

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 24 - GENERAL SOCIAL SERVICE NEEDS

June 2015

Note for Tables 1-5	3
---------------------------	---

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Need for Help in Coordinating Services for an Elderly or Disabled Person in the Past Year	4
Table 2: Need for Marital, Family, or Personal Counseling in the Past Year	6
Table 3: Need for Financial Assistance in the Past Year	9
Table 4: Need for Help in Finding a Job or Choosing an Occupation in the Past Year	11
Table 5: Need for Programs for Jewish Children with Learning Disabilities in the Past Year	14
Table 6: Familiarity with the Local Jewish Family Service	17
Table 7: Perception of the Local Jewish Family Service	21
Table 8: Providing Individual and Family Counseling for Jews as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	25

LIST OF BAR CHARTS

Bar Chart 1: Need for Help in Coordinating Services for an Elderly or Disabled Person in the Past Year	5
Bar Chart 2: Need for Marital, Family, or Personal Counseling in the Past Year	8
Bar Chart 3: Need for Financial Assistance in the Past Year	10
Bar Chart 4: Need for Help in Finding a Job or Choosing an Occupation in the Past Year	13
Bar Chart 5: Need for Programs for Jewish Children with Learning Disabilities in the Past Year	16
Bar Chart 6: Very Familiar with the Local Jewish Family Service	19
Bar Chart 7: Not at All Familiar with the Local Jewish Family Service	20
Bar Chart 8: Excellent Perceptions of the Local Jewish Family Service	23
Bar Chart 9: Fair/Poor Perceptions of the Local Jewish Family Service	24
Bar Chart 10: Importance of Providing Individual and Family Counseling for Jews as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	26
Appendix	27

NOTE FOR TABLES 1-5

Note for **Tables 1-5**: 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 1
NEED FOR HELP IN COORDINATING SERVICES
FOR AN ELDERLY OR DISABLED PERSON IN THE PAST YEAR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Total Who Needed Help in Coordinating Services	Received Jewish Help in Coordinating Services	Received Other Help in Coordinating Services	No Help in Coordinating Services Received
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*.

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

(Jewish Households)




TABLE 2 NEED FOR MARITAL, FAMILY, OR PERSONAL COUNSELING IN THE PAST YEAR COMMUNITY COMPARISONS					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Community	Year	Total Who Needed Counseling	Received Jewish Counseling	Received Other Counseling	No Counseling Received
Seattle	2000	20.5%	1.2%	17.9	1.4
San Francisco	2004	19.0%	0.0%	15.0	4.0
York	1999	18.1%	2.2%	14.2	1.7
Charlotte	1997	16.7%	1.5%	13.5	1.7
Los Angeles	1997	16.2%	2.0%	12.3	1.9
Harrisburg	1994	16.1%	2.1%	13.7	0.3
Tucson	2002	15.7%	0.7%	13.0	2.0
Milwaukee	1996	15.6%	3.2%	12.2	0.2
Minneapolis	2004	14.9%	2.6%	10.4	1.9
Tidewater	2001	14.0%	2.8%	8.8	2.4
Westport	2000	13.6%	0.3%	12.3	1.0
St. Paul	2004	13.4%	2.4%	9.8	1.2
Bergen	2001	13.1%	1.7%	10.0	1.4
Rochester	1999	13.1%	1.1%	10.5	1.5
Rhode Island	2002	12.7%	1.0%	10.1	1.6
Portland (ME)	2007	12.1%	0.2%	10.4	1.5
Washington	2003	12.1%	1.3%	10.2	0.6
Hartford	2000	11.9%	1.4%	9.8	0.7
Richmond	1994	11.2%	1.2%	8.0	2.0
Wilmington	1995	11.0%	1.7%	8.1	1.2
San Antonio	2007	10.4%	1.7%	7.0	1.7
Detroit	2005	10.4%	1.8%	7.4	1.2

**TABLE 2
NEED FOR MARITAL, FAMILY, OR PERSONAL COUNSELING IN THE PAST YEAR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	<i>Total Who Needed Counseling</i>	Received Jewish Counseling	Received Other Counseling	No Counseling Received
Monmouth	1997	10.1%	1.1%	8.0	1.0
New Haven	2010	9.8%	0.5%	8.3	1.0
Lehigh Valley	2007	9.8%	0.8%	8.8	0.2
St. Petersburg	1994	9.2%	1.7%	6.0	1.5
Jacksonville	2002	9.0%	0.9%	7.8	0.3
Miami	2014	8.6%	1.4%	5.5	1.7
Broward	1997	8.2%	1.1%	5.4	1.7
Las Vegas	2005	7.8%	0.5%	6.0	1.3
Middlesex	2008	6.7%	1.1%	5.5	0.1
Sarasota	2001	6.6%	2.3%	3.9	0.4
S Palm Beach	2005	6.2%	1.5%	3.6	1.1
Atlantic County	2004	6.1%	0.8%	4.5	0.8
W Palm Beach	2005	5.2%	1.5%	2.3	1.4

2

NEED FOR MARITAL, FAMILY, OR PERSONAL COUNSELING IN THE PAST YEAR

(Jewish Households)



**TABLE 3
NEED FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN THE PAST YEAR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS


Community	Year	<i>Total Who Needed Financial Assistance</i>	Received Jewish Financial Assistance	Received Other Financial Assistance	No Financial Assistance Received
New Haven	2010	2.8%	0.2%	1.8	0.8
Detroit	2005	2.8%	0.4%	0.6	1.8
Lehigh Valley	2007	2.4%	0.5%	1.7	0.2
Middlesex	2008	1.7%	0.0%	1.2	0.5
San Antonio	2007	1.7%	0.0%	1.0	0.7

Note: The question was asked only of households earning an annual income under \$25,000; households earning \$25,000 and over were assumed not to have needed financial assistance in the past year.

3

NEED FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN THE PAST YEAR

(Jewish Households)



**TABLE 4
NEED FOR HELP IN FINDING A JOB
OR CHOOSING AN OCCUPATION IN THE PAST YEAR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WITH ADULTS AGE 18-64

Community	Year	Total Who Needed Job Counseling	Received Jewish Job Counseling	Received Other Job Counseling	No Job Counseling Received
Minneapolis	2004	17.9%	3.1%	8.0	6.8
St. Paul	2004	16.2%	2.1%	8.7	5.4
Detroit	2005	14.5%	1.8%	6.8	5.9
Miami	2014	12.2%	1.3%	4.0	6.9
New Haven	2010	11.9%	0.0%	3.9	8.0
Charlotte	1997	11.7%	0.1%	5.3	6.3
Las Vegas	2005	11.4%	0.0%	6.0	5.4
Tucson	2002	11.2%	0.7%	4.9	5.6
Wilmington	1995	10.6%	0.3%	5.7	4.6
Middlesex	2008	10.5%	0.0%	6.1	4.4
Washington	2003	10.5%	0.9%	4.9	4.7
San Antonio	2007	9.7%	0.0%	3.5	6.2
Bergen	2001	9.7%	1.6%	3.7	4.4
Monmouth	1997	9.6%	0.0%	5.0	4.6
Lehigh Valley	2007	9.2%	0.0%	4.5	4.7
S Palm Beach	2005	9.1%	0.0%	3.2	5.9
Rhode Island	2002	8.8%	0.1%	5.0	3.7
Richmond	1994	8.6%	0.2%	4.3	4.1
Tidewater	2001	8.5%	0.4%	4.5	3.6
Milwaukee	1996	8.1%	2.4%	2.9	2.8
Rochester	1999	8.0%	1.3%	4.0	2.7
W Palm Beach	2005	7.9%	0.0%	2.1	5.8

TABLE 4
NEED FOR HELP IN FINDING A JOB
OR CHOOSING AN OCCUPATION IN THE PAST YEAR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS


BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WITH ADULTS AGE 18-64

Community	Year	Total Who Needed Job Counseling	Received Jewish Job Counseling	Received Other Job Counseling	No Job Counseling Received
Broward	1997	7.9%	0.1%	4.4	3.4
Hartford	2000	6.9%	0.0%	4.1	2.8
Westport	2000	6.8%	0.1%	3.9	2.8
Atlantic County	2004	4.9%	0.0%	1.5	3.4
Jacksonville	2002	2.7%	0.0%	1.6	1.1
NJPS ¹	2000	9.5%	0.6%	3.1	5.8

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

4 NEED FOR HELP IN FINDING A JOB OR CHOOSING AN OCCUPATION IN THE PAST YEAR

(Jewish Households with Adults Age 18-64)



**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

Community	Year	Total Who Needed Learning Disabled Programs	Attended Jewish Learning Disabled Programs	Attended Other Learning Disabled Programs	No Learning Disabled Programs Attended
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

**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

Community	Year	<i>Total Who Needed Learning Disabled Programs</i>	Attended Jewish Learning Disabled Programs	Attended Other Learning Disabled Programs	No Learning Disabled Programs Attended
Westport	2000	9.7%	0.0%	8.5	1.2
Sarasota	2001	9.3%	0.0%	7.4	1.9
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

5

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

(Households with Jewish Children Age 0-17)



**TABLE 6
FAMILIARITY WITH THE LOCAL JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	<i>Very Familiar</i>	Somewhat Familiar	Not at All Familiar
York	1999	38%	36	26
Detroit	2005	35%	45	20
Tidewater	2001	33%	39	28
Minneapolis	2004	31%	42	28
Richmond	1994	29%	40	31
Jacksonville	2002	27%	32	41
Harrisburg	1994	26%	37	38
Milwaukee	1996	24%	43	34
San Antonio	2007	23%	38	39
St. Paul	2004	22%	43	35
Rochester	1999	22%	43	36
Charlotte	1997	22%	35	44
Rhode Island	2002	18%	38	44
Lehigh Valley	2007	18%	35	47
Orlando	1993	17%	42	41
Hartford	2000	17%	34	49
Wilmington	1995	17%	33	51
Tucson	2002	16%	39	44
Washington	2003	16%	37	48
Atlantic County	2004	16%	33	51
St. Petersburg	1994	15%	33	52
Sarasota	2001	14%	32	54
Las Vegas	2005	11%	29	61
New Haven	2010	10%	35	55

TABLE 6
FAMILIARITY WITH THE LOCAL JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS


BASE: RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	<i>Very Familiar</i>	Somewhat Familiar	Not at All Familiar
Monmouth	1997	10%	28	61
Miami	2014	9%	30	61
Bergen	2001	9%	25	66
Westport	2000	8%	28	64
Howard County	2010	8%	23	69 ¹
Middlesex	2008	8%	23	70
S Palm Beach	2005	7%	23	69
Portland (ME)	2007	7%	19	75
W Palm Beach	2005	7%	18	75
Broward	1997	6%	25	69


¹ Includes the responses *not very familiar* (17%) and *not at all familiar* (52%).

6 VERY FAMILIAR WITH THE LOCAL JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE

(Respondents)



7 NOT AT ALL FAMILIAR WITH THE LOCAL JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE (Respondents)



**TABLE 7
PERCEPTION OF THE LOCAL JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: RESPONDENTS VERY/SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR WITH THE LOCAL JFS

Community	Year	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent/ Good
Tidewater	2001	51%	41	5	3	93%
Minneapolis	2004	49%	43	6	2	92%
York	1999	48%	44	5	3	93%
Jacksonville	2002	48%	43	8	1	91%
Sarasota	2001	45%	45	9	1	90%
St. Petersburg	1994	42%	41	13	4	83%
Tucson	2002	41%	47	9	4	87%
Atlantic County	2004	40%	53	5	1	93%
St. Paul	2004	40%	51	7	3	90%
Charlotte	1997	40%	46	11	4	86%
Richmond	1994	37%	50	11	3	87%
Harrisburg	1994	36%	56	8	1	91%
S Palm Beach	2005	36%	53	8	3	89%
San Antonio	2007	36%	47	13	4	83%
Washington	2003	35%	55	9	1	89%
Detroit	2005	34%	55	9	2	89%
Lehigh Valley	2007	34%	53	9	5	87%
Hartford	2000	33%	58	6	2	92%
Rochester	1999	33%	56	9	3	89%
Milwaukee	1996	33%	55	11	2	87%
Rhode Island	2002	33%	54	9	3	88%
Wilmington	1995	32%	57	8	2	90%
W Palm Beach	2005	32%	53	11	5	85%

TABLE 7
PERCEPTION OF THE LOCAL JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS


BASE: RESPONDENTS VERY/SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR WITH THE LOCAL JFS

Community	Year	<i>Excellent</i>	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent/ Good
Orlando	1993	32%	48	11	9	80%
Miami	2014	30%	54	14	3	84%
New Haven	2010	29%	59	8	4	88%
Monmouth	1997	29%	56	8	8	84%
Westport	2000	25%	64	8	2	89%
Broward	1997	25%	61	7	7	86%
Bergen	2001	25%	52	18	6	77%
Middlesex	2008	24%	58	13	5	82%
Portland (ME)	2007	17%	65	12	6	82%
Las Vegas	2005	17%	57	20	7	73%

8

EXCELLENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE LOCAL JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE


(Respondents Who Are Very/Somewhat Familiar)



9

FAIR/POOR PERCEPTIONS OF THE LOCAL JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE

(Respondents Who Are Very/Somewhat Familiar)



**TABLE 8
PROVIDING INDIVIDUAL AND FAMILY COUNSELING FOR JEWS
AS A MOTIVATION TO DONATE TO A JEWISH ORGANIZATION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

**BASE: RESPONDENTS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WHO DONATED \$100 AND OVER
TO THE LOCAL JEWISH FEDERATION, OTHER JEWISH FEDERATIONS,
OR OTHER JEWISH CHARITIES IN THE PAST YEAR**


Community	Year	<i>Very Important</i>	Somewhat Important	Not at All Important
Tidewater	2001	55%	39	7
Sarasota	2001	50%	36	13
S Palm Beach	2005	49%	39	12
Orlando	1993	49%	31	20
Atlantic County	2004	47%	46	7
Middlesex	2008	46%	41	13
St. Paul	2004	45%	47	8
San Antonio	2007	43%	42	15
Jacksonville	2002	43%	42	15
Rochester	1999	41%	47	12
Bergen	2001	41%	46	13
Minneapolis	2004	39%	52	9
Hartford	2000	39%	48	13
W Palm Beach	2005	39%	43	18
Lehigh Valley	2007	37%	50	13
Rhode Island	2002	34%	52	14
Westport	2000	34%	47	19
Tucson	2002	33%	52	15
Las Vegas	2005	32%	48	21
New Haven	2010	29%	48	23
Washington	2003	23%	57	20

10

IMPORTANCE OF PROVIDING INDIVIDUAL AND FAMILY COUNSELING FOR JEWS AS A MOTIVATION TO DONATE TO A JEWISH ORGANIZATION

% Very Important

(Respondents in Jewish Households Who Donated \$100 and Over to Jewish Charities in the Past Year)



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.