

COLUMBUS, OHIO, JEWRY: AN AMERICAN
MICROCOSM?"

Frank L. Mott
The Ohio State University

Susan H. Mott
Nationwide Life Insurance
(*Contemporary Jewry* v15 1994)

This study uses data from the 1990 Jewish Population Study of Greater Columbus and the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey to compare and contrast characteristics of the Columbus Jewish community with national patterns. While the national statistics mask variations between the component communities, Columbus closely matches the national distributions in, among other things, denominational attachment and intermarriage rates. However, Columbus Jewry differs from national patterns on several demographic measures as well as on measures of ritual and social involvement with the Jewish community. Parallels are drawn between the within-community variation in Columbus and Jews who are strongly versus minimally affiliated throughout the country. Implications for programs and policies are noted, acknowledging the inherent difficulty associated with the reality that Jewish population residentially further removed from the traditional geographic core has the weakest links with Judaism.

The completion of national and local surveys in temporal proximity with each other provides an opportunity to explore carefully the ways in which a local community may mirror or contrast with the "national" Jewish community. Comparisons of this type can provide important insights for community policy-makers to place their objectives in a broader perspective—programmatically as well as from a religious viewpoint. However, there are some constraints to the usefulness of this approach.

First, while a national profile can and does change over time, it nonetheless has a certain built-in inertia, since, barring massive immigration, national patterns for a large population do not change very quickly. While recent Russian Jewish immigration to the United States certainly has been significant, arguably, its magnitude is not sufficient to dramatically alter the national profile in the shorter run.

Secondly, the inherent strength of a national survey is simultaneously its major weakness. Statistics presented for the overall U.S. Jewish population in important ways mask the essential heterogeneity of the population. The overall statistics certainly highlight some aspects of this heterogeneity, particularly with respect to the religious identification of the population. However, the national statistics are largely driven by the patterns which exist in a few larger American communities. Thus, in important respects, any attempt to profile what may be termed an "average Jew" or a "normal" Jewish population is doomed to failure, since there may be fundamental differences between, for example, the New York Jewish community, the community in several other larger cities, and the Jewish communities of varying sizes across the "diaspora" of mid-America (see: Horowitz and Soloman 1992). Arguably, Jews living in much of America outside of the major centers live in a social-psychological environment as different from the Jews in New York as the Jews in New York might be viewed as living in an environment fundamentally different from Israeli Jews. This difference, from our perspective, is at the core of explaining many of the social and demographic variations between communities, including involvement with the religion, intermarriage and how children are being raised.

Thirdly, ascribing cause to variations is complex. People are what they are to some extent because of *where* they live. Additionally, to an unknown degree, they are *where* they are because of their personal preferences, be they economic, locational, social or religious. Of course, in important respects, none of us are in complete control of our behaviors. We often must go to where the jobs are. Some of us also make locational choices based on family preferences or our concern for our religious preferences or those of our children. To some extent, the behavioral and attitudinal data we will present reflect these differences. The profile of Columbus reinforces the notion of heterogeneity. Columbus may in some respects "mirror" the U.S. Jewish population. Where it does, it is emphasized that this does not reflect a uniformity across communities but rather the reality that the "average" may mask tremendous variability. In some respects, there is indeed a national Jewish population as, perhaps, evidenced by such factors as identification with the State of Israel or some general notions about what it is to be a Jew. In other respects, statistics for a community such as Columbus may highlight, for better or for worse (depending on one's personal values), the strengths and weaknesses of American Jewry.

Many of the behaviors and attitudes of members of a relatively smaller community, such as Columbus, reflect its particular social, economic and political history. As we will also show, the profile of a relatively smaller community is extraordinarily sensitive not only to its socio-economic history but also to the time the community is surveyed. When numbers are small, factors such as fertility and, in particular, migration can rapidly alter a profile and have profound implications for the nature and continuity of the Jewish community.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF COLUMBUS JEWRY

The first Jews to settle in Columbus came with the mid-nineteenth century wave of German Jewish immigration. Between 1840 and 1880 these German Jews rapidly ascended the socio-economic ladder and created a successful mercantile society. They established the first synagogues. A Reform congregation followed the establishment of an Orthodox one by a mere 17 years (Raphael 1979: 57). The early German immigrants also created a variety of Jewish philanthropic and social organizations. By 1880, they had achieved both a sense of economic security and a commitment to American values (Raphael 1979: 49).

During the last two decades of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century, the Columbus Jewish community was augmented by the arrival of East European Jews. The newer arrivals created an ethnic neighborhood containing kosher butchers and markets, Orthodox synagogues and "a network of recreation centers, social clubs, organizations and associations that solidified a separate sense of identity within the new American environment" (Raphael 1979: 2). They also began the process of integrating themselves into the existing Jewish community.

During the second quarter of the twentieth century, second and third generation Columbus Jews established a community "at the end of the transit lines in less congested neighborhoods" (Raphael 1979: 3). They organized a centralized philanthropic institution, and they continued to "blend securely into the Columbus scene" (Raphael 1979: 3).

In recent years, the surrounding greater Columbus area has enjoyed sustained economic and population growth, largely due to an investment in a services and trade dominated economy. This investment has resulted in a "steady increase in jobs, low unemployment, and increasing wealth" (Metropolitan Human Services Commission 1993: i). Since 1985 the Columbus metropolitan area has experienced positive

net migration (Metropolitan Human Services Commission 1993: 5). Among the new arrivals to Columbus are Jewish in-migrants to the area, relatively culturally assimilated Jewish professionals pulled by the magnets of the largest professional employers: Ohio State University, state government, Battelle Memorial Institute, the administrative headquarters of Borden, and the home offices of several large insurance companies. While these new arrivals augment the size of the Columbus Jewish community, or at least sustain it, they may experience obstacles to integration into the established Jewish community, just as successive waves of immigrants must have in the past.

DEFINING THE JEWISH SAMPLE

The Jewish samples for Columbus and the United States used in this study are not precisely comparable to each other. Most of the comparisons we make use two Jewish samples for Columbus, an "RDD" ("random digit dialing") sample and a "list" sample, and a third for the United States, the "core" Jewish population as defined in the National Jewish Population Survey summary report (Kosmin, Goldstein, Waksberg, Lerer, Keyser and Scheckner 1991: 3-4; Waksberg n.d.).

The Columbus RDD sample represents a completely random (by telephone) selection of Jewish households in Franklin County, which accounts for almost all of the Jewish population in the Columbus area. The geographic distribution of Jews in the county is based on the geographic distribution of the 292 Jewish households identified in the Fall of 1989 through random digit dialing of about 12,500 county households, 2.3% of whom were "Jewish." A Jewish household was defined as a household which included at least one adult (age 18 or over) who: (1) either has a father or mother identified by the survey respondent as being Jewish; (2) was "raised" Jewish (however the respondent chooses to define it); or (3) currently considers himself or herself Jewish. Typically (in 89% of the cases), at least one member of the household was defined as Jewish according to *all* of the above criteria, and fully 97% of the respondents in these RDD households currently consider themselves Jewish (Mott and Mott 1989). Since the screening interview preceded the longer household interview by several months (the main survey was carried out in the Spring of 1990), weights were developed which distributed the longer RDD household interviews according to the geographic mix indicated by the screener. A variety of cross checks assured us of the appropriateness of this technique (Mott and Mott 1990).

Additionally, a large sample of households known to contain Jews or to be affiliated with the organized Jewish community was used. This sample was randomly selected from a comprehensive list of households prepared by the Columbus Jewish Federation. In this paper, these households and respondents are identified as "list" households; they typify Jewish households which are known to at least one Jewish organization in the community. It should be clear, and the data we present will support this notion, that the "list" sample represents a population much more closely identified with various dimensions of Judaism than is true for the RDD population—which includes a full representation of Jewish households, including those not strongly affiliated with the religion.

A complete definition of the national sample of "core" households may be found in Kosmin et al (1991). The multiple criteria for defining a Jewish household in Columbus are identical to those used in NJPS. For the most part, the national statistics we present are limited to what is defined as the "core Jewish population." It is comprised of (1) born-Jews, (2) Jews-by-choice, and (3) those reared as Jews, but currently without a religion. We were not able to precisely match our Columbus *individual* sample with the core population. However, all of the respondent or household level RDD statistics we report are conceptually quite close to the "core Jewish concept." As mentioned above, fully 97% of the Columbus RDD respondents currently (at the time of the 1990 interview) consider themselves Jewish, although only 79% of all the adults in their household consider themselves currently Jewish.

From a comparative perspective, Columbus "list" respondents and their families should show the strongest identification with Judaism; U.S. core Jews and Columbus RDD respondents are conceptually very similar, and statistics focusing on all Columbus RDD household members show a lesser degree of religious affiliation. Most of the analyses in this paper will contrast the U.S. Jewish core population and the Columbus RDD respondents. In terms of current Jewish affiliation, these two groups are very similar. Most of the statistics for the U.S. core population cited in this report are drawn from Goldstein (1993). The Columbus data, with minor adjustments, are from Mott and Mott (1990), Mott and Abma (1992) and Abma and Mott (1993).

A CONTEMPORARY COMMUNITY OVERVIEW

The profile we will present for Columbus, and the more significant ways in which it differs from the overall U.S. profile, reflects, at least

partly, its particular history. It is essentially a white collar community with substantial employment in state government and at The Ohio State University. As mentioned above, it also has a large private white collar sector which includes such corporate entities as Nationwide Insurance, Borden, Ross Labs, Wendy's, and the Limited. These are longstanding, not just recent, employment developments. Given this employment base, Columbus has been more stable economically in recent decades than most metropolitan areas in the northeastern United States. Because of its favorable economic picture, the population in the Columbus metropolitan area has not only been stable, but has grown over 45%, from 916,000 in 1970 to over 1,345,000 in 1990.¹ During that same two decade interval, the population of Ohio grew by less than two percent and the whole Midwest grew by about five percent (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1993, Tables 31 and 42; U.S. Bureau of the Census 1972, Tables 20 and 36).

The relatively strong local labor market and its largely white collar mix have proven attractive to Jews and non-Jews alike, with one implication being a pattern of net in-migration over the period. The local labor market has undoubtedly been particularly attractive to the Jewish adult population given (as we will show) its extraordinary propensity to be highly educated and white collar oriented. While we cannot estimate the change in the Columbus Jewish population over the past two decades with precision, our best estimate is that it has grown modestly from between 13,000 to 14,000 in 1969 to about 15,600 in 1990. The 1969 estimate is based on approximations derived from a 1969 Columbus Jewish community survey, which included interviews with a sample of Jewish community households (Mayer 1969). Unfortunately, the 1969 survey is not completely comparable to our 1990 random sample survey of the Jewish population.

The Columbus Jewish community in 1969 was not only somewhat smaller than in 1990, but far less dispersed geographically. The Columbus Jewish community has historically been concentrated in a modest sized area on the near east side of Columbus. As we will describe, the Jewish population is now much more dispersed throughout the metropolitan area—but the dispersion is not random in terms of family and individual characteristics. This phenomenon is closely intertwined with migration to the community in recent decades. Much of the story which follows relates to the factors described above, the economic strength of the community and its continuing ability to attract a high caliber work force. Of course, as is almost universally true, these factors, and their implications, are but an overlay to the dynamic

process of change which the national Jewish community has been coping with, for better or for worse, in recent decades.

By way of highlighting the geographic uniqueness of Columbus, a few regional comparative statistics are in order. Two proximate metropolitan areas to Columbus are Cleveland and Pittsburgh—cities which have not been as fortunate in terms of their recent economic climate.² We compare here a few statistics from our Columbus study, the 1987 Cleveland study and the 1984 Pittsburgh survey. While contemporary patterns for Cleveland and Pittsburgh might be slightly different than they were three or six years ago, major changes are not likely to have occurred. Whereas 53% of employed Columbus Jews (in the RDD sample) are in professional occupations, the comparable estimates for Cleveland and Pittsburgh are 39% and 38%. Since there is reason to believe that the Cleveland and Pittsburgh samples more closely represented the affiliated Jewish population, who are more likely to be longer term residents, it is most appropriate to compare the Cleveland and Pittsburgh Jewish samples with our "list" sample for Columbus—the Jewish population which has been identified from either Columbus Jewish Federation or other organizational lists. About 27% of the Columbus "list" population was born in the Columbus area, compared with about 60% for its sister cities. About 10% of the Columbus "list" population is 65 or over and two-thirds are under age 45. In contrast, Cleveland has almost 20% age 65 and over and 57% under age 45. The comparable Pittsburgh statistics are 22% and 52%.

From a slightly different perspective, the larger percentages of long-standing residents in Cleveland and Pittsburgh have important implications for the religion: Cleveland and Pittsburgh Jews are much more likely to belong to a congregation, belong to Jewish organizations and to have their children receive Jewish education. Thus, in a sense, the price that the Columbus community may be paying for having a less static community may be a religion-linked transition more closely attuned to the national picture. Indeed, in many respects, the dynamic profile we present for Columbus may represent a better model for considering programs and policies to deal with the issues encountering contemporary American Jewry.

COLUMBUS AND THE NATIONAL SCENE: A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

As mentioned above, reflecting variations in how the data were collected and processed, the comparisons we are able to make are best made by comparing Columbus RDD respondents with the U.S. core Jewish population. Both of these populations are intended to be representative of a full cross-section of individuals who currently (in 1990) consider themselves Jewish (100% for the U.S. Group and 96.8% for the Columbus sample); most of the comparisons made will be between adults in the two sample populations. Of course, these individuals need not be directly comparable. Indeed, a major objective of this research is to show how Columbus and other U.S. "Jews" may differ from each other in important ways. As may also be seen from Table 1, U. S. core households and Columbus RDD households differ substantially from each other in their religious mix. About 33% of the individuals in the U.S. core households (hereafter termed "core") are not Jewish, compared with only about 21% in the Columbus RDD (hereafter termed "RDD") households .

In some instances in this report, we will also make comparisons with the Columbus "list" respondents or individuals in the list households. It may be recalled that the "list" includes a population which at present identifies much more closely and is more integrated into the Columbus Jewish community. As may be seen in Table 1, 99% of list respondents and 93% of individuals in list households currently consider themselves Jewish. "List" households represent slightly over 50% of all Jewish households in the Columbus metropolitan area. The reason for incorporating list statistics into this report is twofold. First, it profiles households which are considered by the Jewish institutions as being typically Jewish. From the viewpoint of the many Jewish institutions, these are the families which they usually consider within their "domain" (and which, not incidentally, contribute most of the funds collected by the Jewish Federation). Secondly, from a comparative perspective, many of the available Jewish community studies have focused their examination on the equivalent of the Columbus "list" population. Such certainly appears to have been the case in Cleveland and Pittsburgh in the comparisons we made above. In many communities, which have sparse and widespread Jewish populations, drawing a fully representative Jewish sample can be cost prohibitive. Indeed, in designing and implementing the Columbus survey, a very large proportion of the resources was used to randomly select and interview a modest random

or RDD sample and a smaller proportion of resources used for interviewing the easy-to-locate list sample. This cost calculus was acknowledged up front because obtaining a reasonable reliable count of the *total* Jewish population was viewed as of paramount importance.

Table 1. Religious Identification

Sample Characteristics: U.S. Sample

	U. S. Core Population ¹	Total Population in Core Households ¹
Jews by Religion	76.4	51.4
Secular Jews	20.3	13.7
Jews by Choice	3.4	2.3
Current Non-Jews ²		32.6

Sample Characteristics: Columbus

	<u>LIST</u>		<u>RDD</u>	
	Rs	Indivs	Rs	Indivs
Consider				
Selves Jewish	99.3	92.5	96.8	79.4
Don't Consider				
Selves Jewish				
But Raised				
Jewish or Have				
Jewish Parents	0.7	0.7	3.2	1.8
Not Jewish By				
Any Definition	0.0	6.8	0.0	8.8

¹ See footnote to Table 1 in Goldstein (1993)

² Non-Jewish members of core households

The product of this approach is a good baseline estimate of the total Columbus Jewish population and its characteristics in 1990—an essential prerequisite to measuring changes in numbers and characteristics at any point in the future. A case in point relates to the difficulty which we have had in estimating what has transpired with Columbus

Jewry over the past few decades, as the only baseline data we had available was a presumed unrepresentative 1969 sample.

Basic Demographics: Table 2 documents the age structure of the various Columbus and U.S. populations. More than any other characteristic, it reflects the various basic socio-economic and demographic processes such as fertility, migration and employment trends and in turn is the most essential input to virtually all community planning. First, it is instructive to contrast the Columbus list and RDD age structures. The RDD population is substantially younger, reflecting primarily two factors. First, the RDD population is much more heavily represented by 25 to 34 year-olds than is the list population because of

Table 2. Age Structure

AGE	U. S. Core Jews	RDD Jews	<u>Columbus</u> RDD Persons	List Persons	U. S. White Population
0-14	19.0	18.4	21.9	20.6	20.7
15-24	10.9	17.6	14.8	15.0	14.2
25-34	16.1	18.1	20.2	12.1	17.6
35-44	17.4	22.6	22.7	19.8	14.9
45-64	19.5	15.5	13.8	22.6	19.3
65 & +	17.2	8.0	6.7	10.1	13.3
Median	37.3	32.3	31.4	36.5	33.6

the substantially greater in-migration of younger adults among the less affiliated community members. In contrast, the list population is proportionately much more represented among the population age 45 and over—individuals of longer standing in the community. If one constrains the RDD population to the Jewish household members ("Columbus RDD Jews"), the age distribution does not change very much in comparison with the full RDD sample of individuals.

It is of some interest to note that the age distribution of the U.S. core Jewish population mirrors more closely the more established Columbus list population, with the most important difference between the two being the much greater proportion of elderly in the national population. The 17% over age 65 even exceeds the 13% which may be

noted for the entire U.S. white population. This higher aged U.S. Jewish population reflects the fact that a significant proportion of the older Columbus Jewish population has migrated to warmer climes. Much of the remaining difference between the U.S. core and Columbus RDD age structures may be directly tied in with economics, the ability of the Columbus economy, over the past decades, to selectively draw younger and middle-aged workers to an economy which has been somewhat stronger than the overall U.S. workplace.

The current and shorter-term prospective size and mix of the Columbus Jewish population rests essentially on two factors, birth rates and net migration patterns. Jewish fertility both locally and nationally is quite low, reflecting a relatively late age at marriage—closely linked with the high education and career orientation of most Jewish women—as well as low fertility within marriage. About 85% of Columbus Jewish women between the ages of 25 and 64 are in the work force. Very few Jewish women (about 4%) in Columbus marry between the ages of 18 and 24. Even by their late twenties, significant proportions remain single, with the proportion marrying remaining somewhat lower for the full RDD cross-section than for women identified in the list population. In the 25 to 44 year-old age group, about 32% of the RDD women but only 21% of the list women are currently childless (Table 3). While the average Columbus Jewish women in this age category

Table 3. Fertility: Women 25-44

	<u>Columbus</u>		U.S.
	RDD Rs	List Rs	Jewish Women
Women 25-44			
Mean Children Ever Born	1.6	1.8	1.2
% Childless	32.3	21.4	38.7
Mean Children Expected	2.1	2.2	1.9
Mean Children Ever Born			
To Women Aged 25-34			0.9
To Women Aged 35-44			1.5

Source: Mott and Abma 1992 Table 2

currently has had about 1.6 children, her lifetime expectation is to have 2.1 children—essentially the number needed to ensure population replacement, everything else being equal. Given her current level of achieved fertility, this expectation is not unreasonable. In contrast, her U.S. counterpart has only had 1.2 children.

All of the available evidence suggests that at the present time, the movement of population into and out of the Columbus metropolitan area is the primary shorter-term determinant of changes in the size and complexion of the Jewish population. As may be seen in Table 4, less than 20% of the full Jewish cross-sectional population is from the

Table 4. Migration Status of Adult Respondents

	U.S.	
	Core Jews	<u>Columbus Rs</u> RDD List
% Born in Same Local Area	19.3	18.5 27.0
% Born Intrastate, Not Local	24.2	30.1 24.4
% Born Another State	46.1	46.3 39.6
% Foreign Born	10.4	5.1 9.0
% in Area 5 Years or More	77.2	78.7 88.3

Columbus area and slightly over 20% has moved into the area during the past five years. The more established list population is somewhat more likely to have been born in Columbus and to be longer term residents. However, even for this group, almost three quarters were born elsewhere.

Over half of the population were born either in another state or are foreign born. Of those not born in Columbus, but born in the U.S., fully 18% were born in New York City, 15% in Cleveland, and smaller percentages in other locales (Mott and Mott 1990, Table 5.1). Moreover, about half of the Columbus Jewry indicate that they plan to make a move within the next three years, with about half of those (or one-quarter of the full population) indicating that their move may be to a location other than Columbus. Clearly, the Jewish population is extraordinarily mobile, and continued growth can only be assured if in-migration continues at a substantial level and, perhaps, out-migration is below the levels suggested by the above responses. The likely prospective migration is not random. First, 31% of RDD respondents

indicate that it is very likely they will move within the next three years, compared with 15% for list respondents. The difference in likelihood of moving is closely linked with the fact that list respondents have lived in Columbus more years on average and that they are significantly older than their RDD counterparts. However, even if one compares list and RDD respondents of the same age or the same residence tenure, anticipated migration is much higher for the RDD respondents who, as we will show, have weaker links with the Jewish community.

Somewhat surprisingly, there is little difference in the summary migration statistics reported in Table 4 for the U.S. core individuals and Columbus RDD respondents. Almost identical percentages are reported as locally born and having lived in the area five years or more. We have indicated earlier that Columbus Jewry is much less likely to be locally born and raised than Jews living in Cleveland or Pittsburgh. Additionally, statistics from a wide range of local Jewish surveys suggest that the Columbus Jewish population is more mobile than that in most Jewish communities (Mott and Mott 1990, Table 4.4). It may be that a small number of large communities such as Los Angeles and perhaps New York are behind the high national Jewish mobility rate. If such is indeed the case, it is one important piece of evidence supporting the notion that while national statistics may appropriately inform about the "average" American Jew, they may well provide somewhat distorted information regarding the profile of the average *community*. It may also be that the statistics for many of the communities are biased because they disproportionately represent the

Table 5. Educational Attainment, Age 25 and Over:
Percent Distribution

	U.S. Core Jews	<u>Columbus Rs</u> RDD	List	U.S. White Population
≤ High School	27.7	8.8	13.7	62.2
Some College	19.3	18.5	22.1	17.3
College Completed	26.7	33.0	26.3	11.8
Graduate Studies	26.4	39.7	38.0	8.7

more affiliated Jewish population. However, it is useful to note in this regard that while Columbus list respondents are more likely to be locally born than Columbus RDD respondents, the distinction between the two is modest.

Tables 5 and 6 profile the extraordinary skill level of the Columbus population. Indeed, their level of education and occupational attainment significantly exceeds that of the overall Jewish population, which in turn is well above that of the American adult population, particularly for the younger age groups (Mott and Mott 1988). About 73% of the Columbus population age 25 and over has a college degree, with almost 40% having attained some graduate or post-baccalaureate professional training. Based on available statistics, Columbus is close to number one (if not number one) in the country. For the U.S. as a whole, the comparable estimates are 53% and 26% respectively. Slightly over half of Columbus Jews gainfully employed have a professional job and all but a very small percentage are in other white collar occupations. These statistics of course support the evidence of Columbus as a dynamic white collar economy. There is a natural match between the kinds of employment opportunities historically available in the community and the high skill level of the Jewish population, locally and nationally. The notion of Columbus as an employment magnet for American Jews is particularly enhanced during periods of economic downturn, when many other metropolitan areas, particularly in the northeast United States, have not fared as well.

Table 6. Occupation of U.S. Jewish Population and Columbus Respondents: Percent Distribution

	<u>U.S. Core Jews</u>		<u>Columbus Respondents</u>	
	Male	Female	RDD	List
Professional	39.0	36.1	52.6	41.9
Managerial	16.7	13.0	10.6	18.3
Clerical/Sales	24.4	41.1	28.8	34.7
Crafts	8.5	1.8	2.9	1.4
Other	6.4	1.8	3.4	2.2
Service	5.0	6.2	2.2	1.0

Religious Identification and Its Implications: In terms of formal affiliation, the Columbus Jewish community mirrors the nation as a

whole. As may be seen in Table 7, about seven percent of Columbus RDD respondents call themselves Orthodox, 32% Conservative, 41% Reform, with the remaining 20% mostly indicating either other or no specific denominational affiliation. These numbers virtually coincide with the denomination profile of the overall U.S. Jewish population. Columbus list respondents are somewhat more likely to report themselves as Orthodox and less likely to be unaffiliated.

Similarly, the denomination in which the Columbus Jewish population was raised coincides quite closely with the national population. About 21% indicate that they were raised Orthodox and 35% Conservative. For both the Columbus and national population, there is a considerable transition between childhood and adulthood. While the dominant tendency remains for individuals to indicate similar denominations in childhood and adulthood, there is also a considerable tendency for individuals who are currently Conservative to have been raised Orthodox and for those who are Reform to have been raised Orthodox or Conservative. These shifts far outnumber movements from Conservative or Reform to Orthodox or from Reform to Conservative.

Table 7. Current and Childhood Religious Denominations:
Percent Distribution

	U.S. Core Jews	Columbus	
		RDD Respondents	List Respondents
Current Denom.	100.0	100.0	100.0
Orthodox	6.1	6.6	14.0
Conservative	35.1	31.7	34.6
Reform	38.0	40.7	44.7
Other Jewish	11.4	5.2	2.7
Other	9.4	15.8	4.0
Denom. Raised	100.0	100.0	100.0
Orthodox	22.5	20.7	28.8
Conservative	34.3	34.6	32.9
Reform	26.3	33.1	27.7
Other Jewish	7.7	3.3	2.4
Other	9.3	8.3	8.2

While the current and past denominational mix of Columbus closely matches the national distribution, it is worth noting once again that this comparison masks the fact that there is significant variation across the U.S. in the denominational mix of local Jewish populations, with some communities, such as Baltimore, Miami, Pittsburgh or New York, reporting larger proportions Orthodox, but with many communities reporting profiles not substantially different from Columbus (Mott and Mott 1990, Table 14.7). Given the small percentage of Orthodox in many communities, these comparative statistics should be treated cautiously.

Perhaps more informative than the information on formal denominational links is the evidence suggesting the extent to which the Jewish population is actively involved with their religion, ritually and socially. Whereas the evidence on denominational attachment suggests that Columbus and other U.S. Jews are very similar, the more detailed information in Table 8 suggests that the Columbus Jewish community may be more involved than their national counterparts, and that within Columbus, once again, the list population is more involved with aspects of their religion than are their RDD counterparts. Columbus Jews are more likely to light Sabbath candles, attend seder, fast on Yom Kippur and be involved in a Hanukkah celebration and slightly less likely to have a Christmas tree in their home. They are substantially more likely to belong to a synagogue and also more likely to have visited Israel. These last two factors may be related to the fact that the average Columbus Jew is somewhat better off socio-economically. It is of some interest to note that 46% of Columbus families belong to synagogues, compared with 33% for U.S. core Jews. In the National Jewish Population Survey carried out in 1971, the national membership estimate was 47%. Once again, it is suggested that these comparative statistics be interpreted cautiously, as the percent reported as belonging to a synagogue typically is in the range of 40% to 70% in the statistics reported from many community studies. In this regard, it is important to note that almost 75% of Columbus list families report being a member of a congregation. Indeed, the difference between the RDD and list statistics for synagogue membership is much greater than the reported differences for any of the other ritual or social integration statistics.

We have indicated that a significant proportion of U.S. and Columbus Jewry, while formally associated with the religion and calling themselves Jews, perhaps have only marginal involvement, beyond sporadic synagogue attendance on the High Holy days. From

the perspective of the continuity of the religion, such marginal involvement has profound implications for the likelihood that they will marry within the religion and, as important, be raising their children within the religion. In Columbus, fully 45% of Jewish respondents are married to a non-Jew.³ In contrast, the list respondent population, which maintains closer ties with the formal Jewish institutional structure and which interacts to a greater extent with other Jews and Jewish groups in the community, has an intermarriage rate of 19%. List residents are more likely to be included in a full range of Jewish organizational activities, twice as likely to have a Jewish Center membership, almost twice as likely to donate to the Jewish Federation annual drives and are substantially more likely to have parents residing in the community. All of these are factors which can contribute to a greater or lesser isolation from the Jewish community mainstream.

Table 8. Percent "Always" or "Usually" Following Selected Ritual

	U.S. Core Jews	Columbus	
		RDD Rs	List Rs
Light Shabbat Candles	16.9	21.5	20.2
Attend Seder	61.9	74.9	87.0
Use Separate Dishes for Meat	13.0	11.0	14.5
Light Hanukkah Candles	59.7	68.5	80.8
Have A Christmas Tree	27.6	23.1	7.9
% Fasting On Yom Kippur	48.5	63.1	75.2
% Belong \geq 1 Jewish Org.	28.2	27.0	100.0*
% Who Have Been To Israel	26.2	33.8	38.1
% Who Are Synagogue Members	32.9	46.3	73.5

* Rs drawn from list of members of at least one organization.

A major consequence of the considerable intermarriage rate is the propensity of many Jewish families to be raising their children either in a religious void or else within the religion of a non-Jewish partner. The major implication of this propensity is that the already low level of Jewish fertility is further exacerbated by the fact that a significant proportion of children born to Jewish men or women are not being raised Jewish (Abma and Mott 1993). At the national level, this fact

further reduces the already below replacement level fertility by a significant percentage. Its impact in Columbus is similarly felt. As may be seen in Table 9, about 75% of children in Columbus Jewish house-

Table 9. Religion of Children: Percent of Children in Household Being "Raised Jewish" in Husband-Wife Families

	<u>Columbus</u>		U.S. Couples
	List Couples	RDD Couples	
% Children being "Raised Jewish"	94.7	74.2	68.4
Total Intermarried	61.4	44.2	32.7
Mother Jewish	92.7	67.4	—
Father Jewish	28.2	18.4	—
Respondent 18-44			63.4
Total Intermarried			34.7
Mother Jewish			47.8
Father Jewish			22.8
Respondent 45 and Over			74.9
Total Intermarried			31.1

Source: Abma and Mott, 1993

holds are being raised Jewish—compared with 68% for the U.S. overall (Abma and Mott 1993). This difference almost totally reflects the fact that fewer than half of Columbus children in intermarried households—44%—are being raised Jewish. If the mother is Jewish but not the father, the estimate is 67%, whereas if the father is Jewish and the mother not, the percent is 18! The proportion of children raised Jewish in list households is somewhat higher, 61% compared with 44%. Recall that only 19% of Jewish list families are intermarried.

WITHIN-COMMUNITY VARIATION

The modest growth of the Columbus Jewish population over the past quarter century has been accompanied by considerable population dispersion. The 1969 Columbus study suggested that the largest proportion of the Columbus Jewish population lived in the near east side of the city. Of course, this result must be subject to the caveat that

most of the information collected at that time was gathered from individuals known to the Jewish community and that only a very modest attempt was made to "count" the complete Jewish population. The effort which was made was based on only 1,000 random telephone calls throughout the metropolitan area. As we have indicated, the Columbus Jewish population in 1990 is quite dispersed, although, as may be seen in Table 10, the traditional Jewish areas still have the greatest concentration of Jewish population. As of 1990, the near-east area (essentially zip code 43209), which includes the independent city of Bexley which is surrounded on all sides by Columbus, as well as two residential areas within Columbus, Eastmoor, and Berwick, is still heavily Jewish. Over 20% of the households in Bexley itself are estimated to be Jewish, and about ten percent of the households in the contiguous Eastmoor and Berwick neighborhoods of Columbus (essentially the remainder of zip code 43209) are Jewish. As may be seen from Table 11, about one-third of the Jewish population but 43% of the list population live in this area even though it encompasses only about three percent of the Columbus population.

The next heaviest concentration of Jewish population is in the far east area which encompasses zip code 43213, in which in 1990 about six percent of the households were Jewish. It is also a relatively older residential area for Jewish families and includes the largest Reform temple in Columbus. It is an area which fairly recently had a substantial population of younger Jewish families, but which now appears to have a relatively large proportion of middle-aged to older Jewish adults, as children have aged or as families with younger children have moved either back towards the Bexley area or into other newer suburban areas. The remainder of the east side includes several independent communities, which in some instances are havens for growing Jewish populations, disproportionately younger family units. A comparison of Jewish Federation mailing lists for 1990 and 1993 and examination of the 1993 Jewish Community Center membership list provides strong impressionistic evidence that there continues to be significant growth in the Jewish population, particularly younger family households, in these far east areas, partially at the expense of the closer-in east side. However, given the substantial Jewish population in the nearest side, there has not, as of 1993, been any dramatic impact on the community mix.

The areas highlighted above account for about half the Columbus Jewish population. The remaining 50% live either on the northern

perimeter of the community or, for the most part, in a belt running through central Columbus, from the near south side, through the Ohio State University area, extending into the near north areas of the community. For the most part, the density of Jewish population in these

Table 10. Density of Jewish Population in Selected Areas, 1990:
Percent of Households Jewish

All Columbus	2.3
Perimeter North	2.2
Zip 43220	3.8
Bexley Area	9.1
Zip 43209	15.7
Bexley	21.1
Non-Bexley	10.3
East-Southeast	2.4
Zip 43213	5.9
Other Columbus	1.7
Zip 43201	4.9
Zip 43202	3.9
Zip 43206	3.1

areas is modest but growing slightly. We estimate that perhaps half the Jews, but only 30% of the "list" Jewish population, lives in these areas. These are areas which reported very few Jews at the time of the 1969 Jewish population survey, but have witnessed substantial growth since that time, largely through in-migration to the community. As of this date, this substantial area, which encompasses most of the metropolitan area population and half of the Jewish RDD population, has one Reform temple (not counting facilities located on the OSU campus) in comparison with the three Orthodox, one Conservative and two Reform congregations on the east side of town.

Table 11 highlights the tremendous diversity in the Jewish community. While somewhat of an oversimplification, the Columbus Jewish community may be thought of as having two distinct components. One is a population subgroup which has had long-standing ties with the Columbus area and typically has stronger links with the local religious institutions including the synagogues. This population, on average, is more likely to follow religious traditions. Part of the reason that this population, which is on the east side of the community, lives where it

does is clearly for proximity to services-synagogues (particularly for the Orthodox, many of whom need to be within walking distance of a synagogue), kosher butcher and Jewish Community Center. The nature of the causality between residence and involvement is, of course, multi-directional; involved community members want to live near essential services, but living in a "Jewish neighborhood" can also enhance community involvement.

The distinctiveness of the Bexley and, to some extent, the far east areas may be seen readily from the statistics in Table 11. About 94% of the residents of RDD households in the Bexley area are Jewish, compared with about 70% for the other areas. The Bexley area also has the largest percentage of Jewish population locally born and by far the smallest percentage expecting to move within the next three years; 37% were born in Columbus compared with 26% on the far east—but only nine percent on the Perimeter North. From an institutional perspective, about 80% of Bexley area families belong to a synagogue, 68% on the far east, but less than 30% in the other two areas. Bexley area residents are much more likely to volunteer in the Jewish community whereas perimeter north residents are most likely to volunteer in the general community. One important implication of this contrast seems apparent. The relatively shorter length of residence which the north side residents have in the community is not apparently an impediment to broader secular community involvement. Rather, it suggests a different set of community priorities. Further evidence of the distinction between the two segments of the Jewish community may be seen from the statistics on monetary contributions and other membership involvement. Much larger percentages of residents on the east side contribute to the Federation annual fund and about 80% of Jewish Community Center members live on the east side, with over half being in the immediately contiguous 43209 zip code area.

Shifting from the institutional to the more directly religious dimension, parallel evidence may be noted. About 18% of Bexley area families consider themselves Orthodox and 42% Conservative—much larger proportions than in the other areas. The far east and perimeter north areas, which include the two largest Reform synagogues, also have the largest proportion of their residents being Reform. The perimeter north and "other" Columbus areas have by far the largest proportion of Jewish residents who do not identify with any of the three dominant denominational groups.

While large majorities of Jewish residents in all parts of Columbus have themselves attended Hebrew school, almost 90% of Bexley area

Table 11. Variations Within Columbus¹

A. Social and Demographic										
	RDD Pop.	Dist. of List Pop.	% Jewish RDD Pop.	% < 10	RDD Pop.	Mean HH Size	% Born Colum (List)	% Likely to Move in next 3 Yrs.		
									25-64	59.9
Perimeter N.	23.5	20.8	69.4	24.5	59.9	2.8	8.6	29.3		
Bexley Area	30.5	42.5	94.2	18.2	45.6	3.2	37.8	13.0		
ESE Columbus	18.8	26.9	73.9	15.5	58.8	2.5	26.2	26.3		
Other	27.3	9.8	71.2	9.5	64.7	2.0	22.1	47.8		

B. Religious Identification and Observance						
	% Orth.	% Cons.	% Reform	% Raised Orth.	% Ever At. Heb Sch'l	% Kids in Heb Sch'l
Bexley Area	18.7	41.5	31.6	37.3	85.5	87.9
ESE Columbus	3.4	29.1	52.7	22.5	84.2	26.7
Other	4.4	33.8	27.6	13.4	78.0	—

¹ Unless otherwise specified, estimates relate to RDD respondents.

Table 11.¹ Continued

RITUAL OBSERVANCE (% Always/Usually)

	Light Shabbat Candles	Attend Seder	Buy Kosher Meat	Fast Yom Kippur	Have Xmas Tree
Perimeter N.	16.4	57.0	10.4	50.7	49.9
Bexley Area	51.8	91.7	29.0	73.1	10.4
ESE Columbus	21.0	85.2	8.7	76.1	20.3
Other	3.7	68.7	3.7	56.6	15.9

C. Social - Integrative

	% Belong to Syn.	% Vol. Jewish Comm.	% Vol. Gen'l Comm.	% Contrib. Fed.	Mem' ship in Fed. JCC	% w/ Parents in Columbus
Perimeter N.	28.6	15.8	44.7	17.8	18.3	6.9
Bexley Area	79.3	49.7	37.8	69.7	39.9	56.8
ESE Columbus	67.8	14.4	22.3	53.6	25.8	23.7
Other	21.9	1.5	37.8	15.8	16.0	12.5

¹ Unless otherwise specified, estimates relate to RDD respondents.

residents with children are sending their children to Hebrew school—compared with well under 50% for the other areas of town. Bexley area residents are also much more likely to light Sabbath candles and buy kosher meat. In contrast, the variations for the seasonal religious activities, such as attending seders, lighting Hanukkah candles (not reported in table), and fasting on Yom Kippur are more modest, although in all instances, perimeter north residents have the least level of involvement. From a mirror image perspective, almost half of all the RDD households on the northern perimeter have a Christmas tree. This phenomenon is frequently linked with intermarriage and, arguably, with very weak identification with Judaism (Medding, Tobin, Fishman and Rimor 1992).

It is perhaps fair to generalize from the community pattern which we have described for Columbus to the larger Jewish world. Columbus in some ways is clearly mirroring U.S. Judaism and in other respects is perhaps a unique entity, reflecting to some extent its unique history. The uniqueness of Columbus partially rests on its socio-economic environment and its ability to continue to draw Jews from other parts of the U.S. and, more recently, from the Soviet Union. The essential nature of its economy has meant the Jewish population, even more so than the Jewish population nationwide, is well educated and relatively well off economically. It, thus, is perhaps in the fortunate position of being able to service its community and indeed, contribute its "fair share" to others.

The migration dimension, from a religious and community perspective, has both positive and negative implications. From a positive perspective, the net in-migration has enabled the Jewish community to more than hold its own demographically. However, it also means that a large proportion of the Jewish community is inherently very mobile with all that this may imply for not readily developing roots or, if you will, becoming fully integrated religiously or socially into the Jewish community. A disproportionate share of the in-migrants settle in areas of Columbus which are not the traditional Jewish residential areas. These are areas which frequently have newer residential housing, are closer to suburban employment opportunities, and are the dominant growth areas in the Columbus metropolitan area. For reasons of personal choice as well as physical propinquity, the linkages between many of the more recent arrivals and longer term residents, not surprisingly, are weak. Additionally, the available evidence suggests that the same arrivals are disproportionately more assimilated Jews with perhaps weaker ties to their religion. This suggestion is also consistent

with the general notion that individuals more willing to make moves away from their communities of origin (in this case, disproportionately migrants from larger eastern cities) may identify less strongly with the value systems of the communities and, indeed, subcultures of their origin communities.

We have suggested that there may be, while not a dichotomy, at least a distinctive separation between segments of the Columbus community, distinctions which probably have social as well as religious bases. It could be that this pattern is more pronounced in Columbus than in many other areas, simply because the Columbus Jewish population is more mobile than most. The basic thesis of religious identity being a determinant as well as a consequence of integration with the larger social fabric is probably a universal. We have shown for Columbus that there is a strong religious fabric, although perhaps not as strong as in earlier decades. However, this statement must be made cautiously. The inherently superficial nature of much of the available data which probes into overt behaviors rather than more subtle notions about attitudes and values undoubtedly biases studies such as ours towards the more traditional notions of what a religion is or should be. It is easy to make the leap from non-observance along traditional dimensions to non-belonging. What may be needed in a community such as Columbus—or analogously for the larger national community—is a greater effort to incorporate more disparate notions of what religion does or can mean to individuals. It may be that more heterogeneous social, intellectual and religious forms of outreach activities are needed for the twenty-first century. In the case of Columbus, it may not be possible to abstract religious from other social forms of "interventions" if one's objective is to strengthen the local Jewish *community* as well as enhancing the "religious well-being" of *individuals*.

CONCLUSION

What may be concluded? It is clear that the results and what they suggest are not unambiguous. They are contingent not only on how one defines Jewishness but, more importantly, on what is one's reference group. In many respects, comparing Columbus Jewry with the overall U.S. Jewish population is less than satisfactory, as the U.S. and Columbus Jewish populations are extraordinarily heterogeneous—culturally, socio-economically and demographically. Indeed, it is suggested that while, demographically, there may be an "average" American Jew, there may not be an average American Jewish commu-

nity and that, even at the community level, "average" statistics mask an essential heterogeneity. The variations between communities largely reflect the particular histories of the communities as well as their contemporary economic circumstance.

There is always a temptation to make value judgments regarding the relative status of any community. As we have shown, it is not easy to make generalizations about the "Jewishness" of the Columbus community. The generalizations depend, first of all, on what one compares Columbus with and, second of all, what one views as the ideal. At best, one's perspective is closely tied with one's inherent optimism or pessimism, whether the cup is "half empty or half full."

As we have shown, Columbus itself has a very heterogeneous community. It is increasingly dispersed geographically, with different kinds of Jews settling in different parts of the metropolitan area. One constant seems to be a continued concentration of multi-generation Jewish families on the east, particularly near-east side of town, the area which includes most of the synagogues and temples, the Jewish Community Center and the only kosher butcher and bakery. As we have shown, respondents in these areas, particularly those in the closer-in Bexley-Eastmoor-Berwick neighborhoods, are much more likely to be affiliated with a synagogue or the Jewish Community Center, are much more likely to follow the various rituals, and are substantially more likely to be raising their children Jewish. Many of these factors are intimately linked with the fact that families in these areas are more likely to be longer term Columbus residents and are less likely to be intermarried. Their lower intermarriage rate probably reflects not only the more traditional background of families on the east side, but additionally the greater concentration of Jewish adults and children; Jewish children and adults in this area are more likely to encounter Jews in their everyday school and neighborhood related experiences, factors which enhance the likelihood of endogamous dating and marriage. This is not to say that changes are not occurring. There is indeed evidence that the east-side community is spreading out further to the east, northeast, and southeast. This "spreading" is not yet fully defined, but undoubtedly has important implications for the future of the Jewish community, particularly regarding the location and ability to render religious, social and communal services to a community which is becoming increasingly geographically diverse and perhaps religiously and culturally heterogeneous. These are difficult issues to resolve for a Jewish community which is only modest in size. While Columbus appears to have at least held its own, showing a modest

growth in population over the past quarter century, it is not clear that available resources will be able to cope with the needs of a population which is increasingly dispersed geographically. Logistic complications associated with this geographic dispersion can only be further accentuated by the reality that increasing proportions of the Columbus Jewish community are not only further distant from the Jewish "core," but that those geographically furthest from the center have the weakest ties, religiously and socially, with the traditional religious community "hub." Some of this dispersion reflects the heavy in-migration of Jews less affiliated with the community to the non "core" areas. As we have shown, this segment of the community has weaker ties with the formal religious structures and identifies less strongly with the religion. However, as we have also shown, recent in-migration does not have to imply lesser affiliation, as shown by the high rate of volunteerism by non-core residents in secular activities. In this regard, Columbus certainly is not unique as this dispersion of Jewish population with its attendant logistic problems is occurring in many communities (see: Goldstein 1987: 143).

Perhaps somewhat analogously, the American Jewish population is becoming increasingly dispersed geographically with most of the "core" population—those maintaining contact with the religious institutions and rituals—being increasingly concentrated in the larger geographic centers. As is true for Columbus, the causal linkages between residence and involvement with the religion are difficult to interpret; individuals more concerned with institutional linkages and rituals are undoubtedly more likely to choose residences close to organized Jewish communities (Goldstein and Kosmin 1992: 234-235). In turn, having access to religious institutions can enhance an individual's and family's ability to be involved with one's religion both culturally and religiously. Proximity is certainly closely linked with religious social networking, in particular the ability of children and young adults to interact meaningfully with others of the same faith. In this regard, the parallels between Columbus and the U.S. Jewish populations are clear and, from our perspective, disturbing. The resolution of issues associated with the direction of causality between religious involvement and location of residence are well beyond the scope of this particular paper, but are at the heart of the current discussions about the meaning behind the high level of intermarriage of the younger adult Jewish population. In this regard, recent comments by Bernard Reisman are perhaps appropriate (Reisman 1992: 355):

in light of . . . transforming changes in the shaping of Jewish identity, it can be misleading to assess the level of Jewish interest and commitment of today's Jews based on the standards of a prior generation. This is a critical consideration in policy decision, specifically with regard to the controversial question of outreach initiatives to the 'marginals'—primarily the intermarrieds and those minimally or not affiliated with synagogues or other Jewish organizations.

In a world which is severely cost constrained, particularly in smaller communities, meeting the needs of the full Jewish community becomes increasingly difficult, given that those living further from the traditional Jewish centers have interests which are less well defined than those which have been typically expressed by the traditional and often longer-standing members of the community. Finding mechanisms to incorporate this "outlying population" or clarifying whether it is indeed possible to do so, represent, in our estimation, the critical questions for contemporary American Jewry.

NOTES

* The authors acknowledge the outstanding word processing assistance of Judy Doty. The views expressed are those of the authors and in no way represent those of any other individuals or organizations.

¹ Some of this growth reflects annexation and not natural increase or net gains through migration.

² The comparative statistics are synthesized in Mott and Mott (1990). Original sources for the various community comparisons made in this report may also be found in Mott and Mott (1990).

³ This, of course, is the intermarriage rate for all marriages. Based on the research, a first marriage exogamy rate might be somewhat lower (Kosmin, Lerer and Mayer, 1989).

REFERENCES

Abma, Joyce L. and Frank Mott. 1993. "Intermarriage, Childbearing, and Intergenerational Transmission of Jewish Identity: Prospects For the Future of American Jewry." Paper presented at the 1993 Meetings of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, August, Miami, Florida.

Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York. 1984. *The Jewish Population of Greater New York: A Profile*. New York.

ei Goldstein, Sidney. 1993. "Profile of American Jewry: Insights from the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey." Occasional Papers No. 6 (May). New York: North American Jewish Data Bank.

_____. 1987. "Population Trends in American Jewry." *Judaism. A Quarterly Journal of Jewish Life and Thought* 36:135-146.

Goldstein, Sidney and Barry A. Kosmin. 1992. "Religious and Ethnic Self- Identification in the United States 1989-90: A Case Study of the Jewish Population." *Ethnic Groups* 9: 219-245.

ei Horowitz, Bethamie and Jeffrey R. Soloman. 1992. "Why is this City Different from Other Cities? New York and the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey." *Journal of Jewish Communal Services* 68.4: 312-320.

Kosmin, Barry A., Sidney Goldstein, Joseph Waksberg, Nava Lerer, Ariella Keyser and Jeffrey Scheckner. 1991. *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*. New York: Council of Jewish Federations.

ei Kosmin, Barry A., Nava Lerer and Egon Mayer. 1989. "Intermarriage, Divorce, and Remarriage Among American Jews, 1982-87." Family Research Series, No. 1, (August). New York: North American Jewish Data Bank.

Mayer, Albert. 1969. *Columbus Jewish Population Study: 1969*. Columbus: Columbus Jewish Welfare Foundation.

ei Medding, Peter Y., Gary A. Tobin, Sylvia Barack Fishman and Mordechai Rimor. 1992. "Jewish Identity in Conversionary and Mixed Marriages." Pp. 3-76 in *American Jewish Year Book 1992*. New York: The American Jewish Committee.

Metropolitan Human Services Commission. 1993. "Franklin County Community Trends 1993." Columbus, Ohio.

Mott, Frank L. and Joyce Abma. 1992. "Contemporary Jewish Fertility: Does Religion Make A Difference." *Contemporary Jewry* 13: 74-94.

Mott, Frank L. and Susan H. Mott. 1990. *The 1990 Jewish Population Study of Greater Columbus*. Columbus: The Columbus Jewish Federation.

_____. 1989. "Results of Random Digit Dialing for Jewish Households in Franklin County." Unpublished Manuscript. Columbus, Ohio.

_____. 1988. "Using a Market Survey for Characterizing the American Jewish Population: The Utility of the National Family

Opinion (NFO) Panel for Surveying American Jews." In *Towards a National Survey in 1990*. edited by Sidney Goldstein, Sidney Grueneman, Frank L. Mott and Joseph Waksberg. New York: Council of Jewish Federations.

Rafael, Mark Lee. 1979. *Jews and Judaism in A Midwestern Community: Columbus, Ohio 1840-1975*. Columbus: Ohio Historical Society

Reisman, Bernard. 1992. "The Leadership Implications of the National Jewish Population Survey." *Journal of Jewish Communal Service* 68: 350-358.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1972. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1972 (93rd edition)*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Office.

_____. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1993* (113th edition). Washington D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Office.

Waksberg, Joseph. N.D. "Sample Design of the 1990 NJPS" Working Paper.