

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 13 - SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP

June 2015

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Current Synagogue Membership.	4
Table 2: Lifetime Synagogue Membership.	6
Table 3: Current Synagogue Membership by Age of Head of Household.	14
Table 4: Current Synagogue Membership of Households with Children.	22
Table 5: Current Synagogue Membership by Type of Marriage.	24
Table 6: Importance of Cost as a Factor in Joining a Synagogue.	28
Table 7: Current Synagogue Member Households Who Are Synagogue Members in the Local Community.	30
Table 8: Denomination of Synagogue Membership Based upon the Synagogue Survey.	32
Table 9: Orthodox Synagogue Membership Based upon the Synagogue Survey.	34
Table 10: Conservative Synagogue Membership Based upon the Synagogue Survey.	36
Table 11: Reform Synagogue Membership Based upon the Synagogue Survey.	38
Table 12: Overlap Between Synagogue and Jewish Community Center Memberships.	40

LIST OF BAR CHARTS

Bar Chart 1: Current Synagogue Membership.	5
Bar Chart 2: Was a Synagogue Member in the Past, Plan to Join Again in the Future.	9
Bar Chart 3: Was a Synagogue Member in the Past, Do Not Plan to Join Again in the Future.	10
Bar Chart 4: Was Not a Synagogue Member in the Past, Plan to Join in the Future.	11
Bar Chart 5: Plan to Join a Synagogue in the Future.	12
Bar Chart 6: Lifetime Synagogue Membership.	13
Bar Chart 7: Current Synagogue Membership (Head of Household Under Age 35).	16
Bar Chart 8: Current Synagogue Membership (Head of Household Age 35-49).	17
Bar Chart 9: Current Synagogue Membership (Head of Household Age 50-64).	18
Bar Chart 10: Current Synagogue Membership (Head of Household Age 65-74).	19
Bar Chart 11: Current Synagogue Membership (Head of Household Age 75 and Over).	20
Bar Chart 12: Current Synagogue Membership (Head of Household Age 65 and Over).	21
Bar Chart 13: Current Synagogue Membership of Households with Children.	23
Bar Chart 14: Current Synagogue Membership of Intermarried Households.	26
Bar Chart 15: Current Synagogue Membership of Intermarried and In-married Households.	27

SECTION 13 - SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP

Bar Chart 16: Importance of Cost as a Factor in Joining a Synagogue. 29

Bar Chart 17: Current Synagogue Member Households
Who Are Synagogue Members in the Local Community. 31

Bar Chart 18: Denomination of Synagogue Membership (Orthodox). 35

Bar Chart 19: Denomination of Synagogue Membership (Conservative). 37

Bar Chart 20: Denomination of Synagogue Membership (Reform). 39

Bar Chart 21: Both Synagogue and JCC Members. 43

Bar Chart 22: Synagogue Member Only. 44

Bar Chart 23: JCC Member Only. 45

Bar Chart 24: Neither Synagogue nor JCC Members. 46

Appendix. 47

**TABLE 1
CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS


Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Cincinnati	2008	60%		New Haven	2010	43%
Tidewater	2001	58%		Rhode Island	2002	43%
St. Paul	2004	56%		Cleveland	2011	42%
Essex-Morris	1998	56%		St. Petersburg	1994	40%
Minneapolis	2004	54%		Columbus	2013	38%
Rochester	1999	54%		Boston	2005	38%
Pittsburgh	2002	53%		Washington	2003	37%
Hartford	2000	53%		Miami	2014	36%
San Antonio	2007	52%		Chicago	2010	36%
Lehigh Valley	2007	51%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	36%
Detroit	2005	50%		Philadelphia	2009	35%
Bergen	2001	50%		Los Angeles	1997	34%
Jacksonville	2002	49%		Orlando	1993	34%
Charlotte	1997	49%		Portland (ME)	2007	33%
Harrisburg	1994	49%		Atlanta	2006	33%
Howard County	2010	48%		S Palm Beach	2005	33%
Palm Springs	1998	48%		Denver	2007	32%
Monmouth	1997	48%		Tucson	2002	32%
Milwaukee	1996	48%		W Palm Beach	2005	30%
St. Louis	2014	46%		San Diego	2003	29%
Baltimore	2010	46%		Phoenix	2002	29%
Westport	2000	46%		Broward	1997	27%
Wilmington	1995	46%		San Francisco	2004	22%
Sarasota	2001	45%		East Bay	2011	21%
York	1999	45%		Seattle	2000	21%
Richmond	1994	45%		Las Vegas	2005	14%
New York	2011	44%		NJPS ¹	2000	40%
Middlesex	2008	44%				
Atlantic County	2004	44%				

¹ NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.

1

CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP

(Jewish Households)



**TABLE 2
LIFETIME SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

			NOT a Current Member					
			Was a Member in the Past as an Adult		Was NOT a Member in the Past as an Adult			
Community	Year	Current Member ①	Plan to Join in the Future ②	Do NOT Plan to Join in the Future ③	Plan to Join in the Future ④	Do NOT Plan to Join in the Future ⑤	Total Who Plan to Join in the Future ⑥	Lifetime Membership ⑦
Monmouth	1997	48%	11	21	6	15	17%	85%
S Palm Beach	2005	33%	10	38	3	17	13%	84%
W Palm Beach	2005	30%	14	37	3	16	17%	84%
Tidewater	2001	58%	10	10	6	17	16%	83%
San Antonio	2007	52%	10	17	4	17	14%	83%
Middlesex	2008	44%	8	27	3	17	12%	83%
Hartford	2000	53%	8	15	6	18	14%	82%
Jacksonville	2002	49%	12	14	7	18	19%	82%
Atlantic County	2004	44%	12	23	3	18	15%	82%
Lehigh Valley	2007	51%	11	16	3	19	14%	81%
Bergen	2001	50%	8	15	7	19	15%	81%
Detroit	2005	50%	9	18	4	20	12%	80%
Sarasota	2001	45%	6	25	3	21	9%	79%
Westport	2000	46%	8	13	11	22	19%	78%
Rochester	1999	54%	7	10	5	23	12%	77%
Harrisburg	1994	49%	8	11	9	23	17%	77%
Milwaukee	1996	48%	7	13	8	23	15%	77%
St. Paul	2004	56%	6	8	6	24	13%	76%
Minneapolis	2004	54%	6	9	8	24	14%	76%

**TABLE 2
LIFETIME SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

			NOT a Current Member					
			Was a Member in the Past as an Adult		Was NOT a Member in the Past as an Adult			
Community	Year	Current Member ①	Plan to Join in the Future ②	Do NOT Plan to Join in the Future ③	Plan to Join in the Future ④	Do NOT Plan to Join in the Future ⑤	Total Who Plan to Join in the Future ⑥	Lifetime Membership ⑦
Charlotte	1997	49%	7	10	10	24	17%	76%
Richmond	1994	45%	8	14	10	24	18%	76%
Orlando	1993	34%	15	15	11	25	26%	76%
Broward	1997	27%	11	32	6	24	17%	76%
Rhode Island	2002	43%	8	15	9	25	18%	75%
St. Petersburg	1994	40%	9	20	5	26	14%	75%
New Haven	2010	43%	7	21	4	26	11%	74%
Washington	2003	37%	10	12	14	27	24%	73%
Los Angeles	1997	34%	9	13	14	30	23%	70%
Tucson	2002	32%	10	19	9	30	19%	70%
Portland (ME)	2007	33%	7	17	8	35	15%	65%
Las Vegas	2005	14%	17	24	10	35	27%	65%
Wilmington	1995	46%	20		33		NA	NA
East Bay	2011	21%	22		56		NA	NA
Seattle	2000	21%	20		59		36%	NA
NJPS ¹	2000	40%	25		35		NA	NA

**TABLE 2
LIFETIME SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

			NOT a Current Member					
			Was a Member in the Past as an Adult		Was NOT a Member in the Past as an Adult			
Community	Year	Current Member ①	Plan to Join in the Future ②	Do NOT Plan to Join in the Future ③	Plan to Join in the Future ④	Do NOT Plan to Join in the Future ⑤	Total Who Plan to Join in the Future ⑥	Lifetime Membership ⑦

¹ NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.


Jewish households are divided into five categories of synagogue membership based upon the respondents' responses to the following questions:

1. "(Are you/Is anyone in your household) currently a synagogue member?" Based upon the response, a household was categorized as either a *Current Member* (①) or *NOT a Current Member* (② + ③ + ④ + ⑤).
2. If *NOT a Current Member*: "At any time since becoming an adult, (have you/has anyone in your household) ever been a synagogue member?" Based upon the response, a household was categorized as either *Was a Member in the Past as an Adult* (② + ③) or *Was NOT a Member in the Past as an Adult* (④ + ⑤).
3. If *NOT a Current Member*: "Will (you/your household) definitely, probably, probably not, or definitely not become a synagogue member in the future?" (A response of don't know was accepted, but was not read to the respondent.) A household in which the respondent responded definitely or probably was categorized as *Plan to Join in the Future* (② + ④), and a household in which the respondent responded probably not, definitely not, or don't know was categorized as *Do NOT Plan to Join in the Future* (③ + ⑤).

Also shown are the total percentage of households who plan to join a synagogue in the future (regardless of past membership) (⑥) and lifetime synagogue membership (⑦). *Lifetime synagogue membership* is defined as the percentage of households who are members of a synagogue at some time during their adult lives (including households who plan to join a synagogue in the future).


2 WAS A SYNAGOGUE MEMBER IN THE PAST, PLAN TO JOIN AGAIN IN THE FUTURE

(Jewish Households)




3 WAS A SYNAGOGUE MEMBER IN THE PAST, DO NOT PLAN TO JOIN AGAIN IN THE FUTURE

(Jewish Households)



4 WAS NOT A SYNAGOGUE MEMBER IN THE PAST, PLAN TO JOIN IN THE FUTURE


(Jewish Households)



5

PLAN TO JOIN A SYNAGOGUE IN THE FUTURE

(Jewish Households)



6

LIFETIME SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP

(Jewish Households)




TABLE 3								
CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD								
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS								
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS								
Community	Year	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+	65+	All
St. Paul	2004	17%	48%	66%	76%	69%	71%	56%
Harrisburg	1994	28%	44%	62%	71%	64%	68%	49%
Richmond	1994	15%	43%	60%	48%	68%	60%	45%
Tidewater	2001	27%	58%	59%	70%	79%	75%	58%
Cincinnati	2008	42%	63%	58%	49%	77%	64%	60%
Pittsburgh	2002	29%	52%	57%	62%	65%	64%	53%
York	1999	17%	40%	57%	44%	54%	49%	45%
Minneapolis	2004	32%	46%	55%	63%	73%	69%	54%
Charlotte	1997	39%	46%	54%	69%	68%	68%	49%
Rochester	1999	28%	49%	53%	69%	67%	68%	54%
Detroit	2005	57%	64%	52%	49%	33%	39%	50%
Bergen	2001	31%	58%	52%	49%	44%	47%	50%
Milwaukee	1996	29%	48%	52%	54%	60%	57%	48%
Howard County	2010	NA	51%	51%	NA	NA	40%	48%
Hartford	2000	15%	61%	49%	55%	62%	59%	53%
Wilmington	1995	29%	41%	49%	63%	69%	64%	46%
San Antonio	2007	55%	55%	47%	56%	57%	56%	52%
Monmouth	1997	24%	55%	47%	50%	50%	50%	48%
Baltimore	2010	34%	53%	47%	54%	43%	48%	46%
Lehigh Valley	2007	35%	51%	47%	59%	62%	60%	51%
Westport	2000	19%	57%	46%	30%	52%	40%	46%
Washington	2003	19%	42%	46%	44%	32%	37%	37%
Palm Springs	1998	27%	47%	44%	59%	51%	56%	48%
New Haven	2010	41%		44%	42%	43%	43%	43%
Atlantic County	2004	NA	49%	43%	43%	43%	43%	44%
New York	2011	57%	45%	43%	33%	43%	39%	44%

**TABLE 3
CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+	65+	All
Chicago	2010	25%	40%	42%	39%	32%	35%	36%
Columbus	2013	38%	24%	42%	43%	44%	44%	38%
Sarasota	2001	NA	40%	41%	55%	43%	47%	45%
St. Louis	2014	47%	34%	41%	53%	66%	59%	46%
Miami	2014	30%	45%	40%	34%	29%	32%	36%
Cleveland	2011	54%	42%	40%	29%	51%	41%	42%
Jacksonville	2002	44%	47%	38%	60%	72%	67%	49%
Middlesex	2008	44%	44%	37%	42%	54%	49%	44%
Rhode Island	2002	24%	43%	37%	59%	55%	57%	43%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	NA	47%	36%	40%	28%	36%	36%
Denver	2007	24%	29%	36%	34%	44%	38%	32%
St. Petersburg	1994	31%	40%	35%	46%	45%	45%	40%
Portland (ME)	2007	NA	36%	34%	31%	43%	37%	33%
San Diego	2003	20%	31%	33%	23%	32%	28%	29%
Atlanta	2006	31%	33%	31%	24%	60%	40%	33%
W Palm Beach	2005	10%	22%	31%	31%	34%	33%	30%
Tucson	2002	17%	30%	30%	39%	45%	43%	32%
Phoenix	2002	18%	30%	28%	33%	37%	36%	29%
S Palm Beach	2005	27%	38%	27%	33%	34%	34%	33%
Broward	1997	17%	36%	22%	30%	26%	28%	27%
Orlando	1993	15%	38%	20%	68%	62%	65%	34%
East Bay	2011	20%	24%	19%	20%	23%	21%	21%
Las Vegas	2005	14%	10%	12%	17%	21%	19%	14%
Essex-Morris	1998	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	53%	56%
NJPS ¹	2000	34%	41%	42%	40%	41%	40%	40%


¹ NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.

7

CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP

HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD UNDER AGE 35

(Jewish Households)




8

CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP

HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AGE 35-49


(Jewish Households)



9


CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP

HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AGE 50-64 (Jewish Households)



10

CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AGE 65-74 (Jewish Households)




11

CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP


HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AGE 75 AND OVER

(Jewish Households)



12

CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AGE 65 AND OVER (Jewish Households)



**TABLE 4
CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Cincinnati	2008	74%		Richmond	1994	50%
Detroit	2005	71%		St. Louis	2014	49%
Bergen	2001	65%		New Haven	2010	49%
Essex-Morris	1998	65%		St. Petersburg	1994	49%
New York	2011	64%		Chicago	2010	48%
Tidewater	2001	64%		Los Angeles	1997	48%
Hartford	2000	64%		S Palm Beach	2005	46%
Cleveland	2011	60%		York	1999	46%
San Antonio	2007	60%		Wilmington	1995	46%
Pittsburgh	2002	60%		Atlanta	2006	44%
Sarasota	2001	60%		Rhode Island	2002	44%
Westport	2000	60%		Harrisburg	1994	43%
Baltimore	2010	58%		Orlando	1993	43%
Jacksonville	2002	58%		Philadelphia	2009	41%
Howard County	2010	57%		Tucson	2002	41%
Phoenix	2002	57%		Broward	1997	40%
Rochester	1999	57%		Portland (ME)	2007	39%
Monmouth	1997	57%		San Diego	2003	38%
Washington	2003	56%		Columbus	2013	37%
Charlotte	1997	56%		Denver	2007	37%
Milwaukee	1996	56%		Palm Springs	1998	37%
Lehigh Valley	2007	55%		San Francisco	2004	33%
Atlantic County	2004	54%		W Palm Beach	2005	31%
St. Paul	2004	54%		East Bay	2011	28%
Middlesex	2008	53%		Las Vegas	2005	16%
Minneapolis	2004	53%		NJPS ¹	2000	55%
Miami	2014	51%				

¹ NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.

13

CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN



**TABLE 5
CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP BY TYPE OF MARRIAGE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: MARRIED JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	In-married	<i>Intermarried</i>
Cincinnati	2008	80%	38%
Tidewater	2001	84%	37%
Charlotte	1997	82%	32%
Essex-Morris	1998	NA	30%
Sarasota	2001	54%	28%
Pittsburgh	2002	83%	27%
Jacksonville	2002	80%	27%
Boston	2005	63%	27%
St. Louis	2014	71%	26%
Lehigh Valley	2007	71%	26%
Hartford	2000	69%	26%
San Antonio	2007	81%	25%
Howard County	2010	69%	24%
Milwaukee	1996	67%	24%
York	1999	72%	23%
Westport	2000	72%	22%
Miami	2014	51%	22%
Minneapolis	2004	77%	21%
Richmond	1994	69%	20%
Rhode Island	2002	67%	20%
Portland (ME)	2007	58%	20%
St. Paul	2004	81%	19%
Washington	2003	67%	19%
Philadelphia	2009	50%	19%
Rochester	1999	76%	18%
Harrisburg	1994	74%	18%
Detroit	2005	70%	17%
Bergen	2001	63%	17%
New Haven	2010	62%	17%

**TABLE 5
CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP BY TYPE OF MARRIAGE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: MARRIED JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	In-married	<i>Intermarried</i>
Chicago	2010	55%	16%
Middlesex	2008	51%	16%
New York	2011	68%	15%
Atlantic County	2004	59%	15%
Tucson	2002	53%	15%
Columbus	2013	87%	14%
Baltimore	2010	72%	14%
Wilmington	1995	67%	14%
Cleveland	2011	69%	13%
Denver	2007	63%	13%
Monmouth	1997	60%	13%
Orlando	1993	54%	13%
San Francisco	2004	45%	13%
S Palm Beach	2005	40%	13%
Los Angeles	1997	52%	11%
Broward	1997	38%	11%
San Diego	2003	52%	10%
East Bay	2011	47%	10%
Phoenix	2002	47%	10%
W Palm Beach	2005	38%	10%
Palm Springs	1998	64%	9%
St. Petersburg	1994	62%	9%
Atlanta	2006	70%	7%
Las Vegas	2005	23%	6%
Seattle	2000	54%	2%
NJPS ¹	2000	62%	23%

¹ NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.

14

CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP OF INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS



15

CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP OF INTERMARRIED AND IN-MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS




TABLE 6				
IMPORTANCE OF COST AS A FACTOR IN JOINING A SYNAGOGUE				
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS				
BASE: RESPONDENTS IN SYNAGOGUE NON-MEMBER HOUSEHOLDS				
Community	Year	<i>Very Important</i>	Somewhat Important	Not at All Important
Orlando	1993	46%	36	18
Los Angeles	1997	36%	35	29
Richmond	1994	27%	28	45
Harrisburg	1994	26%	20	54
Milwaukee	1996	23%	24	53
St. Petersburg	1994	21%	16	63

16

IMPORTANCE OF COST AS A FACTOR IN JOINING A SYNAGOGUE

% Very Important
(Respondents in Synagogue Non-Member Households)





TABLE 7						
CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBER HOUSEHOLDS						
WHO ARE SYNAGOGUE MEMBERS IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY						
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS						
BASE: SYNAGOGUE MEMBER HOUSEHOLDS						
Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Lehigh Valley	2007	100%		Rhode Island	2002	96%
San Antonio	2007	100%		Bergen	2001	96%
Detroit	2005	100%		New Haven	2010	95%
Minneapolis	2004	100%		Orlando	1993	95%
St. Paul	2004	100%		Tucson	2002	93%
Washington	2003	100%		Miami	2014	91%
Jacksonville	2002	100%		Monmouth	1997	91%
Tidewater	2001	100%		Las Vegas	2005	89%
Hartford	2000	100%		St. Petersburg	1994	89%
Rochester	1999	100%		Middlesex	2008	87%
York	1999	100%		Howard County	2010	81%
Milwaukee	1996	100%		Sarasota	2001	73%
Wilmington	1995	100%		Broward	1997	73%
Harrisburg	1994	100%		Atlantic County	2004	64%
Richmond	1994	100%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	64%
Charlotte	1997	99%		S Palm Beach	2005	57%
Portland (ME)	2007	98%		Palm Springs	1998	54%
Westport	2000	98%		W Palm Beach	2005	51%

17 CURRENT SYNAGOGUE MEMBER HOUSEHOLDS WHO ARE SYNAGOGUE MEMBERS IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

(Synagogue Member Households)



**TABLE 8
DENOMINATION OF SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP
BASED UPON THE SYNAGOGUE SURVEY
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: SYNAGOGUE MEMBER JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Orthodox	Conser- vative	Recon- struc- tionist	Reform	Tradi- tional	Other ²
Monmouth	1997	46%	33	0	21	0	0
Miami	2014	43%	25	1	30	0	1
Bergen	2001	28%	45	1	26	0	1
Middlesex	2008	27%	43	0	18	0	12
New Haven	2010	25%	41	0	31	0	3
Lehigh Valley	2007	20%	42	4	33	0	0
Portland (ME)	2007	19%	32	0	34	0	15
S Palm Beach ☼	2005	19%	46	0	32	0	3
Atlantic County	2004	18%	53	1	29	0	0
Harrisburg	1994	18%	55	5	21	0	0
San Antonio	2007	17%	25	2	51	0	5
Las Vegas	2005	17%	23	2	53	0	5
W Palm Beach ☼	2005	16%	54	0	28	0	3
Rochester	1999	16%	36	0	48	0	0
Los Angeles *	1997	14%	38	3	44	0	2
Westport	2000	13%	29	0	57	0	2
Milwaukee	1996	13%	33	1	53	0	0
Detroit	2005	12%	31	0	52	0	5
Broward	1997	12%	51	2	29	3	3
Washington	2003	11%	42	3	38	0	6
Rhode Island	2002	11%	49	0	40	0	0
Essex-Morris *	1998	11%	51	0	33	0	5

**TABLE 8
DENOMINATION OF SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP
BASED UPON THE SYNAGOGUE SURVEY
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: SYNAGOGUE MEMBER JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Orthodox	Conser- vative	Recon- struc- tionist	Reform	Tradi- tional	Other ²
Richmond	1994	11%	49	0	39	0	0
Jacksonville	2002	10%	51	0	40	0	0
Hartford	2000	9%	54	0	36	0	1
St. Louis	2014	8%	23	2	59	6	3
Buffalo	1995	8%	31	7	53	0	1
Tidewater	2001	7%	53	0	39	0	1
Minneapolis	2004	6%	47	1	46	0	1
Tucson	2002	5%	38	0	53	0	4
Charlotte	1997	5%	41	0	51	0	3
St. Paul	2004	4%	59	0	24	0	13
Sarasota	2001	4%	33	0	46	0	16
Wilmington	1995	4%	25	13	38	21	0
Orlando	1993	3%	61	0	36	0	0
St. Petersburg	1994	2%	33	0	65	0	0
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	0%	0	0	100	0	0
York	1999	0%	30	0	70	0	0
NJPS * ¹	2000	21%	33	3	39		4

⊕ Includes membership in all South Florida synagogues, not just in the service area of each Jewish Federation.

* Results are based upon the Telephone Survey.

¹ NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.

² Includes Jewish Humanistic, Jewish Renewal, unaffiliated, non-denominational, Havurah, etc.

Notes: 1) The *synagogue survey* gathered information from the local synagogues concerning the number of households who are current synagogue members.

2) Membership in Sephardic synagogues is included in *Orthodox*.

**TABLE 9
ORTHODOX SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP
BASED UPON THE SYNAGOGUE SURVEY
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: SYNAGOGUE MEMBER JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS


Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Monmouth	1997	46%		Rhode Island	2002	11%
Miami	2014	43%		Essex-Morris *	1998	11%
Bergen	2001	28%		Richmond	1994	11%
Middlesex	2008	27%		Jacksonville	2002	10%
New Haven	2010	25%		Hartford	2000	9%
Lehigh Valley	2007	20%		St. Louis	2014	8%
Portland (ME)	2007	19%		Buffalo	1995	8%
S Palm Beach 🌐	2005	19%		Tidewater	2001	7%
Atlantic County	2004	18%		Minneapolis	2004	6%
Harrisburg	1994	18%		Tucson	2002	5%
San Antonio	2007	17%		Charlotte	1997	5%
Las Vegas	2005	17%		St. Paul	2004	4%
W Palm Beach 🌐	2005	16%		Sarasota	2001	4%
Rochester	1999	16%		Wilmington	1995	4%
Los Angeles *	1997	14%		Orlando	1993	3%
Westport	2000	13%		St. Petersburg	1994	2%
Milwaukee	1996	13%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	0%
Detroit	2005	12%		York	1999	0%
Broward	1997	12%		NJPS * 1	2000	21%
Washington	2003	11%		See footnotes to Table 8.		

18

DENOMINATION OF SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP

ORTHODOX

(Based Upon the Synagogue Survey)
(Synagogue Member Households)



* Based upon the Telephone Survey.

**TABLE 10
CONSERVATIVE SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP
BASED UPON THE SYNAGOGUE SURVEY
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: SYNAGOGUE MEMBER JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS


Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Orlando	1993	61%		Tucson	2002	38%
St. Paul	2004	59%		Los Angeles *	1997	38%
Harrisburg	1994	55%		Rochester	1999	36%
W Palm Beach 🌐	2005	54%		Sarasota	2001	33%
Hartford	2000	54%		Monmouth	1997	33%
Atlantic County	2004	53%		Milwaukee	1996	33%
Tidewater	2001	53%		St. Petersburg	1994	33%
Jacksonville	2002	51%		Portland (ME)	2007	32%
Essex-Morris *	1998	51%		Detroit	2005	31%
Broward	1997	51%		Buffalo	1995	31%
Rhode Island	2002	49%		York	1999	30%
Richmond	1994	49%		Westport	2000	29%
Minneapolis	2004	47%		Miami	2014	25%
S Palm Beach 🌐	2005	46%		San Antonio	2007	25%
Bergen	2001	45%		Wilmington	1995	25%
Middlesex	2008	43%		St. Louis	2014	23%
Lehigh Valley	2007	42%		Las Vegas	2005	23%
Washington	2003	42%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	0%
New Haven	2010	41%		NJPS * 1	2000	33%
Charlotte	1997	41%				
				See footnotes to Table 8 .		

19

DENOMINATION OF SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP

CONSERVATIVE

(Based Upon the Synagogue Survey)
(Synagogue Member Households)



* Based upon the Telephone Survey.

TABLE 11
REFORM SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP
BASED UPON THE SYNAGOGUE SURVEY
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS

BASE: SYNAGOGUE MEMBER JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS


Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	100%		Washington	2003	38%
York	1999	70%		Wilmington	1995	38%
St. Petersburg	1994	65%		Hartford	2000	36%
St. Louis	2014	59%		Orlando	1993	36%
Westport	2000	57%		Portland (ME)	2007	34%
Las Vegas	2005	53%		Lehigh Valley	2007	33%
Tucson	2002	53%		Essex-Morris *	1998	33%
Milwaukee	1996	53%		S Palm Beach ☼	2005	32%
Buffalo	1995	53%		New Haven	2010	31%
Detroit	2005	52%		Miami	2014	30%
San Antonio	2007	51%		Atlantic County	2004	29%
Charlotte	1997	51%		Broward	1997	29%
Rochester	1999	48%		W Palm Beach ☼	2005	28%
Minneapolis	2004	46%		Bergen	2001	26%
Sarasota	2001	46%		St. Paul	2004	24%
Los Angeles *	1997	44%		Monmouth	1997	21%
Jacksonville	2002	40%		Harrisburg	1994	21%
Rhode Island	2002	40%		Middlesex	2008	18%
Tidewater	2001	39%		NJPS * 1	2000	39%
Richmond	1994	39%		See footnotes to Table 8.		

20

DENOMINATION OF SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP

REFORM

(Based Upon the Synagogue Survey)
(Synagogue Member Households)



* Based upon the Telephone Survey.

**TABLE 12
OVERLAP BETWEEN SYNAGOGUE
AND JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER MEMBERSHIPS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Both Synagogue and JCC Member	Synagogue Member Only	JCC Member Only	<i>Neither Synagogue nor JCC Member</i>
Las Vegas ☼	2005	2%	12	2	85
Broward (Soref) *	1997	4%	22	1	73
W Palm Beach (Boynton) *	2005	5%	22	4	69
Washington (NOVA) *	2003	5%	27	2	67
Broward (Posnack) *	1997	8%	21	4	67
Atlanta	2006	8%	25	2	65
S Palm Beach	2005	6%	26	3	64
Miami (Alper) *	2014	5%	27	5	63
Washington (DCJCC) *	2003	6%	26	5	63
Chicago	2010	6%	30	2	62
Columbus	2013	13%	25	2	61
Miami (Russell) *	2014	7%	28	4	60
Tucson	2002	9%	23	8	60
Orlando	1993	11%	23	6	60
W Palm Beach (Kaplan) *	2005	9%	28	4	59
St. Petersburg	1994	9%	32	3	57
Monmouth (Western) * ☼	1997	6%	37	1	56
Middlesex	2008	2%	42	1	55
New Haven	2010	10%	32	4	54
Rhode Island	2002	6%	37	4	54
Cleveland	2011	13%	29	5	53
Westport **	2000	0%	46	1	53

**TABLE 12
OVERLAP BETWEEN SYNAGOGUE
AND JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER MEMBERSHIPS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Both Synagogue and JCC Member	Synagogue Member Only	JCC Member Only	<i>Neither Synagogue nor JCC Member</i>
Howard County **	2010	3%	45	0	52
Atlantic County	2004	10%	34	5	52
Sarasota	2001	8%	37	4	52
Washington (Gr. Wash) *	2003	7%	38	4	51
Richmond	1994	19%	26	5	50
Bergen (YJCC) *	2001	9%	39	3	49
Wilmington	1995	18%	28	5	49
St. Louis	2014	19%	26	6	48
Miami (Miami Beach) *	2014	13%	33	6	48
Baltimore	2010	13%	32	6	48
Jacksonville	2002	22%	27	4	47
Detroit	2005	11%	39	4	46
Harrisburg	1994	26%	23	5	46
Lehigh Valley	2007	14%	37	4	45
York	1999	17%	28	10	45
Charlotte	1997	30%	19	6	45
Milwaukee	1996	17%	32	7	44
Bergen (Palisades) *	2001	16%	36	6	43
San Antonio	2007	23%	29	6	42
Minneapolis	2004	13%	40	4	42
Tidewater	2001	18%	39	1	42
Hartford	2000	17%	36	5	42

TABLE 12
OVERLAP BETWEEN SYNAGOGUE
AND JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER MEMBERSHIPS
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Both Synagogue and JCC Member	Synagogue Member Only	JCC Member Only	Neither Synagogue nor JCC Member
Pittsburgh	2002	17%	36	6	41
Rochester	1999	21%	33	7	39
Monmouth (Deal) *	1997	25%	32	5	37
St. Paul	2004	27%	28	9	36
Total in Communities with 2+ JCCs					
Broward	1997	5%	22	2	71
W Palm Beach	2005	6%	24	4	66
Washington	2003	6%	31	3	60
Miami	2014	7%	29	5	59
Monmouth	1997	12%	36	2	50
Bergen	2001	13%	37	5	45
NJPS ¹	2000	14%	26	4	56

* In communities with more than one JCC and where data are available for each JCC, results reflect only the memberships of households who live in the service area of each JCC.

** The JCCs are located in neighboring communities.

⊗ JCC is not a full service facility.


¹ NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.

Note: Synagogue membership includes both local and non-local synagogues where available. In some communities, mostly communities with a significant number of part-year households, membership in non-local JCCs is also included.

21

BOTH SYNAGOGUE AND JCC MEMBERS


(Jewish Households)



22

SYNAGOGUE MEMBER ONLY


(Jewish Households)



23


JCC MEMBER ONLY

(Jewish Households)



24

NEITHER SYNAGOGUE NOR JCC MEMBERS (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.