

# **METHODOLOGICAL APPENDIX**

**COVID-19  
COMMUNITY PORTRAIT  
STUDY**

**by  
MICHELLE SHAIN  
ELISHA PENN  
MATTHEW WILLIAMS**



# Methodological Appendix

## COVID-19 Community Portrait Study

### Research Ethics

The Center for Communal Research prioritizes the rights and welfare of our research participants. The protocol for this study was approved by New England IRB, a WIRB-Copernicus Group Company ([www.neirb.com](http://www.neirb.com)).

### Study Summary

We surveyed members of Orthodox synagogues in four communities at three time points during the COVID-19 pandemic. The four communities were:

- ◆ Toco Hills neighborhood of Atlanta, Georgia
- ◆ North Dallas neighborhood of Dallas, Texas
- ◆ New Rochelle and Scarsdale, New York
- ◆ West Hempstead, New York

The three surveys were conducted online using the Qualtrics survey management platform. The survey instruments (available on request) were designed to understand the impact of the pandemic on Orthodox Jews, and they covered a range of topics including religion and health.

## Wave 1: July 2020

### Survey Distribution

#### Toco Hills, Atlanta, Georgia

Two synagogues in the Toco Hills neighborhood of Atlanta, GA participated in the study: Beth Jacob and Ohr HaTorah (formerly the Young Israel of Toco Hills).<sup>1</sup> These two synagogues provided us with the first names and email addresses of all adults from each of their member households.<sup>2</sup> The two lists were combined and deduplicated, resulting in a total of 626 unique households. We sent email invitations with personalized survey links to one randomly-selected adult from each of these households on July 1, 2020. We sent reminder emails with the personalized survey links to nonrespondents on July 7, 2020. In addition, all Ohr HaTorah member households received a generic email reminder from their synagogue on July 7, 2020.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ner Hamizrach, the New Toco Shul, and Netzach Israel declined to participate in the study.

<sup>2</sup> Beth Jacob allowed member households to “opt out” of sharing their email addresses, and 18 did so; 5 Ohr HaTorah member households did not have email addresses.

Table 1. Toco Hills, Atlanta, Georgia survey sample, Wave 1.

	Total Member Households	Accessible Member Households <sup>2</sup>	Total Unique, Accessible Member Households
Beth Jacob	598	580	626
Ohr HaTorah	211	206	

## North Dallas, Dallas, Texas

Two synagogues in the North Dallas neighborhood of Dallas, TX participated in the study: Shaare Tefilla and Ohr HaTorah.<sup>3</sup> These two synagogues provided us with the first names and primary email addresses for each of their member households.<sup>4</sup> The two lists were combined and deduplicated, resulting in a total of 209 unique households. We sent email invitations with personalized survey links to the primary email address for each of these households on July 1, 2020. We sent reminder emails with the personalized survey links to nonrespondents on July 7, 2020. In addition, all Shaare Tefilla and Ohr HaTorah member households received a generic email reminder from their synagogue on July 9, 2020.

Table 2. North Dallas, Dallas, Texas survey sample, Wave 1.

	Total Member Households	Accessible Member Households <sup>4</sup>	Total Unique, Accessible Member Households
Shaare Tefilla	185	40	209
Ohr HaTorah	187	177	

## New Rochelle and Scarsdale, New York

New Rochelle and Scarsdale are contiguous communities in Westchester County, New York. The Young Israel of New Rochelle and the Young Israel of Scarsdale participated in the study.<sup>5</sup> The Young Israel of New Rochelle sent email invitations with personalized survey links to one randomly-selected adult from each of its member households on July 1, 2020. The Young Israel of Scarsdale sent email invitations with a single, open survey link to one randomly-selected adult from each of its member households on July 2, 2020, with instructions not to share the link with others, including other adults in the household. All Young Israel of New Rochelle and Young Israel of Scarsdale member households received a generic email reminder from their synagogue on July 7, 2020.

<sup>3</sup> The Young Israel of Dallas declined to participate in the study.

<sup>4</sup> Shaare Tefilla required member households to “opt in” to sharing their email addresses, and 40 did so; Ohr HaTorah allowed member households to “opt out” of sharing their email addresses, and 10 did so.

<sup>5</sup> Anshe Sholom New Rochelle and Magen David Sephardic Congregation declined to participate in the study.

Table 3. New Rochelle and Scarsdale, New York survey sample, Wave 1.

	Total Member Households	Accessible Member Households	Total Unique, Accessible Member Households
Young Israel of New Rochelle	387	387	721
Young Israel of Scarsdale	334	334	

## West Hempstead, New York

Five synagogues in West Hempstead, New York participated in the study: the Young Israel of West Hempstead, Anshei Shalom, Eitz Chayim of Dogwood Park, Bais Torah U'Tefillah, and Chabad of West Hempstead.<sup>6</sup>

Anshei Shalom sent email invitations with personalized survey links to one randomly-selected adult from each of its member households on June 30, 2020. Eitz Chayim of Dogwood Park sent email invitations with personalized survey links to one randomly-selected adult from each of its member households on July 2, 2020. All Anshei Shalom and Eitz Chayim member households received a generic email reminder from their synagogue on July 10, 2020.

Bais Torah U'Tefillah provided us with the first names and email addresses of one adult member of each member household that the staff believed did not have a membership at another West Hempstead synagogue. We sent email invitations with personalized survey links to each of these households on July 1, 2020. We sent reminder emails with the personalized survey links to nonrespondents on July 7, 2020.

The Young Israel of West Hempstead provided us with the first names and primary email addresses for each of their member households. Chabad of West Hempstead provided us with the names and primary email addresses of each family on their local contact list.<sup>7</sup> The two lists were combined and deduplicated, resulting in a total of 1,945 unique households. We sent email invitations with personalized survey links to the primary email address each of these households on July 2, 2020. We sent reminder emails with the personalized survey links to nonrespondents on July 7, 2020. In addition, all Young Israel of West Hempstead member households received a generic email reminder from their synagogue on July 7, 2020, and all Chabad of West Hempstead member households received a generic email reminder from their synagogue on July 10, 2020.

<sup>6</sup> Zichron Kedoshim declined to participate in the study.

<sup>7</sup> 44 Young Israel of West Hempstead member households and 44 Chabad of West Hempstead households did not have email addresses.



Table 4. West Hempstead, New York survey sample, Wave 1.

	Total Member Households	Accessible Member Households <sup>7</sup>	Total Unique, Accessible Member Households
Anshei Shalom	293	291	(not compared to other membership lists)
Eitz Chayim of Dogwood Park	212	212	(not compared to other membership lists)
Young Israel of West Hempstead	801	757	1,945
Bais Torah U'Tefillah	Unknown	29	
Chabad of West Hempstead	1,811	1,767	

## Incentives

To incentivize participation, the first 100 respondents to complete the survey in each community received a \$10 Amazon.com gift card (i.e., a guaranteed incentive). In addition, all respondents who completed all three surveys were entered into a drawing to win a \$500 Amazon.com gift card, one per community.

## Response Rate

The survey was closed on July 13, 2020. The final survey dispositions for each community are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Final survey dispositions, by community, Wave 1.

	Toco Hills, Atlanta, GA	North Dallas, Dallas, TX	New Rochelle and Scarsdale, NY	West Hempstead, NY	Total
<b>Returned questionnaire</b>					
1.1 Complete	179	70	147	272	668
1.2 Partial	8	0	8	20	36
<b>Eligible, non-interview</b>					
2.11 Refusal	18	10	0	0	28
2.12 Break-off	16	6	21	38	81
<b>Unknown eligibility, non-interview</b>					
3.11 No invitation sent	23	155	2	88	268
3.19 Nothing ever returned	398	120	543	2,003	3,064
3.30 Invitation returned undelivered ('bounce')	4	1	0	115	120
<b>Not eligible, returned</b>					
4.10 Screened out	3	2	0	2	7
<b>Total</b>					
Total	649	364	721	2,538	4,272

For this survey, the response rate will be calculated according to the American Association for Public Opinion Research's Standard Definitions, Response Rate 4 (AAPOR RR4). AAPOR RR4 is defined as the number of interviews (complete plus partial) divided by the number of interviews (complete plus partial) plus the number of non-interviews (refusal and break-off plus non-contacts plus others) plus an estimate of the number of cases of unknown eligibility (unknown if housing unit, plus unknown, other) that are actually eligible:

$$RR4 = \frac{(I + P)}{(I + P) + (R + NC + O) + e(UH + UO)}$$

Thus, in order to calculate AAPOR RR4, we must first estimate what proportion of cases of unknown eligibility is actually eligible (*e*).

There were two potential sources of ineligibility among the cases with unknown eligibility:

1. **Outside target population.** Households were not members of any synagogues in the sample.
2. **Duplicate listings.** Households were members of more than one synagogue in the sample and received multiple survey invitations.

**Outside target population.** The number of individuals who completed the survey but were outside the target population is shown in Table 5 (4.10 Screened out). Taking the number of interviews (complete plus partial) divided by the number of ineligible cases plus the number of interviews (complete plus partial) gives a partial estimate of what proportion of cases of unknown eligibility is actually eligible.

**Duplicate listings.** The survey instrument asked respondents to indicate whether they were members of each participating synagogue in their community. Some reported membership in more than one participating synagogue. We used this information to estimate what proportion of 'non-interviews' represent unique listings.

Table 6 shows our estimates of what proportion of cases of unknown eligibility is actually eligible (*e*) in each community.

Table 6. Estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that is actually eligible (*e*), by community, Wave 1.

	Toco Hills, Atlanta, GA	North Dallas, Dallas, TX	New Rochelle and Scarsdale, NY	West Hempstead, NY	Total
Percent in target population) $\frac{(I + P)}{\text{Ineligible} + (I + P)}$	98%	97%	100%	99%	99%
Percent unique listings	99%	96%	91%	84%	91%
Estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that is actually eligible ( <i>e</i> )	98%	93%	91%	84%	90%

The overall survey response rate was 17% (AAPOR RR4). Response rates are broken down by community in Table 7.

Table 7. Survey response rates, by community, Wave 1.

Toco Hills, Atlanta, GA	29%
North Dallas, Dallas, TX	20%
New Rochelle and Scarsdale, NY	23%
West Hempstead, NY	13%
Total	17%

## Wave 2: August 2020

### Survey Distribution

For Wave 2, we were unable to contact some individuals who had been invited to take the Wave 1 survey (“newly inaccessible” households):

- Four synagogues<sup>8</sup> sent the Wave 1 email invitations to their members directly. For Wave 2, we were able to contact only those individuals who had both responded to our Wave 1 survey and provided us with an email address for further contact.
- Some email invitations to the Wave 1 survey “bounced.”
- Some individuals opted out of future correspondence with us after receiving an email invitation to the Wave 1 survey.

We were also able to contact a few individuals who had *not* been invited to take the Wave 1 survey (“newly accessible” households). Six synagogues<sup>9</sup> invited members who had opted out of the Wave 1 survey to provide their email addresses for the Wave 2 survey, and some did (N=27). The net changes are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Invitations Sent, Wave 1 v. Wave 2.

	Invitations Sent, Wave 1	Newly Accessible for Wave 2	Newly Inaccessible for Wave 2	Net Change	Invitations Sent, Wave 2
Atlanta	626	4	2	+2	628
Dallas	211	7	6	+1	212
New Rochelle/Scarsdale	721	12	602	-590	131
West Hempstead	2,450	4	462	-458	1,992
Total	4,008	27	1,072	-1,045	2,963

This survey was initially launched on August 3, 2020. Data collection was paused later that same day until a relaunch on August 10, 2020. Reminders were sent on August 17 and August 23, 2020.

<sup>8</sup> The Young Israel of New Rochelle, the Young Israel of Scarsdale, Anshei Shalom (West Hempstead), and Eitz Chayim of Dogwood Park (West Hempstead).

<sup>9</sup> Ohr HaTorah (Atlanta), Shaare Tefilla (Dallas), Young Israel of New Rochelle, Young Israel of Scarsdale, Anshei Shalom (West Hempstead), and the Young Israel of West Hempstead.



## Incentives

To incentivize participation, all respondents who completed all three surveys were entered into a drawing to win a \$500 Amazon.com gift card, one per community.

## Response Rate

The survey was closed on August 24, 2020. The final survey dispositions for each community are shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Final survey dispositions, by community, Wave 2.

	Toco Hills, Atlanta, GA	North Dallas, Dallas, TX	New Rochelle and Scarsdale, NY	West Hempstead, NY	Total
<b>Returned questionnaire</b>					
1.1 Complete	143	73	74	222	512
1.2 Partial	4	3	0	10	17
<b>Eligible, non-interview</b>					
2.11 Refusal	0	0	0	0	0
2.12 Break-off	6	2	0	30	38
<b>Unknown eligibility, non-interview</b>					
3.11 No invitation sent	21	152	590	546	1,309
3.19 Nothing ever returned	462	131	55	1,554	2,202
3.30 Invitation returned undelivered ('bounce')	11	2	2	174	189
<b>Not eligible, returned</b>					
4.10 Screened out	2	1	0	2	5
<b>Total</b>					
Total	649	364	721	2,538	4,272

As in Wave 1, in order to calculate AAPOR RR4, we estimate what proportion of cases of unknown eligibility is actually eligible ( $e$ ). The two potential sources of ineligibility among the cases with unknown eligibility remain (1) *Outside target population* and (2) *Duplicate listings*.

*Outside target population.* The number of individuals who completed the survey but were outside the target population is shown in Table 9 (4.10 Screened out). Taking the number of interviews (complete plus partial) divided by the number of ineligible cases plus the number of interviews (complete plus partial) gives a partial estimate of what proportion of cases of unknown eligibility is actually eligible.

*Duplicate listings.* The survey instrument asked respondents to indicate whether they were members of each participating synagogue in their community. Some reported membership in more than one participating synagogue. We used this information to estimate what proportion of ‘non-interviews’ represent unique listings.

Table 10 shows our estimates of what proportion of cases of unknown eligibility is actually eligible (*e*) in each community.

Table 10. Estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that is actually eligible (*e*), by community, Wave 2.

	Toco Hills, Atlanta, GA	North Dallas, Dallas, TX	New Rochelle and Scarsdale, NY	West Hempstead, NY	Total
Percent in target population) $(I + P)$ $\frac{Ineligible + (I + P)}{Ineligible + (I + P)}$	99%	99%	100%	99%	99%
Percent unique listings	100%	95%	91%	83%	91%
Estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that is actually eligible ( <i>e</i> )	98%	93%	91%	82%	90%

The overall survey response rate was 14% (AAPOR RR4). Response rates are broken down by community in Table 11.

Table 11. Survey response rates, by community, Wave 2.

Toco Hills, Atlanta, GA	23%
North Dallas, Dallas, TX	22%
New Rochelle and Scarsdale, NY	11%
West Hempstead, NY	11%
Total	14%

## Wave 3: October 2020

### Survey Distribution

For Wave 3, we were unable to contact some individuals who had been invited to take the Wave 1 survey (“newly inaccessible” households):

- Some email invitations to the Wave 2 survey “bounced.”
- Some individuals opted out of future correspondence with us after receiving an email invitation to the Wave 2 survey.

Further, two eligible individuals who had *not* been invited to take the Wave 2 survey contacted us, asking to take the Wave 3 survey (“newly accessible” households). The net changes are shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Invitations Sent, Wave 2 v. Wave 3.

	Invitations Sent, Wave 2	Newly Accessible for Wave 3	Newly Inaccessible for Wave 3	Net Change	Invitations Sent, Wave 3
Atlanta	628	1	0	+1	629
Dallas	212	0	0	0	212
New Rochelle/Scarsdale	131	0	3	-3	128
West Hempstead	1,992	1	0	+1	1,993
Total	2,963	2	3	-1	2,962

This survey was launched on October 12, 2020. Reminders were sent on October 19, October 21, and October 25, 2020.

## Incentives

To incentivize participation, all respondents who completed all three surveys were entered into a drawing to win a \$500 Amazon.com gift card, one per community.

## Response Rate

The survey was closed on October 26, 2020. The final survey dispositions for each community are shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Final survey dispositions, by community, Wave 3.

	Toco Hills, Atlanta, GA	North Dallas, Dallas, TX	New Rochelle and Scarsdale, NY	West Hempstead, NY	Total
<b>Returned questionnaire</b>					
1.1 Complete	164	65	73	213	515
1.2 Partial	6	1	0	4	11
<b>Eligible, non-interview</b>					
2.11 Refusal	0	0	0	0	0
2.12 Break-off	10	4	2	25	41
<b>Unknown eligibility, non-interview</b>					
3.11 No invitation sent	23	152	593	545	1,313
3.19 Nothing ever returned	436	140	52	1,574	2,202
3.30 Invitation returned undelivered ('bounce')	11	2	1	176	190
<b>Not eligible, returned</b>					
4.10 Screened out	1	0	0	1	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>649</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>2,538</b>	<b>4,272</b>



As in Wave 1 and Wave 2, in order to calculate AAPOR RR4, we estimate what proportion of cases of unknown eligibility is actually eligible (*e*). The two potential sources of ineligibility among the cases with unknown eligibility remain (1) *Outside target population* and (2) *Duplicate listings*.

*Outside target population.* The number of individuals who completed the survey but were outside the target population is shown in Table 13 (4.10 Screened out). Taking the number of interviews (complete plus partial) divided by the number of ineligible cases plus the number of interviews (complete plus partial) gives a partial estimate of what proportion of cases of unknown eligibility is actually eligible.

*Duplicate listings.* The survey instrument asked respondents to indicate whether they were members of each participating synagogue in their community. Some reported membership in more than one participating synagogue. We used this information to estimate what proportion of ‘non-interviews’ represent unique listings.

Table 14 shows our estimates of what proportion of cases of unknown eligibility is actually eligible (*e*) in each community.

Table 14. Estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that is actually eligible (*e*), by community, Wave 3.

	Toco Hills, Atlanta, GA	North Dallas, Dallas, TX	New Rochelle and Scarsdale, NY	West Hempstead, NY	Total
Percent in target population) $\frac{(I + P)}{\text{Ineligible} + (I + P)}$	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percent unique listings	100%	94%	92%	82%	90%
Estimated proportion of cases of unknown eligibility that is actually eligible ( <i>e</i> )	98%	93%	91%	84%	90%

The overall survey response rate was 13% (AAPOR RR4). Response rates are broken down by community in Table 15.

Table 15. Survey response rates, by community, Wave 3.

Toco Hills, Atlanta, GA	27%
North Dallas, Dallas, TX	19%
New Rochelle and Scarsdale, NY	11%
West Hempstead, NY	11%
Total	14%