

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 33 - REASONS FOR DONATING TO JEWISH ORGANIZATION

June 2015

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Importance of Various Motivations to Donate to a Jewish Organization	4
Table 2: Combating Anti-Semitism as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	6
Table 3: Supporting the People of Israel as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	8
Table 4: Supporting the People of Israel as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization by Age	10
Table 5: Providing Social Services for the Jewish Elderly as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	14
Table 6: Providing Jewish Education for Children as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	16
Table 7: Helping Jews Overseas Who Are in Distress as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	18
Table 8: Providing Individual and Family Counseling for Jews as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	20
Table 9: Supporting Educational Trips to Israel as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	22
Table 10: Providing Social, Recreational, and Cultural Activities for Jews as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	24

LIST OF BAR CHARTS

Bar Chart 1: Importance of Combating Anti-Semitism as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	7
Bar Chart 2: Importance of Supporting the People of Israel as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	9
Bar Chart 3: Importance of Supporting the People of Israel as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization (Respondent Under Age 50)	11
Bar Chart 4: Importance of Supporting the People of Israel as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization (Respondent Age 50-64)	12
Bar Chart 5: Importance of Supporting the People of Israel as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization (Respondent Age 65 and Over)	13
Bar Chart 6: Importance of Providing Social Services for the Jewish Elderly as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	15
Bar Chart 7: Importance of Providing Jewish Education for Children as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	17
Bar Chart 8: Importance of Helping Jews Overseas Who Are in Distress as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	19
Bar Chart 9: Importance of Providing Individual and Family Counseling for Jews as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization	21

SECTION 33 - REASONS FOR DONATING TO JEWISH ORGANIZATION

Bar Chart 10: Importance of Supporting Educational Trips to Israel
as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization 23

Bar Chart 11: Importance of Providing Social, Recreational, and Cultural Activities
for Jews as a Motivation to Donate to a Jewish Organization 25

Appendix 26

TABLE 1
IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS MOTIVATIONS
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	Percentage Very Important							
		<i>Anti-Semitism</i>	Israel	Elderly	Children's Jewish Education	Jews Overseas	Counseling	Israel Trips	SRC
Sarasota	2001	80%	56%	72%	64%	55%	50%	30%	41%
Orlando	1993	77%	61%	63%	71%	NA	49%	NA	NA
Hartford	2000	76%	43%	63%	61%	42%	39%	26%	31%
Westport	2000	76%	49%	59%	59%	54%	34%	23%	32%
S Palm Beach	2005	75%	68%	71%	65%	59%	49%	44%	40%
Rochester	1999	75%	52%	69%	61%	58%	41%	NA	NA
Atlantic County	2004	74%	67%	74%	64%	58%	47%	35%	43%
W Palm Beach	2005	73%	63%	64%	63%	55%	39%	34%	33%
Jacksonville	2002	72%	64%	76%	71%	48%	43%	31%	37%
Miami	2004	71%	72%	75%	70%	60%	48%	44%	45%
Tidewater	2001	71%	49%	74%	76%	50%	55%	36%	53%
Middlesex	2008	67%	67%	67%	66%	54%	46%	41%	38%
Rhode Island	2002	67%	60%	67%	64%	52%	34%	28%	33%
Minneapolis	2004	66%	52%	67%	64%	42%	39%	35%	40%
Lehigh Valley	2007	65%	55%	62%	56%	48%	37%	26%	34%
San Antonio	2007	63%	58%	65%	60%	51%	43%	32%	33%
Las Vegas	2005	63%	46%	57%	59%	48%	32%	29%	33%
Bergen	2001	63%	64%	63%	64%	60%	41%	32%	37%
St. Paul	2004	61%	53%	75%	69%	48%	45%	27%	36%
Tucson	2002	58%	42%	59%	59%	39%	33%	27%	27%
Washington	2003	51%	58%	53%	45%	50%	23%	20%	32%

TABLE 1
IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS MOTIVATIONS
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	Percentage Very Important							
		<i>Anti-Semitism</i>	Israel	Elderly	Children's Jewish Education	Jews Overseas	Counseling	Israel Trips	SRC
New Haven	2010	NA	42%	49%	46%	43%	29%	25%	29%
Detroit	2005	NA	65%	62%	59%	39%	NA	NA	NA

Notes: 1) **Boldface** percentages are the highest percentage for each community

2) Key to column headings:

Combating Anti-Semitism (Anti-Semitism)

Supporting the People of Israel (Israel)

Providing Social Services for the Jewish Elderly (Elderly)

Providing Jewish Education for Children (Children's Jewish Education)

Helping Jews Overseas Who Are in Distress (Jews Overseas)

Providing Individual and Family Counseling for Jews (Counseling)

Supporting Educational Trips to Israel (Israel Trips)

Providing Social, Recreational, and Cultural Activities for Jews (SRC)

TABLE 2
COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM
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
Sarasota	2001	80%	18	2
Orlando	1993	77%	20	4
Hartford	2000	76%	22	2
Westport	2000	76%	20	5
Rochester	1999	75%	21	4
S Palm Beach	2005	75%	20	5
Atlantic County	2004	74%	20	6
W Palm Beach	2005	73%	21	6
Jacksonville	2002	72%	25	4
Tidewater	2001	71%	22	7
Rhode Island	2002	67%	30	3
Middlesex	2008	67%	28	6
Minneapolis	2004	66%	30	4
Lehigh Valley	2007	65%	31	4
Bergen	2001	63%	32	5
San Antonio	2007	63%	30	7
Las Vegas	2005	63%	30	7
St. Paul	2004	61%	33	6
Tucson	2002	58%	33	9
Washington	2003	51%	40	9

1

IMPORTANCE OF COMBATING ANTI-SEMITISM AS A MOTIVATION TO DONATE TO A JEWISH ORGANIZATION

% Very Important

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




TABLE 3
SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL
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
S Palm Beach	2005	68%	28	4
Middlesex	2008	67%	28	5
Atlantic County	2004	67%	28	5
Miami	2014	66%	29	5
Detroit	2005	65%	30	5
Bergen	2001	64%	33	3
Jacksonville	2002	64%	32	5
W Palm Beach	2005	63%	31	6
Orlando	1993	61%	34	5
Rhode Island	2002	60%	34	5
Washington	2003	58%	35	7
San Antonio	2007	58%	32	10
Sarasota	2001	56%	39	5
Lehigh Valley	2007	55%	42	4
St. Paul	2004	53%	42	5
Minneapolis	2004	52%	43	6
Rochester	1999	52%	40	8
Tidewater	2001	49%	46	5
Westport	2000	49%	36	15
Las Vegas	2005	46%	41	13
Hartford	2000	43%	54	3
New Haven	2010	42%	45	13
Tucson	2002	42%	44	14

2

IMPORTANCE OF SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL 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)




TABLE 4
SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL AS A MOTIVATION
TO DONATE TO A JEWISH ORGANIZATION BY AGE
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
% VERY IMPORTANT


Community	Year	Overall	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65+
S Palm Beach	2005	68%	64%		64%	70%
Middlesex	2008	67%	73%		57%	68%
Atlantic County	2004	67%	45%		65%	76%
Detroit	2005	65%	60%		64%	70%
Miami	2014	66%	64%		65%	67%
Jacksonville	2002	64%	62%			67%
Bergen	2001	64%	76%	61%	60%	67%
W Palm Beach	2005	63%	53%		66%	64%
Orlando	1993	61%	55%	45%	49%	63%
Rhode Island	2002	60%	56%			66%
San Antonio	2007	58%	62%		52%	63%
Washington	2003	58%	60%		52%	66%
Sarasota	2001	56%	71%		54%	51%
Lehigh Valley	2007	55%	44%		53%	63%
St. Paul	2004	53%	52%		44%	60%
Minneapolis	2004	52%	54%		42%	57%
Rochester	1999	52%	NA	45%	43%	64%
Tidewater	2001	49%	42%		49%	66%
Westport	2000	49%	NA	44%	53%	56%
Las Vegas	2005	46%	31%		52%	59%
Hartford	2000	43%	NA	33%	34%	59%
Tucson	2002	42%	31%			60%
New Haven	2010	42%	38%		43%	43%

3

IMPORTANCE OF SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL AS A MOTIVATION TO DONATE TO A JEWISH ORGANIZATION

% Very Important


(Respondents Under Age 50 in Jewish Households Who Donated \$100 and Over to Jewish Charities in the Past Year)



4 IMPORTANCE OF SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL AS A MOTIVATION TO DONATE TO A JEWISH ORGANIZATION

% Very Important

(Respondents Age 50-64 in Jewish Households Who Donated \$100 and Over to Jewish Charities in the Past Year)



5

IMPORTANCE OF SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL AS A MOTIVATION TO DONATE TO A JEWISH ORGANIZATION

% Very Important

(Respondents Age 65 and Over in Jewish Households Who Donated \$100 and Over to Jewish Charities in the Past Year)




TABLE 5
PROVIDING SOCIAL SERVICES FOR THE JEWISH ELDERLY
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
Jacksonville	2002	76%	18	6
St. Paul	2004	75%	24	1
Tidewater	2001	74%	22	5
Atlantic County	2004	74%	21	5
Miami	2014	72%	24	4
Sarasota	2001	72%	24	4
S Palm Beach	2005	71%	24	5
Rochester	1999	69%	27	3
Rhode Island	2002	67%	31	3
Minneapolis	2004	67%	30	3
Middlesex	2008	67%	29	4
San Antonio	2007	65%	30	5
W Palm Beach	2005	64%	30	7
Hartford	2000	63%	35	2
Bergen	2001	63%	32	5
Orlando	1993	63%	30	7
Detroit	2005	62%	34	4
Lehigh Valley	2007	62%	32	6
Tucson	2002	59%	36	5
Westport	2000	59%	34	7
Las Vegas	2005	57%	37	6
Washington	2003	53%	41	7
New Haven	2010	49%	42	9

6 IMPORTANCE OF PROVIDING SOCIAL SERVICES FOR THE JEWISH ELDERLY 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)



**TABLE 6
PROVIDING JEWISH EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN
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>	<i>Somewhat Important</i>	<i>Not at All Important</i>
Tidewater	2001	76%	19	5
Jacksonville	2002	71%	22	7
Orlando	1993	71%	21	8
St. Paul	2004	69%	29	3
Miami	2014	67%	28	5
Middlesex	2008	66%	27	7
S Palm Beach	2005	65%	28	8
Rhode Island	2002	64%	31	6
Atlantic County	2004	64%	30	6
Minneapolis	2004	64%	29	7
Bergen	2001	64%	29	7
Sarasota	2001	64%	29	7
W Palm Beach	2005	63%	27	10
Hartford	2000	61%	32	8
Rochester	1999	61%	32	7
San Antonio	2007	60%	31	9
Detroit	2005	59%	33	7
Las Vegas	2005	59%	31	10
Tucson	2002	59%	30	12
Westport	2000	59%	29	12
Lehigh Valley	2007	56%	34	10
New Haven	2010	46%	38	17
Washington	2003	45%	42	13

7 IMPORTANCE OF PROVIDING JEWISH EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN 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)




TABLE 7
HELPING JEWS OVERSEAS WHO ARE IN DISTRESS
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
Bergen	2001	60%	35	5
S Palm Beach	2005	59%	36	6
Atlantic County	2004	58%	38	4
Rochester	1999	58%	36	7
Sarasota	2001	55%	39	6
W Palm Beach	2005	55%	36	9
Westport	2000	54%	39	7
Middlesex	2008	54%	38	8
Rhode Island	2002	52%	42	6
San Antonio	2007	51%	43	6
Miami	2014	51%	39	10
Tidewater	2001	50%	45	6
Washington	2003	50%	42	9
St. Paul	2004	48%	47	6
Lehigh Valley	2007	48%	46	7
Jacksonville	2002	48%	43	9
Las Vegas	2005	48%	40	12
New Haven	2010	43%	49	8
Hartford	2000	42%	53	5
Minneapolis	2004	42%	52	7
Detroit	2005	39%	48	13
Tucson	2002	39%	46	15

8 IMPORTANCE OF HELPING JEWS OVERSEAS WHO ARE IN DISTRESS 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)



**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

9

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)




TABLE 9
SUPPORTING EDUCATIONAL TRIPS TO ISRAEL
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
S Palm Beach	2005	44%	36	20
Middlesex	2008	41%	40	19
Tidewater	2001	36%	44	21
Atlantic County	2004	35%	46	19
Minneapolis	2004	35%	43	23
W Palm Beach	2005	34%	39	26
Bergen	2001	32%	47	21
San Antonio	2007	32%	45	23
Jacksonville	2002	31%	47	22
Sarasota	2001	30%	39	31
Las Vegas	2005	29%	40	32
Rhode Island	2002	28%	50	22
St. Paul	2004	27%	54	19
Tucson	2002	27%	42	32
Hartford	2000	26%	50	24
Lehigh Valley	2007	26%	49	25
New Haven	2010	25%	45	30
Westport	2000	23%	49	28
Washington	2003	20%	46	34

10

IMPORTANCE OF SUPPORTING EDUCATIONAL TRIPS TO ISRAEL 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)




TABLE 10
PROVIDING SOCIAL, RECREATIONAL, AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES 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	53%	39	8
Atlantic County	2004	43%	48	9
Sarasota	2001	41%	48	12
Minneapolis	2004	40%	52	8
S Palm Beach	2005	40%	48	12
Middlesex	2008	38%	50	12
Bergen	2001	37%	53	10
Jacksonville	2002	37%	49	14
St. Paul	2004	36%	59	5
Lehigh Valley	2007	34%	54	12
Rhode Island	2002	33%	54	13
Las Vegas	2005	33%	53	14
San Antonio	2007	33%	51	16
W Palm Beach	2005	33%	50	18
Washington	2003	32%	51	17
Westport	2000	32%	49	19
Hartford	2000	31%	52	17
New Haven	2010	29%	55	17
Tucson	2002	27%	56	17

11 IMPORTANCE OF PROVIDING SOCIAL, RECREATIONAL, AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES 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.