JEWISH COMMUNITY STUDY OF NEW YORK: 2011 METHODOLOGY REPORT

UJA-Federation of New York

Comprehensive Report Authors

Steven M. Cohen, Ph.D. Jacob B. Ukeles, Ph.D. Ron Miller, Ph.D. Jewish Policy & Action Research (JPAR)

Sampling Design, Survey Interviewing, Statistical Estimation, and Methodology Report David Dutwin, Ph.D. Robyn Rapoport Social Science Research Solutions (SSRS) and Jewish Policy & Action Research (JPAR)

June 2013

RESEARCH TEAM

Research Team Director Steven M. Cohen, Ph.D.

Survey Director and Chief Methodologist David Dutwin, Ph.D.

Director of Geographic Studies Pearl Beck, Ph.D.

Senior Consultant Ron Miller, Ph.D.

Director of Client Relations and Senior Consultant Svetlana Shmulyian, Ph.D.

Director of Special Studies Jacob B. Ukeles, Ph.D.

Mapping Consultant Joshua Comenetz, Ph.D.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP

Sid Groeneman, Ph.D. Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz, Ph.D. Gary Langer Ilene Marcus, M.P.A., M.S.W. David Marker, Ph.D. David Pollock Joseph Salvo, Ph.D. Elizabeth Schnur, Ph.D. Audrey Weiner, D.S.W., M.P.H.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Jewish Community Study of New York: 2011 benefited from the generosity of many who contributed time, expertise, and financial support. In addition to the funders, committee members, UJA-Federation staff, and community leaders who are acknowledged in the *Comprehensive Report*, we are especially grateful to the members of our technical advisory group listed below, whose feedback and guidance on a variety of methodological and technical issues were critically important to the study's success.

Sid Groeneman, Ph.D.	Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz, Ph.D.	Gary Langer
Ilene Marcus, M.P.A., M.S.W.	David Marker, Ph.D.	David Pollock
Joseph Salvo, Ph.D.	Elizabeth Schnur, Ph.D.	Audrey Weiner, D.S.W., M.P.H.

Every member of the technical advisory group raised valuable questions and generously shared their expertise. In addition, the study team asked several members to perform additional depth-reviews of particular technical aspects. We thank Joseph Salvo for reviewing preliminary population estimates and geographic area definitions and Gary Langer for his expert assistance in carefully reviewing weighting procedures. Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz, David Marker, Sid Groeneman, and David Pollock also provided valuable counsel at several junctures in which their professional areas of indepth expertise were particularly relevant.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. JCSNY 2011 DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY SUMMARY	6
1.1 Overview	6
1.2 Sample Design Objectives	7
1.3 Data Collection	
1.4 Response Rate	8
1.5 Weighting the Sample	
2. SAMPLING METHODS	9
2.1 Overview	9
2.2 Sample Stratification	12
3. DATA COLLECTION	17
3.1 Questionnaire	17
3.1a Screening Questions	17
3.1b Screening Questions for Post-Stratification	
3.2 Pre-Test	
3.2 Field Period	21
3.3 Interviewer Training	21
3.4 Screening	23
3.4 Coding	23
3.5 Timeline	23
3.6 Completed Interviews	24
3.7 Translation	24
3.8 In-Language Interviews	25
3.9 Incentives	25
3.10 Call Rules for the CATI Interviews	
3.11 Refusal Avoidance and Conversion Strategies	
3.12 Caller ID	
3.13 Maximizing Geographic Data	
4. RESPONSE	27
4.1 Overview	27
4.2 Defining the Response Rate	27
4.3 Final Response Rates	
5. SURVEY WEIGHTS AND VARIANCE ESTIMATION	29
5.1. Weighting Overview	29

5.2 Construction of a Screening Dataset	29
5.3 Development of Universe Household Estimates	31
5.4 Completion of the Screening Dataset	32
5.5 Base Weighting	34
5.6 Post-Stratification Correction	36
5.7 Final Weights	36
REFERENCES	40
APPENDIX	41
On Multiple Imputation	41
Overview of Multiple Imputation	41
Method and Results	42
List of Distinctive Jewish Last Names	44
List of Distinctive Russian Names	45
New York Jewish "Jewish" Pronunciations	49
Problem Reporting Sheet	52
Interviewing Calendar	53

1. JCSNY 2011 DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY SUMMARY

1.1 Overview

On behalf of UJA-Federation of New York, Jewish Policy & Action Research (JPAR) conducted the 2011 Jewish Community Study of New York (JCSNY), which was fielded from February to July, 2011. The goal of the JCSNY was to provide information about the Jewish community in the eight-county New York metropolitan area for use in planning and action by the organized Jewish community.

The study collected a representative sample of 5,993 households in which at least one adult age 18 or older considered him or herself Jewish. Interviews were stratified, using a combination of random digit dialing (RDD), listed, and distinctive Jewish name (DJN) sample, to increase the incidence of households with Jewish members. Overall, 57 percent of the interviews were from RDD sample (landlines and cell phones), 37 percent of the interviews were from listed sample, and eight 8 percent were DJN. Specifically, two thousand one hundred and sixty-five interviews (2,165) were completed from randomly selected numbers gathered by UJA-Federation, which included their own internal lists as well as other Jewish community lists. Of those, 307 were conducted via cell phone. The rest of the interviews were completed from numbers in: a residual DJN-sampling frame (n=451); a residual landline RDD sampling frame (n= 2,382); and from a cell phone sampling frame (n= 995).

This report is organized in four sections. The first section discusses the sample design. The next section describes data collection and fielding. The final two sections address weighting procedures and the response rate to the survey.

The study was designed to capture reliable data for a number of populations:

- Each of the eight counties: Bronx, Kings (Brooklyn), Queens, New York (Manhattan), Richmond (Staten Island), Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester.
- Select ZIP code aggregates.
- The breadth of the Jewish population, including those that are not on community lists and cell phone only (CPO) households.

Given the need to maximize statistical power in small geographic areas, the JCSNY 2011 sample size (target = 6,000) was significantly greater than it was in the 2002 study (N = 4,533).

The JCSNY 2011 sample is representative of the eight-county New York metropolitan area's Jewish population living in households. Institutionalized people without access to telephone landlines or cell phones were excluded from the sample.

1.2 Sample Design Objectives

To achieve the sample design parameters stated above, the JCSNY employed a multidimensional sample design. Specifically, the design was stratified by both telephone type and county. This resulted in 56 strata in a 7 x 8 design (see Table 1, below). The sample design will be fully explicated in Section 2, Sampling Methods.

County	Strata	County	Strata
Bronx	FSL Landline	Queens	FSL Landline
Bronx	FSL Cell	Queens	FSL Cell
Bronx	DJN	Queens	ИГО
Bronx	Published High	Queens	Published High
Bronx	Published Low	Queens	Published Low
Bronx	Unpublished	Queens	Unpublished
Bronx	Cell Phone	Queens	Cell Phone
Kings	FSL Landline	Richmond	FSL Landline
Kings	FSL Cell	Richmond	FSL Cell
Kings	DJN	Richmond	NLD
Kings	Published High	Richmond	Published High
Kings	Published Low	Richmond	Published Low
Kings	Unpublished	Richmond	Unpublished
Kings	Cell Phone	Richmond	Cell Phone
Manhattan	FSL Landline	Suffolk	FSL Landline
Manhattan	FSL Cell	Suffolk	FSL Cell
Manhattan	DJN	Suffolk	NLD
Manhattan	Published High	Suffolk	Published High
Manhattan	Published Low	Suffolk	Published Low
Manhattan	Unpublished	Suffolk	Unpublished
Manhattan	Cell Phone	Suffolk	Cell Phone
Nassau	FSL Landline	Westchester	FSL Landline
Nassau	FSL Cell	Westchester	FSL Cell
Nassau	DJN	Westchester	NLD
Nassau	Published High	Westchester	Published High
Nassau	Published Low	Westchester	Published Low
Nassau	Unpublished	Westchester	Unpublished
Nassau	Cell Phone	Westchester	Cell Phone

Table 1 Sample Stratification

Key:

FSL = Federation-supplied list of telephone numbers of likely Jewish households

DJN = "White pages" listed telephone numbers of households with distinctive Jewish names

Published High = randomly generated "white pages" listed numbers in telephone exchanges deemed to be of high Jewish household incidence Published Low = randomly generated "white pages" listed numbers in telephone exchanges deemed to be of low Jewish household incidence Unpublished = randomly generated unpublished phone numbers

Cell Phone = randomly generated cell phone numbers

1.3 Data Collection

The JCSNY 2011 study executed a high quality dual-frame (landline and cell phone) telephone data collection strategy designed to attain the highest cooperation rate possible.

Surveys were conducted in English, Yiddish, and Russian. Screening surveys were also conducted in Spanish, Korean, and Chinese (Mandarin and Cantonese). A hard copy version of the survey was also made available to deaf respondents.

Further details on data collection are provided in the data collection section later in this report.

1.4 Response Rate

The overall response rate for JCSNY 2011 is a composite of the screener completion rate (i.e., success in introducing the survey to a household and the extended interview completion rate (i.e., success in getting the selected person to complete the extended interview).

To maximize the response rate from cell phone users, a \$10 incentive was offered to RDD cell phone respondents upon completion of the survey.

The overall JCSNY 2011 response rate was 31.9 percent. This compares to 39 percent in the 2002 study, which is consistent with industry trends of response rates having dropped about a quarter of a percent annually and the inclusion of a substantial number of cell phone interviews, which typically realize response rates two-thirds of comparable landline interviews.

1.5 Weighting the Sample

Survey data are weighted to adjust for differential sampling probabilities, to reduce any biases that may arise because of differences between respondents and non-respondents (i.e., non-response bias), and to address gaps in coverage in the survey frame (i.e., coverage bias). Survey weights, when properly applied in surveys can reduce the effect of non-response and coverage gaps on the reliability of the survey results (Keeter et al. 2000, Groves 2006).

Details are provided in Section 5, Survey Weights and Variance Estimation.

2. SAMPLING METHODS

2.1 Overview

The JCSNY of 2011 utilized a sample design that included Federation-supplied lists (landline and cell), DJN sample, landline sample split into landline published (high and low expected Jewish household incidence) and unpublished, and cell phone numbers. Notably, this design differs from the sample plan used in the JCSNY of 2002. The JCSNY of 2002 executed a sample design that included Federation-supplied lists, DJN sample, and landline sample split into areas of high, medium, and low expected Jewish household incidence. Given that over 25 percent of United States households now own only a cell phone, to address under coverage of this population UJA-Federation required a survey design that would result in at least 20 percent of all interviews being conducted via cell phone. As such, UJA-Federation and JPAR made efforts to develop a sample plan for the 2011 JCSNY that would be largely comparable to the 2002 design, while incorporating cell phone dialing.

With the inclusion of cell phone strata into the sample plan, the JPAR team needed to consider how to weight the data. In 2002, this process was simpler because we were able to assume that each household resided in only one frame — FSL, or RDD high, medium, or low. While simple in practice, the inclusion of cell phones did have one important effect of the design. Specifically, we would now not be able to weight the data because we would not know the correct number of households that would reside in the RDD high, medium, and low. Specifically, if 25 percent of households since 2002 have "left" the high, medium, and low strata and moved to cell phones only, what percent of *each* strata specifically have moved? An equal 25 percent in each strata? Or more in some than another? Without a way to know the answer to this question, we had to revise the base design. For JCSNY 2011, JPAR relied on experience gained from conducting Jewish community surveys in a dozen other cities and specifically in two cities for which cell phone samples were incorporated. Over the past three years, JPAR has developed a sample design and weighting plan that accounts for the overlap between households in different interviewing strata.

Overall, any Jewish community study starts with one basic number: the number of households (regardless of whether they are Jewish) known to exist in the target geography (in this case, 4,405,466), as provided by United States Census Bureau figures (in this case, the 2010 United States Census). We then divide the number of households in each strata as indicated below.

Strata 1 and 2 — Federation-Supplied Lists (FSL): These sampling frames were provided by UJA-Federation and included names and telephone numbers for 208,027 unique households in the eight-county area.¹ This sample was assumed to yield the highest incidence of Jewish households. Of

¹ During the field period, UJA-Federation of New York indicated that they wanted to ensure that enough interviews would be completed in a number of areas in which the Jewish population was believed to be growing, in order to conduct some area-specific analysis. As fielding proceeded, only Washington Heights appeared to be seriously below this

these households, 3,230 records were quarantined into a separate listed cell phone stratum since they were associated only with cell phone numbers. Of the households including a landline number, 12,933 were randomly selected and called in the course of interviewing and 1,858 interviews were completed with respondents from the FSL Landline Frame. Of the households including only a cell number, 2,448 were randomly selected and called in the course of interviewing and 307 interviews were were completed with respondents from the FSL Cell Phone Frame.

The 208,027 FSL households were subtracted from the total 4,405,466 total households in the eightcounty area, leaving a residual 4,197,439 household to fall in the remaining strata below.

Strata 3 — **Distinctive Jewish Surname (DJN) Frame:** Through SSRS's sister company, Marketing Systems Group (MSG), JPAR obtained a list of all telephone numbers in the eight-county area in which the household was affiliated with a recognizable Jewish last name. In order to avoid duplication, all numbers that were found both in the FSL and DJN strata were removed from the DJN strata. In total we found 98,440 distinctive Jewish surnames, of which 59,110 were not already in the FSL. A sample of 5,150 records was released, of which 451 interviews were completed from the DJN sampling frame.

Further subtraction of DJN households resulted in 4,138,329 non-FSL/DJN households.

Strata 4 and 5 — **Published RDD Sample (High and Low):** After subtracting the FSL and DJN sample from the general RDD frame, the fourth and fifth sampling frames were created from all remaining telephone numbers published in a public directory (InfoUSA). These numbers were split into areas of expected high and low Jewish incidence so that we could oversample the high incidence areas and undersample the low areas, for cost efficiency. From these frames, 156,543 numbers were drawn as the sample (53,184 high and 103,359 low), from which 1,981 interviews were completed with Jewish households (1,365 high and 616 low).

With 1,907,818 listed households published (after FSL and DJN de-duplication), further subtraction resulted in a residual 2,150,511 remaining households.

Strata 6 — **Unpublished RDD Sample:** The sixth sampling frame consisted of all remaining landline phone numbers in the eight-county area. For this frame, 72,746 numbers were drawn as the sample. MSG then utilized their CSS procedure to identify numbers that were non-working or linked to a business, and scrubbed out 42 percent of these numbers, such that only 41,963 remained. Overall, 401 interviews were completed from this sample frame.

Strata 7 — **Cell Phones:** In addition, JPAR dialed cell phones to account for the fact that it was estimated that currently approximately 23.2 percent of households in the eight-county area did not

level. Based on this, a decision was made to oversample this neighborhood. UJA-Federation staff acquired community lists from this area and in May 2011, an oversample of Washington Heights was added to the sample design.

own landline telephones at the time of the study (see Section 5, Survey Weights and Variance Estimation for details on the estimate of cell phone only households).

Importantly, there is a difference between the sampling frame and the interviewing frames, such that our ultimate sample frame is cell phone only (CPO) households. While in practice, we interviewed everyone we encountered on cell phones whether or not they owned a landline telephone, we needed to convert our interviewing frame from all cell phone owners to match our household universe counts of CPO households. At the end of the study, cell phone interviews conducted with dual owners (households that own both a landline and cell phone) were "moved" to whichever other strata they belonged based on information about landline numbers provided in the survey. Specifically, if someone was interviewed on a cell phone and they reported having a landline number that was found in our FSL, we moved that piece of sample, post-interviewing, to the FSL strata. In this manner, we were able to convert the interviewing strata to the sampling strata. Of the 4,405,466 eight-county households, 23.2 percent or 1,023,915 households are CPO. This leaves again, by subtraction, 1,126,596 households to reside in Strata 6 — unpublished RDD. Again, more details of this method are to be found in Section 5, Survey Weights and Variance Estimation.

Overall, 139,492 numbers were sampled and dialed and 995 Jewish household interviews were completed in the cell phone strata.

	Bronx	Kings	Manhattan	Nassau	Queens	Richmond	Suffolk	West- chester	Eight- County Total
FSL (LL)	5,473	50,060	42,102	47,038	21,595	3,713	11,204	23,612	204,797
FSL (CPO)	86	790	664	742	341	59	177	372	3,230
DJN (LL)	1,788	11,291	15,585	8,651	6,960	1,612	7,812	5,411	59,110
RDD Published High (LL)	10,098	106,158	150,291	138,984	50,060	9,145	24,099	80,903	569,738
RDD Published Low (LL)	123,600	225,123	189,645	99,369	352,013	92,232	253,303	82,795	1,418,080
Unpublished (LL)	185,549	266,174	96,270	107,146	179,825	33,934	145,943	111,755	1,126,596
CPO	156,855	257,261	269,289	46,598	169,323	24,822	57,384	42,384	1,023,915
Total	483,449	916,856	763,846	448,528	780,117	165,516	499,922	347,232	4,405,466

The sampling frame developed for the study is provided below, by county:

Sample stratification, household selection criteria, and within household selection criteria are three important features of the sampling design. These are summarized below and then furnished in more detail later in this section, where necessary.

Table 2 Household Universe Counts

1) Sample stratification

- Set interview targets per county.
- Set interview targets per strata (as reviewed above).
- Special oversampling of Washington Heights FSL (see note on page 9).

2) Household-level selection

- Screening households with respondents under 18 years of age.
 - If the person on a landline phone was younger than 18, interviewer asked for another household member who was 18 or older.
 - If there was no household member 18 or older or the respondent on a cell phone was under age 18, the household is not eligible, and the interview was terminated.
- Screening households to interview only households in which at least one adult considered him or herself to be Jewish.
- 3) Individual-level (i.e., within household) selection
 - The person answering the phone served to represent the household, given that the majority of questions in the survey were household-level questions.

Overall the design enacted here is comparable to the 2002 design as much as possible, while transitioning to a world in which a significant number of households only own cell phones. In any event, as will be described later, careful weighting procedures are meant to ensure that data for the present study, as is the case for the 2002 study, closely match a general population cross-section of Jewish households in the eight-county area. As such, weighted data is comparable from one study to the next.

2.2 Sample Stratification

Strata were developed as detailed above. Overall, the reason to stratify is twofold. First, the stratification serves as the primary clusters utilized for assessing survey non-response. For example, as is the case in most Jewish surveys, the cooperation rate among Jewish FSL households is typically much higher than the cooperation rates of Jewish RDD Unpublished households. By weighting to the number of households in each of these strata, we control for a potential overcount of FSL Jewish households (see Dutwin, Miller, and Ben-Porath, 2011). Secondly, the stratification serves to cap costs, since any survey of a low-incidence population tends to be quite costly. There is nothing more expensive in telephone research as the need to "hang-up" on a large majority of households willing to participate in a survey (in this case, non-Jewish households). Costs are limited by oversampling interviews in strata of high Jewish incidence (the FSL, where traditionally Jewish household incidence is over 75 percent) and undersampling in low incidence strata where Jewish incidence in many communities is less than 1 percent.

That said, executing an over/undersampling strategy requires careful consideration of potential costs and benefits. The more one disproportionately samples, the more one introduces variance in the weights, and therefore inflates a survey's margin of error. Thus, a conscious decision was made to limit the oversamples of FSL, DJN, and Published high strata so that they would allow for cost reductions without resulting in an overly large increase in the margin of error. The JCSNY 2011 was designed to attain perhaps the lowest design effect² of any major Jewish community survey conducted.

As shown in the table below, the overall stratification plan was designed to attain a 1.36 design effect (square root design effect = 1.16). In practice, interviews will fall where they fall based on incidence, and therefore the 1.36 was only an estimate. However, the actual design effect for the stratification plan for the project was very close this approximation, at 1.42 (square root design effect = 1.19). It is notable that the design effect is partly a result of oversampling small counties and counties of low expected Jewish incidence (Bronx, Richmond, and Westchester) in order to increase our statistical power in those counties, and partly due to the oversampling of FSL, DJN, and High RDD strata. In fact, the average within-county design effect = 1.11). (Note the table below is the estimated sampling plan, not the final result of the survey.)

² Design effect is the degree to which the variance of weights is inflated in a given sample design, compared to a simple random sample (SRS) design. As such, the margin of error of a given sample design is larger than the margin of error in an SRS by the square root of the design effect. Design effect is also used to measure the total variance introduced by data weighting. This second measure of design effect, used later in this report, is typically quite higher, given that it measures the variance introduced not just from the sample plan, but from the sum total of all weighting corrections such as post-stratification, etc.

	•	• •		•						
County	Strata	Estimated Jewish Households	Estimated Jewish Incidence	Raw Interviews	Final Interviews (Dual Cell Phones Moved)	Estimated Screens	Percent of Jewish Households in Strata	Percent of Interviews in Strata	Within County Weight	Overall Weight
Bronx	List	4,725	85%	130	130	153	27%	34%	0.8	0.3
	DJN	536	30%	20	20	67	3%	5%	0.6	0.2
	Published High	1,463	14%	63	80	552	8%	21%	0.4	0.2
	Published Low	2,598	2%	28	35	1,665	15%	9%	1.6	0.7
	Unpublished	6,205	3%	63	80	3,087	35%	21%	1.7	0.7
	CPO	2,228	5%	78	35	761	13%	9%	1.4	0.6
	TOTAL	17,756	4%	381	380	6,285		deff:	1.24	
Kings	List	43,222	85%	460	460	541	27%	34%	0.8	0.9
	NID	3.387	30%	50	50	167	2%	4%	0.6	0.6
	Published High	36.183	34%	413	500	1.467	23%	37%	0.6	0.7
	Published Low	15.139	7%	58	70	1.041	10%	5%	1.9	2.0
	Unpublished	38.339	12%	140	170	1.431	24%	13%	1.9	2.1
	СРО	20.960	10%	233	105	1.094	13%	8%	1.7	1.8
	TOTAL	157.231	18%	1.355	1.355	5.740		deff:	1.26	
		- , -				-, -				
Nassau	List	40,613	85%	380	380	447	28%	39%	0.7	1.0
	DJN	2,595	30%	25	25	83	2%	3%	0.7	0.9
	Published High	58,347	42%	385	450	1,072	40%	46%	0.9	1.2
	Published Low	12,538	13%	31	36	285	9%	4%	2.4	3.2
	Unpublished	11,397	23%	31	36	159	8%	4%	2.1	2.9
	CPO	20,247	10%	133	60	600	14%	6%	2.3	3.1
	TOTAL	145,737	34%	984	987	2,647		deff:	1.25	

Table 3 Summary of Jewish Community Study of New York 2011 Initial Sample Plan

County	Strata	Estimated Jewish Households	Estimated Jewish Incidence	Raw Interviews	Final Interviews (Dual Cell Phones Moved)	Estimated Screens	Percent of Jewish Households in Strata	Percent of Interviews in Strata	Within County Weight	Overall Weight
Manhattan	List	36,351	85%	305	305	359	26%	29%	0.9	1.1
	DJN	4,676	30%	47	47	157	3%	4%	0.8	0.9
	Published High	34,068	23%	313	420	1,853	25%	40%	0.6	0.7
	Published Low	17,521	9%	59	79	855	13%	8%	1.7	2.0
	Unpublished	18,545	13%	59	79	621	13%	8%	1.8	2.1
	СРО	27,301	21%	267	120	571	20%	11%	1.7	2.1
	TOTAL	138,461	18%	1,050	1,050	4,416		deff:	1.21	
Queens	List	18,645	85%	310	310	365	27%	41%	0.7	0.5
	DJN	2,088	30%	30	30	100	3%	4%	0.8	0.6
	Published High	10,271	21%	150	180	877	15%	24%	0.6	0.5
	Published Low	17,476	5%	90	108	2,175	25%	14%	1.8	1.5
	Unpublished	13,119	6%	67	80	1,310	19%	11%	1.8	1.5
	CPO	8,363	11%	111	50	467	12%	7%	1.8	1.5
	TOTAL	69,963	9%	758	758	5,295		deff:	1.27	
Richmond	List	3,206	85%	115	115	135	26%	34%	0.8	0.3
	DJN	484	30%	25	25	83	4%	7%	0.5	0.2
	Published High	1,502	16%	69	75	457	12%	22%	0.6	0.2
	Published Low	3,944	4%	60	65	1,520	32%	19%	1.7	0.6
	Unpublished	2,355	5%	47	51	1,023	19%	15%	1.3	0.4
	СРО	963	5%	27	12	240	8%	3%	2.2	0.7
	TOTAL	12,454	7%	344	343	3,458		deff:	1.23	

Table 3 Summary of Jewish Community Study of New York 2011 Initial Sample Plan, continued

County	Strata	Estimated Jewish Households	Estimated Jewish Incidence	Raw Interviews	Final Interviews (Dual Cell Phones Moved)	Estimated Screens	Percent of Jewish Households in Strata	Percent of Interviews in Strata	Within County Weight	Overall Weight
Suffolk	List	9,674	85%	160	160	188	24%	28%	0.9	0.6
	DJN	2,344	30%	55	55	183	6%	10%	0.6	0.4
	Published High	4,389	18%	109	145	796	11%	25%	0.4	0.3
	Published Low	12,077	5%	71	95	1,992	30%	16%	1.8	1.2
	Unpublished	6,158	5%	46	61	1,125	15%	11%	1.4	0.9
	СРО	5,951	6%	133	60	1,000	15%	10%	1.4	0.9
	TOTAL	40,593	8%	575	576	5,285		deff:	1.25	
Westchester	List	20.387	85%	195	195	229	27%	35%	0.8	1.0
	DJN	1,623	30%	25	25	83	2%	5%	0.5	0.6
	Published High	21,778	27%	175	210	780	29%	38%	0.8	0.9
	Published Low	8,805	11%	29	35	329	12%	6%	1.9	2.3
	Unpublished	11,397	15%	39	47	323	15%	9%	1.8	2.2
	СРО	10,259	23%	89	40	174	14%	7%	1.9	2.3
	TOTAL	74,249	22%	552	552	1,919		deff:	1.21	
τοται	Liet	176 823	85%	2 055	2 055	2/18	27%	31%	0.8	0.8
TOTAL		17 733	30%	2,000	2,000	2,410	21/0	54/0	0.0	0.0
		100.004	30%	211	211	923	370	570	0.0	0.0
	Published High	168,001	29%	1,678	2,060	7,854	26%	34%	0.7	0.7
	Published Low	90,099	6%	426	523	9,864	14%	9%	1.6	1.6
	Unpublished	107,516	9%	492	604	9,079	16%	10%	1.6	1.6
	СРО	96,273	11%	1,071	482	9,815	15%	8%	1.8	1.8
	TOTAL	656,444	15%	6,000	6,000	39,952		deff:	1.36	

Table 3 Summary of Jewish Community Study of New York 2011 Initial Sample Plan, continued

3. DATA COLLECTION

3.1 Main Questionnaire and Screener

The questionnaire was developed by JPAR researchers in collaboration with the UJA-Federation project team, based on input from the Jewish Community Study Committee. The core of the questionnaire replicated questions appearing in the 2002 JCSNY. In addition, questions were uniquely tailored to address priority areas of interest to UJA-Federation, which were determined based on input by more than 300 community leaders and key informants who were consulted between August and October 2011.

3.1a Screening Questions

The Main Questionnaire consists of those questions asked of eligible respondents. In contrast, the screening interview (or Screener) constitutes those questions asked of all persons who initially answer the phone call, only a small fraction of whom are eligible for participation in the survey and proceed to the Main Questionnaire. In short, the Screener's main purpose is to determine the eligibility of the household and the respondent to participate in the eight-county study of Jewish households.

In 2002, the Screener focused on whether the respondent or any other adult in the household considered him or herself to be Jewish; if yes, then the main interview was initiated with the respondent. (In a few instances, the only person in the household who considered him or herself Jewish was a roommate; in those cases, the interviewer attempted to interview the roommate then or later.) The key question asked in the 2002 Screener was as follows:

S4. Many people living in New York identify with an ethnic or religious group. Do you consider yourself to be Jewish or non-Jewish?

If the respondent did not consider him or herself Jewish, in 2002, interviewers ask a similar question about other members of the household:

S5. Does any other adult member of your household consider himself/herself Jewish?

By contrast, in 2011, after considerable discussion about the changing reality of Jewish life and Jewish self-identification, the Jewish Community Study Committee, in consultation with UJA-Federation professional staff and the researchers, decided to adopt a wider net initially to determine the eligibility of the household to be interviewed for the Jewish Community Study of New York. This decision necessitated adding a series of follow-up questions after the initial screener. The goal was to complete an interview in marginal cases, and to review ambiguous or problematic cases after the survey, so that the opportunity to interview the possibly eligible respondent would not be lost.

The 2011 sequence essentially asked:

S2. Do you consider yourself Jewish, partially Jewish, or not Jewish?

If the respondent did not consider him or herself at least partially Jewish, the respondent was asked whether his or her mother or father considered themselves to be Jewish when the respondent was growing up. If yes for either parent or both, respondents were then asked, "What is your current religion, if any?" If the respondent reported Judaism as their religion, they were transferred to the Main Questionnaire. All "not Jewish" respondents to the original screener question who said that their religion was none or atheist, but had a Jewish parent, were then asked:

S-NJ-4. Some people who have a Jewish parent, but who say they do not have a religion or are an atheist or an agnostic sometimes view themselves as connected to the Jewish people, or identify as a non-religious Jew or as a secular Jew.

Would you describe yourself that way?

Respondents were considered as Jewish if they answered S2 as Jewish or partially Jewish or if they defined themselves as Jewish in S-NJ-4 (or even said "not sure" to widen the pool of possibly-Jewish respondents to complete the main interview).

If the respondent was not Jewish after these questions, a question parallel to the 2002 question on the other people in the household (if any) was asked, but again with "partially Jewish" added.

S5a. Is there any other adult in the household who considers him or herself to be Jewish, or partially Jewish?

Thus, both screeners — in 2002 and 2011 — included as Jewish-for-questionnaire-completion purposes all respondents who considered themselves to be Jewish (including the 2011 "partially Jewish" modification), as well as respondents who indicated that another adult in the household considered themselves to be Jewish. Moreover, both studies employed very similar strategies to exclude Messianic Jews from the Jewish population.

After the wide net was used for interview completion purposes, interviews were completed as possible, including interviews with non-Jewish respondents (as in 2002, about 5 percent of all survey respondents were not Jewish) in order to interview intermarried households and include the perspectives of non-Jewish respondents.

A total of 6,274 interviews with potentially Jewish households were completed using the wide net approach in 2011. After review of ambiguous cases by the research team along with the Jewish Community Study Committee and UJA-Federation of New York staff, we judged a total of 281 interviewed households to be non-Jewish and these surveys were removed from the completed interview data file (see section 5.2 and Table 10 for details).

In point of fact, almost all (99.7 percent, unweighted) respondents eventually classified as Jews for the 2011 study identified as such on the do-you-consider-yourself-Jewish question. Of the 17 others, 13 reported Judaism as their religion in the sequence described above, although they initially indicated that they did not consider themselves to be Jewish or were not sure.

While in 2002 respondents needed to volunteer that they were Jewish and something else or said that they were Jewish but also identified Catholicism or Protestantism (or another religion) as their religion in the main questionnaire, "partially Jewish" was an articulated response category in the 2011 screener (i.e., explicitly offered as an option by the interviewer), a wording choice we developed to reflect both the changed social reality as well as the change in common linguistic usage. "Jewish and something else" (used in 2002) reflects a world of coalesced social identities with hard boundaries; "partially Jewish" (used in 2011) is consistent with a world of more fluid identities and more porous boundaries. In line with this changing reality, far more Jewish respondents in 2011 than in 2002 provided the qualified response, one situated somewhere between Jewish and not Jewish. Of all respondents who were eventually qualified as Jews, 8.3 percent (unweighted) said they were partially Jewish, compared with 1.3 (unweighted) of the Jewish respondents in 2002 who volunteered answers that were coded as "Jewish and something else."

The difference between the two surveys can be explained in several ways, the magnitude of which cannot be determined. First, some people who might otherwise have answered, "Jewish" in 2002 found a more accurate answer of "partially Jewish" in 2011. Second, the same may be said of some who might have otherwise answered "not Jewish" had they not had the explicit option of answering, "partially Jewish." Third, the number of people who reside in the ambiguous or ambivalent category ("Jewish and something else" or "partially Jewish") has undoubtedly grown substantially since 2002. The growing number of offspring of intermarriage, the softening of ethnic and religious group boundaries, the larger number of mostly non-Orthodox intermarried couples over the years, the increased tendency of non-Jewish spouses and other family to come to see themselves as at least partially Jewish, and the increasing social acceptance if not popularity of Jews all play a role in generating people with mixed identities, leading some to respond "partially Jewish" when offered as an explicit response category.

3.1b Screener Questions for Post-Stratification

In addition to the 2011 vs. 2002 screener differences described above, the 2011 screener also obtained information on selected socio-demographic characteristics of a random proportion of non-Jewish respondents who were not interviewed, which matched data collected on Jewish household respondents in order to post-stratify the 2011 data set, following contemporary best research practices. The topics included respondent county of residence, education, gender, and age, in addition to data on the number of household cell phones and landlines — information needed to improve the weighting of the completed interview data set by adjusting the combined Jewish and non-Jewish household demographics of the interviewed sample (within each county) to known targets derived from the 2010 United States Census.

Please see below, Section 5.4 Completion of the Screening Dataset, for a detailed description of the post-stratification process, which was designed to adjust scientifically for the potentially higher response rates among the better educated, females, and the elderly, the increased likelihood that households with multiple phone numbers would be selected randomly for the survey — all within each count.

3.2 Pre-Test

Prior to the field period, JPAR programmed the study into CfMC Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system. Extensive checking of the program was conducted to ascertain that all skip patterns were followed. Pretest interviews were conducted in order to ensure that proper wording, question sequencing, and informational objectives were being met. They also provided an opportunity to (1) get feedback from interviewers and supervisors regarding the clarity of the instrument (including issues and concerns raised by respondents) and (2) monitor interviewers and make modifications to interviewer training procedures and materials.

A total of 35 pretest interviews were completed on January 10 and January 11, 2011 using DJN sample. Overall, the instrument worked well and the respondents seemed to be engaged in the interview. The interviews ranged in length from 18 to 36 minutes and the average length of the interview was 23.5 minutes. Given that we expected the average length of the interview to be 20 minutes, it was deemed necessary to cut or trim several questions in order to more closely approximate the estimated interview length, particularly since most of the interviews were conducted with respondents living in one- or two-person household without any children.

Interviews were recorded and made available to the project team. A summary of recommended revisions was produced and revisions to the instrument were implemented on the basis of the pretest. As anticipated, analysis of the pretest interviews pointed to the benefit of making adjustments both to the interviewer training protocols and the instrument.

We identified questions in the instrument that either seemed to be confusing to respondents or could benefit from further clarification in the instrument. Several adjustments were made, including those indicated below:

• Interviewer instructions were added at several questions to address the possibility that the screener would consider a respondent to be Jewish even if the respondent had indicated that he or she did not consider him or herself to be Jewish or if he or she was not sure if he or she considered him or herself to be Jewish. One respondent interviewed during the pretest did not know how to respond to the items in Q.48 because he did not consider himself to be Jewish even though he said that his mother was Jewish in the screener (and therefore entered the survey as a "Jewish respondent" according to the programming instructions).

- At Q.1, we added a probe in order to be certain that interviewers would ask respondents for their county (if they were born in New York). During the pretest, we noticed that naturally, people say, "I was born in New York," rather than saying where in New York they were born.
- We added a definition of "Sephardic" at Q.7b in order to ensure that we would get more accurate responses to this question. We heard a respondent during the pretest state that her family was from Poland and Russia but she was not sure if that meant that she was Sephardic or not.
- Both respondents and interviewers found the original version of Q.15c asking about employment to be awkward and confusing. JPAR suggested a revised version of this question along with follow-up questions to clarify employment status and reasons for unemployment.
- We changed the question stem in Q.35 from "Do you/or does anyone in your household..." to "How often, if at all, do you/does anyone in your household..." The question stem "Do you" implies that are looking for a response of "yes" or "no," which was not the objective of this question.
- Questions 47 and 48 were restructured because respondents struggled to answer these questions as they were asked in the pretest. Respondents were confused by what it meant to "agree" or "disagree" with the statements in Q.47 and were not sure what was meant by some of the terminology in Q.48. Also, in an effort to reduce the interview length, these questions were programmed so that Jewish respondents were asked to respond to either Q.47 or Q.48 but not both questions.
- Interviewer instructions and probes were added in several places, including at Qs.55, 57a, and 59 to help interviewers explain the kinds of services or help people in the household might be receiving.

3.2 Field Period

The field period for this study was February 8 through July 10, 2011. Telephone interviewing was conducted by one of the JPAR principals, SSRS/Social Science Research Solutions in Media, PA. All interviews were conducted using the CATI system. The CATI system ensured that questions followed logical skip patterns and that complete dispositions of all call attempts were recorded.

The JCSNY team was dedicated to ensuring that members of the deaf community would also be able to participate in the survey. During the field period, UJA-Federation supplied a list of deaf members of the New York-area Jewish community. SSRS sent e-mail invitations and reminders to 62 individuals who had been previously identified as both Jewish and deaf, requesting their participation in the JCSNY by completing a hard copy version of the survey. Three deaf respondents completed the survey.

3.3 Interviewer Training

CATI interviewers received both written materials on the survey and formal training. The written materials were provided prior to the beginning of the field period and included:

- An annotated questionnaire that contained information about the goals of the study as well as detailed explanations of why questions were being asked, potential obstacles to be overcome in getting good answers to questions, and respondent problems that could be anticipated ahead of time as well as strategies for addressing them.
- A list of pronunciations for specific Jewish terms that appear in the survey.
- An interviewer guide, providing project specifications and background information about UJA-Federation and the survey.
- A list of "Frequently Asked Questions" (FAQs) along with standard answers to the FAQs.
- A video supplied by UJA-Federation about the role of UJA-Federation within the New York community.

Interviewer training was conducted both prior to the study pretest (described previously) and immediately before the survey was officially launched. Call center supervisors and interviewers were walked through each question in the questionnaire. Interviewers were given instructions to help them maximize response rates and ensure accurate data collection. They were also instructed to complete the basic Jewish identity-screening question ("Does anyone in your household, including yourself, consider himself or herself to be Jewish or partially Jewish?") even with reluctant respondents, to allow as accurate an account as possible of household Jewish status even where no completed interviews were anticipated. Project team members attended a training to speak about the study goals, answer interviewers' and supervisors' questions, and observe interviews. During the early stages of the field period, team members from JPAR met with interviewers in order to address questions that had arisen and reiterate the study goals. As well, on several occasions the project team listened in on live interviews and recordings.

In order to maximize survey response, JPAR enacted the following procedures during the field period:

- Instituting a call rule of original plus no less than seven callbacks before considering a sampling unit "dead."
- Varying the times of day, and the days of the week that callbacks were placed using a programmed differential call rule.
- Explaining the purpose of the study and assuring respondents that there were no ulterior motives (namely, fundraising) underlying this survey.
- Permitting respondents to set the schedule for a callback.
- Instructing interviewers to attempt completing the single-question Jewish identity screener with all respondents, even if they were about to break-off before the screener (cell phone respondents first have to say that they live in the eight-county area).
- Offering a \$10 incentive to cell phone respondents determined to be living in a Jewish household.

In addition, to promote survey response, a marketing effort was developed by UJA-Federation in consultation with JPAR. It consisted of postcards mailed to the FSL sample, a 30-second television commercial aired on local cable channels at random from February through June, an online ad campaign to New York-area Facebook users for one week each in February, March, and May; distributing posters to agencies serving seniors and Holocaust survivors; an op-ed article in *The Jewish Week* (March 1); a 30-second Russian-language radio spot aired for one week over two Russian-language radio stations; and notices in newsletters of synagogues, Jewish social service agencies, and Jewish community centers. The tagline in all of these publicity efforts was "Hey New York, talk to us."

3.4 Screening

Beyond the data collected from Jewish household respondents, the survey was designed to collect information from all respondents (Jewish or otherwise) at a level that would allow an accurate estimate of Jewish household membership in the eight-county area. In total, 41,049 Jewish status screeners were collected: 8,609 screeners with households in which at least one adult in the household was Jewish and 32,440 where no Jewish adults resided in the household.

3.4 Coding

The importance of coding, the process whereby raw data are converted into meaningful categories, cannot be minimized. SSRS employs only experienced coders. Each one is trained thoroughly by the coding supervisor prior to beginning work on a study. Before this training process begins, the coding supervisor is briefed and an in-depth review of the unique features of the study is held with the project direction staff. Once interviewing is under way, the coding department begins transcribing verbatim answers to the other/specify questions. Codes are constructed by the coding supervisor or study director based on a minimum sample of 20 percent of respondents.

Codes are built on a frequency of 3 percent or more. If an answer does not meet the specified frequency, list sheets of Other Responses are maintained. These listings are updated frequently. If they show an emergence of some response that justifies creation of a new category code, such a code is established. All codes are compiled in a question-by-question coding manual, which is reviewed in a detailed training session. This training session encompasses the following areas:

- Discussion of the study's background and objectives. Each coder is made aware of how the coding function fits into the overall analytic scheme.
- Question-by-question and column-by-column instruction. The entire coding manual is carefully reviewed, with special emphases placed on any problem areas or special features of the project.
- Review of open-ended codes. This ensures that each code is thoroughly understood by the staff.

3.5 Timeline

The study timeline was as follows:

Table 4 Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Project Launch	July 2010
Community Forums	August – October 2010
Questionnaire Development	August 2010 – February 4, 2011
Sample Plan Finalized	February 2011
Pretest Interviews	January 11 - 12, 2011
Field Period	February 8, 2011 – July 10, 2011
First Postcard Mailing to Federation List Sample (Batch 1)	February 9, 2011
First Facebook Ad Campaign	February 18 - 28, 2011
Second Postcard Mailing to Federation-Supplied List Sample (Batch 2)	March 15, 2011
Second Facebook Ad Campaign	March 15 - 22, 2011
Third Postcard Mailing to Federation-Supplied List Sample (Batch 3)	April 21, 2011
Third Facebook Ad Campaign	May 11 - 18, 2011
Fourth Postcard Mailing to Federation-Supplied List Sample (Batch 4)	May 25, 2011
Russian Language Radio Spots Aired	May 26 – June 1, 2011
Data Cleaning Weighting	August – September 2011
Initial Draft Data Set Delivered	October, 2011
Final Dataset Delivered	March 14, 2012
Methodology Report Delivered	March 26, 2012

3.6 Completed Interviews

Table 5 shows the number of completions by sample strata and county.

Table 5 Completed Interviews

	Bronx	Kings	Manhattan	Nassau	Queens	Richmond	Suffolk	West- chester	Eight- County Total
FSL LL	128	353	305	397	255	103	142	175	1,858
FSL CPO	9	115	84	16	43	12	12	16	307
DJN	32	60	81	52	51	48	76	51	451
RDD Published High	42	389	274	293	117	34	73	143	1,365
RDD Published Low	77	133	128	61	41	48	71	57	616
RDD Unpublished	20	47	64	26	75	63	86	20	401
RDD Cell Phone	42	312	209	112	148	32	66	74	995
Total	350	1,409	1,145	957	730	340	526	536	5,993

3.7 Translation

The screener was translated into many languages and the main questionnaire was translated into both Russian and Yiddish.

The Yiddish translation was completed by Targem Translations. Targem Translations was recommended by a member of the JCSNY technical advisory group as the ideal partner to provide the Yiddish translation given their expertise in providing translation services and familiarity with the issues asked about in the instrument.

The Russian translation and the screener translations into Korean, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Spanish were completed by Miros Translations, a provider of translation services in the Philadelphia, PA area. Miros Translations carries out the following procedure for all translations:

- 1. Review of all materials by an account manager/supervisor.
- 2. Translation and editing of documents by a professional translator.
- 3. Review and editing of all translations by a third translator.

The Russian translations were also reviewed by native Russian speakers on the JPAR team and on the JCSNY committee. These individuals suggested changes to the translations to be more consistent with colloquial usage and appropriate grammar. These changes were verified with the professional translators at Miros Translations and were incorporated into the translation as deemed appropriate.

3.8 In-Language Interviews

The complete JCSNY 2011 was administered in English, Russian, and Yiddish; screening interviews were also conducted in Korean, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Spanish. Likely Russian-language interviews were identified by analyzing all published sample (FSL, DJN, RDD published high and low) for whether records contained a likely Russian first and last name (RFN sample). The list of Russian first and last names was taken from the work of Edwin Lawson at SUNY Fredonia, an expert of onomastic sciences. RFN sample was dialed by bilingual interviewers at International Point of Contact (IPC), a survey firm in Manhattan that regularly conducts Russian interviewing. In addition, any Russian language barriers attained during regular interviewing were sequestered and dialed back by IPC Russian interviewers. Language barrier interviewers were also dispositioned into other categories, including Yiddish, Spanish, Korean, Chinese, and unknown. Yiddish and Spanish language barriers were redialed utilizing bilingual interviewers.

	,					
	Language of Interview		Total Sample			
English	English Russian Yiddish					
5,613	374	6	5,993			

Table 6: Completed Interviews by Language of Interview

Table 7: Completed Screeners by Language of Interview

Language of Screener								
Spanish	Russian	Yiddish	Korean	Mandarin	Cantonese			
2,256	388	10	1	558	60			

3.9 Incentives

RDD cell phone respondents were offered a \$10 incentive for participation.

3.10 Call Rules for the CATI Interviews

The initial telephone interviewing included one initial call plus three callbacks. If an interview was not completed at that point, the telephone number was set aside for at least one week to "rest." After that rest period, an additional three callbacks were attempted. Overall, households received seven or more call attempts, on average. To increase the probability of completing an interview, we established a differential call rule that required that call attempts be initiated at different times of day and different days of the week. Callbacks were made on the Sabbath only with expressed permission from the respondent.

3.11 Refusal Avoidance and Conversion Strategies

With the increased popularity of telemarketing and the use of telephone answering machines and calling number identification (i.e., caller-ID), the problem of non-response has become acute in household telephone surveys. In addition to the incentives and call rules for the CATI interviews outlined above, we employed several other techniques to maximize the response rate for the survey. This included providing a clear and early statement that the call was not a sales call.

In an effort to maximize the response rate in the interview phase, respondents were given every opportunity to complete the interview at their convenience. For instance, those refusing to continue at the initiation of or during the course of the telephone interview were offered the opportunity to be contacted at a more convenient time to complete the interview.

A key way to increase response rates is through the use of refusal conversions. Though all of SSRS's interviewers regularly go through "refusal aversion" training, refusals are still a regular part of survey research. SSRS used a core group of specially-trained and highly-experienced refusal conversion interviewers to call all who initially refused the survey in an attempt to persuade respondents to complete the survey.

3.12 Caller ID

A caller ID tag was included in the sample record for all samples. Any respondents with caller ID capabilities on their telephones received the caller ID "Community Study" and a telephone number with a 212 area code. Although it is impossible to verify what respondents actually saw on their caller IDs, preliminary tests indicate that the caller ID was working properly. This ID was set up to decrease the likelihood that the respondent would screen out the phone calls when confronted by an unfamiliar number on the caller ID.

3.13 Maximizing Geographic Data

An initial review of the data found that the data held 157 cases without ZIP code information and 214 cases where county and ZIP code were not consistent. SSRS placed 10 days of additional callbacks in December. Overall, 73 of the missing ZIP codes were attained, and 140 of the mismatches were clarified.

4. RESPONSE

4.1 Overview

Response rates are one method used to assess the quality of a survey, as they provide a measure of how successfully the survey obtained responses from the sample. The American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) has established standardized methods for calculating response rates (AAPOR, 2008). This survey uses AAPOR's response rate definition RR3, with an AAPOR-approved alternative method of addressing ineligible households.

4.2 Defining the Response Rate

SSRS calculates response rates in accordance to AAPOR RR3 calculations. However, the AAPOR Standard Definitions manual does not provide explicit guidelines for screener surveys.

Screener Studies

Generally, screener surveys are different than general population surveys in that there are two levels of eligibility: household and screener. That is, a sample record is "household eligible" if it is determined that the record reaches a valid household. Screener eligible refers to whether known household-eligible records are eligible to in fact complete the full survey. In the case of the JCSNY, screener eligibility refers to whether a household is in the target geography and has at least one member of the household that considers him or herself to be Jewish.

The standard AAPOR RR3 formula is as follows:

Ι

$$I + R + NR + [UNR + UR]e$$

Where:

I: Completed Interview R: Known Eligible Refusal/Break-off NR: Known Eligible Non-Respondent UR: Household, Unknown if Screener Eligible UNR: Unknown if Household e = Estimated Percent of Eligibility

At issue with this calculation for screener surveys is that it does not distinguish the two separate eligibility requirements: UNR and UR and both multiplied by an overall "e" that incorporates any and all eligibility criteria. An alternative RR3 calculation utilized by a large number of health researchers and academicians simply divides "e" into two separate numbers, one for household eligibility and one for screener eligibility:

$I + R + NR + [(UNR)e_2 + (UR)]e_1$

Where:

 e_2 = Estimated Percent of Household Eligibility

 e_1 = Estimated Percent of Screener Eligibility

"e" calculations are completed via the standard "proportional representation" method dictated by AAPOR. In short, e_2 is all identified households / (all identified households + all identified non-households) and e_1 = all identified households eligible to do the full survey / (all identified households known to be eligible to do the full survey + all identified households know to not be eligible to do the full survey).

4.3 Final Response Rates

Final response rates are summarized in Table 8. The response rate for the study was 31.9 percent.

		FSL		Publish-	Publish-	Unpub-	Cell	Total	
Disposition	FSL LL	Cell	DJN	ed High	ed Low	lished	Phones	Landline	Total
Eligible, Interview									
Complete	1,858	307	451	1,365	616	401	995	4,691	5,993
Eligible, Non-Interview									
Refusal and break-off	262	26	56	183	44	62	102	607	735
Break-off	224	25	47	232	132	63	159	698	882
Answering machine household	86	43	26	193	36	55	195	396	634
Physically/mentally incompetent	11		1	9		2	-	23	23
Language problem	25	4	2	58	13	25	33	123	160
Unknown Eligibility, Non-Interview									
Always busy	109	14	43	425	3,769	650	496	4,996	5,506
No answer	1,768	510	1,181	7,602	19,469	6,777	25,723	36,796	63,028
Answering machine	547	136	287	10,219	1,145	2,877	8,404	15,075	23,615
Call blocking	66	3	3	13	5	20	76	107	186
Household, unknown if eligible	763	237	330	7,147	2,118	2,651	8,956	13,009	22,202
No screener completed	1,716	338	1,065	5,687	1,264	6,852	13,256	16,584	30,178
Not Eligible									
Fax/data line	405	36	174	1,789	8,600	1,258	3,543	12,226	15,805
Nonworking number	4,019	346	956	10,188	55,779	41,421	58,574	112,362	171,281
Business, government, etc.	464	56	154	1,113	5,045	779	2,326	7,555	9,937
No eligible respondent	610	368	374	6,962	5,325	8,853	16,655	22,124	39,147
Total phone numbers used	12,933	2,448	5,150	53,184	103,359	72,746	139,492	247,372	389,312
Response Rate 3	40.7%	34.3%	28.7%	20.5%	41.0%	39.4%	29.5%	34.7%	31.9%
Cooperation Rate 3	79.2%	85.8%	81.4%	76.7%	77.8%	76.2%	79.2%	78.2%	78.8%

Table 8 Response Rates by Strata

5. SURVEY WEIGHTS AND VARIANCE ESTIMATION

5.1. Weighting Overview

This section will detail the following steps taken in weighting the 2011 Jewish Community Study of New York:

- 1. Construction of a screening dataset that includes all cases for which there is information identifying the household as a Jewish household or not;
- 2. Development of household universe counts with which to weight data at the household level;
- 3. Completion of the screening dataset by dealing with missing data and dual frame households;
- 4. Development of base weight corrections for number of phones and adults as well as stratification and by-county corrections based on the household universe counts;
- 5. Post-stratification, and;
- 6. Development of final household weights and person weights.

5.2 Construction of a Screening Dataset

This stage commenced with the creation of a full sample file, including cases for all 358,591 sample records (which excludes scrubbed numbers) that were dialed during the field. This file included (1) sample-level variables such as strata, telephone exchange, county, etc., (2) all data that were gathered in the screener-section of the survey, and (3) select questions from the main survey used to determine Jewish status (e.g., does the second/third/etc. adult in the household consider themselves to be Jewish) or weighting (e.g., number of adults in the household, etc.).

Table 9 Full Sample File Sample Counts

Strata	Sample
Federation-Supplied List Landline	12,933
Federation-Supplied List Cell	2,448
DJN (Landline)	5,150
RDD Published High (Landline)	53,184
RDD Published Low (Landline)	103,359
RDD Unpublished (Landline)	41,963
RDD Cell Phone	139,492
Deaf	62
TOTAL	358,591

The second step in developing a screening dataset is to limit cases only to those sample records for which there is a determination of Jewish status. To do so, we develop a Jewish status variable that determines the following statuses of cases:

- 1. Jewish complete interview
- 2. Jewish partial interview
- 3. Jewish origin (does not currently consider self Jewish but has one or more Jewish parent)
- 4. Messianic
- 5. Non-Jewish household
- 6. Unknown

This is done first programmatically, through an extensive set of logic based on answers to screening and main survey questions. This logic is designed to only determine Jewish status for cases in which there is clearly at least one Jewish adult in the household, and for such households, whether that household completed the interview or not. Non-Jewish cases are separated into those that are not Jewish in the conventional sense versus those that are considered Messianic (that is, may consider themselves to be Jewish but believe Jesus was the Messiah), and those that have Jewish origins (at least one parent that was Jewish).

There are a number of cases for which the program logic was not able to determine Jewish status despite Jewish identity and religion data on the respondent and/or other persons in the household. This is due primarily either to a case having incomplete information or seemingly contradictory information. Such cases are generated through programming logic into a "borderline" variable. Overall, 469 cases fell into this category. Each of these cases was independently reviewed by four different members of JPAR, each offering their sense of whether the household includes at least one Jewish member. These cases can be very difficult to determine, given that some number of persons may have been raised Jewish but are now either secular, atheist/agnostic, practicing another religion, etc. Those who are practicing another religion and say explicitly that they are not Jewish would be classified as "non-Jewish." Respondents who grew up Jewish, identify themselves as secular, atheist/agnostic, and do not identify themselves as non-Jewish would be considered Jewish (unless the borderline review process uncovered information indicating that these respondents are either Messianic or practicing another religion). In some households, there is again contradictory information, such as people who said they are Jewish but then later identify their specific religion as Christian or Buddhist. Still others indicated that they are "partially Jewish" since their former spouse was Jewish or because all Christians are really Jewish, or because they sometimes feel Jewish, even though their parents and their religion are Christian. Overall, all 469 cases were given final status codes as either Jewish or non-Jewish.

The final determination of these cases is then used to overwrite the Jewish status variable on a caseby-case basis. This completes the Jewish status variable. The screening dataset is then finalized by deleting all cases for which Jewish status is unknown — that is those cases with a final status of "6" in the Jewish status variable (sample records of all nonworking numbers, no answers, refused, businesses, etc.).

The final screening dataset included the following cases:

Disposition	Screener Data Only	Complete Data	TOTAL
Jewish Complete Interview	0	5,993	5,993
Jewish Partial Interview	2,616	0	2,616
Jewish Origin Interview	472	11	483
Messianic Interview	96	2	98
Non-Jewish Interview	31,591	268	31,859
TOTAL	34,775	6,274	41,049

Table 10 Household Jewish Status by Data Completion

5.3 Development of Household Universe Estimates

Perhaps the most critical step in the entire weighting process is the development of household universe estimates. These estimates serve as critical control totals, the "gold standard" with which data must conform. The first delineation of household counts and the data is by strata. Secondly, we further break down each strata by county, to ensure proper counts by county. This results in a 7 x 8 framework, or 56 weighting cells (see Table 2 above). The process of developing household universe estimates involves determining the estimated number of households that should be included in each of the 56 weighting cells.

The first step in developing household universe estimates involves combining available information about household and population counts at the county level (provided by the United States Census Bureau) with information attained from the sample, including:

- The number of Federation-supplied list households gathered before fielding commenced and the number of such households for which only a cell phone number was supplied.
- The county for each of the FSL households and whether each landline FSL number was published or unpublished.
- The number of households with distinctive Jewish surnames (DJNs) within each county.
- The number of households with a published number in each county.

Using this information, we are able to estimate population counts for 40 of the weighting cells (five of the seven strata in each of eight counties) by de-duplicating (1) the FSL sample from the DJN households and (2) the remaining DJN households from the households with published numbers. Since we know the total number of households by county from the Census, we can then derive the number of unpublished households by subtracting all the aforementioned strata from the total households residing in each county.

The next step is to determine the number of households that reside in the Cell Only RDD frame, since there are no county-level numbers available for such an estimate. In 2011, the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) published an estimate for the five-borough area of New York, using 2009 data. These estimates were produced by the NHIS and the State Health Access Data Assistance

Center (SHADAC) based on a logistic regression model predicting phone use. Replicating their procedure, JPAR derived cell phone only (CPO) household estimates for the eight-county area at the county level. Our model produced five-borough results in line with the NHIS five-borough estimate, therefore providing validity that our estimates for each county would be accurate. It was then necessary to model these data to the time period of the survey field since the most recent published NHIS dataset is from 2009. Given that the increase in CPO households every half-year since 2006 has been roughly linear, we simply made a linear projection to arrive at early 2011 CPO estimates for each county.

An important feature of this procedure is that it solves the problem that there are a number of Jews in the eight-county area that do not have an eight-county area code. Even though it is true that Jews that are CPO with an out-of-area cell phone number (and NOT on the Federation-supplied lists, since we dialed all cell phone only records on that list, regardless of area code) are not covered by the survey, they are counted, in the sense that the cell phone interviews attained in the survey are weighted to the outside NHIS estimate of CPO households in the eight-county area. Of course, this does mean that the cell phone interviews we did attain may hold bias, since they purportedly represent all CPO Jewish households in the eight-county area, but only from interviews of CPOs who have an eight-county area code. While true, research into this issue has found that typically, the under-coverage is under 15 percent (that is, only 10 to 15 percent of all CPOs in the New York City area likely have a non-New York City area code), and that the bias between those covered and those that are not is nominal (Dutwin et al, 2011 and 2012).

A final step in the development of household universe counts is to then separate unpublished households into CPO households and unpublished landline households. This is easily done by multiplying the total households for each county by the CPO estimate with the remaining households being defined as unpublished landline households.

These procedures resulted in the following universe counts and CPO estimates found in Table 2.

5.4 Completion of the Screening Dataset

Weighting the data to the universal household counts involves a rebalancing procedure in which the percent of sample is weighted to the corresponding percent of the universe in the table above. A number of steps were required to attain a comparable table of strata by county from the sample.

First, the county had to be attained for the entire screening dataset. We used the respondentprovided county data from the screener and questionnaire where possible. For landline screener completes missing data for county, JPAR was able to use information supplied by MSG, SSRS's sister company and sample provider (these are based the telephone exchange and prefix). By design, the county was asked upfront in the cell phone screener since the county is not available from MSG for cell phone sample. These steps ensured that there were no missing data on county for all cases in the screening dataset. Second, to match the universe counts, the sample attained from the RDD cell phone strata had to be redistributed to other strata if the data showed such a record to be a dual-use (landline and cell phone) household. In other words, the RDD cell phone frame needed to be converted to a CPO frame to match the fact that the universe counts in Table 2 since these strata are for CPO households only. In theory, we would have expected to use the same procedures for the Federation-supplied list cell phone strata. In practice, however, the two Federation-supplied list strata were collapsed due to small sample sizes in the list CPO frame. Notably, an adjustment was made to correct for a higher probability of selection in the list CPO frame, described later in this report.

The conversion of the sample cell phone RDD frame to a CPO frame first required knowing for every case whether the household was dual status or CPO. A total of 10,605 of 12,176 respondents (87.1 percent) provided this information. The missing cases were imputed using multiple imputation (see Appendix).

In order to ascertain the correct frame for dual users interviewed in the cell phone RDD frame, we asked respondents who owned a landline phone for their landline phone number. Overall, half of all dual users who completed the survey on a cell phone provided us a landline telephone number. Those that provided a landline number were moved to the frame in which their landline number resided. Dual users that did not provide a landline number were randomly assigned to a frame based on the distribution in the table below.

Strata	Total Screening Dataset Sample	Percent of Dual Users Moved Into These Strata
Federation-Supplied List Landline	2,988	4.7%
Federation-Supplied List Cell	563	-
DJN (Landline)	924	1.3%
RDD Published High (Landline)	8,810	15.1%
RDD Published Low (Landline)	6,171	39.9%
RDD Unpublished (Landline)	9,418	38.9%
RDD Cell Phone	12,175	-
TOTAL	41,049	

Table 11 Strata by Cell Phone Interview Dual User Movement in Other Strata

Respondents were randomly assigned by multiple imputation to impute missing cases into CPO status. The model was highly significant and is summarized in the Appendix.

Overall, the sample table for strata by county is as follows:

lowish Community List L	Bronx	Kings	Manhattan	Nassau	Queens	Richmond	Suffolk	West- chester	Eight- County Total
Jewish Community List Cell	234	194	135	17	458 61	181	209 9	17	470
DJN	97	142	155	100	94	90	211	97	986
RDD Published High	319	1,630	1,612	2,808	781	410	1,147	1,071	9,778
RDD Published Low	1,790	1,379	955	730	1,117	722	1,412	533	8,638
RDD Unpublished	1,725	1,513	1,020	783	2,101	1,566	2,862	643	12,213
CPO (cell only)	977	1,567	864	295	1,314	129	362	240	5,748
Total	5,162	7,114	5,337	5,333	5,926	3,096	6,212	2,850	41,049

Table 12 Screener Data Cases by Final Strata by County

In addition to county and CPO status, a number of other variables are necessary for the weighting procedure, and it is highly desirable that these data are fully populated as well. For the base weighting procedure, these variables include the number of landline and cell phone telephones utilized by adults in the household. For post-stratification, we utilize age, education, race/ethnicity, and gender. These demographics were by design only asked of 20 percent of non-Jewish households. This strategy saves costs while furnishing enough cases with data with which to impute. In a normal imputation procedure, one would not want to impute more than 15 percent of cases with data. Here, however, the imputed data are only used to generate a post-stratification weight. After the post-stratification weights have been generated, all non-Jewish imputed cases are deleted from the database as we provide a final file with Jewish cases only. Again, these models were robust and are provided in the Appendix.

5.5 Base Weighting

Once sample universe and sample counts by county and final strata were attained, the formal weighting procedure could commence:

1a. Correction for probability of telephone selection. Each case was given a weight equal to the number of phones they answer (*t*), capped at three, meaning this could range from one to three (a cap of four was considered but only 3.8 percent of cases owned four or more phones). To account for the dual probability of selection, this weight included phones answered by adults in the household, both landlines and cell phones. The phone weight is the reciprocal of the number of phones.

Table 13 Number of Phones by Phone Type

	Number of	Number of	Number of Phones	Total
Number of Phones by	Landlines	Cell Phone Lines	(Cells and Landlines	Number of Phone
Phone Type	in Household	in Household	Combined)	Lines in Household
Zero	8.4%	16.7%	-	
One	59.4%	78.5%	One	16.4%
Two or More	31.9%	4.9%	Two	59.4%
		-	Three or More	24.2%

1b. Correction for probability of Jewish listed selection. Each case in the Jewish listed frame was given a weight equal to the probability of being selected, since Jewish listed cell phones were oversampled at a fraction of 0.174 while Jewish listed landlines were sampled at a fraction of 0.015 (in other words, one of every 68.6 landline records were sampled, compared to one of every 5.7 cell phone records). All other cases (sample other than Jewish listed sample) received a weight of 1.0. Deaf sample was considered part of the Federation-supplied list.

1c. Correction for probability of Washington Heights Jewish listed selection. Each case in the Jewish listed frame was given a weight equal to the probability of being selected, since Washington Heights supplemental sample were oversampled at a fraction of 0.065 while Jewish listed landlines were sampled at a fraction of 0.016 (in other words, one of every 61.5 non-Washington Heights records were sampled, compared to one of every 15.0 Washington Heights phone records). All other cases (sample other than Jewish listed sample) received a weight of 1.0.

2. Non-response (household) correction. In order to correct for the possibility that survey non-response was correlated with any variable of interest, and to attain accurate household counts for demography, we employed a weighting class correction applying the two variables known for all sample members and the total population, as discussed earlier in this report: county and sampling frame. This was accomplished by calculating the household percentage for each of the 56 county-by-frame cells (in Table 5) and then dividing, in each cell, the percentage in the known households by the percentage in the sample for each cell in the table independently. The ratio between the population cell percentage and the weighted sample cell percentage produced the primary household weight.

3. Household adults correction. This base weight correction simply multiplies each case by the number of adults in the household. This is capped at three adults maximum (11.7 percent of the sample were households with four or more adults. This cap is standard in survey research and is designed to limit the design effect based on vary large households) and essentially converts the household weight into a person weight so that the data can be post-stratified to population counts of adults ages 18 and older.

4. *Composite base weight.* The final composite base weight is a product of steps 1a, 1b, 1c, and 2 above: phone, Jewish listed selection, Washington Heights selection, and non-response. This product is

then multiplied by step 3, number of adults, to produce a person-based base weight for poststratification.

5.6 Post-Stratification Correction

We conducted post-stratification weighting in order to correct for biases in response patterns across various demographic groups; post-stratification allows the demographic breakdown of the final data to approximate the breakdown in the target population, i.e., Jews in the eight-county area. For the JCSNY 2011, the total sample for which Jewish eligibility information was available (meaning, ALL screening cases, Jewish *and* non-Jewish) was adjusted by gender, adults in household, education, county, race/ethnicity, phone use, and age to match the population parameters for the eight-county area drawn from the United States Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS), 2009. The ACS data are considered to be the most reliable for providing demographic frequencies for weighting purposes. Total population counts upon which the percentages are based were taken from the 2010 United States Census, however, since this information is more current than the 2009 ACS.

This sample was then weighted using a raking method, an iterative process of adjusting sample to known percentages along certain parameters (in this case, gender, race, education, county, and age), while applying the base weight to correct for the selection process.

The degree to which there are differences between the weighted and unweighted samples across most of the demographic parameters is typical for telephone surveys that tend to under-represent respondents who are under age 30, cell phone only, non-white, and have a high school education or less. The gap by gender in JCSNY is attributable to utilizing the available respondent rather than screen for "youngest male" which is typical in survey research today.

5.7 Final Weights

The final post-stratified weight was then divided by the number of adults (the same variable used before to unweight the sample before post-stratification, capped at three) to again produce weights at the household level. This results in a dataset of a representative weighted cross-section of eight-county households. Non-Jewish screener completes were then deleted from the dataset, and Jewish completes were rebalanced to equal the weighted totals of all Jewish screener dataset cases by strata and county. Simply put, this step transfers the weights of all Jewish screener cases to just Jewish completed interviews.

A final population weight was derived from remultiplying this final household weight by the number of persons in the household.

The final screener household design effect is 2.24. The final screener persons design effect is 2.28. The final household design effect for Jewish completed interviews is 2.47 and the final design effect for people in Jewish households is 3.26. Traditionally, Jewish studies attain high design effects given

their stratification and post-stratification adjustments. As shown in Table 21, the JCSNY has lower design effects relative to other Jewish community studies.

Gender	Population	Proportion	Pre-Rake Sample	Post-Rake Sample
Male	4,323,797	47.2%	34.2%	47.2%
Female	4,845,373	52.8%	65.8%	52.8%
Total	9,169,170	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Phone Use	Population	Proportion	Pre-Rake Sample	Post-Rake Sample
CPO	2,127,247	23.2%	14.6%	23.2%
Dual	5,831,592	63.6%	76.8%	63.6%
LLO	1,210,330	13.2%	8.4%	13.2%
Total	9,169,170	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Race/Ethnicity	Population	Proportion	Pre-Rake Sample	Post-Rake Sample
White/Other	4,447,954	48.5%	60.1%	48.5%
Black	1,709,772	18.6%	16.9%	18.6%
Hispanic	2,016,039	22.0%	13.7%	22.0%
Other	995,405	10.9%	9.2%	10.9%
Total	9,169,170	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Age	Population	Proportion	Pre-Rake Sample	Post-Rake Sample
18 - 29	2,829,512	30.9%	22.8%	30.9%
30 - 49	2,657,471	29.0%	20.8%	29.0%
50 - 64	2,194,848	23.9%	28.2%	23.9%
65+	1,487,339	16.2%	28.2%	16.2%
Total	9,169,170	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Education	Population	Proportion	Pre-Rake Sample	Post-Rake Sample
Less Than High School	1,564,662	17.1%	5.9%	17.1%
High School	2,317,888	25.3%	27.3%	25.3%
Some College	2,225,910	24.3%	21.4%	24.3%
College	3,060,710	33.4%	45.4%	33.4%
Total	9,169,170	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tables 14 - 18 Target Counts and Results

Table 19 Total Screens: Error and Design Effect

	Estimate		95% Confidence Standard Interval Des			Design Unweighted		95% Confidence Estimate	
	Percent	Ν	Error	Lower	Upper	Effect	Count ¹	Lower	Upper
Jewish People	16.8%	1,538,001	0.23%	16.32%	17.23%	1.7	8,609	1,545,035	1,530,967
Jewish Households	15.8%	694,233	0.23%	15.31%	16.21%	1.6	8,609	664,130	703,802

Table 20 Comparative Household Design Effects Across Jewish Community Studies

Community	Ν	Design Effect	SqRt Design Effect
New York (2011) ¹	5,993	2.41	1.58
Cleveland (2011) ¹	1,044	4.62	2.15
Baltimore (2010) ¹	1,213	5.30	2.30
Chicago (2010) ¹	1,993	4.43	2.10
Philadelphia (2009) ¹	1,217	2.52	1.59
New York (2011) ²	5,993	1.75	1.32
Cleveland (2011) ²	1,044	3.75	1.93
Baltimore (2010) ²	1,213	3.58	1.89
Chicago (2010) ²	1,993	3.65	1.91
Cincinnati (2008) ²	912	2.34	1.53
Philadelphia (2009) ²	1,217	1.71	1.31
Denver (2007) ²	1,217	2.52	1.59
Atlanta (2006) ²	1,007	5.25	2.29
San Diego (2003) ²	1,080	1.77	1.33
Phoenix (2002) ²	793	3.17	1.78
New York (2002) ²	4,533	1.45	1.20
Pittsburgh (2002) ²	1,313	1.92	1.39

¹ = Cleveland, Baltimore, Chicago, and Philadelphia are the only studies to have a post-stratification weight; those are provided here.

² = Non-post-stratified weight.

	•	•	0,		0				
	95% Confidence						95% Coi	nfidence	
	Esti	mate	Standard Interval		rval	Design	Unweighted	Estir	nate
	Percent	Ν	Error	Lower	Upper	Effect	Count	Lower	Upper
Bronx	4.3%	30,175	0.3%	3.8%	4.9%	1.2	350	26,201	34,148
Kings	28.8%	200,186	0.6%	27.7%	30.0%	1.5	1,409	190,616	209,755
Manhattan	22.0%	152,531	0.6%	20.9%	23.1%	1.4	1,145	144,097	160,965
Nassau	13.9%	95,555	0.3%	13.2%	14.4%	.43	957	91,545	99,516
Queens	13.8%	96,262	0.7%	12.6%	15.4%	3.2	730	85,795	107,449
Richmond	2.4%	16,473	0.1%	2.2%	2.6%	.26	340	15,114	17,831
Suffolk	6.2%	42,764	0.2%	5.7%	6.6%	.59	526	39,545	45,984
Westchester	8.6%	59,928	0.3%	8.0%	9.3%	.89	536	55,297	64,558

Table 21 Jewish Completes (Household Weight): Error and Design Effect

Table 22 Jewish Completes (Person Weight): Error and Design Effect

	95% Confidence							95% Coi	nfidence
	Estir	nate	Standard	Inte	erval	Design	Unweighted	Estir	nate
	Percent	Ν	Error	Lower	Upper	Effect	Count	Lower	Upper
Bronx	3.5%	53,869	0.4%	2.8%	4.3%	2.5	350	42,551	65,187
Kings	36.5%	560,920	0.9%	34.7%	37.3%	4.2	1,409	522,520	599,321
Manhattan	15.6%	239,630	0.5%	14.6%	16.6%	1.2	1,145	224,140	255,121
Nassau	14.9%	229,862	0.4%	14.1%	15.8%	.80	957	217,475	242,250
Queens	12.9%	197,766	0.8%	11.5%	14.4%	3.7	730	172,643	222,888
Richmond	2.2%	33,912	0.1%	2.0%	2.4%	.34	340	30,588	37,237
Suffolk	5.6%	85,800	0.3%	5.1%	6.1%	.69	526	78,408	91,192
Westchester	8.9%	136,242	0.4%	8.1%	9.7%	1.3	536	123,458	149,026

REFERENCES

The American Association for Public Opinion Research. *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys.* 7th edition. AAPOR, 2011.

Dutwin, D., R. Miller, and E. Ben Porath (In Press). "Jewish Community Studies: Opportunities and Challenges." *Studies in Contemporary Jewry*, 2012.

Dutwin, D., K. Call, R. Rapoport, S. Gildemesiter, and S. Sherr. "Stratification of Cell Phones: Implications for Research." Phoenix, AZ: A paper presented at the 2011 AAPOR National Conference, 2011.

Dutwin, D., N. Buttermore, C. Call, and S. Gildemeister. "Cell Phone Mobility in the U.S.: Implications for State and Local Research." Unpublished Manuscript currently under submission and review, 2012.

Graham, J.W., B.J. Taylor, A.E. Olchowski, and P.E. Cumsille. "Planned Missing Data Designs In Psychological Research." *Psychological Methods*, 11, 323 – 343, 2006.

Rubin, D. B. "Inference and Missing Data." Biometrika, 36, 581 - 592, 1976.

Rubin, D. B. Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys. New York: Chichester, 1987.

APPENDIX

On Multiple Imputation

The utilization of imputation in the 2011 JCSNY is very limited, in the sense that it is only utilized here for the purposes of post-stratification weighting and to assign cases to strata in instances where such information is missing. While the degree of missing data is large, this is by design, and essentially limited to non-Jewish screener data. As Table 24 notes, most Jewish cases were missing data on a few percent of the data, at best. A random (approximate) 20 percent of non-Jewish cases were administered demographic questions. This was again by design, to save costs by avoiding asking an extra two minutes of survey questions to some 26,000 non-Jewish cases. The result was that we attained data on about the same number of non-Jewish households as we did Jewish households (approximately 6,500), enough to be confident in the demographic distribution of non-Jewish households for weighting purposes. And of course, once the weighted procedure was complete, non-Jewish screener data was discarded, resulting in a dataset of Jewish households in which very little data was imputed (and then, only for eight demographic questions).

Overview of Multiple Imputation

Missing data are ubiquitous throughout social science research and can be found in almost all large survey datasets. Replacing the missing values in survey data with plausible substitutes (imputation) became normative in the United States as early as the 1930s. A wide variety of techniques have been developed since that time. Compared with earlier methods of filling in missing values, such as mean substitution and regression imputation, modern imputation methods are designed to account for the missing data mechanism and adjust for the effects of incomplete data on statistical inference. Multiple imputation (Rubin, 1976), has emerged as a technique for addressing the problem of missing data and is now widely used in survey research analysis.

The key idea of multiple imputation (MI) is that missing values are imputed with plausible values drawn from the conditional distribution of the missing data given the observed data under a specified model. This produces a series of "complete" datasets, which can then be used for analysis. For a detailed technical review of multiple imputation see Rubin (1987) and Little and Rubin (2002).

While MI is new to some social scientists, it is well grounded in statistical literature dating back to Rubin's seminal paper in 1976. Bayesian theory underlies the MI procedure, which allows it to be useful in making inferences in small samples even when the proportion of missing values is large (Allison, 2001; Little & Rubin, 2002). A review of the literature shows it is an accepted technique (Graham, 2009; Raghunathan, 2004; Schafer & Graham, 2002).

Method and Results

All imputation models assume (necessarily) that the missing values were missing at random (MAR) (Rubin, 1985). Each imputation model contains a series of correlated auxiliary predictors that are believed to be related to both the likelihood of missingness and to the observed responses, a step that makes the MAR assumption plausible.

Our MI followed the chained-equation procedure (as implemented in SPSS MI). The same model was utilized for each variable. The procedure was set to run 20 iterations and 75 datasets. These datasets were then averaged and the average values recoded into integer level variables and compared against actual data. Below is a summarization of the amount of missing data, and a model summary of the imputation procedure:

Table 23 Missing Data Summary

		Missing	Missing	Missing Within	
Variable	Valid Cases	Non-Jewish	Jewish	Jewish Completes	Total Missing
Jewish Status	41,049	-	-	-	-
County	41,049	-	-		-
Strata	41,049	-	-		-
CPO	39,348	3.2%	7.7%	0.7%	4.1%
Number Landline	18,598	60.6%	32.6%	4.1%	54.7%
Number Cells	17,079	65.1%	33.7%	5.3%	58.4%
Male	13,655	79.1%	22.2%	0.1%	66.7%
Education	11,271	83.9%	30.5%	0.5%	72.5%
Race	11,217	85.4%	33.0%	2.3%	72.7%
Number Adult	12,471	80.3%	30.0%	1.2%	69.6%
Age	21,064	57.0%	17.9%	0.8%	48.7%

				Age 18 –	Educ. LT	Number Cell	Number Landline	Number
Variable	CPO	Male	White	29	H.S.	Phones	Phones	Adults
Jewish	-0.40***	0.06	2.39***	-0.09	-0.66***	0.08***	0.07***	-0.04*
Kings	0.27	0.01	1.25***	0.62***	0.13	-0.05	0.02	0.09*
Manhattan	0.59***	0.06	1.29***	0.07	-0.58**	0.04	0.04*	-0.19***
Nassau	-0.40	0.13	2.15***	-0.26*	-1.19***	0.21***	0.04	0.08
Queens	0.32	0.19	1.09***	0.02	-0.25	0.00	-0.01	0.09*
Richmond	-0.39	0.05	2.36***	-0.16	-0.54	0.18***	-0.06*	0.07
Suffolk	-0.35	0.16	2.88***	-0.36**	-0.79**	0.17***	0.02	0.16***
Westchester	-0.63*	0.14	1.85***	-0.30*	-0.80*	0.15***	0.05*	0.02
FSL Cell	20.96	0.58***	0.25	2.00***	-0.43	0.16***	-0.05	0.02
DJN	-0.01	0.38***	-0.28	0.08	0.25	-0.02	-0.01	-0.06
RDD Published High	-0.30	0.18**	-0.50***	-0.20	0.40	-0.05*	0.01	-0.01
RDD Published Low	-0.78	0.29***	-1.31***	0.73***	0.48	-0.09**	0.15***	-0.05
RDD Unpublished	-0.73	0.23**	-0.88***	0.08	0.43	-0.11***	0.01	0.01
RDD Cell	20.13	0.92***	-1.44***	1.33	0.86**	0.24***	0.02	-0.07*
Number Adults	-0.36***	0.04	-0.19***	0.27	0.10	0.39***	0.02***	
Male	0.13		0.00	-0.07	0.06	0.02	0.05***	0.03
LT H.S.	0.57**	0.03	-1.25***	-0.12		-0.38***	-0.05	0.21***
H.S.	0.23	-0.02	-0.50***	0.54***		-0.27***	-0.04***	0.18***
Some College	-0.09	-0.08	-0.42***	0.29***		-0.13***	-0.04***	0.12***
18 - 29	1.59***	-0.05	-1.29***		-1.01***	0.50***	-0.12***	0.36***
30 - 49	0.95***	-0.06	-1.12***		-0.98***	0.51***	-0.09***	0.07**
50 - 64	0.41*	0.04	-0.70***		-0.70***	0.44***	-0.04***	0.17***
Black	0.18	-0.09		0.04	1.01***	-0.07**	0.02	0.10**
Hispanic	0.39**	0.08		0.70***	1.06***	-0.11***	0.01	0.20***
Other Race	0.39*	0.05		0.97***	0.70**	-0.12***	-0.03	0.29***
Number Cells	-1.21***	0.03	0.18***	0.29***	-0.49***	***	0.08	0.58***
Number Landlines		0.23***	0.03	-0.39***	-0.22**	0.23**		0.09***
CPO		0.26***	-0.24*	0.48***	0.10	-0.09**	-1.09***	-0.27***
Constant	-19.37	-1.31	0.78***	-3.25	-2.48	0.23	0.97***	0.86
R2	.636	.041	.513	.293	.155	.412	.412	.340
Model Chi Square	3579***	312***	4283***	2011***	387***	3742***	1394***	4047***

Table 24 Regression Analysis for Missing Data Variables

* p < .05

** p < .01 *** p < .001

List of Distinctive Jewish Last Names

Abend Abramovitz Abrams Abramson Ackerman Adelman Adler Alderman Altman Ashman Bateman Bauman Becker Beckman Bercovitz Berger Berkowitz Berman Bernstein Birnbaum Blaustein Blomberg Bloom Blum Blumberg Blumenthal Bodenstein Borenstein Brandberg Brodie Brodsky Brody Brownstein Burger Burmeister Cahn Caplan Chaiken Clayman Coffman Cohen Cohn Cushman Dickman Dorman Eisenberg Eisner Engel Epstein Ernst Falkenstein

Falkner Feigenbaum Fein Feinberg Feingold Feldman Fink Finkelstein Fischer Fishback Fisher Fishman Freedman Freinberg Freudenberg Friedman Futterman Gerson Gettmann Ginsberg Ginsburg Glassman Gold Goldberg Golden Goldenberg Goldfarb Goldman Goldmann Goldstein Goodman Gottlieb Gould Grabenstein Green Greenbaum Greenberg Greene Greener Greenfield Greenwald Gross Grossman Grunewald Halperin Halpern Halprin Hasselbaum Herman Herskovits Himmelstein

Hirsch Hirschfield Hoffman Horowitz Horwitz Hurwitz Hyman Isenberg Jacobs Jacobsen Jacobsohn Jacobson Jaffe Jameson Jamieson Kahn Kaplan Kapsaroff Karlebach Katz Katzman Kaufman Kirschbaum Kish Klein Kleinman Klipstein Kohn Lefkowitz Levi Levin Levine Levinson Levitt Levy Lichtenstein Lieberman Margolin Margolis Markowitz Moscowitz Moskowitz Nathan Nathanson Newman Pearlberg Perilstein Perlman Pincus Rabinowitz Rappaport

Rosen Rosenbaum Rosenberg Rosenblatt Rosenbloom Rosenblum Rosenfeld Rosenstein Rosensweig Rosenthal Rothman Rothschild Rothstein Ruben Rubenstein Rubin Saperstein Scharfstein Schneider Schulman Schwartz Segal Seitman Shapiro Shulman Siegel Silberstein Silverburg Silverman Silverstein Solomon Sonenberg Stein Steinberg Stern Straus Strauss Sugarman Weinberg Weiner Weinstein Weintraub Weiss Winkelstein Zeitlin Zimmerman Zuckerman

List of Distinctive Russian Names

Abram Abrasha Adelaide Adskhan Adsxan Afanási Afanasyi Afonya Agaphya Agnes Agnessa Agnessochka Agrapena Agrippina Agus'ka Agusya Aleftina Aleksa Aleksandr Aleksandra Aleksasha Alekse Aleksey Alenka Aleshen'ka Alevtina Alexander Alexandra Ali Alik Alina Alinochka Aliona Aliosha Alisa Alisochka Alka Alla Allochka Allusva Alusha Alya Alyosha Alyoshen'ka An'ul'ka Anastasia Anastasiy Anastasiya Anatoli Anatoliy Anatoly Anatolyi Andre Andréy Andreyka

Andron Andrukha Andryusha Andryushen'ka Andryushka Anechka Anfisa Aniuta Anna Annushka Anton Antonina Antosha Antoshen'ka Anuta Anya Anytik Arif Arkadi Arkady Arkan Arkasha Arli Arly Arsenij Arsenti Arsentiy Arsva Artem Artemi Artemiy Artyom Asulva Asunta Asusha Asy Asya Asyanya Avgusta Avraám Avram Bella Borenka Borenok Borik Boris Borusva Borya Boryushka Bronislav Bronislava Bronislava Bulba Dadenka Dadik

Daniil Danya Danyasha Darya Daryusha Dasha Dashik Den Denichka Denis Denise Deniska Dennis Denya Dima Dimchik Dimitri Dimitryi Dimochka Dimon Dimulia Dimulyk Dina Dinara Dinarik Dinochka Dinya Drunya Dunya Dunyasha Dusen'ka Dusya Dzhonva Efim Efrosinya Egor Ekaterina Elena Elfrida Elizaveta Elya Emmanuil Er Erik Erva Esau Evdokija Evdokiy Evdokiya Evgeni Evgeniy Evgeniya Evgesha Faina Faya

Feden'ka Fedya Feliks Felya Fenya Feoktista Filipp Fima Fisa Fros'ka Fyodor Galchonok Galechka Galina Galinka Galka Galochka Galusha Galya Gane Ganei Ganey Ganna Gannik Ganushkasee Ganya Garik Garva Gavriil Gena Genechka Gennadi Gennady Genulya Genya Georgi Georgiy Gera Gesha Gleb Glebka Glebushka Gnochka Gosha Grigori Grigoryi Grinva Grisha Grishen'ka Gultchara Gusya Gylya Habibi lakov Igor

Igoryok Igoryuk Iliya Iljushka Illia Illya Iluka Ilusha llushen'ka Iluska Inessa Inga Ingeborg Inna Innessa Innochka Innulya Innusha Innusya losif lozefina Ira Iraida Iren Irina Irinka Irinushka Irisha Irishka Iriska Irka Irochka Irok Isaac Isaak Israel Israil Isya Ivan Ivanko Ivashechka Ivalik Izrail Jacob Janna Jannulya Jōannes Jozfina Jozya Julia Kapa Kapitolina Kapiton Karina Katerina Katherine Katrinushka

Katy Katya Katyen'ka Katyookha Katyusha Katyushen'ka Katvushka Ket Khristina Kira Kira Kirill Kiryunchik Kiryusha Kitty Kitya Klara Klarochka Klava Klavdia Klavdiya Klavochka Kol'ka Kolen'ka Kolva Kolyai Kolyan Kolyunja Konstantin Kosten'ka Kostik Kostya Kotik Kotunka Kotya Kronid Kronya Ksenia Kseniy Kseniva Ksyusha Kûros Lado Lapa Lara Larisa Larochka Lazar Lena Lenka Lenochka Lenusya Lenya Leonid Lera Lerchik Lerochka

Lesha Leshen'ka Leshka Lev Lialya Lida Lidia Lidiv Lidiya Lidochka Lidok Lika Likunya Likusva Lilechka Lily Lilya Lilya Lina Liza Lizan'ka Lizaveta Lizochka Liolva Ljubasha Ljubushka Lola Lolita Lora Luba Luban'ka Lubochka Lubov Lubushka Ludmila Lukeriya Lulya Luoshen'ka Lusechka Lusha Lusya Lutik Lyalya Lydia Lyokha Lyolya Lyolyok Lyon'chik Lyonetska Lyonya Lyosha Lyoshik Lyova Lyoyushka Lyubasha Lyuda Lyudochka

Lyusen'ka Lyusya Magomed Mahrk Maiya Maksim Maksimilian Manaza Manazai Manya Manyash Marek Margarita Mari Mariam Marik Marina Marisha Marishka Mariy Mariya Mark Marka Marochka Martemyan Marusen'ka Marusya Masha Masha Mashen'ka Mashka Mashulya Masjavick Maxik Maxim Maximilian Maximushka Mikele Mikha Mikhail Mikhryut Mikhryutka Mila Milochka Mimya Miniok Minya Misha Mishanya Mishen'ka Mishulya Mishunya Mishutka Mishva Mitenka Mitrofan

Mitrosha Mitya Mityai Mixail Moisev Moisu Monva Moses Mukha Musa Musen'ka Musienka Musya Muza Nadeida Naden'ka Nadezhda Nadulva Nadusha Nadya Nadyusha Nadyushen'ka Nadyusho Nadyuska Nanechka Nasten'ka Nastentsiya Nastukha Nastulya Nastya Nastyona Nastyusha Nata Natalia Nataliva Natalochka Natalya Natalyia Natasha Natashen'ka Natashik Natashka Natik Natka Natochka Natulechka Natulya Natysya Nika Nikita Nikitushka Nikolai Nikolasha Nikolashka Nikolay Nikolen'ka Nikolka

Nikusya Nina Ninochka Ninok Ninulya Ninus'ka Ninusen'ka Niura Njurochka Njushen'ka Njusya Nura Nurka Nurochka Nusha Nuta Nutochka Oksana Olechka Oleg Olen'ka Olezhek Olezhka Olga Olgunya Olgusha Olgushka Olka Olushka Olya Osva Palaga Pana Parasha Parashka Pasha Pashka Pashulya Paulina Pava Pavel Pavlik Pavlusha Pavlushka Pelaga Pelagey Pelageya Pepik Petechka Peten'ka Petro Petrusha Petunya Petya Petyunchik Peyunt Philya

Polen'ka Polina Polinka Polinochka Polya Praskovia Praskovva Prokhor Prokofi Prokophij Pronva Proxor Pushkin Pyotr Qanifa Ra'uf Raechka Rafael Rafail Raika Raisa Rapho Rauf Rava Ravusha Rebekka Revekka Rima Rimka Rimma Risha Ritochka Roma Roman Romka Rostam Rostislav Roza Ruslan Rustam Rusva Sakha Sakher Salam Salame Smuil Sanka Sanya Sasha Sashechka Sashen'ka Sashenka Sasher Sashjen Sashka Sashok Sashulya

Sashulyk Sashunya Sashusya Seda Semen Semyon Senechka Senva Serafima Serge Sergei Sergey Sergun'ka Sergunya Serik Servoga Servozha Servozhechka Seryozhen'ka Setka Seva Sevik Sevka Shanifa Shura Shurik Shurka Shurochka Shurtk Slava Slavik Slavochka Slavusha Sofia Sofya Sonya Sonyechka Sophia Sophinka Sophochka Staliina Stalin Stalina Stas Stasik Stepan Styopa Styopan Sveta Svetik Svetlana Svetlanochka Svetlyachok Svetochka Svetulik Svetulya Svyatoslav

Svytoslav Taika Tain'ka Taisiy Taisiya Talka Tamara Tamarochka Tamochka Tan'ka Tan'kin Tanechka Tanurochka Tanushka Tanya Tanyusha Taras Tasha Tata Tatiana Tatochka Tatyana Tatyanus Taya Tavona Tayonochka Timochka Timosha Timur Tolechka Tolen'ka Tolik Tolunchik Tolusha Tolya Tolyasha Toma Tomik Ton'ka Tonechka Tonya Tosen'ka Tosik Tosya Trunchik Tulya Tuoma Tusik Tusya Tyoma Tysya

Vadik Vadim Vadya Vaka Valechka Valen'ka Valentin Valentina Valera Valeri Valeria Valerian Valerik Valeriy Valerochka Valery Valeryi Valik Valodushka Valodya Valy Valva Valyechka Valyusha Van'ka Vanechka Vanek Vanusha Vanushka Vanya Vanyusha Vanyushechka Varnaz Varvara Varya Vas'ka Vasen'ka Vasili Vasilisa Vasilyi Vasilyok Vasunchik Vasya Ven'ka Veniamin Venichka Venya Vera Veranchik Veri Verik

Verochka Veronika Verunchek Verunchik Verus'ka Verusya Veta Vetochka Victoria Vik Vika Viktor Viktoria Viktoriya Vikunchik Vikusya Vilen Vilya Vinik Violetta Vit Vitali Vitalik Vitaliy Vitalv Vitalya Viten'ka Vitunchik Vitunya Vitusha Vitusya Vitya Vityok Vladik Vladimir Vladislav Vladlen Vladvasha Voľ ka Volf Volodechka Volodva Volya Vova Vovedza Vovik Vovka Vovochka Vovok Vsevolod Vyacheslaph

Vyacheslav Vyalya Vyceslav Wolf Xhenura Yakov Yasha Yashenka Yasher Yaer Yul'ka Yulechka Yulenka Yulia Yuliya Yulya Yulyasha Yurasha Yuri Yurik Yurka Yuro Yurochka Yurok Yury Zaika Zakhra Zambik Zaxra Zelik Zhanna Zhannochka Zheka Zhen'ka Zhenechka Zhenusha Zhenya Zhenvs Zheshka Zhora Zhorik Zhozya Zina Zinaida Zinaidik Zinochka Zinulya Zinushka Zoy Zoya Zyama

49

New York Jewish "Jewish" Pronunciations

Anything with an asterisk (*) means that it appears in the questionnaire and you need to know how it's pronounced (because you <u>may</u> have to read it).

Please note the emphasis is on the bold syllables.

<u>Agudah</u>		(Uh- GOOD -ah)	(Q.7) (Q.7a)
	This is a	a Haredi Orthodox Jewish organization.	
*Ashker	<u>nazi</u>	(Ahsh-ken- AH -zee)	(Q.7b)
	This ref Most Je	ers to Jews that are from Eastern France, (wish people in America are Ashkenazic.	Germany, Eastern Europe, and their descendants.
AIPAC		(A- PACK)	(Q.47e)
	This sta	nds for the American Israel Political Activ	ity Committee.
<u>*Bar Mi</u> * Bat M	<u>tzvah</u> itzvah	Bar (MITS -vah) Bat (BAHT) (Mitzvah)	$\begin{array}{l} (Q.33) \\ (Q.20c) \ (Q.20f) \\ (Q.38) \ (Q.38a) \end{array}$
	It is a co	oming of age ceremony for boys (Bar) /gir	ls (Bat), usually at age 13.
<u>*Bukha</u> t	<u>ra</u>	(BOUK -har-ah)	(Q.7c)
	It is the	capital of a province in Uzbekistan.	
<u>Chabad</u>		(HAH-bod)	(Q.7) (Q.7a)
	It is a H vitch).	lasidic (Hah- SEE -dic) movement within Ju	udaism. It is also called Lubavitch (Loo- BAH -
<u>*Hanuk</u>	<u>kah</u>	(HAH-new-kah)	(Q.35c)
	Hanukk lasted ei	ah is the Festival of Lights. In ancient time	es, the Hebrews had enough oil for one night but it
<u>Haredi</u>		(Hah- RAY -dee)	(Q.7) (Q.7a)
	It is the	most conservative form of Orthodox Juda	aism.
*Hasidie	<u>c</u>	(Hah- SEE -dik)	(Q.7) (Q.7a)
	It is a b Jewish f	ranch of Orthodox Judaism that promotes Faith.	spirituality and joy as fundamental aspects of the

* <u>Havurah</u>	(Hah-voo-RAH)	(Q.31)			
An info	ormal Jewish fellowship group that meets r	egularly for discussion or prayer.			
<u>*Judaism</u>	(JOO -dee-izm)	(S-NJ-3) (Q.6a) (Q.6b) (Q.14c) (Q.14cc) (Q.19c) (Q.47c) (Q.50) (Q.51)			
It is the	e cultural, religious, and social practices and	d beliefs of the Jews.			
Lubavitch	(Loo- BAH -vitch)	(Q.7) (Q.7a)			
Lubavi bod).	tch is a Hasidic (Hah- SEE -dik) movement	within Judaism. It is also called Chabad (HAH -			
<u>*Messianic</u>	(MESS-e-an-nick)	(S-NJ-4) (S-5a) (Q.6a) (Q.6aa) (Q.6b) (Q.6bb) (Q.7) (Q.14.c) (Q.14cc) (Q.46bb)			
Relatin	g to a messiah. A Completed Jew, Jew for	Jesus, a born-again Jew.			
* <u>Minyan</u>	(MIN -yen)	(Q.31)			
A miny	ran is a meeting with 10 male Jewish adults	required for certain Jewish obligations.			
*Rabbi	(RA -bye)	(Q.58)			
A spiri	tual leader (male or female) of a Jewish cor	ngregation.			
*Rosh Hashana	<u>h</u> (Rohsh-ha- SHAH -na)	(Q.31)			
Rosh H	Iashanah is the Jewish New Year.				
*Seder	(SAY-der)	(Q.35a)			
A festiv	ve ceremonial meal celebrated on the first	night or first two nights of the Passover holiday.			
<u>*Sephardic</u> <u>*Sephardi</u>	(s'- FAHR -dik) (s'- FAHR -dee)	(Q.7) (Q.7b) (Q.7) (Q.7c)			
Jews fr	om Spain, Portugal, North Africa, and the	Middle East and their descendants.			
<u>*Shabbat</u>	(Sha- BAHT)	(Q.26) (Q.48e)			
The Jev	wish Sabbath, celebrated from sundown or	n Friday evening through nightfall on Saturday.			
*Shul	(SHOOL)	(Q.31)			

It is the Yiddish word for synagogue. The Orthodox and Hasidic sects of Jews usually use this word.

<u>*Synagogue</u>	(SIN-ah-gog)	(Q.23a) (Q.31)
		(Q.32) $(Q.58)$ $(Q.66b)$

It is a Jewish house of worship. It is also called a shul (SHOOL) or temple.

*Yeshiva	(Ye- SH	E-vah)	(Q.7a) (Q.20f) (Q.38)
			(Q.38a)
ł	(Yeshivish)	(Ye- SHE -vish)	(Q.7a)

It is an educational institution for boys and men. Boys can attend for high school and/or post-high school.

<u>*Yom Kippur</u> (Yom-key-**POOR) – Yom rhymes with "Dome"**

(Q.33) (Q.34)

Yom Kippur is the holiest day for all Jews. It is the Day of Atonement that follows Rosh Hashanah (Rohsh-ha-**SHAH**-na) and on which Jews repent their sins of the previous year.

Problem Reporting Sheet

"IS THERE ANYONE WHO CAN HELP ME WITH SOME PROBLEMS THAT I/MY FAMILY IS HAVING?"

(IF RESPONDENT IS DEEPLY DISTRESSED, LET THEM KNOW THAT YOU CAN HAVE SOMEONE FROM UJA-FEDERATION'S J-1-1 REFERRAL SERVICE CALL THEM DIRECTLY. IF THE RESPONDENT WANTS TO RECEIVE A CALL FROM J-1-1, PLEASE COLLECT THEIR NAME AND PHONE NUMBER AND GIVE IT TO THE CALL CENTER SUPERVISOR.

Social work professionals from UJA-Federation's Information and Referral Service may be able to help you. Would you like to have someone give you a call back tomorrow? We will only give them your phone number if you say it is OK to do so; this is not part of the survey, and all they will receive is your phone number, your first name if you want to give it to me, and a general comment about what they might ask you about.

(OR <u>IF THEY DO NOT WANT TO PROVIDE THEIR NAME/NUMBER</u>, PLEASE PROVIDE THE INFORMATION BELOW SO THAT THEY CAN CONTACT THE REFERRAL SERVICE ON THEIR OWN)

Or, if you prefer, I can give you the number to call at your convenience: UJA-Federation's J-1-1 Information and Referral Service — 1.877.UJA.NYJ11 (1.877.852.6951). J-1-1 resource specialists are available Monday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., with 24-hour voicemail, or e-mail j11@ujafedny.org. (J-1-1 is part of UJA-Federation but does not call to ask people for money. It is an information and referral service only.)

Remember — you are touching someone's life. Be respectful and compassionate.

Name (if provided): _____

Phone number: _____

General description of problem (if provided):

Please submit this request to your supervisor. Thank you.

Interviewing Calendar

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
		1	2	3	4 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	5 No interviewing
6	7	8	9	10	11 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	12 No interviewing
13	14	15	16	17	18 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	19 No interviewing
20	21	22	23	24	25 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	26 No interviewing
27	28					

February 2011: Monday – Thursday: 5:00 – 9:00 p.m.; Sunday: 12:00 noon – 9:00 p.m.

March 2011: Monday – Thursday: 5:00 – 9:00 p.m.; Sunday: 12:00 noon – 9:00 p.m.

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
		1	2	3	4 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	5 No interviewing
6	7	8	9	10	11 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	12 No interviewing
13 Daylight Savings Time begins	14	15	16	17 Fast of Esther	18 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	19 Purim/No interviewing
20 Purim — no calls	21 Shushan Purim	22	23	24	25 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	26 No interviewing
27	28	29	30	31		

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
					1 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	2 No interviewing
3	4	5	6	7	8 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	9 No interviewing
10	11	12	13	14	15 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	16 No interviewing
17	18 Erev Passover — no calls	19 Passover – no calls	20 Passover – no calls	21 Passover – no calls	22 Shabbat and Passover – no calls	23 Passover – no calls
24 Passover – no calls	25 Passover – no calls	26 Passover – no calls	27	28	29 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	30 No interviewing

April 2011: Monday – Thursday: 5:00 – 9:00 p.m.; Sunday: 12:00 noon – 9:00 p.m.

May 2011: Monday – Thursday: 5:00 – 9:00 p.m.; Sunday: 12:00 noon – 9:00 p.m.

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1 Yom HaShoah	2	3	4	5	6 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	7 No interviewing
8 Mother's Day	9 Yom HaZikaron	10 Yom HaAtzma'ut	11	12	13 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	14 No interviewing
15	16	17	18	19	20 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	21 No interviewing
22 Lag B'Omer	23	24	25	26	27 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	28 No interviewing
29	30 Memorial Day — no calls	31				

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
			1 Yom Yerushalayim	2	3 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	4 No interviewing
5	6	7 Erev Shavuot — no calls after 2:00 p.m.	8 Shavuot — no calls	9 Shavuot — no calls	10 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	11 No interviewing
12	13	14	15	16	17 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	18 No interviewing
19 Father's Day	20	21	22	23	24 Shabbat — no calls after 2:30 p.m.	25 No interviewing
26	27	28	29	30		

June 2011: Monday – Thursday: 5:00 – 9:00 p.m.; Sunday: 12:00 noon-9:00 p.m.