

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 7 - HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND STRUCTURE

June 2015

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Average Household Size	3
Table 2: Household Size	5
Table 3: Households with Children or Only Adult Children at Home	10
Table 4: Married Households with No Children at Home	17
Table 5: Single Person Households	25
Table 6: Children Age 0-12 Living in Households with Working Parents	34
Table 7: Children Living in Single Parent Households	36
Table 8: Children Living in Households in Which an Adult Is or Was Divorced	38
Table 9: Elderly Persons Who Live Alone	40

LIST OF BAR CHARTS

Bar Chart 1: Average Household Size	4
Bar Chart 2: One-Person Households	8
Bar Chart 3: Households with Four or More Persons	9
Bar Chart 4: Married Households with Children Age 0-17 at Home	13
Bar Chart 5: Single Parent Households with Children Age 0-17 at Home	14
Bar Chart 6: Households with Children Age 0-17 at Home	15
Bar Chart 7: Households with Only Adult Children Age 18 at Home	16
Bar Chart 8: Married Households with No Children at Home	20
Bar Chart 9: Married Households Under Age 35 with No Children at Home	21
Bar Chart 10: Married Households Age 35-49 with No Children at Home	22
Bar Chart 11: Married Households Age 50-64 with No Children at Home	23
Bar Chart 12: Married Households Age 65 and Over with No Children at Home	24
Bar Chart 13: Single Male Households Under Age 65	28
Bar Chart 14: Single Female Households Under Age 65	29
Bar Chart 15: Single Person Households Under Age 65	30
Bar Chart 16: Single Male Households Age 65 and Over	31
Bar Chart 17: Single Female Households Age 65 and Over	32
Bar Chart 18: Single Person Households Age 65 and Over	33
Bar Chart 19: Percentage of Children Age 0-12 Living in Households With Full-Time Working Parents	35
Bar Chart 20: Percentage of Children Age 0-17 Living in Single Parent Households	37
Bar Chart 21: Percentage of Children Age 0-17 Living in Households in Which an Adult Is or Was Divorced	39
Bar Chart 22: Persons Age 65 and Over Who Live Alone	43
Bar Chart 23: Persons Age 75 and Over Who Live Alone	44
Appendix	45

**TABLE 1
AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS


Community	Year	Average ¹		Community	Year	Average ¹
Monmouth	1997	2.79		San Antonio	2007	2.49
Portland (ME)	2007	2.75		Essex-Morris	1998	2.49
Bergen	2001	2.75		Denver	2007	2.47
Buffalo	1995	2.74		Lehigh Valley	2007	2.46
Howard County	2010	2.72		Milwaukee	1996	2.44
Westport	2000	2.72		Washington	2003	2.43
St. Louis	2014	2.71		Phoenix	2002	2.43
Harrisburg	1994	2.68		Jacksonville	2002	2.42
Charlotte	1997	2.66		Rhode Island	2002	2.41
Wilmington	1995	2.66		Seattle	2000	2.38
Cincinnati	2008	2.64		Los Angeles	1997	2.38
Columbus	2013	2.60		Middlesex	2008	2.36
Detroit	2005	2.60		Miami	2014	2.33
St. Paul	2004	2.60		San Francisco	2004	2.32
Pittsburgh	2002	2.59		St. Petersburg	1994	2.32
York	1999	2.59		Atlantic County	2004	2.31
Orlando	1993	2.59		Philadelphia	2009	2.15
Chicago	2010	2.58		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	2.15
Cleveland	2011	2.57		Tucson	2002	2.14
San Diego	2003	2.57		Las Vegas	2005	2.13
Atlanta	2006	2.56		Palm Springs	1998	2.02
New York	2011	2.55		Broward	1997	2.02
Minneapolis	2004	2.55		W Palm Beach	2005	1.99
Tidewater	2001	2.55		Sarasota	2001	1.99
Richmond	1994	2.55		S Palm Beach	2005	1.87
Baltimore	2010	2.54		NJPS	2000	2.31
New Haven	2010	2.53		ACS (US)	2013	2.63
Boston	2005	2.52				
Rochester	1999	2.51				
Hartford	2000	2.50				

¹ Average number of persons in Jewish households.

1

AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE

(Jewish Households)



(persons per household)

**TABLE 2
HOUSEHOLD SIZE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Number of Persons in Household						
		1	2	3	4	5	6+	4+
Philadelphia	2009	39%	32	12	13	4	1	18%
S Palm Beach	2005	35%	53	5	5	2	1	7%
Broward	1997	35%	45	9	9	2	1	12%
Tucson	2002	33%	41	11	10	3	1	15%
Miami	2014	31%	37	13	12	5	3	19%
New York	2011	30%	34	13	11	6	7	23%
Las Vegas	2005	29%	47	13	8	3	1	12%
Los Angeles	1997	28%	36	16	14	4	2	21%
Detroit	2005	28%	34	12	15	5	5	25%
Sarasota	2001	27%	59	7	4	3	1	8%
San Francisco	2004	27%	37	18	15	2	2	18%
Tidewater	2001	27%	32	16	14	9	3	25%
St. Paul	2004	27%	28	17	19	7	3	28%
Seattle	2000	26%	43	12	14	4	2	20%
Middlesex	2008	26%	42	12	12	5	3	19%
Milwaukee	1996	26%	39	12	16	5	3	23%
Rhode Island	2002	26%	38	16	14	6	2	21%
Washington	2003	26%	36	13	18	5	2	24%
Baltimore	2010	26%	35	16	15	4	5	23%
Columbus	2013	26%	33	13	20	5	4	28%
W Palm Beach	2005	25%	61	7	6	1	0	7%
Jacksonville	2002	25%	38	14	16	6	1	22%
Minneapolis	2004	25%	34	14	19	6	2	27%

**TABLE 2
HOUSEHOLD SIZE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Number of Persons in Household						
		1	2	3	4	5	6+	4+
Palm Springs	1998	24%	62	10		4		NA
St. Petersburg	1994	24%	45	12	14	3	1	19%
Cleveland	2011	24%	37	13	15	8	3	26%
Richmond	1994	24%	34	17	16	7	2	25%
Atlantic County	2004	23%	50	8	12	5	2	18%
Hartford	2000	23%	39	13	19	5	2	26%
Pittsburgh	2002	23%	37	15	17	5	3	26%
Boston	2005	23%	31	23	18	5	1	23%
Lehigh Valley	2007	22%	43	12	16	5	2	23%
San Antonio	2007	22%	42	12	17	6	2	24%
New Haven	2010	22%	42	12	15	6	3	24%
Denver	2007	22%	40	16	15	5	1	22%
Rochester	1999	22%	38	14	18	7	1	25%
York	1999	22%	35	17	18	7	1	26%
Westport	2000	22%	31	15	23	9	2	33%
Phoenix	2002	21%	45	15	11	6	2	19%
St. Louis	2014	21%	35	18	15	7	5	26%
Wilmington	1995	21%	34	16	20	7	2	29%
Chicago	2010	20%	40	17	15	7	2	24%
San Diego	2003	20%	39	17	17	6	2	25%
Bergen	2001	20%	36	13	18	9	4	31%
Cincinnati	2008	20%	35	19	15	8	3	26%
Harrisburg	1994	20%	34	18	18	8	3	28%

**TABLE 2
HOUSEHOLD SIZE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

		Number of Persons in Household						
Community	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6+	4+
Monmouth	1997	20%	34	13	22	7	4	33%
Charlotte	1997	20%	32	20	19	8	1	28%
Atlanta	2006	18%	42	14	21	5	0	27%
Orlando	1993	18%	39	19	17	5	2	24%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	16%	66	8	6	4	1	10%
Portland (ME)	2007	14%	39	16	23	6	1	31%
Howard County	2010	13%	41	17	22	7	1	29%
NJPS	2000	30%	39	13	11	4	3	19%
ACS (US)	2010	27%	33	16	13	6	4	23%

2

ONE-PERSON HOUSEHOLDS


(Jewish Households)



3

HOUSEHOLDS WITH FOUR OR MORE PERSONS

(Jewish Households)



**TABLE 3
HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN OR ONLY ADULT CHILDREN AT HOME
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	With Children Age 0-17 at Home			With Only Adult Children Age 18+ at Home
		Married	Single Parent ¹	All ²	
Buffalo	1995	NA	NA	47%	NA
Westport	2000	42%	2%	44%	5%
Charlotte	1997	38%	3%	42%	8%
Harrisburg	1994	38%	1%	40%	8%
St. Paul	2004	36%	2%	40%	7%
Portland (ME)	2007	36%	2%	39%	10%
Atlanta	2006	34%	4%	38%	NA
Boston	2005	NA	NA	38%	NA
Richmond	1994	35%	2%	37%	7%
York	1999	32%	4%	37%	10%
Wilmington	1995	34%	2%	36%	9%
Bergen	2001	33%	3%	36%	10%
Orlando	1993	33%	1%	35%	7%
Minneapolis	2004	32%	3%	35%	10%
East Bay	2011	31%	4%	35%	NA
Monmouth	1997	32%	1%	33%	14%
Tidewater	2001	29%	3%	33%	9%
Seattle	2000	26%	7%	33%	23%
Rochester	1999	30%	3%	32%	8%
Baltimore	2010	27%	5%	32%	NA
Howard County	2010	29%	1%	31%	NA

**TABLE 3
HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN OR ONLY ADULT CHILDREN AT HOME
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	With Children Age 0-17 at Home			With Only Adult Children Age 18+ at Home
		Married	Single Parent ¹	All ²	
Denver	2007	28%	3%	31%	NA
Washington	2003	27%	4%	31%	8%
Chicago	2010	26%	5%	31%	NA
Hartford	2000	28%	2%	30%	9%
Detroit	2005	27%	3%	30%	10%
Milwaukee	1996	27%	3%	30%	7%
Pittsburgh	2002	26%	4%	30%	8%
San Diego	2003	24%	6%	30%	NA
Cincinnati	2008	26%	3%	29%	NA
St. Louis	2014	24%	3%	29%	12%
San Francisco	2004	22%	7%	29%	27%
Jacksonville	2002	25%	2%	28%	8%
Cleveland	2011	22%	5%	28%	NA
Columbus	2013	21%	6%	28%	9%
Rhode Island	2002	25%	2%	27%	9%
San Antonio	2007	24%	3%	27%	13%
Los Angeles	1997	23%	4%	27%	2%
New Haven	2010	24%	2%	26%	13%
St. Petersburg	1994	24%	1%	25%	5%
Lehigh Valley	2007	22%	2%	25%	13%
Phoenix	2002	21%	3%	25%	9%

**TABLE 3
HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN OR ONLY ADULT CHILDREN AT HOME
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	With Children Age 0-17 at Home			With Only Adult Children Age 18+ at Home
		Married	Single Parent ¹	All ²	
New York	2011	20%	5%	25%	NA
Miami	2014	21%	2%	23%	13%
Philadelphia	2009	20%	2%	22%	NA
Middlesex	2008	19%	1%	21%	12%
Tucson	2002	17%	3%	20%	6%
Atlantic County	2004	18%	1%	19%	8%
Broward	1997	14%	2%	16%	6%
Las Vegas	2005	13%	2%	16%	10%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	12%	3%	15%	4%
Sarasota	2001	9%	2%	12%	3%
W Palm Beach	2005	9%	1%	10%	5%
S Palm Beach	2005	8%	1%	9%	5%
Essex-Morris	1998	32%	NA	NA	NA
NJPS	2000	19%	3%	22%	6%
ACS (US)	2012	20%	10%	30%	NA


¹ Includes households with one parent and children age 0-17 at home.

² Includes married households, single parent households, households with unmarried couples, same-sex couple households, and other households with children age 0-17 at home.

4

MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN AGE 0-17 AT HOME


(Jewish Households)



5


SINGLE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN AGE 0-17 AT HOME

(Jewish Households)



6


HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN AGE 0-17 AT HOME (Jewish Households)



7

HOUSEHOLDS WITH ONLY ADULT CHILDREN AGE 18 AND OVER AT HOME

(Jewish Households)



**TABLE 4
MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS WITH NO CHILDREN AT HOME
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65+	All
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	1%	3	16	43	64%
W Palm Beach	2005	1%	1	11	41	54%
Sarasota	2001	1%	1	15	37	54%
S Palm Beach	2005	0%	1	9	38	48%
Atlantic County	2004	0%	3	16	25	44%
St. Petersburg	1994	1%	5	11	22	40%
Middlesex	2008	0%	1	10	28	39%
Denver	2007	7%	23		9	39%
Cleveland	2011	1%	2	21	14	38%
Lehigh Valley	2007	1%	2	17	18	38%
Broward	1997	1%	2	7	28	38%
New Haven	2010	1%	3	12	21	37%
San Antonio	2007	0%	2	15	19	36%
Atlanta	2006	5%	25		6	36%
Phoenix	2002	2%	6	11	17	36%
St. Louis	2014	1%	2	15	16	35%
Las Vegas	2005	3%	4	14	13	35%
Portland (ME)	2007	3%	6	12	14	34%
Hartford	2000	1%	2	12	18	34%
Howard County	2010	1%	1	16	15	33%
Jacksonville	2002	1%	4	12	16	33%
Rochester	1999	1%	3	13	16	33%
Tucson	2002	2%	3	13	15	32%

**TABLE 4
MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS WITH NO CHILDREN AT HOME
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65+	All
Milwaukee	1996	4%	3	11	15	32%
Rhode Island	2002	1%	2	12	16	31%
Los Angeles	1997	3%	15		13	31%
Cincinnati	2008	1%	2	12	14	30%
Bergen	2001	2%	2	10	16	30%
York	1999	4%	4	10	12	30%
Monmouth	1997	2%	3	11	15	30%
Orlando	1993	4%	5	10	11	30%
East Bay	2011	2%	5	15	7	29%
Chicago	2010	3%	3	12	12	29%
Detroit	2005	1%	1	12	15	29%
Miami	2014	1%	1	7	19	28%
Wilmington	1995	4%	3	8	13	28%
Harrisburg	1994	4%	3	12	10	28%
Pittsburgh	2002	2%	3	9	13	27%
San Diego	2003	3%	11		12	26%
Tidewater	2001	3%	3	14	7	26%
Richmond	1994	4%	5	7	9	26%
Columbus	2013	1%	2	12	11	25%
New York	2011	2%	2	7	13	25%
Baltimore	2010	1%	2	9	14	25%
Minneapolis	2004	1%	2	10	12	25%
St. Paul	2004	2%	2	8	11	24%

**TABLE 4
MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS WITH NO CHILDREN AT HOME
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65+	All
Washington	2003	5%	3	11	6	24%
Westport	2000	2%	2	9	12	24%
Charlotte	1997	4%	5	7	7	24%
Philadelphia	2009	3%	1	8	10	22%
Seattle	2000	4%	8	5	4	22%
Boston	2005	4%	2	9	7	21%
NJPS	2000	NA	NA	NA	NA	26%
ACS (US)	2012	NA	NA	NA	NA	29%

8

MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS WITH NO CHILDREN AT HOME


(Jewish Households)



9

MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS UNDER AGE 35 WITH NO CHILDREN AT HOME


(Jewish Households)



10

MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS AGE 35-49 WITH NO CHILDREN AT HOME


(Jewish Households)



11

MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS AGE 50-64 WITH NO CHILDREN AT HOME


(Jewish Households)



12

MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS AGE 65 AND OVER WITH NO CHILDREN AT HOME

(Jewish Households)



**TABLE 5
SINGLE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Under 65			65 and Over		
		Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All
S Palm Beach	2005	2%	3	5%	6%	24	30%
Broward	1997	3%	3	6%	4%	25	29%
Philadelphia	2009	5%	11	16%	6%	17	23%
Detroit	2005	2%	4	6%	7%	16	23%
Miami	2014	5%	5	10%	5%	16	21%
W Palm Beach	2005	1%	3	4%	4%	17	21%
Sarasota	2001	2%	3	6%	4%	17	21%
Middlesex	2008	3%	3	6%	3%	17	20%
Atlantic County	2004	2%	4	6%	5%	12	17%
New Haven	2010	3%	3	6%	4%	12	16%
St. Paul	2004	5%	6	11%	5%	12	16%
New York	2011	9%	6	14%	5%	10	15%
Hartford	2000	4%	5	9%	4%	11	15%
Milwaukee	1996	5%	6	11%	3%	12	15%
St. Petersburg	1994	6%	3	9%	4%	11	15%
Las Vegas	2005	7%	8	15%	5%	10	14%
Minneapolis	2004	5%	6	11%	4%	10	14%
Rhode Island	2002	5%	8	12%	4%	10	14%
Monmouth	1997	3%	3	6%	3%	11	14%
Baltimore	2010	6%	7	13%	3%	10	13%
Cleveland	2011	4%	7	11%	4%	9	13%
Tucson	2002	7%	12	19%	4%	9	13%
Rochester	1999	3%	6	10%	3%	10	13%
Cincinnati	2008	3%	5	8%	2%	10	12%

**TABLE 5
SINGLE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Under 65			65 and Over		
		Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All
Lehigh Valley	2007	4%	5	9%	4%	9	12%
San Antonio	2007	4%	5	9%	4%	8	12%
Pittsburgh	2002	6%	5	11%	3%	9	12%
Bergen	2001	3%	5	8%	3%	10	12%
York	1999	4%	5	9%	3%	10	12%
Los Angeles	1997	9%	7	16%	4%	8	12%
Columbus	2013	5%	10	15%	5%	6	11%
Chicago	2010	4%	5	9%	4%	7	11%
Tidewater	2001	9%	7	15%	4%	8	11%
Richmond	1994	6%	6	13%	3%	8	11%
Jacksonville	2002	7%	8	15%	4%	7	10%
Westport	2000	6%	6	12%	3%	7	10%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	5%	2	6%	5%	5	10%
Wilmington	1995	6%	5	11%	2%	8	10%
Harrisburg	1994	5%	5	10%	2%	8	10%
St. Louis	2014	8%	4	12%	3%	6	9%
Portland (ME)	2007	3%	2	5%	2%	6	9%
Washington	2003	8%	9	17%	3%	6	9%
Seattle	2000	8%	9	17%	3%	6	9%
Boston	2005	6%	9	15%	1%	7	8%
San Francisco	2004	NA	NA	19%	2%	6	8%
Denver	2007	NA	NA	15%	2%	6	7%
San Diego	2003	NA	NA	12%	2%	6	7%
Phoenix	2002	NA	NA	15%	2%	4	6%

**TABLE 5
SINGLE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Under 65			65 and Over		
		Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All
Charlotte	1997	8%	7	15%	2%	4	6%
East Bay	2011	7%	8	14%	2%	3	5%
Atlanta	2006	NA	NA	15%	2%	4	5%
Orlando	1993	7%	6	13%	1%	4	5%
Howard County	2010	3%	7	10%	1%	2	3%
ACS (US)	2012	NA	NA	18%	NA	NA	10%

13


SINGLE MALE HOUSEHOLDS UNDER AGE 65

(Jewish Households)




14 SINGLE FEMALE HOUSEHOLDS UNDER AGE 65

(Jewish Households)



15 SINGLE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS UNDER AGE 65


(Jewish Households)



16


SINGLE MALE HOUSEHOLDS AGE 65 AND OVER

(Jewish Households)




17

SINGLE FEMALE HOUSEHOLDS AGE 65 AND OVER (Jewish Households)



18 SINGLE PERSON HOUSEHOLDS AGE 65 AND OVER

(Jewish Households)



**TABLE 6
CHILDREN AGE 0-12 LIVING IN HOUSEHOLDS WITH WORKING PARENTS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: CHILDREN AGE 0-12 IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Washington	2003	55%		Atlantic County	2004	31%
Jacksonville	2002	41%		S Palm Beach	2005	30%
Broward	1997	41%		St. Paul	2004	30%
Tidewater	2001	40%		Portland (ME)	2007	29%
Tucson	2002	38%		Rhode Island	2002	29%
Richmond	1994	38%		Monmouth	1997	29%
Orlando	1993	38%		Charlotte	1997	28%
New Haven	2010	37%		Lehigh Valley	2007	27%
W Palm Beach	2005	37%		San Antonio	2007	27%
Milwaukee	1996	37%		Detroit	2005	27%
Miami	2014	36%		Westport	2000	27%
Las Vegas	2005	35%		York	1999	27%
Rochester	1999	35%		Hartford	2000	24%
Wilmington	1995	35%		Minneapolis	2004	22%
Sarasota	2001	34%				
Harrisburg	1994	34%		Note: Includes children age 0-12 in Jewish households who live in households in which both parents (or the parent in a single parent household) are employed full time.		
St. Petersburg	1994	34%				
Middlesex	2008	33%				
Bergen	2001	32%				

19

PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN AGE 0-12 LIVING IN HOUSEHOLDS WITH FULL-TIME WORKING PARENTS

(Children Age 0-12 in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 7
CHILDREN LIVING IN SINGLE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
San Francisco	2004	18%		Jacksonville	2002	6%
Sarasota	2001	15%		Charlotte	1997	6%
S Palm Beach	2005	12%		St. Louis	2014	5%
Las Vegas	2005	11%		New Haven	2010	5%
Seattle	2000	11%		Atlantic County	2004	5%
Broward	1997	11%		St. Paul	2004	5%
Columbus	2013	10%		Rhode Island	2002	5%
San Antonio	2007	9%		Hartford	2000	5%
Washington	2003	9%		Westport	2000	5%
Tucson	2002	9%		Milwaukee	1996	5%
York	1999	9%		Portland (ME)	2007	4%
Miami	2014	8%		Wilmington	1995	4%
Atlanta	2006	8%		Monmouth	1997	3%
W Palm Beach	2005	8%		Harrisburg	1994	2%
Tidewater	2001	8%		Richmond	1994	2%
Lehigh Valley	2007	7%		Orlando	1993	2%
Minneapolis	2004	7%		St. Petersburg	1994	1%
Bergen	2001	7%		ACS (US)	2010	27%
Rochester	1999	7%		Note: Includes children age 0-17 in Jewish households who live in households with only one parent.		
Middlesex	2008	6%				
Detroit	2005	6%				

20

PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN AGE 0-17 LIVING IN SINGLE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS

(Children Age 0-17 in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 8
CHILDREN LIVING IN HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH AN ADULT
IS OR WAS DIVORCED
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS


Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Sarasota	2001	50%		Hartford	2000	24%
Las Vegas	2005	47%		Portland (ME)	2007	23%
San Antonio	2007	38%		Westport	2000	23%
Orlando	1993	38%		Richmond	1994	23%
Tucson	2002	36%		St. Petersburg	1994	22%
Broward	1997	36%		Minneapolis	2004	21%
W Palm Beach	2005	33%		St. Paul	2004	21%
York	1999	33%		Rochester	1999	21%
Tidewater	2001	31%		Wilmington	1995	21%
Atlantic County	2004	30%		Miami	2014	20%
Jacksonville	2002	30%		Middlesex	2008	19%
Washington	2003	28%		Detroit	2005	17%
Charlotte	1997	27%		New Haven	2010	16%
Harrisburg	1994	27%		Monmouth	1997	16%
Milwaukee	1996	26%				
Lehigh Valley	2007	25%				
S Palm Beach	2005	25%				
Rhode Island	2002	25%				
Bergen	2001	24%				

Note: Includes children age 0-17 in Jewish households who live in households in which an adult is either currently divorced or divorced and remarried.

21

PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN AGE 0-17 LIVING IN HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH AN ADULT IS OR WAS DIVORCED

(Children Age 0-17 in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 9
ELDERLY PERSONS WHO LIVE ALONE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: ELDERLY PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	65 and Over	75 and Over
St. Paul	2004	40%	48%
Detroit	2005	37%	48%
Tidewater	2001	37%	47%
Washington	2003	35%	45%
Richmond	1994	33%	42%
Milwaukee	1996	31%	44%
Minneapolis	2004	31%	37%
Broward	1997	31%	35%
Cleveland	2011	30%	40%
San Francisco	2004	30%	39%
New York	2011	30%	36%
York	1999	30%	35%
Harrisburg	1994	29%	41%
Miami	2014	29%	35%
Baltimore	2010	28%	37%
Westport	2000	27%	38%
Tucson	2002	27%	35%
Los Angeles	1997	27%	NA
Columbus	2013	26%	45%
Rhode Island	2002	26%	34%
Monmouth	1997	26%	33%
Las Vegas	2005	26%	32%
Pittsburgh	2002	26%	32%
S Palm Beach	2005	26%	31%

**TABLE 9
ELDERLY PERSONS WHO LIVE ALONE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: ELDERLY PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	65 and Over	75 and Over
Rochester	1999	25%	39%
Cincinnati	2008	25%	36%
Hartford	2000	25%	33%
Wilmington	1995	24%	37%
New Haven	2010	24%	31%
Middlesex	2008	24%	29%
Bergen	2001	24%	29%
Charlotte	1997	24%	29%
Denver	2007	24%	25%
St. Petersburg	1994	23%	32%
Chicago	2010	23%	29%
Lehigh Valley	2007	22%	32%
Atlantic County	2004	22%	31%
San Antonio	2007	21%	27%
Jacksonville	2002	21%	24%
Portland (ME)	2007	20%	31%
San Diego	2003	20%	27%
Sarasota	2001	20%	26%
St. Louis	2014	19%	27%
W Palm Beach	2005	19%	22%
Atlanta	2006	18%	28%
Orlando	1993	16%	33%
Phoenix	2002	12%	14%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	10%	14%

**TABLE 9
ELDERLY PERSONS WHO LIVE ALONE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: ELDERLY PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	65 and Over	75 and Over
Howard County	2010	8%	20%
NJPS *	2000	33%	39%
ACS (US) ¹	2011	27%	NA

* Data are for *elderly Jews only*, not all elderly persons in Jewish households.


¹ Includes elderly persons living in nursing homes with or without their own telephone numbers.

Note: Excludes elderly persons living in nursing homes without their own telephone numbers.

22

PERSONS AGE 65 AND OVER WHO LIVE ALONE


(Persons Age 65 and Over in Jewish Households)



23

PERSONS AGE 75 AND OVER WHO LIVE ALONE

(Persons Age 75 and Over in Jewish Households)



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.