



Working Paper No. 508

**The American Jewish Committee's Annual Opinion Surveys: An
Assessment of Sample Quality**

by

Joel Perlmann*

The Levy Economics Institute of Bard College

July 2007

* I am grateful to Yuval Elmelech for suggestions on an earlier draft. Of course, I alone am responsible for the use I made of these suggestions.

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.

ABSTRACT

The American Jewish Committee (AJC) surveys of Jewish opinion are unique both in being conducted annually and in the subject matter covered. This paper assesses the quality of these samples. I first summarize my earlier findings on the implications of limiting a sample to respondents who answered “Jewish” when asked a screening question about their religion. I then explore how well the AJC samples actually represent the chosen target population of Jews by religion. That exploration rests on public use datasets available for five recent AJC survey years. Outcomes from these five datasets can be compared to one another as well as to outcomes from public use datasets of two other recent national surveys of Jews, especially on the demographic characteristics of the respondents. The paper finds some larger-than-expected differences among AJC samples, and between these and the other two types of datasets. Finally, the paper considers the extent to which these differences matter for the substantive analysis of American Jewish opinion

INTRODUCTION

Each year for more than a quarter century, the American Jewish Committee (AJC) has conducted a national survey of Jewish political opinions. The AJC surveys are unique because they have been conducted annually over a long period (no other survey covers so many issues and has so many Jewish respondents) and, in particular, no other national survey of American Jews deals with their opinions about the Israel-Arab conflict. However, as with any survey, we need to attend to issues of sample quality. I have already considered one limitation of the surveys in a separate working paper, namely their limitation to Jews by religion—to respondents who have been selected because they answered “Jewish” when asked a screening question about their religion (Perlmann 2007b). Here I will first summarize my findings about the importance of that selection process. Then I explore how well the AJC samples actually represent the chosen target population of Jews by religion.

JEWS BY RELIGION ... AND OTHERS

The AJC typically introduces its survey data with a statement like the following, taken from the most recent report:

The data reported here are from the 2006 annual survey of American Jewish opinion, sponsored by the American Jewish Committee, detailing the views of American Jews about a broad range of subjects....

The sample consists of 958 self-identifying Jewish respondents selected from the Synovate consumer mail panel. The respondents are demographically representative of the United States adult Jewish population on a variety of measures. (American Jewish Committee 2007).

The phrase “self-identifying Jewish respondents” is all that alerts the reader that the sample is selected from among respondents in Synovate’s consumer mail panel by their responses to a question about their religion. Those Synovate respondents who had said they are Jewish are eligible for the AJC poll. Jewish surveys have always been bedeviled by the need to define rules for identifying Jews in marginal cases, such as when a person of Jewish origin does not report being Jewish by religion. Indeed, similar definitional challenges crop up in the

study of any ethnic or religious group. But the in contemporary America, the definitional problem for Jews is no longer marginal.

In a separate working paper (Perlmann 2007b), I have examined the implications of the AJC limitation by drawing on two national surveys that did not limit attention to Jews by religion. The American Jewish Identity Survey (AJIS) and the National Jewish Populations Survey (NJPS), both taken in 2000–01, include anyone with a Jewish parent or upbringing (as well as Jews by choice, that is, formal or informal converts to Judaism). The most striking finding from my comparison is that the old ways in which surveys of Jews handled ambiguous or marginal cases no longer make sense and the number of “marginal” cases involved is no longer small. The effect of limiting attention to Jews by religion is *not* primarily to eliminate secular or culturally-oriented Jews; plenty of these people, in fact, answer that they are Jews when asked about religion. However, *large majorities* of offspring from mixed marriages—that is, the adult children of intermarried parents—fail to reply Jewish.

The question then arises whether such people, or some subset of them, should be counted as Jews. I explored two competing procedures for addressing that question; each procedure carves out a subset of people not Jewish by religion but who are nonetheless of recent Jewish origin and defines that subset as Jews. This Jewish subset is then added to Jews by religion to define the population designated as American Jews. One procedure focuses on the core Jewish population. The core includes, besides Jews by religion, those Americans of recent Jewish origin who answer that they have no religion. I argued that this procedure is problematic because the response “none” to the religion question has itself changed in recent decades for those with Jewish origins. That response no longer captures people with close connections to the Jewish world who deny the religious connection out of principle. Instead, two out of three who respond “none” are today the products of intermarriage.

I therefore tentatively suggested the second possible procedure for defining a subset of Jewish respondents, namely by self-identity. Americans of recent Jewish origin who are not Jews by religion should be asked (as they were

in the NJPS) whether they consider themselves Jewish for any reason. Those that reply in the affirmative should be counted as Jews. The practical difference between the two procedures I describe is small; Jews by religion comprise about five out of six Jews using either procedure (actually, between seven-eighths and three-quarters in different samples, as discussed below). And some of the others are also captured in both procedures, specifically those of no religion who consider themselves Jews. Nevertheless, the practical difference is likely to grow over time. In any case, I find the self-identity definition conceptually more meaningful.

In terms of evaluating the AJC surveys, the point is that extending the sample for Jewish opinion beyond Jews by religion would add the missing sixth from the population of Jews. To put it differently, either procedure would increase the current population sampled by about a fifth. Using the self-identity definition, for example, we find that 13% of Jews are not Jews by religion in the NJPS dataset. Using the core Jewish population definition (available in both datasets), the comparable figure is 16% in the NJPS and 24% in the AJIS.

Finally, what of the views of people who are not Jews by religion and yet are counted as Jews by one or both these procedures? Not surprisingly, since they are predominantly the products of a different social milieu (intermarriage) than most of the Jews by religion, these people differ from Jews by religion in important demographic and cultural ways. For example, they are more concentrated among younger adults and they are less concentrated in the eastern half of the country. And when asked “How close do you feel to Israel?” they are more likely to reply that they feel distant. Indeed, of the two choices, *somewhat* or *very* distant, they are more likely to reply “very distant” than Jews by religion who feel distant.

How much would the AJC survey outcomes change if the surveys were not limited to Jews by religion? The answer is that most proportions for the entire sample would not change by very much because the great majority of respondents would, in any case, be Jews by religion. For example, in the NJPS, a mere 29% of Jews by religion reported that do not feel close to Israel while 70% of other Jews agreed (by the core

Jewish population definition). A vast difference, surely, yet in the entire sample, 36% feel distant from Israel, up from 29% in the sample of Jews by religion. The change is an undramatic 7 percentage points because it is the product of adding relatively few additional Jews to the AJC sample of Jews by religion. The effect of the addition to the sample is the product of the proportion of additional respondents who feeling distant from Israel times the proportion of new respondents in the total sample: $.70 * .16$ is added to $29 * .84$ to produce $.36$.

Of course, a rise from 29 to 36 is appreciable in relative terms: using this example, the size of the group feeling distant from Israel is 24% higher than shown in the AJC report ($36/29=1.24$). Indeed, once we ask about subgroups of Jews, such relatively sharp differences will be often found. The AJC not only reports the proportion feeling close or distant every year. It also reports responses to all questions in terms of a number of subgroups, including subgroups defined by their closeness to Israel. Similarly, the AJC routinely tabulates all responses by age. But the additional subset of Jews for the sample are notably concentrated among the younger Jews.

Should the AJC be accepting one of the two definitions of Jewishness that goes beyond Jews by religion? The choice obviously involves great tradeoffs of costs vs. quality. Moreover, the choice involves thinking through who should be included in the definition of Jews today. As there is no widely-accepted response, usage varies, but the growing magnitude of the marginal cases continues to push the challenge to center stage. To belabor the point, notice that the *smallest* estimate for the additional percentage of Jews that would be captured by these two procedures (13%) exceeds the proportion of the Orthodox among all Jews.

The AJC is hardly alone in facing this challenge to canvassing Jews. Still, I do think the AJC must find some way of alerting readers to the conceptual thicket through which they are being led, and to how results are likely affected by the limitation to Jews by religion.

THE QUALITY OF AJC SAMPLES OF JEWS BY RELIGION: COMPARING THEM TO THE AJIS AND NJPS

How good are the AJC samples at capturing a representative group of Jews by religion? Recall that AJC respondents are drawn from the consumer mail panel of the marketing firm Synovate. We are told “The respondents are demographically representative of the United States adult Jewish population on a variety of measures,” but we are not told what database is used to determine the demography of the American Jewish population.¹ I suspect that no single database—such as the NJPS—is in fact used, but rather the statement relies on a general sense that demography is derived from the various surveys of Jews over recent decades. The introduction to a single recent report for the year 2000 added two paragraphs on the social and religious characteristics of sample members found that year. However, comparable paragraphs do not appear in the later reports (or, for that matter, in the earlier ones I have seen).² We are also given no other information about sampling procedure, either about how the Synovate panel is collected and maintained, or about how the AJC sample is chosen from within the panel. An interesting case concerns reports of total annual household income. The AJIS and NJPS also gathered information on this topic, but in the AJIS 12% and in the NJPS 18% of respondents provided no information on this sensitive issue. Others gave only incomplete data—under or over \$25,000 in the former and \$100,000 in the latter. Similarly, the General Social Survey (GSS), a carefully-administered annual survey by the National Opinion Research Center, also shows 11% of its Jewish subsample did not answer the income question. Yet in the Synovate sample of Jewish respondents no household lacks income data. Presumably the Synovate panel was constructed to exclude those who refused to reply to this item, or else the data for some households were imputed at

¹ Presumably, of course, we are to understand that the group is “demographically representative” of the Jews by religion.

² Possibly the authors felt it important to include the data for 2000 so that it could be compared to the NJPS, also undertaken that year. But it is also possible that the information is not included routinely for each year because to include such figures would have, in turn, required a much more complex additional discussion to explain them. That is because the proportions in question (education, income, age, religious denomination, etc.) vary from year to year due to sampling error and perhaps also as a result of changes in Synovate methodology (this can be seen in the appendix tables drawn from actual AJC datasets; see below). Such fluctuations, in other words, would raise questions—rightly or wrongly—about the statement that the sample is in fact “demographically representative.”

Synovate by some procedure. What are the details here and how do they affect the data? The answers, of course, may be perfectly reasonable, but we don't know them nor how to take them into account in our use of the results. More generally, Phillips, Lengyel, and Saxe (2002) point out that we “do not know in what ways Jews who agree to be regularly subjected to time-consuming surveys might differ from others.”³

We can, however, construct some precise comparisons between the AJC, AJIS, and NJPS samples on a variety of background social and cultural characteristics. That is, we can try to assess any limitations of the sampling design by the representativeness of the AJC samples compared to the AJIS and NJPS samples. This procedure may raise some eyebrows, because there has been a considerable amount of discussion about the limitations of the existing national samples, especially the 2000–01 NJPS.⁴ Nevertheless, there are several rationales for the comparison I suggest: 1) Whatever their own limitations, the AJIS and NJPS are the best available datasets for such a comparison; 2) I recently compared them to each other, and generally found them more similar in terms of sample members' background characteristics than many, I suspect, expected (Perlmann 2007a); 3) The fact that AJIS and NJPS differed in methodologies and give us two readings from the same year, gives us two points of comparison; and finally, 4) A crucial distinction should be made between the reports on these datasets—especially on the NJPS—and the datasets themselves, since some of the criticism of the reports concerns which respondents the NJPS staff chose to define as Jews.⁵

To the best of my knowledge such a comparison—based on the actual datasets of all three surveys—has not been attempted before. Because we have the datasets available (not merely the published reports), we can tailor comparisons to groups that should be identical except for sampling issues. In particular, we can limit the AJIS and NJPS datasets to Jews by religion, and to respondents 24 years of age and older (the age of the youngest AJC respondents).

³ These authors also mention that the earliest AJC samples were flawed by current standards: “The 1981–5 surveys were based on samples of people with distinctive Jewish surnames listed in telephone directories.”

⁴ See, for example, Kadushin, Phillips, and Saxe (2005) and Saxe, et al. (2007).

⁵ Besides references in the preceding note, see Perlmann (2006)

The AJC should be commended for placing its recent survey data online as public use datasets as well.⁶ Included are the datasets for the survey years 2000–2001 and 2003–2005. The later AJC datasets have not yet been placed in the public domain. The unavailable sample from 2002 was anomalously small, including only some 390 sample members.⁷ Finally, when the datasets were transferred to the North American Jewish Databank for archiving as a public use sample, some of the information on background social characteristics collected by Synovate seems to have been lost. In particular, information on educational attainment is routinely mentioned for each year in the AJC reports, but it is not available for the 2000, 2004, or 2005 datasets.

EVALUATING DATA QUALITY IN THE AJC SURVEYS

Thus, we have public use datasets for five AJC samples from across a six-year period, each with about 1,000 sample members. Any sample can be expected to represent only imperfectly the population from which it was drawn, and certainly this will be true for modest-size samples, as these are. So we should not be surprised to find fluctuation in the social characteristics of sample members over the five samples. On the other hand, we also know (from sampling theory) how much fluctuation to expect, if the samples were all random samples of the same underlying population. As the AJC introduction typically states, a sampling error of about 3 percentage points is to be expected for these samples (American Jewish Committee 2007); in other words, in 95 out of 100 randomly-chosen samples of this size, results will be within 3 percentage points of the true figure in the sampled population. And most samples should differ from the true figure by less than that amount. The mean of all samples is our best guide to the population

⁶ All three surveys are available at the North American Jewish Databank: <http://www.jewishdatabank.org/>.

⁷ There may have been a change in AJC thinking about the sampling effort in the 2001–2 period, particularly in the budget devoted to the effort. The printed report for 2001 is the shortest of the half-dozen or so I have seen, omitting extensive tables found in the other years; and then in 2002 only a truncated sample was collected. Datasets and reports for 2003 and after are again fulsome, but here, too, the AJC reports provide no elaboration about why surveys for 2001–2 were handled differently than those for other years.

mean. Accordingly, I've presented in the appendix the full results for each measure in each sample, and presented in the text the mean and the range of deviation from this mean that we find in the five surveys. The deviations usually fall within 3 percentage points of the mean; nevertheless, they vary by more than that amount in many more cases than we'd expect if these were random samples from the same underlying population (Tables 1–2).

Of course, the AJC surveys are not random samples of the same population for two reasons. First of all, that population—American Jewry—has changed over six years. This factor can be safely ignored for all the general demographic characteristics I examine here and for most or all the Jewish characteristics, too. The demographic factors in question simply do not change rapidly enough: a six-year change in patterns of marital status, age, geographic distribution, or educational attainment, for example, usually will be too small to be discerned in our samples. Moreover, there is no consistent temporal direction to the fluctuations from year to year. Thus, we can ignore this explanation for why the samples differ by more than expected amounts from their mean.

The other reason the samples may differ from their mean has to do with sampling design. If the design is imperfect in some years, the samples in question will be biased. The most obvious way this consideration could explain the greater-than-expected deviations from the mean outcome is that, over time, Synovate's administrators have altered the design for gathering their consumer mail pool or the way they collect the Jewish sample members from within the pool. These alterations could be the result of errors, of course, but more likely they would be the results of efforts to refine the quality of the pool, or change (reduce or increase) the costs of gathering it. Of all this we know nothing. All we can do is to keep probable sources of error in mind and examine the magnitude of the errors. One way to spot those errors is to focus, as I just did, on the fluctuations of five samples from their mean. The other way is to compare AJC survey outcomes to those in the AJIS and NJPS.

General Demographic Characteristics (Table 1)

In all three types of surveys, men and women make up about the same proportion of respondents. In age, however, it is possible that the AJC picks up a modestly more people over 60 at the expense of those under 40. Still, the difference at issue is no greater than the difference in the percentage of younger respondents between the AJIS and the NJPS. When our two standards for comparison differ between themselves in terms of a particular variable by as much they differ from the AJC mean, we have no basis for complaining about the quality of the AJC data. That is not the same as saying the AJC data are adequately representative of the underlying population; we simply have no additional insight into that question from the comparison with the AJIS and NJPS. This same consideration will dampen any tendency to jump at other moderate differences between the AJC and comparison datasets. Regional distributions and educational attainments provide other examples.⁸

Two examples of larger and more perplexing differences between the AJC and other datasets involve marital status and total annual household income. Marital status outcomes are remarkably close for the AJIS and the NJPS; but the mean AJC outcomes show that 5% more respondents are married and 4% less have never been married. Moreover, the AJC surveys differ among themselves on marital status by far more than is typical of other measures. Why so? Sample design, changes in coding, the occasional aberrant outcome? We cannot say and the AJC reports offer no help.

⁸ Because educational attainment information is available in the public use datasets only for 2001 and 2003 (for some reason), our comparisons are more limited in connection with that variable. The point is important because in the introduction to the 2000 survey, the report mentions some demographic benchmarks, and one of these is educational attainment: 14% less than college, 25% some college, 23% four years of college, and 37% five or more years of higher education. By contrast, 30% of respondents were in the highest category of education in both 2001 and 2003. Again, one must be cautious about stressing a single outlier in such comparisons. Especially in the absence of more information on how the samples are collected, all we can do is notice the curious outcome.

Table 1. A Comparison of Background Demographic Characteristics across Three Kinds of Samples: the AJIS and NJPS 2000-01, with the Annual Surveys of the AJC for 2000-01 and 2003-05

	AJIS	NJPS	AJC surveys, 2000-01 and 2003-5		
			mean for all surveys	range for all surveys:	
				below mean	above mean
<i>Gender</i>					
male	47	47	48	4	2
<i>Age</i>					
24-39	19	24	18	3	4
40-59	44	41	42	4	3
60 and over	37	35	40	3	6
<i>total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>		
<i>Census divisions</i>					
New England	2	7	8	1	1
Middle Atlantic	40	37	35	4	4
East North Central	8	9	9	2	1
South Atlantic	23	21	19	1	2
Pacific	16	17	16		
Other	11	10	13	3	3
<i>total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>		
<i>Education</i>					
high school grad. or less	18	17	12	1	1
some college	21	22	28	1	2
four years of college	39	33	30	1	0
5 or more years of higher ed.	23	28	30	0	0
<i>total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>		
<i>Marital status</i>					
Married	64	65	70	12	8
widowed, divorced	19	19	17	5	9
Single	16	16	12	3	3
<i>total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>		
<i>Income (annual total household)</i>					
			GSS*		
Less than \$50,000	18	32	32	40	3
More than \$100,000	50	33	42	26	4

NOTE: Based on Appendix Tables 1-2. Missing data shown there have been allocated among the rest here. See other notes relevant to specific variables there.

*General Social Survey data on Jews 1998, 2000, 2002.

Finally, the results for total annual household income suggest that notably more sample members in the AJC surveys have lower income than those in the other surveys. I have summarized the complex data from the appendix tables in terms of the proportions of households earning under \$50,000 and over \$100,000 annually. On this important measure, there is both a difference between the AJC and the AJIS and NJPS, as well as a difference between the latter two. In order to have as full a perspective as possible, I have also added data from the GSS. While this last includes only some 150 relevant cases, the results are noteworthy even given the larger confidence interval for sampling error.

At the low end, the AJIS shows far fewer Jewish households with income under \$50,000 per year than does the NJPS: 18% vs. 32%. The GSS comes in exactly at the NJPS level. But the AJC surveys averages eight percentage points *more than the highest percentage* for the under \$50,000 group found in the other three surveys (and 22 percentage points more than the lowest percentage found there). Similarly, the AJIS shows far more Jewish households with incomes above \$100,000 annually than does the NJPS: 50% vs. 33%. And here the GSS falls midway between them at 42%. But the AJC surveys average 7 percentage points *less than the lowest percentage* for the over \$100,000 group found in the other three surveys (and 24 percentage points less than the highest percentage found there).

Again, we have no information as to why the income measure should differ so markedly; but it may be the case that the people willing to be in the Synovate panel, and to be available for long calls on their attitudes, are less likely to have higher incomes than other Jews.⁹

⁹ I noted earlier that the Synovate data includes no missing income data. If imputation was used to create this outcome, perhaps the general imputation algorithm used results in an underestimate for Jewish households.

Jewish Characteristics (Table 2)

The distribution of sample members across Jewish denominations yields much the same distribution in the AJC and in the AJIS and NJPS—when the latter two surveys are limited to Jews by religion, of course. A higher average proportion in the AJC declare themselves “just Jews”; however, some differences in denominational proportions between the AJIS and NJPS are as large as this difference between the AJC mean and the other two surveys. The AJC proportion who report that they are members of synagogues or temples accords well with what is found in the other surveys. Finally, there is also no appreciable difference between the AJC samples and the others in feeling close to Israel.

Table 2. A Comparison of Jewish Characteristics across Three Kinds of Samples: the AJIS and NJPS 2000-01, with the Annual Surveys of the AJC for 2000-01 and 2003-05

	AJIS	NJPS	AJC surveys, 2000-01 and 2003-5		
			mean for all surveys	below mean	above mean
<i>Denomination</i>					
Orthodox	8	10	8	1	2
Conservative	36	28	31	2	2
Reform	36	36	30	1	1
other	1	4	2	1	0
none ("just Jew")	18	22	28	3	5
<i>total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>		
<i>Synagogue/Temple member</i>					
% yes	56	48	54	4	5
<i>Emotionally attached (AJC: Feel close to) Israel</i>					
Very	27	33	31	3	5
somewhat	40	38	43	2	3
not very\somewhat distant	18	19	19	1	2
not\distant	15	10	7	2	1
<i>total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>		

NOTE: Based on Appendix Table 3. Missing data shown there have been allocated among the rest here. See other notes relevant to specific variables there.

BY WAY OF A CONCLUSION FROM LIMITED EVIDENCE: DATA QUALITY IN THE AJC SURVEYS FOR JEWS BY RELIGION.

It does seem, in sum, that the number of deviations greater than 3 percentage points exceeds the 1-in-20 prevalence that we might expect from random sampling. Also, two of the demographic measures, marital status and household income, show larger differences than we would expect to find between the AJC mean result and our best available evidence in other surveys.¹⁰ Such fluctuations, and especially such differences between the AJC and the other surveys, can be expected to affect outcomes on opinions. On the other hand, *how much* would these imperfections affect outcomes on opinions?

The goal of the AJC surveys is not to report on demographic characteristics directly—for example, on the distribution of Jewish household income or marital status. So the errors created by having too many Jews of lower income depends on *both* the difference in political opinion between Jews of lower and higher income, *and* on the *difference* in proportions in each income group found in AJC surveys and in the population they are supposed to represent. Suppose, for example, that 80% of high income Jews support a Palestinian state and only 40% of other Jews do so. This supposition is assuredly wrong: I am purposely choosing an extreme example. Suppose further that a perfect sample should have 45% rather than 26% of respondent households with high income. The proportion supporting a Palestinian state would be found to be 50.4% in the AJC survey and 58.0% in the actual population of Jews by religion. This is not a trivial difference, of course, but it is also not a radical distortion despite the radically different opinions by income I used for this hypothetical example. In fact, the proportion favoring a Palestinian state differed by about 3 percentage points across the income divide I mentioned, not by 40 percentage points as in the

¹⁰ Again, “expect to find” is shorthand for “expect to find if each of the three results were from random samples drawn from the same population.”

example. And so, if we had the correct proportion of high-income Jewish households, it would hardly matter at all to this example.¹¹

Nevertheless, these reflections provide only limited reassurance. In the final analysis, the confidence we feel in any sample is only partly based on the magnitude of particular documented biases. A further decrease in confidence is bound to nag at us because we cannot help wondering whether there are other sample problems we have not caught. The best antidote with which to fight such a further uncertainty is additional information on sampling methodology. The AJC and Synovate would serve us well if they added a five-to-ten page appendix on sampling methodology as a regular feature of the reports. Such an appendix might lead to criticism from readers who disagree with particular design choices, but the net effect, I am sure, would be a rise in confidence because we will know more about what we have and understand its strengths and limitations. The fulsome methodological descriptions of the 1990 or 2000 NJPS, and of the recent Pew study of American Muslims (Pew Research Center 2007) are much more detailed than what I am suggesting here, but they can serve as models, and challenges, to the AJC.¹²

In conclusion, I return to statistically-measured biases, rather than ending with the discussion of vaguer uncertainty that goes beyond those biases. This paper has documented probable biases in the coverage of marital status and household income, as well as greater than expected annual fluctuation on sample outcomes generally. These probable biases suggest that moderate adjustments of the AJC survey findings will be useful for Jews by religion and for subgroups among these Jews. Moreover, since Jewish by religion is usually recognized as an incomplete definition for Jews, the AJC results will have to be treated with caution and probably modified for that reason as well.

¹¹ This conclusion holds even assuming that the actual differed from the observed proportion by 19 percentage points as assumed (26% vs. 45% high income). In that case, the actual proportion favoring a Palestinian state (based on 2001 and 2003–5 when the question was asked) would be about 59.4% instead of the observed 58.8%.

¹² Even the one page single-spaced description of method in the AJIS report provides much more detail than we have on the AJC surveys. This report (and those on the two NJPS samples) is available online at the North American Jewish Databank.

REFERENCES

- American Jewish Committee. 2007. "Annual Survey of American Jewish Opinion. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Kadushin, C., B.T. Phillips, and L. Saxe. 2005. "National Jewish Population Survey, 2000–2001: A Guide for the Perplexed." *Contemporary Jewry* 25: 1–32.
- Klaff, V., and F.L. Mott. 2005. "NJPS 2000/01: A Vehicle for Exploring Social Structure and Social Dynamics in the Jewish Population. A Research Note." *Contemporary Jewry* 25: 226–56.
- Perlmann, J. 2006. "The American Jewish Periphery: an Overview." Working Paper #473. Annandale-on-Hudson, NY: The Levy Economics Institute of Bard College.
- . 2007a. "Two National Surveys of American Jews, 2000–01: A Comparison of the NJPS and AJIS." Working Paper #501. Annandale-on-Hudson, NY: The Levy Economics Institute of Bard College.
- . 2007b. "Who's a Jew in an Era of High Inter-marriage? Surveys, Operational Definitions, and the Contemporary American Context." Working Paper #507. Annandale-on-Hudson, NY: The Levy Economics Institute of Bard College.
- Pew Research Center. 2007. *Muslim Americans: Middle Class and Mostly Mainstream*. May. Available at: <http://pewresearch.org/assets/pdf/muslim-americans.pdf> (accessed July 22, 2007).
- Phillips, B., E. Lengyel, and L. Saxe. 2002. "American Attitudes Toward Israel." Prepared for the Office of the President, Brandeis University; Cohen Center For Modern Jewish Studies, Brandeis University, November 22. Accessed on May 25, 2007 at <http://www.cmjs.org/files/IsraelAttitudes.pdf>.
- Saxe, L., E. Tighe, B. Phillips, and C. Kadushin. 2007. *Reconsidering the Size and Characteristics of the American Jewish Population: New Estimates of a Larger and More Diverse Community*. Steinhardt Social Research Institute Report, January (version 1.3 March, 07). Accessed April 27, 2007 at http://www.brandeis.edu/cmjs/files/Rec_AJP_V1.3.pdf.

APPENDIX

Appendix Table 1. A Comparison of Background Demographic Characteristics across Three Kinds of Samples: the AJIS and the NJPS 2000-01, with the Annual Surveys of the AJC for 2000-01 and 2003-05

	AJIS	NJPS	AJC mean	AJC 00	AJC 01	AJC 03	AJC 04	AJC 05
age ranges								
24 - 29	6	9	5	5	7	2	3	6
30 - 39	13	15	14	14	12	15	12	16
40 - 49	20	21	22	20	21	23	18	30
50 - 59	24	20	19	23	19	20	21	15
60 - 69	11	13	18	16	18	21	20	16
70 +	26	22	21	21	23	20	26	17
<i>total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>
broader age ranges								
24-39	19	24	18	19	19	17	15	22
40-59	44	41	42	43	40	43	38	45
60 and over	37	35	40	37	41	41	46	33
Gender								
male	47	47	48	44	48	50	50	49
Census divisions								
New England	2	7	8	7	na	9	8	7
Middle Atlantic	40	37	35	39		35	31	36
East North Central	8	9	9	8		10	10	7
South Atlantic	23	21	19	21		20	19	18
Pacific	16	17	16	15		15	18	16
Other	11	10	13	10		12	13	16
<i>total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>		<i>100</i>		<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>
Marital status								
Married	64	65	70***	78	60	58	70	75
W, D, Sep. [01: no]	19	19	17***	13	40	26	19	12
Single	16	16	12***	9		15	11	12
<i>total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>		<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>99</i>

* Missing shown where 2% or more.

*** Omits 2001, which was coded differently from other years.

Appendix Table 2. A Comparison of Educational Attainment and Household Income across Multiple Samples

	AJIS			NJPS			AJC mean	AJC 2001	AJC 2003													
Education																						
high school graduation or less	18			17			11	10	12													
some college	20			21			27	27	26													
four years of college	38			32			28	26	29													
5 or more years of higher education	22			27			28	28	28													
missing	2			2			6	8	5													
total	100			100			100	100	100													
household total annual income																						
	as reported						allocating missing															
	AJIS			NJPS			GSS*															
				AJIS			NJPS			GSS*			AJC 00		AJC 01		AJC 03		AJC 04		AJC 05	
LT 25K	6	9	12	7	12	14	13	11	16	16	13	12										
GT 25k	3																					
25-50K	10	15	16	11	20	18	27	27	26	29	26	25										
50-75K	16	14	15	18	19	16	20	24	19	19	18	17										
75-90K			5			6																
75-100K	12	12		14	16		14	15	15	12	12	16										
LT 100K		7																				
90-110K			7			7																
GT 100I	43	28		50	33		26	22	25	23	31	29										
GT110K			35			39																
missing	12	17	11																			
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100										
LT50				18	32	32	40	38	41	45	39	37										
GT 100				50	33	42	26	22	25	23	31	29										

Education: Technical education and other miscellaneous descriptions (AJIS, NJPS) classified as missing. In AJC, code 0, not described in available materials, classified as missing (their mean and median incomes exceeded those in "high school graduate of less" category). "Four years of college" (AJC) treated as identical to "college graduate" (AJIS, NJPS). Similarly, "five or more years of higher education" (AJC) treated as identical to "graduate school or more" (AJIS) or detailed descriptions of graduate programs (NJPS).

Income: Includes respondents 24-69 years of age (25-64 in GSS). Twelve percent of the AJIS and 17 % of the NJPS respondents are missing income data; in addition, some AJIS sample members were classified only in terms of whether or not their income exceeded \$25,000 and some NJPS sample members in terms of whether their income exceeded \$100,000. The AJIS respondents who answered in the negative and the NJPS respondents who answered in the affirmative are classified in the first and last rows of the income distribution, the rest in separate rows. In the second set of columns for the AJIS and NJPS, both types of missing cases have been distributed among the other rows in proportion to the responses of the individuals who provided complete information.

GSS: The General Social Survey results for Jews, 1998, 2000, and 2002, (N=155; standard errors, about 4 percentage points). For the summary estimate of the proportion with incomes over \$100,000 per year, half of the 7% reporting incomes \$90,000-110,000 have been added to the 39% with incomes over \$110,000 per year.

Appendix Table 3. A Comparison of Jewish Characteristics across Three Kinds of Samples

Denomination								
Orthodox	8	10	8	10	7	8	7	10
Conservative	33	27	31	31	29	33	31	32
Reform	34	35	30	31	29	30	29	29
other	1	4	2	2	1	2	2	2
none ("just Jew")	17	21	28	25	33	28	30	26
missing*	7	3						
<i>total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>		<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>
Synagogue/ Temple member**								
% yes	53	47	54	59		50	51	57
missing*	5	2						
Emotionally attached (AJC: Feel close to) Israel								
Very	25	33	31	28	28	31	31	36
somewhat	38	38	43	46	43	43	44	41
not very\somewhat distant	17	19	19	18	21	18	19	18
not\distant	14	10	7	7	6	8	6	5
missing*	7							
<i>total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>		<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>

* Missing shown where 2% or more.

** Membership in AJIS and NJPS is for anyone in household; in AJC for respondent.