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# Background and Objectives

For nearly a year, our *kehilla* has been discussing the possibility of having women lead *Kabbalat Shabbat* (not *Minha* or *Ma'ariv*) in some format. The issue was raised by the *Va'adat Minhag veHalakha* (henceforth VMH) for consideration; however, it was understood from the beginning that the *Va'ad Menahel* (henceforth VM) would ultimately have to decide whether to implement any change as well as what would be the nature of such possible change.

The VMH process involved many stages, which I shall not discuss here. The purpose of this report is to present the key findings of the membership survey that was conducted in March 2014. The content of the survey was discussed by the VMH, and presented to the VM; members of both provided valuable suggestions which were incorporated into the questionnaire; and both ultimately approved the questionnaire.

The questionnaire included a small number of background questions (mainly age and gender, as well as current attendance of *Kabbalat Shabbat*), a general question about attitude toward changing the format of *Kabbalat Shabbat*, and ten questions about attitude toward ten specific options for change. It also included various open ended questions with space for members to express opinions not listed in the close-ended questions or other comments related to the issue; as well as several secondary questions (for instance, evaluation of the decision process). The main focus of this report is on the primary close-ended questions, with some attention to the open-ended questions when appropriate.

It was specified that the survey was NOT a vote or a referendum. Rather, it was a non-binding poll of Yedidya members, to give the VMH and VM an indication as to the members' views on the issue of women leading *Kabbalat* Shabbat services. The VMH was to make a recommendation to the VM, which ultimately has the authority to make the decision.

An initial tabulation of responses to the close-ended questions was shared with the general membership on 9 April. This statistical report does not relate to all the tabulations but expands on them to include some of the more complex findings, as well as the limitations of the study and a brief discussion.

In addition, as in any survey report, this one includes data only for those who responded to the survey. Those who did not respond might have different opinions, but those opinions cannot readily be analyzed.

# Methodology and Administration

1. The survey population was comprised of three groups: members, young adults (19‑25) and teens (12/13-18).
2. The survey was launched on Thursday March 20 and closed on Sunday March 31. E‑mail reminders were sent every other day to those who had not yet responded.
3. 275 adult members responded to the survey, out of a potential of 330 who received an invitation to participate; thus, the response rate among these adult members was 83%.[[3]](#footnote-3)
4. There were also sixteen young adult respondents and twelve teen respondents.[[4]](#footnote-4)
5. Some of the adult respondents did not answer all of the survey questions. Still, 254 adult respondents (constituting 77% of the potential respondents, and 92% of the actual respondents) answered all of the first six questions.
6. Overall, the administrative aspects of the survey proceeded rather smoothly
7. Several respondents commented that Questions 5 and 6 (where respondents were asked to indicate how they felt about a list of options relative to the status quo) were difficult to answer due to factors including the number of options and the reference point.
8. Four hours into the survey, a typographical error was identified in the introduction to Question 5. While the response categories themselves ranged from strongly opposed to strongly favor, the English introduction incorrectly stated that the scale ranged from "slightly opposed to strongly favor" (in Hebrew this was stated correctly). Once identified, the error was immediately corrected[[5]](#footnote-5).
9. On March 28-29 phone calls were made to those who had not yet responded to encourage them to respond. The main reason given for hesitation to respond was lack of participation in *Kabbalat Shabbat* services at Yedidya.

# Findings from the Survey of Adult Members

## Should we Keep *Kabbalat Shabbat* Unchanged? (Table 1, )

* The distribution of respondents[[6]](#footnote-6) was about half (49.5%) for change, one quarter (24.0%) against change, and one quarter (26.5%) either neutral (18.2%) or are undecided (8.4%[[7]](#footnote-7); these last two are combined as "neutral/DK" for the rest of the analyses).
* There are (at least) three ways to pose these results (and any of them can be justified):  
  \* (Only) half of the respondentswant change, the other half is neutral or against  
  \* (Only) a quarter of the respondents are against change, the other three quarters are either for change or neutral  
  \* Of those who expressed an opinion other than neutral, two thirds support change, and one third oppose change.

Table : Keep *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Percent of non-Neutral** |
| Yes (don't change it) | 66 | 24.0% | 32.7% |
| No (change it) | 136 | 49.5% | 67.3% |
| Neutral/DK | 73 | 26.5% | -- |
| **Total** | **275** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** |

Figure : Keep *Kabbalat Shabbat*  As Is

## Differences by Age, Gender, and Current Attendance of *Kabbalat Shabbat* (Table 2, Table 3, Table 4, and Table 5)

* Although there was a very slight tendency for the younger respondents to support change more than the older respondents, the differences were quite small.[[8]](#footnote-8)
* Men were somewhat more likely to oppose change, while women were somewhat more likely to be neutral or support change. The difference in the percentage opposed was about 11% (a bit under 30% of men, a bit over 18% of women).
* Those who attend *Kabbalat Shabbat* with some frequency (whether more than half the time or less than half the time) were more likely to oppose change (about 31%, combined, oppose change) than those who attend *Kabbalat Shabbat* rarely or never (14% oppose change). However, fairly similar percentages of all three groups supported change (46%-52% for all three groups). (Note, however, that men are both more likely to attend *Kabbalat Shabbat* and more likely to oppose change, so these differences may well be related to gender in addition to/rather than attendance of *Kabbalat Shabbat*.)

Table : Keep *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is by Age Groups, Entire Sample (incl. ages 12-25)\*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **60-89** | **50-59** | **26-49** | **19-25** | **12-18** | **Total** |
| Yes | 25 | 22 | 19 | 3 | 3 | **72** |
| 26.9% | 21.6% | 23.5% | 18.8% | 25.0% | **23.7%** |
| Neutral/DK | 23 | 30 | 20 | 5 | 2 | **80** |
| 24.7% | 29.4% | 24.7% | 31.3% | 16.7% | **26.3%** |
| No | 45 | 50 | 42 | 8 | 7 | **152** |
| 48.4% | 49.0% | 51.9% | 50.0% | 58.3% | **50.0%** |
| **Total** | **93** | **102** | **81** | **16** | **12** | **304** |
| **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** |

\*Note: This table alone includes respondents ages 12-25. All the other tables include adult respondents only.

Table : Keep *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is by Gender

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Female** | **Male** | **Total** |
| Yes | 25 | 41 | **66** |
| 18.2% | 29.7% | **24.0%** |
| Neutral/DK | 42 | 31 | **73** |
| 30.7% | 22.5% | **26.5%** |
| No | 70 | 66 | **136** |
| 51.1% | 47.8% | **49.5%** |
| **Total** | **137** | **138** | **275** |
| **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** |

Table : Keep *Kabbalat Shabbat* as Is by How Often Attend *Kabbalat Shabbat* Now

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **More than 1/2 the time** | **Less than 1/2 the time** | **Rarely/Never** | **Total** |
| Yes | 23 | 21 | 16 | **60** |
| 28.8% | 33.9% | 14.4% | **23.7%** |
| Neutral/DK | 20 | 10 | 37 | **67** |
| 25.0% | 16.1% | 33.3% | **26.5%** |
| No | 37 | 31 | 58 | **126** |
| 46.3% | 50.0% | 52.3% | **49.8%** |
| **Total** | **80** | **62** | **111** | **253** |
| **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** |

Table : How Often Attend *Kabbalat Shabbat* Now by Gender

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Female** | **Male** | **Total** |
| **More than 1/2 the time** | 27 | 53 | **80** |
| 21.4% | 41.7% | **31.6%** |
| **Less than 1/2 the time** | 31 | 31 | **62** |
| 24.6% | 24.4% | **24.5%** |
| **Rarely/ Never** | 68 | 43 | **111** |
| 54.0% | 33.9% | **43.9%** |
| **Total** | **126** | **127** | **253** |
| **100.%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** |

## Options for Change: General introduction

This section included ten questions. Respondents were asked to rate each of ten options on a scale of one (strongly oppose) to seven (strong favor).[[9]](#footnote-9) These were recoded into support, neutral, and oppose.[[10]](#footnote-10)

Although it was clearly stated that the ratings were to be relative to the status quo, comments indicate that at least some (and perhaps many) of the respondents found these instructions confusing, or thought they should be otherwise, and rated the options relative to their preferred option.[[11]](#footnote-11) In addition, there is evidence that some "strategic voting" may have occurred, such that a respondent treated this as a choice among options, and therefore gave a positive vote only to his/her preferred option so as to give that choice extra weight. A few respondents may have rated the options in various ways for other reasons. In any case, all this suggests that the exact distribution of responses must not be taken too literally.

Finally, the analyses below group the respondents into three categories: opposed, neutral/don't know, and favor. More detailed analyses could be done if appropriate.

## Bima 1 – Woman Leading from *Bima*, No Alternative Service (Table 6, Figure 2)

* This was the single most popular option, with just over half (54%) of the respondents favoring it.
* However, this was also the option with the biggest differences between opponents and supporters of change in general. Among opponents of change, 100% (!) opposed this option (most of them strongly). On the other hand, this option was very popular among supporters of change, with 89% favoring it. Neutrals were split approximately evenly among those who opposed, were neutral, or favored it.

Table : Bima 1 – Woman from *Bima*, No Alternative Service by Attitude to Keeping *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attitude Toward Option** | **Keep *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is** | | | **Total** |
| **Yes** | **Neutral/DK** | **No** |
| Oppose | 61 | 20 | 10 | **91** |
| 100.0% | 29.9% | 7.9% | **35.8%** |
| Neutral/DK | 0 | 21 | 4 | **25** |
| 0.0% | 31.3% | 3.2% | **9.8%** |
| Favor | 0 | 26 | 112 | **138** |
| 0.0% | 38.8% | 88.9% | **54.3%** |
| **Total** | **61** | **67** | **126** | **254** |
| **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** |

Figure : Options for Women Leading from *Bima* by Attitude to Keeping *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is

## Bima 2 – Woman Leading from *Bima* Upstairs, Men Downstairs (Table 7, Figure 2)

* Overall, about two in five respondents (39%) favored this option.
* The differences between opponents and supporters of change were less than for Bima1; still, 80% of opponents of change opposed this option, and 60% of supporters of change favored it.
* It is interesting that 34% of supporters of change opposed this option (see discussion in section ‎C, above).
* It is interesting that neutrals were less favorable to this option than to Bima1, with 54% opposing it, and only 27% supporting it.

Table : Bima 2 – Woman from *Bima*, Men Downstairs by Attitude to Keeping *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attitude Toward Option** | **Keep *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is** | | | **Total** |
| **Yes** | **Neutral/DK** | **No** |
| Oppose | 49 | 36 | 43 | **128** |
| 80.3% | 53.7% | 34.1% | **50.4%** |
| Neutral/DK | 6 | 13 | 7 | **26** |
| 9.8% | 19.4% | 5.6% | **10.2%** |
| Favor | 6 | 18 | 76 | **100** |
| 9.8% | 26.9% | 60.3% | **39.4%** |
| **Total** | **61** | **67** | **126** | **254** |
| **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** |

## Bima 3 – Woman Leading from *Bima* Downstairs, Men Upstairs (Table 8, Figure 2)

* Overall, just about half of the respondents (51%) opposed this option, and only one-third (33%) favored it.
* Interestingly, there was very little difference between opponents (54%) and proponents (52%) of change in the extent of their opposition to the option.
* In terms of support, one quarter (25%) of opponents of change and about two in five (39%) proponents favored the option.

Table : Bima 3 – Woman from *Bima*, Men Upstairs by Attitude to Keeping *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attitude Toward Option** | **Keep *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is** | | | **Total** |
| **Yes** | **Neutral/DK** | **No** |
| Oppose | 33 | 32 | 65 | **130** |
| 54.1% | 47.8% | 51.6% | **51.2%** |
| Neutral/DK | 13 | 14 | 12 | **39** |
| 21.3% | 20.9% | 9.5% | **15.4%** |
| Favor | 15 | 21 | 49 | **85** |
| 24.6% | 31.3% | 38.9% | **33.5%** |
| **Total** | **61** | **67** | **126** | **254** |
| **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** |

## Bima 4 – Woman Leading *Kabbalat Shabbat* for Private Event (Table 9, Figure 2)

* Nearly half of the respondents (44%) favored this option, with limited differences among the subgroups, with another 20% neutral.
* Just over one-third (35%) opposed it, with proponents of change most likely (41%) to oppose it and neutrals least likely (25%) to oppose it.

Table 9: Bima 4 – Woman from *Bima*, Private Event by Attitude to Keeping *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attitude Toward Option** | **Keep *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is** | | | **Total** |
| **Yes** | **Neutral/DK** | **No** |
| Oppose | 22 | 17 | 51 | **90** |
| 36.1% | 25.4% | 40.5% | **35.4%** |
| Neutral/DK | 11 | 19 | 21 | **51** |
| 18.0% | 28.4% | 16.7% | **20.1%** |
| Favor | 28 | 31 | 54 | **113** |
| 45.9% | 46.3% | 42.9% | **44.5%** |
| **Total** | **61** | **67** | **126** | **254** |
| **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** |

## Bima 5 – Woman Leading *Kabbalat Shabbat* as *Tefillat Nashim* (Table 10, Figure 2)

* Overall, close to half of the respondents (44%) opposed this option, and only one-third (32%) favored it, making this the least popular of the *bima* options, though only casually less popular than Bima 3 (33% overall favored it).
* Unlike other options, more opponents of chage favored the option (46%) than opposed it (26%).
* Proponents of change, however, were strongly against this option, with 59% opposing it and only 23% favoring it.

Table : Woman from *Bima*, Tefillat Nashim by Attitude to Keeping *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attitude Toward Option** | **KeepKabbalat Shabbat As Is** | | | **Total** |
| **Yes** | **Neutral/DK** | **No** |
| Oppose | 16 | 23 | 74 | **113** |
| 26.2% | 34.3% | 58.7% | **44.5%** |
| Neutral/DK | 17 | 19 | 23 | **59** |
| 27.9% | 28.4% | 18.3% | **23.2%** |
| Favor | 28 | 25 | 29 | **82** |
| 45.9% | 37.3% | 23.0% | **32.3%** |
| **Total** | **61** | **67** | **126** | **254** |
| **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** |

## Other Options

This report does not include the *ezrat nashim* options because each of them received less support than the parallel *bima* option. Overall, those who favored the parallel *bima* options found these options less palatable, whereas those who opposed the parallel *bima* options found these options no less unpalatable.

## Other Issues Raised Regarding Options

* Several respondents raised two important issues in choosing among options:  
  \* On the one hand, the Bima 1 option (see above) would leave at least some of the opponents with no place they felt comfortable davening that Friday night. Therefore, it was suggested, there should always be at least some parallel option led by men.  
  \*On the other hand, the other options (particularly Bima 2 and Bima 3) would divide up the *kehilla*, at least for *Kabbalat Shabbat*, and possibly for *Ma'ariv* as well.[[12]](#footnote-12) Some noted that since attendance at *Kabbalat Shabbat* is not very high as it is, and since a multiplicity of voices adds to the beauty of the *tefilla*, splitting up would be a bad idea.
* Despite the lack of support for the *Ezrat Nashim* options, there was some discussion in the comments sections as to where a woman might stand when leading *Kabbalat Shabbat*. A few respondents suggested that it might be easier if a woman led *Kabbalat Shabbat* from other than the usual place, such as from the amud, where women currently stand for the four *tefillot*, or that the *bima* could be moved into the *ezrat nashim* for *Kabbalat Shabbat*.
* Several respondents raised various possibilities for *Kabbalat Shabbat* being led by multiple leaders, including a man and a woman together, two or more women together, or a mixed group of children leading the service. However, the low level of support for the multiple leaders, *Ata Hor'eita*-like option (only 29% favored it) suggest that these possibilities would not receive broad support.

Another issue a few respondents raised was where "downstairs" would be. Several respondents suggesting that a woman leading *Kabbalat Shabbat* would bother them less if it was from Merkaz Dov than from the entry level, while others opposed the use of Merkaz Dov.

## Frequency of Woman-Led *Kabbalat Shabbat* (Table 11)

This was purposely asked only as an open-ended question, with the understanding that, if change were adopted, the decision as to frequency would be made based on what seemed best for the community and might change over time.

I coded (and then recoded) the responses, to the extent possible, into categories of frequency, ranging from never to weekly, plus several other answers – as often as possible; Gabbai decides based on qualifications; and other answers (flexible, random, depends on the option chosen).

It should be noted that only about half the respondents (49.5%) answered this question. The respondents who didn't answer probably have different opinions than the sample as a whole. In particular, many of those who opposed change (who comprise 30.2% of those who didn't answer the question) may have felt that it was unnecessary to specify that they didn't want a woman-led *Kabbalat Shabbat* ever. Others who didn't respond to the question might be in favor of woman-led *Kabbalat Shabbat* being held more often or less often than those who did respond.

With that major caveat in mind, of those who responded to the question, the following preferences emerged:

Never: 13%  
Once a month (or even less often): 23%  
Once every two-three weeks (two categories in the table): 30%  
Weekly, or as often as possible (two categories in the table): 19%  
Gabbai decides (based on qualifications, or other): 6%  
Other (including flexible, depends on option chosen): 10%

Table : Desired Frequency of *Kabbalat Shabbat*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** |
| Never | 17 | 6.2 | 12.5 |
| Once a month (or less often) | 31 | 11.3 | 22.8 |
| Once or twice a month | 19 | 6.9 | 14.0 |
| Every other week, more or less | 22 | 8.0 | 16.2 |
| As often as possible | 7 | 2.5 | 5.1 |
| Every week, or almost so | 19 | 6.9 | 14.0 |
| Gabbai decides | 8 | 2.9 | 5.9 |
| Other (includes flexible, depends on option) | 13 | 4.7 | 9.6 |
| **Total Valid Answers** | **136** | **49.5** | **100.0** |
| Missing or Don't Know | 139 | 50.5 |  |
| **Total Sample** | **275** | **100.0** |  |

## Change in Attendance of *Kabbalat Shabbat* ()

The respondents were asked how often they attend *Kabbalat Shabbat* now and how often they would attend if a woman were to lead *Kabbalat Shabbat*, on those Shabbatot. The options were: regularly (at least half the time), sometimes (but less than half the time), and rarely/never. For the second variable, there were also options of "it depends" and "don't know". Open-ended answers were coded into one of those categories, to the extent possible[[13]](#footnote-13).

* Overall, 11% said they'd attend *Kabbalat Shabbat* less often, 60% about the same, 23% more often, and 6% that it depended on the option chosen.
* Among opponents of change, 42% said they'd attend *Kabbalat Shabbat* about the same, 42% less often (including those who said they might/would leave Yedidya), 16% that it would depend on the choice, and none that they would attend *Kabbalat Shabbat* more often (though nearly half currently attend *Kabbalat Shabbat* regularly, so could not attend more often).
* Among supporters of change, 60% would attend *Kabbalat Shabbat* about the same as currently, 36% more often, and the other 4% said less often, or it depends.

In short, people's expectation about future attendance of *Kabbalat Shabbat* fit in with their attitude towards change.

Table : Changing Attendance at *Kabbalat Shabbat* by Attitude to Keeping *Kabbalat Shabbat*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Keep *Kabbalat Shabbat* As Is** | | | **Total** | |
| **1 Yes** | **2 Neutral/DK** | **3 No** |
| Less Often | 19 | 3 | 2 | **24** |
| 42.2% | 5.3% | 1.8% | **11.1%** |
| About the Same | 19 | 42 | 68 | **129** |
| 42.2% | 73.7% | 59.6% | **59.7%** |
| More Often | 0 | 9 | 41 | **50** |
| 0.0% | 15.8% | 36.0% | **23.1%** |
| Depends | 7 | 3 | 3 | **13** |
| 15.6% | 5.3% | 2.6% | **6.0%** |
| **Total** | **45** | **57** | **114** | **216** |
| **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** | **100.0%** |

## The Process

* Between two-thirds and three-quarters of respondents who expressed opinions on the various process questions (i.e., excluding those who didn't answer or said they didn't participate or didn't know) found the process as a whole, and each of the specific items to be somewhat or very helpful. Fewer than one in six found any of them somewhat or very unhelpful.
* However, there was a small minority of respondents who commented that they felt that the process was biased, and that the decision makers had already decided in advance to implement change and were not interested in listening to the positions of opponents. In addition, several spoke with sorrow of the divisiveness caused by the process.

## Comments

* Here, as well as in various other places, a number of respondents, mostly opponents of change, stated that if change was implemented, they might have to leave Yedidya, and they felt that supporters of change didn't care about this. There were a few supporters of change who indicated, to a greater or lesser degree, that they would be very disappointed in Yedidya if there were no change. Other supporters felt that opponents were trying to blackmail the process by threatening to leave.
* On the other hand, many respondents, whether opponents or supporters of change, were appreciative of the work done.

# Limitations

There are several limitations to the survey:

* There was one typographical mistake, discussed above, which seems not to have affected results.
* In terms of the ten options, despite efforts of the questionnaire writers, and discussion within VMH in an attempt to make the intention as clear as possible, it became obvious, based on specific comments as well as results of these questions, that different respondents interpreted the questions differently. This increases the difficulty of comparing the options. Still, the lead question, about overall attitude to change, was clear to everyone, and moreover, it seems that the trends, if not the specific details, are also reasonably clear.
* Finally, there were, as noted, 55 members who were sent an invitation to participate in the survey and did not respond, despite repeated e-mail reminders and a round of phone reminders. Several additional members did not provide Yedidya with an email address and hence did not receive a survey invitation at all. Although these numbers should be noted, it should also be noted that the overall response rate was very high (83% of those who received an invitation), and that many of those who did not respond indicated in the course of the phone reminders that, given their low participation either in Yedidya generally or in *Kabbalat Shabbat* specifically, they felt that that they should not be voicing their opinions about issues which did not affect them so much. In any case, we cannot conclusively state anything about the viewpoints of these members.

# Discussion

1. When it comes to the general question of attitude toward change, the numbers themselves are fairly clear (with a one-half, one-quarter, one-quarter division of respondents among the major choices), but the interpretation is less clear. Three different possible interpretations are listed. The VMH and VM, with input from *kehilla* members, must decide whether and to what extent change is mandated.
2. When it comes to the question of specific options which might be adopted, it is important to consider the opinions of all respondents, but also to consider separately the opinions of those who oppose, favor, and are neutral about change.
3. Finally, while each of these questions starts with a statistical analysis, in the end each involves other issues which are not within the scope of this report.

# Appendix: Who was Involved

Writing of Survey Questionnaire in English: Laura Rosen, Mindy Schimmel, and Dina Weiner, with input from Bruce Rosen

Translation of Questionnaire into Hebrew: Avital Ordan and Debbie Weissman , with input from Elazar Nachalon

Administration of Survey: Bruce Rosen and Mindy Schimmel

Statistical Analysis: Mindy Schimmel, with input from Bruce Rosen, Laura Rosen, and Dani Kahn

Writing of Survey Report: Mindy Schimmel; Methodology and Administration section co-written with Bruce Rosen

Review of Survey Report: Laura Rosen, Bruce Rosen, Deborah Lustig, Herschy Katz, and Dani Kahn

1. Mindy has a Master's degree in statistics and a doctorate in sociology, both from the University of Chicago. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Earlier drafts of this report benefited from input from Laura Rosen, Bruce Rosen, Deborah Lustig, Herschy Katz, and Dani Kahn (in reverse alphabetical order); I am greatly appreciative of their assistance. For further details as to who was involved in the survey and write-up at various stages, see the Appendix. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. There were an additional 10-15 members who did not provide an email address. They had an opportunity to fill out a survey manually in the office, but none made use of this opportunity. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Yedidya membership files do not include e-mail addresses for the vast majority of young adults and youths. Young adults interested in participating in the survey were encouraged to send their e-mail addresses to the office. Youth interested in participating in the survey could do so either via the Yedidya youth facebook page or by sending in their e-mails to the office. Most of those who sent in email addresses responded, but that is only a small fraction of the young adult and youth who are children of members. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The survey administrators carried out analyses to assess the extent to which the error may have affected the findings. These analyses suggest that there was no substantial effect. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Again, this and all analyses and percentages refer to survey respondents, and do not include those who, for whatever reason, did not respond to the survey. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. As a general point: Numbers in the text and the tables do not always sum to 100.0% because of rounding errors. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. This analysis alone includes results from the young adult and teen questionnaires. They were not included in the other tables, as this report focuses on the adult members. Moreover, adding them to the analyses would not have materially affected the results both because there were very few of them, and because their responses to this and most questions were similar to those of the adults, [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. There was also a choice of don't know, which, as noted below, was coded as equivalent to neutral. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. This was done partly for the sake of simplicity. Seven-way tables are also available. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. This particularly applies to those who supported change, and Bima 1, and then opposed Bima 2 and Bima 3. Although some may genuinely oppose any split option, at least some of them just wanted to indicate that they think Bima 1 preferable to these other two options. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. It might be too complicated to come together again for *Ma'ariv*, so the woman leading *Kabbalat Shabbat* would be replaced by a man for *Ma'ariv*, but the groups would remain separate. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. For both variables, those who stated that they are not regularly in Jerusalem/Israel were coded as rarely/never. For frequency if women's *Kabbalat Shabbat* was instituted, "no change" was coded as such, "more" or "less" were coded based on whether it seemed there would be a change in category. Those who said they would leave Yedidya were coded as rarely/never. Those who said "it depends" were coded as such. Some cases were not informative enough to be coded at all. Don't know was treated as missing. Overall, 79% of respondents were coded for both variables. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)