

SOURCES OF STATISTICS ON JEWISH VITAL EVENTS
AND MIGRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

SIDNEY GOLDSTEIN

In the most r
Jewish population, Dr.
task of drawing even a
graphic situation of wo
by vast lacunae in our
true in the United Stat
knowledge of the Jewish
premium placed on separ
United States, a questi
any decennial U.S. cens
marriage records of two
vital registration recor
or divorce. In the gene
prehensive information c
social scientists concer
ligious differentials ar
largely on specialized s
But in most instances, b
total population, the sa
several hundred Jews and
by making comprehensive
difficult, if not imposs
reasons, Jewish groups h
own data on the size, di
processes of the Jewish
than 20 Jewish communiti

Introduction

In the most recent definitive work on the world's Jewish population, Dr. U.O. Schmelz points out that "the task of drawing even a rough outline of the present demographic situation of world Jewry is greatly complicated by vast lacunae in our knowledge"⁽¹⁾. This is especially true in the United States where major gaps exist in our knowledge of the Jewish population. Because of the high premium placed on separation of church and state in the United States, a question on religion has not appeared in any decennial U.S. census, nor, with the exception of the marriage records of two states, does it appear in the vital registration records on births, deaths, marriage, or divorce. In the general absence of official and comprehensive information on religion from official sources, social scientists concerned with research in which religious differentials are a key focus have had to rely largely on specialized surveys to obtain their data⁽²⁾. But in most instances, because those surveys focus on the total population, the sample seldom includes more than several hundred Jews and often considerably fewer, thereby making comprehensive analyses of the Jewish subgroup difficult, if not impossible. For these and other reasons, Jewish groups have felt the need to collect their own data on the size, distribution, composition and vital processes of the Jewish population. Since 1955, more than 20 Jewish communities have undertaken such surveys⁽³⁾.

Currently, the National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) is in the process of providing the first comprehensive picture of the Jewish demographic situation in the United States as a whole.

Other papers at this Seminar are focussing on the overall purpose of NJPS and its design. This paper is intended to review what sources have been available to date on the vital statistics of the American Jewish population and in what ways NJPS will provide new sources and new insights on the growth and redistribution patterns of the Jewish population in the United States. To the extent that low fertility, out-marriages, and growth rates are of special interest as part of the wider general concern of Jewish survival, the availability of information on births, deaths, intermarriages, and migration becomes particularly crucial to any analysis of the demographic situation of American Jewry. Here, each of these events will be reviewed from several perspectives: first, to examine the sources of data available to date and their limitations; next, to examine the contributions to be made by NJPS; and finally, looking beyond NJPS, to indicate those sources of data which may provide a continuing picture in the future of what is happening to the vital processes of American Jewry. It is tempting to compare the American situation with that of Jewish communities in other countries, but since a comprehensive world overview has already been provided by Dr. Schmelz's study, this discussion will very largely be limited to the United States.

PAST SOURCES OF VITAL AND MIGRATION STATISTICS

Fertility

Insights on American Jewish fertility have had to be based on sample survey studies. These fall into several categories. Since religion has been recognized as a major factor affecting fertility behavior, it has been included in all major fertility surveys undertaken since the 1940's, beginning with the screening phase of the Indianapolis Study⁽⁴⁾. Most of the national information on the fertility behavior and attitudes of Jews⁽⁵⁾ is a by-product of the several rounds of the Growth of American Families Studies (GAF) and the Princeton Fertility Studies. However, the 1955 GAF Study⁽⁶⁾ included only 66 Jewish couples; and the 1960 round of GAF⁽⁷⁾ as well as the 1957 and 1960 phases of the Princeton Study⁽⁸⁾ included only a little over 100 Jewish couples. Detailed analysis of these data for purposes of measuring Jewish fertility behavior is therefore greatly restricted.

In its Current Population Survey of March, 1957, the U.S. Bureau of the Census included a question, "What is his religion?"⁽⁹⁾. Unlike the decennial census, the monthly survey, which encompassed 35,000 households, is voluntary. In addition to providing one of the best bases for determining the religious composition of the American population and the social and economic characteristics of religious groups⁽¹⁰⁾, the survey also provided information on the number of children ever born to ever married women⁽¹¹⁾. Tabulated by age of mother, these data corroborate the low fertility levels of the Jewish population.

To date, a comparable question on religion has not been included in any succeeding Current Population Survey. The 1957 data therefore remain a unique source of official statistics on Jewish fertility in the United States.

Some limited insights into Jewish fertility may be provided by the November 1969 supplement to the Current Population Survey⁽¹²⁾ which included several questions on various dimensions of the ethnic composition of the American population. One question asked foreign languages spoken in the respondent's home when he was a child; a second asked the respondent's origin or descent. These questions should yield some information on the Jewish population, the first largely through identification of persons listing Yiddish as the language spoken in their childhood home, the second through respondents listing themselves as Jewish in origin or descent rather than listing the country from which their forefathers came to the United States. A question on number of children ever born permits evaluation of ethnic differentials in fertility. However, use of the data for measuring Jewish fertility holds little promise since neither ethnic question can be expected to yield a comprehensive, representative coverage of the total Jewish population. Relying on Yiddish spoken in childhood home biases the sample in favor of older persons and those coming from Eastern Europe. The second question is limited by the way in which different segments of the Jewish population identify themselves ethnically. Those who are marginal Jews as well as those who regard their Jewishness strictly in religious terms are more likely to respond to an origin question in terms of place of origin rather than Jewishness.

Given these limitations, the data from the November, 1969 CPS supplement will not be particularly valuable for measurement of the size or composition of the Jewish population or its fertility patterns. Inclusion of a question on languages spoken in the 1970 census will have the same limitation. The decennial census does not have a question on origin or descent except for Spanish and Latin American groups.

In 1967, in its National Birth Sample Survey, the National Center for Health Statistics began a three-year study focussing on health care received by the mother and her baby⁽¹³⁾. The survey collects information on the characteristics of the family, including the religious preference of both the mother and her husband. The additional availability of information on education and income provides the basis for measuring socio-economic differentials within religious groups. Collection of information on year of first marriage provides an opportunity to measure both age at marriage and relation of first birth to date of marriage. The sample for this study consists of approximately one in every 1,000 families out of approximately 4,000,000 U.S. families having a baby during each calendar year. Chosen from the registration records on births, it yields approximately 3,000 sample cases of whites. Assuming 3 per cent Jewish, this mail survey will yield about 90 Jewish cases each year. The processing of the 1967 sample is about to be finished; the 1968 and 1969 data are in various stages of collection. While representing a possible new source of information on fertility, the number of cases will be small;

and in the absence of an annual base population, the chance to calculate rates is restricted.

Reflecting the frustrations due to inadequate official statistics on Jewish fertility and to the limited number of cases of Jews in nationwide general fertility surveys, an increasing number of Jewish community surveys have included direct questions on fertility⁽¹⁴⁾. By providing information for a large number of cases on number of children ever born classified by age of mother and other key variables, these studies permit detailed analyses of fertility patterns. In the Providence⁽¹⁵⁾ and Springfield⁽¹⁶⁾ studies, for example, such data were exploited through cohort analysis to ascertain trends in Jewish fertility as well as to ascertain the effects of age of marriage, education, social class, generation status, Jewish identification, and intermarriage on fertility levels. Inclusion of a question in the Springfield study on expected future births added to the insights provided by the cohort analysis and demonstrated the influence of education on the levels of Jewish fertility among younger segments of the population.

Jewish community surveys have considerably greater value than the national fertility surveys with small numbers of Jews, and are superior to measurement of fertility based solely on events recorded in or dealt with by Jewish institutions, such as use of returns from Mohelim (ritual circumcision) in Britain⁽¹⁷⁾. On the other hand, community surveys may yield unrepresentative results if the universe for selection of the sample is biased in favor of households included in master lists of the community. Also, a given community may not be

representative of the country as a whole; depending on its size, location, and the generation status of its population, considerable deviation from national averages may occur.

Fertility analyses based on Jewish community surveys generally have the further limitation of not having directly comparable data available for the non-Jewish population. The first major American study to overcome this limitation was Lazerwitz's 1966 and 1967 investigation of fertility differentials among Jews, Protestants, and Catholics in Cook (including Chicago) and Southern Lake Counties in Illinois⁽¹⁸⁾. Collection of 572 Jewish interviews provides a significant body of data for analysis of Jewish fertility and for comparison of Jewish patterns with those of non-Jewish groups. The possibility of similar comparative studies with adequate numbers of Jews holds promise as an important source of future information on Jewish fertility.

Mortality

Death records in the United States do not include information on religion. Nor has the National Mortality Sample Survey conducted annually by the National Center for Health Statistics ever included religion among the information collected⁽¹⁹⁾. Substitute sources must therefore serve as the basis for identifying the Jewish deceased in order to measure the level of Jewish mortality and the extent to which it resembles that of the general population with respect to sex and age specific rates and cause of death. No recent study exists in which the

sample survey approach has been used to measure Jewish mortality in the United States. Several reasons exist for this.

Relying on a general, conventional survey to identify recent deaths would require an unusually large sample to yield enough cases to compute stable rates. For example, a survey of 2,000 households containing approximately 6,500 persons could be expected to have had only about 65 deaths in the year preceding the survey. Moreover, such survey statistics may be biased in favor of those deceased who left behind them a family unit to be included in the survey sample⁽²⁰⁾; deceased persons who had lived alone are not as likely to be identified. Given these several considerations, Jewish community population surveys in the U.S. to date have not attempted to encompass mortality.

Attention has therefore focused on sources of information for directly identifying Jewish deceased. Among the clues used in several studies are the place of burial of the deceased and the particular funeral directors who handled the funeral. However, the value of such information probably varies, depending on whether burial is restricted to cemeteries identified with a particular religious group and on whether funerals are largely handled by funeral directors of the same religious denomination as the deceased. Studies in New York City⁽²¹⁾ and in St. Louis⁽²²⁾ indicate, for example, that a very high percentage of Jewish funerals are handled by a restricted number of funeral directors and that practically all Jewish burials occur in a Jewish cemetery. In the New York study, however, which was restricted to identifying

religious affiliation on the basis of cemetery of internment, over 20 percent of the total deaths had to be regarded as of unspecified religion because the bodies were either cremated, interred out of town, or buried in the city cemetery. These unspecified deaths were allocated to each religious group in the same proportion as the "specified" deaths based on known place of burial, thereby weakening the value of this particular study for an analysis of Jewish mortality.

Another serious limitation in these studies was the absence of information on the Jewish population whose deaths were being analyzed⁽²³⁾. In the absence of exact information on the age and sex structure of the Jewish community, any analysis of the number of deaths and the age composition of the deceased has limited value for measuring differentials. Since age composition in particular is a major variable in affecting the overall level of mortality, information on age-specific mortality is essential if the mortality experience of the Jews and of the total population are to be compared in a meaningful way.

Studies of three communities - Providence, Rhode Island; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and Detroit, Michigan - have overcome the major limitations inherent in the earlier attempts to measure Jewish mortality⁽²⁴⁾. For each of these communities, Jewish deaths were initially gathered from the records of "Jewish" funeral directors, who, with rare exception, are responsible for handling all Jewish deaths in their respective communities. In the case of Providence, all of these deaths were further checked in the files of the State Division of Vital Statistics⁽²⁵⁾.

These records were used to ascertain age, sex, and cause of death. In each of the communities, surveys of the Jewish population provided the base population data necessary for computation of age and sex specific death rates and for construction of life tables. In their paper on Jewish mortality in the United States, Fauman and Mayer⁽²⁶⁾ combined the data from these three communities to give a first approximation of national Jewish mortality patterns. The results show that for both males and females expectation of life from birth through age 64 was higher for Jews than for the total white population. At age 65, Jewish expectation of life was lower. It must now be determined whether the patterns based on these three communities are typical of a properly representative national sample. The acquisition of such national data remains a major challenge facing Jewish demography in the United States.

Intermarriage

In contrast to the complete absence of a question on religion in birth and death records, information on religion is collected directly as part of the marriage record in two states: Iowa beginning in 1953 and Indiana beginning in 1960. For selected years, the data from both the Iowa⁽²⁷⁾ and the Indiana⁽²⁸⁾ records have been analyzed to ascertain intermarriage rates. Since both states record religion professed at the time of marriage, the measurement of intermarriage is restricted to those couples in which one spouse reports a religion different from that of the other. Conversions occurring before

marriage therefore are not measurable. To this extent, the calculated rates represent minimal intermarriage figures.

A similar objection characterizes the data on intermarriage derived from the March, 1957, Current Population Survey⁽²⁹⁾. Since religious identification was based on the question "What is his religion?", it did not identify as Jewish those who were born or raised as Jews but who converted to another religion before March, 1957. Nor were converts to Judaism separately identifiable. Intermarriage rates like those of the Iowa and Indiana studies therefore refer to spouses of different religious preference at the time of the survey. The census survey found that 7.2 percent of all married couples in which one spouse was Jewish had a non-Jewish partner. However, this represents a minimum intermarriage rate, since it excludes the unknown number who had converted and who appeared as homogamous marriages. The intermarriages are further underenumerated because those Jews who intermarry may have a greater than average tendency to report themselves as without religion instead of as Jewish. To correct for these deficiencies, a question on the religion into which the person was born or in which he was raised is essential; but this type of question is unlikely to be introduced either into official marriage records or future census surveys.

In the United States, it is the community population survey that has been the major mechanism for measuring intermarriage⁽³⁰⁾. By asking both current religion and religion at birth of all married persons in the household, it is possible to identify those couples

who are currently of mixed religion as well as those religiously homogamous couples in which one of the partners was born non-Jewish. This procedure was used, for example, in both the Providence and the Springfield studies. The importance of obtaining data on conversion is illustrated by the Providence data⁽³¹⁾ which show that 2.6 percent of all married couples included one partner who was non-Jewish at the time of the survey. But an additional 1.9 percent constituted couples in which the non-Jewish partner had converted to Judaism, making the marriage homogamous by the time of the study. Moreover, further information on the extent of intermarriage was obtained by ascertaining whether those children of the head of household who were living away from home had intermarried, and, if so, whether one of the partners had converted. This procedure is particularly valuable in detecting Jewish individuals who intermarry and convert to a non-Jewish faith. Finally, by getting religion of all household members, including young children, it is possible to ascertain whether children of mixed marriages are being raised as Jews, a key consideration for future growth.

The Providence study also illustrates a weakness of community population surveys for purposes of measuring intermarriage. To the extent that the samples for such surveys are often largely based on master lists of the Jewish community, they represent households identified with the community. Marginal households and especially those in which the Jewish partner to an intermarriage has converted to a non-Jewish religion or has simply "given up" his or her Jewishness are not likely

to be included in the sample. To overcome this, a sample based on a master list must be supplemented with one chosen on an area basis⁽³²⁾. Providing questions are asked about both current religion and religion at birth, and reliable answers are obtained, the latter should identify those intermarriages which otherwise would be missed. Given the important impact which intermarriage may have on future growth patterns of the community, it is particularly crucial that surveys make provision to identify the full range of cases.

Migration

Among the demographic concerns which have received the least attention in research on the American Jewish population is the redistribution of Jews within the United States through the process of migration. For such an analysis, national data are essential. Yet, only two very limited sets of information are available, and neither lends itself to analysis of the dynamics of population redistribution.

The 1957 CPS report contains data on the distribution of the members of each religious group among the major regions of the United States and between urban and rural places of residence⁽³³⁾. Within the urban group, it also distinguishes the number living in urbanized places of 250,000 and over and those in other urban places. The concentration of Jews in the Northeastern region and in large urban places is clearly documented by these data. But in the absence of comparable materials for later years, no evidence for measuring the extent of change in

residential distribution is available. Moreover, even the 1957 CPS did not ascertain the extent and character of migration differentials among religious groups.

The annual reports in the American Jewish Year-book contain information on the Jewish population of the United States by state and specific localities within states⁽³⁴⁾. Many of the estimates are too poor in quality, however, to warrant definitive use of these data for estimating redistribution⁽³⁵⁾ and, like the census survey, they contain no information on migration per se.

The only insights gained on the role of migration in Jewish population redistribution come from local Jewish community surveys. In some of these surveys, considerable attention has been given to migration, including questions on date of movement into the state, city, and house of residence at the time of the survey; and the place of residence before the last move. In this way, redistribution of population both within the area under investigation and the role of in-migration as a factor in the growth of the total area's Jewish population can be ascertained. Losses through out-migration are more difficult to identify since most local surveys restrict themselves to persons resident in the area at the time of the survey. Some limited insights into out-migration can, however, be obtained by inclusion of questions on residence of children of heads of household in the survey sample⁽³⁶⁾. Also, insights into possible future movement may be obtained through questions on plans to move within the next one to five years and the anticipated destination of such a move.

To date the importance of migration in the future development and growth of the American Jewish community has been seriously underrated. The suburbanization of the Jewish population is a major development which may have significant impact on the vitality of the local community. The more widespread distribution it introduces into residential patterns will have an impact on rates of intermarriage, on the extent of integration of Jews into the total community, and on the ease with which ties can be maintained to the various Jewish institutions located in former areas of Jewish concentration. On the national scene, a higher rate of redistribution may also be occurring as Jews enter the salaried professional and executive world in increasing numbers and transfer or are transferred to branch firms located in places where large Jewish communities do not exist. Moreover, the repeated movement associated with such occupations may well be a new phenomenon on the American Jewish scene which may lead to less stable ties of the individual to the community. While local surveys can provide some insights, especially on the suburbanization phenomenon, national data are essential for a full evaluation of the extent, character, and implications of internal migration by Jews.

Historically, of course, international migration has been the major variable in the growth of the American Jewish community. While movement from abroad continues, albeit at a much lower level than in the late 19th and early 20th century, information on the volume and characteristics of such movement is fragmentary. Since 1943, the category of Jews has been discontinued in official immigration statistics. Available data are based on three

sources⁽³⁷⁾: 1) emigrants from Israel to the United States tabulated by Israeli authorities; 2) immigrants assisted by HIAS; 3) estimates of non-assisted immigrants based on ratios of assisted to non-assisted migrants in those earlier years when information on both groups was available. The assumption that such ratios remain constant is questionable and consequently raises serious doubts about the accuracy of current estimates of immigration of Jews to the United States.

Vital and Migration Statistics from NJPS

Goals and Innovations

The overall purpose and design of the National Jewish Population Survey has been described elsewhere⁽³⁸⁾. This section of this paper will discuss those parts of NJPS which are designed to provide vital statistics on the American Jewish population, and, in so doing, permit the first comprehensive evaluation of the components of growth in that population. In designing these segments of the national study, several guidelines were followed:

- (1) NJPS will attempt to obtain as comprehensive and accurate data as possible on vital events about which we have minimal information and which are keys to understanding the present size and future growth of the American Jewish population.
- (2) These data will be obtained in a form which renders them most comparable to information on the general population collected in the 1970 decennial census and in vital statistics, thereby permitting

determination of the extent to which Jewish patterns resemble those of the non-Jewish population. (3) NJPS will try to overcome as many of the limitations as possible inherent in existing sources of data, including the local community surveys. (4) It will experiment with newly developed techniques which may permit us to exploit even further than originally intended this first opportunity to investigate nationally the vital processes of the Jewish population.

Before turning to the specific sets of data to be made available through NJPS, two major methodological innovations which should greatly enhance the value of all the information on vital processes to be collected need to be reviewed. The first of these developments, which will be especially important for data on intermarriage, is the determined effort being made in both the sample design and the associated screening processes to identify all persons who are currently Jewish, who were born Jewish, or whose father or mother was born Jewish. By allowing maximum opportunity for the identification as Jews or as former Jews of all such persons and by determining whether individuals converted to or from Judaism, the study will insure the widest possible coverage of the American Jewish population. Thus we can have confidence that the rates obtained reflect not only the behavior of individuals in the central files of Jewish community organizations but also those on the fringes and indeed even those who have left the Jewish community.

The major innovation in NJPS is in connection with the concerted effort being made to produce vital statistics. Until now, surveys have relied largely on

census type questions focussing on retrospective information to obtain insights into Jewish vital events. For births, this usually involved fertility histories providing data on the number of children ever born by age of mother and the cumulative number born by the end of reproduction. In the absence of direct fertility data, the child-woman ratio has also been relied upon to gain fertility insights. For marriage, surveys determined age at marriage, frequency of marriage, and whether it was a mixed marriage. Mortality data are notorious by their omissions from Jewish population surveys. Overall, survey data have rarely been used to assess current levels of fertility, mortality, and intermarriage. Yet current information is crucial to a full assessment of Jewish population growth patterns. Because of the dearth of vital statistics to meet this need, an alternative source is essential.

Dr. Monroe Sirken of the U.S. National Center for Health Statistics recently proposed an improved method of producing vital statistics from population surveys. In a paper presented before the Population Association of America in 1968⁽³⁹⁾, Dr. Sirken cited the need even in the United States for expanding the scope on vital records. Religion represents one such badly needed item. Through extensive discussion with Dr. Sirken, the appropriateness of his particular sample design was explored for use in NJPS to get current vital data on Jews. Let us first review the proposed method, drawing heavily on Dr. Sirken's paper, and then suggest its value for NJPS.

Births and deaths, like disease, occur with relative rarity in a population, so that any attempt to use a single-time population survey to enumerate vital

events occurring within a given calendar period is not likely to yield a sufficiently large number of cases to permit reliable and unbiased estimates of the event. In a conventional sample design, each sample household would report the number of vital events that occurred during the reference period to persons who reside in the household at the time of the survey and to persons who were formerly residents of the household and died during the reference period. From the reported events an unbiased sample estimate is derived of the number of vital events occurring in the total population represented by the sample.

As Dr. Sirken points out, the conventional survey has two major defects. One is the relatively large sampling variability due to the relative infrequency with which such events occur. For example, if NJPS should have a sample of 10,000 households of approximately 32,000 persons, the entire sample survey could be expected to yield about 480 births, 320 deaths, 250 marriages, 50 divorces and 25-50 intermarriages, if the conventional survey approach were used. Given the desirability of obtaining age specific birth rates and age and sex specific death rates, the numbers in each subsegment would be considerably smaller. The second problem, which is probably the lesser of the two for the Jewish population, is that measurement error may result from a given event being reported by more than one household, especially in those cases where a household dissolved, or in not being reported at all because no household remains to report it. Deaths of persons living alone are a case in point.

To overcome these limitations of the conventional approach, Dr. Sirken has proposed a survey design

with "multiplicity". The design "provides specifically for vital events to be reported by many households and indeed thrives upon multiple reporting of the same event by more than one household in the population"⁽⁴⁰⁾. This multiple reporting is achieved by requesting sample households to report vital events that occurred to persons in other households as well as those that occurred to its own members. The design with multiplicity specifies a rule that designates which non-members of the sample household are to be reported by the sample household. Alternative bases of the rule are possible. The one adopted for NJPS bases the rule on specified consanguine relationships between the persons in the sample household and persons in other households.

As used here, the multiplicity rule thereby provides clusters of households linked through consanguine relationships. The survey assigns to each reported vital event a multiplicity 's' which is an integer equal to the size of the cluster of related households in the population that would report the event according to the multiplicity rule. From the number of vital events reported by sample households and their assigned multiplicities, an unbiased sample estimate is derived of the number of events that occurred in the population during the calendar period.

The design with multiplicity largely overcomes the limitations inherent in the conventional approach. First, the number of vital events recorded is considerably increased through inclusion of events occurring to persons linked to the sample household by a consanguine relationship. Second, the likelihood of missing events

that occurred in a dissolved household is reduced by the increased probability that the event will be reported by a relative specified by the multiplicity rule. Response errors remain a problem, but by restricting the multiplicity rule to close relatives, errors can be reduced.

It is premature to say "what gains in accuracy and precision of estimate of vital statistics can be realized by the survey design with multiplicity"⁽⁴¹⁾. Theoretically, the design has considerable potential. It is currently being tested in a National Center of Health Statistics sponsored study in Los Angeles. Its promise seems sufficiently great to incorporate it into NJPS since the very purposes for which it is designed apply most appropriately to the needs of NJPS for statistics on births, deaths, marriages, divorces, and intermarriages among Jews. Without such an approach, NJPS would necessarily be restricted to relying on more traditional census type questions, precluding thereby the opportunity to gain important insights on the extent and character of current vital behavior among Jews.

In applying the multiplicity approach to the households in NJPS, the consanguine relationships for which data on vital events will be collected in addition to those recorded for household members are as follows: for births, the sisters and daughters of all household members; for deaths, the spouses, fathers, mothers, brothers, and sisters of all household members; for marriages and divorces, the children of all household members. A crude estimate indicates that use of multiplicity will increase the total number of births recorded to about 1500, the number of deaths to between

750-1000, the number of marriages to about 500-600, and divorces to about 100. Assuming that 10-20 percent of all marriages involve intermarriages, such cases would number 50-100. To achieve this number of vital events by a conventional survey would require at least a 30,000 household sample, and even then the risk of missing events occurring in single person households would remain. Use of multiplicity hopefully will therefore significantly enhance the contribution NJPS will make to the understanding of Jewish vital events. Retention of the standard retrospective questions will continue to yield a body of more traditional data on fertility and marriage. Together the data from multiplicity and the retrospective materials will provide a wealth of information on Jewish vital events in the United States unmatched in any respect in any previous local or national survey. A brief review of the information to become available follows.

Marriage, Divorce, and Intermarriage

For all currently married persons in the sample household, data will be obtained on number of previous marriages, date of marriage, religion of the partners at the time the couple met, and present religion. For those whose marriage was ended through death of a spouse, divorce, separation, or annulment, information will be collected on when the marriage was terminated and what the religion of the partners was at the time they met and at the time the marriage was terminated. These data provide the basis for ascertaining changing age at marriage, the extent of intermarriage and of conversion,

repeated marriage, the relation between intermarriage and marital dissolution, and the relation between intermarriage and fertility.

Obtaining data on the marital status and incidence of intermarriage for all children of all married household members, regardless of whether the children currently are members of the household, makes possible comparison of generational differences in intermarriage and conversion as well as determination of whether children of intermarried parents are more likely to intermarry than are children of homogamous marriages. The data from the multiplicity section will make available comparable data on all marriages, intermarriages, and divorces occurring during 1969 to members of the household and to all children of household members regardless of residence. Current rates, based on these data, will supplement the retrospective materials permitting thereby a thorough evaluation of changing marriage patterns.

Fertility

For every ever married woman, a complete fertility history will be obtained, including number of children born into the marriage, number of adopted children, date of birth of each child, sex, whether or not the child is still living and if not, the date of death. The religion in which the child was reared and his present religion will provide still an additional source of data on the extent of loss or gain through conversion. Together, these retrospective fertility data will permit measurement of cumulative fertility by

specific age. Coordinated use with the marriage and age data will allow determining whether and how the number and spacing of children has changed among different age and marriage cohorts. In addition, availability of a wealth of other data about the socio-economic, religious identification, and residence characteristics of the parents will permit evaluation of the extent and character of fertility differentials within the Jewish population.

Regretfully, time and cost limitations did not permit inclusion in the survey of a core of questions focussing on the use of family planning and on attitudes toward ideal family size. One question does, however, ask the number of additional children which each currently married couple with wife under age 45 expects to have. These data will prove useful in indicating the estimated completed family size of this younger segment of the population, thereby permitting some insights into the future course of Jewish fertility and how the completed fertility of these younger groups is likely to differ from that of older cohorts in the population.

The design for multiplicity will obtain data on all births occurring during 1969 both within the household and to daughters and sisters of all household members. Data on age of mother and on the age composition of the base population covered in NJPS will permit calculation of age specific fertility rates. Moreover, together with the data to be collected on mortality, the fertility information from the multiplicity design can be used to construct such measures as total, gross, and net reproduction rates and even rates of intrinsic growth. Since the multiplicity design does not include questions

on social and demographic characteristics other than age of the mothers for those living outside the household, no evaluation of these data to measure fertility differentials will be feasible. Despite this limitation, the data should provide the first opportunity to fully assess current Jewish fertility and growth rates in the United States.

Mortality

The measurement of mortality will rely almost exclusively on information obtained through the design with multiplicity. The only exception is the identification of deaths occurring to the children reported born to all the ever married women in the sample households.

From the multiplicity design, the mortality analysis will collect data on deaths occurring during 1969. The questionnaire calls for reporting all deaths occurring in the household and to spouses, parents, and siblings of all household members. In addition, infant deaths occurring during 1969 in the household and to sisters and daughters of all household members will also be recorded. Through relation to the data on births collected for these same persons, infant mortality rates can be calculated. For deaths in older groups, the base data from NJPS on age and sex composition will permit calculation of age specific mortality rates and construction of life tables.

Migration

In the absence of any prior direct information on the mobility patterns of Jews, a most promising body of information on migration should be yielded by NJPS.

The questionnaire contains several sets of questions designed to measure residential mobility and migration.

As part of the general background information, data are collected for all household members on place of birth, i.e., city and state or country. This information will permit comparison of present residence with birth-place to ascertain lifetime migration patterns. With controls for age, some insights into changing direction of moves may be gained. Comparison of the current residence data with those of the 1970 decennial census will indicate how the Jewish population differs in its geographic distribution from the general population with respect to regions, to metropolitan vs. non-metropolitan areas, and to urban-suburban-rural. Comparison with the state of birth data from the 1970 census will permit determination of how Jewish lifetime migration differs from that of the general population. Finally, for the foreign-born, information will be collected on year of immigration, thereby allowing assessment of the extent to which international movement to the United States contributes to the growth of the Jewish population and how the places of origin of recent migrants compare to those of earlier waves of immigration.

Turning specifically to mobility and migration, the interview calls for information on the year in which the head of household moved into his present residence and the specific address of the previous residence. This information is intended mainly to yield data on intra-urban movement and on suburbanization, but it will also indicate more distant moves for the head of household. For those moving from outside the city or town of

present residence, information will be collected on the reason for the move.

For all household members, two sets of mobility questions are included. The first is directed at the latest migration experience regardless of when it occurred, the second at mobility during a fixed period. Each household member will be asked when he moved into the current town or city of residence and from where he moved, thus providing a record of the most recent move made involving a change in town or city of residence. For the general population this will provide an overall profile of the direction of Jewish population movement within the United States and will permit some measurement of migration differentials by relating the type of move to the characteristics of the migrants. Such an analysis will be limited, however, because the characteristics data will refer largely to 1970 whereas the last move may have taken place at any time in the past.

Following U.S. census procedure, NJPS also includes a question on where each household member was living five years earlier - on April 1, 1965⁽⁴²⁾. This fixed-date question identifies those persons who are living at a different place in 1970 than in 1965. This permits measurement of intra-urban, intra-state, and interstate movement. Also, restricting the mobility being measured to the most recent five-year period permits more meaningful relation of the migration to the current characteristics of the migrants in order to measure migration differentials. Again, as with state of birth data, comparability between NJPS and U.S. Census data will permit interesting comparisons between the extent and character

of Jewish and non-Jewish population movement in the United States. Moreover, coordinated use of the place of birth, the 5-year migration question, and the data on latest move will suggest the extent of repeated population movement among Jews and whether this movement is leading to greater dispersion of the Jewish population⁴³).

Information on migration is not restricted to current members of the household. For all children living away from home, information is obtained on the age at which the child left home and his place of current residence. Although not directly measuring migration, these data will indicate the extent of dispersal of Jewish family members. With controls for age of parents and of children, they should permit determination of whether a greater tendency exists for younger persons to live far from their parental homes. The cohesiveness of the extended family and of the community itself may be affected by such a development.

A final set of questions relates to future mobility. For each household member, a question asks whether he has any plans to move within the next five years, how definite these plans are, and what the destination of the proposed move would be. Although eventual migration behavior is not likely to correspond exactly with declared plans, the answers to these questions should provide clues about the future stability of the Jewish population and the general direction in which moves are likely to occur.

Changes in Religion

Whether the American Jewish population experiences growth or declines depends both on the relation between natural increase and loss or gain through conversion on the other. As far as is ascertainable, no centralized system of records on conversion to Judaism is maintained in the United States, although some records may exist in local rabbinic offices. Information on conversion from Judaism to another religion is virtually nonexistent or at least non-accessible for research purposes. Informal withdrawals are not recorded at all and may show up in a religious census, such as the 1957 CPS, only as "without religion", but such persons would be grouped with those who have withdrawn from other religions and are not therefore identifiable as former Jews.

NJPS will, through its sampling and screening designs, provide maximum coverage of changes in religion through conversion and informal withdrawal. As Dr. Schmelz points out in his overview of world statistics on the Jews, surveys such as NJPS will open up new vistas in this complicated but important field⁽⁴⁴⁾.

NJPS will ascertain such changes in several ways. Through initial screening, all persons who were born Jewish and all those who are now Jewish will be identified. In addition, persons will be asked whether their father and mother were born Jewish. All persons identified as presently or formerly Jewish by such criteria will be included in the survey. For all persons in the sample households, data will be obtained on whether their parents (a) if born Jewish, had ever converted to

another religion or (b) if born non-Jewish, had ever converted to Judaism. If conversion occurred, the reasons for it will also be obtained. Another set of questions focus on the household members themselves and ascertain, if the member is now Jewish but was born non-Jewish, when and why conversion occurred. For those currently non-Jewish but born Jewish, similar questions are asked in addition to current religious preference. Through these questions a comprehensive evaluation of changes in religion should be possible, assuming, of course, that accurate responses to the questions are given.

This coverage will be supplemented by additional questions about the spouses to each marriage reported in the survey. Comparison of religion at the time the couple met and at the time of the survey (or at the time of termination of the marriage) will provide data for identifying mixed marriages and conversions. Questions on religion in which children of all marriages were raised and their current religion as well as religion of children's spouses provide the basis for measuring religious change for this segment of the population. Finally, in the multiplicity section, questions regarding marriages and divorces during 1969 inquire about the religion of the spouses before marriage and at the time of the survey, providing the basis for measuring intermarriages and conversions associated with marriage during 1969.

Change in religion represents an "official" withdrawal from Judaism. As Dr. Schmelz points out, "various shades and degrees of estrangement from Judaism, from Jewish cultural values, and from organized Jewish life"⁽⁴⁵⁾ can also be delineated and measured through the analysis

of varied indicators of Jewish identity. NJPS contains a wide range of such behavioral and attitudinal indicators. Together with the data on intermarriage and conversion, they should allow thorough evaluation of the strength and character of ties to Judaism among American Jews.

Overview

Through integrated use of the wealth of data to be collected on fertility, mortality, migration, marriage and divorce, and conversion into and out of Judaism, NJPS should provide the most comprehensive view yet obtained on the patterns of growth and distribution of the Jewish population of the United States and of the components of change responsible for the patterns observed. National in character, much of the assembled data will permit comparisons with data from official government vital statistics and censuses on the general population, thereby permitting measurement of differentials between Jewish and non-Jewish patterns of fertility, mortality and migration. At the same time, comparisons will also be possible with similar materials being collected for Jewish communities in other countries, thereby permitting assessment of ways in which Jewish demographic behavior in the United States resembles that of Jews in Israel and in other parts of the world. Finally, NJPS results can be compared with the findings of local surveys and of varied but incomplete national sources in order to assess how accurate these have been in providing a picture of Jewish vital events in the United States. The research prospects are indeed exciting.

Future Sources of Data

Despite its great promise, NJPS will remain of only limited value if it is not the first of a continuing series of similar studies conducted on a regular basis in the decades ahead. The American Jewish community is constantly changing, in part as reflection of changes in the larger American community, in part because of factors unique to the Jewish community. Such changes need to be documented for meaningful self-assessment and planning. Hopefully, the results of NJPS will clearly show the value of national surveys and plans will be made to repeat it at regular intervals so that future changes in size, composition, distribution, and vital events can be measured against the benchmarks provided by the 1970 survey. But between surveys the means must be available to monitor demographic changes.

To a degree, continued reliance must be placed on the varied sources used to date, such as local Jewish population surveys and national surveys in which Jews constitute a small segment of the total sample. The possibility of incorporating a question on religion into a CPS during the 1970's seems more likely than was the case during the 1960's, especially since a leading spokesman from the Jewish community encouraged such an approach in lieu of a question in the 1970 decennial census⁽⁴⁶⁾. To achieve this will require concerted effort by representatives of the Jewish community and acquiescence by other groups which have opposed a question on religion in the census. But even if such efforts meet with success, one must recognize that census questions do not always yield

data that can answer the questions being asked by the Jewish community itself.

Although inclusion of a question on religion in birth and death registration records does not seem probable in the foreseeable future, the strong desirability of such information for research purposes should lead to continuous efforts on behalf of such a move. The successful inclusion of a question on religion in the National Birth Sample Survey indicates that collection of such information by government is feasible, from the point of view of both policy and public cooperation. Revisions of the standard vital statistics records are made infrequently (the last two major revisions occurred in 1949 and 1968). Despite this, efforts to include a question on religion, preferably in the confidential segment of the vital statistics record where it would be available for use only for statistical purposes, should be initiated and strongly advocated to the National Association of Registrars and other appropriate professional and government committees concerned with development of the vital registration system.

The marriage records of two states which already include questions on religion provide a model for other states to follow. Efforts in this direction may have greater chances of success in the near future than efforts at inclusion of religion in birth and death records. Ideally, all states should follow this practice. At a minimum one might hope that those states with relatively large Jewish populations would do so, so that comparisons can be made of the experience of these populations with those of Iowa and Indiana where the smaller numbers of Jews may display atypical patterns.

In the meantime, the National Center for Health Statistics should be encouraged to continue to collect information on religion as part of its sample birth survey and to incorporate a question on religion in the annual mortality surveys. Moreover, hopefully, NCHS will augment these natality and mortality surveys by comparable follow-back marriage and divorce surveys and include religion of the partners among the variables on which information will be collected. But even if these surveys are continued and/or increased in coverage, it must be recognized that the number of cases of events occurring to Jews will be small and will be of research value only on a cumulative basis and then only if appropriate information can be collected on the base populations so that rates can be computed. At least for the immediate future, the Jewish community is likely to continue to be left largely to its own resources for information on Jewish vital processes.

A major use to which the NJPS results should be put is to evaluate the extent to which its findings coincide with those of sources used to date. By identifying areas of similarity or difference, we will be in a much stronger position to know which limited sources may continue to be used with some assurance that results based on them are indicative of the more general scene. For example, how will the death rates and life expectancies derived from NJPS compare with those based on the geographically limited analyses in Providence, Milwaukee, and Detroit? How closely will the cumulative fertility rates resemble those observed in local communities or in the earlier 1957 CPS? Do the national figures on inter-marriage more closely support the high rates observed for

Washington and various California cities or the lower rates noted in Rochester, Providence, Springfield, and Camden? Recognizing that local variations exist, using the results of NJPS as a standard against which these local deviations can be noted will enable continued use of local surveys in the intermediary period between the 1970 and the next NJPS to estimate more reliably what the true national rates are.

At the same time, one must explore new sources of data. Unlike research in Great Britain, reliance upon such sources as records of circumcision to estimate births or synagogue records in conjunction with civil records to estimate marriages seems entirely inappropriate in the United States, given the different patterns of behavior and of record keeping. Use on the local level of Jewish funeral directors and burials in Jewish cemeteries has yielded promising results; and efforts should probably be made to insure continuing and wider use of these sources in conjunction with the local population surveys to estimate mortality rates and life expectancies. Lesser attention has been given to the use of hospital records as a source of information on births. In certain localities, a high proportion of all births occur in a single or a few hospitals. Hospital records generally contain information on the religion of mother. Where one could gain access to such records and be certain of near-universal coverage, the means exist for ascertaining the number of Jewish births and of calculating birth rates, based again on data from local population surveys.

Identification of Jewish death, birth, and marriage records through the use of Distinctive Jewish Names

should also be explored⁽⁴⁷⁾. However, given the relative infrequency of the events themselves, and the substantial error possible in the use of the existing lists of DJN's to identify specific individuals as Jewish, this approach will not likely yield direct, worthwhile results. At best, it may serve as a screening device for identifying cases as likely Jewish and require mail or interview follow-up to assure the accuracy of the religious identification. To overcome objections raised about the typicality of the standard lists of names in current use, the names of Jewish families obtained in the NJPS might themselves be used as the basis for a new approach to use of names to identify vital events occurring to Jews. Initially, efforts should be directed toward comparison of the NJPS names with those in standard lists of DJN's with special attention given to both regional and generational differences. Following such evaluations, the feasibility and validity of using the NJPS names as the basis for identification of Jewish vital events can be more realistically explored. But use of either the standard list or a new one based on NJPS will be limited unless accurate base population data are available to construct rates.

Particularly promising as a future source of vital events data is the incorporation of the design with multiplicity into local Jewish population surveys. This approach has the great advantage of producing information on considerably greater and less biased numbers of vital events than would be yielded by the conventional survey. Moreover, by identifying the vital events through the survey, the availability of data on the base population necessary for computing desired rates is assured. By

extending the multiplicity rule to encompass more distant relatives, the number of vital events recorded can be increased, although probably at the expense of accuracy of response. The experience of NJPS with multiplicity warrants careful assessment as does the testing being done independently by Dr. Sirken.

In a relatively short time, demographic research on the American Jewish community has advanced remarkably. Both the increased recognition of the need for research and the considerably higher level of sophistication at which local research is being conducted attest to the achievements to date and provide optimism for the future. NJPS is a milestone in its own right. In the years ahead, through analysis of the rich data promised by NJPS and through further development and innovation on the local level, one can have confidence that more will be known about American Jewish demographic behavior than has ever been known in the past. In turn, one can hope that the facts will prove so useful for understanding the American Jewish population situation and for guiding its future development that added incentive will be given community leaders to lend support to larger, better, and continuing research endeavors in the years ahead.

NOTES

1. SCHMELZ, U.O., Jewish Population Studies (Jerusalem, Institute of Contemporary Jewry, 1970), p. 13.
2. See, for example, WHELPTON, Pascal K., CAMPBELL, Arthur A., and PATTERSON, John E., Fertility and Family Planning in the United States (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1960); WESTOFF, Charles, POTTER, Robert Jr., SAGI, Philip, and MISHLER, Eliot, Family Growth in Metropolitan America (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1961); WESTOFF, Charles, POTTER, Robert Jr., and SAGI, Philip, The Third Child (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1963).
3. SCHMELZ, *op. cit.*, p. 97-99.
4. WHELPTON, Pascal K. and KISER, Clyde V., "Differential Fertility Among Native-White Couples in Indianapolis, "Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility, 1, Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, 21 (July, 1943), p. 226-271.
5. GOLDSTEIN, Sidney and GOLDSCHIEDER, Calvin, Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 115-122.
6. FREEDMAN, Ronald, WHELPTON, Pascal K., and CAMPBELL, Arthur A., Family Planning, Sterility and Population Growth (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959).

7. WHELPTON, CAMPBELL, and PATTERSON, op. cit.
8. WESTOFF, POTTER, SAGI, and MISHLER, op. cit.; and WESTOFF, POTTER, and SAGI, op. cit.
9. U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, "Religion Reported by the Civilian Population of the United States: March, 1957," Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 79 (February 2, 1958).
10. GOLDSTEIN, Sidney, "Socioeconomic Differentials Among Religious Groups in the United States," American Journal of Sociology, 74 (May, 1969), p. 612-631.
11. ROSENTHAL, Erich, "Jewish Fertility in the United States," Eugenics Quarterly, 8 (December, 1961), p. 198-217; and, GLICK, Paul C., "Intermarriage and Fertility Patterns Among Persons in Major Religious Groups," Eugenics Quarterly, 7 (March, 1960). Pp. 31-38.
12. At the time this paper was prepared, no results from the November, 1969 CPS have been published.
13. At the time this paper was being prepared, no results from the 1967 Natality Survey had been published. For a fuller discussion of the methods followed in the Survey, see "Methods and Response Characteristics: National Natality Survey, 1963," Vital and Health Statistics, National Center for Health Statistics, Public Health Service Publication, Series 22, No. 3 (September, 1966).
14. Cf. GOLDSTEIN, Sidney, The Greater Providence Jewish Community: A Population Survey (Providence, R.I., The General Jewish Committee of Providence, 1964), pp. 66-70; and, WESTOFF, Charles, A Population Survey (Cherry Hill, N.J., Jewish Federation of

- Camden County, 1964), p. 35-36. In other such surveys, which omitted questions of fertility, insights into Jewish fertility levels could be obtained only through use of the child-woman ratio, i.e., the number of children under 5 per 1,000 women 20-44 years of age.
15. GOLDSTEIN and GOLDSCHIEDER, op. cit., p. 115-136.
 16. GOLDSTEIN, Sidney, A Population Survey of the Greater Springfield Jewish Community (Springfield, Mass., The Springfield Jewish Community Council, 1968), p. 42-48. See also, GOLDSTEIN, Sidney, "Completed and Expected Fertility in an American Jewish Community," Jewish Social Studies, 33 (April-July, 1971), p. 212-227.
 17. THE BOARD OF DEPUTIES OF BRITISH JEWS, Statistical and Demographic Research Unit, "Anglo-Jewry's Birth Rate," WP 11/SJP/MS (February, 1969), Mimeographed.
 18. LAZERWITZ, Bernard, "Jewish Identification and Jewish Fertility in the Chicago Jewish Community." Papers in Jewish Demography - 1969 (Jerusalem, World Union of Jewish Studies and Institute of Contemporary Jewry, 1973; p. 207-218.
 19. "Socio-economic Characteristics of Deceased Persons," Vital and Health Statistics, Series 22, No. 9 (February, 1969). See also, SIRKEN, Monroe, "Sampling Survey Program of the National Vital Statistics Division," Proceedings of the 9th National Meeting of the Public Health Conference on Records and Statistics, 1962, PHCRS Document No. 574, p. 39-41.

20. BILLINGS, J.S., "Vital Statistics of the Jews," North American Review, 152 (1891), p. 70.
21. SEIDMAN, H., GARFINKEL, L., and CRAIG, L., "Death Rates in New York City by Socio-economic Class and Religious Group and By Country of Birth, 1949-1951," Jewish Journal of Sociology, 4 (December, 1962), p. 254-272.
22. GORWITZ, K., "Jewish Mortality in St. Louis and St. Louis County, 1955-1957," Jewish Social Studies, 24 (October, 1962), p. 248-254.
23. The New York study used the least squares method to estimate the Jewish and non-Jewish white population and death rates by age, sex, and socio-economic class. The St. Louis study made no attempt to estimate the Jewish population by age and used only overall estimates of the total Jewish population living in the St. Louis area for computing crude death rates.
24. FAUMAN, S. Joseph, and MAYER, Albert J., "Jewish Mortality in the U.S.," Human Biology, 41 (1969), p. 416-426.
25. GOLDSTEIN, Sidney, "Jewish Mortality and Survival Patterns : Providence, Rhode Island, 1962-1964," Eugenics Quarterly, 15 (March, 1966), p. 48-61.
26. FAUMAN and MAYER, op. cit.
27. ROSENTHAL, Erich, "Studies of Jewish Inter-marriage in the United States," American Jewish Yearbook, Vol. 64 (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1963), p. 34-51.

28. ROSENTHAL, Erich, "Jewish Inter-marriage in Indiana," American Jewish Yearbook, Vol. 68 (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1967), p. 243-264.
29. GLICK, op. cit., and ROSENTHAL, "Studies in Jewish Inter-marriage in the United States," op. cit.
30. Some studies in England have relied on records of synagogue marriages, but these are biased both against marriages in which one partner remains non-Jewish and against those marginal cases in which a civil rather than a religious ceremony is conducted. See, for example, PRAISS, S.J. and SCHMOOL, Marlene, "Synagogue Marriage in Great Britain, 1966-68," Working Paper No. 10, Board of Deputies of British Jews, Statistical and Demographic Research Unit (July, 1969), Mimeographed; PRAISS, S.J. and SCHMOOL, Marlene, "Statistics of Jewish Marriages in Great Britain: 1901-1965, " The Jewish Journal of Sociology, 9 (December, 1967), p. 149-174.
31. GOLDSTEIN and GOLDSCHIEDER, op. cit., p. 157-161.
32. Compare the procedures used in Washington, D.C., reported in ROSENTHAL, "Studies on Jewish Inter-marriage," op. cit.
33. U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, op. cit.
34. CHENKIN, Alvin, "The Jewish Population in the United States," American Jewish Yearbook, Vol. 70 (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1969, p. 260-272.

35. SCHMELZ, U.O., "Evaluation of Jewish Population Estimates," American Jewish Yearbook, Vol. 70 (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1969), p. 273-288.
36. GOLDSTEIN, The Greater Providence Jewish Community, p. 114-115.
37. DIAMOND, Jack J., "Jewish Immigration to the United States," American Jewish Yearbook, Vol. 70 (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1969), p. 289-294.
38. See MASSARIK, Fred, "Planning the United States Jewish Population Study Toward Insight into American Jewish Demography and Identity," Papers in Jewish Demography - 1969, p. 251-263, and LAZERWITZ, Bernard, "The National Jewish Population Survey Sample Design" in this volume.
39. SIRKEN, Monroe, "A Sample Design to Improve the Accuracy of Vital Statistics Derived from Population Surveys." Paper presented at meetings of the Population Association of America, Boston, Massachusetts, April, 1968. See also, SIRKEN, Monroe, "Household Surveys with Multiplicity," Journal of the American Statistical Association, 65 (March, 1970), p. 257-266.
40. SIRKEN, "A Sample Design to Improve the Accuracy of Vital Statistics," p. 6.
41. Ibid., p. 21.
42. SHRYOCK, Henry Jr., Population Mobility Within the United States (Chicago, Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago, 1964), p. 22-26.

43. ELDRIDGE, Hope T., "Primary, Secondary, and Return Migration," Demography, 2 (1965), p. 444-455.
44. SCHMELZ, op. cit., p. 77.
45. Ibid.
46. ABRAM, Morris , "The American Jewish Committee Statement on the 1970 U.S. Decennial Census," Testimony submitted before Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the U.S. House of Representatives, August 17, 1966. Mimeographed.
47. MASSARIK, Fred, "New Approaches to the Study of the American Jew," Jewish Journal of Sociology, 8 (December, 1966), p. 175-191.