

Ethnic Identity and the Census: The Case of the American Jewish Population

Ira Rosenwaiké

It has been observed that, other than Israel, only official census statistics in Eastern Europe and Canada recognize the concept of Jewish ethnic origin/nationality. In other countries, when census data on Jewish populations are available, they are based on questions concerning religion (Millman, 1983). In the United States, as in many other Diaspora countries, Jews tend to identify themselves and to be identified as members of a religious group. However, a question on religion has never been included in a U.S. decennial census, and has been included in the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey only once (in 1957). Therefore, attempts to exploit U.S. decennial census data to view the demographic characteristics of American Jews have had to rely on various indirect measures of Jewish identification (for example, birthplace or mother tongue) (Goldstein, 1983).

In this paper the 1980 census query on ancestry is examined in order to determine whether it can provide proxy data useful to the study of the American Jewish population. It is found that despite the purposeful lack of published statistics some data may be derived, but these are of limited potential utility to researchers and must be viewed with proper caution.

Prior to 1980 the decennial census of the United States asked three types of questions to describe the cultural origins of the population: race, birthplace (of the individual and/or his/her parents) and mother tongue. In the 1980 census the questions about place of birth of parents and mother tongue were dropped. For the first time, however, a sample of the population was asked an open-ended question on ancestry. This question was designed to "identify ethnic or national origin groups." (Levin and Farley, 1982). Although self-enumeration was employed in the 1980 census, the printed questionnaire provided a number of examples. The exact wording was:

What is this person's ancestry?... (For example: Afro-American, English, French, German, Honduran, Hungarian, Irish, Italian, Jamaican, Korean, Lebanese, Mexican, Nigerian, Polish, Ukrainian, Venezuelan, etc.) (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983a, p. 9).

A large number of countries have included an ethnic item in their censuses, the U.S. S.R. being a particularly noteworthy example (Shryock and Siegel, 1973, pp. 252-53). In this connection it is of interest to note that although the Soviet Union has not included an item on religion in any census, numerous demographic studies have been made of its Jewish population based on the ethnic group statistics reported in the critical censuses (see for example, Lewis et al., 1976). Canada has included a question on

ethnic origin in its enumerations since 1871 (Shryock and Siegel, 1983, p. 255). In that country, too, a wealth of data on the Jewish population has appeared as a result of tabulations of these statistics – although Canada also queries religious affiliation in its censuses – (see, for example, Norland, 1974; for details of changes in the definition of Jewish ethnicity in successive Canadian censuses, see Millman, 1973).

Demographers interested in American Jews were of the opinion that the newly-introduced ancestry item would not be as useful as the well-established Canadian reporting. For example, Goldstein, prior to the release of data from the 1980 census, was skeptical about the value of the new census item as a rich source of data on the American Jewish population, observing that “the results are not likely to prove useful for evaluation of the Jewish population of the United States, except possibly to give some indication of how many individuals regard themselves exclusively as Jews or as ‘hyphenated’ Jews” (Goldstein, 1983, p. 286).

As noted above, the question on ancestry was open-ended and not a multiple choice item as in Canada, where “Jewish” has been among a lengthy list of check-box options. Most Jews identified themselves in the 1980 census entirely in terms of particular countries of origin, as Goldstein had predicted. But no test of his expectation on the utility of the query for ascertaining the demographic characteristics of the American Jewish population has been possible for another reason: the Census Bureau chose not to publish such material. The instruction sheet mailed with each census form specifically instructed respondents in answering the census item:

Ancestry (or origin or descent) may be viewed as the nationality group, the lineage, or the country in which the person or the person’s parents or ancestors were born before their arrival in the United States. Persons who are of more than one origin and who cannot identify with a single group should print their multiple ancestry (for example, German-Irish). Be specific: for example, if ancestry is ‘Indian,’ specify whether American Indian, Asian Indian, or West Indian. Distinguish Cape Verdean from Portuguese, and French Canadian from Canadian. A religious group should not be reported as a person’s ancestry (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983a, p. 9).

Thus, in the words of a prestigious National Academy of Sciences panel charged by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce with evaluating the plans for the then forthcoming 1980 census, “The Jewish category is purposefully not to be used as a reporting category even if filled in by the respondent... Nevertheless, the realities of the situation are that many religious and non-religious Jews think of themselves as ethnically (as a people, a culture, a language) Jewish, not German, Polish, Ukrainian, etc. Because of the overlap of ethnicity and religion in this case, the decision not to use ‘Jewish’... means the self-identification basis for the ethnic distribution will not be used in this case and, to that extent, will not reflect social realities” (National Academy of Sciences, 1978, p. 73).

It is particularly ironic that the Census Bureau under the Carter administration did not consider ‘Jewish’ to be an allowable category, because in earlier years the agency had sympathized with the desire of American Jews to secure information about their numbers. In a report relating to the 1940 census, for instance, Bureau demographers remarked on the need for obtaining statistics that “differentiate persons, such as those of Jewish extraction, who constitute a distinct ethnic or national group, but who are

completely obscured in the statistics on country of origin" (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1943, p. 6).

The 1980 census origin (Spanish, non-Spanish) and ancestry questions, in the words of the National Academy of Sciences panel, "allow any individual with a strong sense of group consciousness – however removed in generational distance – to identify as a member of that group" (National Academy of Sciences, 1978, p. 71). An exception, however, appears in the case of the hundreds of thousands of American Jews, who so identified themselves in the census forms. These responses were unacceptable to the Census Bureau. Those who specified "both an ancestry and a religion" were tabulated only as Germans or Russians. Persons who specified only 'Jewish' were not so tabulated but were classified under the category "ancestry not specified" (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983b, p. 6).

Sources of Data

The ancestry question, an interesting new innovation in the 1980 census, thus quite obviously cannot be of use in the study of the American Jewish community since all references to Jews have been deliberately eliminated from the published tabulations. Whether or not it might have been a valuable source of data if the instructions had not indicated that a religious group should not be reported, and if 'Jewish' had been coded and tabulated – as was 'Cape Verdean', 'Armenian', 'Lebanese' and more than one hundred other responses – must remain an open question. It may be of some interest, however, to examine – indirectly only, in the absence of any direct data – some information about the large number of persons who apparently identified themselves as Jewish despite the Census Bureau prohibition. An attempt is possible because information on a 5% sample (the A sample) of the population is available to the individual investigator in machine-readable form. These public-use microdata tapes contain detailed information on the characteristics of enumerated persons (while maintaining confidentiality) that permits the user to derive new cross-classifications (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983b). The Census Bureau coded those persons who identified themselves as Jewish, plus all other persons who specified the name of a religious group in response to the ancestry item, into a common category, 'religious group'. It is possible that in various parts of the country Amish, Hutterites, Sikhs, and other groups may have been so classified.

A majority of persons reported their ancestry by specifying a single ancestry, but some reported more than one ancestry group. Multiple ancestry responses were coded and tabulated in the 1980 census. For example, a person reported as 'English-Irish' appears in two multiple ancestry categories: 'English' and 'Irish'. As indicated above, persons who reported themselves as Russian-Jews, for example, were tabulated only as Russians in the published counts; however, the public-use microdata tape contains two separate codes for these individuals, indicating both the 'Russian' and 'religious group' categories.

In those areas where Jews are concentrated it seems most probable that the bulk of persons categorized to 'religious group' were those who specified their ancestry to be Jewish. Since New York City was the home of the largest Jewish population in the United States around 1980 – fully one-fifth of the national total residing within its

five boroughs (Chenkin, 1982) – it is an ideal setting for testing this possibility. Accordingly, we have undertaken an examination of the characteristics of those who were coded to ‘religious group’ in the 1980 census microdata sample, in either the single origin category or as part of a multiple ancestry. Since New York City may not necessarily typify the experience nationwide, we also view the comparable coding in two other large centers of Jewish concentration – metropolitan Los Angeles (Los Angeles County) and metropolitan Chicago (Cook County).

Results

The microdata sample for New York City indicates a total of 134,120 persons with an ancestry code solely a ‘religious group’. Table 1 shows the distribution of these persons by nativity, and for specific birth-places. The results are very much in keeping with the supposition that, in New York City at least, ‘religious group’ is nearly synonymous with ‘Jewish’. The highest percentage among those with an ancestry of ‘religious group’ – over 20% – is exhibited by Israel, the Jewish State. Percentages almost as high (16.3 and 14.1%, respectively) are shown for natives of Russia and Poland, which are, according to previous studies of New York City, overwhelmingly Jewish places of origin (Kantrowitz, 1973, p. 31). Very slightly higher percentages are calculated when those persons who did not specify an ancestry or who left the item blank are excluded. Very low percentages reporting a religious group – fractions of 1% in New York – occur for specific countries of birth whose immigrants are generally Roman Catholic, such as Italy and Ireland, or Greek Orthodox (Greece). Similarly, among the population born in the United States only 1.8% of all non-white individuals were included among those reporting a religious group.

TABLE 1. PERSONS WITH ‘RELIGIOUS GROUP’ REPORTED AS SINGLE ANCESTRY, BY PLACE OF BIRTH: NEW YORK CITY, 1980

Place of birth	Totals		Religious group		
	All persons	Persons excluding ‘not specified/ not reported’ ancestry	Number	% of total from place	% of total excluding ‘not specified/ not reported’ ancestry
Total	7,092,200	6,181,260	89,620	1.9	2.2
U.S.S.R.	87,740	84,320	14,280	16.3	16.9
Poland	77,520	75,080	10,940	14.1	14.6
Israel	16,600	15,860	3,400	20.5	21.4
Romania	17,620	16,980	2,000	11.4	11.8
Austria	26,280	25,480	2,460	9.4	9.7
Czechoslovakia	16,460	15,980	1,520	9.2	9.5
Hungary	22,800	22,240	1,140	5.0	5.1
Italy	158,340	155,180	4,280	0.1	0.1
Ireland	42,780	42,020	80	0.1	0.1
Greece	42,380	41,460	60	0.4	0.4
All other foreign	1,196,860	1,071,000	160	0.7	0.8
Puerto Rico	420,960	388,680	8,180	0.1	0.1
United States (ex. Puerto Rico)	4,965,860	4,226,980	280	1.8	2.1

TABLE 2. PERSONS WITH 'RELIGIOUS GROUP' REPORTED AS SINGLE ANCESTRY OR AS ONE OF THE MULTIPLE ANCESTRY RESPONSES, BY PLACE OF BIRTH: NEW YORK CITY, 1980

Place of birth	Single ancestry		Multiple ancestry	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	134,120	100.0	63,980	100.0
Foreign: total	44,220	33.0	21,640	33.8
U.S.S.R.	14,280	10.6	7,300	11.4
Poland	10,940	8.2	5,400	8.4
Israel	3,400	2.5	440	0.7
Austria	2,460	1.8	880	1.4
Romania	2,000	1.5	760	1.2
All other	11,140	8.3	6,860	10.7
Native: total	89,900	67.0	42,340	66.2
United States	89,620	66.8	42,000	65.6
Puerto Rico	280	0.2	340	0.5

In New York City, according to the 5% sample, 63,980 persons gave a multiple response to the ancestry query of a religion and an origin or nationality. Once again, it is obvious through indirect means, namely examination of the nativity and race cross-classifications, that the overwhelming majority of such responses must have been by Jews, reporting themselves as 'American-Jew', 'Russian-Jew', 'Polish-Jew', etc. Table 2 indicates that the nativity distribution of the double ancestry 'religious group' persons was very similar to that of the sole ancestry 'religious group' individuals: 34% being born abroad among the former and 33% among the latter. The Soviet Union and Poland predominated among the overseas countries of origin.

The combined numbers of persons coded to 'religious group' among New York City residents in 1980, whether as their sole ancestry, or as one of two ancestry categories, totalled 198,100. In Table 3 the figures for this combined group are shown by

TABLE 3. PERSONS WITH 'RELIGIOUS GROUP' REPORTED AS SINGLE OR MULTIPLE ANCESTRY, BY PLACE OF BIRTH: NEW YORK CITY, 1980

Place of birth	Number	% of total from place	% of total excluding 'not specified/not reported' ancestry
Total	198,100	2.8	3.2
U.S.S.R.	21,580	24.6	25.6
Poland	16,340	21.1	21.8
Israel	3,840	23.1	24.2
Romania	3,340	12.7	13.1
Austria	2,760	15.7	16.3
Czechoslovakia	1,860	11.3	11.6
Hungary	1,680	7.4	7.6
Italy	80	0.1	0.1
Ireland	100	0.2	0.2
Greece	240	0.6	0.6
All other foreign	14,040	1.2	1.3
Puerto Rico	620	0.1	0.2
United States (except Puerto Rico)	131,620	2.7	3.1

all persons born in these countries were coded to 'religious group' than was the case U.S.S.R., Poland and Israel, more than 20% indicated a religious group in their census forms. There can be little doubt these were Jewish respondents. Similarly, although it is not quite so obvious, the bulk of those born in the United States coded to 'religious group' also must have supplied an entry of 'Jewish' in their questionnaires. These informants were the children and possibly grandchildren of Russian and Polish (etc.) immigrants, in many cases undoubtedly, living in the same household with their parents.

In considering the importance of the ethnic identification data it is most opportune that a carefully conducted survey of the Jewish population was taken in New York City in 1981, since this provides useful baseline data against which the population with an ancestry coded to a religious group (e.g., Jewish) can be compared. The total Jewish population in 1981 in New York City, according to this survey taken under the auspices of the UJA/Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, was placed at 1,133,000 (Ritterband and Cohen, 1984, p. 128). This would indicate that up to 12% of New York's Jews, or 134,000 persons may have reported their ancestry in the 1980 census solely as 'Jewish', and as many as 17% (up to 198,000) may have specified 'Jewish' or combined terms such as Russian-Jew or Polish-Jew.

Some observers may certainly feel that data for New York City alone are insufficient to represent the national reporting pattern. Accordingly the public-use microdata for other areas were also examined. One of those areas, Los Angeles County, which has the second largest Jewish community in the United States, is a continent apart from New York City, and presumably its residents have a different life-style.

Table 4 shows that in Los Angeles – as in New York City – a clear majority of those foreign-born persons identified by the code 'religious group', either solely or with another code, were natives of the U.S.S.R., Poland and Israel. Smaller percentages of

TABLE 4. PERSONS WITH 'RELIGIOUS GROUP' REPORTED AS SINGLE OR MULTIPLE ANCESTRY, BY PLACE OF BIRTH: LOS ANGELES COUNTY, 1980

Place of birth	Totals		Religious group		
	All persons	Persons excluding 'not specified/not reported' ancestry	Number	% of total from place	% of total excluding 'not specified/not reported' ancestry
Total	7,495,200	6,690,640	66,160	0.9	0.1
U.S.S.R.	35,340	33,020	6,240	17.7	18.9
Poland	16,920	16,360	3,160	18.7	19.3
Israel	9,920	9,560	1,140	11.5	11.9
Romania	3,660	3,580	460	12.6	12.8
Austria	6,720	6,620	300	4.5	4.5
Italy	21,840	21,340	20	0.1	0.1
Ireland	5,840	5,760	20	0.3	0.3
Mexico	696,380	673,440	380	0.1	0.1
All other foreign	900,620	826,640	7,360	0.8	0.9
Puerto Rico	16,820	16,000	0	-	-
United States (ex. Puerto Rico)	5,781,140	5,078,320	47,080	0.8	0.9

birthplace. It may now be observed that among natives of each of three countries – in New York City; nevertheless, in the first two countries, the proportions approached 20%. As in New York, about one-third of the 'religious group' total in Los Angeles were of foreign birth and about two-thirds were born in the U.S.

Los Angeles also conducted a survey of its Jewish population close to the 1980 census; the total estimated for the metropolitan area based on the 1979 population study, a 1981 updating and a 1983 reanalysis of the data, was some 501,000 persons (Huberman, 1983). Accordingly, if all 66,160 individuals who gave a religious group single or multiple ancestry response were Jewish, this would indicate that 13% of the Los Angeles Jewish community identified itself in this manner. However, probably 11 or 12% would be a more reasonable estimate since obviously there were others (such as Sikhs) who also were coded to 'religious group'.

The Los Angeles Jewish community, as measured by the sample survey it conducted, differed in at least one respect from many other Jewish communities that conducted similar surveys between 1979 and 1983: it had fewer aged persons. Only 12% of its population was in the 65 and over bracket (Huberman, 1983), compared with 14%, for example, in Chicago and Cleveland, and as high as 20% in Rochester (Tobin and Lipsman, 1984, p. 151). As will be observed shortly, a disproportionate share of those classified as 'religious group' in the 1980 census were elderly. The relative shortage of elderly among Los Angeles Jewry (if the survey results are representative) could account for the relatively small percentage giving a Jewish response to the ancestry query.

The last area considered in the present paper is Cook County, which houses most (but not all) of metropolitan Chicago Jewry. In Cook County, based on the public-use microdata sample, a total of 42,640 persons were identified as responding to a religious group category (either as their single identification or as part of a multiple ancestry group). Table 5 indicates that among those with a foreign place of birth the ranking,

TABLE 5. PERSONS WITH 'RELIGIOUS GROUP' REPORTED AS SINGLE OR MULTIPLE ANCESTRY, BY PLACE OF BIRTH: COOK COUNTY, 1980

Place of birth	Totals		Religious group		
	All persons	Persons excluding 'not specified/not reported' ancestry	Number	% of total from place	% of total excluding 'not specified/not reported' ancestry
Total	5,277,680	4,720,920	42,640	0.8	0.9
U.S.S.R.	22,480	21,620	4,600	20.5	21.3
Poland	59,560	58,600	1,980	3.3	3.4
Israel	4,180	4,020	520	12.4	12.9
Romania	4,900	4,820	260	5.3	5.4
Austria	7,020	6,820	220	3.1	3.2
Italy	37,740	37,300	0	-	-
Ireland	12,860	12,640	0	-	-
Greece	19,460	19,100	0	-	-
Mexico	146,460	140,720	40	0.0	0.0
All other foreign	331,560	298,840	2,940	0.9	1.0
Puerto Rico	59,220	55,180	40	0.1	0.1
United States (ex. Puerto Rico)	4,572,240	4,060,820	32,040	0.7	0.8

as in the case of the other areas examined, was U.S.S.R. first, Poland second and Israel a distant third. Furthermore, about 20% of all persons reporting the Soviet Union as their birthplace identified with a religious group, a proportion comparable to that found for New York and Los Angeles. Much less comparable is the fact that only about 3% of those born in Poland reported a religious group in response to the ancestry item. This is easily explained, however. Chicago is the major center of Polish culture in America and in contrast to many other areas not more than 10% of that city's Polish population is Jewish (Lopata, 1976).

As in New York and Los Angeles, a Jewish community survey was taken close to the date of the 1980 census. This survey, which included some suburban areas outside of Cook County, found a metropolitan Chicago Jewish population in 1981 of 248,000 (Friedman, 1984, p. 36). Allowing for differences in spatial definitions and the fact that some of the 'religious group' persons in Cook County must have been non-Jews, it seems likely that perhaps 15-16% of the Jewish population in metropolitan Chicago identified themselves as Jewish in the 1980 census.

In Tables 6 to 9 some basic demographic characteristics of the 'religious group' populations of the three areas examined are presented. In all three population centers only 1 or 2% of those who gave a religious group as their single ancestry were reported as black and at least 95% were counted as white. In addition, some of those who marked their races as 'other' and provided a write-in response may have been white (Table 6). Table 7 indicates that the proportion reporting a religious group as their sole ancestry was highest in New York City (almost 70%) and lowest in Cook County (less than 60%). In each of the three major areas 5% or more women than men reported a religious group as their origin (Table 8). It may be of interest to note that in every community for which sample data from Jewish community surveys conducted in recent years have been available, females have outnumbered males (Tobin and Lipsman, 1984, p. 150).

TABLE 6. PERSONS WITH 'RELIGIOUS GROUP' REPORTED AS SINGLE ANCESTRY, BY RACE: THREE MAJOR POPULATION CENTERS, 1980

Race	New York City	Los Angeles County	Cook County (Chicago)
Total	134,120	40,200	25,280
White	129,900	38,160	24,100
Black	2,980	480	420
Other specified races	560	900	480
"Other" (write-in)	680	660	280

TABLE 7. PERSONS WITH 'RELIGIOUS GROUP' REPORTED AS A SPECIFIC ANCESTRY: THREE MAJOR POPULATION CENTERS, 1980

Religious group	New York City	Los Angeles County	Cook County (Chicago)
Total	198,100	66,160	42,640
As single ancestry	134,120	40,200	25,280
As multiple ancestry	63,980	25,960	17,360

TABLE 8. SEX OF PERSONS WITH 'RELIGIOUS GROUP' REPORTED AS SINGLE OR MULTIPLE ANCESTRY: THREE MAJOR POPULATION CENTERS, 1980

Sex	New York City	Los Angeles County	Cook County (Chicago)
Total	198,100	66,160	42,640
Male	95,600	32,200	20,680
Female	102,500	33,960	21,960

TABLE 9. PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF AGE OF PERSONS WITH 'RELIGIOUS GROUP' REPORTED AS SINGLE OR MULTIPLE ANCESTRY: THREE MAJOR POPULATION CENTERS, 1980

Age group	New York City	Los Angeles County	Cook County (Chicago)
Number	198,100	66,160	42,640
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under 15	13.3	10.6	11.7
15-24	10.8	13.5	11.9
25-44	22.2	24.4	23.3
45-64	24.2	23.2	23.3
65 and over	29.7	28.4	30.8

The age structure of those who reported a religious group as an ancestry is clearly biased upwards. In each of the three cities (as shown in Table 9) close to 30% of the total was reported as aged 65 years or older in 1980. Clearly this is a higher percentage than for the Jewish population as a whole in those respective communities. The sample survey taken in 1981 indicated about 19% of those in New York City who responded to the age item were 65 and over (Ritterband and Cohen, 1984, p. 148). As noted earlier, surveys in the metropolitan areas of Los Angeles and Chicago indicated that 12 and 14%, respectively, were recorded as 65 years or above.

Since data have been presented for only three major areas it cannot be concluded that the pattern demonstrated here applies nationally. But although many of America's Jews reside in small communities the great majority live in major metropolitan centers. On the surface it appears likely that reporting patterns in these areas were similar to those exhibited for the widely scattered major communities illustrated here.

Discussion

Some demographers may have anticipated that the introduction of an ancestry query in the 1980 census of the United States, similar to that long in use in Canada, might be a useful source of data on the nation's Jewish population. Others, such as Goldstein, were less convinced this would be the case. What seems to have been anticipated by few (and eventually opposed by most knowledgeable social scientists) was that the Bureau of the Census, in effect, would prohibit the reporting of 'Jewish', even if it was the ancestry group 'with which the person identifies.' In a recent examination

of the subject of ethnicity among whites, ethnic identification was considered to be 'the ethnic tags by which individuals describe themselves to others' (Alba and Chamlin, 1983, p. 241). The authors concluded that among the scholarly community: 'There has...been scant attention paid to ethnic identity.'

The Jewish communities examined here, New York City (exclusive of its large suburban population), Los Angeles County and Cook County contain a total of about 1.9 million Jews, according to recently conducted surveys, or somewhat more than one-third of the national total. In these three areas combined, a total of about 307,000 persons reported a religious group as a single or multiple response to the 1980 census query on ancestry. Perhaps as many as 90% of these persons were Jewish. If these illustrations can be generalized, then despite the 1980 census schedule's directive that 'a religious group should not be reported as a person's ancestry,' it would appear that about four-fifths of a million persons described themselves as Jews or as hyphenated Jews. Whether two or four times that number might have done so had this instruction not appeared can only be speculated. As it turns out then, not a single statistic on so-called 'Jews' appears in census publications and those data that can be produced through public-use microdata samples clearly are subject to major biases. It must be observed also that the three communities studied, although inclusive of a major share of national Jewry, may not be entirely representative. Although the experience observed here may perhaps also apply to other large American Jewish communities, it is possible that in smaller communities, or perhaps newer centers, there was less of a tendency to respond with a 'religious group' category to the ancestry question.

It is fortunate indeed that at the very time the ancestry query was shedding so little additional light on the characteristics of American Jewry, local Jewish population studies were proliferating. As many as fifteen Jewish community surveys were conducted by mid-decade (Phillips, 1984, p. 132). Although in many cases the sample sizes involved are quite small, the important fact is that these surveys include such major metropolitan areas as New York, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Chicago, Miami, and Washington – locales containing well over half of the American Jewish community. These surveys not only provide data on social and demographic characteristics, as found in the U.S. census, but information on religious characteristics (e.g., denominational identification, synagogue membership), on community involvement (e.g., membership in Jewish organizations) and on particular issues (e.g., intermarriage) (Tobin and Lipsman, 1984; Phillips, 1984). While America's Italians, Portuguese and other white ethnic groups have much new data from the decennial census, American Jews at least have alternative useful sources of information.

References

- Alba, R.D. and Chamlin, M.B. (1983). "A Preliminary Examination of Ethnic Identification Among Whites". *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 48. pp. 240-47.
- Chenkin, A. (1982). "Jewish Population in the United States, 1982". *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 82. pp. 127-129.

- Friedman, P.B. (1984). "Interpreting and Communicating the Results of Jewish Population Studies", in: Cohen, S.M., Woocher, J.S. and Phillips, B.A. (eds.), *Perspectives in Jewish Population Research*. Westview Press, Boulder, Colo. pp. 31–39.
- Goldstein, S. (1983). "Review of Jewish Population Studies in the United States of America", in: Schmelz, U.O., Glikson, P. and Gould, S.J. (eds.), *Studies in Jewish Demography: Survey for 1972–1980*. Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. pp. 286–291.
- Huberman, S. (1983). "Demographic Highlights of the Los Angeles Jewish Community". Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles.
- Kantrowitz, N. (1973). *Ethnic and Racial Segregation in the New York Metropolis*. Praeger, New York.
- Levin, M.J. and Farley, R. (1982). "Historical Comparability of Ethnic Designations in the United States." *Proceedings of the American Statistical Association*, Social Statistics Section.
- Lewis, R.A., Rowland, R.H. and Clem, R.S. (1976). *Nationality and Population Change in Russia and the USSR: An Evaluation of Census Data*. Praeger, New York.
- Lopata, H.Z. (1976). *Polish-Americans: Status Competition in an Ethnic Community*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Millman, I.I. (1983). "Data on Diaspora Jewish Populations from Official Censuses", in: Schmelz, U.O., Glikson, P. and Gould, S.J. (eds.), *Studies in Jewish Demography: Survey for 1972–1980*. Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem.
- National Academy of Sciences (1978). "Counting the People in 1980: An Appraisal of Census Plans." *Report from the Panel on Decennial Census Plans*. Committee on National Statistics, National Research Council. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.
- Norland, J.A. (1974). "Canada's Jewish Population: Selected Demographic Characteristics". *Canadian Studies in Population*, Vol. 1. pp. 75–91.
- Phillips, B.A. (1984). "Exploring Possibilities for Follow-up Studies of Jewish Communal Surveys", in: Cohen, S.M., Woocher, J.S. and Phillips, B.A. (eds.), *Perspectives in Jewish Population Research*. Westview Press, Boulder, Colo. pp. 128–133.
- Ritterband, P. and Cohen, S.M. (1984). "The Social Characteristics of the New York Area Jewish Community, 1981". *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 84. pp. 128–161.
- Ritterband, P. and Cohen, S.M. (1984). "The Social Characteristics of the New York Area Jewish Community, 1981". *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 84. pp. 128–161.
- Shryock, H.S. and Siegel, J.S. (1973). "Methods and Materials of Demography". U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- Tobin, G.A. and Lipsman, J.A. (1984). "A Compilation of Jewish Demographic Studies", in: Cohen, S.M., Woocher, J.S. and Phillips, B.A. (eds.), *Perspectives in Jewish Population Research*. Westview Press, Boulder, Colo. pp. 137–166.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (1943). "Population; Nativity and Parentage of the White Population, Mother Tongue". *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940*. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1983a). "Ancestry of the Population by State: 1980". *Census of Population and Housing 1980*. Supplementary Reporting PC80-51-10. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1983b). "Public-Use Microdata Samples Technical Documentation". *Census of Population and Housing, 1980*. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.