Region of Residence and Jewish Identification, US 2000-01

Isaac W. Eberstein & Kyle Reese-Cassal

Center for Demography & Population Health

Florida State University

Extended abstract submitted to the Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America, March 31- April 2, 2005, Philadelphia, PA.

Contact Information:
Isaac W. Eberstein, Center for Demography & Population Health, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2240, 850-644-7108 (voice), 850-644-8818 (fax), ieberstn@fsu.edu.

Kyle Reese-Cassal, Center for Demography & Population Health, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2240, 850-644-4269 (voice), 850-644-8818 (fax), kr03@fsu.edu.

An earlier version of this paper was presented to a conference on "Religion, Families, and Health" at the University of Texas at Austin, April 2004.

Brief Abstract

This research examines variability in the extent and form of ethnic identification among Jews in the US, with a primary interest in place of residence, using data from the National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01. Jewish identification is operationalized in terms of denominational preference, subjective Jewish identity, and ritual behavior. Overall relationships are examined, and controls for demographic and social variables are considered, in order to explore the mechanisms associated with differences in the extent and nature of Jewish identification between places. Findings indicate that denominational affiliation varies by region and county size, with more Orthodox in the Northeast and the largest metropolitan areas, and Reform and Other Jews more distributed to other regions and smaller places. Region, but not county size, is significantly related with ritual behavior (West and South less observant), while county size is related with subjective Jewish identity (less in non-metropolitan and the largest metropolitan areas).

Extended Abstract

Jews are a cultural group with a core in the traditions of Judaism. The group can be viewed to emphasize ethnicity, religion, or both. Although for some purposes it is most appropriate to consider group-level differences between those who would identify or be identified as Jews and members of other groups (e.g., Christians, Moslems, etc), for other purposes it is important to consider within-group differences in ethnic identification among the population of American Jews. Differences in subjective identification, behavior and/ or organizational affiliation are particularly meaningful for understanding conflicts and change within the Jewish community more generally, as well as more particularly the patterns and trends in various expressions of group membership on the individual and household level.

This research examines variability in the extent and form of ethnic identification among Jews in the US, with a primary interest in place of residence, using data from the National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01. Jewish identity is operationalized in terms of denominational preference, subjective Jewish identification, and ritual behavior. The analysis explores patterns of Jewish identification, with a particular focus on region and county size. Overall relationships are examined, and controls for demographic and social variables are considered, in order to explore the mechanisms associated with differences in the extent and nature of Jewish identification between places. In the remainder of this extended abstract, key aspects of the analysis are highlighted along with important findings. Substantial editing, the addition of pertinent literature, some elaborations and revisions to the analysis, and a thorough write-up will be completed prior to the PAA meetings.

Demographic Context

By way of background, the US Jewish population is at best stable but most probably in demographic decline. The population in 2000 has been variously estimated from 5.2 to 6.1 million, in comparison with 5.5 million in 1990, or about 2% of the entire US population. Jews are characterized by high education and income, late marriage, low fertility, extensive in-marriage (but 47% current out-marriage is defined as a problem within the Jewish community), and low immigration since WWII. Although Jews have certainly been the objects of prejudice and discrimination, there have been relatively low levels of both organized and indigenous anti-Semitism in the US.

Table 1 describes the US Jewish population in 2000 by county size and region of residence. Jews remain concentrated in the Northeast (39%), although this reflects a substantial decline from over two-thirds (68%) in 1930. Correspondingly, populations in the South (25%) and West (24%) have increased. Within region, Jews reside mainly in the largest metropolitan areas, although some live in other places – including small non-metropolitan counties. Jews in the Northeast are most likely to live in the largest areas (81%), while those in the Midwest are most likely to live in the smallest non-metropolitan areas (8.1%). Southern Jews are more concentrated in small metropolitan areas (33%).

Table 1

Lifetime migration patterns in Table 2 provide more specificity to the amount and direction of interregional movement. Table 2a indicates the amount of movement by

region of residence, with the major streams being from the Northeast and Midwest to the South and West. Only about half of Jews born in the Midwest continue to live there. Table 2b looks at these data in a slightly different way, indicating the relative mix of the population by origin across regions. Whereas almost nine of ten Jews living in the Northeast were born there, fewer than 36% of those living in the South were born in the region. Indeed, more Jewish southerners were born in the Northeast (45%) than in the South.

Table 2

No doubt migration operates to reduce regional differences in the nature of ethnic identification among Jews. Still, the possibilities of Jewish life are different outside areas with large Jewish concentrations. For instance, it is more logistically difficult to maintain a Kosher household in areas without markets that stock food that meets religious dietary standards. Similarly, a synagogue or Temple may or may not be present to enable membership and attendance at services, and there may not be convenient access to a Jewish community center. Jewish youth groups may be sparse, such that inter-dating may be more common. Further, the sheer size differences between the Jewish and non-Jewish populations may prevent the smaller group from successfully combating hegemonic Christianity (e.g., the FCA-sponsored "rally round the flag pole" for Christian prayer before the daily start of public high school) except in a legal or otherwise formal venue. Thus, it is reasonable to expect variations in the ways in which ethnic identity is manifested among Jews depending on place of residence. This will be explored here.

Data

Data are taken from the National Jewish Population Survey, 2000-01 (www.jewishdatabank.org). This survey was funded by Jewish organizations as a means to guide communal planning. It was a response to a particular concern over population decline and assimilation. The national survey was collected via RDD across strata emphasizing the top 40 metropolitan areas, with other areas getting a lower weight. All adults were screened in cooperating households, with households classified as Jewish or Persons of Jewish Background based on the presence of these individuals. A randomly selected Jewish adult was used as a household informant. The overall survey obtained a response rate of 28.2%. All findings reported here are based on weighted data. Standard errors have not yet been adjusted for the complex sample design; this will be implemented in revision.

Jewish adults were identified based on responses to four questions asked in sequence: Jewish religion (yes [includes "Jewish" in combination with other religions], no), Jewish mother or father, "raised Jewish," and "consider self Jewish." A "yes" answer to any of these four questions was taken to indicate a Jewish individual, with two exceptions. If the respondent answered "no" to "self" but "yes" to any of the first three questions, then the respondent was considered a Person of Jewish Background (PJB) rather than a currently Jewish adult. Similarly, if the respondent answered "yes" to self but "no" to each of the first three questions, they were not considered Jewish or PJB. The result of these decision rules is that the most assimilated persons of Jewish origin were not asked many of the "Jewish" questions, thereby limiting the present analysis to a study of variation in ethnic identification among this more narrowly delimited population.

It may be reasonable to assume lower levels of identification among the more assimilated group, but this is not certain.

Measures

Three aspects of Jewish identification are examined here: traditional religious identity (denominational preference, synagogue membership, and attendance at religious services), subjective ethnic identity, and ritual behavior. These measures indicate individuals' organizational affiliation, how they think of themselves, and what they do.

Table 3 presents data on religious identity. Synagogue membership and frequency of attending services are cross-classified by denomination. Note that some of the groups making up the various denomination categories may not be considered to be "Jewish" by all observers based on religious grounds. There is a continuum of traditional religious identity varying from Orthodox to Conservative, Reform, and "Other." Persons identifying as Orthodox are most likely to be affiliated with a synagogue and most likely to attend services monthly or more often, with those identifying as "Other" being least likely on both. Those identifying as Conservative and Reform are intermediate, with Conservative consistently more observant on these criteria and Reform less. These data suggest that denomination per se is an effective summary of traditional religious identity and an important dimension of the larger concept of ethnic identification among American Jews.

Table 3

Measures of subjective Jewish identity and reported ritual behavior are shown in Table 4. The three indicators of subjective identity (sense of belonging, how I see myself [reversed], and importance of being Jewish) are converted to a five point scale (highest identification equals highest score) and summed, with the resulting index internally consistent at an alpha of .64. The frequency distribution of the subjective identity scale indicates responses that are clustered toward the high end, with a mean of 3.8, a median of 4.0, and relatively few scores at the lower end. In contrast, an index of ritual behavior (each item is converted to 1 for "yes" and summed; alpha = .84) shows scores that are clustered toward the low end (mean = 3.1, median =3.0), with relatively few at the highest end of ritual observance. Note that synagogue membership and attendance frequency are moved from a separate measure of traditional religious identity to this index in order to facilitate analysis. These two indexes of Jewish identification indicate that high subjective identity is associated with low ritual behavior – individuals identify but do not behave in ways traditionally associated with group membership.

Table 4

Table 5 illustrates the interrelationships of the two indexes of subjective Jewish identity and ritual behavior with denomination, the third measure of overall Jewish identification. As expected, the pattern of denominational differences indicated above is again evident on both measures: Orthodox highest, followed in turn by Conservative, Reform, and Other. Interestingly, the differences are most pronounced for the measure of ritual behavior. Subjective Jewish identity does not vary as strongly as behavior. Indeed, the measure of ritual behavior is at its maximum among the Orthodox (where the median is the highest score possible on the index), suggesting a need for additional items to distinguish at this high level of observance. Further, these indexes are so strongly interrelated with denomination, it is reasonable to ask whether any variability remains in

the other aspects of Jewish identification by place of residence, after denomination is controlled.

Table 5

Findings

Table 6 cross-classifies the Jewish population by denomination and region of residence, in order to clarify the basis for regional differentials in the indexes of subjective identity and behavior. (Differences in marginal totals reflect missing values.) Most Orthodox are in the Northeast, with about half of the Reform and Other Jews in the South and West. Nearly all Orthodox are in the largest metropolitan areas, in comparison with three-quarters or so of the other groups. Reform is more concentrated in small metropolitan areas and the smallest non-metropolitan areas than are the other groups, except that "Other" is more among the larger non-metropolitan areas. Jews in non-metropolitan areas are smaller in number than in metropolitan areas, but these areas contain important segments of the non-Orthodox groups.

Table 6

Table 7 presents information on denominational shifting, which gives some indication of both the meaning of denomination and the factors underlying much of the conflict and change in denominational practice. In general, the table indicates a move from more to less traditional over the life course, but there is a small and symbolically important counter-stream. Reform is more likely to hold on to those raised in the denomination, while Orthodoxy is least likely. Turning the perspective, only approximately half (54%) of persons currently Reform were raised in this denomination, in comparison with about four-fifths (79.2%) of the Orthodox. About a quarter (25.4%) of current Reform adherents were raised Conservative, and an additional 8.8% were raised Orthodox. This likely portends significant shifts in Reform practice in a "traditional" direction as these individuals remake Reform liturgy to reflect their nostalgic vision of their childhood observance, without the strictures (and restrictions) of Orthodoxy.

Table 7

The data in Tables 6 and 7 indicate that denomination is related to region and county size of residence, likely both as a cause of movement and as a consequence of location. Clearly, the presence and scale of a Jewish community is or can be a factor in the migration decision and/or in choice of location. Thus, analysis must take into account denomination, as one important dimension of Jewish identification, when examining the links between other aspects of this concept and place of residence. Succinctly, it is of interest whether there is anything left that will be associated with place of residence after denomination is controlled. This is addressed in Tables 8 and 9 in turn for each of the two indexes (subjective identification and ritual behavior).

Table 8 presents standardized coefficients from a series of regressions of the index of subjective Jewish identification on region, county size, denomination, and several control variables entered in stepwise format by block. Variables included are respondent's sex, the presence of children in the household, respondent's education, migrant status, generational status from the time of immigration, age, marital status (including Jewish status of partner [spouse or living together]), and denomination in which the individual was raised. Each of these is theoretically important. The last

equation includes the index of ritual behavior as a control. Table 9 contains parallel information for the index of ritual behavior as the dependent variable, with the last equation containing the index of subjective Jewish identity as a control. Findings in the two tables are complementary and suggest an important role for both geographic and demographic variables in the expression of ethnic identification within the US Jewish community.

Tables 8 & 9

Specifically, the data suggest that differences in Jewish identification exist by region and county size; these are not solely due to denominational or demographic composition. However, the nature of the relationships differs for the two indexes. Controls make place of residence more important for subjective identity but less important for ritual behavior. Regional and county size differences in subjective identity were insignificant before controls, but after adjusting for denomination and the demographic variables, residents of the South and of non-metropolitan areas are seen to have lower degrees of subjective identity. Also, identity is marginally lower in the largest metropolitan areas. In contrast, initially significant differences in ritual behavior by region and county size are erased after controls, except for lower observance among residents of the West.

Similarly, denomination remains important for the other two dimensions of Jewish identity after controls have been introduced, although again the exact nature of the denominational effects varies between the two indexes. The equations in Table 9 indicate consistent direct effects of denomination on ritual behavior (Orthodox highest, Reform and Other lowest) controlling for the demographic variables as well as subjective identity, but parallel controls in Table 8 indicate that the direct effects of denomination on subjective identity are effectively erased when ritual behavior is added to an equation containing all the demographic variables. This suggests a system of relationships such that denominational differences in subjective identity occur mainly through ritual behavior. In contrast, differences in ritual observance are directly associated with denominational affiliation.

Although not a central focus, the data in the tables suggest that the demographic control variables are important for the two indexes of Jewish identity, and also that there are some differences in these relationships across measures. The variables are interrelated among themselves and with the other predictor variables (especially denomination), so there are some flips in direction and in the significance of specific coefficients as controls are introduced. The system of relationships that is suggested is one in which most of the associations of these variables with Jewish identification are indirect for subjective identity but direct for ritual behavior.

The first block of demographic variables contains individual characteristics such as sex, age, education, migrant status, generation, and presence of children in the household. These variables express important aspects of the social circumstances that can impact the individual's ethnic identification. One might expect, for example, less intense ethnic identification among males, younger persons, those with higher education, migrants, those in later generations more removed from the immigrant experience, and persons residing in households without children. Most of these expectations are borne out by the findings in Tables 8 and 9, although neither consistently nor without some important caveats and qualifications concerning differences between the two indexes of

Jewish identification and between relationships before and after the introduction of statistical controls.

Specifically, males do exhibit lower levels of ritual behavior after controls for the other variables have been introduced, but gender differences in behavior are weak at the bivariate level. Similarly, gender differences in subjective identity are insignificant at the bivariate level, become statistically significant in the expected direction after demographic characteristics are controlled (equations 4 and 5 in Table 8), but again become insignificant after ritual behavior is held constant (equation 6). This suggests a direct role of gender in ritual behavior and an indirect role in subjective identification, such that females are more ritually observant and have greater subjective Jewish identity.

Contrary to expectations, the age pattern of ritual behavior is inverse – older persons are less observant – and this association is consistently direct and significant regardless of the presence of other control variables. A different pattern is evident for the index of subjective identity. In this case, the age pattern is positive at the bivariate level – older persons have a more intense Jewish identity – but controls for the other variables reduce it to insignificance.

In contrast, educational differences in subjective Jewish identity are opposite expectations – positive instead of negative – and consistent regardless of the presence of control variables. The relationship between education and ritual behavior is also positive at the bivariate level, albeit insignificant, but this coefficient becomes statistically significant after controls for the demographic and household variables. Interestingly, educational differences in ritual behavior are erased after controlling for subjective identity (equation 6), suggesting the association between ritual observance and education is indirect.

The expectation that Jewish migrants would exhibit lower ethnic identification is consistent with the data for ritual behavior, but not for subjective identity. In the latter case, migrant status is insignificant until all other factors have been taken into account, and then a positive association is apparent. Although migrants are less observant in their behavior, migrant status is also associated with somewhat higher subjective Jewish identity.

The pattern of lesser Jewish identification with later generations is fairly consistent for both ritual behavior and subjective identity, although the specific pattern of significant coefficients varies across the two indexes. Net of control variables, the immigrant (first) generation is more observant in behavior, while the last (fourth or later) generation has less intense subjective identity. There is also some indication of significantly higher subjective identification for the first generation, but this coefficient weakens to insignificance with controls, particularly for ritual behavior. Both indexes imply a weakening of Jewish identification with later generations.

The presence of children in the household is associated with higher levels of subjective identity and more observant behavior. After controlling for ritual behavior, the coefficient for subjective identity becomes insignificant. Living in a household with children certainly seems to be associated with higher degrees of Jewish identification.

The second block of control variables contains a measure of marital status, including whether the spouse or partner is Jewish, and information on the denomination in which the individual was raised. Both variables maintain significant direct relationships with ritual behavior in the expected directions (Jewish spouse/ Orthodox

background have more observant behavior, non-Jewish spouse/ Reform & Other background are less observant). Analogous patterns exist for subjective identity, although controls for ritual behavior tend to reduce these relationships to insignificance. This implies that the links to subjective identity are indirect.

Overall, the data in Tables 8 and 9 indicate the interrelationships among the variables considered here. Denominational affiliation is particularly important for ritual behavior and indirectly for subjective Jewish identity, even after the other variables are held constant. Indeed, this pattern of direct relationships with ritual behavior and indirect relationships with subjective Jewish identity is a reasonable summary of the findings for many of the demographic variables included in the analysis. However, education and migrant status are directly associated with subjective identity net of controls, and the partial relationship between education and ritual behavior is explained by subjective identity.

The most important variables of interest, region and county size, are significantly related with the index of subjective identity net of controls for the other factors being considered. Region, but not county size, is significantly related with ritual behavior. Also, region and county size are both related with denomination. Thus, persons living in the West are less observant and those in the South have less intense subjective Jewish identity. Similarly, persons living in the largest metropolitan areas and those in non-metropolitan areas also have less intense subjective identity. Orthodox are most likely to live in the Northeast and in the largest metropolitan areas, while a greater proportion of Reform and Other Jews live in the South and West than is the case for the other denominations. This geographic variation in Jewish identification may be particularly meaningful for within group differences in the way group membership is expressed, even after adjusting for compositional differences between areas in the other variables in the analysis. Although migration and other forces of mass communication and popular culture no doubt operate so as to level much of the distinctiveness of group members living in different regions and types of areas, some differences remain.

Conclusions

The most important findings of this research are that the extent and pattern of Jewish identification vary by region and county size. Although demographic trends may contribute to diversity and change within areas, these trends may also work increasingly to level differences between areas. It is important to study the ways in which ethnic group membership is experienced and expressed in different types of places, and the implications of these varying forms and meanings for groups, their members, and the larger society. Ethnic identification and Jewish identity in particular, can take on complex forms.

The present work points to some of ways in which denominational affiliation, subjective Jewish identity, and Jewish ritual behavior vary according to region, county size, and a range of important demographic factors. Of course, the relative causal priority of region or county size for the extent of Jewish identification, or of Jewish identification for choice of where to live, is an issue that cannot be assessed with cross-sectional data as are employed here. What can be said is that differences exist in Jewish identification by place of residence, overall and after controls for other important variables have been

introduced, and that these differences may be important for individuals, local communities, and the future of the group more broadly.

Table 1. Jewish Population by County Size and Region of Residence

		Northeast	Midwest	South	West	Total
Metro	**A**	81.4	55.4	50.6	70.4	67.9
	B	13.6	24.0	32.8	16.5	20.3
Nonmetro	**C**	4.5	12.5	10.9	8.2	7.9
	D	0.6	8.1	5.8	4.9	3.8
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% by Region	**Total**	39.2%	12.5%	24.6%	23.7%	100%

LR Chi^2 461, df= 9, p<.001

Nielsen County Size

A counties: Top 21 Metropolitan Areas
B counties: > 85,000 households (small metro areas)
C counties: > 20,000 households (large non metro areas)
D counties: Not A, B, or C counties (small non metro areas)

Source: National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01.

Table 2a. Jewish Population by Regions of Current Residence and Birth

		Region of Birth						
		Northeast	Midwest	South	West	Foreign Born	Total	Total US Population
Region of Residence	Northeast	63.3	8.8	11.9	8.6	46.1	38.0	19.1
	Midwest	4.1	49.5	10.0	3.7	7.6	13.3	22.9
	South	21.5	20.3	64.0	7.8	19.5	28.5	35.6
	West	11.1	21.4	14.0	79.9	26.8	23.2	22.4
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	N	2,312	814	620	617	738	4,377	

LR Chi^2 2812, df=12, p<.001

Table 2b. Jewish Population by Regions of Birth and Current Residence

		Region of Birth					
		Northeast	Midwest	South	West	Total	N
Region of Current Residence	Northeast	88.0	4.3	4.4	3.2	100%	1,663
	Midwest	16.1	69.1	10.6	3.9	98.8%	583
	South	44.7	14.8	35.6	4.3	99.4%	1,115
	West	25.2	17.1	8.6	48.5	99.4%	1,016
	Total	52.8	18.6	14.2	14.1	99.7%	4,377

LR Chi^2 2812, df =12, p<.001

Table 3. Jewish Population by Synagogue Membership & Frequency of Attending Services, by Denominational Identification

		Denomination				
		Conservative	**Orthodox**	**Reform**	**Other**	**Total**
Synagogue Member	**Yes**	59.8	83.9	47.1	13.6	43.3
	No	40.2	16.1	52.9	86.4	56.7
	N	952	342	1272	1162	3728
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
LR Chi^2 832, df=3, p=.000						
Frequency Attend Services	**Never**	17.1	6.7	25.7	61.0	32.7
	< 1- month	47.6	21.7	52.3	29.9	41.3
	Monthly +	35.3	71.6	21.9	9.1	25.9
	N	953	341	1263	1153	3710
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
LR Chi^2 945, df=6, p=.000						

Denominational categories (*illustrative, out of 46 coded survey responses*):
Conservative: Conservative; Conservadox; Traditional (Jewish).
Orthodox: Orthodox; Hasidic/Lubavitch/Satmar; Haredi.
Reform: Reform; Reconstructionist; combination of Reform and Conservative.
Other: Just Jewish; Post-denominational Jew; Jewish Renewal; Liberal; No Jewish Denomination; Secular; Humanistic; Non-practicing Jew; Messianic; Catholic; Baptist; Pentecostal; Agnostic; Atheist; No Religion; Other.

Table 4. Measures of Jewish Identity.

Table 4A. Subjective Jewish Identification. (alpha = .64)

I have a strong sense of belonging to the Jewish people.

Strongly agree	57.1%
Somewhat agree	28.2%
Neither A/D	1.1%
Somewhat disagree	8.9%
Strongly disagree	4.6%

Overall, the fact that I am a Jew has very little to do with how I see myself. *(R)*

Strongly agree	25.8%
Somewhat agree	21.9%
Neither A/D	2.1%
Somewhat disagree	20.7%
Strongly disagree	29.5%

How important is being Jewish in your life?

Very	49.9%
Somewhat	35.2%
Not very	10.1%
Not at all	4.8%

Frequency Distribution – Subjective Identity

Score	Percent	
1.00 (Low)	1.5%	
1.33	1.6%	
1.67	2.4%	Mean = 3.82
2.00	2.0%	SD = 1.01
2.33	4.4%	Median = 4.00
2.67	3.9%	
3.00	4.7%	
3.33	12.2%	
3.67	15.2%	
4.00	12.3%	
4.33	7.8%	
4.67	10.5%	
5.00 (High)	21.4%	

Table 4B. Jewish Ritual Behavior. (alpha = .80)

Synagogue member in household *(Yes =1; otherwise = 0)*	
Current Member	31.3%
Nonmember	56.7%
Synagogue attendance frequency past year *(Monthly or more)*	
Never	50.0%
Occasionally (< 1 per month)	30.7%
Monthly or more	19.3%
Frequency of lighting Sabbath candles *(Usually or always)*	
Always (every week)	19.3%
Usually	7.3%
Sometimes	25.9%
Never	47.5%
Held/ Attend Seder last Passover *(Yes)*	
Yes	57.3%
No	42.7%
Number of nights lit candles last Hanukkah *(Most or all nights)*	
All eight nights	40.7%
Most nights	7.3%
Some nights	14.3%
None of the nights	37.7%
Keep kosher in your home *(Yes)*	
Yes	20.4%
No	77.1%
Other responses	2.5%
Fast during last Yom Kippur *(Part or all of the day)*	
All day	44.3%
Part of the day	12.4%
Did not fast	38.9%
Could not (health, age, etc.)	4.4%

Frequency Distribution – Ritual Behavior

Score	Percent	
0 (Low)	13.2%	
1	14.1%	Mean = 3.12
2	15.9%	SD = 2.16
3	15.8%	Median = 3.00
4	14.1%	
5	9.0%	
6	8.4%	
7 (High)	9.5%	

Table 5a. Subjective Jewish Identification by Denomination

		Denomination				
		Conservative	Orthodox	Reform	Other	Total
Subjective ID (1-5)	Mean	4.16	4.50	3.88	3.29	3.82
	Median	4.33	4.58	4.00	3.33	4.00
	St Dev	0.76	0.69	0.91	1.09	1.01
	N	908	328	1222	1074	3619

Table 5b. Jewish Ritual Behavior by Denomination

Ritual Behavior (0-7)	Mean	3.99	5.99	2.95	1.70	3.12
	Median	4.00	7.00	3.00	1.00	3.00
	St Dev	1.89	1.74	1.68	1.73	2.16
	N	908	328	1222	1074	3619

Table 6a. Jewish Population by Denomination & Region

		Denomination				
		Conservative	**Orthodox**	**Reform**	**Other**	**Total**
Region	**Northeast**	44.4	67.0	37.6	38.6	42.3
	Midwest	11.4	6.4	13.5	11.7	11.7
	South	26.5	12.3	25.5	21.9	23.4
	West	17.7	14.3	23.4	27.8	22.5
	N	955	342	1,270	1,171	3,738
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

LR Chi^2 131, df=9, p=.000

Table 6b. Jewish Population by Denomination & County Size

County Size	**A**	75.6	93.3	70.8	70.9	74.1
	B	19.1	6.4	22.6	17.5	18.6
	C	3.9	-	4.2	9.5	5.4
	D	1.4	0.3	2.5	2.1	1.9
	N	956	342	1,272	1,172	3,742
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

LR Chi^2 153, df=9, p=.000

Table 7a. Jewish Population by Current Denomination and Denomination Raised

		Denomination Raised				
		Conservative	**Orthodox**	**Reform**	**Other**	**Total**
Current Denomination	**Conservative**	53.8	30.1	6.2	9.4	27.1
	Orthodox	2.9	40.3	1.3	3.3	9.8
	Reform	28.1	16.5	76.6	18.2	36.0
	Other	15.2	13.1	15.9	69.1	27.1
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	N	1,055	625	826	731	3,237

Table 7b. Jewish Population by Denomination Raised and Current Denomination

		Denomination Raised					
		Conservative	**Orthodox**	**Reform**	**Other**	**Total**	**N**
Current Denomination	**Conservative**	64.8	21.5	5.8	7.9	100%	876
	Orthodox	9.7	79.2	3.5	7.5	100%	318
	Reform	25.4	8.8	54.3	11.4	100%	1,165
	Other	18.2	9.3	14.9	57.5	100%	878
	Total	32.6	19.3	25.5	22.6	100%	3,237

LR Chi^2 2030, df=9, p<.001

Table 8. Subjective Jewish Identification (Betas)

	Bivariate[a] (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Region *(Midwest)*						
Northeast	.015	-.004	-.034	-.035	-.036	-.035
South	-.045	-.050(*)	-.053*	-.053*	-.057*	-.054*
West	-.043	-.054*	-.027	-.027	-.017	.005
County Size *("B")*						
Large Metro	.031	.005	.011	-.024	-.031	-.035(*)
Non Metro	-.087***	-.090***	-.058**	-.059**	-.054**	-.056**
Denomination *(Cons)*						
Orthodox	.100***		.098***	.106***	.089***	.015
Reform	-.125***		-.160***	-.158***	-.111***	-.041
Other	-.393***		-.372***	-.366***	-.323***	-.181***
Male *(Female)*	-.008			-.044**	-.041*	-.025
Children in HH *(None)*	.078***			.058***	.050**	-.014
Education	.130***			.141***	.134***	.124***
Migrant *(Nonmigrant)*	.010			.024	.023	.036(*)
Generation *(Third)*						
First	-.006			.051**	.036(*)	.004
Second	.051**			.027	.011	.009
Fourth	-.114***			-.061***	-.052**	-.044**
Age	.055***			.008	-.023	.024
Married *(Unmarried)*						
Partner Jewish	.200***				.070***	.011
Partner Non-Jewish	-.091***				-.061***	-.017
Denom Raised *(Cons)*						
Orthodox	.067***				.010	-.021
Reform	-.144***				-.076***	-.048*
Other	-.186***				-.026	-.006
Ritual Behavior	.498***					.397***

Note: a. "Bivariate" includes all dummies within each variable.

Table 9. Jewish Ritual Behavior (Betas)

	Bivariate[a] (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Region *(Midwest)*						
Northeast	.110***	.086**	.014	.002	-.002	.008
South	-.021	-.016	-.026	.003	-.007	.008
West	-.089***	-.100***	-.077***	-.070**	-.055**	-.050*
County Size *("B")*						
Large Metro	.118***	.084***	.041*	.022	.011	.020
Non Metro	-.048**	-.034(*)	.002	-.005	.006	.021
Denomination *(Cons)*						
Orthodox	.265***		.282***	.246***	.187***	.162***
Reform	-.227***		-.240***	-.238***	-.177***	-.146***
Other	-.489***		-.426***	-.443***	-.360***	-.271***
Male *(Female)*	-.012			-.041**	-.040**	-.028*
Children in HH *(None)*	.246***			.178**	.161***	.147***
Education	.031			.036*	.025(*)	-.012
Migrant *(Nonmigrant)*	-.102***			-.028	-.032(*)	-.038*
Generation *(Third)*						
First	.077***			.107***	.080***	.070***
Second	.052**			.038*	.006	.003
Fourth	-.081***			-.034*	-.019	-.004
Age	-.069***			-.056***	-.116***	-.110***
Married *(Unmarried)*						
Partner Jewish	.298***				.149***	.129***
Partner Non-Jewish	-.156***				-.113***	-.096***
Denom Raised *(Cons)*						
Orthodox	.202***				.079***	.076***
Reform	-.180***				-.072***	-.051**
Other	-.208***				-.049**	-.042**
Subjective Jewish ID	.498***					.276***

Notes: a. "Bivariate" includes all dummies within each variable.