

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Questionnaire Design	2-2
Telephone Survey	2-2
Definition of an Eligible Household	2-4
Definition of an Eligible Respondent	2-4
Publicity	2-5
Relationships Between Variables	2-5
Creation Versus Collection of Data	2-5
Jewish Institutions Survey	2-6

Without understanding there is no knowledge; without knowledge there is no understanding.

(Pirkei Avot 3:17)

This study of the Broward Jewish community consisted of a Telephone Survey of 1,201 Jewish households in Broward, a Distinctive Jewish Name Counting Project, and a Jewish Institutions Survey.

QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The questionnaire was designed through a cooperative effort by the Demographic Study Committee, Jewish Federation of Broward County staff, community rabbis, Jewish agency executives and lay leadership, and Dr. Ira M. Sheskin of the University of Miami. Meetings were held with various groups of rabbis and educators.

TELEPHONE SURVEY

Consistent with many other Jewish community studies, this study involved a Telephone Survey with a random digit dialing (RDD) sample combined with a list sample from the Jewish Federation of Broward County mailing list, and households with Distinctive Jewish Names (DJNs) In total, 1,201 22-minute telephone interviews were conducted, including xxx interviews from the RDD sample (both landlines and cell phones), xxx interviews from the List sample, and xx interviews with N households.

The sample size of x,xxx is adequate so that we can be 95% certain that the margin of error for the overall results (the results when examining all 1,000 interviews) is no greater than $\pm 3.1\%$. When results are *not* based upon the total sample size of 1,000 (for example, when results are presented for households with elderly persons), the margin of error is greater than $\pm 3.1\%$. (See the “Sample Size and Margin of Error” section in this Chapter for more information.) The 1,200 interviews represent 1.7x% of the 72,000 Jewish households in Broward.

RDD Sample. The RDD methodology is necessary for a study to obtain results that accurately represent a population. The major advantage of this methodology is that it produces a random sample of Jewish households to be interviewed. When done well, the RDD methodology will yield a high *survey cooperation rate* (the percentage of households who identify themselves as containing one or more Jewish persons who agree to be interviewed). The RDD methodology also guarantees anonymity to respondents.

An important aspect of the RDD methodology is that it provides the ability to interview households who are not listed in the telephone directory. The RDD methodology facilitates calling households who have recently migrated into the study area and other households whose telephone numbers are not yet published in the local area telephone directory. Perhaps more importantly, the RDD methodology does not rely upon Jewish households making themselves known to the Jewish community by joining a synagogue, a Jewish Community Center, or other Jewish organizations, or by donating money to a Jewish fund raising campaign, which would result in a sample that is inherently biased toward more Jewishly-connected households. Thus, a more accurate representation of the Jewish community should be obtained with the RDD methodology than with telephone directory

methods or methods that rely upon randomly selecting households from Jewish organization mailing lists.

The RDD Telephone Survey proceeded as follows. For all six digit area code/telephone exchange codes in the study area, four-digit random numbers were generated by a computer to produce ten-digit telephone numbers. When a number was dialed, there was no guarantee that a household, let alone a Jewish household, would be reached. In fact, xxx,xxx different numbers were dialed more than xxx,xxx times to obtain the xxx RDD interviews. This is a yield rate of 0.x% (xxx divided by xxx,xxx). The remainder of the numbers dialed were either disconnected, not in service, changed to unlisted or other listed numbers, business numbers, government numbers, fax machines, non-Jewish households, ineligible Jewish households, not answered by a person after multiple attempts, or answered by persons who refused to respond to the screener (the introduction to the survey which determined if we were speaking with a Jewish household—see Appendix A) or who refused to cooperate with the survey. In total, xx% (the *screener cooperation rate*) of households reached cooperated with the screener to identify whether the households were Jewish or non-Jewish. Of the Jewish households reached, xx% (the *survey cooperation rate*) cooperated with the survey.

Of the xxx RDD surveys, xx were completed on cell phones.

Federation List Sample. After the completion of the RDD Telephone Survey, an additional xxxx telephone interviews were conducted with households on the Jewish Federation of Broward County mailing list.

This allowed us to call households with cell phones at a far more reasonable cost than with RDD, where the xx RDD cell-phone interviews took about xx hours each to complete. Of the xx List surveys, xxx ere completed on landlines; xxx on cell phones with non-local area codes (not 281, 346, 713, and 832) and xxx on local cell phones (with a 281, 346, 713, or 832).

DJN Sample. An additional xx telephone interviews were conducted from households with a DJN listed in a computerized directory.

In total, xxx surveys were completed via RDD, xxx via list, and xx via DJN. Xx were completed on landlines and xx on cell phones.

DEFINITION OF AN ELIGIBLE HOUSEHOLD

An eligible household is one that contains at least one person who is Jewish as defined in the “Definitions” section in Chapter 1. The following were excluded from the study:

- ❶ Persons in institutions, such as nursing homes, who do not have their own telephone numbers at bedside.
- ❷ Households without telephones. In Broward County, This percentage is negligible for Jewish households.
- ❸ Households containing no persons capable of being interviewed due to physical (including hearing impairments) or mental health limitations.

DEFINITION OF AN ELIGIBLE RESPONDENT

No procedure was used to select a person at random to be interviewed within each Jewish household in Broward. Rather, an attempt was made to interview a Jewish person within each household who was age 18 or over. The only known bias resulting from this procedure was that xx% of respondents were female, whereas xx% of adults in Jewish households in Broward are female. Because all basic demographic and education questions are asked about *all* adults in the household, this bias does not influence the results in any significant manner. Where the reported results are based on the respondent’s own behavior, such as volunteerism, or on his/her opinion, such as the perception of anti-Semitism, results are shown separately for males and females.

Any respondent age 18 or over who identified himself/herself as Jewish was interviewed. In households containing non-Jewish members, the Jewish member was interviewed whenever possible because some questions are not applicable to non-Jews.

Note that the respondent in x.x% of the 1,000 interviews was not Jewish. In almost all of these cases, the respondent was the non-Jewish spouse, partner, or significant other of a Jewish adult. In most cases, questions that were respondent-only questions were asked of the non-Jewish respondent on behalf of the Jewish household member (in a *proxy* fashion). A few attitudinal questions were *not* asked of non-Jewish respondents.

Non-Jewish household members were generally interviewed in two situations. First, in some cases, the Jewish household member would not cooperate with the survey, but the non-Jewish household member would. Second, in some cases, the Jewish household member was simply unavailable at the time of the survey.

PUBLICITY

A post card about the study was sent to all Jewish households and an e-mail was sent to all known Jewish households. Advertisements were placed in the local Jewish newspaper and synagogue bulletins. Letters were sent to all local area rabbis, synagogue presidents, and Jewish institutions. Flyers were distributed around the community. Pulpit announcements were distributed to all local synagogues. A billboard was placed at the entrances to the Jewish Community Centers. The purpose of this publicity was to notify potential respondents that they might be contacted to participate in the study and to make them more receptive and cooperative.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN VARIABLES

An important distinction must be made between *correlation* and *cause and effect*. Simply because a correlation—a *relationship*—is found between two variables, it **does not necessarily imply** that one *causes* the other. Thus, because one finds a relationship between, for example, synagogue membership and charitable donations, it does not necessarily imply a cause and effect relationship. That is, if it is shown that synagogue members are more likely to donate to charities, it does not imply that joining a synagogue causes one to be more philanthropic. Separately, it could be that higher income households are more likely to both join a synagogue and be philanthropic. That is, the relationship shown between synagogue membership and charitable donations could actually reflect a relationship between synagogue membership and household income and between philanthropy and household income.

CREATION VERSUS COLLECTION OF DATA

Surveys often create data rather than collect it. That is, persons are asked to think about some issues that they have probably not thought about before in quite the same way (terms such as *definitely* and *very familiar*). Also, groups of people react to questions in varying ways. Thus, if one finds a significant difference between, for example, the responses of the elderly and the non-elderly, it may be due to a real difference in attitudes between the two subgroups resulting from the different environments in which the two subgroups matured, or to a real difference in experiences between the two subgroups. On the other hand, the difference may very well be attributable to the varying manner in which persons of different ages respond to questions.

JEWISH INSTITUTIONS SURVEY

Brief surveys, comprising the Jewish Institutions Survey, were administered to the synagogues in Broward, the Jewish Community Center, and the Jewish Federation of Broward County. Information about enrollments in Jewish day schools is collected on a regular basis by the Federation and this information was incorporated into this report. The results appear in Chapters 4, 7, 8, and 14.

Synagogue Survey. The Synagogue Survey was completed by the executive director, rabbi, synagogue president, or another member of the synagogue staff of each synagogue.

The Synagogue Survey queried the number of member households in 2005 and 2015 and information on synagogue mergers. Also collected were preschool/child care, supplemental school, and day camp enrollments, and the number of participants in Jewish teenage youth groups in 2015.

Jewish Community Center (JCC) Survey. The JCC Survey was completed by the executive director the JCC.

The JCC Survey queried the number of Jewish member households in 2005 and 2015 and preschool/child care and day camp enrollments in 2015.

Jewish Federation Survey. The Jewish Federation Survey was completed by the Jewish Federation of Broward County with assistance from Jewish Family Service.

The Jewish Federation Survey queried the number of Jews without telephones in nursing homes, group quarters for mentally handicapped persons, group quarters for physically handicapped persons, prisons, and military bases, if any; the number of Jewish students in college dormitories whose parents do not live in Broward; and the number of participants in independent Jewish teenage youth groups in 2015. Also collected were data on the current number of Jewish households on the Jewish Federation mailing list by zip code as well as the number of Jewish donors to the Annual Campaign, number of Jewish households who donated to the Annual Campaign, and amount raised by the Annual Campaign for each year from 2005-2015.