

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 8 - MARITAL STATUS, SECULAR EDUCATION, AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS

June 2015

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Marital Status	3
Table 2: Level of Secular Education	11
Table 3: Employment Status	17
Table 4: Elderly Persons Employed Full Time or Part Time	25

LIST OF BAR CHARTS

Bar Chart 1: Currently Married	6
Bar Chart 2: Single, Never Married	7
Bar Chart 3: Currently Divorced	8
Bar Chart 4: Divorce Rate	9
Bar Chart 5: Currently Widowed	10
Bar Chart 6: High School Degree of Less	14
Bar Chart 7: 4-Year College Degree or Higher	15
Bar Chart 8: Graduate Degree	16
Bar Chart 9: Employed Full Time	20
Bar Chart 10: Employed Part Time	21
Bar Chart 11: Retired	22
Bar Chart 12: In the Labor Force	23
Bar Chart 13: Unemployment Rate	24
Bar Chart 14: Elderly Persons Employed Full Time or Part Time	27
Bar Chart 15: Elderly Persons Employed Full Time	28
Bar Chart 16: Elderly Persons Employed Part Time	29
Appendix	30

**TABLE 1
MARITAL STATUS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: ADULTS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Currently Married	Single, Never Married	Currently Divorced	Separated	Currently Widowed	Divorce Rate ①
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	82%	6	6	0	7	68
Portland (ME)	2007	79%	12	3	0	5	42
Howard County *	2010	77%	10	7	0	5	94
Westport	2000	75%	13	6	1	6	80
Harrisburg	1994	75%	15	4	1	6	52
St. Petersburg	1994	75%	10	6	0	8	83
W Palm Beach	2005	74%	7	5	0	14	61
Sarasota	2001	74%	7	6	1	14	76
York	1999	74%	11	6	1	8	77
Atlantic County	2004	73%	11	5	0	10	71
Hartford	2000	73%	15	5	0	7	67
Rochester	1999	73%	16	3	1	7	45
Monmouth	1997	73%	15	4	0	8	50
Bergen	2001	72%	15	5	1	7	75
Charlotte	1997	72%	17	6	0	5	82
Richmond	1994	71%	18	4	1	7	52
New Haven	2010	70%	16	5	0	8	77
Middlesex	2008	70%	14	4	0	12	57
Lehigh Valley	2007	70%	16	7	0	6	102
San Antonio	2007	70%	16	7	1	6	106
St. Paul	2004	70%	17	6	0	7	80
Jacksonville	2002	70%	18	6	0	6	80
Milwaukee	1996	70%	16	6	0	8	79

**TABLE 1
MARITAL STATUS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: ADULTS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Currently Married	Single, Never Married	Currently Divorced	Separated	Currently Widowed	Divorce Rate ①
Atlanta *	2006	69%	19	8	0	4	113
S Palm Beach	2005	69%	7	6	0	19	87
Essex-Morris	1998	69%	16	6	1	9	80
Buffalo	1995	69%	19	12			NA
Wilmington	1995	69%	19	5	1	6	74
Tidewater	2001	68%	17	8	1	6	122
Orlando	1993	68%	22	6	0	4	85
Chicago *	2010	67%	22	4	1	6	60
Cincinnati *	2008	67%	13	8	1	11	122
Minneapolis	2004	67%	18	7	1	8	103
Detroit	2005	66%	17	6	0	12	84
Rhode Island	2002	66%	20	6	0	7	97
Broward	1997	65%	11	5	0	19	78
Phoenix *	2002	64%	20	10		7	NA
Palm Springs *	1998	64%	11	11		14	NA
Denver *	2007	63%	12	15	1	8	234
Washington	2003	63%	27	6	1	5	88
Las Vegas	2005	62%	19	10	1	9	164
Tucson	2002	62%	20	9	1	9	145
Miami	2014	61%	18	8	1	10	134
Cleveland *	2011	60%	16	12	0	12	200
San Diego *	2003	60%	18	12	1	9	200
Los Angeles	1997	60%	21	8	1	9	140

**TABLE 1
MARITAL STATUS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: ADULTS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Currently Married	Single, Never Married	Currently Divorced	Separated	Currently Widowed	Divorce Rate ①
St. Louis	2014	59%	22	9	2	8	156
Baltimore *	2010	59%	19	7	2	13	118
Philadelphia *	2009	59%	10	13		18	NA
Pittsburgh *	2002	59%	18	7	2	13	123
Seattle *	2000	57%	26	12	3	2	210
East Bay	2011	55%	45				NA
New York *	2011	52%	23	9	2	13	176
Columbus *	2013	47%	22	13	5	13	276
NJPS ¹	2000	55%	25	9	1	8	158
ACS ² (US)	2012	48%	32	11	2	7	213

① The *divorce rate* is the number of divorced adults per 1,000 married adults.

* The percentage of adults in Jewish households reported as “living with a partner” or “living together” was distributed proportionately among *Single, Never Married, Currently Divorced, Separated, and Currently Widowed*.

¹ NJPS 2000 data are for *Jewish adults only*, not all adults in Jewish households.


² Includes *persons age 15 and over*.

Note: Adults in Jewish households who live as same-sex couples are not shown in the table.

1

CURRENTLY MARRIED


(Adults in Jewish Households)



2

SINGLE, NEVER MARRIED


(Adults in Jewish Households)



3

CURRENTLY DIVORCED


(Adults in Jewish Households)



4

DIVORCE RATE


(Adults in Jewish Households)
(Divorced Adults per 1,000 Married Adults)





CURRENTLY WIDOWED

(Adults in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 2
LEVEL OF SECULAR EDUCATION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: ADULTS AGE 25 AND OVER IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	High School Degree or Less ¹	Some College/ 2-Year College Degree	4-Year College Degree	Graduate Degree	Total 4-Year College Degree or Higher
Westport	2000	6%	8	46	41	86%
Washington	2003	7%	8	33	52	85%
Howard County	2010	8%	10	31	52	82%
Portland (ME)	2007	8%	11	39	42	81%
New Haven	2010	11%	12	36	42	78%
East Bay	2011	12%	11	39	38	77%
Bergen	2001	13%	11	41	35	76%
Atlanta	2006	8%	17	44	32	76%
Cincinnati	2008	12%	13	36	39	75%
Essex-Morris	1998	11%	15	37	38	75%
San Antonio	2007	10%	16	38	36	75%
Denver	2007	10%	16	34	40	74%
Chicago	2010	10%	17	35	39	73%
San Diego	2003	12%	17	36	35	72%
Charlotte	1997	10%	18	47	25	72%
Philadelphia	2009	15%	15	30	41	71%
Lehigh Valley	2007	14%	15	34	37	71%
Miami	2014	14%	15	39	32	71%
Pittsburgh	2002	17%	13	32	38	70%
Columbus	2013	18%	13	35	35	70%
Minneapolis	2004	12%	18	40	30	70%

**TABLE 2
LEVEL OF SECULAR EDUCATION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: ADULTS AGE 25 AND OVER IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	High School Degree or Less ¹	Some College/ 2-Year College Degree	4-Year College Degree	Graduate Degree	Total 4-Year College Degree or Higher
Hartford	2000	16%	15	36	34	69%
St. Paul	2004	12%	19	36	33	69%
Rochester	1999	16%	17	30	38	68%
Tucson	2002	13%	19	33	35	68%
Rhode Island	2002	16%	15	35	33	68%
Phoenix	2002	11%	22	36	31	67%
Cleveland	2011	13%	21	34	33	66%
Milwaukee	1996	15%	19	39	28	66%
Middlesex	2008	20%	14	39	28	66%
Richmond	1994	16%	18	38	28	66%
St. Louis	2014	18%	18	31	33	63%
Baltimore	2010	17%	20	30	33	63%
Detroit	2005	19%	18	31	31	63%
Harrisburg	1994	21%	16	33	29	63%
Jacksonville	2002	19%	20	38	22	61%
Wilmington	1995	23%	17	31	29	60%
York	1999	18%	21	35	26	60%
Atlantic County	2004	24%	18	35	24	59%
Tidewater	2001	15%	27	36	23	59%
Sarasota	2001	19%	23	34	25	58%
Monmouth	1997	22%	21	35	22	58%

**TABLE 2
LEVEL OF SECULAR EDUCATION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: ADULTS AGE 25 AND OVER IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	High School Degree or Less ¹	Some College/ 2-Year College Degree	4-Year College Degree	Graduate Degree	Total 4-Year College Degree or Higher
New York	2011	22%	21	24	33	57%
W Palm Beach	2005	24%	22	35	20	55%
Orlando	1993	21%	26	34	19	53%
St. Petersburg	1994	25%	25	30	20	49%
Las Vegas	2005	24%	27	32	18	49%
S Palm Beach	2005	28%	24	31	18	49%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	24%	27	31	18	48%
Broward	1997	41%	24	24	11	35%
BASE: ADULTS AGE 18 AND OVER IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS						
Seattle	2000	18%	8	36	38	73%
Buffalo	1995	19%	12	30	39	68%
Los Angeles	1997	28%	12	30	28	58%
BASE: RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES AGE 18 AND OVER						
Palm Springs	1998	21%	27	34	18	52%
NJPS ²	2000	18%	21	33	28	60%
ACS (US)	2012	42%	29	18	11	28%


¹ Includes *Technical or Trade School Degree*.

² NJPS 2000 data are for *Jewish adults age 25 and over*, not all adults age 25 and over in Jewish households.

6

HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE OR LESS


(Adults Age 25 and Over in Jewish Households)



7

4-YEAR COLLEGE DEGREE OR HIGHER


(Adults Age 25 and Over in Jewish Households)



8

GRADUATE DEGREE

(Adults Age 25 and Over in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 3
EMPLOYMENT STATUS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: ADULTS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	In the Labor Force			Retired	Home-maker	Student	Other ¹	In the Labor Force ❶	Unem- ploy- ment Rate ❷
		Full Time	Part Time	Unem- ployed						
Washington	2003	62%	11	2	12	4	8	1	74%	3%
Charlotte	1997	61%	11	1	9	11	5	2	73%	2%
Howard County	2010	59%	13	3	14	2	6	3	75%	4%
Richmond	1994	59%	10	1	14	8	7	1	70%	1%
Orlando	1993	57%	8	2	17	8	7	1	67%	3%
Westport	2000	56%	15	1	13	11	4	0	72%	1%
St. Louis	2014	56%	14	1	22	3	2	1	70%	1%
Harrisburg	1994	56%	11	2	15	9	6	1	69%	3%
Tidewater	2001	55%	12	1	16	8	7	1	68%	1%
Jacksonville	2002	55%	8	1	22	7	6	2	63%	1%
Cleveland	2011	52%	17	2	21	6	1	3	71%	3%
Chicago	2010	52%	13	5	17	4	6	3	69%	7%
Milwaukee	1996	52%	13	1	20	7	6	1	66%	1%
Wilmington	1995	52%	9	1	19	7	10	1	62%	2%
Essex-Morris	1998	51%	16	2	19	7	4	1	69%	3%
York	1999	51%	13	1	19	9	5	2	64%	1%
St. Paul	2004	50%	10	2	21	6	9	3	62%	3%
Monmouth	1997	50%	9	1	24	9	6	1	60%	2%
Portland (ME)	2007	49%	16	1	20	6	7	1	66%	2%
Bergen	2001	49%	12	1	21	7	8	2	62%	1%

**TABLE 3
EMPLOYMENT STATUS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: ADULTS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	In the Labor Force			Retired	Home-maker	Student	Other ¹	In the Labor Force ^①	Unem- ployment Rate ^②
		Full Time	Part Time	Unem- ployed						
San Antonio	2007	49%	10	1	26	9	3	2	60%	2%
Baltimore	2010	48%	15	4	20	4	9	2	66%	5%
Buffalo	1995	48%	12	3	22	7	8	1	63%	4%
Rochester	1999	48%	12	1	23	7	6	3	62%	2%
Minneapolis	2004	46%	14	3	20	6	8	2	64%	5%
Los Angeles	1997	46%	11	3	21	7	9	3	60%	4%
Las Vegas	2005	46%	9	3	32	5	3	3	57%	5%
Rhode Island	2002	45%	12	2	24	5	10	2	59%	3%
Lehigh Valley	2007	44%	13	1	24	6	9	2	58%	2%
Miami	2014	44%	11	2	29	5	8	1	57%	3%
Columbus	2013	44%	10	2	23	6	7	9	53%	4%
New Haven	2010	43%	12	2	26	5	10	2	57%	4%
Hartford	2000	43%	12	2	30	5	8	1	57%	3%
St. Petersburg	1994	42%	9	1	36	6	4	2	52%	2%
Detroit	2005	41%	17	1	24	7	7	3	60%	2%
New York	2011	41%	14	5	25	5	4	5	60%	9%
Tucson	2002	41%	10	2	31	4	10	2	53%	5%
Atlantic County	2004	37%	12	1	38	6	4	1	50%	2%
Middlesex	2008	37%	9	2	41	3	7	1	48%	4%
Broward	1997	33%	6	1	51	5	3	1	39%	3%
Palm Springs ²	1998	30%	9	2	52	4	2	0	41%	5%

**TABLE 3
EMPLOYMENT STATUS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: ADULTS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	In the Labor Force			Retired	Home-maker	Student	Other ¹	In the Labor Force ^①	Unemployment Rate ^②
		Full Time	Part Time	Unemployed						
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	27%	6	0	63	2	2	1	33%	1%
Sarasota	2001	25%	9	1	57	4	3	1	35%	2%
W Palm Beach	2005	22%	7	1	64	2	3	1	30%	3%
S Palm Beach	2005	18%	8	1	67	3	3	1	26%	3%
Denver	2007	71%		3	17	4	2	3	74%	4%
Seattle	2000	69%		3	13	5	7	2	72%	4%
Philadelphia ²	2009	67%		4	22	4	2	1	71%	6%
Atlanta	2006	67%		3	16	10	2	1	71%	4%
Cincinnati	2008	64%		2	24	7	2	2	66%	2%
San Diego	2003	63%		2	22	7	5	1	66%	4%
Phoenix	2002	58%		5	25	8	3	1	64%	9%
Pittsburgh	2002	58%		1	24	2	4	11	59%	1%
NJPS ³	2000	49%	13	4	21	5	5	4	65%	5%
ACS ⁴ (US)	2012	58%		6	35				64%	9%

① The percentage of adults *in the labor force* is the sum of the percentages of adults who are employed full time, employed part time, and unemployed at the time of the survey.

② The *unemployment rate* is the percentage of adults who were unemployed at the time of the survey divided by the percentage of adults in the labor force.

¹ Includes Disabled and Volunteer.

² Includes respondents and spouses only.


³ NJPS 2000 data are for *Jewish adults only*, not all adults in Jewish households.

⁴ Includes *persons age 16 and over*.

9

EMPLOYED FULL TIME


(Adults in Jewish Households)



10

EMPLOYED PART TIME


(Adults in Jewish Households)



11


RETIRED

(Adults in Jewish Households)




12

IN THE LABOR FORCE (Adults in Jewish Households)



13

UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (Adults in Jewish Households)



**TABLE 4
ELDERLY PERSONS EMPLOYED FULL TIME OR PART TIME
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: PERSONS AGE 65 AND OVER IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Full Time	Part Time	Total Employed
Howard County	2010	25%	16	41%
Westport	2000	18%	20	38%
Chicago	2010	18%	15	32%
Charlotte	1997	20%	11	31%
San Antonio	2007	17%	11	29%
Detroit	2005	13%	16	29%
Atlanta	2006	NA	NA	29%
Miami	2014	17%	11	28%
Cleveland	2011	15%	13	28%
New Haven	2010	15%	13	28%
St. Louis	2014	14%	14	27%
Lehigh Valley	2007	11%	15	27%
Milwaukee	1996	11%	15	26%
Denver	2007	NA	NA	26%
Baltimore	2010	13%	12	25%
Columbus	2013	NA	NA	25%
New York	2011	17%	7	24%
Bergen	2001	14%	10	24%
Richmond	1994	13%	11	24%
Minneapolis	2004	10%	14	24%
Cincinnati	2008	NA	NA	24%
Washington	2003	12%	9	22%
Rhode Island	2002	10%	11	22%
Monmouth	1997	9%	13	22%
Tidewater	2001	13%	8	21%
Portland (ME)	2007	7%	14	21%

TABLE 4
ELDERLY PERSONS EMPLOYED FULL TIME OR PART TIME
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS

BASE: PERSONS AGE 65 AND OVER IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS


Community	Year	Full Time	Part Time	Total Employed
Jacksonville	2002	14%	6	20%
Rochester	1999	10%	10	20%
Atlantic County	2004	9%	10	19%
Harrisburg	1994	14%	4	18%
Seattle	2000	NA	NA	16%
Las Vegas	2005	7%	9	15%
Pittsburgh	2002	NA	NA	15%
Wilmington	1995	10%	4	14%
York	1999	8%	6	14%
St. Paul	2004	4%	10	14%
Hartford	2000	7%	6	13%
Sarasota	2001	6%	7	13%
Orlando	1993	7%	5	12%
Middlesex	2008	6%	6	12%
San Diego	2003	NA	NA	12%
Tucson	2002	6%	5	11%
St. Petersburg	1994	5%	5	11%
Phoenix	2002	NA	NA	11%
S Palm Beach	2005	4%	6	9%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	3%	6	9%
W Palm Beach	2005	3%	5	8%
Broward	1997	3%	4	8%
NJPS ¹	2000	7%	7	14%
US ²	2007	NA	NA	16%

¹ NJPS 2000 data are for *Jewish persons age 65 and over only*, not all persons age 65 and over in Jewish households.

² Source: <http://www.bls.gov/lau/ptable14full2007.pdf>

14 ELDERLY PERSONS EMPLOYED FULL OR PART TIME


(Persons Age 65 and Over in Jewish Households)



15

ELDERLY PERSONS EMPLOYED FULL TIME


(Persons Age 65 and Over in Jewish Households)



16

ELDERLY PERSONS EMPLOYED PART TIME

(Persons Age 65 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.