

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 12 - INTERMARRIAGE

June 2015

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Inter marriage	3
Table 2: Couples Inter marriage Rate by Age of Head of Household	9
Table 3: Interest in Singles Programs in the Past Year	17
Table 4: Ever Used a Jewish Internet Dating Service	20
Table 5: Religion of Children Being Raised in Inter married Households	22
Table 6: Jewish Children Being Raised Within Each Type of Marriage	26
Table 7: Children in Jewish Households Who Are Being Raised Jewish	31
Table 8: Persons in Jewish Households Who Are Jewish	33
Table 9: Jews Who Are Jews-by-Choice	35

LIST OF BAR CHARTS

Bar Chart 1: Inter marriage	7
Bar Chart 2: Couples Conversion Rate	8
Bar Chart 3: Inter marriage (Head of Household Under Age 35)	11
Bar Chart 4: Inter marriage (Head of Household Age 35-49)	12
Bar Chart 5: Inter marriage (Head of Household Age 50-64)	13
Bar Chart 6: Inter marriage (Head of Household Age 65-74)	14
Bar Chart 7: Inter marriage (Head of Household Age 75 and Over)	15
Bar Chart 8: Inter marriage (Head of Household Age 65 and Over)	16
Bar Chart 9: Interest in Singles Programs in the Past Year	19
Bar Chart 10: Ever Used a Jewish Internet Dating Service	21
Bar Chart 11: Children Being Raised Jewish in Inter married Households	25
Bar Chart 12: Jewish Children Who Are Being Raised in Inter married Households	29
Bar Chart 13: Jewish Children Who Are Being Raised in Conversionary In-married Households	30
Bar Chart 14: Percentage of Children Age 0-17 in Jewish Households Who Are Jewish	32
Bar Chart 15: Persons in Jewish Households Who Are Jewish	34
Bar Chart 16: Jews Who are Jews-by-Choice	36
Appendix	37

**TABLE 1
INTERMARRIAGE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

		Individual Rate: Percentage of Married Jews Who Are Married to Non-Jews	Couples Rate: Percentage of Married Couples Who Are:			Couples Conversion Rate ④
Community	Year		Inter- married ③	In-married		
				2 Born/ Raised Jews ①	Conver- sionary ②	
Portland (ME)	2007	44%	61%	33	6	9%
East Bay	2011	44%	61%	39		NA
Seattle	2000	38%	55%	35	10	15%
San Francisco	2004	38%	55%	40	5	8%
Denver	2007	36%	53%	33	14	21%
Columbus	2013	35%	52%	48		NA
Atlanta	2006	33%	50%	40	10	17%
Las Vegas	2005	32%	48%	46	6	12%
St. Louis	2014	32%	48%	52		NA
Charlotte	1997	30%	47%	44	10	18%
York	1999	29%	46%	41	14	24%
Tucson	2002	30%	46%	46	8	15%
Boston	2005	30%	46%	50	4	9%
San Diego	2003	28%	44%	45	11	20%
Jacksonville	2002	28%	44%	45	11	20%
Tidewater	2001	28%	43%	45	12	22%
Washington	2003	26%	41%	52	6	13%
Phoenix	2002	25%	40%	51	9	18%
St. Paul	2004	25%	39%	49	12	24%
Cleveland	2011	23%	38%	62		NA
San Antonio	2007	23%	37%	50	13	25%

**TABLE 1
INTERMARRIAGE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

		Individual Rate: Percentage of Married Jews Who Are Married to Non-Jews	Couples Rate: Percentage of Married Couples Who Are:			Couples Conversion Rate ④
Community	Year		Inter- married ③	In-married		
				2 Born/ Raised Jews ①	Conver- sionary ②	
Pittsburgh	2002	22%	36%	51	13	27%
Lehigh Valley	2007	22%	36%	55	9	21%
Cincinnati	2008	20%	34%	53	13	27%
Richmond	1994	21%	34%	56	10	23%
Rhode Island	2002	21%	34%	59	7	18%
New Haven	2010	21%	34%	60	6	16%
Harrisburg	1994	20%	33%	56	11	26%
Chicago	2010	20%	33%	57	10	23%
Minneapolis	2004	20%	33%	59	8	20%
Wilmington	1995	19%	33%	60	7	18%
Westport	2000	20%	33%	61	6	16%
Orlando	1993	19%	32%	59	9	22%
Rochester	1999	17%	30%	62	8	22%
Howard County	2010	17%	29%	52	19	40%
St. Petersburg	1994	17%	29%	58	14	32%
Milwaukee	1996	16%	28%	68	4	12%
Philadelphia	2009	16%	28%	72		NA
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	15%	27%	62	12	30%
Atlantic County	2004	15%	26%	68	6	19%
Buffalo	1995	15%	26%	71	3	10%
Hartford	2000	13%	23%	69	8	27%
Los Angeles	1997	13%	23%	71	6	20%

**TABLE 1
INTERMARRIAGE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

Community	Year	Individual Rate: Percentage of Married Jews Who Are Married to Non-Jews	Couples Rate: Percentage of Married Couples Who Are:			Couples Conversion Rate ④
			Inter-married ③	In-married		
				2 Born/ Raised Jews ①	Conver- sionary ②	
New York	2011	12%	22%	72	6	23%
Baltimore	2010	11%	20%	71	9	31%
Sarasota	2001	11%	20%	76	4	17%
Palm Springs	1998	10%	19%	81		NA
Broward	1997	10%	18%	78	4	19%
Bergen	2001	10%	17%	78	5	23%
Monmouth	1997	9%	17%	81	3	15%
Miami	2014	9%	16%	74	9	37%
Detroit	2005	9%	16%	76	8	33%
W Palm Beach	2005	9%	16%	79	5	22%
Middlesex	2008	7%	14%	84	2	14%
S Palm Beach	2005	5%	9%	88	3	24%
NJPS	2000	31%	48%	52		NA

See footnotes on next page.

**TABLE 1
INTERMARRIAGE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

		Individual Rate: Percentage of Married Jews Who Are Married to Non-Jews	Couples Rate: Percentage of Married Couples Who Are:			Couples Conversion Rate ④
Community	Year		Inter- married ③	In-married		
				2 Born/ Raised Jews ①	Conver- sionary ②	

Three different types of marriage are defined:

① **In-marriage:** An *in-marriage* is a marriage in which both spouses were born or raised Jewish and currently consider themselves Jewish.

② **Conversionary In-marriage:** A *conversionary in-marriage* is a marriage in which one spouse was born or raised Jewish and currently considers himself/herself Jewish and the other spouse was not born or raised Jewish but currently considers himself/herself Jewish (no question about formal conversion was asked in some studies).

③ **Inter-marriage:** An *intermarriage* is a marriage in which one spouse currently considers himself/herself Jewish and the other spouse does not currently consider himself/herself Jewish.


An additional measure is calculated from the last two types of marriage defined above:

④ **Couples Conversion Rate:** The *couples conversion rate* is calculated by dividing the percentage of conversionary in-married couples (②) by the total percentage of married couples involving marriages between Jewish persons and persons not born or raised Jewish (conversionary in-married couples (②) and intermarried couples (③)).

1

INTERMARRIAGE

(Couples Intermarriage Rate)



2

COUPLES CONVERSION RATE

(Married Couples)




TABLE 2								
COUPLES INTERMARRIAGE RATE BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD								
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS								
BASE: MARRIED COUPLES IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS								
Community	Year	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+	65+	All
Columbus	2013	NA	76%	45%	33%	17%	30%	52%
Las Vegas	2005	33%	71%	47%	32%	28%	31%	48%
East Bay	2011	78%	67%	56%	58%	36%	50%	61%
Portland (ME)	2007	NA	65%	64%	32%	30%	31%	61%
Tucson	2002	44%	63%	51%	23%	20%	21%	46%
Denver	2007	70%	62%	47%	41%	14%	34%	53%
Charlotte	1997	43%	62%	27%	14%	NA	16%	47%
St. Louis	2014	66%	60%	52%	34%	9%	24%	48%
Phoenix	2002	34%	60%	42%	22%	17%	19%	40%
San Diego	2003	51%	59%	37%	34%	9%	22%	44%
York	1999	74%	56%	28%	14%	43%	29%	46%
Sarasota	2001	NA	55%	24%	8%	10%	9%	20%
Chicago	2010	24%	54%	29%	11%	18%	14%	33%
Atlanta	2006	62%	51%	42%	64%	40%	55%	50%
St. Paul	2004	48%	51%	34%	12%	14%	13%	39%
Jacksonville	2002	44%	51%	49%	34%	24%	29%	44%
Washington	2003	53%	49%	32%	27%	37%	32%	41%
Pittsburgh	2002	59%	48%	33%	12%	12%	12%	36%
Rhode Island	2002	40%	48%	37%	17%	13%	15%	34%
Rochester	1999	36%	48%	22%	6%	11%	7%	30%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	NA	48%	35%	18%	7%	15%	27%
Cincinnati	2008	42%	45%	31%	39%	9%	28%	34%
W Palm Beach	2005	42%	45%	24%	6%	5%	6%	16%
New Haven	2010	NA	45%	39%	25%	13%	19%	34%
Minneapolis	2004	52%	43%	26%	20%	7%	14%	33%
Cleveland	2011	NA	42%	40%	52%	14%	36%	38%


TABLE 2								
COUPLES INTERMARRIAGE RATE BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD								
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS								
BASE: MARRIED COUPLES IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS								
Community	Year	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+	65+	All
Lehigh Valley	2007	56%	41%	37%	25%	21%	23%	36%
Wilmington	1995	54%	41%	18%	10%	6%	7%	33%
Atlantic County	2004	NA	41%	27%	23%	0%	14%	26%
Richmond	1994	63%	40%	20%	6%	14%	10%	34%
Tidewater	2001	93%	37%	42%	11%	6%	8%	43%
Harrisburg	1994	51%	37%	30%	10%	3%	8%	33%
Milwaukee	1996	36%	37%	27%	7%	21%	11%	28%
Broward	1997	57%	36%	20%	4%	3%	3%	18%
St. Petersburg	1994	47%	36%	31%	16%	9%	14%	29%
San Antonio	2007	33%	35%	43%	36%	26%	32%	37%
Westport	2000	50%	32%	35%	33%	6%	23%	33%
Orlando	1993	58%	31%	33%	NA	NA	13%	32%
Hartford	2000	43%	29%	23%	10%	12%	11%	23%
New York	2011	14%	29%	24%	19%	12%	15%	22%
Howard County	2010	NA	29%	33%	NA	NA	18%	29%
Middlesex	2008	26%	27%	15%	7%	3%	5%	14%
S Palm Beach	2005	42%	26%	14%	5%	4%	4%	9%
Baltimore	2010	15%	26%	27%	13%	7%	11%	20%
Miami	2014	19%	25%	15%	13%	8%	11%	16%
Bergen	2001	25%	24%	12%	11%	11%	11%	17%
Monmouth	1997	32%	22%	10%	7%	10%	8%	17%
Detroit	2005	22%	18%	19%	10%	10%	10%	16%
Palm Springs	1998	53%		25%	4%	NA	4%	19%
NJPS	2000	59%	58%	46%	24%	19%	NA	48%

3

INTERMARRIAGE

HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD UNDER AGE 35

(Couples Inter marriage Rate)




4

INTERMARRIAGE

HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AGE 35-49


(Couples Inter marriage Rate)





INTERMARRIAGE

HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AGE 50-64 (Couples Intermarriage Rate)




6

INTERMARRIAGE


HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AGE 65-74

(Couples Inter marriage Rate)



7

INTERMARRIAGE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AGE 75 AND OVER (Couples Inter marriage Rate)




8

INTERMARRIAGE

HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AGE 65 AND OVER

(Couples Inter-marriage Rate)



**TABLE 3
INTEREST IN SINGLES PROGRAMS IN THE PAST YEAR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: HOUSEHOLDS WITH SINGLE JEWISH ADULTS AGE 18-64

Community	Year	<i>Total Interested in Singles Programs</i>	Attended		Did Not Attend Singles Programs
			Jewish Singles Programs	Other Singles Programs	
Charlotte	1997	29%	19%	3	6
San Antonio	2007	28%	7%	1	21
Las Vegas	2005	28%	14%	1	13
St. Paul	2004	28%	17%	1	9
Westport	2000	27%	7%	4	17
S Palm Beach	2005	26%	15%	1	10
Lehigh Valley	2007	25%	6%	3	17
Detroit	2005	23%	10%	2	11
W Palm Beach	2005	23%	9%	4	11
Minneapolis	2004	23%	6%	0	17
Tucson	2002	23%	4%	2	17
Monmouth	1997	23%	8%	1	14
Washington	2003	22%	13%	2	7
Jacksonville	2002	22%	16%	1	5
York	1999	22%	10%	0	13
St. Petersburg	1994	21%	9%	3	10
Middlesex	2008	20%	7%	4	10
Rochester	1999	19%	8%	1	10
Broward	1997	19%	12%	4	4
Milwaukee	1996	19%	16%	0	2
New Haven	2010	18%	7%	1	10
Hartford	2000	18%	5%	5	8

TABLE 3
INTEREST IN SINGLES PROGRAMS IN THE PAST YEAR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS


BASE: HOUSEHOLDS WITH SINGLE JEWISH ADULTS AGE 18-64

Community	Year	<i>Total Interested in Singles Programs</i>	Attended		Did Not Attend Singles Programs
			Jewish Singles Programs	Other Singles Programs	
Rhode Island	2002	17%	5%	2	10
Harrisburg	1994	15%	5%	2	8
Richmond	1994	14%	5%	2	8
Atlantic County	2004	13%	4%	2	8
Tidewater	2001	12%	6%	1	5
Bergen	2001	11%	5%	1	5
Sarasota	2001	8%	3%	1	3

9

INTEREST IN SINGLES PROGRAMS IN THE PAST YEAR

(Households with Single Jewish Adults Age 18-64)



**TABLE 4
EVER USED A JEWISH INTERNET DATING SERVICE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: HOUSEHOLDS WITH SINGLE JEWISH ADULTS AGE 18-64

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
S Palm Beach	2005	26%		Las Vegas	2005	17%
St. Paul	2004	24%		New Haven	2010	16%
Middlesex	2008	21%		Atlantic County	2004	15%
San Antonio	2007	18%		Minneapolis	2004	15%
Lehigh Valley	2007	17%		W Palm Beach	2005	14%

10 EVER USED A JEWISH INTERNET DATING SERVICE

(Households with Single Jewish Adults Age 18-64)




TABLE 5					
RELIGION OF CHILDREN BEING RAISED IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS					
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS					
BASE: CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS					
Community	Year	Jewish	Part Jewish	Non-Jewish	Other Responses ¹
S Palm Beach	2005	75%	11	14	
Sarasota	2001	74%	9	17	
Howard County	2010	62%	17	4	17% Undecided
Atlantic County	2004	60%	17	23	
Cincinnati	2008	60%	7	11	18% No Religion 4% Undecided
Boston	2005	60%	4	8	28% No Religion
Hartford	2000	59%	15	26	
Bergen	2001	59%	8	33	
Harrisburg	1994	57%	43		
Westport	2000	56%	10	34	
Chicago	2010	49%	26	9	15% No Religion 1% Undecided
Jacksonville	2002	49%	11	40	
Portland (ME)	2007	47%	26	27	
Miami	2014	46%	30	24	
Tucson	2002	45%	26	29	
Washington	2003	45%	14	41	
Tidewater	2001	45%	9	46	
New Haven	2010	43%	22	35	
Broward	1997	43%	14	43	
York	1999	43%	10	47	
Los Angeles	1997	43%	57		
Las Vegas	2005	42%	12	46	
San Antonio	2007	39%	25	36	

TABLE 5					
RELIGION OF CHILDREN BEING RAISED IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS					
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS					
BASE: CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS					
Community	Year	Jewish	Part Jewish	Non-Jewish	Other Responses ¹
Atlanta	2006	39%	15	28	4% No Religion 14% Undecided
Orlando	1993	39%	61		
San Francisco	2004	38%	12	14	36% No Religion
St. Paul	2004	37%	28	35	
Lehigh Valley	2007	36%	27	37	
Pittsburgh	2002	36%	11	39	14% Undecided
Milwaukee	1996	36%	64		
Wilmington	1995	36%	64		
Richmond	1994	36%	64		
Rhode Island	2002	35%	24	41	
W Palm Beach	2005	34%	31	35	
Charlotte	1997	34%	20	46	
Middlesex	2008	33%	34	33	
Cleveland	2011	33%	22	7	23% No religion 14% Undecided
Rochester	1999	32%	20	48	
Monmouth	1997	31%	18	51	
New York	2011	31%	11	46	13% Undecided
Detroit	2005	31%	7	62	
Minneapolis	2004	30%	33	37	
Baltimore	2010	30%	18	10	17% No Religion 25% Undecided
St. Petersburg	1994	29%	71		

**TABLE 5
RELIGION OF CHILDREN BEING RAISED IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS


Community	Year	Jewish	Part Jewish	Non-Jewish	Other Responses ¹
St. Louis	2014	27%	18	18	26% No Religion 8% Undecided 4% Don't Know
Phoenix	2002	26%	18	50	6% Undecided
San Diego	2003	21%	29	39	11% Undecided
Palm Springs	1998	19%	19	62	
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	18%	47	35	
Denver	2007	18%	11	48	23% Undecided
Columbus	2013	11%	27	8	21% No Religion 33% Undecided
NJPS	2000	NA		67%	NA

¹ Communities have queried this information in different ways. Some communities include "No Religion" and "Undecided" as possible responses, while others do not. This significantly affects the comparability of the data and as such the comparisons should be treated with caution.

11

CHILDREN BEING RAISED JEWISH IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS

(Children Age 0-17 in Inter-married Jewish Households)



What percentage of children in intermarried households are being raised Jewish?

TABLE 6				
JEWISH CHILDREN BEING RAISED WITHIN EACH TYPE OF MARRIAGE				
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS				
BASE: JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS				
Community	Year	In-married		Intermarried ③
		2 Born/Raised Jews ①	Conversionary ②	
Columbus	2013	32%		68
Las Vegas	2005	43%	11	46
Portland (ME)	2007	46%	11	43
St. Louis	2014	57%		43
Tucson	2002	44%	15	42
Sarasota	2001	44%	16	40
Boston	2005	62%		38
York	1999	40%	24	36
Atlantic County	2004	48%	17	35
Jacksonville	2002	47%	22	31
Tidewater	2001	50%	19	31
San Francisco	2004	71%		29
Howard County	2010	48%	24	28
W Palm Beach	2005	58%	16	27
Washington	2003	64%	10	27
Cincinnati	2008	56%	19	25
Atlanta	2006	60%	15	25
Chicago	2010	63%	13	24
Harrisburg	1994	61%	16	23
Broward	1997	67%	10	23
Pittsburgh	2002	56%	22	22
Wilmington	1995	65%	13	22
Phoenix	2002	44%	35	21
Lehigh Valley	2007	65%	14	21

TABLE 6				
JEWISH CHILDREN BEING RAISED WITHIN EACH TYPE OF MARRIAGE				
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS				
BASE: JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS				
		In-married		
Community	Year	2 Born/Raised Jews ①	Conversionary ②	Intermarried ③
New Haven	2010	68%	11	21
St. Paul	2004	50%	30	20
Hartford	2000	66%	14	20
Rhode Island	2002	67%	13	20
Westport	2000	73%	7	20
San Diego	2003	59%	22	19
Richmond	1994	65%	16	19
Rochester	1999	65%	15	19
S Palm Beach	2005	72%	9	19
Denver	2007	53%	30	17
San Antonio	2007	57%	26	17
Charlotte	1997	68%	15	17
Orlando	1993	72%	11	17
Milwaukee	1996	75%	8	17
Minneapolis	2004	69%	15	16
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	31%	55	13
Cleveland	2011	87%		13
St. Petersburg	1994	59%	30	11
Bergen	2001	81%	8	11
Miami	2014	80%	11	9
Middlesex	2008	87%	4	9
Baltimore	2010	81%	11	8
Monmouth	1997	89%	4	7
Detroit	2005	86%	8	6

TABLE 6				
JEWISH CHILDREN BEING RAISED WITHIN EACH TYPE OF MARRIAGE				
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS				
BASE: JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS				
		In-married		
Community	Year	2 Born/Raised Jews ①	Conversionary ②	<i>Intermarried</i> ③
New York	2011	90%	4	5

Three different types of marriage are defined:

① In-marriage: An *in-marriage* is a marriage in which both spouses were born or raised Jewish and currently consider themselves Jewish.


② Conversionary In-marriage: A *conversionary in-marriage* is a marriage in which one spouse was born or raised Jewish and currently considers himself/herself Jewish and the other spouse was not born or raised Jewish but currently considers himself/herself Jewish (no question about formal conversion was asked in some studies).

③ Intermarriage: An *intermarriage* is a marriage in which one spouse currently considers himself/herself Jewish and the other spouse does not currently consider himself/herself Jewish.

12

JEWISH CHILDREN WHO ARE BEING RAISED IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS

(Jewish Children Age 0-17 in Married Households)




In what types of married households are the Jewish children being raised?

13

JEWISH CHILDREN WHO ARE BEING RAISED IN CONVERSIONARY IN-MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS

(Jewish Children Age 0-17 in Married Households)



In what types of married households are the Jewish children being raised?

**TABLE 7
CHILDREN IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WHO ARE BEING RAISED JEWISH
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASED: CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Miami	2014	93%		Tidewater	2001	74%
S Palm Beach	2005	92%		Minneapolis	2004	73%
Bergen	2001	92%		Richmond	1994	73%
Detroit	2005	88%		Lehigh Valley	2007	72%
Hartford	2000	87%		Rhode Island	2002	71%
Sarasota	2001	85%		Wilmington	1995	71%
Westport	2000	85%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	70%
Monmouth	1997	85%		Rochester	1999	70%
Middlesex	2008	84%		Philadelphia	2009	69%
New York	2011	81%		Tucson	2002	68%
Cincinnati	2008	81%		W Palm Beach	2005	67%
Atlantic County	2004	81%		Pittsburgh	2002	67%
Harrisburg	1994	81%		York	1999	67%
New Haven	2010	79%		Charlotte	1997	66%
Baltimore	2010	78%		Portland (ME)	2007	65%
San Antonio	2007	78%		San Francisco	2004	65%
Buffalo	1995	78%		Phoenix	2002	60%
Broward	1997	77%		Seattle	2000	59%
St. Petersburg	1994	77%		San Diego	2003	57%
Orlando	1993	77%		Denver	2007	56%
Howard County	2010	76%		Las Vegas	2005	56%
Washington	2003	76%		St. Louis	2014	52%
Cleveland	2011	75%		Columbus	2013	34%
Chicago	2010	75%		Los Angeles *	1997	81%
St. Paul	2004	75%		Boston *	2005	77%
Jacksonville	2002	75%		NJPS	2000	64%
Milwaukee	1996	75%				
Atlanta	2006	74%				

* May include children who are part Jewish.

14

PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WHO ARE JEWISH




**TABLE 8
PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WHO ARE JEWISH
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
S Palm Beach	2005	96%		San Antonio	2007	81%
Miami	2014	94%		St. Paul	2004	81%
Middlesex	2008	92%		Rochester	1999	81%
Detroit	2005	92%		Orlando	1993	81%
Bergen	2001	92%		Washington	2003	80%
W Palm Beach	2005	90%		Jacksonville	2002	80%
Monmouth	1997	90%		Rhode Island	2002	80%
Sarasota	2001	89%		Boston	2005	79%
Broward	1997	89%		Tidewater	2001	79%
Hartford	2000	88%		Wilmington	1995	79%
Los Angeles	1997	88%		Richmond	1994	79%
New York	2011	87%		Phoenix	2002	78%
Atlantic County	2004	87%		Pittsburgh	2002	78%
Palm Springs	1998	87%		Tucson	2002	78%
Baltimore	2010	86%		Chicago	2010	76%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	86%		Atlanta	2006	76%
Philadelphia	2009	85%		Las Vegas	2005	76%
Howard County	2010	84%		York	1999	76%
Westport	2000	84%		San Diego	2003	75%
Buffalo	1995	84%		San Francisco	2004	73%
New Haven	2010	83%		Charlotte	1997	73%
Milwaukee	1996	83%		Denver	2007	72%
St. Petersburg	1994	83%		Portland (ME)	2007	71%
Cleveland	2011	82%		Seattle	2000	70%
Cincinnati	2008	82%		Columbus	2013	69%
Lehigh Valley	2007	82%		St. Louis	2014	68%
Minneapolis	2004	82%				
Harrisburg	1994	82%		NJPS	2000	78%

15

PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WHO ARE JEWISH



**TABLE 9
JEWS WHO ARE JEWS-BY-CHOICE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS


Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
York	1999	9.7%		Portland (ME)	2007	3.5%
St. Paul	2004	8.0%		New Haven	2010	3.4%
Jacksonville	2002	7.2%		Los Angeles	1997	3.3%
San Antonio	2007	6.9%		Hartford	2000	3.1%
Harrisburg	1994	6.4%		Detroit	2005	3.0%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	6.0%		Wilmington	1995	2.8%
Charlotte	1997	5.9%		Atlantic County	2004	2.7%
Washington	2003	5.8%		Westport	2000	2.7%
Tidewater	2001	5.8%		Bergen	2001	2.6%
St. Petersburg	1994	5.4%		Sarasota	2001	2.3%
Richmond	1994	5.3%		Milwaukee	1996	2.3%
Las Vegas	2005	4.8%		W Palm Beach	2005	2.0%
Minneapolis	2004	4.8%		Middlesex	2008	1.4%
Tucson	2002	4.3%		Broward	1997	1.4%
Rhode Island	2002	4.1%		Monmouth	1997	1.4%
Rochester	1999	4.1%		S Palm Beach	2005	1.3%
Orlando	1993	4.1%		San Francisco ¹	2004	7.0%
Lehigh Valley	2007	4.0%				
Miami	2014	3.8%				
Buffalo	1995	3.8%				

¹ Results are based on *adults only*, not all Jewish persons.

16

JEWES WHO ARE JEWS-BY-CHOICE

(Jewish Persons 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.