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Abstract

This article presents an overview of the field of Jewish identity studies. Highlights and milestones in diverse segments of the literature are indicated, including demographics, contents and meanings of identity, Israeli identity and the Israel-Diaspora relationship, the impact of anti-Semitism, comparative studies, typologies of Jewish identity, and a brief review of philosophical, theoretical, and creative writings on Jewish identity.

The methodology of studying Jewish identity is discussed. A mapping sentence of the field is presented, providing an exploratory conceptual framework. A structural analysis of a sample of 180 studies is conducted. Smallest Space Analyses of the content issues and methods in the sample of articles yield graphic representations of the structure of Jewish identity studies. Content issues may be differentiated into those related to ethnicity, identity conflicts, peoplehood, and historical forces. A clear differentiation is seen between quantitative and qualitative methods, and between the use of primary data and secondary sources.

Directions for future studies, including a synopsis of some of the major gaps in the literature, are discussed.
I. Introduction

Over the past half century, there has been growing concern with and attention to the issue of “Jewish identity.” It may be argued that fundamental questions regarding what it means to be a Jew have been of primary concern since Biblical times (that is, each of the patriarchs struggled with existential questions of personal religious identity, and the Children of Israel in the desert with questions of national identity). Rabbis, Jewish philosophers, and thinkers through the ages have also wrestled with these questions (see, for example, Stern, 1994). However, the sociological concept of Jewish identity—and the more general concept of ethnic identity—are relatively recent paradigms.

Increased social mobility and opportunity to choose and create one’s identity have given rise to a parallel increase in self-awareness, study, discussion, debate, and activity regarding the nature of collective and individual Jewish identity. There are numerous research projects dedicated to the study of various aspects of Jewish identity, and countless educational and community programs aimed at strengthening “Jewish identity.” Philosophical writings by Jewish intellectuals and creative works by Jewish writers and film-makers have likewise wrestled with questions of Jewish identity. Thus, while the products of this field are rich, they are also scattered.

In Steinberg’s (1984) state-of-the-art essay on Jewish education, he writes, “There is a need to produce a viable theoretical and conceptual framework and a systematic methodological scheme for the applied study of contemporary systems of Jewish education” (p. 93). The same may be said regarding studies of Jewish identity. This article aims towards such a goal. While it is clearly impossible to comprehensively cover the field, this chapter endeavors to provide a useful summary in two ways. First, highlights and milestones in the literature on Jewish identity from different time periods, countries, and genres are noted. This article deals primarily with empirical studies of Jewish identity. The studies included were selected in order to offer examples of the themes discussed and the observations made about the field. They are not meant to be an exhaustive representation of the many important works published. The broad and rich literature of philosophical, theoretical, and creative

---

1 Countless Jewish authors have explicitly addressed issues of Jewish religious, communal, cultural, and national identity through their fiction, memoirs, films, essays, etc. These creative works have made serious and significant contributions to the body of literature on Jewish identity and are therefore worth mentioning in this chapter, albeit
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exploration of Jewish identity is touched on only very briefly.

Second, an extensive survey of scientific works on Jewish identity was conducted, and the results were categorized by content and methods. This survey covers a broad sample of the available literature. Analysis of this categorization provides valuable insights into major trends in Jewish identity research, including both the issues addressed and the methods used to attend to them. Thus, I offer an overview and synthesis of the works discussing the nebulous concept of “Jewish identity,” and point towards directions for future research.

II. Contemporary identity studies

Only since the beginning of the 20th century have social scientists systematically identified and empirically studied the ways in which individuals and groups of people define themselves vis-à-vis others (Barth, 1969; Erikson, 1968, 1974; Geertz, 1973; Goffman, 1959, 1961; Mead, 1934; Weber, 1922; Wheelis, 1959). While this article focuses on research related to Jewish identity, it is important to note here some of the work being done on racial, ethnic, and religious identity among other minority groups, as the fields are complementary. Jewish identity studies have been enriched by the work done in the general field of ethnic studies, and the many studies conducted on Jewish identity have contributed to the larger field.

Phinney’s (1990, p. 499) review of research on ethnic identity notes that “identity is central to the psychological functioning of members of ethnic and racial minority groups, but research on the topic is fragmentary and inconclusive.” Most studies of ethnic identity draw on “social identity theory, as presented by social psychologists; acculturation and culture conflict, as studied by social psychologists, sociologists, or anthropologists; and identity formation, drawn from psychoanalytic views and from developmental and counseling psychology” (p. 501). Phinney found that the main components of ethnic identity addressed in the literature included self-identification, sense of belonging, attitudes (positive and negative) towards one’s group, and ethnic involvement (which may include language, friends, religious practice, area of residence, and political activity).

Whereas early research on minorities in Western cultures assumed their gradual assimilation (Drachsler, 1920; Gordon, 1964), in recent
decades this has shifted to studies of how cultural identity forms and transforms in pluralistic societies (Bernal, 1993; Berry, 1984, 1990). There has been increased recognition of the multi-faceted nature of identity, the trajectory of identity development over time, and the multiple identities many—indeed most—individuals juggle (Appadurai, 1996; Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006; Gergen, 1991; Giddens, 1991; Glazer & Moynihan, 1975; Head, 1997; King, 1997; Nagel, 1994; Phinney, 1989, 1990; Romanucci-Ross & de Vos, 1995; Sarup, 1996; Scott & Friedman, 1998; Smith, 1991; Spickard & Burroughs, 2000; Verkuyten, 2005; Woodward, 2004; Worchel, Morales, Paez, & Deschamps, 1998).

In the contemporary world, there is greater freedom to choose one’s identity or identities than was possible in the past. Ascribed, inherited, and primordial identities are gradually being supplanted by achieved, voluntarily chosen, and constructed identities. Choice in the realm of identity becomes not only possible but mandatory; a “heretical imperative” (Berger, 1979). According to Gans (1979, 1994), this shift represents a replacement of holistic ethnic identities affecting all parts of daily life with “symbolic” identities; or in the words of Ro’i (2005; Ro’i & Beker, 1991), “thick” cultural identities are being replaced by “thin” ones. Nevertheless (and at least in part in reaction to the above-described social trends), there has been a simultaneous revival of national, religious, and ethnic identification around the world (Featherstone, 1990; Novak, 1972; Sahliyeh, 1990). This revival may be manifested as resurgent fundamentalism. It also may be expressed through a search for holistic and authentic personal and group identity. The search for identity may include, for example, participation in a local community or travel (see MacCannell, 1976, 1992; E. Cohen, 1984, 1988; Kelner, 2002).

Studies of international networks connecting migrants in various host countries with their home countries have added greatly to understandings of how group identities adapt and change (Alba & Silberman, 2002; Berry, 1997; Centrie, 2004; Guibernau & Rex, 1997). Since Jews have for centuries maintained a balance between the maintenance of a distinctive group identity and acculturation into the dominant society, they have become a classic case study in the field of ethnicity and identity (Spicer, 1971). Other minorities have looked to the Jews as a model for identity preservation (Charry & Charry, 2000; Goodstein, 1998). The Dalai Lama, for example, has explicitly expressed interest in learning about Jewish cultural tools for survival (Goldman, 1992; Katz, 1991). Even more, there has been a sort of universalization
III. Explorations of Jewish identity: A wide and varied field

Jewish identity is a broad concept and difficult to define. Herman (1988, p. 2) explicitly differentiates between identification (“the process by which the individual comes to see himself as part of the Jewish group”) and identity (“what being Jewish means in the life of the individual, the content of his Jewishness”). Himmelfarb (1980, 1982) reviewed literature on identity and identification of American Jews and found that most studies focus on identification, which is itself a multi-dimensional phenomenon consisting of ritual behavior, institutional participation, social ties, attitudes towards Israel, religious belief, knowledge of Judaism, and philanthropy. Gitelman, Kosmin, and Kovács (2003, p. 342) distinguish between Jewish consciousness (strength of affiliation) and Jewish meaning (how Jews understand Jewishness). Conscious identification as a Jew and the meanings associated with Jewish identity simultaneously encompass issues of religion, nationality, culture, history, economics, demographics, psychology, theology, and sociology. The literature on Jewish identity is correspondingly broad, including sociological research from a variety of angles, philosophical writings, and theoretical and creative explorations of Jewish identity.

III A. Demographic studies

Some primary questions regarding Jewish identity, such as the number of Jews, where they live, marriage, and childbearing patterns have been addressed through demographic studies. As was discovered during the design and implementation of a national study of Jews in France (E.H. Cohen, 2008a, 2009b), even the most basic question of how many Jews live in a given country is far from simple to assess empirically. National censuses in many countries do not permit requiring citizens to state their religion. The halakhic definition of matrilineal descent makes Jewish association extremely difficult to ascertain, and consequent
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demographic estimations problematic. Generally, Jewish population must be calculated based on voluntary surveys in which participants state whether or not they are Jewish, or participation in various Jewish institutions (schools, synagogues, etc.). Thus, demographic studies address, *inter alia*, the basic issue of voluntary identification with the Jewish People.

The American Jewish Committee has been conducting surveys and publishing results and analyses in the American Jewish Yearbook since 1899.² The yearly publications include statistics, directories, research articles and essays by key scholars, and a “year in review.” Taken together, they provide a rich and evolving picture of Jewish-American life over the past century (as well as some overview of important issues and events in other parts of the Jewish world). More recently, the Jewish People Policy Planning Institute launched a similar project. Their publications (JPPPI, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007) offer a comparative look at the results of these and other surveys (such as the Israeli national census and United Nations data). Sergio DellaPergola (who has also played a leading role in the studies of the JPPPI) directed some of the most comprehensive and important demographic studies of world Jewry (DellaPergola, 1996, 1999; 2008; DellaPergola, Rebhun, & Toltz, 2000, 2005; Bensimon & DellaPergola, 1984). Ritterband has looked at the Jewish demographic characteristics in terms of geography (1986) and fertility rates (1992).

The National Jewish Population Surveys conducted in the United States (Goldstein, 1971; Kosmin et al., 1990; NJPS, 2003) have provided valuable information about the largest Diaspora population today. The results (for instance, the revelation that the intermarriage rate exceeds 50%) have had profound and wide-reaching impacts on educational and community policy decisions.

The Institute for Jewish Policy Research conducted a broad survey of Jews in the United Kingdom, documenting current trends of basic indicators of identity such as synagogue membership, marriage patterns, participation in and affiliation with the Jewish community, religious practice, and religious belief, as well as Jews’ political and social views (Miller, Schmool, & Lerman, 1996).

In addition to their inherent worth, demographic studies provide a valuable baseline for studies and analyses of the complex contents and meanings of Jewish identity.

² The availability and accessibility of this monumental work has been exponentially increased through their searchable online archives, at: http://www.ajcarchives.org.
III B. Contents and meanings of Jewish identity

Studying Jewish identity is particularly challenging because Judaism consists of overlapping and intertwined elements of religion, culture, nationality, ethnicity, and psychology, with additional factors of language, education, reaction to prejudice, and connection to Israel. Researchers have looked at each of these various aspects and the interactions between them, for example, studies of the psychology of Jewish identity (Arnow, 1994; Herman, 1988; London & Chazan, 1990), language (Bekerman, 1997; Hofman & Fisherman, 1970; Kheimets & Epstein, 2001; Nevo & Olshtain, 2007), gender issues (Fishman, 1995) and ethnicity (Brandes, 2004; S. Cohen, 1997; Dashefsky & Shapiro, 1974), to name only a few.

Simon Herman (1962, 1970, 1977, 1988), one of the pioneers in the field, strove to create a systematic conceptual framework and contemporary Jewish identity studies and outline the parameters of the field (although he lamented that most studies of Jewish identity continued to be fragmented; see Herman, 1988). Herman’s research was guided by the work of Kurt Lewin, one of the founders of modern social psychology. Lewin (1947) writes that the “social field” affects the individual and that individuals impact their social field. Following Lewin’s theoretical guidelines, Herman’s work was pivotal in opening the study of Jewish identity as a dynamic, multi-faceted phenomenon to be studied comparatively and in the context of the majority cultures in which Jews live. Herman delineates the elements of Jewish identity and expressions of contemporary Jewish identity, particularly in reference to the Shoah, Zionism, and Israel. He considers differences in identification and identity between Israeli and Diaspora (particularly American) Jews, as well as between Diaspora Jews who have and have not visited Israel. He looks at stability and changes in expressions of Jewish identity over the course of several decades.

Other early studies explored various aspects and patterns of Jewish identification and identity in the open, pluralistic, and multi-cultural societies into which most Diaspora Jews were integrating during that era (Dashefsky & Shapiro, 1974; Eisenstadt, 1977; Hertzberg, 1968; Hyman, 1976, 1979; Kelman, 1977; Klineberg et al., 1969; Reisman, 1979; Sklare, 1958; Sklare & Greenblum, 1967; Slesinger, 1979). While only a few took a comparative approach (for example, Lipset, 1963), it is possible to note some recurring themes that emerged from these studies. It was repeatedly found that the places in which Jews were socialized and educated (home, community, school, and especially nation) have
an impact upon expressions and understandings of Jewish identity. As mentioned, in contemporary, postmodern society, trends have emerged pertaining to expression of personal and group social identification as voluntarily created, complex, and evolving during one’s life (Goldberg & Krausz, 1993; Rosen, 1995). In this regard, Jews were “ahead of the curve,” having been forced to negotiate overlapping identities as they struggled to maintain a distinct group identity while adapting to the various cultures in which they lived. French Jewish thinker Leon Askénazi (1984—see reference for 2005) posits that multiplicity of identity is a basic defining characteristic of Jews in Exile or Diaspora. Lee Shulman asserts that the inherent multiplicities and bricolage in Jewish identity are strengths rather than burdens, and that “pedagogies of multiple identity formation,” should be a consciously pursued educational goal.²

Fishman (2000) documents the development of a form of Judaism in the US which blends American values and behaviors with traditional Jewish ones.

Particularly in Western countries, an increasing number of people born into Jewish families choose not to identify as Jews, or to opt for a largely symbolic identification (Dershowitz, 1997). At the same time, new meanings are being attached to Jewish practice (Graham, 2004). Daniel Elazar (1989, 1995; Elazar & Cohen, 1985) explores the concept of covenant in the social organization of the Jewish people. Religion and peoplehood have been linked since the Children of Israel were commanded by God to be a “holy nation.” The interactions between religious, ethnic, and national identities among Jews and the tensions between particularistic and universal values have been repeatedly discussed and debated, particularly since the creation of the modern State of Israel. Yeshayahu Leibowitz’s writings (1992) examine the inter-relationships between the Jewish State, the Jewish religion, and universal human values. Challenges inherent to a religious-Zionist approach to Jewish education are outlined by Kaniel (2000).

Since belonging to the Jewish collective has become increasingly voluntary and its meanings more fragmented, there has been a rise in the discussion about what “Jewish peoplehood” means, and how to socialize and educate towards membership in this collective in the contemporary world, particularly given the decline of the ideologies (religious and political) which motivated participation in the Jewish community in the past (Kopelowitz & Engelberg, 2007; Kopelowitz & Revivi, 2008). Despite the proliferation of “multiple identities” and the dynamics of identity change over time, Schachter (2002) confirms
that consistency and continuity are critical aspects of a “good” (or in Erikson’s terminology, a “consolidated”) Jewish identity, and particularly the importance of parents as agents in transmitting a cohesive identity (Schachter & Ventura, 2008).

Increased choice and freedom have led to a fragmentation of identity on institutional, ideological, and personal levels. Jews may—and do—express the wide range of possibilities from full assimilation into the dominant society and non-affiliation with any aspect of Judaism to religious orthodoxy and fundamentalism (Harris, 1995; Landau, 1993; Silberstein, 1993). As just one illustration of institutional fragmentation, the Foundation for Jewish Camping offers almost 20 different categories of camps, ranging from “Lubavitch-Orthodox” to “secular-social justice.” Parallel to institutional fragmentation is the psychological fragmentation of identity within the individual. For many, Judaism has become compartmentalized, and is now distinct from other aspects of identity (Charmé, 2000; Krausz & Tulea, 1998). Nevertheless, in his synthesis and summary of eight separate studies of Jews across Europe, Graham (2004) found that there are “threads” of shared attitudes, values, and practices linking Jews in different countries.

There is an ongoing debate regarding the viability and stability of denominationalism in the Jewish world (Lazerwitz, Winter, Dashefsky & Tabory, 1998; Himmelfarb & Loar, 1984), with some predicting the end of denominations and others seeing polarization and fragmentation. Data collected from among American Jews found considerable switching between denominations, although only a minority (15%) declare themselves unaffiliated with any of the official branches of Judaism (Lazerwitz, Winter, Dashefsky, & Tabory, p. 79-80). Interestingly, these findings are similar to those of a study of American religious groups (PEW, 2008), which found movement within the “marketplace of religions” and in particular a rise in the number of young adults who declare themselves to be unaffiliated, although in comparison to other groups, the American-Jewish population is relatively stable.

In addition to looking at the identity implications of switching between denominations, it is important to consider the phenomenon of switching religions, in this case particularly that of conversion into Judaism. Since biological ancestry and family are major aspects of identity for many Jews, the identity of converts represents a distinctive phenomenon. Particularly given the number of people who convert into Judaism after marrying a Jew, understanding the ways in which the sub-population of converts perceives Jewish identity and passes it on to their
children is of great relevance to the future of Jewish identity studies (see, for example, Cooper, 2009; Medding, Tobin, Fishman, & Rimor, 1992).

Over the past several generations, Jewish identity-education has moved out of the home and community and become the domain of formal and informal educational institutions (such as schools, camps, and youth movements). Increasing numbers of Jews have moved out of homogenous communities and are acculturated or assimilated into the dominant societies of the countries where they live (Goldstein, 1996). The secularization of the surrounding societies (particularly in Western Europe) and the increased opportunities to integrate into them has led to a decline in ritual practice outside of Orthodox enclaves. At the same time, there has been an increased perception that Judaism is primarily a religion, and a corresponding decline in emphasis on the ethnic nature of Jewish identity, particularly among American Jews, who since WWII have constituted by far the largest Diaspora population (Breitman, 1983; S. Cohen, 1998; Gordis & Ben-Horin, 1991).

As part of an international study of Jewish youth, two parallel scales have been designed to assess the cognitive and affective content of Jewish identity (Cohen, E.H., 2004; Cohen & Bar Shalom, 2006). Analyses of the responses of different sub-populations to lists of components and symbols have enabled the development of typologies of Jewish identity. The cognitive element is addressed through a list of components of identity, by which the survey population may define themselves as Jewish according to various aspects [birth, culture, education, religion, reaction to anti-Semitism, etc.]. “Culture” forms the center of this typology of cognitive components of identity. It is surrounded by historical, psychological, institutional, and biological regions. This typology also represents the dichotomy of situational versus primordial aspects of Jewish identity. The affective realm is addressed through an evolving list of symbols of Jewish identity, designed to invoke a wide range of feelings about Judaism (for example, Jerusalem, Auschwitz, Shabbat candles, and Woody Allen). Symbols representing the struggle and triumph of the weak over the strong, particularly the Biblical story of David and Goliath, form the core of such an affective typology of Jewish identity. Surrounding this core are an array of symbols related to religion, family, Israel, the Shoah, justice, and contribution to world culture.

III D. Israeli identity and the Israel-Diaspora relationship

Zionism and the creation of the State of Israel, of course, have dramatically affected contemporary Jewish identity. Rav Abraham Isaac
Kook (chief Ashkenazi rabbi of the Yishuv in Palestine during the British Mandate) advocated the idea that Zionism was a spiritual as well as a political movement, a stage in the messianic process. According to the French researcher Korcz (1969, p. 94) each Jew's attitudes regarding Israel may be used to conceptualize their meanings and manners of being Jewish. After centuries of Diaspora and exile during which Israel was a utopian ideal, Jews have had to re-construct their identity vis-à-vis the reality of the modern State (Boyarin & Boyarin, 1995; Dash-Moore & Troen, 2001; Gorny, 1994). Some did this by moving to Israel and participating in the emerging Israeli national identity, consciously creating a “New Jew” (Almog, 2000; Aviv & Shneer, 2005; Gelber, 1996). Others established a connection with Israel from their home countries. The role of Israel in Diaspora Jewish identity has been the subject of many studies and publications. The strength and nature of the connection with Israel (and, less frequently, with Israelis) is often used as an indicator of Jewish identity among Diaspora Jews (see, among many others: Auerbach, 2001; Ezrahi, 2001; Mittelberg, 2000). The connection between Jewish adolescents and young adults with Israel has been an issue of particular interest for researchers (E.H. Cohen, 2008b; Saxe & Chazan, 2008; Zisenwine & Walters, 1982).

A number of researchers have tracked the distinctive Israeli-Jewish identity as it has emerged (Auron, 1993; Deshen, Liebman, & Shokeid, 1995; Shapira, 2004; Weingrod, 1986; Zerubavel, 1994). The field of Israeli-Jewish identity studies includes research and writings on the many sub-cultures of which Israeli society is comprised (Ayalon, Ben Rafael, & Sharot, 1985; Markowitz, 1993) and distinctive cultural phenomenon, such as the kibbutz (Ben Rafael, 1997; Mittelberg, 1988), connection with the Land of Israel (Ben Ari & Bili, 1997; Katriel, 1995), army life (Dar & Kimhi, 2001; Lomsky-Feder & Ben-Ari, 1999; Sasson-Levy, 2002), and the post-army tour (Noy & Cohen, 2006).

Beginning in the late 1960s, Shlomit Levy and colleagues embarked on a longitudinal study of the values, attitudes, and components of Jewish identity among Israelis (Levy, 1985, 2002; Levy & Guttman, 1976; Levy, Levinsohn & Katz, 1993, 2000). Among the many important findings of this study was the emphasis on national aspects of identity, including the importance of army service and the significance of the Shoah on Israeli-Jewish identity. They found that while trends of increased secularism and decreased communality can be seen in Israeli society, there is still significant observance of Jewish traditions, particularly among the Sephardi Jews and the growing Orthodox population. Liebman and
Katz (1997) wrote a response to the Guttman Report emphasizing the characteristics of Israeli Judaism. Continuing in this vein, I took an in-depth look at the identity, values, and leisure pursuits of Israeli youth at the turn of the millennia (E.H. Cohen, 2008c). This survey indicates a spectrum of religious beliefs, strongly related to general values and behaviors; an emphasis on the State of Israel over Jewish religion; and a high value on personal enjoyment.

III E. Impacts of anti-Semitism and the Shoah on Jewish identity

Jewish identity, unquestionably, has been indelibly affected and shaped by the history of anti-Semitism and persecution which Jews have experienced both communally and individually. Again, one could argue that the impact of anti-Semitism on Jewish identity began in Biblical times. Pharaoh was the first to recognize and name the national identity of the Hebrews as such and immediately viewed them as a group to be suppressed; anti-Semitism thus represents an externally imposed aspect of Jewish identity. Numerous researchers and writers—both Jewish and non-Jewish—have dealt with this aspect in depth and from a variety of angles. Negative attitudes towards Jews by well-respected philosophers and social scientists has had an impact on the field of ethnic studies. Jewish identity may be said to challenge philosophical, psychological, and socio-historical approaches (Levy-Valensi, 1983; Trigano, 1977, 1984). When the Jewish experience apparently contradicts major theories and philosophies regarding human nature, such as Marxism (among others), the theory may be revised and expanded or the Jewish experience may be dismissed as an aberration. Unfortunately, academic anti-Semitism has too often given rise to the latter reaction. For example, Max Weber’s (1905) study of capitalism delegated Jews to the role of pariah (Barbalet, 2006). Historically there has been a tension between anti-Semitism and philo-Semitism, with various religious and political groups (particularly Christians) who have identified themselves as the new Jews in a new Zion (Siker, 1991; Vangmeren, 1988).

Sartre (1948) wrote that anti-Semitism is a primary factor in the formation of Jewish identity, and without it Jews would cease to exist as a distinctive group. While subsequent studies have emphasized the

---

3 The ways in which people, and particularly adolescents, spend their free time is a behavioral manifestation of identity and values. See, for example: Haggard & Williams, 1992; Kelly, 1983; Shaw, Kleiber, & Caldwell, 1995.

4 The propensity of groups of people who are hostile to the Jews to present themselves as the true Israelites deserves a study in itself.
internal cohesion (though not homogeneity) of the Jewish people (E.H. Cohen, 2004; Heilman, 1992; Sacks, 1993; Volkov, 2004), group loyalty may be inspired in reaction to the external pressure of anti-Semitism.\(^5\) Askénazi (1948, 1966, 1970—see reference for 2005) and Trigano (1984), however, both insist on the epistemological necessity to relate to the “fait juif” (Jewish fact) as self-normative, internally formulated, and consistent, not merely a response to external pressures.\(^6\)

Jewish researchers have examined the myriad impacts of anti-Semitism on Jews’ identity, both internally and vis-à-vis non-Jews (Bar Shalom, 2002; S.J. Cohen, 1999; Finkielkraut, 2004; Morris-Reich, 2004; Ostow, 2003). Specifically, the long-term and deep-seated psychological and sociological impacts of the Shoah on Jewish identity have been written on, debated, and discussed extensively (Berger, 1997; Braiterman, 1998; Fackenheim, 1994; Neusner, 1981; among many others). The intertwined histories of the Shoah and the birth of the State of Israel have had a deep and lasting impact on Israeli national identity (Auron, 2006, 2008; Levy, 1996; Zertal, 1998). This connection is being reinforced and emphasized among today’s Israeli youth through educational programs, visits to Yad Vashem, and pilgrimages to sites in Europe (Auron, 2008; Feldman, 2000, 2001).

### III F. Comparative studies of Jewish identity

The field of Jewish identity studies has flourished, and a plethora of valuable case studies has been conducted. Particularly useful are those studies which have taken a comparative approach and provided a summary and synthesis. Compilations which include studies from various countries are also valuable.

Steven Cohen and Gabriel Horenczyk’s book (1999) compiles writings on education and identity by key researchers from throughout

\(^5\) For example, French philosopher and Nobel Laureate Henri Bergson, who, although not a practicing Jew (born to a Jewish father and non-Jewish mother) rejected an exemption from the Vichy government’s anti-Semitic laws and registered himself as a Jew in 1940 (Boorstin, 1998; http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/biography/Bergson.html

\(^6\) “Le fait juif est toute la réalité de l’être, de l’existence, du développement des Juifs, et de leur principe d’activité. Il n’est pas structuré en réalité par sa conformité à une norme externe, mais bien par sa récurrence et sa régularité internes” (Trigano, 1984, p. 27). Author’s translation: “The Jewish fact is the whole reality of the being, of the existence, of the development of the Jews and their principle of activity. It is not structured in reality by its conformity to an external norm but by its recurrence and internal regularity.”
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III G. Typologies of Jewish identity

In addition to compilations of works on Jewish identity in various contexts, there have been a number of typologies of Jewish identity developed, through which researchers have sought to provide a theoretical framework for the field. Typologies offer varied ways to organize the content results of studies. Graham (2004, p. 33) categorizes typologies of Jewish identity as: 1) typologies of racial and ethnic origin; 2) scales of religiosity and observance; 3) historical and generational
typologies; 4) identity and characterization typologies; 5) typologies of
ties, engagement, and process. Again, space only permits mentioning a
small portion of these works here.

Several typologies have been developed by researchers of French
Jews. One of the earliest was developed by Sylvie Korcaz (1969). Considering
attitudes regarding Jewish religion, community, and Israel, she catego-
rized five types of Jews. Her study dealt specifically with
French Jews, and some of the names she assigned to the categories are
distinctively French, but they may nevertheless be useful in guiding the
study of other populations as well. They consist of: 1) the most committed
and involved Jews, who she terms “the House of Israel”; 2) conditional
Jews, who identify themselves as Jews but show few resultant behaviors
or attitudes; 3) the “Israelites,” or Jews who conform to the French
political culture of private religion subsumed to public citizenship; 4)
the “Chagall Jews,” who espouse an idealized and romanticized type of
Jewish identity; 5) the Sephardi or North Africa Jews, who at the time of
her study were still in the early years of migration and integration into
French society.

Another researcher of French Jews, Dominique Schnapper (1980),
compiled a typology that considers differences in Jewish behavior and
practice. She constructed three ideal types: 1) practicing Jews, who
respect and observe Jewish religious and cultural traditions; 2) militan-
ts, who have transferred the moral and metaphysical content of Jewish
religion into the political arena; and 3) Israelites, who she defines as
assimilated Jews with a weak, ambiguous, or externally imposed type
of identity. Schnapper distinguishes between sub-groups using the
following three ideal types as a framework for considering five empirical
variables: number of generations in the country (in this case, France);
relationship to Judaism; relationship to Israel, community membership
and participation; and cultural level,. For example, the number of
generations in France may be used to differentiate between practicing
Jews who are “implanted” (socialized in France) and those who are
“transplanted” (socialized outside France). Relationship to Judaism may
be used to distinguish between “traditionalists” and “new” practicing
Jews; relationship to the community may be used to differentiate
between “core” and “marginal” Jews. Azria’s (2003) typology of religious
behaviors uses two axes: Jewish law (halakha) versus tradition (minhag)
and individual versus collective practices. This typology does not place
modernity in opposition to religion.

In his study among North American Jews, Steven Cohen looked
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at patterns of identification and assimilation. Based on scales of ritual observance, institutional participation, and stated beliefs, Cohen and his colleagues developed a simple but effective typology of the core of affiliated and active Jews, the “moderately affiliated,” and those who are largely assimilated and distant from the community (Cohen & Eisen, 2000). A similar typology was previously developed by French researcher Annie Kriegel (1984), in which the intensity of belonging to the community is rated on a scale from 0 to 100, and thus individuals may be situated along a spectrum from the core to the periphery. In this typology, the chosen position of individuals does not assume a fixed or perpetual involvement.7

The typologies described above look at distinctively Jewish, and even specifically French-Jewish or American-Jewish, cases. E.H. Cohen (2008b, 2009a, 2009b) developed an axiological typology to be applied to Jews. It considers Jews’ relationships to a set of universal values. This typology arranges the values along two axes: a political axis between authority and autonomy, and a social axis between altruism and egoism. From this, four categories of Jews are deduced: individualists who stress values of autonomy and egoism; universalists who stress values of autonomy and altruism, traditionalists who stress values of authority and altruism; and revivalists who combine values of autonomy and authority. Since it refers to general values, this typology can be used to compare a variety of Jewish populations. In the citations above, it is successfully and fruitfully applied to French Jews, Israeli youth, and participants in the international youth movement B’nai Akiva, respectively. It may even to be used to compare the value structure of Jews with that of other ethnic groups.

IV. Philosophical, theoretical, and creative writings on Jewish identity

Different in style from the scientific studies discussed above but no less important to the cumulative exploration of Jewish identity are the multiple philosophical essays and treatises and the novels, stories, screenplays, poetry, and other creative works which wrestle with the subject. Again, the sheer depth and breadth of the literature defies

7 The original text in French reads: La communauté est un “type de groupement où le degré d’appartenance présente des intensités très variables -du degré pratiquement 0 au degré 100 (…) (et où)le lieu où chacun choisit de se situer sur le rayon très étendu qui va du centre à la périphérie n’a pas la fixité d’un engagement perpétuel.”
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anything more than a brief noting of major trends and citation of a few examples. The present goal is not to be comprehensive or even to summarize the literature, but rather to note the crucial role that fiction, memoirs, philosophy, and other non-academic works have played in the exploration of Jewish identity. Bauman (2008) suggests that the tension between Jewish identity and assimilation pressures gave rise to an “unprecedented cultural creativity and spiritual discovery” (p. 4) which helped pioneer postmodern thought on national, individual, and ethnic identity. In the state of the art of Jewish identity, it is important not to overlook this aspect, even if acknowledgement is necessarily restricted to noting general themes and their relevance to the larger field.

The varieties of Jewish experiences throughout the Diaspora and in Israel have produced a similarly wide variety of writings. For example, French Jewish writers have dealt with the issue of Jewish identity in the context of the dominant French Republican ideology and political culture of secular national identity (Finkielkraut, 1994; Trigano, 2006). Because of France’s colonial history in North Africa, there is also a body of French literature reflecting the Jews’ experiences as a minority in the colonies and the subsequent migration of North African Jews to France (Memmi, 1957, 1962). Their unique position as an acculturated yet distinct minority in French life allowed French Jewish intellectuals to express a distinctive voice within the public discourse on issues related to national and minority identity. French filmmakers have been influential in addressing critical issues, such as the betrayal of France’s Jews and its Republican values during the Vichy regime (Greene, 1999). As part of the Nouveaux Philosophes movement, French Jews such as Bernard-Henri Lévy (1981, 2008, among his many other works) have participated in the discussion surrounding the “identity crisis” in France and throughout Europe regarding national and minority identities. André Neher (1962, 1970) takes a theological and religious approach to issues of Jewish identity in Diaspora, particularly after the Shoah. Emmanuel Levinas explores the “difficult freedom” with which Jews must contend (1963).

The experience of the Jews in America produced another body of literature, one that frequently deals with issues of acculturation and assimilation. The contribution of Jews to American literature and media can hardly be exaggerated, although not all is explicitly Jewish in nature. Many Jewish-American books and films have manifestly Jewish main characters but deal with the theme of acculturation as opposed to preservation of identity, a common occurrence among many groups in an immigrant country such as the United States. Prominent examples
are the writings of Saul Bellow, Bernard Malamud, and Chaim Potok, and the films of Woody Allen and Barbra Streisand, while Hannah Arendt’s political-philosophical writings (1951, 1963) raise important and controversial questions regarding authority and complicity. The body of theoretical and creative literature produced by American Jews gives insights into a range of issues intrinsic to Jewish identity, from perceptions of Israel (Furman, 1997) to collective memory of the Holocaust (Berger, 1985).

Israeli writers have explored and expressed the personal and communal struggles regarding religious, national, and ethnic identity within the modern State of Israel. Among the most well-known are novelists A.B. Yehoshua, Amos Oz, T. Carmi, Aharon Appelfeld, and poet Yehuda Amichai (J. Cohen, 1990, p. 45). Yehoshua’s recent controversial assertion that Jewish life is richer, broader, and more meaningful in Israel than in the Diaspora has rekindled a debate regarding classic Zionist ideology, post-Zionism, and contemporary Jewish identity in the Diaspora (AJC, 2006).

V. The methodology of studying Jewish identity

As the field of Jewish studies has developed and evolved, so have methodologies, tools, and techniques for studying it. In a recently published collaborative essay, four researchers (Charmé, Horowitz, Hyman, & Kress, 2008, p. 115) “avoid defining the content of Jewish identity” and instead “seek to expand the kinds of analytic questions and research methodologies in ways that that permit …viewing Jewish identities as emerging from the complex interplay of ‘Jewishness’ in the environment with other aspects of the self.” In this section I will turn from the content of Jewish identity to a brief summary of the methods used to study it.

Generally speaking, studies may use quantitative or qualitative methods for collecting data. Some studies combine both. Many works on Jewish identity are not in themselves empirical field studies, but draw on the existing literature. Authors and researchers may or may not take a theoretical approach to the subject addressed. Each of these various types of methods has its strengths and weaknesses. Quantitative data collected through questionnaires and surveys provides facts which may be validated and verified through other means. For example, some basic demographic statistics may be corroborated through enrollment records at Jewish day schools. This enables the researcher to ascertain
the representativity of the sample and the accuracy of the information collected. Such data, particularly when the sample is large (as in the case of the National Jewish Population Surveys and similar large-scale studies) provides valuable information on major trends and features of the population. Bubis and Marks’s (1975) study was important in its systematic comparison of pre- and post-program attitudes towards Jewish identity among participants in day school programs in Israel and in the US. Early efforts to develop scales of Jewish identity (Geismar, 1954; Segalman, 1967; Zak, 1973) were important methodological contributions, providing a basis for subsequent expanded and refined scales of identity (E.H. Cohen, 2004; Horowitz, 1999).

The weakness of the quantitative methods is that the individual’s worldview and narrative is not heard. For this, qualitative methods are effective, as subtle and complex views may be expressed in interviews or focus group discussions. Anthropological observations further reveal aspects of a situation which may not be measurable in a questionnaire. Schnapper (1980, 1983) and Horowitz (1999, 2000) used individuals’ narratives to trace “journeys,” or trajectories of Jewish identity, emphasizing the dynamic nature of that paradigm. Particularly interesting are the typologies Schnapper was able to infer from patterns she noted in the 100 or so in-depth interviews she conducted. Face-to-face discussions may also be useful in comparing divergent populations for which it may be difficult to design a comprehensive questionnaire. For example, a study of spirituality among Jewish and Arab Israeli youth used interviews to ascertain how members of the two groups conceptualize spirituality (Rich & Cinamon, 2007). Once the parameters of the field are identified through qualitative methods, quantitative tools may subsequently be designed and applied.

A major difficulty with qualitative data is how to construct useful generalizations from the many different points of view expressed. For this reason, some researchers advocate combining the two methods (Cohen & Bar Shalom, 2006; Horowitz, 2000; Newman & Benz, 1998). While combining the methods is not simple, when synthesized, qualitative and quantitative results enrich one another.

A major challenge in studies of Jewish identity is comparability between Jewish populations in different countries. It must be said that this is a serious weakness in the field. While some edited collections have included studies done in different countries, providing an international picture of Jewish identity, few studies have applied the same instruments in different countries, which would allow for true comparison of data.
DellaPergola has offered indicators for comparing Jews in various countries in some of his studies of the demographic characteristics of world Jewry (DellaPergola 2008, 1999, 1996; DellaPergola, Rebhun, & Tolts, 2000; DellaPergola & Rebhun, 2001) and Jewish education (Genuth, DellaPergola, & Dubb, 1985; see also JPPPI, 2004, 2005, 2006). Cohen has done so in some studies, notably the longitudinal study of participants in Israel Experience tours (E.H. Cohen, 2008b). In his pioneering sociology of Judaism, Sharot (1976) undertakes to systematically compare Jews in differing social contexts across space and time:

*The religious and cultural differences are analysed in relation to the socio-economic composition of the Jewish communities, to the dominant non-Jewish religious and cultural environments, and to the wider social structures, especially as they affected the relationships between gentiles and Jews.* (p. 4)

Based on a review of scientific literature on identity formation, Tur Kapsa, Pereg, and Mikulincer (2004) advocate an integrative model which combines behavioral and psycho-social approaches to the study of Jewish identity.

The Facet Theory school of theory construction and data analysis pioneered by Israeli sociologist Louis Guttman has been useful in taking a structural look at a variety of social issues (Israeli, Jewish, and universal), graphically portraying the data and developing typologies (Guttman, 1959; Canter, 1985; Levy, 1994). One of the key tools of Facet Theory is the *mapping sentence*, through which a researcher may organize the theoretical framework of a study by defining the “facets” of the subject being studied. The mapping sentences articulate the facets of the field under study, such as population, didactic approach, modularity (cognitive, affective, behavioral), orientation (Israel, Diaspora, Jewish people), subject matter, type of institution, recipient, educational agent, and so on.

This device has been used to conceptually defines sub-fields of Jewish identity such as Jewish identification among Israelis (Levy, 1985), and Jewish education (Cohen & Levy, 2005). The mapping sentence presented here drew on various aspects included in previously published examples, with components added to cover as completely as possible the holistic concept of Jewish identity.
VI. Towards a structural approach

VI A. Mapping sentence of Jewish identity studies

Based on the previously published mapping sentences cited above and the review of literature presented here, I developed an exploratory mapping sentence of the field of Jewish identity studies, which may serve as a definitional framework for the subsequent analysis.

A \{ \text{Jewish, non-Jewish} \} \text{observer perceives the } B \{ \text{Jewish identity, Jewish identification} \} \text{ of } C \{ \text{individual, family, community, Jewish people} \}

D \{ \text{Israel, Diaspora, Unspecified} \} \text{ in the } E \{ \text{past, present, future} \} \text{ as expressed through the } F \{ \text{cognitive, affective, instrumental} \} \text{ modality,}

G \{ \text{internal, external} \} \text{ agents, collecting and organizing } H \{ \text{qualitative, quantitative, multi-method} \} \text{ method of}

I \{ \text{religious, cultural, ethnic, national} \} \text{ inquiry related } J \{ \text{Jewish identity, Jewish identification} \} \text{ explores the } R \{ \text{high, low} \}

K \{ \text{continuity, adaptation} \}.

The mapping sentence of Shlomit Levy (1985) was particularly useful in guiding the design of the mapping sentence presented here, and some of the facets overlap (for example, the time frame and area of residence), but the majority of the facets in this mapping sentence are new.

VI B. Analysis of a literature search on “Jewish identity”

As a step towards a quantitative analysis of the literature on Jewish identity, I compiled and analyzed a sample of 180 items (books, chapters, journal articles, and research monographs). There were several sources of potential items for inclusion: 1) a search of the Eric database using the keywords “Jewish identity”; 2) a compiled bibliography of the works related to Jewish identity which I have referenced in my research and publications; 3) a searchable catalogue of Jewish research posted on a NYU-sponsored website www.bjpa.org.
Table 1: Categorization of four sample articles from literature survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTENT ISSUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Semitism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endogamy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender issues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel-Arab conflict</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel-Diaspora</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israeli national identity</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish identity-explicitly mentioned</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoah</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>METHODS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical review</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature survey</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary data</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These sources yielded thousands of items. Many were only marginally or unrelated to the psycho-social concept of Jewish identity (for example, the Eric search included numerous articles on medical research conducted among an Israeli or Jewish population). These
irrelevant items were weeded out. Additionally, items were deleted from the sample if the abstract or article summary available through the search bases did not include the methods used in the study. From the remaining items, now numbering in the hundreds, I randomly selected a broad sample, choosing from throughout the list, which was alphabetized by author’s name.

The 180 items selected were categorized in terms of content questions addressed and methods used. In Table 1 the categorizations of four articles are presented as illustrations. The categorization was based on the articles’ abstracts or books’ table of contents. Thus, only the major issues and elements which the authors themselves emphasized are indicated; in many cases the studies may touch on some other issues in passing, but these minor aspects are not indicated in the table.

Table 2 shows the frequency of each content issue addressed and method used within the sample. The issue of Jewish identity is addressed explicitly (that is, the phrase “Jewish identity” appears in the title, abstract, or table of contents) in just under a third of the works. Israel occupies a large place in the field of contemporary Jewish studies: over 60% of the articles address either Israeli national identity or Israel-Diaspora relations. Despite concern with intermarriage, a relatively small amount of research was found that deals directly with this issue. Significantly, only 10% of the studies dealt with theoretical issues. Lack of a theoretical framework, as mentioned earlier, is a problem in the field of Jewish identity studies.

A quarter of the works used questionnaires and just under a quarter drew on previously collected data (such as the National Jewish Population Study, etc.). Qualitative methods of interviews and observation were used in a third of the works. Over half of the studies were built primarily on the historical and scientific literature.

VI C. Structural representation of the field of Jewish identity studies

To further explore the structural relationships between these variables, a multi-dimensional data analysis tool known as Smallest Space Analysis (SSA) was applied. The SSA, in brief, begins with the computation of a correlation matrix between the selected variables. The correlations are then plotted in a “cognitive map” in such a way that strongly correlated items are close together and weakly or negatively correlated items are far apart. The researcher then looks for contiguous regions of semantically related items (for a full explanation of the SSA
The SSA technique was applied to the data.

The SSA for the content items is shown in Figure 1. It has been divided into four quadrants. The south-east quadrant includes issues related to historical forces which impact Jewish identity: anti-Semitism and the Shoah, the Israel-Diaspora relationship, and the general category of “history.” Moving clockwise, the south-west quadrant, which has been labeled “Peoplehood” contains the largest number of issues. Towards the center of this section is the explicit issue of Jewish identity, surrounded by related issues of religion, community, demographics, education, behavior and marriage (endogamy). The north-west corner includes ethnicity and related issues of language and migration. It also contains the “theory” issue. The north-east quadrant has been entitled “Identity Conflicts.” The issues in this region are the Israel-Arab conflict (as it pertains to and impacts Jewish identity), Israeli national identity, gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content issue</th>
<th>Addressed in sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish identity-addressed explicitly</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israeli national identity</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel-Diaspora</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel-Arab conflict</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender issues</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoah</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Semitism</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endogamy</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Used in sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature survey</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical review</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary data (from previous studies)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

process see Guttman, 1968, 1982; Levy, 1994). The SSA technique was applied to the data.
issues, and psychology. The center of the map is conspicuously empty. This indicates that the various sub-fields are distinct, even fragmented.

The overall structure of the map graphically represents numerous aspects of group identity and cohesiveness which are being addressed in current critical literature. As studies have noted, group identity and the boundaries defining a group may be internally created and embraced or externally imposed by others (Barth, 1969, 1994; Romanucci-Ross and de Vos, 1995). Jewish identity includes both aspects, and the SSA map differentiates between these diverse forces impacting group identity. The content items in the left-hand side of the map relate to internal forces which pull people together and give a sense of group cohesiveness based on community and common interests (religion, education, language, etc.). The items in the right-hand side of the map relate to the external encounters, conflicts, and threats which push members of a group together in response to adversity. In most cases these refer to the relationship, often violent, with non-Jews (the Israeli-Arab conflict, anti-Semitism, the Shoah, etc.). In some cases there is an “internal Other” within the Jewish people, as in the Israel-Diaspora relationship or gender relations.

The vertical division of the map also reveals something about the way in which Jewish identity is addressed in the literature. The content items in the upper half of the map are ones which authors and researchers tend to deal with from a discourse or theory-oriented perspective. The items in the lower half are those which are more apt to be dealt with in terms of practice and daily life. Some of the entries in the upper half are clearly more discourse oriented (theory, ethnicity, psychology) while those in the lower half are clearly more practice oriented (demographics, behavior). In other cases the subject itself is not inherently practice or discourse oriented. Rather, its placement on the map reflects the way in which researchers tend to address that issue. For example, studies on the Shoah often relate to individuals’ experiences and the impact those experiences have had on their daily lives (two examples from our sample are Levine, 1982 and Rosenthal, 2002). In contrast, studies of Jewish identity that deal with the Israel-Arab conflict often look at ideological stances behind the conflict (see, for example, Bar-Tal & Antebi, 1992; Bekerman, 2002). This is not to say, of course, that there have not been valuable studies published on practical daily aspects of the Israel-Arab conflict or on the ideologies and discourse behind the Shoah. However, the pattern of correlations displayed in the SSA attests to trends among studies which deal with these issues specifically as they relate to Jewish
identity. This aspect of the analysis deserves further investigation in future studies.

A separate SSA was conducted on the data disclosing the differing methodologies employed in studies of Jewish identity. Due to limitations of space, this figure is not included here (it is available upon request from the author). The results of the SSA on the methods, in brief, show a clear differentiation between qualitative and quantitative approaches. It additionally shows an explicit contrast between primary and secondary sources. This structural outcome indicates that the methodology used in studies in the field of Jewish identity fit by and large within the general methodological approaches used in contemporary social sciences.

Figure 1: Smallest Space Analysis of content issues of the Jewish identity studies

VII. Conclusion and Directions for Future Research

In this article I have endeavored to give a concise yet thorough overview of the field of Jewish identity studies. Since long before the emergence of sociological studies of ethnicity, Jews have wrestled with
existential questions of group identity. The Jews’ history of dispersal, their struggle to maintain a distinct identity while living among other cultures, the repeated attempts to annihilate Jewish culture, and the co-option of parts of the Jewish narrative into Western civilization all impact the ways in which Jewish identity is understood and studied.

The general sociological study of ethnic identity and explicit analysis of Jewish identity are complementary. Trends documented among other populations and broad-spectrum theories regarding acculturation and transmission of culture are useful in looking at the specific case of Jewish identity. Parallel to this, the distinctive case of Jewish survival in the Diaspora has contributed much to the study of cultural preservation and change among other populations. An effort has been made in this document to present a broad sample of important works in the field, including representative samples from different time periods and a range of locations in the Jewish world. General trends have been noted, but the field is too vast to be covered in a single chapter. There is a need for future works that will explore in greater depth the ways in which studies of Jewish identity have evolved over time, as well as a report elaborating on the specific ways in which approaches to Jewish identity differ in different communities.

The structural approach offered here provides a framework for evaluating the field of Jewish identity studies, indicating gaps and weaknesses which may be addressed in future studies. The fields of ethnicity and migration studies have provided directions of inquiry and a theoretical basis for studying Jewish identity, necessarily incomplete, since Judaism is more than an ethnicity. The field of social psychology has provided another theoretical foundation from which to study Jewish identity, specifically the ways in which Jews address the political, social, and personal conflicts which impact the Jewish world. An historical approach may also be taken, examining the internal and external forces that have shaped the social context within which Jews form their identities. Jewish identity studies also encompass many issues related to Peoplehood, that is, the myriad ways the individual relates to the group, a domain including education, religious practice and belief, and community involvement. The empty region in the center of the map seems to indicate that there is still much work to be done in integrating these various approaches.

While there have been numerous compilations of studies conducted among various populations, there are virtually no truly comparative studies of Jewish identity. Although Jewish identity is a global issue, a
global approach to its study has not yet emerged. Based on the rich existing literature, comprehensive tools for comparing typologies of Jewish identity around the world may be developed and applied to diverse populations in order to provide a holistic view of the complex and wide-ranging topic of Jewish identity.
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