

## **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 23 - HEALTH LIMITATIONS

June 2015

Note for Tables 5-6 .....	18
---------------------------	----

### LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Households in Which a Member Is Health Limited .....	3
Table 2: Elderly Couple Households in Which a Member Is Health Limited .....	7
Table 3: Elderly Single Households Who Are Health Limited .....	11
Table 4: Respondent's Health .....	15
Table 5: Need for Programs for Jewish Children with Learning Disabilities in the Past Year .....	19
Table 6: Need for Help in Coordinating Services for an Elderly or Disabled Person in the Past Year .....	22

### LIST OF BAR CHARTS

Bar Chart 1: Households in Which a Member is Health Limited .....	5
Bar Chart 2: Households in Which a Member is Health Limited and Needs Daily Assistance .....	6
Bar Chart 3: Elderly Couple Households in Which a Member is Health Limited .....	9
Bar Chart 4: Elderly Couple Households in Which a Member is Health Limited and Needs Daily Assistance .....	10
Bar Chart 5: Elderly Single Households in Which a Member is Health Limited .....	13
Bar Chart 6: Elderly Single Households in Which a Member is Health Limited and Need Daily Assistance .....	14
Bar Chart 7: Respondent's Health (Excellent) .....	16
Bar Chart 8: Respondent's Health (Fair/Poor) .....	17
Bar Chart 9: Need for Programs for Jewish Children with Learning Disabilities in the Past Year .....	21
Bar Chart 10: Need for Help in Coordinating Services for an Elderly or Disabled Person in the Past Year .....	23
Appendix .....	24

**TABLE 1  
HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A MEMBER IS HEALTH LIMITED  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

**BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS**

		<b>Health-Limited Member in Household</b>	
<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Daily Assistance Needed</b>
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	23%	6%
S Palm Beach	2005	22%	7%
St. Paul	2004	22%	7%
Middlesex	2008	21%	7%
Broward	1997	21%	7%
W Palm Beach	2005	20%	7%
Minneapolis	2004	19%	8%
New Haven	2010	19%	7%
Tucson	2002	19%	5%
Lehigh Valley	2007	18%	7%
Las Vegas	2005	18%	5%
St. Petersburg	1994	18%	4%
Cincinnati	2008	18%	NA
York	1999	17%	9%
Portland (ME)	2007	17%	6%
Atlantic County	2004	17%	6%
San Antonio	2007	17%	5%
Detroit	2005	17%	4%
Rochester	1999	17%	4%
Los Angeles	1997	16%	7%
Rhode Island	2002	16%	4%
San Diego	2003	16%	NA

**TABLE 1  
HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A MEMBER IS HEALTH LIMITED  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

**BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Health-Limited Member in Household</b>	
		<b>Total</b>	<b>Daily Assistance Needed</b>
Miami <sup>1</sup>	2014	15%	6%
Sarasota	2001	15%	5%
Hartford	2000	15%	5%
Milwaukee	1996	15%	5%
Jacksonville	2002	14%	6%
Bergen	2001	14%	5%
Harrisburg	1994	14%	5%
Tidewater	2001	14%	4%
Monmouth	1997	14%	4%
Wilmington	1995	12%	5%
Richmond	1994	11%	3%
Orlando	1993	10%	4%
Seattle	2000	8%	3%
Westport	2000	8%	3%
Charlotte	1997	8%	3%
Washington	2003	8%	2%
NJPS <sup>2</sup>	2000	13%	4%


<sup>1</sup> Health-Limited adults only.

<sup>2</sup> NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.

1


# HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A MEMBER IS HEALTH LIMITED

(Jewish Households)



2

# HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A MEMBER IS HEALTH LIMITED AND NEEDS DAILY ASSISTANCE (Jewish Households)



<b>TABLE 2</b>			
<b>ELDERLY COUPLE HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A MEMBER IS HEALTH LIMITED</b>			
<b>COMMUNITY COMPARISONS</b>			
<b>BASE: ELDERLY COUPLE JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS</b>			
		<b>Health-Limited Member in Household</b>	
<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Daily Assistance Needed</b>
St. Paul	2004	43%	24%
York	1999	40%	18%
Minneapolis	2004	33%	15%
San Diego	2003	31%	NA
Harrisburg	1994	30%	8%
St. Petersburg	1994	28%	8%
Richmond	1994	28%	5%
Cincinnati	2008	28%	NA
Middlesex	2008	27%	12%
Tucson	2002	27%	5%
Jacksonville	2002	26%	12%
Broward	1997	26%	11%
Charlotte	1997	25%	11%
Rhode Island	2002	25%	8%
Tidewater	2001	25%	8%
Wilmington	1995	24%	18%
Rochester	1999	24%	6%
Miami	2014	23%	11%
San Antonio	2007	23%	10%
Hartford	2000	23%	8%
Lehigh Valley	2007	22%	10%
S Palm Beach	2005	22%	9%
W Palm Beach	2005	22%	9%
Washington	2003	21%	12%

**TABLE 2  
ELDERLY COUPLE HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A MEMBER IS HEALTH LIMITED  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


**BASE: ELDERLY COUPLE JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Health-Limited Member in Household</b>	
		<b>Total</b>	<b>Daily Assistance Needed</b>
New Haven	2010	21%	11%
Portland (ME)	2007	21%	11%
Orlando	1993	21%	10%
Atlantic County	2004	20%	9%
Monmouth	1997	20%	6%
Milwaukee	1996	20%	6%
Las Vegas	2005	19%	7%
Bergen	2001	18%	8%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	18%	7%
Detroit	2005	16%	3%
Sarasota	2001	14%	6%
Westport	2000	14%	0%
NJPS <sup>1</sup>	2000	22%	12%


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



# 3 ELDERLY COUPLE HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A MEMBER IS HEALTH LIMITED



# 4 ELDERLY COUPLE HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A MEMBER IS HEALTH LIMITED AND NEEDS DAILY ASSISTANCE



**TABLE 3  
ELDERLY SINGLE HOUSEHOLDS WHO ARE HEALTH LIMITED  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

**BASE: ELDERLY SINGLE JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Health-Limited Household</b>	
		<b>Total</b>	<b>Daily Assistance Needed</b>
Lehigh Valley	2007	39%	11%
New Haven	2010	38%	12%
St. Paul	2004	37%	14%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	37%	11%
Minneapolis	2004	36%	12%
Cincinnati	2008	36%	NA
Tucson	2002	34%	11%
Rochester	1999	33%	11%
Detroit	2005	33%	5%
Portland (ME)	2007	32%	9%
Rhode Island	2002	32%	9%
Harrisburg	1994	31%	14%
Las Vegas	2005	31%	5%
Wilmington	1995	30%	12%
Miami	2014	29%	9%
San Antonio	2007	29%	4%
San Diego	2003	29%	NA
Monmouth	1997	28%	8%
Middlesex	2008	28%	7%
S Palm Beach	2005	27%	7%
Bergen	2001	27%	4%
Atlantic County	2004	26%	6%
Broward	1997	26%	6%
Milwaukee	1996	24%	6%


**TABLE 3  
ELDERLY SINGLE HOUSEHOLDS WHO ARE HEALTH LIMITED  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

**BASE: ELDERLY SINGLE JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS**


<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Health-Limited Household</b>	
		<b>Total</b>	<b>Daily Assistance Needed</b>
Tidewater	2001	24%	5%
Richmond	1994	23%	6%
Jacksonville	2002	22%	12%
Sarasota	2001	22%	7%
W Palm Beach	2005	21%	4%
Hartford	2000	20%	7%
Washington	2003	20%	4%
St. Petersburg	1994	19%	1%
York	1999	16%	7%
Charlotte	1997	13%	4%
Orlando	1993	9%	5%
Westport	2000	9%	0%
NJPS <sup>1</sup>	2000	28%	5%

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

# 5 ELDERLY SINGLE HOUSEHOLDS WHO ARE HEALTH LIMITED



# 6 ELDERLY SINGLE HOUSEHOLDS WHO ARE HEALTH LIMITED AND NEED DAILY ASSISTANCE



**TABLE 4  
RESPONDENT'S HEALTH  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


**BASE: RESPONDENTS**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Very Good</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b><i>Fair/ Poor</i></b>
Pittsburgh	2002	44%	NA	40	12	4	16%
Cleveland	2010	42%	NA	41	14	3	17%
Denver	2007	38%	32	15	10	5	15%
St. Louis	2014	38%	NA	44	15	3	18%
New York	2011	37%	NA	38	17	8	25%
Howard County	2010	35%	26	23	12	4	17%
Philadelphia	2009	33%	28	22	11	4	15%
Atlanta	2006	32%	26	26	14	2	16%
Cincinnati	2008	31%	30	26	10	3	13%
Chicago	2010	29%	33	21	11	5	16%
Baltimore	2010	28%	39	18	11	4	15%

# 7

## RESPONDENT'S HEALTH

Excellent  
(Respondents)






# 8

## RESPONDENT'S HEALTH

Fair/Poor  
(Respondents)



## NOTE FOR TABLES 5-6

Note for **Tables 5-6**: While the best indicators of social service needs include such factors as age, household structure, and household income, respondents in Jewish households in the communities listed in these tables were asked directly about their need for a variety of social services in the past year. When respondents reported that their households needed a service, they were asked whether the service had been received. If the households received the service, the respondents were asked whether the service had been received from a Jewish source (*Jewish*) or a non-Jewish source (*Other*).

**TABLE 5  
NEED FOR PROGRAMS FOR JEWISH CHILDREN  
WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES IN THE PAST YEAR  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

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

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Total Who Needed Learning Disabled Programs</b>	<b>Attended Jewish Learning Disabled Programs</b>	<b>Attended Other Learning Disabled Programs</b>	<b>No Learning Disabled Programs Attended</b>
San Antonio	2007	14.4%	1.0%	10.7	2.7
Minneapolis	2004	14.4%	1.6%	10.4	2.4
Washington	2003	14.1%	1.8%	8.3	4.0
Hartford	2000	13.6%	0.0%	11.1	2.5
Las Vegas	2005	13.2%	0.0%	11.8	1.4
W Palm Beach	2005	12.9%	0.0%	11.8	1.1
Bergen	2001	12.1%	3.4%	6.5	2.2
New Haven	2010	11.9%	0.9%	8.4	2.6
Miami	2014	11.2%	1.7%	7.8	1.7
St. Paul	2004	10.9%	1.8%	6.4	2.7
Middlesex	2008	10.7%	1.1%	7.0	2.6
Rochester	1999	10.6%	0.0%	8.5	2.1
Rhode Island	2002	10.5%	0.8%	8.2	1.5
Detroit	2005	10.4%	2.5%	6.2	1.7
Tucson	2002	10.2%	2.0%	3.1	5.1
Tidewater	2001	10.2%	0.7%	8.8	0.7
Broward	1997	10.2%	0.0%	6.8	3.4
Atlantic County	2004	9.8%	0.0%	9.8	0.0
S Palm Beach	2005	9.7%	1.0%	6.4	2.3
Jacksonville	2002	9.7%	0.8%	7.3	1.6
Westport	2000	9.7%	0.0%	8.5	1.2
Sarasota	2001	9.3%	0.0%	7.4	1.9

**TABLE 5  
NEED FOR PROGRAMS FOR JEWISH CHILDREN  
WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES IN THE PAST YEAR  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


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

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b><i>Total Who Needed Learning Disabled Programs</i></b>	<b>Attended Jewish Learning Disabled Programs</b>	<b>Attended Other Learning Disabled Programs</b>	<b>No Learning Disabled Programs Attended</b>
Monmouth	1997	9.0%	0.0%	7.1	1.9
Lehigh Valley	2007	8.8%	1.0%	6.7	1.1
Milwaukee	1996	7.6%	0.6%	6.4	0.6
Charlotte	1997	7.1%	0.0%	5.3	1.8
Richmond	1994	6.3%	0.0%	6.3	0.0
Wilmington	1995	4.9%	0.7%	2.1	2.1

9

# NEED FOR PROGRAMS FOR JEWISH CHILDREN WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES IN THE PAST YEAR

(Households with Jewish Children Age 0-17)



**TABLE 6  
NEED FOR HELP IN COORDINATING SERVICES  
FOR AN ELDERLY OR DISABLED PERSON IN THE PAST YEAR  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


**BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS**

<b>Community</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Total Who Needed Help in Coordinating Services</b>	<b>Received Jewish Help in Coordinating Services</b>	<b>Received Other Help in Coordinating Services</b>	<b>No Help in Coordinating Services Received</b>
Lehigh Valley	2007	17.6%	2.7%	13.1	1.8
Middlesex	2008	17.3%	3.0%	12.4	1.9
Minneapolis	2004	16.5%	7.3%	6.6	2.6
St. Paul	2004	15.8%	6.4%	7.9	1.5
Miami	2014	15.3%	3.3%	10.6	1.4
New Haven	2010	14.8%	2.2%	11.8	0.8
Atlantic County	2004	14.1%	3.4%	9.7	1.0
Tucson	2002	13.8%	3.9%	7.6	2.3
San Antonio	2007	13.2%	2.6%	9.9	0.7
Tidewater	2001	13.1%	4.6%	6.2	2.3
Portland (ME)	2007	13.0%	1.3%	10.6	1.1
Rhode Island	2002	12.5%	2.9%	7.1	2.5
Bergen	2001	11.9%	2.5%	7.0	2.4
Washington	2003	11.6%	3.4%	7.0	1.2
Detroit	2005	11.4%	5.2%	5.5	0.7
S Palm Beach	2005	11.2%	1.9%	7.8	1.5
W Palm Beach	2005	10.3%	2.2%	7.1	1.0
Jacksonville	2002	9.5%	5.0%	3.6	0.9
Sarasota	2001	8.3%	3.6%	4.3	0.4
Phoenix *	2002	20.0%	NA	NA	NA
Pittsburgh *	2002	19.0%	NA	NA	NA

\* Question was asked about *needing assistance for an elderly relative*.

# 10 NEED FOR HELP IN COORDINATING SERVICES FOR AN ELDERLY OR DISABLED PERSON IN THE PAST YEAR

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