous research has found that married couples often are more affiliated with Jewish organizations and synagogues, especially in relation to activities for children. They tend to be more active if they have children enrolled in Jewish education (Cohen and Ritterband 1988 as cited in Liebman and Cohen 1990). *Having more children age 12 or younger* is therefore also related to greater Jewish involvement in the community. At the same time, we recognize that having young children increases the domestic and financial responsibilities of adults, which may actually hinder communal participation. *Larger household size* similarly results in increased domestic roles, which may hinder participation in activities related to the communal religious and local ethnic factors, particularly the latter. This would be in addition to the greater financial burden, which would be controlled by the income variable (discussed below).

On the other hand, *singles* (especially if they are older) sometimes feel alienated by the Jewish community because of this familial orientation (Diamant 1989; Fishman 1993; Hartman and Hartman 2009; Schneider 1984). *Divorce* is not generally a stigma in the Jewish community. However, it may broaden the “bridging” social capital of the individual, and in that sense weaken the “bonding” Jewish capital, and with it, Jewish identity. Divorced individuals may have more difficulty finding their place in the Jewish community and may also have broadened social contacts in their search for second (or higher) mates. The measure used is whether the respondent has *ever divorced*.

Socioeconomic Status Variables Many sociological studies of religion find that higher levels of secular education are associated with lower levels of religiosity (Beyerlein 2004; Darnell and Sherkat 1997; Massengill 2008). Past studies of American Jews, however, have shown an overall positive relationship between secular education and Jewish identity, which has been extensively studied (e.g., Hartman and Hartman 1996a, b, 2009, 2011; Lehrer 2009). Higher education, of course, generally leads to higher income and given the high cost of living Jewishly (Chiswick and Chiswick 2000; Wertheimer 2010), one would expect stronger

Jewish identity among respondents with higher levels of education and income. Sheskin (2004, Table 7-1) shows a strong relationship between household income and synagogue membership, for example, in almost all 22 communities in our sample.

However, too much investment in particularistic Jewish cultural and social capital appears to have a negative impact on secular achievement (Chiswick and Huang 2008; Hurst and Mott 2006), resulting in the Orthodox having a somewhat lower level of education than the other denominations. Hence, an inverse relationship between higher education and the private religious factor has been found in the past (Hartman and Hartman 2009) and is also consistent with the work of Schieman (2010), who found that socioeconomic status is negatively related to beliefs in divine involvement and control.

Structural location theory (de Vaus and McAllister 1987) hypothesizes that the greater the investment in the secular infrastructure (e.g., participating in the labor force), the lower the investment in the religious infrastructure and hence lower levels of religiosity should be evident. Investment in the labor force may also be seen as an investment in “bridging” social capital, which may be opposed to particularistic religious or ethnic identity. However, as regards Jewish women, religious and ethnic identity have been found to be related positively to labor force involvement, especially once family status and number of children have been controlled (Hartman and Hartman 2011). By controlling for this variable, we control for the sources of variation it introduces.

Education is measured in this study by *highest degree attained*. Labor force participation is measured by whether respondents are *currently employed*. We have two indicators of socioeconomic status: *household income* and *housing value*.

Demographic/Geographic Variables *Gender*: Women have been found to be more religiously and ethnically identified, both among Jews (Hartman and Hartman 2009) and more generally (e.g., Collett and Lizardo 2009; Hertel 1995; Mueller and Johnson 1975; Putnam and Campbell 2010; Rayburn 2004; Stark 2002; Walter and Davie 1998; Weber 1963 [1922]; Woolever et al. 2006). The reasons for this have been explained in some detail in the literature cited. For our purposes, we include the variable to reinforce previous findings as well as to control for any variation in Jewish identity that gender may introduce.

Age: Putnam and Campbell (2010) find a clear positive relationship between age and religiosity. However, the relationship between age and Jewish identity has been found to be more complex. While older Jews tend to be more involved in activities related to the communal religious factor and local ethnic factor, younger Jews tend to be more involved in private expressions of identity (Hartman and Hartman 2009). On the other hand, Sered (1992) found personal religiosity among Jews to increase with age (at least among women). In other respects, the Baby Boom generation is less (or more) Jewishly identified than younger or older cohorts (Hartman and Hartman 2009, pp. 138–140; Waxman 2001). Age is therefore introduced as a control variable, and it reflects cohort (year of birth) as well as life cycle stage.

Immigrant Status: While one might expect international immigrants to be less integrated into the local community, Goldstein and Goldstein (1996) found that they were in fact often more integrated because of their heightened need for local services. In particular, Jews from the former Soviet Union received significant assistance from Jewish Family Services throughout the country, and, thus, became aware of the local Jewish community.

Length of Residence in the Community: Rebhun (1995) examined whether immigrants to a community had stronger or weaker Jewish identity and found that mobility had a small negative effect on Jewish identity after controlling for major socio-demographic variables. This supported the hypothesis that migration disrupts, rather than enhances, Jewish identity. However, Rebhun's indicator of Jewish identity did not distinguish the different dimensions of Jewish identity (rather, it conflated them into one indicator). Further, Rebhun's analysis only reflected the three large communities of Boston, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia; whether this holds true for other communities will require the empirical testing we do here.

Goldstein and Goldstein (1996, p. 206), analyzing NJPS 1990, found a "holding power of traditionalism," that is, the most traditional Jews (including Orthodox) were less likely to be mobile. The Goldsteins also found that Jews new to a community may be less affiliated with Jewish institutions (unless they are international immigrants in need of services the institutions offer). Sheskin shows a positive relationship between length of residence and affiliation with Jewish institutions (e.g., Sheskin 2009, Table 7-1). Rebhun's (2011) latest analysis, using NJPS 1990 and NJPS 2000–2001, found that migration had little net effect on Jewish identity, and he predicted that the effect of migration would continue to weaken.

Controlling for length of residence in the community therefore controls for these various sources of influence on Jewish identity.

Intentions to Move: We also control for intentions to move from the community, as respondents who expect to leave a community are likely to be pulling up roots, and therefore may be less involved in their local community.

Survey-Level Variables

Three survey-level indicators were selected to examine whether the manner in which the data were collected had a significant effect on the findings: the extent of cooperation with the survey once it was determined that a household was Jewish (the *survey cooperation rate*), the *sample size*, and the *year of the field work*.

We expected that the relative proportions of the sample generated by RDD and DJN sampling techniques might be related to Jewish identity (a higher percent of DJN being associated with stronger Jewish identity, per the rationale presented in footnote 5). The variation among the communities is relatively small. Most of the communities have over 60 % DJN and four of the communities have 100 % RDD samples (Table 1), three of which are in Florida. We mention this as a source of variation in case additional community studies are added in the future when the influence of this variable can be tested more adequately.

Some recent literature suggests that some aspects of Jewish identity, such as informal social ties, have been weakening over time although, in other respects, Jewish identity, such as Jews' ties to communal institutions and activities, may be strengthening (Cohen 2003; Rebhun 2011). Thus, we have controlled for the year of the field work, although we did not expect that the ten-year span would make a significant difference in Jewish identity.

Multiple Regression Results

Four multiple regression models were developed, one for each Jewish identity factor. The dependent variables were the factor scores on each of the four factors defined in Table 3. The variables were entered into the model in groups to identify the respective contributions of these groups. First we entered each group of variables separately to identify their respective gross contributions to Jewish identity. Table 5 presents the R^2 for each of these separate regression analyses. Here we see some interesting differences between the indicators of religious identity and those of ethnic identity.

For the two factors of religious identity, individual-level characteristics of Jewish background/connection at 27 and 33 % were, by far, more important than any other group of variables. Other individual-level characteristics explained much less of the variance in the religious identity factors, but for the most part explained more than the community-level characteristics.

Table 5 Regression analyses for the four Jewish identity factors

Separate R^2 for each group of variables for the four Jewish identity factors*					
Model	Variable groupings	Jewish identity factors (%)			
		Religious identity		Ethnic identity	
		Communal religious factor (ceremony)	Private religious factor (ritual)	Broader ethnic factor	Local ethnic factor
<i>Jewish community-level characteristics</i>					
1	Jewish community infrastructure/context	3.0	2.1	10.9	12.8
<i>Individual-level characteristics</i>					
2	Jewish background/connection	27.3	32.7	11.8	5.8
3	Family status	6.9	3.4	3.5	0.7
4	Socioeconomic status	3.4	0.1	4.8	2.8
5	Demographic/geographic	1.6	2.9	7.0	12.2
<i>Survey-level characteristics</i>					
6	Survey variables	1.3	0.4	1.7	2.7

* R^2 expressed as percentage of variance explained in the dependent variable in the regression, by each set of independent variables separately ("gross" percentage of variance explained)

For the two ethnic factors, a similar pattern was observed, but the individual characteristics not specifically related to Jewish background/connection were relatively more important than they had been for the religious identity factors. For example, demographic/geographic variables explained less than 3 % of each of the two religious identity factors, but a gross 7.0 % of the broader ethnic factor, and 12.2 % of the local ethnic factor.

The community-level characteristics explained more variance in the ethnic identity factors than in the religious identity factors: the Jewish community infrastructure/context variables explained 12.8 % of the variance in the local ethnic factor and 10.9 % of the variance in the broader ethnic factor. Only for the local ethnic factor did the Jewish community characteristics explain more of the variance than any group of individual-level variables.

Finally, survey-level variables explained only 3 % or less of the variance in any of the identity factors, reinforcing the validity of the meta-file.

One of the purposes of these separate regressions for each group of variables was to eliminate variables that had no relationship with individual Jewish identity. However, in each group of variables, each of the independent variables was significant at $p < .05$ for at least one factor of Jewish identity, so all were retained for the next stage of the analysis.

The regressions above enabled gross comparisons. That is, we have examined each group of variables individually, without holding the other groups of variables constant. When we combined all variables in stepwise multiple regressions, the analysis was clarified somewhat by using three models.

In Model 1 (Table 6), we entered the Jewish community/infrastructure context variables only to discern the extent to which various aspects of Jewish identity are related to Jewish community infrastructure/context.

In Model 2, we added the various individual-level variables, including Jewish background/connection, family status, socioeconomic status, and demographic/geographic variables.

In Model 3, we added survey-level variables, both to control for variation in survey administration and to validate the idea of aggregating the various surveys into a meta-data file.

At the bottom of Table 6, the cumulative R^2 at each stage of analysis is presented. Because all variables have been entered into the multiple regressions at the final stage, the regression coefficients in Model 3 reflect the *net* effects of each of the variables once all other variables have been controlled. When considering the strength of the relationship of a particular variable across factors, we examine the unstandardized coefficients (B); when comparing the relative importance of a variable's relationship with a particular factor, we look at the standardized regression coefficients (β). For clarity, only coefficients with a statistical significance of at least $p < .05$ are presented in Table 6.¹²

Looking first at the regression coefficients for the community-level variables in Model 1, we compare which community characteristics are related to each of the four expressions of Jewish identity, and the relative strengths of the relationships

¹² The complete SPSS outputs for the multiple regressions are available from the authors upon request.

Table 6 Multiple regression analysis of Jewish identity factors showing standardized regression coefficients, β s (unstandardized regression coefficients, Bs, in parentheses)*

Dependent Variable	Religious Identity						Ethnic Identity					
	Communal Religious Factor ("Ceremony")			Private Religious Factor ("Ritual")			Broader Ethnic Factor ("Klal Yisrael")			Local Ethnic Factor		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Independent Variable Model	.659*	-2.007*	-37.280	.264*	1.842*	-3.802	-2.213*	-6.097*	17.397	.626*	-3.435*	-4.415
Community-Level												
Number of Jewish households	-.051 (-.000)*	-.043 (-.000)*		-.084 (-.000)*			.170 (.000)*	.153 (.000)*			-.113 (-.000)*	-.133 (-.000)*
Percent Jewish					-.034 (-.350)*	-.027 (-.271)*	.079 (.838)*	.075 (.791)*			-.072 (-.737)*	-.028 (-.285)*
% Jewish households in top three zips		-.055 (-.390)*		-.051 (-.362)*	-.046 (-.324)*		.325 (2.400)*	.284 (2.099)*			-.157 (-1.116)*	-.191 (-1.360)*
Annual campaign per Jewish household		-.058 (.000)*	-.038 (.000)*	-.056 (.000)*	-.045 (.000)*	-.038 (.000)*	.109 (.000)*	.104 (.000)*	.022 (.000)*	.262 (.001)*	.196 (.001)*	.190 (.001)*
Number of Orthodox synagogues	-.038 (-.003)*	.119 (.548)		.140 (.012)*			.099 (.009)*	.110 (.010)*		-.047 (-.004)*	-.060 (-.005)*	-.085 (-.007)*
Increasing synagogue membership	-.043 (-.090)*	-.031 (-.066)*					.045 (.099)*	.059 (.130)*	.046 (.100)*	-.104 (-2.19)*	-.091 (-1.92)*	-.098 (-2.07)*
Decreasing synagogue membership					-.028 (-.063)*					-.108 (-2.44)*	-.071 (-1.62)*	-.081 (-1.83)*
% of married couples intermarried	-.196 (-.014)*	-.181 (-.013)*	-.098 (-.007)*	-.046 (-.003)*	-.054 (-.004)*			.374 (.027)*	.049 (.004)*		.029 (.002)*	

Table 6 continued

Dependent Variable	Religious Identity						Ethnic Identity					
	Communal Religious Factor ("Ceremony")			Private Religious Factor ("Ritual")			Broader Ethnic Factor ("Klal Yisrael")			Local Ethnic Factor		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Individual-Level												
<i>Jewish Background/Connections</i>												
Orthodox	.119 (.548)*	.119 (.547)*	.119 (.547)*	.479 (2.234)*	.479 (2.234)*	.479 (2.234)*	.072 (.346)*	.072 (.346)*	.070 (.338)*	.027 (.125)*	.027 (.125)*	.027 (.125)*
Conservative	.379 (.815)*	.379 (.816)*	.379 (.816)*	.163 (.354)*	.163 (.355)*	.163 (.355)*	.134 (.302)*	.134 (.302)*	.129 (.291)*	.119 (.258)*	.119 (.258)*	.119 (.258)*
Reform/Reconstructionist	.305 (.642)*	.306 (.643)*	.306 (.643)*	-.062 (-.132)*	-.062 (-.132)*	-.062 (-.132)*	.030 (.067)*	.030 (.067)*	.027 (.060)*	.089 (.189)*	.089 (.189)*	.089 (.189)*
Jewish day school	.050 (.172)*	.052 (.177)*	.052 (.177)*	.071 (.244)*	.071 (.246)*	.071 (.246)*	.055 (.196)*	.055 (.196)*	.049 (.175)*	.021 (.072)*	.021 (.072)*	.020 (.071)*
Supplemental Jewish school	.090 (.190)*	.090 (.189)*	.090 (.189)*				.019 (.041)*	.019 (.041)*	.019 (.043)*	.031 (.067)*	.031 (.067)*	.031 (.067)*
Jewish overnight camp							.034 (.046)*	.034 (.046)*	.033 (.045)*	.024 (.030)*	.024 (.030)*	.023 (.030)*
Jewish youth group	.047 (.053)*	.047 (.054)*	.047 (.054)*							.026 (.030)*	.026 (.030)*	.026 (.029)*
Hillel				.023 (.023)*	.022 (.024)*	.022 (.024)*	.018 (.019)*	.018 (.019)*		.016 (.016)*	.016 (.016)*	.016 (.016)*
Household with Jewish children	.102 (.251)*	.102 (.251)*	.102 (.251)*				-.033 (-.084)*	-.033 (-.084)*	-.029 (-.075)*	.057 (.141)*	.057 (.141)*	.057 (.142)*
Resides in densest Jewish area	.043 (.087)*	.040 (.081)*	.040 (.081)*				.054 (.115)*	.054 (.115)*	.066 (.141)*	.035 (.072)*	.035 (.072)*	.037 (.075)*
Intermarried	-.189 (-.504)*	-.197 (-.527)*	-.197 (-.527)*	-.026 (-.069)*	-.028 (-.077)*	-.028 (-.077)*	-.181 (-.509)*	-.181 (-.509)*	-.157 (-.440)*	-.115 (-.310)*	-.115 (-.310)*	.037 (.075)*

Table 6 continued

Dependent Variable	Religious Identity						Ethnic Identity					
	Communal Religious Factor ("Ceremony")			Private Religious Factor ("Ritual")			Broader Ethnic Factor ("Klal Yisrael")			Local Ethnic Factor		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Individual-Level												
<i>Family status</i>												
Currently married			-.020 (.002)*									
Single, never married			-.129 (-.437)*		.020 (.067)*	.019 (.064)*					-.030 (-.102)*	-.029 (-.100)*
Ever divorced			-.052 (-.131)*								-.030 (-.079)*	-.028 (-.074)*
Number of children age 0–12			-.056 (-.075)*		.025 (.034)*	.024 (.033)*					-.046 (-.064)*	-.037 (-.052)*
Household size			.114 (.087)*		.056 (.043)*	.057 (.044)*					.060 (.048)*	.053 (.042)*
<i>Socio-Economic</i>												
Highest degree attained					.020 (.017)*	.020 (.017)*					.085 (.075)*	.087 (.076)*
Current employment			.018 (.037)*								-.076 (-.158)*	-.052 (-.109)*
Household income			.035 (.071)*								.099 (.209)*	.087 (.185)*
Housing value			.027 (.019)*								.031 (.023)*	.085 (.062)*

Table 6 continued

Dependent Variable	Religious Identity						Ethnic Identity					
	Communal Religious Factor ("Ceremony")			Private Religious Factor ("Ritual")			Broader Ethnic Factor ("Klal Yisrael")			Local Ethnic Factor		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Individual-Level												
<i>Demographic</i>												
Gender		.058 (.119)*	.057 (.116)*								.056 (.116)*	.056 (.117)*
Age		-.092 (.005)*	-.101 (-.006)*				.236 (.014)*	.258 (.016)*				
Foreign born		.028 (.091)*	.030 (.097)*	.063 (.203)*	.063 (.205)*		.059 (.198)*	.054 (.182)*				
Length of residence				-.020 (-.020)*	-.021 (-.020)*		-.050 (-.049)*	-.043 (-.043)*			.265 (.255)*	.267 (.257)*
Intent to move				-.017 (-.077)*	-.017 (-.076)*						.017 (.077)*	.017 (.077)*
Survey-Level												
Survey cooperation rate			-.077 (-.004)*		-.032 (-.002)			.360 (.019)*				
Sample size			-.057 (.000)*					.122 (.000)*				.037 (-.000)*
Year of field work			.045 (.018)*					-.033 (-.014)*				
R²	.030	.332	.337	.021	.342	.343	.109	.285	.343	.128	.267	.267
N = 19,800												

* All coefficients shown are statistically significant at $p < .05$

(using the unstandardized coefficients—Bs—in parentheses). While four and five community-level characteristics are related to the religious Jewish identity factors, six characteristics are related significantly to broader ethnic identity and seven characteristics to local ethnic identity. None of the regression coefficients are as large for the religious identity factors as they are for the two ethnic identity factors. This is reflected in the R^2 for Model 1, which indicates that only 3 % of the variance (or less) is explained by these community-level characteristics in the two religious identity factors, while more than 10 % of the variance is explained by these characteristics in the two ethnic identity factors (10.9 and 12.8 %, respectively). In particular, the percent Jewish, Jewish density (% of Jewish households in the top three zips), and community stability (increasing or decreasing synagogue membership) are most strongly related to the ethnic factors. Note that community instability (increasing or decreasing synagogue membership) is negatively related to local community integration, with $\beta = -.104$ and $-.108$, respectively, suggesting that stability promotes greater local ethnic identity.

Once individual-level variables and survey-level variables are introduced into the regression models (Model 3), most of the community-level variables lose the statistical significance of their relationship with religious identity and broader ethnic identity. However, seven characteristics retain statistically significant relationships with local ethnic identity even in Model 3, and a comparison of unstandardized regression coefficients over Models 1–3 for local ethnic identity shows that most of the relationships retain at least the same strength as they had independently in Model 1. In addition to percent Jewish, Jewish density, and community stability, smaller Jewish population, larger annual campaign per household, and fewer Orthodox synagogues are all related to stronger local ethnic identity. Smaller Jewish populations, less dense Jewish communities, and stronger Federation campaigns (per household) are all related more strongly to local ethnic identity than any of the other variables except length of residence in the community.

Model 3 shows which of the individual-level indicators are related to each of the Jewish identity factors, even when community-level and survey-level variables are held constant.

For the **communal religious factor** (Ceremony), being Conservative or Reform/Reconstructionist have the strongest relationships ($\beta = .379$ and $.305$, respectively), followed by being Orthodox ($\beta = .119$); that is, denominational preference (of any kind) has the strongest relationship with expressing Jewish identity in a communal religious way, possibly because some of the communal celebrations take place in synagogues or with other congregants. Three other individual-level variables have particularly strong relationships with this expression of Jewish identity: being intermarried is negatively related ($\beta = -.197$), as is being single, never married ($\beta = -.132$), while having a larger household is related positively to communal religious identity. Note that being intermarried has a stronger negative relationship with communal religious identity than does the proportion intermarried in the community ($\beta = -.098$).

For the **private religious factor** (Ritual), being Orthodox has a β of $.479$, nearly three times the strength of any other coefficient, and being Conservative has the next strongest relationship ($\beta = .163$). Being Reform/Reconstructionist has a negative

relationship ($\beta = -.062$) with the private religious factor. Given the correlation of this factor with Orthodox identification, it is not surprising that we see a significant relationship with having attended a Jewish day school as a child ($\beta = .072$) and household size ($\beta = .057$). (Typically, Orthodox Jews have larger households than other Jewish households.)

For the **broader ethnic factor** (“Klal Yisrael”), the strongest relationships to Jewish identity are being Conservative ($\beta = .129$), not being intermarried ($\beta = -.157$), and being older ($\beta = .258$). Jewish community context has minimal relationship to this type of identity, once individual-level and survey-level indicators have been controlled. Note that the communal percentage of intermarried couples retains a statistically significant (small, positive) effect ($\beta = -.049$) in Model 3.

For the **local ethnic factor**, we see the strongest relationships with Jewish community context, as noted above. The strongest individual-level relationship is with length of residence in the community ($\beta = .267$); it is noteworthy that the individual variable of length of residence is associated more strongly with local ethnic identity than the community-level characteristic of community stability. Higher education is also related to stronger local ethnic integration ($\beta = .116$), as is self-identifying as Conservative ($\beta = .119$).

As indicated above, the **survey-level variables** contribute little explanation to the four Jewish identity factors as a group (Table 5 shows R^2 less than 3 % when they are entered into the regression equations by themselves, for each of the four identity factors), which reinforces the validity of using a meta-data file for this type of analysis. Adding in the survey-level indicators to the stepwise regression model in Table 6 (comparing Models 2 and 3) makes little difference for the two religious identity factors, although the survey indicators weaken the effect of the community-level indicators in both cases. While some of the survey-level variables retain statistically significant relationships with religious identity even in Model 3, they are relatively weak relationships (beta coefficients $<.080$). The survey-level indicators make little difference to local ethnic identity, either.

However, the survey-level indicators add nearly 6 % to the explanation of variance in the broader ethnic factor. In particular, in communities where the survey cooperation rate is higher ($\beta = .360$) and the sample size larger ($\beta = .122$), broader ethnic identity is stronger. We suggest that these are indicators of stronger communal integration and therefore replace the more indirect measures of number of Jewish households and their density. Annual campaign per household remains statistically significant in Model 3, as does increasing synagogue membership, both signs of a vibrant Jewish community. In other words, the survey-level characteristics seem to be acting more as community indicators than methodological controls.

Given the idiosyncratic nature of some of the community studies (as noted in the *Main Reports* of the community studies), some of the variation in survey methodology is intricately related to particular communities and therefore may indeed be less indicative of the survey methodology than of community characteristics. For example, the fieldwork for the Detroit, Washington, DC, and Las Vegas studies was accomplished using a professional market research firm whereas the 19 other studies were completed using (paid) members of the local

Jewish community. Could the Las Vegas results be different because of this methodological difference? Perhaps. But, the Las Vegas results are probably different from the other communities because Las Vegas is simply a very different place, Jewishly and otherwise. Using the recently released New York community study (Cohen et al. 2012), Sheskin (2012) notes the similarities and differences of New York City from other communities (no other community being as large, diverse, or poor) and concludes that Jewish communities do vary. Thus, when we control for survey-level variables it is not clear, exactly, what we are controlling. The fact that the survey-level variables add little to the overall explanation in most of the identity factors is the more important result because it validates the concept of combining and analyzing the 22 community studies together.

Next, we consider each of our hypotheses, on the basis of Model 3, which shows the net effect of each of the variables when all variables have been controlled.

Hypothesis 1: (Jewish identity is impacted by the nature of the Jewish infrastructure/context and population where an individual resides) is only very partially supported, and, in fact, at times is related to Jewish identity in ways contrary to our expectations.

Hypothesis 1a: (The size of the Jewish community will impact Jewish identity: larger Jewish communities will act to strengthen ethnic identity, while smaller Jewish communities will exhibit stronger religious identity) is not supported. The number of Jewish households in the community has a significant relationship only with the local ethnic factor, but not in the hypothesized direction. That is, individuals in *smaller* Jewish communities tend to be more integrated into the local Jewish community, as indicated by the local ethnic factor, than are individuals in larger Jewish communities. Number of Jewish households is not related significantly to the other Jewish identity factors.

Hypothesis 1b: (A higher percent Jewish in a community will act to strengthen Jewish identity) is not supported. A higher percentage Jewish is negatively associated with private religious identity and broader ethnic identity and is not related significantly to the other two expressions of Jewish identity.

Hypothesis 1c: (Stable Jewish communities will be characterized by stronger Jewish identity) is supported with regard to the local ethnic factor, which shows a negative relationship with both increasing and decreasing synagogue membership. Broader ethnic identity, on the other hand, is positively associated with increasing synagogue membership, a sign of a vibrant Jewish community.

Hypothesis 1d: (Jewish populations that are clustered in one part of a metropolitan area, rather than being geographically dispersed throughout that metropolitan area, will exhibit stronger Jewish identity) is not supported. In fact, density is related negatively to the local ethnic factor, and is not related significantly to any of the other identity factors.

Hypothesis 1e: (Jewish communities with a higher percentage of married couples who are intermarried will be characterized by individuals with weaker Jewish identity) is partially supported by a significant negative relationship with communal religious identity. Of more importance, however, is whether the individual is intermarried. Surprisingly, the percentage intermarried in a community

has a weak *positive* relationship with broader ethnic identity when other variables are controlled.

Hypothesis 2: (The more developed the Jewish institutions in a community, the stronger the individual Jewish identity) is partially supported.

Hypothesis 2a: (The greater the number of Orthodox synagogues in a community, the stronger the religious identity) is not supported. The number of Orthodox synagogues in a community has only one statistically significant relationship with the Jewish identity factors, and it is a *negative* relationship with local ethnic identity. The Orthodox community may be more identified with the local *Orthodox* community than the broader Jewish communal services and institutions.

Hypothesis 2b: (A larger Jewish Federation annual campaign per household will act to strengthen Jewish identity, especially the local ethnic factor) is partially supported. The size of the Jewish Federation annual campaign per household is related positively to the two ethnic factors, as expected. However, it is related negatively to the two religious identity factors. We considered that this might be related to Orthodox households contributing less to the local Jewish Federation. The Decade 2000 data show that Orthodox households are more likely to contribute to Jewish Federation annual campaigns than non-Orthodox households, but they tend to contribute smaller amounts due to lower incomes and their tendency to contribute to Orthodox-specific charities, such as Orthodox Jewish day schools.

In sum, most of our hypotheses about the relationships between Jewish community characteristics and Jewish identity were only partially supported or not confirmed, and in several cases were reverse significant. In fact, not for even one Jewish community-level variable are our hypotheses supported across all four factors. In some cases, controlling for the individual-level variables eliminated the significance of the community-level variable, suggesting that certain types of communities may attract households with characteristics that are related to different types of Jewish identity, and this may influence the nature of Jewish identity in that community, but it is not the community-level characteristics themselves that do so. Community-level variables retain their relationship with Jewish identity mainly on the local ethnic level.

Hypothesis 3: (The strength of the relationship between individual-level variables and individual Jewish identity will be impacted by community context) was supported for local ethnic identity, but not for the other three factors of Jewish identity. Table 7 shows the unstandardized regression coefficients of the individual-level variables when community-level variables are excluded from (Model A) and included in the regression equations (Model B). For the first three factors (the two religious identity factors and the broader ethnic identity factor) controlling for community-level characteristics hardly affects the importance of the individual-level variables and Jewish identity, be they denominational self-identification, Jewish background, family status, socioeconomic status, or demographic/geographic characteristics. Although for some of the variables the coefficients are smaller when community-level variables are controlled (Model A > Model B), the differences are small. In four cases, the unstandardized

regression coefficients become slightly larger when community context is controlled, suggesting a very small effect of clarifying the effect of the individual-level variable (the negative effect of living in a household with Jewish children on broad ethnic identity, the positive effect of household income on broad ethnic identity, and the negative relationship of length of residence in a community on private religious identity and broad ethnic identity).

There are more changes in the relationship of individual-level variables to local ethnic identity when the community-level variables are controlled. In 11 of the 25 cases, the unstandardized regression coefficients of the individual-level variables are smaller when community context is controlled. Thus, the relationship of being Orthodox, Conservative, or Reform, having gone to a Jewish day school or participated in a Jewish youth group, currently being employed, and length of residence in the community all are reduced when community-level indicators enter the regression equation, suggesting that part of their effect is the kind of communities these people (choose to) live in. On the other hand, in six of the cases, the relationship of the individual-level variable to local community integration is strengthened when the community context is controlled. The relationship of local community integration to three variables becomes statistically significant, once community context is controlled: household size, housing value, and intent to move. Some of the relationship with the local ethnic factor was thus camouflaged when community-level indicators were not held constant. While none of the changes are extremely large, this pattern reinforces what we found above, that community context is especially important in relation to local ethnic identity, as compared to its importance in relation to the other identity factors.

Conclusions

While the importance of place in both religious and ethnic identity has long been recognized by geographers (Frazier and Tettey-Fio 2010; Stump 2008), it has not been researched systematically regarding Jewish identity. Our research may be viewed as the beginning of a systematic “sociology of Jewish place” (Horowitz 1999). In this concluding discussion, we will focus on what we have learned about the structure of Jewish identity and how it varies across communities; the relationship of community characteristics to various types of Jewish identity; implications for community leaders; and implications for future research on Jewish identity.

The Structure of Jewish Identity

The first important result is that we are able to identify the same structure of Jewish identity across all 22 communities. These factors reinforce previous multidimensional studies of Jewish identity (e.g., Cohen 2009; Glenn and Sokoloff 2010; Hartman and Hartman 1996a, 2001, 2009; Phillips 1991; Rebhun 2004; Sharot 2011). The expression of religious identity is shown to be separate from the expression of ethnic identity. Religious identity, in turn, can be divided into a

Table 7 Unstandardized regression coefficients for individual-level variables in two multiple regression models of Jewish identity factors* (Model A does not include Jewish community-level variables; Model B does)**

Model	Communal religious factor (“ceremony”)		Private religious factor (“ritual”)		Broader ethnic factor (“klal yisrael”)		Local ethnic factor	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
Jewish background/connections								
Orthodox	.543*	.547*	2.248*	2.234*	.336*	.338*	.144*	.125*
Conservative	.816*	.816*	.351*	.355*	.289*	.291*	.279*	.258*
Reform/ reconstructionist	.643*	.643*	-.135*	-.132*	.061*	.060*	.204*	.189*
Jewish day school	.176*	.177*	.255*	.246*	.174*	.175*	.077*	.071*
Supplemental Jewish school	.187*	.189*	-.041*		.044*	.043*	.080*	.067*
Jewish overnight camp					.047*	.045*	.039*	.030*
Jewish youth group	.050*	.054*					.039*	.029*
Hillel			.026*	.024*				
Household with Jewish children	.244*	.251*			-.069*	-.075*	.145*	.142*
Resides in densest Jewish area	.093*	.081*			.140*	.141*		.075*
Intermarried	-.554*	-.527*	-.078*	-.077*	-.422*	-.440*	-.299*	-.307*
Family status								
Currently married	-.003*	-.002*						
Single, never married	-.458*	-.447*	.070*	.064*			-.094*	-.100*
Ever divorced	-.139*	-.133*			-.072*	-.074*		
Number of children age 0–12	-.079*	-.077*	.032*	.033*	-.051*	-.052*		
Household size	.089*	.087*	.044*	.044*	.042*	.042*		.099*
Socio-economic								
Highest degree attained			.020*	.017*	.079*	.076*	.108*	.099*
Current employment					-.102*	-.109*	.108*	.087*
Household income	.092*	.077*	-.082*	-.084*	.176*	.185*		
Housing value			-.017*	-.017*	.062*	.062*		.025*
Demographic								
Gender	.118*	.116					.106*	.117*
Age	-.005*	-.006*			.015*	.016*		
Foreign born	.085*	.097*	.222*	.205*	.181*	.182*		
Length of residence				-.020*	-.035*	-.043*	.308*	.257*
Intent to move			-.087*	-.076*				.077*

* All coefficients presented are statistically significant at $p < .05$

** Survey-level variables are controlled in both models

communal religious factor, which includes the more commonly observed ritual expressions of Jewish identity, and the private religious factor, which includes the less commonly observed expressions that entail a private commitment to daily ritual. Likewise, ethnic identity can be divided into a broader ethnic factor, which reflects Jewish “secular” culture and peoplehood (“klal yisrael”), and a factor of local ethnicity, which includes familiarity with and participation in the local Jewish Federation and its agencies. By replicating the four-factor structure of Jewish identity for each of the 22 communities individually, we reinforced the validity of the meta-analysis.

Along with this predominant similarity between communities, our analysis also highlighted variation in this structure across communities, an area that could benefit from further research. For example, in communities where synagogue membership loads more highly on the broader ethnic factor rather than the communal religious factor, is individual religious identity stronger on average? In communities where contributions to the Jewish Federation load more highly on the local ethnic factor rather than the broader ethnic factor, is broader ethnic identity weaker on average? This might be another avenue for investigating the impact of community context on individual Jewish identity.

Previous studies of Jewish identity have identified public and private dimensions of both religious and ethnic identity. Because there were few if any indicators in the 22 questionnaires concerning private ethnic identity, no separate factor of private ethnicity emerged. This finding reinforces the desirability of standardizing local Jewish community study questionnaires and including questions based upon this theoretical framework, even if it is not in the immediate interest of a given community. Only by some centralized subsidization of the cost of adding such “non-practical” questions to local community studies, could individual communities perhaps be enticed to cooperate with such a venture. It certainly is worth exploring, although most local community studies already have lengthy questionnaires and adding such material might mean deleting questions that local Jewish Federations would consider more important. These 22 local Jewish community studies benefitted from the fact that all 22 questionnaires were designed by the same researcher and only minor wording changes occurred on a few questions. More standardization between researchers would make analyses such as the one presented here much more possible and worthwhile.

The Relationship of Community Characteristics to Individual Jewish Identity

Besides increasing sample size (in this case, to almost 20,000) and achieving significant representation across various Jewish settings, an important innovation in using these 22 community studies in the Decade 2000 Data Set is that we have much more detail about the Jewish infrastructure in the community of each respondent than has been the case in any analysis of local or National Jewish Population Surveys in the past. Almost all of the infrastructure variables in Table 2 were collected as part of the original studies and were included in the study reports. This practice facilitated addressing the question of the extent to which Jewish community infrastructure is related to an individual’s expressions of Jewish identity. The

answer is that Jewish community infrastructure is related to Jewish identity primarily in terms of local ethnic identity; its contributions to the other three factors of Jewish identity (communal religious identity, private religious identity, and broader ethnic identity) are minor, once we control for individual-level and survey-level characteristics.

One question that arises from this finding is what the role of local community ethnicity is in reinforcing individual Jewish identity of various sorts; in other words, looking at local community ethnicity as a means to an end, rather than an end in itself. An even bigger issue is how the broader infrastructure of a community matters to an individual. Perhaps only in the actual interaction with communal institutions (appearing in the “familiarity with” and “participation in” questions loading highly on the local ethnic factor) is Jewish identity reflected. Nevertheless, certain features of the broader Jewish context would seem to be necessary (a minimal “critical mass” of Jews, having synagogues in proximity, perhaps kosher eating establishments, some Jewish services) to reinforce Jewish identity.

So perhaps the important question is: which of the features in the Jewish communal context are important and how are they important? The minor effect of community context on most of the expressions of individual Jewish identity suggests that the most important characteristics of the communal context may not be included in our analysis, and may even be characteristics for which we do not usually collect data. Similarly, these community studies do not have some of the more familiar attitudinal indicators usually asked to determine strength of Jewish identity (such as “How important is being Jewish in your life?” and extent of agreement with the statement, “Jews in the United States and Jews elsewhere around the world share a common destiny”) and social—but impractical—indicators (such as “How many of the people you consider to be your closest friends are Jewish?” and extent of agreement with the statement, “I have a special responsibility to take care of Jews in need around the world”). Such limitations to the data may minimize the relationship that is found. Again, we emphasize the desirability of standardizing a portion of the community studies’ questionnaires to facilitate comparability between researchers and inclusion of more communities in a meta-data file such as Decade 2000. Particularly when national studies of American Jews are not being funded, the ability to aggregate local Jewish community studies is imperative, and subsidizing a common core of questions for community studies would be far less costly than developing a new national Jewish population study.

Despite their weak contribution to the explanation of three of the factors of Jewish identity, features of Jewish infrastructure are significantly related to integration into the local Jewish community (the local ethnic factor). As mentioned above, with the present data we cannot determine causality—people with certain types of Jewish identity may seek communities with certain infrastructures, and/or a community’s infrastructure may influence certain aspects of Jewish identity. But the relationships themselves are notable. Integration into the local community is more likely in smaller Jewish communities, which are not particularly dense and which tend to have stable Jewish populations. Where there is stronger integration into the local community, individuals in the community are more likely to be mobilized to contribute to the Jewish Federation annual campaign.

It is possible that there are other features of Jewish communities not measured by these surveys (e.g., number of actual cultural activities offered), which further research may uncover. It is also possible that characteristics of *virtual* communities are related to Jewish identity. The latest New York community study (Cohen 2012) notes that more than a third of New York Jews access Jewish websites, for example, and 16 % claim to belong to online Jewish groups (p. 114). Again, further research is needed to explore this.

Implications for Community Leaders

Local community studies are usually undertaken to provide practical applications for the local community. It is worthwhile to consider whether this aggregate analysis of community studies has any practical application for local community leaders. First, it is important to note that strong Jewish identity is found in many types of communities. Some community features are not related to most expressions of Jewish identity, but are positively related to one another. Clearly, a Jewish community being larger and more developed is not a clear recipe for stronger Jewish identity in all of its aspects, nor is Jewish population density or mobilizing a strong Jewish Federation annual campaign. Strong Jewish identity can be found in stable Jewish communities and not-so-stable Jewish communities. The options seem to be limitless. As Goldscheider (1986) once suggested, Jews will find a way to create the social and institutional networks that work for them, if they do not already exist; they are not limited to a particular recipe for communal structure.

The stronger relationship of smaller, stable Jewish communities to local ethnic identity may, however, be instructive. Even in larger communities, if smaller units of close interaction can be simulated (e.g., in learning *havurahs*), a similar effect of stronger local ethnic identity may be achieved.

Another application of our research may be derived from the persisting importance of individual-level characteristics for Jewish identity. Controlling for community-level characteristics did not erase the significance of the more commonly researched relationships between individual-level variables and Jewish identity, be they denominational self-identification, Jewish background, family status, socioeconomic status, or demographic characteristics. It does become clear from the results, however, that some types of individual-level characteristics are related to certain expressions of Jewish identity, while other types have stronger relationships to other expressions; further, some of the relationships between individual-level characteristics and expressions of Jewish identity are positive with one factor of Jewish identity, and negative with another. For example, Jewish background and denominational preference are much more closely related to religious identity, while the socioeconomic characteristics of education and income are more related to broader ethnic orientation among Jews. Awareness of individual characteristics of residents may be an important variable in tailoring community activities to a particular population's needs. Younger Jews may be attracted to communal religious activities, while older Jews respond to activities tapping broader ethnic identity.

While family status is only weakly related to most of the expressions of Jewish identity, being single seems to be associated with weaker communal religious identity more than other expressions of Jewish identity. Community leaders might be sensitive to this and attempt to design community religious activities that are inclusive of those in their community who are not married.

Implications for Future Research

Our findings suggest that analyses of religious and ethnic expressions of Jewish identity should not be lumped together, and that some of the contradictory emphases in different research studies of Jewish identity (see Hartman, forthcoming) may be linked to foci on different types of Jewish identity rather than Jewish identity in its multifaceted complexity.

We should note that while the 22 community studies in the Decade 2000 Data Set represent a wide range of Jewish community settings, they are not a “representative” sample of American Jewish communities. We lack representation of the “Pacific Northwest” (using Silk and Walsh’s [2008] regional divisions) and only sparse representation of the “Pacific,” “Mountain West,” and “Southern Crossroads.” The data set does not include several of the communities with the largest concentrations of American Jews (New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Boston). We do not know how their inclusion might change the results of our analysis. In the future we hope to incorporate community studies of other researchers and later studies completed by Professor Sheskin to make the meta-data file more representative geographically and to keep the data current. Adding in earlier studies of these same communities may also clarify the suggested trends by using a different methodological approach. Additional studies, incorporating larger Jewish communities, communities in geographic areas not currently represented adequately, and communities with data from a longer time span will almost certainly increase the variation of the variables and enhance the analysis.

Following the approach of Stump (1986), who analyzed regional variations in the determinants of religiosity, further research will also examine the hypothesis that in different regions of the country, types of Jewish identity are related to various features of the Jewish community and perhaps to the broader community characteristics as well, and these may in turn affect how individual-level characteristics are related to Jewish identity. For example, living in the more religious South may result in stronger religious Jewish identity, while living in the less communally oriented West may result in stronger non-traditional or private expressions of Jewish identity.

Another question we hope to consider is whether identifying as Orthodox, Conservative, or Reform implies different expressions of Jewish identity in the various regions of the country. Our findings reinforce previous conclusions of the important relationships between denominational preference and strength of different kinds of Jewish identity. However, the interaction of denomination and place has been the subject of little systematic study.

With regard to survey cooperation rate, it does not surprise us that in communities with stronger Jewish religious identity and local ethnicity, the Jewish

population is more ready to volunteer time to participate in a survey about its Jewish community. This relationship reinforces the need to control for the variable to make certain it does not affect other findings. Sample size may also reflect the readiness of the community to participate. We do not think these findings invalidate the results of the meta-analysis; they do, however, speak to the need to control for variance at the survey level. In the future we hope to find procedures to include more about survey variance in our analyses.

In conclusion, we are just at the beginning of this “sociology of Jewish place,” but we are at a stage that we hope will allow us to address questions of interest about the construction of Jewish identity in contemporary American life. We hope that the potential in this analysis will strengthen a commitment to introduce more standardization into portions of the community studies’ questionnaires. We also hope more questions can be included that might result in a more nuanced reflection of contemporary Jewish engagement in communal life.

Acknowledgments We gratefully acknowledge the support of the North American Jewish Data Bank for Harriet Hartman’s 2010 Berman Summer Research Fellowship and to the Religious Research Association for Harriet Hartman’s Jacquet Research Award. Naturally, responsibility for the content presented herein is the sole responsibility of the authors.

References

- Alexander, Bobby. 1987. Ceremony. In *The encyclopedia of religion*, vol. 3, ed. M. Eliade, 179–183. New York: Macmillan.
- Ament, Jonathan. 2004. *Jewish immigrants in the United States*. Report 7 in the United Jewish Communities report series on the National Jewish Population Survey 2000–01. New York: United Jewish Communities. www.jewishdatabank.org. Accessed 8 July 2011.
- Baker, Sally, and Jacob B. Ukeles. 1994. *Campus and community: Strengthening the identity of Jewish college students*. New York: American Jewish Committee. www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=2530. Accessed 8 July 2011.
- Benson, Peter L., Eugene C. Roehlhepartan, and Stephanie P. Rude. 2003. Spiritual development in childhood and adolescence: Toward a field of inquiry. *Applied Developmental Science* 7(3): 205–213.
- Beyerlein, Kraig. 2004. Specifying the impact of conservative Protestantism on educational attainment. *Journal for the Social Scientific Study of Religion* 43(4): 505–518.
- Beyerlein, Kraig, and John R. Hipp. 2006. From pews to participation: The effect of congregation activity and context on bridging civic engagement. *Social Problems* 53(1): 97–117.
- Bock, Geoffrey. 1977. *Does Jewish schooling matter?*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Bradburn, Norman M., Seymour Sudman, and Brian Wansink. 2004. *Asking questions: The definitive guide to questionnaire design—For market research, political polls, and social and health*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Bubis, Gerald B., and Lawrence E. Marks. 1975. *Changes in Jewish identification: A comparative study of a teen age Israel camping trip, a counselor-in-training program, and a teen age service camp*. New York: Jewish Community Center Association.
- Chiswick, Carmel U., and Barry Chiswick. 2000. The cost of living Jewishly and Jewish continuity. *Contemporary Jewry* 21(1): 78–90.
- Chiswick, Barry, and Jidong Huang. 2008. The earnings of American Jewish men: Human capital, denomination, and religiosity. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 47(4): 694–709.
- Christaller, Walter. 1933. *Die zentralen orte in Süddeutschland*, Gustav Fisher, Verlag, Jena; translated as *Central Places in Southern Germany* (trans: Baskin, W.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Christiano, K.J., W.H. Swatos Jr., and P. Kivisto. 2007. *Sociology of religion: Contemporary developments*, 2nd ed. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Cnaan, Ram A. 1993. Personal characteristics, Jewish identity, and the needs of Jewish graduate students in the Philadelphia area. *Journal of Jewish Communal Service* 69 (4): 55–60. www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=3297.
- Cohen, Steven M. 1983. *American modernity and Jewish identity*. New York: Tavistock Publications.
- Cohen, Steven M. 1995. *The impact of varieties of Jewish education upon Jewish identity: An inter-generational perspective*. New York: Jewish Agency for Israel. www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=202.
- Cohen, Steven M. 2007. *The differential impact of Jewish education on adult Jewish identity*. New York: AVI CHAI Foundation. www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=3052.
- Cohen, Steven M. 2000. Camp Ramah and adult Jewish identity. In *RAMAH: Reflections at 50: Visions for a new century*, ed. S.A. Dorph, 95–129. New York: National Ramah Commission.
- Cohen, Steven M. 2003. Jewish identity research in the United States: Ruminations on concepts and findings. In *Continuity, commitment and survival: Jewish communities in the diaspora*, ed. S. Encel, and L. Stein. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Cohen, Steven M. 2006. *A tale of two Jewries: The “inconvenient truth” for American Jews*. New York: Jewish Life Network/Steinhardt Foundation.
- Cohen, Erik H. 2009. Particularistic education, endogamy, and educational tourism to homeland: An exploratory multidimensional analysis of Jewish diaspora social indicators. *Contemporary Jewry* 29: 169–189. www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=4815.
- Cohen, Steven M., and Arnold Eisen. 2000. *The Jew within: Self, family, and community in America*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Cohen, Steven M., and Alan Ganapol. 1998. *Building Jewish identity: A study of Young Judea alumni*. New York: Hadassah. www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=114.
- Cohen, Steven M., and Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz. 2004. *The impact of childhood Jewish education upon adults' Jewish identity: Schooling, Israel travel, camping and youth groups*. Report 3 in the United Jewish Communities Report Series on the National Jewish Population Survey 2000–01. New York: United Jewish Communities. www.jewishdatabank.org. Accessed 8 July 2011.
- Cohen, Steven M., Ron Miller, Ira M. Sheskin, and Berna Torr. 2011. *Camp works, the long-term impact of Jewish overnight camp, evidence from 26 U.S. Jewish population studies on adult Jewish engagement*. New York: Foundation for Jewish Camp.
- Cohen, Steven M., and Paul Ritterband. 1988. *The utilization of Jewish communal services in Queens and Long Island*. New York: United Jewish Appeal/Federation of Jewish Philanthropies.
- Cohen, Steven M., Jack Ukeles, and Ron Miller. 2012. *Jewish community study of New York: 2011 Comprehensive report*. New York: UJA Federation of New York.
- Collett, Jessica L., and Omar Lizardo. 2009. A power-control theory of gender and religiosity. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 48(2): 213–231.
- Cooper, Harris, and Erika A. Patall. 2009. The relative benefits of meta-analysis using individual participant data or aggregated data. *Psychological Methods* 14: 165–176.
- Curran, Patrick J., and Andrea M. Hussong. 2009. Integrative data analysis: The simultaneous analysis of multiple data sets. *Psychological Methods* 14(2): 81–100.
- Curran, Patrick, Andrea M. Hussong, Li Cai, Wenjing Huang, Laurie Chassin, Kenneth J. Sher, and Robert A. Zucker. 2008. Pooling data from multiple longitudinal studies: The role of item response theory in integrative data analysis. *Developmental Psychology* 44(2): 365–380.
- Darnell, Alfred, and Darren Sherkat. 1997. The impact of Protestant fundamentalism on educational attainment. *American Sociological Review* 62(2): 306–315.
- Dashefsky, Arnold, and Cory Lebson. 2002. Does Jewish schooling matter? A review of the empirical literature on the relationship between formal Jewish education and dimensions of Jewish identity. *Contemporary Jewry* 23: 96–131.
- de Vaus, David, and Ian McAllister. 1987. Gender differences in religion: A test of the structural location theory. *American Sociological Review* 52(4): 472–481.
- Demerath III, N.J. 1965. *Social class in American Protestantism*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Diamant, Carol (ed.). 1989. *Jewish marital status*. New York: Hadassah.
- Dollinger, Marc. 2000. *Quest for inclusion, Jews and liberalism in modern America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dougherty, Kevin, and Andrew Whitehead. 2011. A place to belong: Small group involvement in religious congregations. *Sociology of Religion* 72(1): 91–111.
- Fishman, Sylvia Barack. 1993. *A breath of life: Feminism in the American Jewish community*. New York: Free Press.

- Fishman, Sylvia Barack, and Alice Goldstein. 1993. *When they are grown they will not depart: Jewish education and the Jewish behavior of American adults. Research report 8*. Waltham, MA/New York: Brandeis University, Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies/Jewish Education Service of North America. www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=2896. Accessed 13 Jan 2011.
- Frazier, John W., and Eugene L. Tettey-Fio. 2010. *Race, ethnicity, and place in a changing America*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Glenn, Susan A., and Naomi B. Sokoloff (eds.). 2010. *Boundaries of Jewish identity*. Baltimore: University of Washington Press.
- Goldscheider, Calvin. 1986. *Jewish continuity and change*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Goldstein, Sidney. 1981. Jews in the United States: Perspectives from demography. In *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 81, ed. D. Singer, and L. Grossman, 3–59. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Goldstein, Sidney. 1990. Jews on the move: Implications for American Jewry and for local communities. *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* 32: 5–30.
- Goldstein, Sidney. 1991. Jews on the move. *Moment* 16(24–29): 49–51.
- Goldstein, Alice. 1993. Jewish education and Jewish identity: Findings from the National Jewish Population Survey of 1990. In *Jewish population studies, papers in Jewish demography*, 289–302. Jerusalem: The Avraham Harman Institute of Contemporary Jewry and The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=424.
- Goldstein, Sidney, and Alice Goldstein. 1996. *Jews on the move*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Graham, Otis. 1983. From snowbelt to sunbelt: The impact of migration. *Dialogue* 59: 8–15.
- Hartman, Harriet. Forthcoming. Studies of Jewish identity and continuity in the U.S.: Competing, complementary, and comparative perspectives. *Studies in Contemporary Jewry*.
- Hartman, Harriet, and Moshe Hartman. 2001. Dimensions of Jewish identity among American Jews. In *Papers in Jewish demography, 1997*, ed. Sergio DellaPergola and J. Even, 239–260. Jerusalem: The Avraham Harman Institute of Contemporary Jewry and The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Hartman, Harriet, and Moshe Hartman. 2009. *Gender and American Jews: Patterns in work, education, and family in contemporary life*. Waltham, MA: University Press of New England/Brandeis University Press.
- Hartman, Harriet, and Moshe Hartman. 2011. Jewish identity and the secular achievements of American Jewish men and women. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion* 50(1): 133–153.
- Hartman, Harriet, and Ira Sheskin. 2011. *The influence of community context and individual characteristics on Jewish identity: A 21-community study*. Storrs, CT: North American Jewish Data Bank.
- Hartman, Moshe, and Harriet Hartman. 1996a. *Gender equality and American Jews*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hartman, Moshe, and Harriet Hartman. 1996b. More Jewish, less Jewish: Implications for education and labor force characteristics. *Sociology of Religion* 57(2): 175–193.
- Hartman, Moshe, and Harriet Hartman. 2003. Gender and Jewish identity. *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 18(1): 37–61.
- Hertel, Bradley R. 1995. Work, family and faith: Recent trends. In *Work, family, and religion in contemporary society*, ed. Nancy Ammerman, and Wade Roof, 81–122. New York: Routledge.
- Himmelfarb, Harold. 1974. The impact of religious schooling: The effects of Jewish education upon adult religious involvement. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Horowitz, Bethamie. 1999. Jewishness in New York: The exception or the rule? In *National variations in Jewish identity: Implications for Jewish education*, ed. S. Cohen, and G. Horenczyk, 223–243. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Horowitz, Bethamie. 2001. Informal education and Jewish identity development. *Sh'ma: A Journal of Jewish Responsibility*. www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=2329. Accessed 15 Jan 2011.
- Hurst, Dawn, and Frank Mott. 2006. Secular pay-offs to religious origins: Gender differences among American Jews. *Sociology of Religion* 67(4): 439–463.
- Kadushin, Charles, and Elizabeth Tighe. 2008. How hard is it to be a Jew on college campuses? *Contemporary Jewry* 28(1): 1–20.
- Kelley, Jonathan, and Nan Dirk De Graaf. 1997. National context, parental socialization, and religious belief: Results from 15 nations. *American Sociological Review* 62(4): 639–659.

- Keysar, Ariela, and Barry A. Kosmin. 2001. *The camping experience 1995–1999—The impact of Jewish summer camping on the conservative high school seniors of the “four up” study*. New York: National Ramah Commission.
- Keysar, Ariela, and Barry A. Kosmin. 2005. *Research findings on the impact of Camp Ramah: A companion study to the 2004 “eight up” report on the attitudes and practices of conservative Jewish college students*. New York: National Ramah Commission.
- Kosmin, Barry A., and Ariela Keysar. 2006. *Religion in a free market*. Ithaca, NY: Paramount Marketing Publishing.
- Kosmin, Barry A., Sidney Goldstein, Joseph Waksberg, Nava Lerer, Ariela Keysar, and Jeffrey Scheckner. 1991. *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*. New York: Council of Jewish Federations.
- Kotler-Berkowitz, Laurence, Steven M. Cohen, Jonathon Ament, Vivian Klaff, Frank Mott, and Danyelle Peckerman. 2003. *Strength, challenge and diversity in the American Jewish population*. New York: United Jewish Communities.
- Lazerwitz, Bernard, and Ephraim Tabory. 2002. National religious context and familial religiosity within a Jewish framework. *Review of Religious Research* 44(1): 22–37.
- Lehrer, Evelyn L. 2009. *Religion, economics, and demography: An economic perspective on the role of religion in education, female employment, fertility, cohabitation, marriage and divorce*. New York: Routledge.
- Liebman, Charles, and Steven M. Cohen. 1990. *Two worlds of Judaism: The Israeli and American experiences*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Massarik, Fred, and Alvin Chenkin. 1973. United States National Jewish population study. In *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 73, ed. D. Singer, and L. Grossman, 264–306. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Massengill, Rebekah. 2008. Educational attainment and cohort change among conservative Protestants, 1972–2004. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 47(4): 545–562.
- McCloud, Sean. 2007. *Divine hierarchies: Class in American religion and religious studies*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.
- Mueller, Charles W., and Weldon T. Johnson. 1975. Socioeconomic status and religious participation. *American Sociological Review* 40(6): 785–800.
- Phillips, Bruce. 1991. Sociological analysis of Jewish identity. In *Jewish identity in America*, ed. D. Gordis, and Y. Ben-Horin, 3–26. Los Angeles: University of Judaism.
- Phillips, Bruce A. 1993. Regional differences among American Jews. In *Papers in Jewish demography 1989*, ed. U.O. Schmelz and S. DellaPergola, 104–112. Jerusalem: Avraham Harman Institute of Contemporary Jewry and The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=2752.
- Phillips, Benjamin, and Sylvia Fishman. 2006. Ethnic capital and intermarriage: A case study of American Jews. *Sociology of Religion* 67(4): 487–505.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Putnam, Robert D., and David E. Campbell. 2010. *American grace: How religion divides and unites us*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rabinowitz, Jonathan, Israel Kim, and Bernard Lazerwitz. 1992. Metropolitan size and participation in religio-ethnic communities. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 31(3): 339–345.
- Rayburn, Carole. 2004. Religion, spirituality, and health. *American Psychologist* 59(1): 52–53.
- Rebhun, Uzi. 1995. Geographic mobility and religioethnic identification: Three Jewish communities in the U.S. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 34(4): 485–498.
- Rebhun, Uzi. 2004. Jewish identities in America: Structural analyses of attitudes and behaviors. *Review of Religious Research* 46(10): 43–63.
- Rebhun, Uzi. 2011. *The wandering Jew*. New York: Academic Press.
- Regnerus, Mark, Christian Smith, and Brad Smith. 2004. Social context in the development of adolescent religiosity. *Applied Developmental Science* 8(1): 27–38.
- Rieger, Miriam. 2004. *The American Jewish elderly*. Report 6 in the United Jewish Communities report series on the National Jewish Population Survey 2000–01. New York: United Jewish Communities. www.jewishdatabank.org. Accessed 8 July 2011.
- Riley, Leonard D., Paul C. Lambert, and Ghada Abo-Zaid. 2010. Meta-analysis of individual participant data: Rationale, conduct, and reporting. *British Medical Journal* 340(7745): 521–525.

- Roehlhepartan, Eugene C., Peter L. Benson, and Peter C. Scales. 2011. Spiritual identity: Contextual perspectives. In *The handbook of identity theory and research*, ed. S.J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, and V.L. Vignoles, 545–562. New York: Springer.
- Saxe, Leonard. 2010. U.S. Jewry 2010: Estimates of the size and characteristics of the population. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Jewish Studies, Boston.
- Schieman, Scott. 2010. Socioeconomic status and beliefs about God's influence in everyday life. *Sociology of Religion* 71(1): 25–51.
- Schiff, Alvin I., and Mareleyn Schneider. 1994. *The Jewishness quotient of Jewish day school graduates: Studying the effect of Jewish education on adult Jewish behavior*. New York: David J. Azrieli Graduate Institute of Jewish Education and Administration, Yeshiva University.
- Schneider, Susan Weidman. 1984. *Jewish and female: Choices and changes in our lives today*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Sered, Susan. 1992. *Women as ritual experts: The religious lives of elderly Jewish women in Jerusalem*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sharot, Stephen. 2011. *Comparative perspectives on Judaism and Jewish identities*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 1991. The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey: Implications for small Jewish communities. Paper presented at the general assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations, Baltimore.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 1997. *The Blue Star impact: Evaluating 50 years of Blue Star's mission*. Hollywood, FL: Blue Star Camps. www.jewishdatabank.org. Accessed 9 July 2011.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 1998. A methodology for examining the changing size and spatial distribution of a Jewish population: A Miami case study. *Shofar, Special Issue: Studies in Jewish Geography* 17(1): 97–116. www.bjpa.org.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 2001. *How Jewish communities differ: Variations in the findings of local Jewish demographic studies*. New York: City University of New York, North American Jewish Data Bank. www.bjpa.org.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 2004. *The Jewish community study of Greater Washington*. Rockville: The Kaplan Foundation.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 2005a. *Geographic differences among American Jews*. Report 8 in the United Jewish Communities Report Series on the National Jewish Population Survey 2000–01. New York: United Jewish Communities. www.jewishdatabank.org. Accessed 8 July 2011.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 2005b. Comparisons between local Jewish community studies and the 2000–01 National Jewish Population Survey. *Contemporary Jewry* (25): 158–192. www.bjpa.org.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 2005c. *The Jewish community study of the twin cities*. Minneapolis and St. Paul: The Minneapolis Jewish Federation and the United Jewish Fund and Council of Greater St. Paul.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 2009. *The Jewish community study of Middlesex County*. South River: The Jewish Federation of Greater Middlesex County.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 2010a. A geographical approach to an analysis of the distancing hypothesis. *Contemporary Jewry* 30(2–3): 219–226.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 2010b. Elderly Jews: An increasing priority for the American Jewish community? *Changing Jewish Communities*, vol. 58, Jerusalem: Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs. www.jcpa.org.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 2010c. *The Jewish overnight camp experience*. New York: Foundation for Jewish Camp.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 2011. *The Jewish community population study of Greater New Haven*. Woodbridge, CT: The Jewish Federation of Greater New Haven.
- Sheskin, Ira M. 2012. Op-Ed: N.Y.'s Jewish community report can apply elsewhere in U.S. JTA. <http://www.jta.org/news/article-print/2012/06/18/3098421/op-ed-nys>. Accessed 18 June 2012.
- Silk, Mark, and Andrew Walsh. 2008. *One nation divisible: How regional religious differences shape American politics*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sklare, Marshall. 1971. *America's Jews*. New York: Random House.
- Smith, Christian. 2003. *The secular revolution*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Smith, Christian, David Sikkink, and Jason Bailey. 1998. Devotion in Dixie and beyond: A test of the "Shibley thesis" on the effects of regional origin and migration on individual religiosity. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 37(3): 494–506.
- Stark, Rodney. 2002. Physiology and faith: Addressing the "universal" gender difference in religious commitment. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41(3): 495–507.

- Stump, Roger W. 1986. Regional variations in the determinants of religious participation. *Review of Religious Research* 27(3): 208–225.
- Stump, Roger W. 2008. *The geography of religion, faith, place, and space*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Tighe, Elizabeth, David Livert, Melissa Barnett, and Leonard Saxe. 2010. Cross-survey analysis to estimate low-incidence religious groups. *Sociological Methods and Research* 39(1): 56–82.
- Walter, Tony, and Grace Davie. 1998. The religiosity of women in the modern West. *British Journal of Sociology* 49(4): 640–660.
- Waxman, Chaim. 2001. *Jewish baby boomers: A communal perspective*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Waxman, Chaim. 2003. *Jewish education does matter*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, School of Education. www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=3038.
- Weber, Max. 1963 [1922]. *The sociology of religion* (trans: Fischeff, E.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Weissbach, Lee Shai. 2005. *Jewish life in small-town America: A history*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Wertheimer, Jack. 2005. *The American synagogue—Recent trends and issues*. New York: American Jewish Committee. www.bjpa.org/Publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=3178.
- Wertheimer, Jack. March, 2010. The high cost of Jewish living. *Commentary*. www.commentarymagazine.com/article/the-high-cost-of-jewish-living/. Accessed 18 June 2012.
- Woolever, Cynthia, Deborah Bruce, Wulff Keith, and Ida Smith-Williams. 2006. The gender ratio in the pews: Consequences for congregational vitality. *Journal of Beliefs and Value: Studies in Religion and Education* 27(1): 25–38.

Author Biographies

Harriet Hartman is Professor of Sociology at Rowan University. She is the current President of the Association for the Social Scientific Study of Jewry. She has published extensively on the Jewish family, marital status, and gender issues. She is the author, with Moshe Hartman, of *Gender Equality and American Jews*. Her most recent book, also with Moshe Hartman, is *Gender and American Jews: Patterns in Work, Education, and Family in Contemporary Life*.

Ira M. Sheskin is Professor of Geography and Regional Studies and the Director of the Jewish Demography Project of the Sue and Leonard Miller Center for Contemporary Judaic Studies at the University of Miami. He has completed more than 40 Jewish community studies for Jewish Federations throughout the country and was a member of the National Technical Advisory Committee that planned both the 1990 and 2000–2001 National Jewish Population Surveys. His publications include books entitled *Survey Research for Geographers* and *How Jewish Communities Differ*. He is the author, with Arnold Dashefsky of the annual article on Jewish demography which appears in the *American Jewish Year Book* and is also now published on www.jewishdatabank.org.