

VOLUNTEERING + VALUES

A REPAIR THE WORLD Report on Jewish Young Adults

TECHNICAL REPORT



REPAIR THE WORLD works to inspire American Jews and their communities to give their time and effort to serve those in need. We aim to make service a defining part of American Jewish life.

Suggested Citation:

Chertok, F., Gerstein, J., Tobias, J., Rosin, S., & Boxer, M.(2011). *Volunteering + Values: A Repair the World Report on Jewish Young Adults*, Technical Report. New York: Repair the World.

© 2011 Brandeis University and Gerstein | Agne Strategic Communications
All Rights Reserved

weRepair.org

THE AUTHORS

Fern Chertok
Joshua Tobias
Shirah Rosin
Matthew Boxer
Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies

Jim Gerstein
Gerstein | Agne Strategic Communications

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Support for this research was provided by Repair the World. We appreciate the contributions of Jon Rosenberg and extend our thanks to Wendy Rosov of Rosov Consulting for her advice and guidance throughout the project. We acknowledge with thanks Benjamin Phillips, Senior Analyst/Project Director at Abt SRBI and former Associate Research Scientist at the Steinhardt Social Research Institute and Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies for his important contribution to the design of the survey and sampling frames. We would like to thank the Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies colleagues who assisted this project including Janet Whittredge and Ben Lefebvre for development of the sample management and tracking system, Graham Wright for assistance in data analysis, Deborah Grant for preparation of the final report, and Masha Lokshin for project administration. We also acknowledge with appreciation for their work our interview operations team leaders Iva Perovic and Rachel Bernstein as well as our telephone interview team: Catherine Bennet, Ben Bistricher, Sarah Epstein, Andrew Glynn, Quinn Lockwood, Andrea Lyons, Gabrielle Santoro, Matthew Schmidt, Jimmy Taber, and Yulia Tolskaya. We would also like to thank Alex Remington at Gerstein | Agne for his hard work on this project. This project was also assisted by the staff at Knowledge Networks with special thanks to Jordon Peugh and Karen Semans. We also wish to thank Jillian Kornswieg for her extensive work on the design of the report.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	2
Sampling Strategy	3
Taglit Applicant Sample	4
Knowledge Networks Sample	7
Data Collection	8
Taglit Samples	8
Knowledge Networks Sample	10
Incentives	10
Response Rates	11
Removal of Ineligibles	11
Response Rates by Sample	11
Weighting	13
Taglit Sample Weights	13
Knowledge Networks Sample Weights	14
Combined Weights	14
Combined Sample Post-Stratification Weights	16
Sample Characteristics	17
Comparing Jewish Volunteer Rates to National Datasets	21
Comparing Current Dataset to National Jewish Datasets	22
Data Analysis	26
Factors Associated with Volunteering	26
Factors Associated with Regular Volunteering	36
Factors Associated with Volunteering under Jewish Auspices	44
Factors Associated with Volunteering under Jewish Auspices as their Primary Volunteer Activity	51
Factors Associated with a Jewish Lens on Volunteering	52
Sense of Efficacy and Gender	55
References	56
Appendix A: Survey Instrument	58
Appendix B: Survey Communications	78
Appendix C: Calling Protocol	80

List of Tables

Table 1: Characteristics of Taglit Sampling Strata	6
Table 2: Interview Mode by Taglit Sample	9
Table 3: Ineligibles by Sample	11
Table 4: Response Rates	12
Table 5: Variables Used in the Calculation of Composite Weights	15
Table 6: Characteristics of Weights	16
Table 7: General Demographics	17
Table 8: Jewish Demographics	19
Table 9: Current Jewish Religious Involvement	19
Table 10: Years of Jewish Education	20
Table 11: Comparison of Volunteer Rate across Surveys	21
Table 12: Currently Orthodox by Sample Frame	23
Table 13: Raised Orthodox in NJPS 2000 and Volunteering + Values Study	23
Table 14: Parental Inter-marriage by Sample Frame	24
Table 15: Parental Inter-marriage in NJPS 2000 and Volunteering + Values	24
Table 16: Proportions College Graduates in Jewish Population Studies	24
Table 17: Logistic Regression Model of Volunteering (Youth Participation Variables)	28
Table 18: Logistic Regression of Volunteering (Jewish Participation Variables)	29
Table 19: Logistic Regression of Volunteering by Student Status	30
Table 20: Logistic Regression of Volunteering by Marital Status	31
Table 21: Logistic Regression of Volunteering by Parental Status	32
Table 22: Logistic Regression on Volunteering by Common Good Motivations Scale	33
Table 23: Logistic Regression of Volunteering by Current Jewish Religious Involvement Scale	34
Table 24: Logistic Regression of Volunteering (Full Model)	35
Table 25: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering (Youth Participation Variables)	36
Table 26: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering (Jewish Participation Variables)	37
Table 27: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering by Student Status	38
Table 28: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering by Marital Status	39
Table 29: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering by Parental Status	40
Table 30: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering by Common Good Motivations Scale	41
Table 31: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering by Current Jewish Religious Involvement Scale	42
Table 32: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering (Full Model)	43
Table 33: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices (Jewish Participation Variables)	44
Table 34: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices by Current Jewish Religious Involvement Scale	45
Table 35: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices by Compassion and Social Justice Jewish Perspective Scale	46
Table 36: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices by Student Status	47
Table 37: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices by Relationship Status	48
Table 38: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices by Parental Status	49
Table 39: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices (Full Model)	50
Table 40: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices (Primary Activity)	51
Table 41: Ordinary Least Squares Regression of Jewish Compassion and Social Justice Scale	53
Table 42: Ordinary Least Squares Regression of Jewish Community Ambassadorship	54
Table 43: Ordinal Logistic Regression of Sense of Efficacy by Gender	55

Sampling Strategy

Developing a representative sample of Jewish young adults presents considerable methodological challenges. Because Jews are such a rare population, obtaining a representative sample large enough to conduct meaningful analysis using a probability-based approach is prohibitively expensive. For example, the National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) of 2000-2001, the last large-scale attempt to conduct a nationally representative demographic study of the American Jewish population cost in excess of six million dollars (Phillips, 2007). Additionally, young adults are a particularly difficult population to contact because of their mobility and their greater likelihood of only using a cell phone (Keeter, 2007).¹ Because of these challenges, previous attempts to measure the volunteer involvement of adult Jews under the age of 35 have been unable to obtain samples adequate for developing accurate estimates (Cohen & Fein, 2001).

To address these challenges, the Volunteering + Values study employed a hybrid dual-frame approach to sampling using both a list-frame and a probability frame. This approach has been used successfully by a number of other studies to obtain estimates of other hard-to-reach populations such as those at risk for HIV/AIDS (Kalton, 2002). The list-frame in this study is the Taglit-Birthright Israel (Taglit) applicant pool. Since 2000, Taglit has provided free ten-day trips to Israel to young Jewish adults ages 18-26 who live outside of Israel and have never had a peer educational experience in Israel. Taglit sponsors trips twice a year, generally during summer and winter school vacations. Since its inception, there have been twenty-three rounds of applicants, and the applicant pool is now the largest list of young American Jews with over 300,000 members. The applicant pool includes both participants and nonparticipants from virtually the entire spectrum of Jewish backgrounds and denominational identities. Substantial numbers are less engaged Jews, including secular Jews and those with no connection to Jewish organizations (Saxe et al., 2008).

The probability sample frame was obtained using the Knowledge Networks online research panel (KnowledgePanel®). The Knowledge Networks online panel is a representative sample of the U.S. population and includes groups who may not be represented in the Taglit applicant pool, including those who were not eligible for the program. However, the small number of Jewish young adults in the Knowledge Networks panel is not sufficient, by itself, to provide meaningful estimates of young Jewish adult volunteer involvement or compare differences between sub-groups. A hybrid-sampling approach provided a sample that both resembles the larger American Jewish population of young adults and is large enough to conduct meaningful analysis.

¹ According to Federal law cell phones cannot be contacted using random-digit dialing technology. Furthermore, cell phone numbers, unlike landlines, often do not correspond to a specific geographic area. As a result it is much more difficult to obtain a representative sample of cell phone-only households.

Taglit Applicant Sample

The Taglit Applicant sampling frame consisted of all eligible summer applicants who applied to Taglit programs between 2004 and 2010. Winter trips were excluded from the sampling frame to avoid potential overlap with the Jewish Futures study (Saxe et al., 2011). The Taglit sampling scheme was designed to yield the maximum response rate while obtaining a sample with pre-determined characteristics. These included an even distribution of gender, an even distribution of ages between 18 and 32,² and the correct proportion of Taglit participants and nonparticipants from the 2004-2010 summer rounds (40% nonparticipants and 60% participants). It was decided that there would be no minimum quota for intersections between categories (e.g., male nonparticipants) and no requirement for a minimum number of cases to be drawn within each stratum defined by round, participant status, gender or age.

Projected response rates were estimated for each round, participant, gender and age cell using data from previous surveys. Response rates for rounds between summer 2002 and 2004 were estimated using a logistic regression model on response by age, gender, round, and participant status of responses to Wave 1 of the *Jewish Futures* study (Saxe et al., 2009). Response rates for rounds between summer 2007 and summer 2008 were estimated from a post-trip survey of applicants between summer 2007 and winter 2009 fielded in the first quarter of 2010. Response rates for summer 2009 and 2010 were estimated from response rates to a post-trip survey of applicants to those rounds conducted in the fourth quarter of 2009. Estimated response rates for rounds between summer 2005 and summer 2006 were the average of projections from Wave 1 of the *Jewish Futures* study and the post-trip survey of rounds between summer 2007 and winter 2009. The estimated response rate was maximized using mixed integer programming in the AMPL environment with the solver CPLEX, which uses branch and bound methods for linear integer problems. The objective function was:

$$\min_{\mathbf{n}} \sum_{h=1}^L n_h$$

Subject to:

$$\begin{aligned} n_h &\leq N_h; \\ n_h &\in \mathbb{N}; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h &\geq 600; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h p_0 &\geq 240; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h p_1 &\geq 360; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h f_0 &\geq 300; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h f_1 &\geq 300; \end{aligned}$$

² Current contact information for those between the ages of 33-35 is much more difficult to obtain since these individuals' applied to Taglit between 2001-2003. Given the cost involved in obtaining responses from those in this age group, the research team in consultation with Repair the World, decided to exclude those over 32 from the Taglit sample.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{19} &\geq 40; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{20} &\geq 40; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{21} &\geq 40; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{22} &\geq 40; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{23} &\geq 40; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{24} &\geq 40; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{25} &\geq 40; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{26} &\geq 40; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{27} &\geq 40; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{28} &\geq 40; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{29} &\geq 40; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{30} &\geq 40; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{31} &\geq 40; \\ \sum_h^L n_h r_h a_{32} &\geq 40. \end{aligned}$$

Where:

- \mathbb{N} is the set of positive integers;
- $h = 1, 2, \dots, L$ strata;
- n is the allocated sample (where $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$);
- r_h is the expected response rate in the h th stratum;
- p is Taglit participation (0 = nonparticipant, 1 = participant);
- f is gender (0 = male, 1 = female);
- a is age (coded naturally).

To allow for overestimation of the response rate, the final sample allocation was 10% greater than estimated through mixed integer programming. The original stratified sample contained 960 cases. Subsequent to drawing the sample, it was determined that additional steps would need to be taken to ensure that the desired sample size ($n=600$) would be achieved within a two-month time frame. A response rate of 63% would have been necessary in order to achieve 600 cases. Previous studies of Taglit applicants required a six-month data collection period in order to achieve a similar response rate (Saxe et al., 2009). The consolidated time frame was necessary in order to ensure that the survey asked about a consistent time period and to prevent cost overruns.

The additional sample was drawn of the same size as the first (i.e., $n=960$). In order to maintain the same coverage properties as the previously drawn sample, cases were drawn from within the same strata as the first sample. In a number of cases, the number of cases to be drawn from a given stratum exceeded the population size of the stratum. In these situations, the number of additional cases required beyond the size of the stratum were drawn from a stratum from the same round, age, and participant status but the opposite gender (e.g., in the case of too few 22-year-old male participants from summer 2009, additional cases would be drawn from 22-year-old female participants from summer 2009). The final allocation of cells is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1: Characteristics of Taglit Sampling Strata

Round	Participant	Gender	Age	Sample 1 (n)	Sample 2 (n)	Total
Summer 2004	Yes	Male	32	0	84	84
Summer 2004	Yes	Female	32	123	39	162
Summer 2006	Yes	Male	29	64	64	128
Summer 2006	Yes	Male	30	63	63	126
Summer 2006	Yes	Male	31	0	41	41
Summer 2006	Yes	Female	31	63	22	85
Summer 2008	Yes	Female	28	73	73	146
Summer 2010	No	Male	19	68	60	128
Summer 2010	No	Female	19	0	8	8
Summer 2010	No	Male	21	2	2	4
Summer 2010	No	Male	23	2	2	4
Summer 2010	No	Male	24	2	2	4
Summer 2010	No	Male	25	3	3	6
Summer 2010	Yes	Male	20	44	44	88
Summer 2010	Yes	Male	21	4	4	8
Summer 2010	Yes	Male	22	34	34	68
Summer 2010	Yes	Male	23	10	10	20
Summer 2010	Yes	Male	24	61	61	122
Summer 2010	Yes	Male	25	60	60	120
Summer 2010	Yes	Male	26	63	63	126
Summer 2010	Yes	Male	27	0	34	34
Summer 2010	Yes	Female	19	5	5	10
Summer 2010	Yes	Female	20	15	15	30
Summer 2010	Yes	Female	21	57	57	114
Summer 2010	Yes	Female	22	27	27	54
Summer 2010	Yes	Female	23	51	51	102
Summer 2010	Yes	Female	27	66	32	98
Total				960	960	1920

Knowledge Networks Sample

The Knowledge Networks online panel is recruited using both list-assisted random digit dialing (RDD) and address-based sampling (ABS). The list-assisted RDD frame covers 100 blocks (i.e., XXX-XXX-XXNN) with two or more listed telephone numbers, oversampling telephone exchanges with high concentrations of African-American and Hispanic households. The approximately 70% of telephone numbers that are matched to an address are mailed an advance letter (nonmatched households are under sampled at rate of .75 compared to matched households in order to increase efficiency). Following the mailings, households are called by telephone for up to 90 days and 14 attempts, and refusal conversion is attempted.

In April 2009, Knowledge Networks began large-scale ABS recruitment in order to improve coverage of households without telephone access, wireless-only households, and households where cell phones are primarily used. ABS panel recruitment procedures are similar to those employed in the RDD frame. Knowledge Network's response rates for recruitment efforts are not reported. Various reports put the Knowledge Networks sample recruitment response rate at 41% (Schlenger et al., 2002), 44% (Silver et al., 2002), 52% (Smith, 2003), 37% (Couper et al., 2004), and 56% (Chang & Krosnick, 2009).

Jewish panel members were identified using a question about religious affiliation from Knowledge Networks' basic demographic survey. Because many people with Jewish background identify as "No Religion," a follow-up question was asked of those panelists who selected "No Religion" to determine if they considered themselves Jewish for any reason or had a Jewish mother or father. For the Volunteering + Values study, Jewish panelists were excluded if they were under the age of 18 or over the age of 35. A total of 204 panelists were selected to receive the survey.

Data Collection

Data collection was managed by the Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies (CMJS). Field operations for the Taglit Sample were conducted internally using an in-house call center and survey management system. The Knowledge Networks sample field operations were managed by Knowledge Networks using their own internal system. The survey was designed as a dual-mode telephone and online instrument, with the aim of minimizing mode effects (Dillman, 2007). The instrument was created using LimeSurvey, an open-source survey program (Schmitz, 2009).³

Taglit Samples

Contact information from Sample 1 was reviewed and cleaned using the people search service Accurint (powered by LexisNexis) prior to commencing with data collection. All verified contact information was kept (including phone numbers and email addresses) and annotated. All other information was archived. Due to time restrictions individuals in Sample 2 were not pre-searched prior to the launch of the study. A few individuals in Sample 2 who lacked a working phone number were searched during the data collection period.

Invitations to participate in the study, with unique links to the online instrument, were sent to all potential respondents in the Taglit sample on September 20, 2010. All potential respondents were first invited via email to take the survey online. Each sample was sent five email reminders. Communications with prospective survey respondents are presented in Appendix B. The first three reminders were sent to both Taglit samples on each of the following dates: September 27, 2010; October 4, 2010; and October 18, 2010. A fourth reminder was sent to Sample 2 on October 28, 2010 and to Sample 1 on November 8, 2010. The fifth and final reminder was sent to both samples on November 22, 2010. Online surveys were the predominant mode of data collection for the Taglit samples (Table 2).

³ CMJS staff made some modifications to the source code of LimeSurvey before using it for this study (LimeSurvey is open-source software released under the terms of the GNU General Public License v. 2). These modifications were mainly to allow greater compatibility between LimeSurvey and the in-house CATI and bulk-email sending systems.

TABLE 2: Interview Mode by Taglit Sample

Taglit Sample	Online Interviews	Phone Interviews	Total
<i>Sample 1</i>	390	61	451
<i>Sample 2</i>	321	78	399
Total	711	139	850

All potential respondents who did not respond to the initial email or reminders were contacted by telephone. Phone interviewing began for Sample 1 on October 6th and for Sample 2 on October 26th. At least two attempts were made to contact all non-respondents. Interviewers were instructed to attempt to complete an interview whenever they made contact with a potential respondent. If necessary, callbacks were scheduled. If the respondent seemed hesitant to participate over the phone, interviewers were able to send an email containing the unique URL of the survey for a given respondent. In cases where someone other than the potential respondent answered a call, the interviewer was instructed to confirm this was the best number at which to reach that person. If confirmed, the interviewer left a message for the potential respondent about the study and directions for how to contact CMJS staff if they had any questions. If the individual informed the caller that this number was not the best way to reach the potential respondent, the interviewer tried to obtain new contact information. In the cases where an interviewer reached a voicemail, they were instructed to leave voice messages. Voice messages were personalized for the respondent in situations where the voicemail was confirmed to belong to the potential respondent (see Appendix C for calling protocol).

Interviewing was carried out at CMJS by a group of interviewers predominantly comprised of Brandeis University undergraduate and graduate students. Some of the callers had worked as interviewers in previous CMJS studies. All callers completed training sessions led by CMJS staff members. A calling supervisor was present at each calling shift in order to field questions and monitor the quality of interviews. In general, the standard of interviewing was very high. The similarity in ages between the callers and respondents assisted in developing rapport. In view of the demographic characteristics of the target population, it is unlikely that professional interviewers would have achieved better results.

In cases where a Russian-speaking parent was reached, interviewers transferred the case to a native Russian speaker on the interviewing staff. In addition, respondents with Russian names were also allocated, where possible, to native Russian-speaking interviewers. CMJS staff created a sophisticated Web-accessible interface to manage phone interviewing and ongoing updating contact information.

Knowledge Networks Sample

Data collection for the Knowledge Networks sample began on October 19, 2010 and ended on November 5, 2010. A smaller follow-up survey was conducted between November 10, 2010 and November 30, 2010. Knowledge Networks respondents were only able to complete the survey online. Panel members in the sample frame were informed about their eligibility for the survey via a notification email that contained their unique link to the study. After three days, automatic reminders were sent to non-respondents. Custom reminders were then sent to non-respondents throughout the field period to encourage participation.

Incentives

Respondents in the Taglit sample were informed that completion of the full survey, (either online or over the phone) would earn them a \$15 Amazon.com gift certificate. To be eligible to receive the incentive, respondents were required to complete at least 70% of the survey. At the end of the instrument, respondents were asked to provide an email address to which the gift code was sent. Respondents were also given the opportunity to opt-out of receiving a gift card; 17 out of the 779 who were eligible to receive the incentive (2%) requested this option. Overall, 746 gift cards were distributed. Knowledge Networks respondents were incentivized using Knowledge Networks' own internal incentive system.

Response Rates

Removal of Ineligibles

Some individuals who were selected to participate in the study were subsequently discovered to be ineligible and were removed from the sample prior to calculation of response rates in accord with AAPOR guidelines (AAPOR, 2000) (Table 3). Respondents in the Knowledge Networks sample who did not have at least one Jewish parent and were not currently Jewish were removed from the sample in order to make eligibility to it comparable to the Taglit sample, which excludes such individuals. Respondents with at least one Jewish parent, even if they did not consider themselves currently Jewish, were left in the sample because they would be eligible for Taglit. In addition, some respondents were excluded from the Knowledge Networks sample because they were missing information about whether they had ever applied to Taglit. This information was necessary in order to determine proper overlap weights (see Weighting).

TABLE 3: Ineligibles by Sample

Sample Frame	Not eligible for Taglit	Missing information	Deceased	Total
<i>Taglit</i>				
Sample 1	0	0	1	1
Sample 2	0	0	1	1
<i>Knowledge Networks</i>				
Total	12	11	2	25

Response Rates by Sample

Interviews were conducted with 951 eligible respondents, and the overall response rate was 45% (Table 4). Relatively few individuals refused to complete the survey; the overall cooperation rate for this survey was 83%.⁴ While the vast majority of email invitations to those in the Taglit sample were sent successfully (99%), it is unclear how many respondents received the email in accounts that they check regularly.

⁴ Response rates and cooperation rates were calculated using the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) standard definitions. The response rate is the number of interviews, in this case both completed and partial, divided by the number of eligible units in the sample. AAPOR Response Rate (4) estimates what proportion of cases with unknown eligibility are actually eligible for the survey and includes them in the denominator. The cooperation rate is the number of interviews, including both completes and partial interviews, divided by the number of cases where direct contact was made with the respondent.

TABLE 4: Response Rates

Sample Frames	Response Rates	# of Respondents
Taglit	44%	850
<i>Sample 1</i>	47%	451
<i>Sample 2</i>	42%	399
Knowledge Networks	52%	101
Overall	45%	951

Weighting

Taglit Sample Weights

Because the Taglit sample was stratified, design weights were calculated based on the respondent's stratum. Design weights for a stratified survey are determined using the inverse of the probability of selection:

$$w_h = \frac{N_h}{n_h}$$

where n_h is the achieved sample in stratum h and N_h is the population size of stratum h . Thus each case is assigned a weight equal to the number of elements in the population of the frame it "represents."

However, because the large number of strata ($L = 27$) proved problematic, some strata were represented by a small number of respondents. One stratum did not have any respondents to weight. To minimize problems associated with small cell sizes, strata were collapsed based on several criteria. First, strata were collapsed by gender. Then, because there continued to be large differences in the sizes of different strata, all non-participants (who were only present in the summer 2010 round) were collapsed into a single stratum and 19 and 20-year-olds participants in that round were combined into a single stratum. This resulted in fourteen mutually exclusive and exhaustive strata with a roughly equal number of respondents within each stratum. Once all strata were collapsed, design weights were calculated in the manner described above.

Having defined the design weights, it is possible that substantive differences between the known characteristics of the achieved sample and the known characteristics of the frame (a subset of the Taglit registration database) may still remain, leading to bias. In this case it would be possible to create post-stratification weights that adjust for these differences by iteratively adjusting the salient demographic variables of the sample to reflect the expected distribution in the frame, while holding the sum of the weights constant. To this end, response to the survey was predicted using multivariate logistic regression models that utilized known values from the registration database: age; sex; participation status; round; Jewish denomination at time of application; and, for summer 2008 and 2010 applicants, number of years of Jewish day school, supplementary school, Sunday school, and Jewish camp. When modeled in this way, the only variable that was found to predict survey response significantly was round, with applicants to later rounds (2008 and 2010) being more likely to respond than those of earlier rounds (2004 and 2006). This discrepancy was likely due to the quality of contact information provided in the registration database (with information from earlier rounds more likely to be out of date) and not due to substantive differences in the characteristics of the respondents and non-respondents (as exemplified by the non-significance of other variables). Because describing a proportional sample of Taglit applicants was not a goal of this study, the Taglit applicant pool being used merely as a convenience sample, it was determined that applying post-stratification weights to adjust for round was unnecessary. Thus the design weights were considered the final weights for the Taglit sample.

Knowledge Networks Sample Weights

Data from the Knowledge Networks sample was weighted in several stages. The initial stage used Knowledge Networks' design weights, which adjust for variation in the probability of selection. Cases with higher weights were less likely to be selected, while cases with lower weights had a higher probability of selection. These weights have a mean of 1.0003 across eligible Jewish panel members (compared to 1.000 across all panel members), indicating the Jews had very slightly lower probabilities of selection than the sample as a whole. The second step in weighting was to calculate weights for non-response. Knowledge Networks made available socio-demographic information on all qualified panel members. Analyses were conducted to determine whether any socio-demographic variables were associated with response to this survey. When response to the survey was modeled using multivariate logistic regression analysis, the only variable that was significantly related to survey response was educational attainment, with those panel members with college degrees being significantly more likely to respond than those without college degrees. Because there was only a single variable significantly related to non-response, it was not necessary to use raking algorithms to adjust for several variables simultaneously. Post-stratification weights were calculated simply by adjusting the weights for college graduates down and those for non-college graduates up, so that the observed proportion of college graduates in the achieved sample matched the observed proportion of college graduates in the frame. For college graduates, this was achieved by dividing the expected proportion of college graduates over the observed proportion and multiplying the result by the design weights. Non-college graduates in turn had their design weights multiplied by the expected proportion of non-college graduates over the observed proportion. This single adjustment corrected for the overrepresentation of college graduates in the achieved sample while holding the sum of the weights constant, and the result was used as the final weight for the Knowledge Networks sample.

Combined Weights

Because individuals in the Knowledge Networks panel might also have applied to Taglit, there is a possibility these individuals have a higher probability of selection. We followed Hartley's (1962) method of calculating composite weights in multiple frame surveys usually defined as λ_i , which takes into account the design effects of each frame (in this case the list frame L and the overlap domain lr).

$$\text{overlapwt}_i = \text{bwt}_{rtw}_i \lambda \text{ if } i \in l$$

$$\text{overlapwt}_i = \text{postwt}_i (1 - \lambda) \text{ if } i \in lr$$

$$\text{overlapwt}_i = \text{postwt}_i \text{ if } i \in r$$

The parameter λ was estimated as:

$$\lambda = \frac{\sum_i \lambda_i \left(\frac{n_{lr}}{deff_{y_{lr}}} + \frac{n_L}{deff_{y_L}} \right)}{\sum_i \left(\frac{n_{lr}}{deff_{y_{lr}}} + \frac{n_L}{deff_{y_L}} \right)}$$

where y was a variable of interest, $deff_y$ was the design effect of the y th estimated proportion in L or lr , and:

$$\lambda_y = \frac{\sigma_{y_{lr}}^2}{\sigma_{y_L}^2 + \sigma_{y_{lr}}^2}$$

where σ_y^2 was the variance of a proportion. The variables of interest used in the calculation of λ are listed in Table 5.

TABLE 5: Variables Used in the Calculation of Composite Weights

Variable	Description
female	Respondent female
agecat	Respondent over age 25
student	Respondent currently a student
altbrk12mths	Respondent participated in an alternative break in last 12 months
volunteer	Respondent volunteered in last 12 months
jvolunteer	Respondent volunteered with a Jewish organization in last 12 months
makediff	When I volunteer I can make a difference (strongly agree)
parentmrg	Respondent's parents intermarried
daysch	Respondent attended day school
supsch	Respondent attended part time/Hebrew school
youthgrp2cat	Respondent participated in Jewish youth group in high school
hsvol2cat	Respondent volunteered in high school (somewhat/often)
hsciveng2cat	Respondent participated in a civic engagement/advocacy program in high school
relattnd2cat	Respondent attended Jewish religious services
libprog	Respondent politically Liberal or Progressive

Combined Sample Post-Stratification Weights

After the samples were combined a final set of post-stratification weights was added to adjust the achieved sample to the initial sample design characteristics. The sample was readjusted to weight on the following variables:

- **Age**—Age was weighted based on the recent CMJS cross-survey analysis project estimates of the American Jewish population.⁵ The cross-survey analysis project uses data from other national surveys that ask about religion to estimate the number of Jews in different age groups.
- **Gender**—Gender was weighted to yield an even number of men and women.

Weights were raked to yield an even distribution of gender and a distribution of age categories that reflected the American Jewish population.⁶ These raked weights were the final weights used in all analyses (Table 6).

TABLE 6: Characteristics of Weights

Weight	<i>n</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min	Max	Max:Min Ratio
Unweighted	951	1.00	.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Design weights (Taglit)	850	12.98	8.92	5.07	41.42	8.17
Design weights (Knowledge Networks)	101	1.04	.63	.25	4.73	18.92
Non-Response weights (Knowledge Networks)	101	1.04	.61	.22	4.11	18.68
Combined weights	951	.30	.35	.10	4.11	39.96
Final raked weights	951	.30	.37	.08	5.02	62.75

⁵ Presented at the American Jewish Studies Conference in December 2010 (Saxe, 2010).

⁶ Raking was carried out using QBAL a sample balancing program (Werner, 2004).

Sample Characteristics

The Volunteering + Values sample frame was designed to yield a diverse sample that included responses from the full spectrum of Jewish backgrounds and denominational identities among young adults. The researchers attempted to sample sub-populations within the Jewish community, such as those who did not identify as Jewish by religion, who are less likely to respond to surveys on Jewish topics. While this sample was not designed to be completely representative, respondents in the achieved sample come from a wide array of Jewish backgrounds and life experiences (Tables 7- 10). In addition, the sample is large enough to conduct meaningful analysis of sub-populations. Tables presented in this section are based on the achieved weighted sample.

TABLE 7: General Demographics

Variable	% of Sample
Gender	
<i>Male</i>	50%
<i>Female</i>	50%
Taglit Participation	
<i>Taglit Participant</i>	52%
<i>Taglit Non-Participant</i>	48%
Age	
<i>18</i>	1%
<i>19</i>	14%
<i>20</i>	8%
<i>21</i>	6%
<i>22</i>	5%
<i>23</i>	6%
<i>24</i>	4%
<i>25</i>	9%
<i>26</i>	5%
<i>27</i>	8%
<i>28</i>	7%
<i>29</i>	6%
<i>30</i>	4%
<i>31</i>	6%

32	5%
33	2%
34	3%
35	2%
Highest Degree	
<i>High School</i>	23%
<i>Associates</i>	7%
<i>Bachelor's</i>	44%
<i>Master's</i>	19%
<i>Professional</i>	6%
<i>Doctoral</i>	1%
<i>Other</i>	0%
Political Views	
<i>Conservative</i>	13%
<i>Moderate</i>	25%
<i>Progressive</i>	13%
<i>Liberal</i>	48%
Marital Status	
<i>Never married</i>	72%
<i>Engaged to be married</i>	3%
<i>Married</i>	19%
<i>Living with a life partner</i>	3%
<i>Separated or divorced</i>	2%
Children	
<i>Yes</i>	11%
<i>No</i>	89%

TABLE 8: Jewish Demographics

Variable	% of Sample
Attended Jewish overnight camp	43%
Worked at Jewish overnight camp	13%
Parental marriage	
<i>Inmarried parents</i>	74%
<i>Intermarried parents</i>	26%

TABLE 9: Current Jewish Religious Involvement

Frequency	Religious Services	Jewish Learning	Shabbat Meal
Never	29%	54%	29%
Rarely	32%	25%	40%
Sometimes	22%	13%	22%
Always	17%	8%	9%

TABLE 10: Years of Jewish Education

Years of Jewish Education	Supplementary School	Day School
0	31%	84%
1	4%	1%
2	5%	1%
3	3%	2%
4	5%	1%
5	8%	1%
6	6%	2%
7	9%	1%
8	7%	1%
9	3%	1%
10	9%	1%
11	3%	1%
12	8%	4%

Comparing Jewish Volunteer Rates to National Datasets

Overall 70% of Jewish young adults in our sample indicated that they volunteered in the past twelve months. Comparing the volunteer rate obtained in the current survey to national surveys of volunteering is difficult due to the different ways each of these surveys asks about volunteering. Specifically, the rate of volunteering usually rises as the number of questions asked about volunteering increases (Steinberg et al., 2002). This phenomenon can be seen by comparing the volunteer participation of the subset of young adults with similar educational backgrounds in the Volunteering + Values study and in three national surveys of volunteering (Table 11). The Current Population Study and the Center on Philanthropy Panel Study had similar rates of volunteering while Giving and Volunteering in the United States reports a much larger figure. Respondents in the latter survey were given more opportunities to indicate that they volunteered and the definition of volunteering was expanded to include all types of informal help for non-household members.

TABLE 11: Comparison of Volunteer Rates across Surveys

Survey	Subsample Characteristics	% Volunteered in Last Twelve Months
Volunteering + Values Study	18-35 College educated Jews	75%
Current Population Study	18-35 College educated	34%
Center on Philanthropy Panel Study	18-35 College educated head of household	35%
Giving and Volunteering in the United States	21-35 College educated	91%

Because volunteer participation is sensitive to question wording it is not appropriate to compare volunteer rates directly between this survey and other national datasets. However the Volunteering + Values Study can be compared to other datasets in terms of what variables are most likely to predict volunteering (see Data Analysis).

Comparing Current Dataset to National Jewish Datasets

One of the problems with conducting research on the Jewish community is the lack of comprehensive, accurate population data. Information on religion is not collected by the Census Bureau, so estimates of the size and characteristics of the Jewish population have been made by independent surveys. The decennial National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) has been the primary source of these estimates. NJPS used probability based sampling methods (RDD) to collect representative samples of American Jews in 1990 and 2000-2001. However the 2000-2001 study made a number of methodological decisions that likely resulted in over-sampling of religiously involved Jews under age 30 and under-sampling of college students living away from home (Kadushin et al., 2005). CMJS conducts an ongoing cross-survey analysis project that uses existing national surveys to estimate basic information about the size and demographics of the Jewish community. However, because the estimates are derived from national surveys, they do not contain any extensive information on respondents' Jewish background and education (Tighe et al., 2010). In 2010, CMJS conducted a study similar to NJPS 2000-2001 using the Knowledge Networks online panel. However, as noted earlier, the Knowledge Networks Panel contained only a limited number of young adults. Comparing the Volunteering + Values sample to the 2010 CMJS study is problematic in part because of the high degree of overlap between the Knowledge Networks panel members in both studies (69%). While none of the available surveys offers an ideal comparison dataset, we suspect that the Volunteering + Values sample under-represents certain sub-populations based on the available data and our *a priori* assumptions about the Taglit frame.

For example, it is likely that Orthodox respondents are under-represented in the sample. Those who participated previously in a peer educational group trip to Israel are not eligible for Taglit. Because Orthodox young adults are more likely to have participated in a peer educational group trip to Israel, they are likely under-represented in the Taglit applicant pool (Cohen, 1999). Although including the Knowledge Networks frame potentially corrected for some of this Taglit eligibility bias, in practice, the Knowledge Networks sample yielded similar proportions of Orthodox respondents as the Taglit sample (Table 12).

TABLE 12: Currently Orthodox by Sample Frame

Sample	% Orthodox
Taglit	7%
Knowledge Networks	5%
Overall	6%

As compared to a comparable age group in NJPS 2000-2001, we find that Orthodox-raised respondents make up a much smaller proportion of the Volunteering + Values sample (Table 13). Although it is difficult to know which estimate is more accurate, it is likely that the Volunteering + Values sample does under-represent the Orthodox because of Taglit eligibility requirements, but the true proportion of Orthodox young adults is also likely lower than reported in NJPS 2000-2001 because of its over-sampling of religiously involved young adults.

TABLE 13: Raised Orthodox in NJPS 2000-2001 and Volunteering + Values Study

Study	% Orthodox
Volunteering + Values Study	6%
NJPS 2000-2001	14%

Another potential source of bias is an under-representation of children of intermarriage. Although the Taglit frame encompasses a broad swath of the American Jewish young adult population, it likely misses young adults with the most tenuous connections to Judaism. In particular, children of intermarriage are likely under-represented among Taglit applicants (Chertok et al., 2008). This bias is corrected in part by the inclusion of the Knowledge Networks frame, which included a much higher proportion of children of intermarriage (Table 14). However, the overall proportion of children of intermarriage in the current sample is still lower than the proportion among 18 to 35-year-olds in NJPS 2000-2001 (Table 15).

TABLE 14: Parental Inter-marriage by Sample Frame

Sample	% Parental Inter-marriage
Taglit	22%
Knowledge Networks	31%
Overall	26%

TABLE 15: Parental Inter-marriage in NJPS 2000-2001 and Volunteering + Values Study

Study	% Parental Inter-marriage
Volunteering + Values Study	26%
NJPS 2000-2001	37%

College graduates are also likely over-represented in the current sample. Compared to a similar age group the proportion of respondents with bachelor's degrees or higher was far greater in the Volunteering + Values sample than in other Jewish population studies (Table 16).

TABLE 16: Proportion of College Graduates in Jewish Population Studies

Study	% College Graduates
CMJS Cross-Survey Analysis (18-34)	49%
NJPS 2000-2001	51%
CMJS/Knowledge Networks Panel 2010	50%
Volunteering + Values Study	63%

Many Taglit applicants are recruited through college-based Jewish organizations that run trips. As a result, Taglit applicants are more likely to be college graduates than the general Jewish population. In addition, college graduates may be more likely to respond to the survey. Respondents in the Knowledge Networks frame were more likely to have a college degree than non-respondents. While we were able to correct for this bias in the Knowledge Networks frame using non-response weights, we were unable to correct for it in the Taglit frame since information about current level of education for the frame was unavailable.

Without a true benchmark with which to compare our estimates it is impossible to know exactly where and how our sample is biased. While we do suspect that there is some bias, we are confident that our study covers the full spectrum of Jewish identities with a wide distribution of educational, religious, and life experiences. Furthermore the survey provides valuable information on the relationship between variables, for example what factors predict volunteering among young Jewish adults, which was not previously available (see Data Analysis).

Data Analysis

One goal of this study was to understand what factors might best predict certain behaviors and attitudes related to volunteering. Instead of isolating the impact of a specific causal independent variable, the purpose of the analysis was to find a model that best explains volunteer habits. As a result, multivariate regression models were used to identify variables that had the most explanatory power. Multivariate regressions also isolated the effect of a variable on a specific behavior or outcome while controlling for correlations between variables in the model.

Identification of variables for the regression models occurred in two stages. During the first stage, individual variables were grouped into clusters based on type (e.g., Jewish education) and regressed on the dependent variable. Conducting the regression analysis this way allowed identification of the variables that best predicted the dependent variable among variables of similar types. Additionally, limiting the size of the initial regression models decreased the possibility of a spurious result from an over-fitted regression model with too many variables (Harrell et al., 1996). The regression models also included a pool of variables designed to control for respondent background: gender, age, Taglit participation, parental intermarriage, high school ritual practice, and Jewish denomination. Because denomination is not an ordinal variable, dummy variables were created for each denominational category with Conservative designated as the excluded category.

During the second stage, significant variables from each cluster were introduced into a regression model that also contained the pool of background variables. This regression model constitutes the unrestricted model. Variables were then progressively removed from the unrestricted model in a stepwise fashion with an exit criterion of $\alpha=.051$ to create a parsimonious restricted model. In most instances, the restricted model included only those variables that were statistically significant. In a few instances, a non-significant variable was retained because excluding it significantly reduced the overall predictive power of the model.

The following tables contain the results from regression analysis included in the Volunteering + Values report. Each regression from the first stage is presented individually. The second stage of the regression is presented together with columns containing the coefficients from both the unrestricted and restricted/final regression models. Standard errors are reported in parenthesis after the regression coefficient and asterisks are used to denote statistically significant variables.

Factors Associated with Volunteering

Volunteering in the past year was determined through four different survey questions. Respondents who said that in a typical week in the last twelve months they spent at least one hour or more volunteering were automatically coded as volunteers. Those who said they participated in an immersive service learning program in the past twelve

months were also considered volunteers. If respondents answered no to both of those two questions, they were asked two follow-up questions about their volunteer involvement in the past year. Respondents who answered affirmatively to either of those two questions were coded as volunteering. Respondents whose responses to the questions on their volunteer service indicated that they had not volunteered were coded as non-volunteers. See the full instrument in Appendix A for full details on branching.

Regression analysis was conducted using a logistic model with volunteering coded as a dummy variable (Tables 17-24).

TABLE 17: Logistic Regression Model of Volunteering (Youth Participation Variables)

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Parental Volunteering	0.123 (0.143)
HS Volunteering	0.455** (0.155)
HS Civic Engagement Org	0.509* (0.255)
HS Advocacy Org	-0.0129 (0.312)
HS Non-Jewish Youth Group	0.122 (0.286)
Female	0.638* (0.255)
Age	0.00905 (0.0297)
Orthodox	1.180 (0.611)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.763* (0.364)
Just Jewish/Secular	0.191 (0.341)
Other Religion	0.695 (0.540)
High School Candles	0.407 (0.276)
Parental Inter marriage	0.647* (0.322)
Taglit Participation	0.0299 (0.248)
Constant	-1.896* (0.915)
Observations	764

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

TABLE 18: Logistic Regression of Volunteering (Jewish Participation Variables)

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Hours of Jewish Education	0.000137 (8.02e-05)
Attend Jewish Camp	-0.326 (0.273)
Work Jewish Camp	0.391 (0.371)
Jewish HS Youth Group	0.421** (0.135)
Female	0.684** (0.243)
Age	0.0118 (0.0289)
Orthodox	0.787 (0.653)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.767* (0.358)
Just Jewish/Secular	0.287 (0.361)
Other Religion	0.594 (0.527)
High School Candles	0.330 (0.293)
Parental Inter-marriage	1.013** (0.332)
Taglit Participation	0.160 (0.251)
Constant	-1.261 (0.822)
Observations	746

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 19: Logistic Regression of Volunteering by Student Status

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Student	0.191 (0.257)
Female	0.823** (0.236)
Age	0.0235 (0.0330)
Orthodox	1.207* (0.592)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.604 (0.345)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.108 (0.333)
Other Religion	0.312 (0.521)
High School Candles	0.450 (0.269)
Parental Inter marriage	0.811* (0.316)
Taglit Participation	0.0787 (0.244)
Constant	-0.688 (0.939)
Observations	778

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 20: Logistic Regression of Volunteering by Marital Status

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Married/Life Partner	0.616 (0.380)
Female	0.819** (0.237)
Age	-0.0220 (0.0339)
Orthodox	1.312* (0.612)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.621 (0.344)
Just Jewish/Secular	0.0103 (0.334)
Other Religion	0.446 (0.510)
High School Candles	0.394 (0.270)
Parental Inter-marriage	0.752* (0.303)
Taglit Participation	0.216 (0.250)
Constant	0.304 (0.864)
Observations	778

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 21: Logistic Regression of Volunteering by Parental Status

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Child	0.381 (0.592)
Female	0.751** (0.236)
Age	0.00132 (0.0308)
Orthodox	1.150 (0.591)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.676* (0.344)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.0130 (0.331)
Other Religion	0.412 (0.509)
High School Candles	0.416 (0.268)
Parental Inter-marriage	0.782* (0.310)
Taglit Participation	0.146 (0.242)
Constant	-0.144 (0.810)
Observations	789

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 22: Logistic Regression on Volunteering by Common Good Motivations Scale

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Common Good Motivations	0.207* (0.103)
Female	0.643* (0.255)
Age	0.0111 (0.0296)
Orthodox	1.299* (0.605)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.705* (0.347)
Just Jewish/Secular	0.0163 (0.339)
Other Religion	0.329 (0.531)
High School Candles	0.443 (0.271)
Parental Inter-marriage	0.825* (0.321)
Taglit Participation	0.108 (0.248)
Constant	-1.473 (0.844)
Observations	771

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 23: Logistic Regression of Volunteering by Current Jewish Religious Involvement Scale

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Current Jewish Religious Involvement	0.717*** (0.174)
Female	0.742** (0.239)
Age	0.0383 (0.0287)
Orthodox	0.601 (0.587)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.712* (0.347)
Just Jewish/Secular	0.227 (0.343)
Other Religion	0.625 (0.546)
High School Candles	0.144 (0.277)
Parental Inter-marriage	0.890** (0.320)
Taglit Participation	-0.115 (0.244)
Constant	-2.355** (0.873)
Observations	784

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 24: Logistic Regression of Volunteering (Full Model)

Variables	Unrestricted Model	Restricted Model
HS Volunteering	0.365*	0.435**
	(0.149)	(0.132)
HS Civic Engagement Org	0.429	
	(0.253)	
Jewish HS Youth Group	0.246	
	(0.136)	
Common Good Motivations	0.157	
	(0.107)	
Current Religious Jewish Involvement	0.624**	0.611****
	(0.193)	(0.152)
Female	0.584*	0.665**
	(0.262)	(0.251)
Age	0.0300	
	(0.0308)	
Orthodox	0.952	
	(0.639)	
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.877*	
	(0.363)	
Just Jewish/Secular	0.426	
	(0.359)	
Other Religion	0.881	
	(0.572)	
High School Candles	0.124	
	(0.295)	
Parental Inter-marriage	0.881**	0.848**
	(0.329)	(0.286)
Taglit Participation	-0.0583	
	(0.262)	
Constant	-4.388***	-1.908***
	(1.076)	(0.493)
Observations	745	808

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

Factors Associated with Regular Volunteering

Regular volunteering was determined by the question on volunteer frequency given to those who volunteered in the last twelve months. Those who said they volunteered at least once per month were coded as regular volunteers. Respondents who volunteered less than once per month or did not volunteer were coded as non-regular volunteers. Regression analysis was conducted using a logistic model with regular volunteering coded as a dummy variable (Tables 25-32).

TABLE 25: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering (Youth Participation Variables)

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Parental Volunteering	0.351** (0.112)
HS Volunteering	0.154 (0.156)
HS Civic Engagement Org	-0.204 (0.247)
HS Advocacy Org	0.122 (0.351)
HS Non-Jewish Youth Group	0.189 (0.294)
Female	0.425 (0.238)
Age	0.00785 (0.0285)
Orthodox	0.940 (0.539)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.105 (0.353)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.219 (0.321)
Other Religion	-0.459 (0.514)
High School Candles	0.251 (0.272)
Parental Inter marriage	-0.000335 (0.304)
Taglit Participation	0.436 (0.273)
Constant	-2.814** (0.936)
Observations	745

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 26: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering (Jewish Participation Variables)

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Hours of Jewish Education	-7.28e-05 (8.35e-05)
Attend Jewish Camp	0.223 (0.271)
Work Jewish Camp	0.250 (0.317)
Jewish HS Youth Group	0.119 (0.133)
Female	0.496* (0.235)
Age	-0.00806 (0.0294)
Orthodox	0.594 (0.702)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.0164 (0.355)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.318 (0.308)
Other Religion	-0.598 (0.493)
High School Candles	0.341 (0.273)
Parental Inter marriage	0.217 (0.314)
Taglit Participation	0.394 (0.281)
Constant	-1.439 (0.862)
Observations	728

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 27: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering by Student Status

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Student	0.246 (0.273)
Female	0.550* (0.229)
Age	0.00449 (0.0323)
Orthodox	0.275 (0.609)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.0862 (0.348)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.378 (0.308)
Other Religion	-0.596 (0.506)
High School Candles	0.375 (0.269)
Parental Inter marriage	0.148 (0.300)
Taglit Participation	0.407 (0.281)
Constant	-1.629 (0.932)
Observations	758

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 28: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering by Marital Status

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Married/Life Partner	0.247 (0.415)
Female	0.550* (0.232)
Age	-0.0255 (0.0326)
Orthodox	0.304 (0.616)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.0894 (0.355)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.354 (0.311)
Other Religion	-0.590 (0.499)
High School Candles	0.314 (0.270)
Parental Inter marriage	0.126 (0.296)
Taglit Participation	0.439 (0.281)
Constant	-0.828 (0.794)
Observations	758

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 29: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering by Parental Status

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Child	0.333 (0.530)
Female	0.506** (0.229)
Age	-0.0191 (0.0306)
Orthodox	0.186 (0.586)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.0730 (0.343)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.375 (0.307)
Other Religion	-0.590 (0.492)
High School Candles	0.347 (0.263)
Parental Inter marriage	0.165 (0.296)
Taglit Participation	0.462 (0.298)
Constant	-0.957 (0.778)
Observations	769

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 30: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering by Common Good Motivations Scale

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Common Good Motivations	0.288*
	(0.117)
Female	0.353
	(0.233)
Age	-0.00930
	(0.0288)
Orthodox	0.338
	(0.708)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.0585
	(0.350)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.372
	(0.315)
Other Religion	-0.621
	(0.513)
High School Candles	0.420
	(0.263)
Parental Inter-marriage	0.174
	(0.301)
Taglit Participation	0.350
	(0.275)
Constant	-2.686**
	(0.963)
Observations	751

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 31: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering by Current Jewish Religious Involvement Scale

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Current Jewish Religious Involvement	0.595*** (0.170)
Female	0.486* (0.226)
Age	0.0102 (0.0280)
Orthodox	-0.190 (0.611)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.108 (0.336)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.154 (0.316)
Other Religion	-0.432 (0.515)
High School Candles	0.143 (0.265)
Parental Inter marriage	0.278 (0.293)
Taglit Participation	0.240 (0.269)
Constant	-2.833*** (0.872)
Observations	764

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 32: Logistic Regression of Regular Volunteering (Full Model)

Variables	Unrestricted Model	Restricted Model
Parental Volunteering	0.291*	0.363***
	(0.115)	(0.104)
Common Good Motivations	0.314*	0.271**
	(0.122)	(0.104)
Current Religious Jewish Involvement	0.578**	0.554***
	(0.169)	(0.151)
Female	0.341	
	(0.236)	
Age	0.0267	
	(0.0279)	
Orthodox	0.586	
	(0.610)	
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.0471	
	(0.352)	
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.134	
	(0.340)	
Other Religion	-0.423	
	(0.549)	
High School Candles	0.133	
	(0.275)	
Parental Inter-marriage	0.220	
	(0.313)	
Taglit Participation	0.245	
	(0.275)	
Constant	-5.589***	-4.435***
	(1.155)	(0.676)
Observations	731	799

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

Factors Associated with Volunteering under Jewish Auspices

Respondents were asked about the types of organizations with which they volunteered in the past twelve months. Those who indicated that they volunteered with a Jewish organization were coded as having volunteered under Jewish auspices. Respondents who indicated that they did not volunteer with a Jewish organization or did not volunteer were coded as not volunteering under Jewish auspices. The survey also asked about the organizations with which respondents engaged in their primary activity. Regression analysis was conducted using a logistic model with volunteering under Jewish auspices coded as a dummy variable (Tables 33-39).

TABLE 33: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices (Jewish Participation Variables)

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Hours of Jewish Education	0.000242** (8.31e-05)
Attend Jewish Camp	0.00718 (0.285)
Work Jewish Camp	0.682* (0.326)
Jewish HS Youth Group	0.114 (0.135)
Female	0.303 (0.269)
Age	-0.0504 (0.0345)
Orthodox	0.363 (0.754)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.126 (0.348)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.457 (0.347)
Other Religion	-2.031** (0.647)
High School Candles	0.157 (0.308)
Parental Inter marriage	0.127 (0.330)
Taglit Participation	0.276 (0.325)
Constant	-0.802 (0.938)
Observations	746

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 34: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices by Current Jewish Religious Involvement Scale

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Current Jewish Religious Involvement	1.277*** (0.197)
Female	0.282 (0.264)
Age	-0.0292 (0.0366)
Orthodox	0.173 (0.657)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.0728 (0.317)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.241 (0.326)
Other Religion	-2.408** (0.784)
High School Candles	-0.0911 (0.278)
Parental Inter-marriage	0.0877 (0.334)
Taglit Participation	-0.0709 (0.304)
Constant	-3.294** (0.984)
Observations	784

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 35: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices by Compassion and Social Justice Jewish Perspective Scale

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Jewish Compassion and Social Justice	0.176*
	(0.0788)
Female	0.366
	(0.263)
Age	-0.0412
	(0.0334)
Orthodox	1.428*
	(0.557)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.0144
	(0.348)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.520
	(0.344)
Other Religion	-2.153**
	(0.739)
High School Candles	0.327
	(0.281)
Parental Inter marriage	0.0267
	(0.336)
Taglit Participation	0.403
	(0.323)
Constant	-1.172
	(0.880)
Observations	752

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 36: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices by Student Status

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Student	0.164 (0.386)
Female	0.386 (0.264)
Age	-0.0506 (0.0475)
Orthodox	1.045* (0.601)
Reform/Reconstructionist	-0.0321 (0.336)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.722* (0.334)
Other Religion	-2.260** (0.648)
High School Candles	0.360 (0.283)
Parental Intermarriage	-0.0911 (0.315)
Taglit Participation	0.274 (0.310)
Constant	-0.174 (1.286)
Observations	778

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 37: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices by Relationship Status

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Currently in a Relationship	-1.018*
	(0.495)
Female	0.368
	(0.256)
Age	-0.0122
	(0.0425)
Orthodox	1.448*
	(0.607)
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.0631
	(0.342)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.642*
	(0.343)
Other Religion	-2.228**
	(0.656)
High School Candles	0.328
	(0.271)
Parental Inter-marriage	-0.160
	(0.314)
Taglit Participation	0.112
	(0.344)
Constant	-0.826
	(0.934)
Observations	778

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 38: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices by Parental Status

Variables	Regression Coefficients
Child	-0.316 (0.696)
Female	0.367 (0.263)
Age	-0.0518 (0.0380)
Orthodox	1.185* (0.570)
Reform/Reconstructionist	-0.00431 (0.343)
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.679** (0.334)
Other Religion	-2.233** (0.647)
High School Candles	0.313 (0.281)
Parental Inter-marriage	-0.130 (0.318)
Taglit Participation	0.256 (0.339)
Constant	-0.0456 (0.877)
Observations	789

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 39: Logistic Regression of Volunteering under Jewish Auspices (Full Model)

Variables	Unrestricted Model	Restricted Model
Jewish Compassion and Social Justice	0.0188 (0.0749)	
Current Religious Jewish Involvement	1.378*** (0.198)	1.102*** (0.196)
Work Jewish Camp	0.434 (0.326)	0.693* (0.292)
Hours of Jewish Education	0.000312** (9.76e-05)	0.000183* (7.12e-05)
Currently in a Relationship	-1.270* (0.502)	-1.160** (0.406)
Female	0.323 (0.277)	
Age	0.0734 (0.0495)	
Orthodox	0.147 (0.636)	
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.231 (0.350)	
Just Jewish/Secular	0.0594 (0.358)	
Other Religion	-2.758** (0.972)	
High School Candles	-0.178 (0.310)	
Parental Inter marriage	0.241 (0.352)	
Taglit Participation	-0.165 (0.348)	
Constant	-6.467** (1.288)	-3.863*** (0.477)
Observations	690	795

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

Factors Associated with Volunteering under Jewish Auspices as their Primary Volunteer Activity

Respondents who indicated that they volunteered were asked about the type of organization that sponsored their primary volunteer activity. Those who said a Jewish organization sponsored their primary volunteer activity were coded as primary Jewish volunteers. The regression analysis for primary Jewish volunteering used the same variables as in the full model for volunteering with a Jewish organization, because it was assumed that similar factors should lead to volunteering with a Jewish organization as one's primary activity (Table 40).

TABLE 40: Logistic Regression of Primary Volunteering under Jewish Auspices

Variables	Unrestricted Model	Restricted Model
Jewish Compassion and Social Justice	0.0565 (0.103)	
Current Religious Jewish Involvement	1.385*** (0.248)	1.214*** (0.304)
Work Jewish Camp	0.0171 (0.454)	
Hours of Jewish Education	0.000165 (0.000133)	0.000154* (7.72e-05)
Currently in a Relationship	-2.418* (0.946)	-1.517* (0.609)
Female	-0.0763 (0.331)	
Age	0.153* (0.0683)	
Orthodox	0.0340 (0.784)	
Reform/Reconstructionist	-0.358 (0.454)	
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.0939 (0.485)	
Other Religion	-1.972** (1.002)	
High School Candles	0.199 (.336)	
Parental Inter-marriage	-0.162 (0.416)	
Taglit Participation	-0.233 (0.493)	
Constant	-8.991*** (1.611)	-5.051*** (0.804)
Observations	690	807

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

Factors Associated with a Jewish Lens on Volunteering

Two types of Jewish perspective on service were measured, "Compassion and Social Justice" and "Communal Ambassadorship". To determine what factors caused respondents to score higher on these measures we used an ordinary least square regression model. Because we suspected that holding a Jewish perspective was highly associated with both Jewish background and volunteer behavior those variables were included in the full model. Demographic variables were also included in the full model as controls (Table 40-41).⁷

⁷ Figure 26 in the report used an ordinary least squares regression of only Current Jewish Religious involvement on Community Ambassadorship. Since the purpose of the figure was to describe the relationship between the two variables, not create a full model, a multivariate approach was deemed unnecessary.

TABLE 41: Ordinary Least Squares Regression of Jewish Compassion and Social Justice Scale

Variables	Unrestricted Model	Restricted Model
Age	-0.0548 (0.0293)	
Female	-0.139 (0.193)	
Orthodox	-0.188 (0.437)	
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.0159 (0.277)	
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.335 (0.310)	
Other Religion	-1.049** (0.376)	
Parental Inter-marriage	-0.552* (0.240)	-0.692** (0.217)
Taglit Participation	-0.290 (0.185)	
High School Candles	-0.0485 (0.214)	
Hours of Jewish Education	-5.12e-05 (5.75e-05)	
Work Jewish Camp	0.136 (0.279)	
Attend Jewish Camp	-0.268 (0.217)	
HS Volunteering	0.0301 (0.115)	
Parental Volunteering	0.0607 (0.0974)	
Jewish Youth Group	0.0218 (0.112)	
Current Religious Jewish Involvement	0.867*** (0.130)	0.888*** (0.131)
Currently in a Relationship	0.818** (0.292)	
Child	-0.0150 (0.435)	
Regular Volunteer	0.0512 (0.200)	
Common Good Motivations	0.557*** (0.109)	0.485*** (0.0867)
Liberal Progressive	-0.562* (0.230)	-0.625** (0.219)
Constant	0.737 (0.846)	-0.375 (0.396)
Observations	603	713

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

TABLE 42: Ordinary Least Squares Regression of Jewish Community Ambassadorship Scale

Variables	Unrestricted Model	Restricted Model
Age	-0.0421 (0.0258)	-0.0427* (0.0200)
Female	-0.217 (0.175)	
Orthodox	-0.516 (0.485)	
Reform/Reconstructionist	0.0257 (0.268)	
Just Jewish/Secular	-0.562* (0.264)	
Other Religion	-1.000** (0.349)	
Parental Inter-marriage	-0.324 (0.218)	-0.550*** (0.181)
Taglit Participation	0.0913 (0.188)	
High School Candles	0.423 (0.219)	
Hours of Jewish Education	-4.65e-05 (6.06e-05)	
Work Jewish Camp	0.338 (0.221)	
Attend Jewish Camp	-0.565** (0.174)	
HS Volunteering	0.106 (0.113)	
Parental Volunteering	-0.132 (0.0861)	
Jewish Youth Group	-0.0505 (0.0900)	
Current Religious Jewish Involvement	0.593*** (0.147)	0.772*** (0.132)
Currently in a Relationship	0.120 (0.293)	
Child	-0.127 (0.369)	
Regular Volunteer	0.0804 (0.209)	
Common Good Motivations	0.406*** (0.0860)	0.370*** (0.0749)
Liberal Progressive	-0.340 (0.191)	
Constant	1.141 (0.819)	0.319 (0.580)
Observations	616	784

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

Sense of Efficacy and Gender

Regression analysis was used to determine the impact that gender had on respondents' sense of efficacy. Sense of efficacy was measured using a 1-4 scale where a score of "1" signified that respondents strongly believed they could make a difference and a score of "4" signified that they strongly believed that problems were too big for them to solve. In order to more precisely identify the impact of gender, the analysis controlled for other variables that were also likely to predict efficacy such as volunteer involvement, education attainment, and political views. Regression analysis was conducted using an ordinal logistic regression model (Table 43).

TABLE 43: Ordinal Logistic Regression of Sense of Efficacy by Gender

Variables	Unrestricted Model	Restricted Model
Female	-0.570** (0.199)	-0.636*** (0.172)
Age	-0.0448 (0.0303)	-0.037 (0.020)
Regular Volunteer	-0.601* (0.269)	-0.544* (0.224)
Occasional Volunteer	-0.627** (0.240)	-0.570** (0.193)
Liberal/Progressive	0.147 (0.192)	
Current Religious Jewish Involvement	0.203 (0.156)	0.198 (0.117)
Parental Volunteering	-0.172 (0.0946)	
HS Volunteering	0.0656 (0.121)	
Parental Inter marriage	-0.123 (0.233)	
HS Diploma/Associates	-0.447 (0.362)	
Bachelors Degree	-0.204 (0.235)	
Student	0.472* (0.239)	
Constant		
Observations	679	831

***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

References

- AAPOR. (2000). Standard definitions: Final dispositions of case codes and outcome rates for surveys. Lenexam KS: American Association for Public Opinion Research.
- Chertok, F., Phillips, B., & Saxe, L. (2008). It's not just who stands under the chuppah: Intermarriage and engagement. Waltham, MA: Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies, Brandeis University.
- Chang, L, & Krosnick, J. (2009). National surveys via RDD telephone interviewing versus the internet comparing sample representativeness and response quality. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 73(4), 641-678
- Cohen, E. H. (1999). Prior community involvement and 'Israel experience' educational tours. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, 13(2), 76-91.
- Cohen, S., & Fein, L. (2001). American Jews and their social justice involvement: Evidence from a national survey. New York, N.Y: Amos-The National Jewish Partnership for Service.
- Couper, M.P, Tourangeau, R., & Kenyon, K. (2004). Picture this! Exploring visual effects in web surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 68(2), 255-66.
- Dillman, D. A. (2007). Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Harrell, F. E., Lee, K. L. and Mark, D. B. (1996). Multivariable prognostic models: Issues in developing models, evaluating assumptions, and adequacy, and measuring and reducing errors. *Statistics in Medicine*, 15, 361-387.
- Hartley, H. O. (1962). Multiple frame surveys. *ASA Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section*, 203-206.
- Kadushin, C., Phillips, B., & Saxe, L. (2005). National Jewish population survey: A guide to the perplexed. *Contemporary Jewry*, 25, 1-22.
- Kalton, G. (2002). Sampling considerations in research on HIV risk and illness. In D.Ostrow & R. Kessler (Eds), *Methodological issues in AIDS behavioral research*. New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 53-72.
- Keeter, S. (2007). How serious is polling's cell-only problem? Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Phillips, B. (2007). Numbering the Jews: Evaluating and improving surveys of American Jews. Waltham MA: Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies, Brandeis University.

- Saxe, L., Phillips, B., Wright, G., Boxer, M., Hecht, S., & Sasson, T. (2008). Taglit-Birthright Israel evaluation 2007-2008 cohort. Waltham, MA: Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies, Brandeis University.
- Saxe, L., Phillips, B., Sasson, T., Hecht, S., Shain, M., Wright, G., & Kadushin, C. (2009). Generation Birthright Israel: The impact of an Israel experience on Jewish identity and choices. Waltham, MA: Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies, Brandeis University.
- Saxe, L. (2010, December). U.S. Jewry 2010: Estimates of the size and characteristics of the population. Presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Jewish Studies, Boston MA.
- Saxe, L., Sasson, T., Hecht, S., Phillips, B., Shain, M., Wright, G., & Kadushin, C. (2011). Jewish Futures Project. The impact of Taglit-Birthright Israel: 2010 update. Waltham, MA: Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies, Brandeis University.
- Schlenger, W.E., Caddell, J.M., Ebert, L.B., Jordan, K., Rourke, K.M., Wilson, D., Thalji, L. J., Dennis, M., Fairbank, J.A., & Kulka, R.A. (2002). Psychological reactions to terrorist attacks: Findings from the national study of Americans' reactions to September 11. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 288(5), 581-88.
- Schmitz, C. (2009). LimeSurvey - the open source survey application.
- Silver, R.C, Hilman, A., McIntosh, D.N., Poulin, M., & Gil-Rivas, V. (2002). Nationwide longitudinal study of psychological responses to September 11. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 288(10), 1235-44.
- Steinberg, K., Rooney, P., & Chin, W. (2002) Measurement of volunteering: A methodological study using Indiana as a test case. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31, 484-501.
- Smith, T.W. (2003). An experimental comparison of knowledge networks and the GSS. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 15(2), 167-79.
- Tighe, E., Livert, D., Barnett, M., & Saxe, L. (2010). Cross-survey analysis to estimate low-incidence religious groups. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 39, 56-82.
- Werner, J. (2004). QBAL. A professional sample balancing program: User's guide. Pittsfield, MA: Jan Werner Data Processing.

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

1. **[All]** There are many important issues facing our society and world today. In your own words, please list THREE different issues for which you would be most interested in volunteering?

1.

2.

3.

2. **[All]** In the past 12 months have you ever...

	Yes	No
Contacted or visited a public official at any level of government?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Donated money to an organization or cause?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attended a meeting of any level of government?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Contacted or written to a newspaper or magazine?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Taken part in a protest or demonstration?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Signed a written or email petition?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Registered voters?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Decided NOT to buy something because you dislike the social and political values of the company that makes or distributes the item?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bought something because you like the social and political values of the company that makes or distributes the item?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. **[All]** During a typical week in the last 12 months, about how much time did you spend on the following activities?

	No time	1-2 hours	3-9 hours	10 or more hours
Working for pay or a paid internship	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Commuting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Household activities, for example housework, child care or food preparation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attending class or studying	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Volunteering	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Doing recreational things with family, friends or others, for example, eating together, sports, gaming, talking or texting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Doing recreational things on your own, for example exercising, reading or surfing the web)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. **[If classes > No Time]** Are you currently enrolled in an educational program such as college, graduate school or a certificate program?
- Yes
 - No
 -
5. **[If 3. Attending Class or Studying > No Time and 4=Yes]** In what type of program are you enrolled?
- GED
 - Associate/ Junior College
 - Bachelor's
 - Master's
 - Professional
 - Doctoral
 - Other (Please describe)

6. **[If 3. Working for pay or paid internship=No time]** You indicated that in a typical week you do not spend any time working for pay or at a paid internship. At any time in the past 12 months have you worked for pay or worked at a paid internship?
- Yes
 - No
7. **[(If 3. Working for pay or paid internship>No time) or (Working for pay or paid internship=No time and 6=Yes)]** Which of the following best describes your primary employer?
- A for-profit company
 - A local, state or national government organization
 - A not-for-profit organization
 - Self-employed
8. **[If 7=A local, state, or national government organization]** What is the name of the government organization or agency for which you work?
-
9. **[If 7=A local, state, or national government organization]** Please describe the focus of this government organization.
-
10. **[If 7=A not for profit organization]** What is the name of the not-for-profit organization for which you work
-
11. **[If 7=A not for profit organization]** Please describe the focus of this not-for-profit organization
-

[All] In the past 12 months have you participated in a short, medium, or long term immersive volunteer program, for example Habitat for Humanity, Global Service Corps, or AVODAH?

- Yes
- No

12. **[All]** When did you most recently participate in the following types of programs?

	Never	PRIOR to the past 12 months	In the past 12 months
A short-term (less than 2 week) immersive volunteer program, for example an alternative break or Habitat for Humanity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A medium-term (2-12 week) immersive volunteer program, for example Bike and Build or Global Service Corps	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A long-term (3 months or longer) immersive volunteer program, for example the Peace Corps or AVODAH	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. **[IF short term>Never]** What is the name of the organization or organizations that ran the short term immersive or alternative break program(s) in which you participated?

14. **[IF medium term>Never]** What is the name of the organization or organizations that ran the medium-term volunteer program(s) in which you participated?

15. **[IF long term>Never]** What is the name of the long-term program or programs in which you participated?

16. **[(If 3. Volunteering=No time or no answer AND 12=No)** You indicated that in a typical week you do not spend any time volunteering. At any time in the past 12 months have you engaged in any volunteer activities? That is, actually working in any way to help others for no pay, like tutoring or working in a soup kitchen.
- Yes
 - No
17. **[(If 3. Volunteering=No time or no answer AND 12=No AND 17=No]**Sometimes volunteering includes actions done informally or on your own, like delivering bottled water to elderly neighbors on hot days or gathering goods for a fundraiser. Have you engaged in any of these types of activities in the past 12 months?
- Yes
 - No
18. **[(If Volunteering>No time OR 12=Yes OR 17=Yes OR 18=Yes]** Overall in the past 12 months, how frequently did you volunteer?
- One time only
 - Once every few months
 - About once a month
 - 2-3 times a month
 - About once a week
 - More than once a week

19. [If Volunteering>No time OR 17=Yes OR 18=Yes OR (12=Yes AND 19>One time only)] Thinking about all the volunteer work you did in the past 12 months was any of this volunteer work organized by ...?

	Yes	No	Don't know
A local, state or national government organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A Jewish not-for-profit organization or synagogue	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Another not-for-profit organization or religious group	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A political campaign or party	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A club or group that you belong to such as a fraternity or Junior League	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Your employer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Your friends, independent of an organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
You, independent of an organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

20. [Same branching as 19] Thinking about all the volunteer work you did in the past 12 month how personally meaningful did you find this work?
- Not at all meaningful
 - A little meaningful
 - Somewhat meaningful
 - Very meaningful

21. [Same branching as 20] Not including any short, medium or long-term immersive volunteer programs in which you may have participated, what is the volunteer activity in which you were most involved in the past 12 months?

22.[Same branching as 20] Please describe the types of work you did most often in this MAJOR volunteer work?

23.[Same branching as 20] How were you recruited or asked to do this MAJOR volunteer work?

24.[(If Volunteering>No time OR 12=Yes OR 17=Yes OR 18=Yes) AND 19>One time only] In the past 12 months, how frequently did you engage in this MAJOR volunteer work?

- One time only
- Once every few months
- About once a month
- 2-3 times a month
- About once a week
- More than once a week

25.[Same branching as 20] Which of the following best describes the primary organizer of this MAJOR volunteer work?

- A local, state or national government organization
- A Jewish not-for-profit organization or synagogue
- Another not-for-profit organization or religious group
- A political campaign or party
- A membership club or group such as a fraternity or Junior League
- Your employer
- Your friends, independent of an organization
- You, independent of an organization
- Don't know

26.[Same branching as 20] What population(s) or target groups benefited most from this volunteer work?

27. **[Same branching as 20]** Did this volunteer work serve...?
- Jews and non-Jews
 - Jews
 - Non-Jews
 - Don't know
28. **[((If Volunteering>No time OR 17=Yes OR 18=Yes) OR (12=Yes AND 19>One time only)) AND (Working>No time OR 6=Yes)]**
Was this MAJOR volunteer work required by your employer?
- Yes
 - No
29. **[((If Volunteering>No time OR 17=Yes OR 18=Yes) OR (12=Yes AND 19>One time only)) AND (Attending class>No time)]**
Was this MAJOR volunteer work a requirement for a class or part of an unpaid internship?
- Yes
 - No
30. **[((If Volunteering>No time OR 17=Yes OR 18=Yes) OR (12=Yes AND 19>One time only)) AND (4=Yes)]**
Did this MAJOR volunteer work fulfill a community service requirement at your school?
- Yes
 - No

38. [All] Please describe any other reasons you might have for deciding NOT to volunteer.

39.[All] Here are some reasons that people give for why they DON'T volunteer through or for Jewish organizations or synagogues. For each reason, please indicate how much of a reason it is to you for NOT volunteering through or for Jewish organizations. Using a scale from 1-7 where 1 means not at all a reason and 7 means a major reason [Randomized]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Not at all a reason						Major reason
The issues addressed by Jewish organizations are not interesting or important to me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not have much in common with people who volunteer with Jewish organizations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I don't have someone who will volunteer with me at a Jewish organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I don't know what volunteer opportunities are available through Jewish organizations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I find Jewish organizations to be out of touch with the way I think about things.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am not comfortable in most Jewish organizations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My non-Jewish friends would not feel welcome	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am not interested in the volunteer activities that Jewish organizations are hosting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

40. [All] Please describe any other reasons you might have for deciding NOT to volunteer with or through a Jewish organization.

41. [All] Please describe the types of work you would most prefer to do as a volunteer.

42.[All] When opting to engage in volunteer work to what extent do you prefer opportunities that ... [Randomized]

	1	2	3	4
	Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Very much
Let you set your own schedule	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Involve a short-term commitment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Involve a long-term commitment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Involve a one-time only commitment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Take place in close geographic proximity to your home	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Allow you to volunteer from home	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Have a clear beginning and end point	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Allow you to work alone	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Allow you to work as part of a team	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Allow you to work with friends	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

43.[All] Here are different pairs of statements. For each pair please indicate which statement comes closer to your own point of view, and whether you strongly or somewhat agree with the selected statement. **(Randomized)**

OR

- When I give my time or raise money to address a problem facing our world, I can make a difference.
 - Most of the problems facing our world are just too big for me as an individual to make a difference.
- Strongly agree with the first statement
 - Somewhat agree with the first statement
 - Somewhat agree with the second statement
 - Strongly agree with the second statement

44. [All]

OR

- When thinking about volunteering, I prefer to do service that primarily helps other Jews
 - When thinking about volunteering, it is not important to me whether my service is helping Jews or helping non-Jews
- Strongly agree with the first statement
 - Somewhat agree with the first statement
 - Somewhat agree with the second statement
 - Strongly agree with the second statement

45. [All]

OR

- When I take action to make the world a better place, I usually consider it an action based on Jewish values.
 - When I take action to make the world a better place, I do not usually consider it an action based on Jewish values.
- Strongly agree with the first statement
 - Somewhat agree with the first statement
 - Somewhat agree with the second statement
 - Strongly agree with the second statement

Here are some statements about volunteering. For each statement, please indicate whether you find it to be a not at all convincing, little convincing, somewhat convincing or very convincing, reason for you to volunteer. **(Randomized)**

- 46.**[All]** Jews have a responsibility to look out for those in need. As a minority that has faced discrimination and persecution throughout history, we understand the importance of helping people during difficult times.
- Not at all convincing
 - A little convincing
 - Somewhat convincing
 - Very convincing
- 47.**[All]** A strong Jewish community is important for the prosperity of all American Jews. It is very important to contribute time to volunteer activities through or for Jewish organizations and synagogues, so we can strengthen the Jewish community.
- Not at all convincing
 - A little convincing
 - Somewhat convincing
 - Very convincing
48. **[All]** Repairing the world- also known as Tikkun Olam – is a guiding Jewish principle. Our religion and heritage requires that we do things that promote the welfare of society as a whole.
- Not at all convincing
 - A little convincing
 - Somewhat convincing
 - Very convincing
- 49.**[All]** We all have a responsibility to each other. Whether it is helping the poor to make ends meet or ensuring the rights of those facing discrimination, we must all pitch in and volunteer to help those who need it.
- Not at all convincing
 - A little convincing
 - Somewhat convincing
 - Very convincing

50. [All] Were you raised by...
- Two Jews
 - A Jew and a non-Jew
 - Two non-Jews
 - A Jew
 - A non-Jew
51. [All] Thinking about how you were raised, were you raised as...
- Conservative
 - Orthodox
 - Reform
 - Reconstructionist
 - Just Jewish
 - Not Jewish
 - Something else _____.
52. [All] Are you currently...
- Conservative
 - Orthodox
 - Reform
 - Reconstructionist
 - Just Jewish
 - Not Jewish
 - Something else _____.
53. [All] During your high school years, did someone in your home regularly light Shabbat candles?
- Yes
 - No
54. [All] Did you attend an overnight camp that had Shabbat services and/or a Jewish education program?
- Yes
 - No
55. [All] Did you work at an overnight camp that had Shabbat services and/or a Jewish education program?
- Yes
 - No

56. **[All]** During grades 1-12 did you ever attend a supplementary Jewish school, like Hebrew or Sunday school?

- Yes
- No

57. **[If q57=Yes]** For how many years did you attend such a school?

- 1 or less
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12 or more years

58. **[All]** During grades 1-12, did you ever attend a full time Jewish day school?

- Yes
- No

59. **[If q59=yes]** For how many years did you attend such a school?

- 1 or less
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12 or more years

60. [All] During your high school years, how involved were you in Jewish youth groups. For example BBYO, NFTY, Young Judaea, or USY?
- Not at all
 - A little
 - Somewhat
 - Very much

61. [If 61>Not at all] With which Jewish youth group were you most involved?

62.[All]During your high school years how often....

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Did your parents engage in volunteer activities?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Did you volunteer?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

63. [All] During your high school years did you participate in ...

	Yes	No
An organization or club that promotes civic engagement, for example Model UN or student council?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An advocacy organization or club, for example Amnesty International?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A non-religious youth program, for example Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, or 4-H?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

64.[All] In the last 12 months, how often did you participate in each of the following?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Special Shabbat meal or activity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jewish learning/text study	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Jewish religious services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attending cultural events or viewing films, television programs, or on-line content on Jewish topics or Israel?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

DEMOGRAPHICS [All]

65. Are you ...

- Never married
- Engaged to be married
- Married
- In a civil union
- Living with life partner
- Separated/divorced
- Widowed

66.. Do you have any children?

- Yes
- No

67. What is your highest educational accomplishment?

- High school diploma or GED certificate
- Associate's Degree (AA, AN, etc.)
- Bachelor's Degree (BA, BS, etc.)
- Master's Degree (MA, MS, MBA, MSW, etc.)
- Professional Degree (JD, MD, etc.)
- Doctoral Degree (PhD, etc.)
- Other

68. Thinking in political terms, would you say you that you are conservative, moderate, progressive, or liberal?

- Conservative
- Moderate
- Progressive
- Liberal

69. What websites, blogs or social networking sites do you most frequently use?

Appendix B: Survey Communications

Invitation to Survey

Email from: Fern Chertok: xxxxxxxx@brandeis.edu

Subject Line: Participate in Brandeis University's Perspectives of Jewish Young Adults Study

Text:

Dear {Respondent Name},

You have been selected to participate in a national study on the perspectives of Jewish young adults.

The survey should take you about 15 minutes to complete. Upon completion, you will be presented with a \$15 Amazon.com gift card in appreciation of your time.

The information you will provide is incredibly valuable in helping best understand the concerns, values, and involvements of Jewish young adults today.

To begin your survey, please click on the link below.

{Link}

This link is your personal link to the survey. Please do not share this link.

This Perspectives of Jewish Young Adults study is being conducted by the Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University. Participation is voluntary and all responses will be kept confidential. If you have problems accessing the survey, please email xxxxxx@brandeis.edu or call (xxx) xxx-xxxx.

Sincerely,

Fern Chertok
Associate Research Scientist
Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies
Brandeis University

Sample Reminder

Email from: Fern Chertok: xxxxxxxx@brandeis.edu

Subject Line: Still time to participate in Brandeis University's Perspectives of Jewish Young Adults Study!

Text:

Dear {Respondent Name},

Recently you were invited to participate in a survey on the perspectives of Jewish young adults today. The survey should take you about 15 minutes to complete. Upon completion, you will be presented with a \$15 Amazon.com gift card in appreciation of your time.

The information you will provide is incredibly valuable in helping us best understand the opinions and motivating values of Jewish young adults across the country.

To begin your survey, please click on the link below.

{Link}

This Perspectives of Jewish Young Adults study is being conducted by the Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University. Participation is voluntary and all responses will be kept confidential. If you have problems accessing the survey, please email xxxxxxxx@brandeis.edu or call (xxx) xxx-xxxx.

Sincerely,

Fern Chertok
Associate Research Scientist
Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies
Brandeis University

Appendix C: Calling Protocol

Hello, I'm calling from Brandeis University. My name is [YOUR FIRST NAME]. How are you doing today? I wanted to talk to you about a study we are conducting on the perspectives of Jewish young adults today. The survey will take about 18 minutes and when you complete the survey you will receive a \$15 Amazon.com gift card to thank you for your time.

Is now a good time for you to take the survey?

If unwilling/unable to take survey at this point:

Is there a better time that we could call you? [Be mindful of our calling times. Try to press for a specific time. Make sure you confirm what TIME ZONE the respondent lives in because it may have changed since they applied.]

If unwilling to take survey by phone or give a callback time:

Can I email you the survey? You can complete it online when you have a chance. [Confirm email address.]

Scenario: Respondent has a partial survey status

Hello, I'm calling from Brandeis University. My name is [YOUR FIRST NAME]. How are you doing today? I wanted to talk to you about a study we are conducting on perspectives of Jewish young adults today. We see that you received our email and started to take our survey. I wanted to know if you had a few minutes to complete the survey with me over the phone. When you complete the survey you will receive a \$15 Amazon.com gift card to thank you for your time.

Scenario: Respondent lives at this number but is unavailable

For Participants, Replicate 1: Hello, I'm calling from Brandeis University. My name is [YOUR FIRST NAME]. I wanted to talk to [RESPONDENT NAME] about a study we are conducting on the perspectives of Jewish young adults today. The survey will take about 18 minutes and once completed [RESPONDENT NAME] will receive a \$15 Amazon.com gift card to thank his/her for his/her time. What is the best way for me to get in touch with [RESPONDENT NAME]? [Get callback time and/or other phone number/time zone. If the individual is overseas, we still want their contact info! Try to press for a phone number.]

Scenario: Respondent is known at this number but doesn't live there

For Participants, Replicate 1: Hello, I'm calling from Brandeis University. My name is [YOUR FIRST NAME]. I wanted to talk to [RESPONDENT NAME] about a study we are conducting on the perspectives of Jewish young adults today. The survey will take about 18 minutes and once completed [RESPONDENT NAME] will receive a \$15 Amazon.com gift card to thank his/her for his/her time. We would like to ask [RESPONDENT NAME] to participate in the study. Would you be able to give me a better way I could reach him/her?

If reluctant to give out respondent's contact information:

We will send [RESPONDENT NAME] a \$15 Amazon gift card if s/he completes the short survey. Many organizations here in North America look to our research to better understand Jewish young adults and the kinds of Jewish experiences they are looking for in their lives right now. The number will only be used to contact this person for this study, we won't give this information to anyone outside the research team or use it any other purposes. Responses to this study will be kept strictly confidential.

If still unwilling to give out respondent's contact information, give contact information and ask for message to be relayed: xxx-xxx-xxxx, xxxxxs@brandeis.edu. Also see if you can confirm any of the other contact info that we have for the respondent.

Scenario: Respondent seems not known at this number

[Probe for information.] Do you know where I can reach [RESPONDENT NAME]?

If not known:

Thank you very much.

If known, go to "Respondent is known at this number but doesn't live there" scenario above.

Scenario: The person who answers this number doesn't seem to understand English.

If parents/relatives who pick up the phone are Russian speakers and there is a caller who is a Russian speaker close by, hand over the call to that caller. If there is not a Russian-speaking caller nearby, say "I will ask a colleague who speaks Russian to call you later." Select the disposition of "Language barrier" and make sure to notify supervisor that this case needs to be handed over to a Russian speaker. If the language barrier is not Russian, select the disposition of "Language barrier" and note which language it is (if you can tell).

Scenario: It is clear that you have reached a workplace

In this case, use a very generic script.

I'm calling from Brandeis University. My name is [YOUR FIRST NAME]. We are trying to get in touch with [RESPONDENT NAME] with regards to a study we are conducting.

If respondent no longer works there:

Would you be able to give me her/his forwarding contact information?

If respondent currently works there but is unavailable, or if unwilling to give out respondent's contact information, give contact information and ask for message to be relayed. xxx-xxx-xxxx, xxxxxx@brandeis.edu.