



Working Paper No. 501

**Two National Surveys of American Jews, 2000–01:
A Comparison of the NJPS and AJIS**

by

Joel Perlmann

The Levy Economics Institute of Bard College

May 2007

The Levy Economics Institute Working Paper Collection presents research in progress by Levy Institute scholars and conference participants. The purpose of the series is to disseminate ideas to and elicit comments from academics and professionals.

The Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, founded in 1986, is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, independently funded research organization devoted to public service. Through scholarship and economic research it generates viable, effective public policy responses to important economic problems that profoundly affect the quality of life in the United States and abroad.

The Levy Economics Institute
P.O. Box 5000
Annandale-on-Hudson, NY 12504-5000
<http://www.levy.org>

Copyright © The Levy Economics Institute 2007 All rights reserved.

Two National Surveys of American Jews, 2000–01: A Comparison of the NJPS and AJIS

by Joel Perlmann

ABSTRACT

While there have been very few national surveys of American Jews, two that we do have are from the same period, 2000–01. They were conducted by different researchers using different sampling methods. Known as the NJPS and the AJIS, these surveys are now available as public-use datasets, but they have not yet been systematically compared. This paper first describes what modifications in sample composition must be made to meaningfully compare the surveys' results. Then it reviews basic demographic and cultural orientations of respondents; on most measures, the samples are quite similar. The paper stresses that both surveys can be thought of as samples of Americans of recent Jewish origin; and in both surveys, a large minority of people have both Jewish and non-Jewish origins (typically as the products of parental intermarriage). Many of these respondents do not report themselves Jewish by religion; indeed, many declare that they are Christians. One notable feature of the surveys is that the AJIS sample includes modestly more people of Jewish origin who do not identify themselves as Jewish by religion today. The paper concludes by urging the importance of asking all respondents who did not declare themselves Jewish by religion the question, "Do you consider yourself Jewish in any way?"

1. INTRODUCTION: TWO NATIONAL SAMPLES FROM THE SAME PERIOD—AN UNUSUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR COMPARISON

National samples of American Jews have been rare and costly. The federal census does not canvass Americans by religion and voluntary Jewish efforts have typically been limited to local areas. Creating a national sample of a small percentage of the population is very costly because so many households have to be screened out (Jews comprise some 2% of Americans).

Nevertheless, there have been four efforts to create a national sample of American Jews by Jewish voluntary organizations—a preliminary effort in 1970, a good sample from 1990, and two samples from 2000. There is no guarantee that we will have more such national samples of American Jews in the future; technical problems related to telephone sampling are especially costly to overcome for small populations. The national samples from 1990 and 2000 are therefore rare—not to say priceless. It is all the more striking, then, that two of these samples were collected in the same year—the National Jewish Population Survey of 2000–2001 and the American Jewish Identity Survey of 2001, referred to here as NJPS and AJIS respectively. Since both are now available as public use datasets, we can systematically compare them.¹

The two samples were collected by different survey organizations and researchers, using different sampling methods for reaching American households and the Jewish population. Nevertheless, both of these national samples of American households are based on the same four screening questions:

What is your religion, if any?

Were your mother or father Jewish?

Were you raised Jewish?

Do you consider yourself Jewish for any reason?

¹ The North American Jewish Databank website (<http://www.jewishdatabank.org>) conveniently provides access to the datasets, documentation, and the substantive final reports based on these datasets.

Answering “yes” to any of these screening questions qualified the respondent for inclusion in the sample. The samples differed in how they handled household members—who was chosen as a respondent and what information was collected on others. But by restricting attention to the *respondent* chosen in each sampled household, we can compare the two samples quite precisely.

The screener questions should make it clear that the “American Jews” surveyed in both samples can be thought of as “Americans of recent Jewish origin.” Nearly half of those who answered *one of these* screener questions in the affirmative *did not* so answer *the* first screening question—they did not report themselves Jewish by religion. Indeed, many mentioned that they are Christians. Americans of recent Jewish origin who do not report their religion as Jewish may still feel that they have other reasons to think of themselves as Jews—they may embrace no religion, and feel ethnically or culturally Jewish, for example. They may also tell the interviewer that they embrace Christianity or some other religion, but that they nevertheless consider themselves Jewish in some way. Analysts, of course, can choose to omit such individuals from their analysis—defining for themselves a definition of who counts as a Jew. However, here I try to include all those who responded affirmatively to any of the screener questions—that is, to include all Americans of recent Jewish origin, whatever they tell us about their current Jewish attachments. Nevertheless, for sake of sample comparability, I must make two exclusions from the AJIS.

1) The NJPS does not include anyone who qualified for the sample on the basis of the fourth screening question only. In fact, 38 people responded no to the first three questions and yes to the fourth, but the NJPS administrators eventually placed all these people in a separate sample of Americans, *other than* those of recent Jewish origin (the National Sample of Religion and Ethnicity, NSRE).² For the sake of comparability, I

² In the NSRE, these 38 sample members are weighted up to represent over 1.5 million Americans. Many of these people gave only reasons connected with Christianity (e.g., “Jesus was a Jew”) for identifying with Jewishness. If we included them in the sample of Americans of recent Jewish origin, they would radically skew the social profile of the Jewish group towards the South and Midwest, lower education, fundamentalist Christian outlook, etc. On the other hand, if the sample members were only moved from the NJPS to the NSRE on a post-hoc basis, and would have received radically lower weights in the NJPS, including them there would have had only a small effect. But it is simpler to eliminate such sample members from the AJIS sample than to reintroduce them into the NJPS sample.

have therefore eliminated respondents from the AJIS sample who qualified based only on the fourth screener question (48 respondents in all).

2) Due to a misunderstanding, in the early waves of the AJIS data collection, interviewers failed to ask respondents who were not Jewish by religion one of the survey questions: whether or not their parents had been born Jewish.³ After the error was caught, interviewers asked this question of such respondents in all later waves of the data collection. Fortunately, the AJIS was made up of scores of independent waves of sample collection; consequently those who had been asked the question (n=313) can be weighted up to stand in for those who had not been asked it (n=246).

Generally, the screening questions produced two large groups of respondents in each sample: those who qualified on the basis of religion and those who qualified on the basis of origin only. Among those qualifying by origin, the great majority mentioned a Jewish parent; only a tiny fraction in each sample qualified by virtue of the third screener question, raised Jewish rather than parentage Jewish. Some of those who qualified by origin rather than religion reported that they had no religion, others said they were Christians, or (in a small number of cases) members of other religions. Finally, the reader should bear in mind that the NJPS is a much larger sample: 5,148 respondents to the 931 in the AJIS as it is used here. Respondents exclusively Jewish by religion number 3,067 in the NJPS and 614 in the AJIS.

2. SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC AND CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS

The samples generally agree on the big picture (Table 1), and this is true of the basic demographic features of the two sampled populations. The proportions are roughly the same for broad age categories, men and women, the nine census divisions of the country, the New York metro area, the other older, large Jewish communities (Chicago, Philadelphia, and Boston), and for the group of major Jewish communities today (the older large communities, as well as the DC area and various metro areas in Florida and California). The same is true for those with a BA degree and for type of family structure.

³ At issue is not the screener question about whether one's mother or father "were" Jewish, but rather a separate question about whether mother or father were born Jewish.

Four measures of cultural orientation can be easily compared across the two samples—political party support, proportion of Jewish friends, travel to Israel, and emotional attachment to Israel. Here, too, distributions are quite similar across the samples, at least after the differing proportions with missing data have been taken into account.

The most notable differences in Table 1 are that the AJIS includes a modestly older age profile and a strikingly higher proportion of households with a total annual income of \$100,000 a year or more. For some reason, AJIS also includes rather fewer respondents with advanced degrees. The counterintuitive nature of these two findings characterizing the same sample should warn us to be careful about scanning many results for differences across samples, with no prior theory as to *which differences* will prove to be statistically significant.

Nevertheless, it is hard to ignore the difference in total annual income. Among all respondents, 34% of AJIS and 25% of NJPS sample members between the ages of 25 and 64 answered that their total household income was over \$100,000 a year. Moreover, the difference is *more extreme* when we focus on a narrower cultural group—respondents reporting themselves to be exclusively Jewish by religion. In this subgroup, more respondents in both samples reported the high income, but this was especially true of the AJIS respondents: 45% so reporting compared to 29% in the NJPS. This difference by sample (in both the entire group and among those exclusively Jewish by religion) is statistically significant in a logistic regression model that regresses high income status on age group, census division, metro area, BA status, and sex of the respondent.⁴

The General Social Survey (GSS) sheds some additional light on this matter.⁵ Identifying GSS respondents by religion should lead us to a population roughly comparable to the AJIS and NJPS respondents who are exclusively Jewish by religion. In the 1998, 2000, and 2002 GSS, respondents were asked to report their total household income in similar ranges to those used in our samples: 35% reported amounts of \$110,000 or more, and another 7% reported amounts of \$90,000 to \$110,000. Thus, we

⁴ Controlling for age and age squared as linear variables rather than controlling for broad age groups produces the same result.

⁵ Accessed at http://sda.berkeley.edu/cgi-bin/hsda?harc_sda+gss04 on May 5, 2007; I'm grateful to Yuval Elmelech for help navigating the site.

may assume that some 38–40% would have reported incomes over \$100,000. This would put the GSS results decidedly closer to those of the AJIS, but nevertheless between the AJIS and the NJPS. Note, too, that the GSS for all three years together includes only 155 Jewish respondents (in the 25–64 age range); thus, sampling variability is large and suggests that the true figure in the population could easily be as high as that reported in the AJIS—but also just about as low as that reported in the NJPS. The most sensible tentative conclusion is probably that the low proportion with incomes over \$100,000 in the NJPS is not impossible but is probably too low; at the same time it may be modestly overstated in the AJIS.

3. JEWISH BY RELIGION, JEWISH BY FAMILY ORIGINS

As I mentioned earlier, about half the respondents in each sample ended up there by reporting themselves Jewish by religion (including a small number of converts to Judaism), while the others reported only that they had a Jewish parent or (in rare cases) were raised Jewish. Those who mentioned that they were Jewish by religion were nearly all *exclusively* Jewish by religion—that is, they mentioned no other religious involvement.

However, while the samples both show these findings, the proportion who mentioned that they were Jewish by religion was notably higher in the NJPS: 62% to 54%. Since these figures are based on the entire samples, they would easily meet the strictest standards of statistical significance.⁶ And even when numerous background factors are taken into account—differences in age, geographic residence, education, income, and sex of the respondent, the higher rate declaring themselves Jewish by religion is confirmed. Although the difference is not terribly dramatic in substantive terms, it is large enough to suggest differences in sampling methodology. And this difference can, of course, influence all other findings when they are not presented for each subgroup—Jewish by religion or other.

⁶ The standard error of the difference in proportions would be 1.5 percentage points in a simple random sample.

This cross-sample difference in the proportion that reported themselves Jewish by religion turns up within each major age group; it also turns up in both the second and third types of metro areas. However, within the New York metro area, the cross-sample difference is so muted as to be inconsequential. The fact that the difference is stronger outside New York is also consistent with the hypothesis that differences in sample design plays a hand here, since more uncertainty about sampling design may be involved where Jews are a smaller proportion of the population than in New York.

4. TYPES OF FAMILY ORIGIN: THE LEGACY OF PREVALENT PARENTAL INTERMARRIAGE

From the point of view of American ethnicity generally, the most crucial single insight gleaned from the national surveys has been the high rate of American Jewish outmarriage over the course of the last third of the twentieth century. Since this pattern has now existed for closer to half than a quarter of a century, its significance for the next generation has emerged as well in the surveys from 2000—or at least emerged when it has been allowed to emerge, rather than hidden by decisions to focus on those of Jewish origin who retain familiar forms of Jewish attachment. Here I compare the reports of respondents concerning their origins—whether they had one or two Jewish-born parents. A large fraction, however, fall into a third class, “other”; these respondents reflect a wide variety of unusual situations. Some of these are people who had no Jewish-born parents but had converted to Judaism themselves, others had parents who had converted to Judaism. But these converts are a small fraction of the “other” group; others were the children of one or two partly-Jewish parents, the product of still earlier family experience with outmarriage. And still others simply did not report enough information on their parents for me to classify them elsewhere.

So the straightforward comparison ignores the respondents in the “other” origins category and focuses on the percentages who report one or two Jewish-born parents. Thus, in the AJIS the proportions were 53:30 and in the NJPS 60:23; the proportion with only one Jewish parent is thus larger in the AJIS. As we will soon see, both in terms of

origins and in terms of current Jewish attachment, the anomalous “other” group is much more similar to those who report one rather than two Jewish-born parents.

The crucial point is that the data on origins by sample in Table 3 perfectly parallels the responses to the first screener question, Jewish by religion, that we observed in Table 2. The ratio favors the mixed-origin proportion in the AJIS for every comparison presented in Table 3, by age and by metro status. But, as with the first screener question, the difference is inconsequential in the New York metro area. Also, these two responses are capturing roughly the same subgroups: when origin type is controlled in a logistic regression, the association between sample type and Jewish by religion drop to insignificant levels.

5. COMPARING REPORTS OF JEWISH ATTACHMENTS TODAY

The NJPS allowed for respondents to more easily list multiple religions and denominations; to make the two samples as comparable as possible, I have classified Jewish attachments by the first mention of religion and denomination. Also it seems to have been easier for an NJPS respondent to report being Jewish by religion and yet list a Christian denomination, or Christian by religion and list a Jewish denomination. I restricted NJPS denominational information to those who had reported themselves as Jews under religion and who then reported a Jewish denomination under that heading.⁷

Thus, Jews by religion are classified by denomination or as “just Jews” when they listed no denomination. Those who were not Jewish by religion are classified either as reporting no religion, a religion other than Judaism or Christianity (this last a tiny proportion of each sample), or Christianity. Finally, a small proportion (2% in NJPS and 5% in AJIS) are missing the data necessary for classification.

⁷ Also, in the NJPS, the fourth screener question (“do you consider yourself Jewish for any reason?”) was asked of *every respondent* who had not reported a Jewish religious attachment. But, in the AJIS, the fourth screener question was only asked of those who had responded in the negative to the first three screener questions. This added NJPS information facilitated recoding of respondents whose religious attachment was listed as missing or as none (in my earlier work, I had recoded them to “just Jews”). And it also allowed me to reclassify many Christians as people who considered themselves also to be Jews. But for meaningful comparison with the AJIS, the use of this information from the fourth screening question must be ignored. Finally, in AJIS, a tiny number of cases reported more than one denomination, too; I limited attention to the first listed (which may or may not have been the first mentioned by respondents in that sample).

Generally, rather more of the AJIS sample members report themselves as Christian. This difference is statistically significant in a logistic regression controlling for the background variables mentioned earlier—until the number of parents born Jewish is controlled. With that control, the association between sample and the likelihood of reporting oneself Christian drops to statistical insignificance.⁸

In sum, those whose parents had intermarried were themselves more likely to declare themselves Christian, regardless of the background factors controlled or the sample in which they were surveyed. There is a strong association for Americans of Jewish origin between the likelihood of having had two Jewish-born parents, the likelihood of declaring oneself Jewish by religion, and the likelihood of not declaring oneself Christian. No surprise, this. There is also a weaker positive connection between any one of these strongly-associated responses and the likelihood of having been selected by the AJIS rather than the NJPS survey methodology.

6. JEWISH ORIGINS AND JEWISH SELF-IDENTITY: MOVING BEYOND THE FIRST SCREENER QUESTION

Before concluding this overview of results in two surveys, it is important to notice some revealing outcomes that are related to a peculiarity in the NJPS survey methodology. Recall the second, third and fourth screener questions: 2) Were your parents Jewish?; 3) Were you raised Jewish?; and 4) Do you consider yourself Jewish for any reason? Each of these questions was meant to be asked only if the screener question preceding it was not answered in the affirmative. I have already mentioned (in the introduction) that no respondents were included in the NJPS by virtue of the fourth screener question alone. Here I want to call attention to another feature of this last screener question—the important potential of the question “Do you consider yourself Jewish in any way?”—for substantive understanding rather than screening.

In the AJIS, the question was only used to screen respondents for inclusion in the sample. However, in the NJPS, after the screening was completed and the designated

⁸ This shift across two logistic models (with controls for age, region, metro type, BA status, and gender of respondent) is observed whether age is controlled by major group or by individual year and its squared value; similarly it is observed whether or not high income status is controlled.

respondent in the household had been selected, *all those who had Jewish origins but had not answered that they were Jewish by religion* were asked whether they considered themselves Jewish for any reason. Whatever the reasons for this difference in survey questions, and whatever the uses made of it for post-hoc classifications by the NJPS staff, the important point here is that this information was asked of 1,381 representative Americans of Jewish origin (when weighted, a third of all NJPS respondents).

This question allows those of Jewish origin who did not report themselves Jewish by religion to self-identify as Jewish in some way, or to avoid doing so. In this sense, it operates rather like the United States Census ancestry question “With which ancestry group or groups do you identify?” Or rather, the question is actually closer to the Census’ Hispanic origin question, since it focuses the respondent’s attention on one particular ancestry (Hispanic origin in one case, Jewish origin in the other) and asks whether the respondent identifies with those origins.

So consider in closing the NJPS responses to the question “Do you consider yourself Jewish for any reason?” (Table 5A).⁹ A third of those who reported no religion, and almost a quarter of the rest—including 22% of those who reported themselves Christian—answered in the affirmative.

Analysts will no doubt relate to these findings in different ways. For some observers, it will be important to stress the blurry, or porous boundaries of the Jewish people in an era of intermarriage, a condition in which the experience of the American Jewish people is coming to resemble that of other descendents of European immigrants. In that condition, multiple origins and multiple attachments are likely to become more common. Other observers may wish to eliminate people who give these complex responses.

Still, just what do we learn from these responses? After all, some observers have argued that the census ancestry data does not reveal the *salience* that the respondent attributes to the response. Likewise, in the NJPS survey, we can speculate about how, after some ten minutes of answering questions concerning one’s Jewish origins, a Christian individual of partly Jewish origins might be inclined to recognize those Jewish

⁹ Those few who answered in the affirmative, but considered themselves Jewish only for reasons related to their Christian faith (e.g., “Jesus was a Jew”) were reclassified as having provided a negative response (approximately 5% of the subgroup asked the question).

roots enough to affirm that (s)he considers himself or herself Jewish in some way. The respondent may only be acknowledging a genealogical background, not a contemporary cultural meaning. On the other hand, it would be foolhardy to simply assume this minimal salience.

Certainly the available evidence, however thin, suggests that those who answered in the affirmative do differ somewhat from those who answered in the negative. Table 5B uses the four measures of cultural orientation also used in Table 1: support for the Democratic Party, having Jewish friends, whether one has visited Israel, and whether one feels emotionally attached to Israel. Limiting attention to NJPS respondents who did not report themselves Jewish by religion, I distinguished between those who identified themselves as Christians and the rest (i.e., those with no religion and those with another religion). I then divided the Christian and other respondents according to whether or not they considered themselves Jewish in any way.

In connection with all four measures, on which Jews traditionally have scored high, those who reported that they consider themselves Jewish in some way scored higher than those who reported that they do not. This was the case among Christians and among others. In connection with the first three measures (Democratic Party, Jewish friends, visiting Israel), Christians also scored lower than the others, suggesting a fuller degree of assimilation. On the other hand, on the question of emotional involvement with Israel, the Christians are more likely to report a stronger involvement than the others. This outcome makes sense given the Christian emphasis on the land of Israel, as well as the considerable pro-Israel feeling in many Christian circles. Nevertheless, those Christians who also considered themselves Jewish in some way were more likely to report emotional involvement with Israel than those who did not. A second source of strength for the emotional involvement thus seems to be associated with recognizing the Jewish origins as relevant to one's identity.

All in all, then, it would be useful to ask Americans of Jewish origin who do not report themselves Jewish by religion whether or not they consider themselves Jewish in any way. Whether the utility of this question will outlive the first generation with many people with mixed origins, Jewish and non-Jewish, we cannot say. But for the moment, when appreciable fractions of these people do not report themselves Jewish by religion,

but do tell us that they consider themselves Jewish in some way, it is important to explore what they are telling us.

Table 1. Comparing AJIS and NJPS 2000-2001: Selected Demographic and Cultural Characteristics

	ALL RESPONDENTS		EXCLUSIVELY JEWISH BY RELIGION		
	AJIS*	NJPS	AJIS	NJPS	
<i>Age distribution</i>					
	1834	24	29	20	24
	3554	37	37	36	37
	5599	39	34	44	39
<i>Gender</i>					
Sex=M		48	46	48	47
<i>Census divisions</i>					
New Engl.		5	7	4	7
Middle Atl.		29	32	39	38
ENC		9	9	10	8
WNC		3	3	2	2
South Atl.		21	19	22	19
ESC		3	2	2	1
WSC		7	4	3	3
Mtn.		6	5	4	3
Pacific		18	19	15	17
		100	100	100	100
<i>Metro areas: 1</i>					
NYC		23	24	33	31
Chi, Bos, Phi		10	12	11	13
all other		66	63	56	56
<i>Metro areas: 2</i>					
NYC metro area		23	24	33	31
Other major Jewish Concentrations		39	43	41	45
All other places		38	33	26	24
<i>Education (ages 25-64)</i>					
Less than BA		39	40	26	31
BA or more		61	60	74	69
Graddeg		23	28	28	33

Table 1, Continued

	ALL RESPONDENTS		RESPONDENTS EXCLUSIVELY JEWISH BY RELIGION	
	AJIS*	NJPS	AJIS	NJPS
<i>hh income GT 100K (ages 25-64)</i>				
yes	34	25	45	29
missing	14	14	13	17
<i>Marital status/children in home</i>				
married/no	35	34	36	38
/yes	22	22	24	23
single/no	8	7	10	8
/yes	1	0	1	0
cohabit/no	5	1	4	1
/yes	1	0	1	0
other/no	23	28	22	25
/yes	5	7	3	5
	100	100	100	100
<i>Political party</i>				
Republican	15	17	10	13
Democrat	33	49	41	58
independent	22	21	20	18
other	0	7	0	5
missing	30	6	29	6
<i>Friends: half or more Jewish?</i>				
yes	41	45	59	63
missing**	6	1	3	0
<i>Visited Israel?</i>				
yes	26	29	39	42
missing**	6	2	5	3
<i>Emotionally attached to Israel?</i>				
no	30	20	14	10
not very	16	20	17	19
somewhat	29	34	37	38
very	19	25	25	33
missing	8	1	7	0

* See text for discussion of two groups of respondents omitted from the AJIS. Total sample sizes NJPS=5,148, AJIS=931; exclusively Jewish by religion: NJPS=3,067, AJIS=614

** Shown where percentage missing is appreciable in one or both samples.

Table 2. Responses to the AJIS and NJPS 2000-01 Screener questions: Jewish by religion and others

Description of sample member	Percentages by sample	
	AJIS	NJPS
Exclusively Jewish by religion*	53	61

Jewish by religion	53	62
Others of Jewish origin		
-- Jewish by parentage	42	35
-- 'raised' Jewish	4	2
All 'Jewish' respondents**	100	100
% Exclusively Jewish by religion*		
-- by age ranges		
18-34	44	51
35-54	53	60
55 and older	60	70
-- by metro areas		
NYC metro area	75	77
Other major Jewish concentrations	57	65
All other places	37	44

*A few respondents mentioned another religion while mentioning "Jewish." Others mentioned another religion when asked about denomination. These respondents are coded as Jewish by religion, but not as exclusively Jewish by religion.

** Includes all Americans of recent Jewish origin. See text, introduction for a discussion of cases excluded from the AJIS sample.

Table 3. Respondents' Origins: One or Two Jewish-born Parents (by survey)

<i>Origins for:</i>	<i>percentage by survey</i>	
	AJIS	NJPS
<i>-- entire sample</i>		
Two parents born Jewish	53	60
One parent only born Jewish	30	23
other family backgrounds*	18	17
Total	100	100
<i>-- ages 18-34</i>	AJIS	NJPS
Two parents born Jewish	37	44
One parent only born Jewish	41	37
other family backgrounds*	22	20
Total	100	100
<i>-- ages 35-54</i>		
Two parents born Jewish	50	59
One parent only born Jewish	30	23
other family backgrounds*	20	18
Total	100	100
<i>-- ages 55 and older</i>		
Two parents born Jewish	64	74
One parent only born Jewish	22	12
other family backgrounds*	14	14
Total	100	100
<i>-- NYC metro area</i>		
Two parents born Jewish	75	77
One parent only born Jewish	16	15
other family backgrounds*	9	8
Total	100	100
<i>-- other major Jewish concentrations</i>		
Two parents born Jewish	57	64
One parent only born Jewish	24	21
other family backgrounds*	19	14
Total	100	100
<i>-- all other places</i>		
Two parents born Jewish	35	40
One parent only born Jewish	44	32
other family backgrounds*	22	28
Total	100	100

* for the composition of the "other family backgrounds" category, see text, section 4.

Table 4. Categories of Attachment to Jewishness and to Other Religions: AJIS and NJPS 2000-01

Entire sample		AJIS	NJPS
	Attachment type		
	Answered Jewish by religion: branch/denom		
	Orthodox*	5	7
	Conservative*	18	17
	Reform*	19	22
	Other denominations	1	2
	Other responses to branch/denom.	10	14
	No response	4	2
	<i>subtotal: Jewish by religion</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>64</i>
	No religion specified	19	13
	Other religion than Judaism or Christianity	1	4
	Christian	24	19
	<i>subtotal: not Jewish by religion</i>	<i>43</i>	<i>36</i>
	<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>
Age ranges		AJIS	NJPS
18 - 34	Jewish	46	54
	No religion specified	23	19
	Other religion than Judaism or Christianity	1	6
	Christian	29	21
	<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>
35 - 54	Jewish	55	62
	No religion specified	20	12
	Other religion than Judaism or Christianity	0	4
	Christian	24	22
	<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>
55 - 99	Jewish	66	73
	No religion specified	14	10
	Other religion than J or Xtn	1	2
	Christian	19	15
	<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>
Metro areas		AJIS	NJPS
NYC	Jewish	80	78
	No religion specified	8	9
	Other religion than J or Xtn	0	1
	Christian	12	11
	<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>

Table 4, Continued

		AJIS	NJPS
other Major Jewish concentrations	Jewish	62	67
	No religion specified	21	13
	Other religion than J or Xtn	0	4
	Christian	16	16
	<i>Total</i>	100	100
all other places	Jewish	39	48
	No religion specified	23	16
	Other religion than J or Xtn	1	6
	Christian	38	29
	<i>Total</i>	100	100

* Among Jews by religion (57% of AJIS, and 64% of NJPS respondents) the big three denominations were reported by respondents as follows: AJIS: Orthodox 9%, Conservative 32%, and Reform 33%; NJPS: Orthodox 10%, Conservative 27%, and Reform 35%.

Table 5. NJPS Respondents Who Did Not Consider Themselves Jewish by Religion: "Do you consider yourself Jewish for any reason?"

A. Attachment type (not Jewish by religion)	% yes response: consider self Jewish for any reason	
No religion reported	33	
Religion other than Christianity reported	25	
Christian religion reported	22	
<i>Total*</i>	28	
B. Attitudinal measures for those not Jewish by religion	By response to "Consider self Jewish"	
	yes	no
<i>Political party: % Democrat</i>		
No religion or other religion	46	32
Christian religion	37	32
<i>more than half of friends Jewish? % yes</i>		
No religion or other religion	31	14
Christian religion	21	12
<i>Visited Israel? % yes</i>		
No religion or other religion	20	10
Christian religion	8	6
<i>Emotional attachment to Israel? % strong**</i>		
No religion or other religion	44	30
Christian religion	55	39

*Includes 5% of the subsample who could not be classified into any of the three categories due to missing data, among whom 63% responded that they did consider themselves Jewish for some reason. Omitting this group reduces the total who responded in the affirmative to 26%

** % giving either of the two stronger responses of the four offered.