

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 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


| Community | Year | % | | Community | Year | % |
|------------------|-------------|----------|--|------------------|-------------|----------|
| 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


| Community | Year | Median ¹ | | Community | Year | Median ¹ |
|------------------|-------------|----------------------------|--|---|-------------|----------------------------|
| 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 | | ¹ The <i>Median</i> Housing Value is adjusted to 2015 dollars using the Inflation Calculator from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (www.bls.gov). | | |
| 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

| Community | Year | <i>Cooperation with Detailed Income Categories</i> | Cooperation with Under or Over \$100,000 Question Only |
|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| 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

| Community | Year | <i>Cooperation with Detailed Income Categories</i> | Cooperation with Under or Over \$100,000 Question Only |
|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| 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

| Community | Year | <i>Cooperation with Detailed Income Categories</i> | Cooperation with Under or Over \$100,000 Question Only |
|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| 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

| Community | Year | Median | | Community | Year | Median |
|------------------|-------------|---------------|--|------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 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).

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

| Community | Year | Median | | Community | Year | Median |
|------------------|-------------|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 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 Table 4 . | | |



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

| Community | Year | Under \$25,000 | \$25- \$50,000 | \$50- \$100,000 | \$100,000 and Over | \$200,000 and Over |
|------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 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 |
| Studies Prior to 2000 | | | | | | |
| 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


| Community | Year | Under \$25,000 | \$25- \$50,000 | \$50- \$100,000 | \$100,000 and Over | \$200,000 and Over |
|------------------|-------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 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)




Communities
completing studies
2000 to current

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)



| TABLE 8 | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------|--|------------------|-------------|----------|
| HOUSEHOLDS LIVING BELOW THE FEDERAL POVERTY LEVELS | | | | | | |
| COMMUNITY COMPARISONS | | | | | | |
| BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS | | | | | | |
| Community | Year | % | | Community | Year | % |
| 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

| Community | Year | % | | Community | Year | % |
|------------------|-------------|----------|--|------------------|-------------|----------|
| 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 | | | | | | | |
| Community | Year | Well Off | Have Some Extra Money | Comfortable/ Have Enough Money | Just Managing to Make Ends Meet | Cannot Make Ends Meet | Just Managing/ Cannot Make Ends Meet |
| 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

| Community | Year | Total Who Needed Financial Assistance | Received Jewish Financial Assistance | Received Other Financial Assistance | No Financial Assistance Received |
|------------------|-------------|--|---|--|---|
| 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

| Community | Year | Total Who Needed Job Counseling | Received Jewish Job Counseling | Received Other Job Counseling | No Job Counseling Received |
|------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 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


| Community | Year | Total Who Needed Job Counseling | Received Jewish Job Counseling | Received Other Job Counseling | No Job Counseling Received |
|-------------------|-------------|--|---|--|---|
| 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 ¹ | 2000 | 9.5% | 0.6% | 3.1 | 5.8 |

¹ 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.