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 31 - WILLS
June 2015

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF BAR CHARTS

TABLE 1 HAVE WILLS THAT CONTAIN PROVISIONS FOR CHARITIES COMMUNITY COMPARISONS					
BASE: RESPONDENTS AGE 50 AND OVER					
			Have Wills That Contain Provisions for:		
Community	Year	Have No Wills	No Charities	*Jewish Charities*	Non-Jewish Charities Only
Milwaukee	1996	16%	NA	19	NA
Cincinnati	2008	15%	62	17	6
Sarasota	2001	7%	73	17	4
Rochester	1999	10%	71	16	4
Lehigh Valley	2007	14%	66	15	4
San Antonio	2007	14%	67	14	6
Minneapolis	2004	24%	56	14	6
Harrisburg	1994	NA	NA	14	NA
Detroit	2005	17%	65	13	5
S Palm Beach	2005	10%	74	13	3
W Palm Beach	2005	9%	76	13	3
Atlantic County	2004	10%	73	13	5
St. Paul	2004	31%	53	13	3
Pittsburgh	2002	20%	63	13	4
Tucson	2002	13%	68	13	6
Chicago	2010	25%	58	12	5
Hartford	2000	10%	75	12	3

			Have Wills That Contain Provisions for:		
TABLE 1 **HAVE WILLS THAT CONTAIN PROVISIONS FOR CHARITIES** **COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**					
BASE: RESPONDENTS AGE 50 AND OVER					
Community	**Year**	**Have No Wills**	**No Charities**	*Jewish Charities*	**Non-Jewish Charities Only**
York	1999	19%	NA	12	NA
Miami	2014	25%	63	10	2
Baltimore	2010	24%	60	10	6
New Haven	2010	16%	67	10	8
Rhode Island	2002	16%	66	10	7
Denver	2007	22%	58	9	11
Portland (ME)	2007	15%	62	9	14
San Diego	2003	18%	65	9	7
Jacksonville	2002	26%	62	9	3
Westport	2000	10%	76	9	6
Wilmington	1995	11%	NA	9	NA
Richmond	1994	NA	NA	9	NA
Columbus	2013	15%	66	8	11
Phoenix	2002	22%	68	8	3
Bergen	2001	17%	72	8	3
Tidewater	2001	18%	71	8	3
Charlotte	1997	7%	NA	8	NA
Washington	2003	20%	68	7	6
Broward	1997	11%	80	7	2

			Have Wills That Contain Provisions for:		
Community	**Year**	**Have No Wills**	**No Charities**	*Jewish Charities*	**Non-Jewish Charities Only**
Las Vegas	2005	25%	64	6	6
Monmouth	1997	10%	NA	6	NA
Middlesex	2008	16%	77	5	2
NJPS [1]	2000	27%	58	11	4

TABLE 1
HAVE WILLS THAT CONTAIN PROVISIONS FOR CHARITIES
**COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: RESPONDENTS AGE 50 AND OVER

[1] NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample.*
Note: Respondents who have wills that contain provisions for both Jewish and non-Jewish charities are included in *Have Wills That Contain Provisions for Jewish Charities*.

1

HAVE NO WILLS
(Respondents Age 50 and Over)

City	Percentage
St. Paul	31%
Jacksonville	26%
Miami	25%
Chicago	25%
Las Vegas	25%
Baltimore	24%
Minneapolis	24%
Denver	22%
Phoenix	22%
Washington	20%
Pittsburgh	20%
York	19%
San Diego	18%
Tidewater	18%
Detroit	17%
Bergen	17%
New Haven	16%
Middlesex	16%
Rhode Island	16%
Milwaukee	16%
Columbus	15%
Cincinnati	15%
Portland (ME)	15%
Lehigh Valley	14%
San Antonio	14%
Tucson	13%
Broward	11%
Wilmington	11%
South Palm Beach	10%
Atlantic County	10%
Hartford	10%
Westport	10%
Rochester	10%
Monmouth	10%
West Palm Beach	9%
Sarasota	7%
Charlotte	7%

2

HAVE WILLS THAT CONTAIN PROVISIONS
FOR JEWISH CHARITIES
(Respondents Age 50 and Over)

City	%
Milwaukee	19%
Cincinnati	17%
Sarasota	17%
Rochester	16%
Lehigh Valley	15%
San Antonio	14%
Minneapolis	14%
Harrisburg	14%
Detroit	13%
South Palm Beach	13%
West Palm Beach	13%
Atlantic County	13%
St. Paul	13%
Pittsburgh	13%
Tucson	13%
Chicago	12%
Hartford	12%
York	12%
Miami	10%
Baltimore	10%
New Haven	10%
Rhode Island	10%
Denver	9%
Portland (ME)	9%
San Diego	9%
Jacksonville	9%
Westport	9%
Wilmington	9%
Richmond	9%
Columbus	8%
Phoenix	8%
Bergen	8%
Tidewater	8%
Charlotte	8%
Washington	7%
Broward	7%
Las Vegas	6%
Monmouth	6%
Middlesex	5%

3

Have Wills That Contain Provisions for Non-Jewish Charities Only

(Respondents Age 50 and Over)

Location	Percentage
Portland (ME)	14%
Columbus	11%
Denver	11%
New Haven	8%
San Diego	7%
Rhode Island	7%
Baltimore	6%
Cincinnati	6%
San Antonio	6%
Las Vegas	6%
Minneapolis	6%
Washington	6%
Tucson	6%
Westport	6%
Chicago	5%
Detroit	5%
Atlantic County	5%
Lehigh Valley	4%
Pittsburgh	4%
Sarasota	4%
Rochester	4%
South Palm Beach	3%
West Palm Beach	3%
St. Paul	3%
Jacksonville	3%
Phoenix	3%
Bergen	3%
Tidewater	3%
Hartford	3%
Miami	2%
Middlesex	2%
Broward	2%

| TABLE 2 |
| FAMILIARITY WITH THE LOCAL JEWISH FOUNDATION/ENDOWMENT FUND COMMUNITY COMPARISONS |

BASE: RESPONDENTS				
Community	Year	*Very Familiar*	Somewhat Familiar	Not at All Familiar
Tidewater	2001	18%	30	52
Jacksonville	2002	10%	21	70
Hartford	2000	9%	20	71
Milwaukee	1996	7%	17	76
Minneapolis	2004	7%	15	78
Tucson	2002	6%	15	80
Washington	2003	3%	15	83
S Palm Beach	2005	2%	6	92
Broward	1997	2%	6	92

4

Very Familiar
with the Local Jewish Foundation/Endowment Fund
(Respondents)

Location	Percentage
Tidewater	18%
Jacksonville	10%
Hartford	9%
Milwaukee	7%
Minneapolis	7%
Tucson	6%
Washington	3%
South Palm Beach	2%
Broward	2%

0%　　20%　　40%　　60%　　80%　　100%

5

Not at All Familiar
with the Local Jewish Foundation/Endowment Fund
(Respondents)

Location	Percentage
South Palm Beach	92%
Broward	92%
Washington	83%
Tucson	80%
Minneapolis	78%
Milwaukee	76%
Hartford	71%
Jacksonville	70%
Tidewater	52%

0%   20%   40%   60%   80%   100%

TABLE 3 PERCEPTION OF THE LOCAL JEWISH FOUNDATION/ENDOWMENT FUND COMMUNITY COMPARISONS						
BASE: RESPONDENTS VERY/SOMEWHAT FAMILIAR WITH THE LOCAL JEWISH FOUNDATION/ENDOWMENT FUND						
Community	Year	*Excellent*	Good	Fair	Poor	Excellent/ Good
Jacksonville	2002	34%	48	15	4	82%
Hartford	2000	33%	55	11	1	88%
Broward	1997	33%	54	11	2	86%
Tucson	2002	33%	52	13	2	85%
Milwaukee	1996	31%	60	8	2	90%
Tidewater	2001	31%	58	9	3	89%
Minneapolis	2004	26%	58	15	1	84%
S Palm Beach	2005	25%	64	6	4	89%
Washington	2003	22%	59	18	2	81%

6

Excellent Perceptions of
the Local Jewish Foundation/Endowment Fund
(Respondents Who Are Very/Somewhat Familiar)

City	Percentage
Jacksonville	34%
Hartford	33%
Broward	33%
Tucson	33%
Milwaukee	31%
Tidewater	31%
Minneapolis	26%
South Palm Beach	25%
Washington	22%

0%   20%   40%   60%   80%   100%

7 Fair/Poor Perceptions
of the Local Jewish Foundation/Endowment Fund

(Respondents Who Are Very/Somewhat Familiar)

Washington	20%
Jacksonville	19%
Minneapolis	16%
Tucson	15%
Broward	14%
Tidewater	12%
Hartford	12%
South Palm Beach	10%
Milwaukee	10%

Fair ■Poor

0%   20%   40%   60%   80%   100%

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.

❻ **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.

❼ **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:

❶ 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.

❷ 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.

❸ 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.