

COMPARISONS OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES: A COMPENDIUM OF TABLES AND BAR CHARTS

Comparisons of Jewish Communities: A Compendium of Tables and Bar Charts was prepared by Dr. Ira M. Sheskin for the Berman Jewish DataBank, under a grant provided by the Mandell and Madeleine Berman Foundation and with support from The Jewish Federations of North America.

The compendium is a single source of tables and bar charts designed to provide a comparative context for understanding American Jewish communities. It is intended for local Jewish communities seeking to compare themselves to others, as well as for researchers, teachers, and students of American Jewry.

Each of the 36 Sections of this compendium is available as a stand-alone PDF. A single PDF (a "portfolio of all Sections") with all content is also available.

The comparison tables and bar charts are based on local Jewish community studies archived at the DataBank (www.jewishdatabank.org). The Data Bank holds reports, questionnaires, methodological documentation and information about sponsoring organizations and researchers for each study in the compendium. From time to time, the compendium is updated with information from new local Jewish community studies.

Following social science convention, the year of each community study reflects when the survey interviews were completed, which may differ from the year the study report was issued.

The compendium also includes information from the National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01 (NJPS, www.jewishdatabank.org/NJPS2000.asp) and the US Census Bureau's Decennial Census and American Community Survey (ACS, www.census.gov/acs/www/).

The Appendix at the end of this section provides further information to help readers use the tables and bar charts.

For further information or inquiries, please contact the Data Bank at:
info@jewishdatabank.org.

Note that this edition of *Comparisons of Jewish Communities* (Current Jewish Population Report 12) is an updated version of reports released in 2012 (Report 5) and 2013 (Report 8). It replaces the Columbus 2001 results with 2013 results, Miami 2004 results with 2014 results, and St. Louis 1995 results with 2014 results.

Dr. Sheskin (isheskin@miami.edu) is the Director of the Jewish Demography Project of the Sue and Leonard Miller Center for Contemporary Judaic Studies and Professor and Chair of Geography and Regional Studies at the University of Miami.

SECTION 6 - AGE

June 2015

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Age Distribution	3
Table 2: Age 0-17	6
Table 3: Age 18-34	8
Table 4: Age 35-49	10
Table 5: Age 50-64	12
Table 6: Age 65 and Over	14
Table 7: Number of Persons Age 65 and Over	16
Table 8: Age 75 and Over	18
Table 9: Median Age	20
Table 10: Percentage Female	22
Table 11: Number of Jewish Children Age 0-5 Being Raised Jewish	24
Table 12: Number of Jewish Children Age 6-12 Being Raised Jewish	26
Table 13: Number of Jewish Children Age 13-17 Being Raised Jewish	28
Table 14: Number of Jewish Children Age 0-17 Being Raised Jewish	30

LIST OF BAR CHARTS

Bar Chart 1: Age 0-17	7
Bar Chart 2: Age 18-34	9
Bar Chart 3: Age 35-49	11
Bar Chart 4: Age 50-64	13
Bar Chart 5: Age 65 and Over	15
Bar Chart 6: Number of Persons Age 65 and Over	17
Bar Chart 7: Age 75 and Over	19
Bar Chart 8: Median Age	21
Bar Chart 9: Percentage Female	23
Bar Chart 10: Number of Jewish Children Age 0-5	25
Bar Chart 11: Number of Jewish Children Age 6-12	27
Bar Chart 12: Number of Jewish Children Age 13-17	29
Bar Chart 13: Number of Jewish Children Age 0-17	31
Appendix	32

**TABLE 1
AGE DISTRIBUTION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	0-17	18-34	35-49	50-64	65 and Over	75 and Over
Charlotte	1997	28%	21	31	12	9	3%
Richmond	1994	25%	19	31	12	13	7%
Orlando	1993	23%	23	28	14	12	4%
Harrisburg	1994	27%	19	28	14	13	6%
Westport	2000	31%	12	28	16	14	6%
York	1999	26%	12	27	18	16	9%
Los Angeles	1997	20%	18	26	18	19	8%
St. Paul	2004	27%	14	26	17	16	10%
Minneapolis	2004	26%	13	26	19	18	9%
Seattle	2000	24%	29	25	13	9	3%
Wilmington	1995	26%	21	25	13	15	6%
Tidewater	2001	25%	17	25	21	12	6%
Milwaukee	1996	24%	16	25	15	20	9%
Rochester	1999	24%	12	25	20	20	10%
San Francisco	2004	19%	24	24	22	12	5%
Boston	2005	24%	20	24	21	12	6%
Monmouth	1997	25%	16	24	17	19	8%
Atlanta	2006	24%	15	24	24	11	5%
Portland (ME)	2007	26%	11	24	24	16	8%
San Diego	2003	20%	23	23	20	15	8%
Washington	2003	23%	22	23	22	10	5%
St. Petersburg	1994	19%	15	23	16	28	13%
Hartford	2000	22%	12	23	19	23	12%

**TABLE 1
AGE DISTRIBUTION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	0-17	18-34	35-49	50-64	65 and Over	75 and Over
Pittsburgh	2002	21%	20	22	19	18	10%
Denver	2007	22%	18	22	26	12	5%
Phoenix	2002	20%	16	22	22	20	12%
Las Vegas	2005	13%	15	22	25	26	11%
Bergen	2001	27%	14	22	19	18	8%
Chicago	2010	21%	20	19	23	18	9%
Jacksonville	2002	21%	17	19	23	20	12%
Tucson	2002	16%	16	19	25	23	12%
Columbus	2013	21%	25	18	21	16	7%
St. Louis	2014	19%	23	18	21	18	11%
Philadelphia	2009	19%	20	18	27	17	9%
Rhode Island	2002	20%	19	18	21	23	13%
San Antonio	2007	21%	11	18	27	24	12%
New York	2011	23%	19	17	21	20	12%
Cleveland	2011	22%	15	17	28	18	9%
Detroit	2005	25%	12	17	22	24	14%
Cincinnati	2008	20%	17	16	28	19	10%
Howard County	2010	18%	16	16	35	15	4%
New Haven	2010	20%	12	16	26	27	16%
Broward	1997	15%	11	16	12	46	29%
Atlantic County	2004	16%	9	16	26	34	16%
Baltimore	2010	24%	20	15	22	19	10%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	13%	6	15	18	48	18%

**TABLE 1
AGE DISTRIBUTION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	0-17	18-34	35-49	50-64	65 and Over	75 and Over
Miami	2014	19%	18	14	19	31	16%
Lehigh Valley	2007	18%	14	14	30	23	12%
Middlesex	2008	18%	12	14	21	36	23%
Palm Springs	1998	12%	7	13	20	48	23%
Sarasota	2001	10%	6	12	20	53	31%
W Palm Beach	2005	9%	6	11	17	57	32%
S Palm Beach	2005	9%	5	9	16	62	40%
Essex-Morris	1998	23%	62			15	5%

BASE: JEWS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Buffalo	1995	20%	60			20	7%
NJPS ¹	2000	19%	16	29	19	16	8%
ACS (US)	2013	23%	24	20	20	14	6%

¹ Persons in Jewish households.

**TABLE 2
AGE 0-17
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Westport	2000	31%		Pittsburgh	2002	21%
Charlotte	1997	28%		New Haven	2010	20%
St. Paul	2004	27%		Cincinnati	2008	20%
Bergen	2001	27%		San Diego	2003	20%
Harrisburg	1994	27%		Phoenix	2002	20%
Portland (ME)	2007	26%		Rhode Island	2002	20%
Minneapolis	2004	26%		Los Angeles	1997	20%
York	1999	26%		Miami	2014	19%
Wilmington	1995	26%		St. Louis	2014	19%
Detroit	2005	25%		Philadelphia	2009	19%
Tidewater	2001	25%		San Francisco	2004	19%
Monmouth	1997	25%		St. Petersburg	1994	19%
Richmond	1994	25%		Howard County	2010	18%
Baltimore	2010	24%		Middlesex	2008	18%
Atlanta	2006	24%		Lehigh Valley	2007	18%
Boston	2005	24%		Atlantic County	2004	16%
Seattle	2000	24%		Tucson	2002	16%
Rochester	1999	24%		Broward	1997	15%
Milwaukee	1996	24%		Las Vegas	2005	13%
New York	2011	23%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	13%
Washington	2003	23%		Palm Springs	1998	12%
Essex-Morris	1998	23%		Sarasota	2001	10%
Orlando	1993	23%		S Palm Beach	2005	9%
Cleveland	2011	22%		W Palm Beach	2005	9%
Denver	2007	22%				
Hartford	2000	22%		BASE: JEWS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS		
Columbus	2013	21%		Buffalo	1995	20%
Chicago	2010	21%		NJPS ¹	2000	19%
San Antonio	2007	21%		ACS (US)	2013	23%
Jacksonville	2002	21%				
				¹ Persons in Jewish households.		

1

AGE 0-17

(Persons in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 3
AGE 18-34
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS


Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Seattle	2000	29%		Milwaukee	1996	16%
Columbus	2014	25%		Cleveland	2011	15%
San Francisco	2004	24%		Atlanta	2006	15%
St. Louis	2013	23%		Las Vegas	2005	15%
San Diego	2003	23%		St. Petersburg	1994	15%
Orlando	1993	23%		Lehigh Valley	2007	14%
Washington	2003	22%		St. Paul	2004	14%
Charlotte	1997	21%		Bergen	2001	14%
Wilmington	1995	21%		Minneapolis	2004	13%
Baltimore	2010	20%		New Haven	2010	12%
Chicago	2010	20%		Middlesex	2008	12%
Philadelphia	2009	20%		Detroit	2005	12%
Boston	2005	20%		Hartford	2000	12%
Pittsburgh	2002	20%		Westport	2000	12%
New York	2011	19%		Rochester	1999	12%
Rhode Island	2002	19%		York	1999	12%
Harrisburg	1994	19%		Portland (ME)	2007	11%
Richmond	1994	19%		San Antonio	2007	11%
Miami	2014	18%		Broward	1997	11%
Denver	2007	18%		Atlantic County	2004	9%
Los Angeles	1997	18%		Palm Springs	1998	7%
Cincinnati	2008	17%		W Palm Beach	2005	6%
Jacksonville	2002	17%		Sarasota	2001	6%
Tidewater	2001	17%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	6%
Howard County	2010	16%		S Palm Beach	2005	5%
Phoenix	2002	16%		NJPS ¹	2000	16%
Tucson	2002	16%		ACS (US)	2013	24%
Monmouth	1997	16%				

¹ Persons in Jewish households.

2

AGE 18-34

(Persons in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 4
AGE 35-49
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS


Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Charlotte	1997	31%		Chicago	2010	19%
Richmond	1994	31%		Jacksonville	2002	19%
Westport	2000	28%		Tucson	2002	19%
Harrisburg	1994	28%		Columbus	2013	18%
Orlando	1993	28%		St. Louis	2014	18%
York	1999	27%		Philadelphia	2009	18%
Minneapolis	2004	26%		San Antonio	2007	18%
St. Paul	2004	26%		Rhode Island	2002	18%
Los Angeles	1997	26%		Cleveland	2011	17%
Tidewater	2001	25%		New York	2011	17%
Seattle	2000	25%		Detroit	2005	17%
Rochester	1999	25%		Howard County	2010	16%
Milwaukee	1996	25%		New Haven	2010	16%
Wilmington	1995	25%		Cincinnati	2008	16%
Portland (ME)	2007	24%		Atlantic County	2004	16%
Atlanta	2006	24%		Broward	1997	16%
Boston	2005	24%		Baltimore	2010	15%
San Francisco	2004	24%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	15%
Monmouth	1997	24%		Miami	2014	14%
San Diego	2003	23%		Middlesex	2008	14%
Washington	2003	23%		Lehigh Valley	2007	14%
Hartford	2000	23%		Palm Springs	1998	13%
St. Petersburg	1994	23%		Sarasota	2001	12%
Denver	2007	22%		W Palm Beach	2005	11%
Las Vegas	2005	22%		S Palm Beach	2005	9%
Phoenix	2002	22%		NJPS ¹	2000	29%
Pittsburgh	2002	22%		ACS (US)	2013	20%
Bergen	2001	22%				

¹ Persons in Jewish households.

3

AGE 35-49

(Persons in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 5
AGE 50-64
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Howard County	2010	35%		Sarasota	2001	20%
Lehigh Valley	2007	30%		Rochester	1999	20%
Cleveland	2011	28%		Palm Springs	1998	20%
Cincinnati	2008	28%		Miami	2014	19%
Philadelphia	2009	27%		Minneapolis	2004	19%
San Antonio	2007	27%		Pittsburgh	2002	19%
New Haven	2010	26%		Bergen	2001	19%
Denver	2007	26%		Hartford	2000	19%
Atlantic County	2004	26%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	18%
Las Vegas	2005	25%		York	1999	18%
Tucson	2002	25%		Los Angeles	1997	18%
Portland (ME)	2007	24%		W Palm Beach	2005	17%
Atlanta	2006	24%		St. Paul	2004	17%
Chicago	2010	23%		Monmouth	1997	17%
Jacksonville	2002	23%		S Palm Beach	2005	16%
Baltimore	2010	22%		Westport	2000	16%
Detroit	2005	22%		St. Petersburg	1994	16%
San Francisco	2004	22%		Milwaukee	1996	15%
Washington	2003	22%		Harrisburg	1994	14%
Phoenix	2002	22%		Orlando	1993	14%
St. Louis	2014	21%		Seattle	2000	13%
Columbus	2013	21%		Wilmington	1995	13%
New York	2011	21%		Broward	1997	12%
Middlesex	2008	21%		Charlotte	1997	12%
Boston	2005	21%		Richmond	1994	12%
Rhode Island	2002	21%		NJPS ¹	2000	19%
Tidewater	2001	21%		ACS (US)	2013	20%
San Diego	2003	20%				

¹ Persons in Jewish households.

4

AGE 50-64 (Persons in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 6
AGE 65 AND OVER
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
S Palm Beach	2005	62%		Minneapolis	2004	18%
W Palm Beach	2005	57%		Pittsburgh	2002	18%
Sarasota	2001	53%		Bergen	2001	18%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	48%		Philadelphia	2009	17%
Palm Springs	1998	48%		Columbus	2013	16%
Broward	1997	46%		Portland (ME)	2007	16%
Middlesex	2008	36%		St. Paul	2004	16%
Atlantic County	2004	34%		York	1999	16%
Miami	2014	31%		Howard County	2010	15%
St. Petersburg	1994	28%		San Diego	2003	15%
New Haven	2010	27%		Essex-Morris	1998	15%
Las Vegas	2005	26%		Wilmington	1995	15%
San Antonio	2007	24%		Westport	2000	14%
Detroit	2005	24%		Harrisburg	1994	13%
Lehigh Valley	2007	23%		Richmond	1994	13%
Rhode Island	2002	23%		Denver	2007	12%
Tucson	2002	23%		Boston	2005	12%
Hartford	2000	23%		San Francisco	2004	12%
New York	2011	20%		Tidewater	2001	12%
Jacksonville	2002	20%		Orlando	1993	12%
Phoenix	2002	20%		Atlanta	2006	11%
Rochester	1999	20%		Washington	2003	10%
Milwaukee	1996	20%		Seattle	2000	9%
Baltimore	2010	19%		Charlotte	1997	9%
Cincinnati	2008	19%				
Los Angeles	1997	19%		BASE: JEWS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS		
Monmouth	1997	19%		Buffalo	1995	20%
St. Louis	2014	18%		NJPS ¹	2000	16%
Cleveland	2011	18%		ACS (US)	2013	14%
Chicago	2010	18%				
				¹ Persons in Jewish households.		


5

AGE 65 AND OVER

(Persons in Jewish Households)



6 NUMBER OF PERSONS AGE 65 AND OVER (Persons in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 8
AGE 75 AND OVER
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
S Palm Beach	2005	40%		Minneapolis	2004	9%
W Palm Beach	2005	32%		York	1999	9%
Sarasota	2001	31%		Milwaukee	1996	9%
Broward	1997	29%		Portland (ME)	2007	8%
Middlesex	2008	23%		San Diego	2003	8%
Palm Springs	1998	23%		Bergen	2001	8%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	18%		Los Angeles	1997	8%
Miami	2014	16%		Monmouth	1997	8%
New Haven	2010	16%		Columbus	2013	7%
Atlantic County	2004	16%		Richmond	1994	7%
Detroit	2005	14%		Boston	2005	6%
Rhode Island	2002	13%		Tidewater	2001	6%
St. Petersburg	1994	13%		Westport	2000	6%
New York	2011	12%		Wilmington	1995	6%
Lehigh Valley	2007	12%		Harrisburg	1994	6%
San Antonio	2007	12%		Denver	2007	5%
Jacksonville	2002	12%		Atlanta	2006	5%
Phoenix	2002	12%		San Francisco	2004	5%
Tucson	2002	12%		Washington	2003	5%
Hartford	2000	12%		Essex-Morris	1998	5%
St. Louis	2014	11%		Howard County	2010	4%
Las Vegas	2005	11%		Orlando	1993	4%
Baltimore	2010	10%		Seattle	2000	3%
Cincinnati	2008	10%		Charlotte	1997	3%
St. Paul	2004	10%				
Pittsburgh	2002	10%		BASE: JEWS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS		
Rochester	1999	10%		Buffalo	1995	7%
Cleveland	2011	9%		NJPS ¹	2000	8%
Chicago	2010	9%		ACS (US)	2013	6%
Philadelphia	2009	9%				

¹ Persons in Jewish households.

7

AGE 75 AND OVER (Persons in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 9
MEDIAN AGE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Age ¹		Community	Year	Age ¹
S Palm Beach	2005	70.9		Los Angeles	1997	42.5
W Palm Beach	2005	68.5		Chicago	2010	42.4
Sarasota	2001	66.4		Bergen	2001	42.3
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	64.3		St. Paul	2004	42.2
Broward	1997	59.4		Denver	2007	42.0
Atlantic County	2004	55.8		Monmouth	1997	41.9
Palm Springs	1998	55.0		Tidewater	2001	41.6
Middlesex	2008	54.9		Milwaukee	1996	41.6
New Haven	2010	51.6		Pittsburgh	2002	41.3
Lehigh Valley	2007	51.6		St. Louis	2014	41.2
Las Vegas	2005	50.4		Baltimore	2010	41.1
San Antonio	2007	50.2		San Francisco	2004	39.6
Howard County	2010	50.0		San Diego	2003	39.6
Miami	2014	49.5		Boston	2005	39.0
Tucson	2002	49.1		Westport	2000	38.9
Cincinnati	2008	47.9		Washington	2003	38.8
Cleveland	2011	47.1		Richmond	1994	38.7
Detroit	2005	47.1		Harrisburg	1994	37.5
St. Petersburg	1994	45.9		Columbus	2013	37.4
Jacksonville	2002	45.6		Orlando	1993	37.2
Rhode Island	2002	45.5		Wilmington	1995	36.9
Hartford	2000	45.1		Charlotte	1997	35.8
Philadelphia	2009	45.0		Seattle	2000	33.5
Phoenix	2002	44.6		BASE: JEWS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS		
Portland (ME)	2007	44.1		Buffalo	1995	40.8
Rochester	1999	44.0		NJPS ²	2000	38.8
Atlanta	2006	43.3		ACS (US)	2013	37.6
New York	2011	42.8		¹ Median age in years.		
Minneapolis	2004	42.7		² Persons in Jewish households.		
York	1999	42.5				

8

MEDIAN AGE

(Persons in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 10
PERCENTAGE FEMALE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
S Palm Beach	2005	56%		Lehigh Valley	2007	51%
Philadelphia	2009	55%		San Antonio	2007	51%
Broward	1997	55%		Atlanta	2006	51%
W Palm Beach	2005	54%		Minneapolis	2004	51%
Sarasota	2001	54%		Washington	2003	51%
Miami	2014	53%		Phoenix	2002	51%
New Haven	2010	53%		Pittsburgh	2002	51%
Middlesex	2008	53%		Hartford	2000	51%
Detroit	2005	53%		Westport	2000	51%
Las Vegas	2005	53%		Essex-Morris	1998	51%
Atlantic County	2004	53%		Harrisburg	1994	51%
Tucson	2002	53%		Orlando	1993	51%
Rochester	1999	53%		St. Louis	2014	50%
York	1999	53%		New York	2011	50%
Columbus	2013	52%		Chicago	2010	50%
Cleveland	2011	52%		Howard County	2010	50%
Denver	2007	52%		Portland (ME)	2007	50%
Boston	2005	52%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	50%
St. Paul	2004	52%		Charlotte	1997	50%
Rhode Island	2002	52%		Monmouth	1997	50%
Bergen	2001	52%		Baltimore	2010	49%
Tidewater	2001	52%		San Diego	2003	49%
Palm Springs	1998	52%		Jacksonville	2002	49%
Los Angeles	1997	52%		BASE: JEWS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS		
Milwaukee	1996	52%		Seattle	2000	53%
Wilmington	1995	52%		Buffalo	1995	49%
Richmond	1994	52%		NJPS ¹	2000	51%
St. Petersburg	1994	52%		ACS (US)	2013	51%
Cincinnati	2008	51%		¹ Persons in Jewish households.		

9

PERCENTAGE FEMALE

(Persons in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 11
NUMBER OF JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 0-5 BEING RAISED JEWISH
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

Community	Year	Number		Community	Year	Number
New York	2011	107,274		Rochester	1999	1,167
Chicago	2010	19,842		Rhode Island	2002	1,159
Washington	2003	15,050		St. Petersburg	1994	1,143
Atlanta	2006	11,013		New Haven	2010	1,127
Miami	2014	9,053		Wilmington	1995	950
Broward	1997	8,400		Jacksonville	2002	903
Philadelphia	2009	7,982		Tucson	2002	847
Baltimore	2010	6,163		Richmond	1994	827
Bergen	2001	5,220		Charlotte	1997	815
Phoenix	2002	4,837		Atlantic County	2004	748
San Diego	2003	4,257		Columbus	2013	723
Cleveland	2011	4,200		St. Paul	2004	719
Detroit	2005	4,076		Harrisburg	1994	685
Denver	2007	4,056		Portland (ME)	2007	576
Monmouth	1997	3,934		Tidewater	2001	556
S Palm Beach	2005	3,272		Sarasota	2001	496
Las Vegas	2005	2,565		San Antonio	2007	428
Middlesex	2008	2,496		Howard County	2010	421
W Palm Beach	2005	2,472		Lehigh Valley	2007	312
Minneapolis	2004	2,183		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	130
Hartford	2000	2,118		York	1999	76
St. Louis	2014	2,000		Los Angeles *	1997	27,115
Pittsburgh	2002	1,763		Seattle *	2000	3,700
Cincinnati	2008	1,360		Buffalo *	1995	1,570
Milwaukee	1996	1,278				
Orlando	1993	1,185				
Westport	2000	1,179				

* May include children who are part Jewish.

10

NUMBER OF JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 0-5




TABLE 12 NUMBER OF JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 6-12 BEING RAISED JEWISH COMMUNITY COMPARISONS						
Community	Year	Number		Community	Year	Number
New York	2011	125,799		Westport	2000	1,660
Chicago	2010	23,344		New Haven	2010	1,518
Washington	2003	17,630		Orlando	1993	1,424
Philadelphia	2009	13,830		Tucson	2002	1,204
Broward	1997	12,720		Rhode Island	2002	1,196
Bergen	2001	8,795		Howard County	2010	1,144
Atlanta	2006	8,449		Richmond	1994	1,141
Miami	2014	7,440		Wilmington	1995	1,092
Baltimore	2010	7,256		Atlantic County	2004	1,072
Monmouth	1997	7,081		Tidewater	2001	1,036
Detroit	2005	6,864		St. Paul	2004	959
Cleveland	2011	6,600		Columbus	2013	926
Denver	2007	5,800		Jacksonville	2002	826
San Diego	2003	5,180		San Antonio	2007	783
St. Louis	2014	4,400		Portland (ME)	2007	777
S Palm Beach	2005	4,319		Harrisburg	1994	758
Phoenix	2002	4,050		Charlotte	1997	660
Middlesex	2008	3,432		Sarasota	2001	558
Pittsburgh	2002	3,401		Lehigh Valley	2007	504
W Palm Beach	2005	3,090		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	240
Hartford	2000	3,030		York	1999	209
Las Vegas	2005	2,363		Los Angeles *	1997	38,735
Minneapolis	2004	2,270		Seattle *	2000	3,100
St. Petersburg	1994	2,167		Buffalo *	1995	2,239
Rochester	1999	2,001				
Cincinnati	2008	1,970				
Milwaukee	1996	1,949				

* May include children who are part Jewish.

11

NUMBER OF JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 6-12




TABLE 13 NUMBER OF JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 13-17 BEING RAISED JEWISH COMMUNITY COMPARISONS						
Community	Year	Number		Community	Year	Number
New York	2011	95,586		Howard County	2010	1,211
Chicago	2010	16,633		Atlantic County	2004	1,112
Washington	2003	13,975		Rochester	1999	1,084
Philadelphia	2009	11,038		St. Paul	2004	1,068
Broward	1997	8,880		St. Petersburg	1994	1,048
Atlanta	2006	8,658		Tucson	2002	1,026
Baltimore	2010	6,809		Tidewater	2001	916
Detroit	2005	6,078		Columbus	2013	899
Miami	2014	5,850		Rhode Island	2002	865
Cleveland	2011	5,500		Richmond	1994	811
Bergen	2001	5,220		Jacksonville	2002	774
Denver	2007	4,032		Westport	2000	756
San Diego	2003	4,024		Wilmington	1995	728
Monmouth	1997	4,000		Portland (ME)	2007	635
Phoenix	2002	3,481		San Antonio	2007	573
S Palm Beach	2005	3,403		Sarasota	2001	465
St. Louis	2014	2,800		Lehigh Valley	2007	464
Pittsburgh	2002	2,468		Charlotte	1997	450
Middlesex	2008	2,444		Harrisburg	1994	430
W Palm Beach	2005	2,348		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	150
Minneapolis	2004	2,095		York	1999	133
Cincinnati	2008	2,016		Los Angeles *	1997	29,435
Hartford	2000	1,955		Seattle *	2000	2,400
New Haven	2010	1,633		Buffalo *	1995	1,343
Las Vegas	2005	1,485				
Orlando	1993	1,450				
Milwaukee	1996	1,341				

* May include children who are part Jewish.

12

NUMBER OF JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 13-17





TABLE 14						
NUMBER OF JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 0-17 BEING RAISED JEWISH						
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS						
Community	Year	Number		Community	Year	Number
New York	2011	328,659		Rochester	1999	4,252
Chicago	2010	59,819		Orlando	1993	4,059
Washington	2003	46,655		Westport	2000	3,595
San Francisco	2004	35,227		Rhode Island	2002	3,220
Philadelphia	2009	32,850		Tucson	2002	3,077
Broward	1997	30,000		Atlantic County	2004	2,932
Atlanta	2006	28,120		Richmond	1994	2,779
Miami	2014	22,343		Howard County	2010	2,776
Baltimore	2010	20,228		Wilmington	1995	2,770
Bergen	2001	19,235		St. Paul	2004	2,746
Detroit	2005	17,018		Columbus	2013	2,548
Cleveland	2011	16,300		Tidewater	2001	2,508
Monmouth	1997	15,015		Jacksonville	2002	2,503
Denver	2007	13,888		Portland (ME)	2007	1,988
San Diego	2003	13,461		Charlotte	1997	1,925
Phoenix	2002	12,368		Harrisburg	1994	1,873
S Palm Beach	2005	10,994		San Antonio	2007	1,784
St. Louis	2014	9,200		Sarasota	2001	1,519
Middlesex	2008	8,372		Lehigh Valley	2007	1,280
W Palm Beach	2005	7,910		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	520
Pittsburgh	2002	7,632		York	1999	418
Hartford	2000	7,103		Los Angeles *	1997	95,285
Minneapolis	2004	6,548		Boston *	2005	48,000
Las Vegas	2005	6,413		Seattle *	2000	9,200
Cincinnati	2008	5,346		Buffalo *	1995	5,152
Milwaukee	1996	4,568				
St. Petersburg	1994	4,358				
New Haven	2010	4,278				

* May include children who are part Jewish.

13

NUMBER OF JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 0-17



COMPARISONS OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES: A COMPENDIUM OF TABLES AND BAR CHARTS

APPENDIX

This appendix provides further information to help readers use the tables and bar charts, including rules for inclusion of local studies in the compendium, methodological issues in comparing communities, the order of communities, and tips for reading the tables and bar charts.

RULES FOR INCLUSION OF COMMUNITY STUDIES

To be included in the comparison tables and bar charts, a community study must meet the following criteria:

- ❶ The study had to include a telephone survey using random digit dialing for at least part of the sample.
- ❷ The study had to be completed since 1993. If a community completed multiple studies during this period, only the results of the most recent study are shown.
- ❸ The study had to ask the questions addressed in the tables and bar charts using wording similar to other studies and to report the results in a manner facilitating comparison. In many cases where the original results were not reported in a manner facilitating comparison, Dr. Sheskin obtained the original survey data and produced results that permit comparisons. In some cases, differences in the wording of the questions or categories used to report the results are noted in the footnotes to the tables.
- ❹ The study had to ask the questions addressed in the tables and bar charts of the same set of households or persons in a household (known as the *base*) as other studies asked. For example, a question asked only about *Jewish children in Jewish households* cannot be included in the tables and bar charts with other studies that asked the same question about *all children (both Jewish and non-Jewish) in Jewish households*. Minor differences in the set of households or persons queried are noted in the footnotes to the tables. In some cases, communities for which the base is significantly different from that used in the table are listed at the end of the table with the alternative base noted. Such communities are not included in the comparison bar charts.

COMPARISONS AMONG COMMUNITIES: METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS

As noted, comparisons among Jewish communities help provide an important context for understanding American Jewish communities. Nonetheless, the comparisons should be treated with caution for the following reasons:

❶ **Different Dates of the Studies.** The Jewish community studies included in the comparison tables and bar charts were completed over an extended period of time. Differences between Community A in 1993 and Community B in 2010 may be due to the temporal differences in the community studies. For example, the intermarriage rate in Community A may be lower than in Community B simply because the community study in Community A was completed 17 years earlier, when intermarriage rates generally were lower. This is an extreme example since most comparisons are between studies completed closer in time than in this illustration.

❷ **Different Sampling Methods.** Three different sampling methods generally have been used in Jewish community studies: a random digit dialing (RDD) only sample (drawn from randomly generated telephone numbers); an RDD sample combined with a Distinctive Jewish Name (DJN) sample (drawn from a telephone directory); and an RDD sample combined with a List sample (usually drawn from the local Jewish Federation mailing list). Only Jewish communities that used RDD sampling for at least part of the sample are included in the comparison tables and bar charts. Different sampling methods *may* lead to differences in survey results. See Section I - Methodology for the sampling methods and sample sizes used in each community study included in the comparison tables and bar charts.

❸ **Different Questionnaires.** A variety of questionnaires have been used in Jewish community studies. For examples, see the Jewish Survey Question Bank (<http://jewishquestions.bjpa.org/>). The survey research literature indicates that even small changes in question wording or in the sequence in which questions are asked on a telephone survey can have a significant impact upon survey results.

❹ **Small Sample Sizes.** In general, when comparing the overall results for Jewish households or persons in Jewish households among Jewish communities, the sample sizes used in the community studies are such that differences of five percentage points or more may be considered statistically significant. On the other hand, when comparing the results among Jewish communities for *population subgroups* (such as households with children or respondents under age 35), the sample sizes may be substantially smaller such that even differences of 10-15 percentage points may not be statistically significant.

❺ **Missing Data.** Researchers sometimes treat missing data and “don’t know” responses differently, leading to minor differences in reported results.

⑥ **Identifying Jewish Households.** While there is considerable agreement among researchers and policy makers about how to define Jewish households and persons, different studies may use different questions for qualifying Jewish households and respondents, and researchers may use different methods for deciding if households and persons should be considered Jewish when a particular case is ambiguous.

⑦ **Time-Specific Conditions.** Some comparisons are affected by the year in which a study was completed. This applies particularly to comparisons on economic variables such as income and philanthropy (which may be affected by the state of the economy in a given year) and variables related to Israel (which may be affected by the political situation in Israel in a given year).

ORDER OF COMMUNITIES IN THE COMPARISON TABLES AND BAR CHARTS

Tables. Each comparison table is ordered based upon one particular data column (referred to as the *primary column* in the discussion below), in descending order of magnitude of the data. Except for those tables with only one data column, the primary column has an *italicized* heading. The choice of primary column is determined by the data thought to be most interesting. Thus, for example, the household size table is ordered by the percentage of one-person households and the employment status table is ordered by the percentage employed full time. While listing the communities in alphabetical order might simplify finding the results quickly for a particular community, such a presentation would be much less helpful in facilitating comparisons among Jewish communities.

When two or more communities show the same percentage (or number) in the primary column, three rules are followed to determine the order in which the communities are listed:

① The first rule applies when a secondary column is used to order the communities that show the same percentage in the primary column.

In some cases, when the primary column is the sum of two (or more) other columns, the communities are listed according to the community that has the higher percentage on the more “extreme” of the columns being summed. For example, if two communities show the same percentage for “always/usually,” the community with the highest “always” percentage is listed first.

In other cases, a table is ordered on a particular column, but a secondary “related” column is used to order the communities that show the same percentage in the primary column. For example, in the employment status table, if two communities show the same percentage for “full time,” the community with the highest “part time” percentage is listed first.

If the communities continue to show the same percentages after applying this rule, the process is continued using the next appropriate column.

② The second rule applies when the first rule is not applicable or does not resolve the situation, that is, the communities show the same percentages in all the data columns. In this case, the community with the most recent study is listed first.

③ The third rule applies when the first two rules do not resolve the situation, that is, the communities also have the same year of study. In this case, the communities are listed in alphabetical order.

Communities for which data are unavailable for the primary column (but are available for other columns) are listed below a thick horizontal line in the tables.

Bar Charts. Comparison bar charts correspond to each primary column in the comparison tables, with the data presented in the same order as it appears in the table. In addition, for tables with multiple data columns, additional bar charts are presented to correspond to those additional data columns thought to be most interesting, with the data presented in descending order of magnitude. In these additional bar charts, when two or more communities show the same percentage (or number), the community with the most recent study is listed first. If the communities also have the same year of study, the communities are listed in alphabetical order.

READING THE TABLES AND BAR CHARTS

Demographic data are easily misunderstood. The most common error in interpretation occurs when readers do not concentrate on the *nature of the denominator (or base) used in calculating a percentage*. Thus, the base in each table and bar chart is generally shown directly below the title.

In some tables and bar charts, “don't know” responses are included in the computations, while in other tables and bar charts they are excluded. The inclusion or exclusion of “don't know” responses depends on whether “don't know” is a statement of value (generally included) or merely an inability to remember or a refusal to respond (generally excluded). In some tables and bar charts, “don't know” responses are treated as negative responses. For example, if a respondent does not know whether the household maintains a synagogue membership, a reasonable assumption is that they do not. Missing responses are excluded from the tables and bar charts.

The reader may notice small differences in the percentages between tables and bar charts due to rounding. At times, also due to rounding, the reported percentages may not sum to 100% and the reported numbers may not sum to the appropriate numerical total. However, the convention employed shows the total as 100% or the appropriate numerical total.

White numbers in black circles (❶, ❷, ❸, etc.) are used in the column headings of tables to indicate that definitions of the terms are provided in the footnotes at the bottom of the table.

Some of the footnotes in the tables are not included in the bar charts to simplify the presentation.

ERRORS IN THE TABLES AND BAR CHARTS

In an undertaking like this, errors in the data are inevitable. Please bring potential errors to the attention of Ira Sheskin at isheskin@miami.edu.