

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 36 - SUMMARY MEASURES

June 2015

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Association with the Jewish Community	3
Table 2: Overall Involvement in Jewish Activity	6
Table 3: Summary of Donations to Charities in the Past Year	8
Table 4: Philanthropic Market Share in the Past Year	18

LIST OF BAR CHARTS

Bar Chart 1: Association with the Jewish Community	5
Bar Chart 2: Overall Involvement in Jewish Activity	7
Bar Chart 3: Donated to Local Jewish Federation in the Past Year	11
Bar Chart 4: Donated to Other Jewish Federations in the Past Year	12
Bar Chart 5: Donated to Any Jewish Federation in the Past Year	13
Bar Chart 6: Donated to Other Jewish Charities in the Past Year	14
Bar Chart 7: Donated to Any Jewish Charity in the Past Year	15
Bar Chart 8: Donated to Non-Jewish Charities in the Past Year	16
Bar Chart 9: Donated to Any Charity in the Past Year	17
Bar Chart 10: Local Jewish Federation's Share of Charitable Dollars in the Past Year	21
Bar Chart 11: Other Jewish Federations' Share of Charitable Dollars in the Past Year	22
Bar Chart 12: Other Jewish Federations' and Other Jewish Charities' Share of Charitable Dollars in the Past Year	23
Bar Chart 13: Other Jewish Charities' Share of Charitable Dollars in the Past Year ..	24
Bar Chart 14: Non-Jewish Charities' Share of Charitable Dollars in the Past Year ..	25
Bar Chart 15: Jewish Charities' Share of Charitable Dollars in the Past Year	26
Bar Chart 16: Local Jewish Federation's Share of Charitable Dollars in the Past Year	27
Appendix	28

**TABLE 1
ASSOCIATION WITH THE JEWISH COMMUNITY
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
St. Paul	2004	67%		S Palm Beach	2005	54%
Rochester	1999	65%		New Haven	2010	53%
Detroit	2005	64%		Cleveland	2011	52%
Sarasota	2001	64%		Rhode Island	2002	52%
Milwaukee	1996	64%		Westport **	2000	52%
Bergen	2001	63%		Miami	2014	51%
Lehigh Valley	2007	62%		Martin-St. Lucie *	1999	50%
San Antonio	2007	62%		Broward	1997	50%
Pittsburgh	2002	62%		Howard County **	2010	49%
Tidewater	2001	62%		St. Petersburg	1994	49%
Hartford	2000	62%		Chicago	2010	48%
Monmouth	1997	62%		Washington	2003	48%
Minneapolis	2004	60%		Tucson	2002	48%
York	1999	60%		Portland (ME) *	2007	46%
Richmond	1994	60%		Los Angeles	1997	46%
Wilmington	1995	59%		Orlando	1993	46%
Harrisburg	1994	59%		Columbus	2013	43%
Baltimore	2010	58%		Atlanta	2006	42%
Middlesex	2008	58%		San Francisco	2004	37%
Jacksonville	2002	58%		Seattle	2000	31%
W Palm Beach	2005	57%		Las Vegas 🌳	2005	21%
Atlantic County	2004	57%		Phoenix ¹	2002	38%
Charlotte	1997	57%		NJPS ²	2000	51%
St. Louis	2014	56%		See footnotes on next page.		

TABLE 1
ASSOCIATION WITH THE JEWISH COMMUNITY
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS

Footnotes to Table 1

Definition:

Jewish households are defined as associated with the Jewish community if someone in the household is a member of a synagogue, the JCC, or a Jewish organization.

* No JCC is located in the community and no JCC membership is included in Association.

** Includes JCC membership in JCCs that are located in neighboring communities.

⊗ JCC is not a full service facility.

¹ Includes participation in a JCC program without necessarily being a member of the JCC.

² NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.


Notes: 1) In some communities, mostly communities with a significant number of part-year households, membership in non-local JCCs is also included.

2) Association includes membership in both local and non-local synagogues and in local JCCs.

1

ASSOCIATION WITH THE JEWISH COMMUNITY

(Jewish Households)



**TABLE 2
OVERALL INVOLVEMENT IN JEWISH ACTIVITY
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**


BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Monmouth	1997	97%		Wilmington	1995	90%
Middlesex	2008	96%		Sarasota	2001	89%
Detroit	2005	96%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	89%
Bergen	2001	96%		Orlando	1993	89%
S Palm Beach	2005	95%		Cleveland	2011	88%
W Palm Beach	2005	95%		Tucson	2002	88%
Atlantic County	2004	95%		York	1999	88%
Minneapolis	2004	95%		Charlotte	1997	88%
Rochester	1999	95%		St. Petersburg	1994	88%
Miami	2014	93%		Portland (ME)	2007	87%
St. Paul	2004	93%		Baltimore *	2010	86%
Westport	2000	93%		Jacksonville	2002	86%
Broward	1997	93%		Phoenix	2002	84%
Milwaukee	1996	93%		St. Louis	2014	83%
Harrisburg	1994	93%		Las Vegas	2005	83%
Chicago *	2010	92%		Columbus	2013	72%
Howard County *	2010	92%				
Lehigh Valley	2007	92%				
Tidewater	2001	92%				
Hartford	2000	92%				
Richmond	1994	92%				
New Haven	2010	91%				
San Antonio	2007	91%				
Pittsburgh	2002	91%				
Washington	2003	90%				
Rhode Island	2002	90%				
Los Angeles *	1997	90%				

* Excludes attendance at synagogue services at least once per year.
Note: Jewish households exhibit *overall involvement* if they either ❶ are associated with the Jewish community (are members of a synagogue, JCC, or Jewish organization), or ❷ practice (always/usually participate in a Pass-over Seder, always/usually light Chanukah candles, always/usually light Sabbath candles, or keep a kosher home), or ❸ contain a Jewish respondent who attends synagogue services at least once per year (other than for special occasions), or ❹ donated to a Jewish charity in the past year.

2 OVERALL INVOLVEMENT IN JEWISH ACTIVITY

(Practice, Attend Synagogue Services at Least Once per Year, Associated, or Donated to a Jewish Charity in the Past Year)
(Jewish Households)



* Excludes attendance at synagogue services at least once per year

**TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF DONATIONS TO CHARITIES IN THE PAST YEAR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Percentage of Households Who Donated						
		Jewish Federations			Jewish Charities		Non-Jewish Charities	Any Charity
		Local	Other ¹	Any	Other	Any		
Wilmington	1995	41%	3%	44%	50%	66%	89%	97%
Detroit	2005	55%	1%	56%	68%	78%	85%	94%
Rochester	1999	61%	NA	61%	60%	75%	84%	94%
Howard County	2010	37%	NA	NA	51%	57%	90%	93%
Cincinnati	2008	50%	NA	NA	61%	70%	84%	93%
Portland (ME)	2007	25%	NA	25%	44%	50%	89%	92%
Chicago	2010	44%	NA	NA	54%	67%	84%	91%
Lehigh Valley	2007	52%	NA	52%	56%	70%	87%	91%
San Antonio	2007	53%	NA	53%	55%	69%	82%	91%
St. Paul	2004	46%	9%	51%	53%	66%	79%	91%
Hartford	2000	48%	2%	48%	55%	67%	83%	91%
Middlesex	2008	44%	15%	51%	59%	73%	79%	90%
Washington	2003	32%	6%	35%	51%	60%	84%	90%
St. Louis	2014	38%	NA	38%	53%	60%	84%	89%
New Haven	2010	37%	11%	43%	45%	60%	83%	89%
Atlantic County	2004	31%	33%	58%	49%	72%	75%	89%
Pittsburgh *	2002	45%	NA	NA	59%	65%	83%	89%
Rhode Island	2002	46%	1%	47%	49%	61%	79%	89%
Bergen	2001	46%	12%	52%	60%	71%	76%	89%
Sarasota	2001	43%	26%	59%	59%	71%	82%	89%
Tidewater	2001	49%	1%	50%	52%	64%	83%	89%

**TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF DONATIONS TO CHARITIES IN THE PAST YEAR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Percentage of Households Who Donated						
		Jewish Federations			Jewish Charities		Non-Jewish Charities	Any Charity
		Local	Other ¹	Any	Other	Any		
Westport	2000	35%	6%	39%	50%	63%	85%	89%
Charlotte	1997	43%	1%	43%	49%	61%	83%	89%
Cleveland	2011	45%	NA	NA	57%	65%	81%	88%
Philadelphia	2009	41%	NA	NA	NA	58%	83%	88%
W Palm Beach	2005	35%	21%	47%	54%	67%	79%	88%
Martin-St. Lucie ²	1999	21%	16%	37%	54%	66%	79%	88%
Baltimore	2010	40%	NA	NA	59%	63%	76%	87%
Atlanta *	2006	25%	NA	NA	46%	48%	78%	87%
Minneapolis	2004	50%	3%	51%	54%	65%	78%	87%
Milwaukee	1996	51%	1%	52%	55%	67%	79%	87%
Harrisburg	1994	49%	2%	51%	NA	69%	79%	87%
S Palm Beach	2005	37%	20%	50%	54%	69%	74%	86%
Tucson	2002	33%	6%	38%	47%	56%	79%	86%
Monmouth	1997	37%	10%	45%	55%	66%	73%	86%
Richmond	1994	42%	2%	43%	NA	66%	80%	86%
Denver	2007	23%	NA	NA	39%	44%	81%	85%
San Diego	2003	26%	NA	NA	46%	52%	79%	85%
Phoenix	2002	25%	NA	29%	46%	51%	80%	85%
Broward	1997	43%	10%	51%	53%	67%	67%	84%
New York	2011	24%	NA	NA	55%	59%	68%	83%
York	1999	41%	1%	42%	45%	60%	76%	83%

TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF DONATIONS TO CHARITIES IN THE PAST YEAR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Percentage of Households Who Donated						
		Jewish Federations			Jewish Charities		Non-Jewish Charities	Any Charity
		Local	Other ¹	Any	Other	Any		
St. Petersburg	1994	34%	6%	39%	NA	65%	74%	83%
Jacksonville	2002	39%	1%	40%	47%	59%	76%	82%
Orlando	1993	30%	1%	31%	NA	58%	71%	81%
Las Vegas	2005	21%	9%	26%	33%	44%	75%	80%
Miami	2014	32%	8%	37%	47%	61%	65%	79%
Columbus	2013	26%	NA	26%	33%	37%	73%	76%
Los Angeles	1997	41%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Palm Springs	1998	37%	37%	62%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Boston	2005	34%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Buffalo	1995	34%	NA	NA	NA	54%	77%	NA
San Francisco	2004	23%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Seattle	2000	15%	NA	16%	NA	NA	NA	NA
NJPS ³	2000	NA	NA	25%	40%	49%	63%	73%

* Excludes households who donated to charities specifically established for September 11 and Hurricane Katrina victims.

¹ In some communities, no question was asked about donations to *Other Jewish Federations*. If the question had been asked, the percentage of households who donated to *Other Jewish Federations* and *Any Jewish Federation* in the past year would likely be higher.


² Martin-St. Lucie has no Local Jewish Federation and is served by the Jewish Federation of Palm Beach County.

³ NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.


3

DONATED TO LOCAL JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR

(Based upon the Telephone Survey)
(Jewish Households)




4 DONATED TO OTHER JEWISH FEDERATIONS IN THE PAST YEAR (Jewish Households)



5


DONATED TO ANY JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR

(Including Local Jewish Federation and Other Jewish Federations)
(Jewish Households)



6 DONATED TO OTHER JEWISH CHARITIES IN THE PAST YEAR


(Excluding Jewish Federations)
(Jewish Households)



7

DONATED TO ANY JEWISH CHARITY IN THE PAST YEAR


(Including Jewish Federations and Other Jewish Charities)
(Jewish Households)



DONATED TO NON-JEWISH CHARITIES IN THE PAST YEAR

(Jewish Households)


8



9

DONATED TO ANY CHARITY IN THE PAST YEAR

(Jewish Households)



**TABLE 4
PHILANTHROPIC MARKET SHARE IN THE PAST YEAR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: CHARITABLE DOLLARS DONATED BY JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Jewish Charities			Non-Jewish Charities	Jewish Charities' Share of All Charitable Dollars	Local Jewish Federation's Share of Jewish Charitable Dollars
		Local Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Federations ¹	Other Jewish Charities			
Richmond	1994	42%	0	17	41	59%	71%
Rochester	1999	40%	0	21	39	61%	66%
Milwaukee	1996	39%	0	27	34	67%	59%
Lehigh Valley	2007	33%	0	28	38	62%	54%
Minneapolis	2004	33%	1	28	39	62%	53%
Harrisburg	1994	33%	0	30	36	64%	52%
Charlotte	1997	33%	0	34	33	67%	49%
Tidewater	2001	32%	0	25	43	57%	57%
Hartford	2000	32%	0	29	39	61%	53%
York	1999	32%	0	28	40	60%	53%
Jacksonville	2002	32%	0	31	37	63%	50%
Wilmington	1995	29%	0	25	46	54%	54%
San Antonio	2007	28%	0	32	40	60%	47%
Rhode Island	2002	27%	0	26	48	52%	51%
Orlando	1993	27%	0	38	35	65%	42%
St. Paul	2004	25%	1	35	39	61%	41%
Detroit	2005	24%	0	39	37	63%	37%
Broward	1997	20%	14	34	32	68%	29%
S Palm Beach	2005	20%	20	33	28	72%	27%
Miami	2014	19%	5	39	37	63%	31%

**TABLE 4
PHILANTHROPIC MARKET SHARE IN THE PAST YEAR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: CHARITABLE DOLLARS DONATED BY JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Jewish Charities			Non-Jewish Charities	Jewish Charities' Share of All Charitable Dollars	Local Jewish Federation's Share of Jewish Charitable Dollars
		Local Jewish Federation	Other Jewish Federations ¹	Other Jewish Charities			
St. Petersburg	1994	19%	43		38	62%	31%
Monmouth	1997	18%	5	45	32	68%	27%
W Palm Beach	2005	17%	20	32	31	69%	24%
Tucson	2002	16%	9	31	45	55%	29%
New Haven	2010	15%	3	28	53	47%	33%
Washington	2003	15%	1	30	55	45%	33%
Middlesex	2008	15%	5	49	31	69%	22%
Sarasota	2001	15%	21	35	30	70%	21%
Atlantic County	2004	12%	26	34	28	72%	16%
Portland (ME)	2007	11%	0	27	63	37%	28%
Westport	2000	11%	5	27	57	43%	25%
Bergen	2001	11%	4	56	30	70%	15%
Las Vegas	2005	8%	8	28	56	44%	18%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	8% ²	18	28	46	54%	14%
NJPS ³	2000	19%		43	38	62%	NA

See footnotes on the next page.

TABLE 4
PHILANTHROPIC MARKET SHARE IN THE PAST YEAR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS

BASE: CHARITABLE DOLLARS DONATED BY JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

		Jewish Charities					
Community	Year	<i>Local Jewish Federation</i>	<i>Other Jewish Federations</i> ¹	<i>Other Jewish Charities</i>	Non-Jewish Charities	Jewish Charities' Share of All Charitable Dollars	Local Jewish Federation's Share of Jewish Charitable Dollars

¹ In some communities, no question was asked about amounts donated to *Other Jewish Federations* and zeros have been entered in the table. If the question had been asked, there would likely be a very small percentage of charitable dollars donated to *Other Jewish Federations* in the past year.

² Martin-St. Lucie has no Local Jewish Federation and is served by the Jewish Federation of Palm Beach County.


³ NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.

Note: The percentages in the table should be viewed as rough approximations, since respondents were not asked to report the exact amounts their households donated, but rather were asked to report their donations in various amount categories (e.g., \$100-\$500). When calculating the amounts donated in each category of donations (Local Jewish Federation, Other Jewish Federations, Other Jewish Charities, and Non-Jewish Charities), the amount used was the midpoint of the range in each amount category. For example, all households who donated under \$100 were assumed to have donated \$50. All households who donated \$25,000 and over were assumed (conservatively) to have donated \$25,000. These amounts were multiplied by the number of households who donated each amount to derive the total amount donated in each category of donations. These total amounts were then converted to percentages.

10

LOCAL JEWISH FEDERATION'S SHARE OF CHARITABLE DOLLARS IN THE PAST YEAR


(Charitable Dollars Donated by Jewish Households)



11

OTHER JEWISH FEDERATIONS' SHARE OF CHARITABLE DOLLARS IN THE PAST YEAR

(Charitable Dollars Donated by Jewish Households)




In some communities, the question about amounts donated to Other Jewish Federations was not asked because it was deemed immaterial. Zeros have been entered in the graph; however, if the question had been asked, there likely would be a very small percentage of charitable dollars donated to Jewish Federations in other communities.

12

OTHER JEWISH FEDERATIONS' AND OTHER JEWISH CHARITIES' SHARE OF CHARITABLE DOLLARS IN THE PAST YEAR

(Charitable Dollars Donated by Jewish Households)




In some communities, the question about amounts donated to Other Jewish Federations was not asked because it was deemed immaterial. Zeros have been entered in the graph; however, if the question had been asked, there likely would be a very small percentage of charitable dollars donated to Jewish Federations in other communities.

Communities with white bars did not ask about Other Jewish Federations and Other Jewish Charities separately



13


OTHER JEWISH CHARITIES' SHARE OF CHARITABLE DOLLARS IN THE PAST YEAR (Charitable Dollars Donated by Jewish Households)



14

NON-JEWISH CHARITIES' SHARE OF CHARITABLE DOLLARS IN THE PAST YEAR

(Charitable Dollars Donated by Jewish Households)




15

JEWISH CHARITIES'

SHARE OF CHARITABLE DOLLARS IN THE PAST YEAR


(Charitable Dollars Donated by Jewish Households)



16

LOCAL JEWISH FEDERATION'S SHARE OF JEWISH CHARITABLE DOLLARS IN THE PAST YEAR

(Jewish Charitable Dollars Donated by 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.