

## **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](http://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](http://www.jewishdatabank.org/NJPS2000.asp)) and the US Census Bureau's Decennial Census and American Community Survey (ACS, [www.census.gov/acs/www/](http://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](mailto: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](mailto: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 9 - ECONOMIC FACTORS

June 2015

### LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Housing Value Cooperation Rate .....	3
Table 2: Median Housing Value (Adjusted for Inflation to 2015 Dollars) .....	5
Table 3: Household Income Cooperation Rate .....	7
Table 4: Median Household Income (Adjusted for Inflation to 2015 Dollars) .....	11
Table 5: Median Household Income of Households with Children (Adjusted for Inflation to 2015 Dollars) .....	13
Table 6: Median Household Income of Elderly Households (Adjusted for Inflation to 2015 Dollars) .....	15
Table 7: Household Income (Not Adjusted for Inflation) .....	17
Table 8: Households Living Below the Federal Poverty Levels .....	26
Table 9: Households with Elderly Persons Living Below the Federal Poverty Levels .	28
Table 10: Subjective Assessment of Household's Financial Status .....	30
Table 11: Need for Financial Assistance in the Past Year .....	32
Table 12: Need for Help in Finding a Job or Choosing an Occupation in the Past Year .....	34

### LIST OF BAR CHARTS

Bar Chart 1: Housing Value Cooperation Rate .....	4
Bar Chart 2: Median Housing Value .....	6
Bar Chart 3: Household Income Cooperation Rate .....	10
Bar Chart 4: Median Household Income .....	12
Bar Chart 5: Median Household Income of Households with Children .....	14
Bar Chart 6: Median Household Income of Elderly Households .....	16
Bar Chart 7: Earn Under \$25,000 (Community studies from 2000 to current) .....	20
Bar Chart 8: Earn \$100,000 and Over (Community studies from 2000 to current) ...	21
Bar Chart 9: Earn \$200,000 and Over (Community studies from 2000 to current) ...	22
Bar Chart 10: Earn Under \$25,000 (Community studies prior to 2000) .....	23
Bar Chart 11: Earn \$100,000 and Over (Community studies prior to 2000) .....	24
Bar Chart 12: Earn \$200,000 and Over (Community studies prior to 2000) .....	25
Bar Chart 13: Households Living Below the Federal Poverty Levels .....	27
Bar Chart 14: Households with Elderly Persons Living Below the Poverty Levels ...	29
Bar Chart 15: Subjective Assessment of Household's Financial Status .....	31
Bar Chart 16: Need for Financial Assistance in the Past Year .....	33
Bar Chart 17: Need for Help in Finding a Job or Choosing an Occupation in the Past Year .....	36
Appendix .....	37

**TABLE 1  
HOUSING VALUE COOPERATION RATE  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

**BASE: JEWISH HOMEOWNER HOUSEHOLDS**


<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>%</b>		<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>%</b>
Detroit	2005	94%		Milwaukee	1996	89%
Tucson	2002	94%		Wilmington	1995	88%
Rochester	1999	94%		S Palm Beach	2005	87%
Las Vegas	2005	93%		W Palm Beach	2005	87%
St. Paul	2004	93%		New Haven	2010	86%
Miami	2014	92%		Sarasota	2001	86%
Lehigh Valley	2007	92%		Hartford	2000	86%
San Antonio	2007	92%		Monmouth	1997	86%
Jacksonville	2002	92%		St. Petersburg	1994	86%
Broward	1997	92%		Atlantic County	2004	85%
Minneapolis	2004	91%		Middlesex	2008	82%
Rhode Island	2002	91%		Richmond	1994	82%
Washington	2003	90%		Orlando	1993	80%
Bergen	2001	89%		Harrisburg	1994	77%
Tidewater	2001	89%				
Westport	2000	89%				
Charlotte	1997	89%				

Note: Shows the percentage of respondents who cooperated with the housing value question.

1

# HOUSING VALUE COOPERATION RATE

(Jewish Homeowner Households)



**TABLE 2  
MEDIAN HOUSING VALUE  
(ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION TO 2015 DOLLARS)  
COMPARISON WITH OTHER COMMUNITIES**

**BASE: JEWISH HOMEOWNER HOUSEHOLDS**


<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Median <sup>1</sup></b>		<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Median <sup>1</sup></b>
Westport	2000	\$743,000		S Palm Beach	2005	\$262,000
Bergen	2001	\$509,000		San Antonio	2007	\$258,000
Washington	2003	\$471,000		Tidewater	2001	\$249,000
Los Angeles	1997	\$440,000		Jacksonville	2002	\$244,000
Las Vegas	2005	\$439,000		Tucson	2002	\$244,000
Minneapolis	2004	\$427,000		Wilmington	1995	\$240,000
Atlantic County	2004	\$419,000		Milwaukee	1996	\$229,000
Middlesex	2008	\$406,000		Richmond	1994	\$214,000
New Haven	2010	\$398,000		Harrisburg	1994	\$198,000
St. Paul	2004	\$384,000		Rochester	1999	\$190,000
W Palm Beach	2005	\$368,000		Orlando	1993	\$172,000
Detroit	2005	\$361,000		St. Petersburg	1994	\$144,000
Lehigh Valley	2007	\$355,000		Broward	1997	\$120,000
Rhode Island	2002	\$337,000		ACS (US)	2013	\$178,000
Monmouth	1997	\$304,000		<sup>1</sup> The <i>Median</i> Housing Value is adjusted to 2015 dollars using the Inflation Calculator from the Bureau of Labor Statistics ( <a href="http://www.bls.gov">www.bls.gov</a> ).		
Charlotte	1997	\$279,000				
Sarasota	2001	\$274,000				
Hartford	2000	\$270,000				

2

## MEDIAN HOUSING VALUE

(Adjusted for inflation to 2015 dollars)

(Jewish Homeowner Households)



**TABLE 3  
HOUSEHOLD INCOME COOPERATION RATE  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b><i>Cooperation with Detailed Income Categories</i></b>	<b>Cooperation with Under or Over \$100,000 Question Only</b>
Cincinnati	2008	86%	NA
Orlando	1993	84%	NA
St. Paul	2004	83%	8%
Baltimore	2010	83%	NA
Denver	2007	83%	NA
Atlanta	2006	83%	NA
Columbus	2013	82%	NA
Cleveland	2011	82%	NA
Atlantic County	2004	82%	10%
Minneapolis	2004	82%	9%
New Haven	2010	82%	7%
Lehigh Valley	2007	82%	5%
Charlotte	1997	81%	9%
Portland (ME)	2007	81%	8%
Tucson	2002	81%	8%
San Antonio	2007	81%	7%
Tidewater	2001	81%	6%
Rochester	1999	80%	10%
St. Louis	2014	80%	NA
East Bay	2011	80%	NA
Howard County	2010	80%	NA
Miami	2014	79%	12%
York	1999	78%	13%

**TABLE 3**  
**HOUSEHOLD INCOME COOPERATION RATE**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b><i>Cooperation with Detailed Income Categories</i></b>	<b>Cooperation with Under or Over \$100,000 Question Only</b>
Washington	2003	78%	8%
New York	2011	78%	NA
Chicago	2010	78%	NA
Philadelphia	2009	78%	NA
Seattle	2000	78%	NA
St. Petersburg	1994	78%	NA
Westport	2000	77%	10%
Los Angeles	1997	77%	NA
Jacksonville	2002	76%	8%
Detroit	2005	75%	9%
Las Vegas	2005	75%	9%
Rhode Island	2002	75%	8%
Middlesex	2008	75%	7%
Pittsburgh	2002	75%	NA
Wilmington	1995	75%	NA
San Francisco	2004	74%	NA
Boston	2005	73%	NA
Phoenix	2002	73%	NA
Milwaukee	1996	71%	12%
Bergen	2001	71%	10%
Harrisburg	1994	71%	NA
Richmond	1994	71%	NA
Monmouth	1997	69%	13%



**TABLE 3  
HOUSEHOLD INCOME COOPERATION RATE  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


**BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b><i>Cooperation with Detailed Income Categories</i></b>	<b>Cooperation with Under or Over \$100,000 Question Only</b>
San Diego	2003	69%	NA
Broward	1997	67%	18%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	67%	10%
Buffalo	1995	67%	NA
S Palm Beach	2005	66%	13%
W Palm Beach	2005	66%	12%
Hartford	2000	63%	11%
Sarasota	2001	61%	12%

Note: Shows the percentage of respondents who cooperated with the income question.

# 3 HOUSEHOLD INCOME COOPERATION RATE

(Jewish Households)



**TABLE 4  
MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
(ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION TO 2015 DOLLARS)  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

**BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS**


<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Median</b>		<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Median</b>
Westport	2000	\$186,000		Chicago	2010	\$89,000
Bergen	2001	\$142,000		Rhode Island	2002	\$89,000
Essex-Morris	1998	\$133,000		Seattle	2000	\$89,000
Howard County	2010	\$130,000		Milwaukee	1996	\$89,000
Washington	2003	\$125,000		Harrisburg	1994	\$89,000
East Bay	2011	\$123,000		Palm Springs	1998	\$88,000
New Haven	2010	\$114,000		Philadelphia	2009	\$87,000
Monmouth	1997	\$114,000		W Palm Beach	2005	\$87,000
Hartford	2000	\$111,000		Denver	2007	\$86,000
Detroit	2005	\$106,000		Baltimore	2010	\$83,000
San Antonio	2007	\$105,000		San Diego	2003	\$82,000
Atlantic County	2004	\$105,000		Buffalo	1995	\$81,000
Boston	2005	\$103,000		York	1999	\$80,000
San Francisco	2004	\$103,000		Los Angeles	1997	\$78,000
Charlotte	1997	\$103,000		Orlando	1993	\$77,000
Middlesex	2008	\$102,000		Las Vegas	2005	\$76,000
Portland (ME)	2007	\$101,000		Tucson	2002	\$74,000
Atlanta	2006	\$101,000		St. Louis	2014	\$73,000
Jacksonville	2002	\$101,000		Cleveland	2011	\$73,000
Lehigh Valley	2007	\$100,000		S Palm Beach	2005	\$73,000
Cincinnati	2008	\$97,000		New York	2011	\$70,000
Minneapolis	2004	\$97,000		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	\$69,000
Richmond	1994	\$96,000		St. Petersburg	1994	\$68,000
Phoenix	2002	\$95,000		Broward	1997	\$60,000
Rochester	1999	\$95,000		Columbus	2013	\$54,000
St. Paul	2004	\$94,000		NJPS	2000	\$71,000
Pittsburgh	2002	\$93,000		ACS (US)	2013	\$53,000
Tidewater	2001	\$93,000				
Wilmington	1995	\$93,000				
Miami	2014	\$92,000				
Sarasota	2001	\$90,000				

Notes: 1) The *Year* indicates when the field work for the study was completed. The *Median Household Income* is for the previous year.  
2) The *Median Household Income* is adjusted to 2015 dollars using the Inflation Calculator from the Bureau of Labor Statistics ([www.bls.gov](http://www.bls.gov)).

4

# MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME

(Adjusted for inflation to 2015 dollars)  
(Jewish Households)



**TABLE 5  
MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN  
(ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION TO 2015 DOLLARS)  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


**BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Median</b>		<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Median</b>
Westport	2000	\$254,000		Minneapolis	2004	\$122,000
Bergen	2001	\$191,000		Phoenix	2002	\$118,000
Los Angeles	1997	\$178,000		Rochester	1999	\$118,000
Howard County	2010	\$175,000		Atlanta	2006	\$117,000
Washington	2003	\$172,000		W Palm Beach	2005	\$117,000
Middlesex	2008	\$160,000		Richmond	1994	\$117,000
New Haven	2010	\$150,000		Wilmington	1995	\$116,000
S Palm Beach	2005	\$147,000		Chicago	2010	\$114,000
East Bay	2011	\$145,000		Portland (ME)	2007	\$114,000
Detroit	2005	\$144,000		Tidewater	2001	\$114,000
Lehigh Valley	2007	\$140,000		Las Vegas	2005	\$112,000
San Antonio	2007	\$139,000		St. Petersburg	1994	\$109,000
Monmouth	1997	\$139,000		San Diego	2003	\$106,000
Atlantic County	2004	\$138,000		Tucson	2002	\$106,000
Hartford	2000	\$138,000		Harrisburg	1994	\$106,000
Miami	2014	\$134,000		St. Louis	2014	\$104,000
San Francisco	2004	\$131,000		Orlando	1993	\$102,000
Jacksonville	2002	\$131,000		York	1999	\$99,000
Milwaukee	1996	\$128,000		Columbus	2013	\$97,000
Pittsburgh	2002	\$127,000		Cincinnati	2008	\$97,000
Rhode Island	2002	\$127,000		Broward	1997	\$97,000
Charlotte	1997	\$126,000		Cleveland	2011	\$93,000
St. Paul	2004	\$125,000		New York	2011	\$91,000
Boston	2005	\$124,000		Sarasota	2001	\$91,000
Seattle	2000	\$124,000		Baltimore	2010	\$90,000
Denver	2007	\$122,000				
				See footnotes to <b>Table 4</b> .		



# MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN

(Adjusted for inflation to 2015 dollars)



**TABLE 6**  
**MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF ELDERLY HOUSEHOLDS**  
**(ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION TO 2015 DOLLARS)**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS AGE 65 AND OVER

Community	Year	Median	Community	Year	Median
Westport	2000	\$104,000	Monmouth	1997	\$57,000
Essex-Morris	1998	\$95,000	Baltimore	2010	\$56,000
East Bay	2011	\$90,000	San Diego	2003	\$56,000
Howard County	2010	\$88,000	Hartford	2000	\$56,000
Sarasota	2001	\$86,000	Los Angeles	1997	\$55,000
Cincinnati	2008	\$83,000	Wilmington	1995	\$55,000
Washington	2003	\$78,000	Jacksonville	2002	\$54,000
W Palm Beach	2005	\$76,000	Phoenix	2002	\$54,000
San Francisco	2004	\$75,000	Richmond	1994	\$54,000
Bergen	2001	\$74,000	Cleveland	2011	\$53,000
New Haven	2010	\$72,000	Atlanta	2006	\$53,000
San Antonio	2007	\$71,000	Denver	2007	\$52,000
Portland (ME)	2007	\$70,000	Orlando	1993	\$52,000
Lehigh Valley	2007	\$68,000	New York	2011	\$51,000
Atlantic County	2004	\$68,000	Detroit	2005	\$51,000
Chicago	2010	\$66,000	Las Vegas	2005	\$47,000
Miami	2014	\$65,000	Minneapolis	2004	\$46,000
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	\$62,000	Tidewater	2001	\$46,000
Rochester	1999	\$62,000	Columbus	2013	\$43,000
Charlotte	1997	\$61,000	Boston	2004	\$42,000
Middlesex	2008	\$58,000	St. Petersburg	1994	\$41,000
S Palm Beach	2005	\$58,000	York	1999	\$40,000
Rhode Island	2002	\$58,000	Milwaukee	1996	\$40,000
Tucson	2002	\$58,000	Harrisburg	1994	\$39,000
Seattle	2000	\$58,000	St. Paul	2004	\$38,000
Pittsburgh	2002	\$57,000	Broward	1997	\$36,000
St. Louis	2014	\$57,000			


See footnotes to **Table 4**.

6

# MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF ELDERLY HOUSEHOLDS

(Jewish Households with Persons Age 65 and Over)

(Adjusted for inflation to 2015 dollars)





**TABLE 7**  
**HOUSEHOLD INCOME**  
**(NOT ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION)**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Under \$25,000	\$25- \$50,000	\$50- \$100,000	\$100,000 and Over	\$200,000 and Over
Westport	2000	4%	8	24	64	30%
Howard County	2010	9%	9	22	60	NA
East Bay	2011	9%	12	24	56	NA
Bergen	2001	8%	13	28	52	19%
New Haven	2010	11%	11	26	52	16%
Washington	2003	6%	13	33	47	12%
Miami	2014	14%	17	23	46	20%
Middlesex	2008	12%	17	27	44	12%
Detroit	2005	17%	14	26	44	16%
San Antonio	2007	8%	14	35	43	17%
Boston	2005	27%		30	43	12%
Lehigh Valley	2007	13%	14	33	41	16%
Portland (ME)	2007	9%	13	39	39	16%
Atlantic County	2004	10%	17	35	38	14%
Philadelphia	2009	14%	17	31	38	NA
Baltimore	2010	12%	19	30	38	NA
Chicago	2010	11%	19	34	37	NA
Atlanta	2006	29%		34	37	NA
Phoenix	2002	14%	23	28	36	NA
San Francisco	2004	13%	19	33	35	11%
Minneapolis	2004	20%	14	33	34	12%
St. Louis	2014	9%	19	39	33	NA

**TABLE 7  
HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
(NOT ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION)  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

**BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Under \$25,000</b>	<b>\$25- \$50,000</b>	<b>\$50- \$100,000</b>	<b>\$100,000 and Over</b>	<b>\$200,000 and Over</b>
Hartford	2000	13%	18	36	33	9%
St. Paul	2004	16%	21	30	33	11%
Jacksonville	2002	13%	20	35	32	11%
Pittsburgh	2002	21%	17	30	32	NA
Columbus	2013	28%	21	19	32	NA
Cleveland	2011	16%	18	35	31	NA
San Diego	2003	43%		26	31	NA
Rhode Island	2002	17%	21	32	30	9%
New York	2011	42%		28	30	NA
W Palm Beach	2005	13%	20	40	28	9%
Tidewater	2001	13%	22	37	28	11%
Sarasota	2001	10%	28	36	26	9%
Las Vegas	2005	17%	24	34	26	7%
S Palm Beach	2005	19%	25	32	25	9%
Tucson	2002	22%	24	31	23	6%
Seattle	2000	21%	17	42	20	6%
Cincinnati	2008	12%	18	70		NA
Denver	2007	12%	22	66		NA
<b>Studies Prior to 2000</b>						
Essex-Morris	1998	22%		33	44	NA
Palm Springs	1998	20%	25	21	34	NA
Monmouth	1997	13%	16	42	29	6%

**TABLE 7**  
**HOUSEHOLD INCOME**  
**(NOT ADJUSTED FOR INFLATION)**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

**BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS**


<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Under \$25,000</b>	<b>\$25- \$50,000</b>	<b>\$50- \$100,000</b>	<b>\$100,000 and Over</b>	<b>\$200,000 and Over</b>
Charlotte	1997	11%	24	37	29	7%
Rochester	1999	16%	21	34	28	7%
Los Angeles	1997	21%	24	33	22	7%
Richmond	1994	16%	26	37	21	5%
Milwaukee	1996	21%	23	36	21	5%
York	1999	16%	27	37	19	8%
Harrisburg	1994	20%	26	36	19	5%
Buffalo	1995	20%	29	32	19	NA
Wilmington	1995	18%	26	38	18	4%
St. Petersburg	1994	30%	30	25	16	6%
Orlando	1993	23%	33	32	13	4%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	14%	39	35	12	2%
Broward	1997	33%	28	28	11	3%
NJPS	2000	22%	24	33	21	NA
ACS	2013	23%	24	30	23	5%

Note: Comparisons of household income by income category should be treated with caution because the data have *not* been adjusted for inflation and cost of living variations exist from community to community.

# 7

## EARN UNDER \$25,000


(NOT adjusted for inflation)  
(Jewish Households)



8

# EARN \$100,000 AND OVER


(NOT adjusted for inflation)  
(Jewish Households)



9

# EARN \$200,000 AND OVER


(NOT adjusted for inflation)  
(Jewish Households)



# 10

## EARN UNDER \$25,000


(NOT adjusted for inflation)  
(Jewish Households)



11

# EARN \$100,000 AND OVER

(NOT adjusted for inflation)  
(Jewish Households)






12

# EARN \$200,000 AND OVER

(NOT adjusted for inflation)  
(Jewish Households)




<b>TABLE 8</b>						
<b>HOUSEHOLDS LIVING BELOW THE FEDERAL POVERTY LEVELS</b>						
<b>COMMUNITY COMPARISONS</b>						
<b>BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS</b>						
<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>%</b>		<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>%</b>
New York	2011	10.9%		Detroit	2005	1.6%
Minneapolis	2004	6.4%		Rhode Island	2002	1.6%
St. Paul	2004	5.5%		S Palm Beach	2005	1.5%
Las Vegas	2005	3.1%		San Antonio	2007	1.4%
San Diego	2003	3.0%		Atlantic County	2004	1.4%
Rochester	1999	2.9%		Bergen	2001	1.3%
Tucson	2002	2.7%		Westport	2000	1.3%
Tidewater	2001	2.4%		Hartford	2000	1.1%
Miami	2014	2.0%		W Palm Beach	2005	1.0%
Middlesex	2008	2.0%		Jacksonville	2002	0.7%
New Haven	2010	1.9%		Sarasota	2001	0.5%
Lehigh Valley	2007	1.8%		Washington	2003	0.4%
Portland (ME)	2007	1.7%		NJPS	2000	5.0%

13

# HOUSEHOLDS LIVING BELOW THE FEDERAL POVERTY LEVELS

(Jewish Households)



**TABLE 9**  
**HOUSEHOLDS WITH ELDERLY PERSONS**  
**LIVING BELOW THE FEDERAL POVERTY LEVELS**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


**BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WITH PERSONS AGE 65 AND OVER**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>%</b>		<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>%</b>
St. Paul	2004	14.0%		Hartford	2000	2.3%
New York	2011	13.6%		Bergen	2001	2.1%
Minneapolis	2004	9.8%		Westport	2000	2.0%
Tidewater	2001	5.7%		Atlantic County	2004	1.9%
Las Vegas	2005	4.5%		S Palm Beach	2005	1.8%
Rhode Island	2002	3.8%		Detroit	2005	1.7%
Portland (ME)	2007	3.5%		San Antonio	2007	1.3%
Rochester	1999	3.3%		Jacksonville	2002	1.2%
Middlesex	2008	3.1%		W Palm Beach	2005	1.0%
Miami	2014	2.9%		Washington	2003	0.5%
Tucson	2002	2.9%		Sarasota	2001	0.5%
New Haven	2010	2.5%		NJPS	2000	9.0%
Lehigh Valley	2007	2.5%				

14

# HOUSEHOLDS WITH ELDERLY PERSONS LIVING BELOW THE FEDERAL POVERTY LEVELS

(Jewish Households with Persons Age 65 and Over)



**TABLE 10**  
**SUBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF HOUSEHOLD'S FINANCIAL STATUS**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

**BASE: RESPONDENTS**


<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Well Off</b>	<b>Have Some Extra Money</b>	<b>Comfortable/ Have Enough Money</b>	<b>Just Managing to Make Ends Meet</b>	<b>Cannot Make Ends Meet</b>	<b><i>Just Managing/ Cannot Make Ends Meet</i></b>
New York	2011	9%	16	33	37	5	42%
Cleveland	2010	7%	8	44	36	5	41%
Columbus	2013	13 %	11	40	28	8	36%
Chicago	2010	9%	9	47	30	5	35%
Baltimore	2010	10%	10	47	30	3	33%
San Diego	2003	10%	11	49	27	3	30%
Miami	2014	15%	20	36	26	3	29%
Atlanta	2006	15%	24	33	23	5	28%
Palm Springs	1998	31%		42	23	4	27%
Phoenix *	2002	13%	25	34	25	2	27%
Denver	2007	10%	17	47	24	2	26%
Howard County	2010	13%	15	47	21	4	25%
St. Louis	2014	16%	18	43	20	4	24%
Cincinnati	2008	13%	16	49	19	3	22%
Pittsburgh *	2002	8%	28	42	21	1	22%

\* Question response was "very well off" rather than "well off."

15

# SUBJECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF HOUSEHOLD'S FINANCIAL STATUS

Just Managing/Cannot Make Ends Meet  
(Respondents)



Note for **Tables 11-12**: While the best indicators of social service needs include such factors as age, household structure, and household income, respondents in Jewish households in the communities in these tables were asked directly about their need for a variety of social services in the past year. When respondents reported that their households needed a service, they were asked whether the service had been received. If the households received the service, the respondents were asked whether the service had been received from a Jewish (*Jewish*) source or a non-Jewish (*other*) source.

**TABLE 11**  
**NEED FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN THE PAST YEAR**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS


<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Total Who Needed Financial Assistance</b>	<b>Received Jewish Financial Assistance</b>	<b>Received Other Financial Assistance</b>	<b>No Financial Assistance Received</b>
New Haven	2010	2.8%	0.2%	1.8	0.8
Detroit	2005	2.8%	0.4%	0.6	1.8
Lehigh Valley	2007	2.4%	0.5%	1.7	0.2
Middlesex	2008	1.7%	0.0%	1.2	0.5
San Antonio	2007	1.7%	0.0%	1.0	0.7

Note: The question was asked only of households earning an annual income under \$25,000; households earning \$25,000 and over were assumed not to have needed financial assistance in the past year.



# 16 NEED FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN THE PAST YEAR

(Jewish Households)



**TABLE 12**  
**NEED FOR HELP IN FINDING A JOB**  
**OR CHOOSING AN OCCUPATION IN THE PAST YEAR**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WITH ADULTS AGE 18-64

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Total Who Needed Job Counseling</b>	<b>Received Jewish Job Counseling</b>	<b>Received Other Job Counseling</b>	<b>No Job Counseling Received</b>
Minneapolis	2004	17.9%	3.1%	8.0	6.8
St. Paul	2004	16.2%	2.1%	8.7	5.4
Detroit	2005	14.5%	1.8%	6.8	5.9
Miami	2014	12.2%	1.3%	4.0	6.9
New Haven	2010	11.9%	0.0%	3.9	8.0
Charlotte	1997	11.7%	0.1%	5.3	6.3
Las Vegas	2005	11.4%	0.0%	6.0	5.4
Tucson	2002	11.2%	0.7%	4.9	5.6
Wilmington	1995	10.6%	0.3%	5.7	4.6
Middlesex	2008	10.5%	0.0%	6.1	4.4
Washington	2003	10.5%	0.9%	4.9	4.7
San Antonio	2007	9.7%	0.0%	3.5	6.2
Bergen	2001	9.7%	1.6%	3.7	4.4
Monmouth	1997	9.6%	0.0%	5.0	4.6
Lehigh Valley	2007	9.2%	0.0%	4.5	4.7
S Palm Beach	2005	9.1%	0.0%	3.2	5.9
Rhode Island	2002	8.8%	0.1%	5.0	3.7
Richmond	1994	8.6%	0.2%	4.3	4.1
Tidewater	2001	8.5%	0.4%	4.5	3.6
Milwaukee	1996	8.1%	2.4%	2.9	2.8
Rochester	1999	8.0%	1.3%	4.0	2.7
W Palm Beach	2005	7.9%	0.0%	2.1	5.8

**TABLE 12**  
**NEED FOR HELP IN FINDING A JOB**  
**OR CHOOSING AN OCCUPATION IN THE PAST YEAR**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WITH ADULTS AGE 18-64


<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Total Who Needed Job Counseling</b>	<b>Received Jewish Job Counseling</b>	<b>Received Other Job Counseling</b>	<b>No Job Counseling Received</b>
Broward	1997	7.9%	0.1%	4.4	3.4
Hartford	2000	6.9%	0.0%	4.1	2.8
Westport	2000	6.8%	0.1%	3.9	2.8
Atlantic County	2004	4.9%	0.0%	1.5	3.4
Jacksonville	2002	2.7%	0.0%	1.6	1.1
NJPS <sup>1</sup>	2000	9.5%	0.6%	3.1	5.8

<sup>1</sup> NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.

# 17

## NEED FOR HELP IN FINDING A JOB OR CHOOSING AN OCCUPATION IN THE PAST YEAR

(Jewish Households with Adults Age 18-64)



## 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](mailto:isheskin@miami.edu).