

## **COMPARISONS OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES: A COMPENDIUM OF TABLES AND BAR CHARTS**

*Comparisons of Jewish Communities: A Compendium of Tables and Bar Charts* was prepared by Dr. Ira M. Sheskin for the Berman Jewish DataBank, under a grant provided by the Mandell and Madeleine Berman Foundation and with support from The Jewish Federations of North America.

The compendium is a single source of tables and bar charts designed to provide a comparative context for understanding American Jewish communities. It is intended for local Jewish communities seeking to compare themselves to others, as well as for researchers, teachers, and students of American Jewry.

Each of the 36 Sections of this compendium is available as a stand-alone PDF. A single PDF (a "portfolio of all Sections") with all content is also available.

The comparison tables and bar charts are based on local Jewish community studies archived at the DataBank ([www.jewishdatabank.org](http://www.jewishdatabank.org)). The Data Bank holds reports, questionnaires, methodological documentation and information about sponsoring organizations and researchers for each study in the compendium. From time to time, the compendium is updated with information from new local Jewish community studies.

Following social science convention, the year of each community study reflects when the survey interviews were completed, which may differ from the year the study report was issued.

The compendium also includes information from the National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01 (NJPS, [www.jewishdatabank.org/NJPS2000.asp](http://www.jewishdatabank.org/NJPS2000.asp)) and the US Census Bureau's Decennial Census and American Community Survey (ACS, [www.census.gov/acs/www/](http://www.census.gov/acs/www/)).

The Appendix at the end of this section provides further information to help readers use the tables and bar charts.

For further information or inquiries, please contact the Data Bank at:  
[info@jewishdatabank.org](mailto:info@jewishdatabank.org).

**Note that this edition of *Comparisons of Jewish Communities* (Current Jewish Population Report 12) is an updated version of reports released in 2012 (Report 5) and 2013 (Report 8). It replaces the Columbus 2001 results with 2013 results, Miami 2004 results with 2014 results, and St. Louis 1995 results with 2014 results.**

---

Dr. Sheskin ([isheskin@miami.edu](mailto:isheskin@miami.edu)) is the Director of the Jewish Demography Project of the Sue and Leonard Miller Center for Contemporary Judaic Studies and Professor and Chair of Geography and Regional Studies at the University of Miami.

## **SECTION 21 - INFORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION OF CHILDREN CAMP AND YOUTH GROUP**

June 2015

### **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Day Camp Attended or Worked at by Jewish Children This Past Summer . . .	3
Table 2: Overnight Camp Attended or Worked at by Jewish Children This Past Summer . . . . .	9
Table 3: Familiarity with the Local Jewish Overnight Camp . . . . .	15
Table 4: Perception of the Local Jewish Overnight Camp . . . . .	18
Table 5: Participate in a Jewish Teenage Youth Group . . . . .	21
Table 6: Jewish Children Currently Involved in Formal or Informal Jewish Education	23

### **LIST OF BAR CHARTS**

Bar Chart 1: Attended or Worked at a Jewish Day Camp This Past Summer . . . . .	5
Bar Chart 2: Attended or Worked at a Non-Jewish Day Camp This Past Summer . . .	6
Bar Chart 3: Did Not Attend or Work at a Day Camp This Past Summer . . . . .	7
Bar Chart 4: Jewish Day Camp Market Share This Past Summer . . . . .	8
Bar Chart 5: Attended or Worked at a Jewish Overnight Camp This Past Summer . .	11
Bar Chart 6: Attended or Worked at a Non-Jewish Overnight Camp This Past Summer . . . . .	12
Bar Chart 7: Did Not Attend or Work at an Overnight Camp This Past Summer . . . .	13
Bar Chart 8: Jewish Overnight Camp Market Share This Past Summer . . . . .	14
Bar Chart 9: Very Familiar with Local Jewish Overnight Camp . . . . .	16
Bar Chart 10: Not at All Familiar with Local Jewish Overnight Camp . . . . .	17
Bar Chart 11: Excellent Perceptions of Local Jewish Overnight Camp . . . . .	19
Bar Chart 12: Fair/Poor Perceptions of Local Jewish Overnight Camp . . . . .	20
Bar Chart 13: Participate in a Jewish Teenage Youth Group . . . . .	22
Bar Chart 14: Jewish Children Currently Involved in Formal or Informal Jewish Education . . . . .	24
Appendix . . . . .	25

**TABLE 1**  
**DAY CAMP ATTENDED OR WORKED AT**  
**BY JEWISH CHILDREN THIS PAST SUMMER**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 3-17

Community	Year	Attended or Worked at a Day Camp		Did Not Attend or Work at a Day Camp	Jewish Day Camp Market Share ①
		Jewish	Non- Jewish		
Miami	2014	37%	12	52	76%
San Antonio	2007	33%	10	58	78%
Charlotte	1997	33%	10	57	76%
Jacksonville	2002	32%	8	60	81%
Minneapolis	2004	31%	8	62	80%
Portland (ME)	2007	30%	18	52	62%
Middlesex	2008	29%	22	50	57%
Rochester	1999	26%	19	55	58%
Bergen	2001	25%	17	58	61%
Monmouth	1997	25%	36	39	41%
Atlantic County	2004	23%	12	65	66%
Tidewater	2001	23%	13	65	64%
St. Paul	2004	22%	8	70	73%
Lehigh Valley	2007	22%	16	63	58%
Sarasota	2001	21%	5	74	83%
New Haven	2010	21%	19	60	53%
W Palm Beach	2005	21%	20	59	51%
S Palm Beach	2005	21%	28	51	43%
Richmond	1994	20%	12	68	62%
Milwaukee	1996	19%	9	72	69%

**TABLE 1**  
**DAY CAMP ATTENDED OR WORKED AT**  
**BY JEWISH CHILDREN THIS PAST SUMMER**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 3-17

Community	Year	Attended or Worked at a Day Camp		Did Not Attend or Work at a Day Camp	Jewish Day Camp Market Share ❶
		Jewish	Non- Jewish		
Las Vegas	2005	18%	10	72	63%
Wilmington	1995	17%	18	65	50%
Washington	2003	17%	27	56	39%
Tucson	2002	15%	15	71	50%
Hartford	2000	15%	24	62	38%
Rhode Island	2002	14%	21	66	40%
Broward	1997	13%	20	68	40%
Westport	2000	6%	40	54	14%
NJPS <sup>1</sup>	2000	27%	21	52	56%


❶ The *Jewish Day Camp Market Share* is defined as the percentage of Jewish children age 3-17 attending or working at a day camp this past summer who attended or worked at a *Jewish* day camp. Market shares are calculated from small sample sizes and the results should be treated with caution.

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

1

# ATTENDED OR WORKED AT A JEWISH DAY CAMP THIS PAST SUMMER


(Jewish Children Age 3-17)



**2**


# ATTENDED OR WORKED AT A NON-JEWISH DAY CAMP THIS PAST SUMMER

(Jewish Children Age 3-17)



# 3 DID NOT ATTEND OR WORK AT A DAY CAMP THIS PAST SUMMER


(Jewish Children Age 3-17)



4

# JEWISH DAY CAMP MARKET SHARE THIS PAST SUMMER

(Jewish Children Age 3-17)





**TABLE 2  
OVERNIGHT CAMP ATTENDED OR WORKED AT  
BY JEWISH CHILDREN THIS PAST SUMMER  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

**BASE: JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 6-17**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Attended or Worked at an Overnight Camp</b>		<b>Did Not Attend or Work at an Overnight Camp</b>	<b>Jewish Overnight Camp Market Share ①</b>
		<b>Jewish</b>	<b>Non- Jewish</b>		
Miami	2014	20%	3	78	88%
Bergen	2001	20%	9	71	70%
Jacksonville	2002	19%	4	77	83%
Rochester	1999	19%	9	71	67%
Minneapolis	2004	18%	3	78	84%
St. Paul	2004	18%	7	75	74%
Rhode Island	2002	18%	12	70	60%
Middlesex	2008	17%	3	80	86%
Sarasota	2001	17%	10	73	64%
Charlotte	1997	16%	5	80	76%
Milwaukee	1996	16%	8	76	69%
New Haven	2010	15%	8	77	66%
San Antonio	2007	14%	5	80	73%
Washington	2003	14%	12	74	54%
Wilmington	1995	13%	6	81	67%
Richmond	1994	12%	16	72	42%
Westport	2000	12%	17	72	41%
Atlantic County	2004	11%	2	87	88%
Las Vegas	2005	11%	3	86	81%
S Palm Beach	2005	11%	6	84	67%
Tidewater	2001	11%	9	80	55%

**TABLE 2**  
**OVERNIGHT CAMP ATTENDED OR WORKED AT**  
**BY JEWISH CHILDREN THIS PAST SUMMER**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 6-17


Community	Year	Attended or Worked at an Overnight Camp		Did Not Attend or Work at an Overnight Camp	Jewish Overnight Camp Market Share <sup>❶</sup>
		Jewish	Non-Jewish		
Lehigh Valley	2007	10%	10	80	52%
W Palm Beach	2005	9%	3	88	74%
Tucson	2002	8%	2	91	84%
Broward	1997	8%	6	86	56%
Hartford	2000	7%	13	81	34%
Monmouth	1997	5%	4	91	57%
Portland (ME)	2007	5%	14	81	25%
NJPS <sup>1</sup>	2000	20%	8	72	70%

❶ The *Jewish Overnight Camp Market Share* is defined as the percentage of Jewish children age 3-17 attending or working at an overnight camp this past summer who attended or worked at a *Jewish* overnight camp. Market shares are calculated from small sample sizes and the results should be treated with caution.

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


# 5 ATTENDED OR WORKED AT A JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP THIS PAST SUMMER

(Jewish Children Age 6-17)




# 6 ATTENDED OR WORKED AT A NON-JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP THIS PAST SUMMER

(Jewish Children Age 6-17)




# 7 DID NOT ATTEND OR WORK AT AN OVERNIGHT CAMP THIS PAST SUMMER

(Jewish Children Age 6-17)



# 8 JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP MARKET SHARE THIS PAST SUMMER

(Jewish Children Age 6-17)




**TABLE 3**  
**FAMILIARITY WITH THE LOCAL JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

**BASE: RESPONDENTS**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b><i>Very Familiar</i></b>	<b>Somewhat Familiar</b>	<b>Not at All Familiar</b>
Detroit	2005	40%	35	25
New Haven	2010	23%	37	40
Rhode Island	2002	19%	34	47

# 9 VERY FAMILIAR WITH LOCAL JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP

(Respondents)






10

# NOT AT ALL FAMILIAR WITH LOCAL JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP

(Respondents)



**TABLE 4**  
**PERCEPTION OF THE LOCAL JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


**BASE: RESPONDENTS VERY/SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR  
WITH THE LOCAL JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b><i>Excellent</i></b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Excellent/ Good</b>
Rhode Island	2002	41%	51	8	1	91%
Detroit	2005	40%	48	9	2	88%
New Haven	2010	31%	56	11	2	87%

11

# EXCELLENT PERCEPTIONS OF LOCAL JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP


(Respondents Who Are Very/Somewhat Familiar)



# 12

## FAIR/POOR PERCEPTIONS OF LOCAL JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP

(Respondents Who Are Very/Somewhat Familiar)



**TABLE 5  
PARTICIPATE IN A JEWISH TEENAGE YOUTH GROUP  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


**BASE: JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 13-17**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>%</b>		<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>%</b>
San Antonio	2007	48%		Lehigh Valley	2007	37%
Detroit	2005	48%		Miami	2014	33%
Milwaukee	1996	43%		New Haven	2010	32%
Middlesex	2008	41%		Portland (ME)	2007	22%
Bergen	2001	39%		Las Vegas	2005	22%

# 13

# PARTICIPATE IN A JEWISH TEENAGE YOUTH GROUP

(Jewish Children Age 13-17)



**TABLE 6**  
**JEWISH CHILDREN CURRENTLY INVOLVED IN**  
**FORMAL OR INFORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION**  
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

**BASE: JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 0-17**


<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>%</b>
Detroit	2005	77%
San Antonio	2007	72%
Miami	2014	66%
Middlesex	2008	65%
Lehigh Valley	2007	62%
Portland (ME)	2007	61%
New Haven	2010	59%
Las Vegas	2005	30%

Note: Jewish children are *currently involved* in formal or informal Jewish education if they currently attend a Jewish pre-school/child care program, currently attend a Jewish day school, currently attend a Jewish supplemental school, attended or worked at a Jewish day camp this past summer, attended or worked at a Jewish overnight camp this past summer, or currently participate in a Jewish teenage youth group.

# 14

## JEWISH CHILDREN CURRENTLY INVOLVED IN FORMAL OR INFORMAL JEWISH EDUCATION

(Jewish Children Age 0-17)





## COMPARISONS OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES: A COMPENDIUM OF TABLES AND BAR CHARTS

### APPENDIX

This appendix provides further information to help readers use the tables and bar charts, including rules for inclusion of local studies in the compendium, methodological issues in comparing communities, the order of communities, and tips for reading the tables and bar charts.

#### RULES FOR INCLUSION OF COMMUNITY STUDIES

To be included in the comparison tables and bar charts, a community study must meet the following criteria:

- ❶ The study had to include a telephone survey using random digit dialing for at least part of the sample.
- ❷ The study had to be completed since 1993. If a community completed multiple studies during this period, only the results of the most recent study are shown.
- ❸ The study had to ask the questions addressed in the tables and bar charts using wording similar to other studies and to report the results in a manner facilitating comparison. In many cases where the original results were not reported in a manner facilitating comparison, Dr. Sheskin obtained the original survey data and produced results that permit comparisons. In some cases, differences in the wording of the questions or categories used to report the results are noted in the footnotes to the tables.
- ❹ The study had to ask the questions addressed in the tables and bar charts of the same set of households or persons in a household (known as the *base*) as other studies asked. For example, a question asked only about *Jewish children in Jewish households* cannot be included in the tables and bar charts with other studies that asked the same question about *all children (both Jewish and non-Jewish) in Jewish households*. Minor differences in the set of households or persons queried are noted in the footnotes to the tables. In some cases, communities for which the base is significantly different from that used in the table are listed at the end of the table with the alternative base noted. Such communities are not included in the comparison bar charts.

## COMPARISONS AMONG COMMUNITIES: METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS

As noted, comparisons among Jewish communities help provide an important context for understanding American Jewish communities. Nonetheless, the comparisons should be treated with caution for the following reasons:

❶ **Different Dates of the Studies.** The Jewish community studies included in the comparison tables and bar charts were completed over an extended period of time. Differences between Community A in 1993 and Community B in 2010 may be due to the temporal differences in the community studies. For example, the intermarriage rate in Community A may be lower than in Community B simply because the community study in Community A was completed 17 years earlier, when intermarriage rates generally were lower. This is an extreme example since most comparisons are between studies completed closer in time than in this illustration.

❷ **Different Sampling Methods.** Three different sampling methods generally have been used in Jewish community studies: a random digit dialing (RDD) only sample (drawn from randomly generated telephone numbers); an RDD sample combined with a Distinctive Jewish Name (DJN) sample (drawn from a telephone directory); and an RDD sample combined with a List sample (usually drawn from the local Jewish Federation mailing list). Only Jewish communities that used RDD sampling for at least part of the sample are included in the comparison tables and bar charts. Different sampling methods *may* lead to differences in survey results. See Section I - Methodology for the sampling methods and sample sizes used in each community study included in the comparison tables and bar charts.

❸ **Different Questionnaires.** A variety of questionnaires have been used in Jewish community studies. For examples, see the Jewish Survey Question Bank (<http://jewishquestions.bjpa.org/>). The survey research literature indicates that even small changes in question wording or in the sequence in which questions are asked on a telephone survey can have a significant impact upon survey results.

❹ **Small Sample Sizes.** In general, when comparing the overall results for Jewish households or persons in Jewish households among Jewish communities, the sample sizes used in the community studies are such that differences of five percentage points or more may be considered statistically significant. On the other hand, when comparing the results among Jewish communities for *population subgroups* (such as households with children or respondents under age 35), the sample sizes may be substantially smaller such that even differences of 10-15 percentage points may not be statistically significant.

❺ **Missing Data.** Researchers sometimes treat missing data and “don’t know” responses differently, leading to minor differences in reported results.

⑥ **Identifying Jewish Households.** While there is considerable agreement among researchers and policy makers about how to define Jewish households and persons, different studies may use different questions for qualifying Jewish households and respondents, and researchers may use different methods for deciding if households and persons should be considered Jewish when a particular case is ambiguous.

⑦ **Time-Specific Conditions.** Some comparisons are affected by the year in which a study was completed. This applies particularly to comparisons on economic variables such as income and philanthropy (which may be affected by the state of the economy in a given year) and variables related to Israel (which may be affected by the political situation in Israel in a given year).

### **ORDER OF COMMUNITIES IN THE COMPARISON TABLES AND BAR CHARTS**

**Tables.** Each comparison table is ordered based upon one particular data column (referred to as the *primary column* in the discussion below), in descending order of magnitude of the data. Except for those tables with only one data column, the primary column has an *italicized* heading. The choice of primary column is determined by the data thought to be most interesting. Thus, for example, the household size table is ordered by the percentage of one-person households and the employment status table is ordered by the percentage employed full time. While listing the communities in alphabetical order might simplify finding the results quickly for a particular community, such a presentation would be much less helpful in facilitating comparisons among Jewish communities.

When two or more communities show the same percentage (or number) in the primary column, three rules are followed to determine the order in which the communities are listed:

① The first rule applies when a secondary column is used to order the communities that show the same percentage in the primary column.

In some cases, when the primary column is the sum of two (or more) other columns, the communities are listed according to the community that has the higher percentage on the more “extreme” of the columns being summed. For example, if two communities show the same percentage for “always/usually,” the community with the highest “always” percentage is listed first.

In other cases, a table is ordered on a particular column, but a secondary “related” column is used to order the communities that show the same percentage in the primary column. For example, in the employment status table, if two communities show the same percentage for “full time,” the community with the highest “part time” percentage is listed first.

If the communities continue to show the same percentages after applying this rule, the process is continued using the next appropriate column.

② The second rule applies when the first rule is not applicable or does not resolve the situation, that is, the communities show the same percentages in all the data columns. In this case, the community with the most recent study is listed first.

③ The third rule applies when the first two rules do not resolve the situation, that is, the communities also have the same year of study. In this case, the communities are listed in alphabetical order.

Communities for which data are unavailable for the primary column (but are available for other columns) are listed below a thick horizontal line in the tables.

**Bar Charts.** Comparison bar charts correspond to each primary column in the comparison tables, with the data presented in the same order as it appears in the table. In addition, for tables with multiple data columns, additional bar charts are presented to correspond to those additional data columns thought to be most interesting, with the data presented in descending order of magnitude. In these additional bar charts, when two or more communities show the same percentage (or number), the community with the most recent study is listed first. If the communities also have the same year of study, the communities are listed in alphabetical order.

## READING THE TABLES AND BAR CHARTS

Demographic data are easily misunderstood. The most common error in interpretation occurs when readers do not concentrate on the *nature of the denominator (or base) used in calculating a percentage*. Thus, the base in each table and bar chart is generally shown directly below the title.

In some tables and bar charts, “don't know” responses are included in the computations, while in other tables and bar charts they are excluded. The inclusion or exclusion of “don't know” responses depends on whether “don't know” is a statement of value (generally included) or merely an inability to remember or a refusal to respond (generally excluded). In some tables and bar charts, “don't know” responses are treated as negative responses. For example, if a respondent does not know whether the household maintains a synagogue membership, a reasonable assumption is that they do not. Missing responses are excluded from the tables and bar charts.

The reader may notice small differences in the percentages between tables and bar charts due to rounding. At times, also due to rounding, the reported percentages may not sum to 100% and the reported numbers may not sum to the appropriate numerical total. However, the convention employed shows the total as 100% or the appropriate numerical total.

White numbers in black circles (❶, ❷, ❸, etc.) are used in the column headings of tables to indicate that definitions of the terms are provided in the footnotes at the bottom of the table.

Some of the footnotes in the tables are not included in the bar charts to simplify the presentation.

### **ERRORS IN THE TABLES AND BAR CHARTS**

In an undertaking like this, errors in the data are inevitable. Please bring potential errors to the attention of Ira Sheskin at [isheskin@miami.edu](mailto:isheskin@miami.edu).