

# CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

## CHAPTER TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
Purposes of the Study . . . . .	1-2
Definitions of the Study Area and Geographic Areas . . . . .	1-4
Definitions . . . . .	1-6
Community Comparisons . . . . .	1-10
Comparisons with NJPS 2000-01 . . . . .	1-22
Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. . . . .	1-22
Reading the Tables . . . . .	1-23
Rounding of Numbers and Percentages . . . . .	1-24
Changes in the Number of Persons in Jewish Households by Geographic Area, 1997-2016. . . . .	3-17

*In the beginning . . .*

(Genesis 1:1)

## PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

This is the Main Report arising from the 2016 demographic study of the Jewish population in the service area of the Jewish Federation of Broward County. The study commenced in September 2015 and was completed in January 2017. Dr. Ira M. Sheskin of the University of Miami and Social Science Research Solutions (SSRS) of Media, PA were engaged to undertake the effort. The project was funded by the Jewish Federation of Broward County. A previous studies of this community was conducted in 1997 and the results of this study are available on [www.jewishdatabank.org](http://www.jewishdatabank.org).

As shown by the recent Pew Research Center Survey on Jewish Americans,<sup>1</sup> significant changes in the American Jewish community present major challenges. Research and planning based upon sound information have become essential components of the activities of the organized American Jewish community. Scientific Jewish community studies have been completed in almost 60 American Jewish communities since 1993 (**Table 1-1**), covering more than 85% of the more than 6.8 million American Jews counted in the *American Jewish Year Book*.<sup>2</sup>

National Jewish Population Surveys (NJPS) were conducted by the Council of Jewish Federations (which merged into United Jewish Communities) in 1971 and 1990 and by United Jewish Communities (now The Jewish Federations of North America) in 2000-01.

This study will assist the Jewish Federation of Broward County, Jewish agencies, local synagogues, and Jewish organizations in developing the community's strengths and in designing projects and programs to address its needs. It will provide information to help the community set priorities and guide decision making for the next decade and beyond.

In many ways, the term *demographic study* is a misnomer, for studies such as this one are actually designed to collect information about more than just strict demographic factors. Thus, this is called a *Jewish population study*. This study has collected data about a broad range of demographic and geographic characteristics, religious and community involvement, service delivery, and philanthropic behavior. The relationship between the first three types of data (demographic, geographic, and religious) and service delivery and campaign information are of particular importance, as are issues of Jewish continuity. More specifically, this study was designed to collect information about the following:

---

<sup>1</sup> Pew Research Center (2013). *A Portrait of Jewish Americans*. (Washington, DC: Pew Research Center) at [www.pewforum.org](http://www.pewforum.org).

<sup>2</sup> Ira Sheskin and Arnold Dashefsky (2015). "Jewish Population in the United States, 2015," in Arnold Dashefsky and Ira Sheskin (Editors) (2015) *American Jewish Year Book, 2015, Volume 115* (Dordrecht: Springer) pp. 163-260 at [www.jewishdatabank.org](http://www.jewishdatabank.org).

- ◆ Jewish Population Size
- ◆ Geographic Distribution
- ◆ Geographic Profile
- ◆ Demographic Profile
- ◆ Religious Profile
- ◆ Membership Profile
- ◆ Jewish Education
- ◆ Jewish Agencies
- ◆ Social Service Needs
- ◆ Israel
- ◆ Anti-Semitism and Anti-Israelism
- ◆ The Media
- ◆ Philanthropic Profile

Three driving forces helped to define the need for, and the nature of, this study.

**First**, the 1990<sup>3</sup> and 2000-01<sup>4</sup> National Jewish Population Surveys and the 2013 Pew Research Center study of Jewish Americans<sup>5</sup> and their reports of significant rates of intermarriage and issues of Jewish continuity have seriously impacted the agenda of the American Jewish community. Concern about Jewish continuity is as great in Broward as in any other community. This study was designed, in part, to provide the Jewish Federation of Broward County, Jewish agencies, local synagogues, and Jewish organizations with information to enable them to provide services and programs to contribute to the development of a Jewish community that will offer compelling reasons for all Jews to maintain their Jewish identity and remain active members of the community.

**Second**, complex decisions must be made by the Jewish Federation of Broward County and Jewish agencies. Questions were asked which will assist the Jewish Federation of Broward County and Jewish organizations and agencies that provide, or are concerned with, social and educational services. This study finds that the Jewish population of Broward is diverse demographically (with large numbers of both children and elderly) and, as a result, the social service network is critical to the continuing strength of the community. This study provides the data to help fine tune this network and prioritize the services offered.

**Third**, while the Jewish Federation of Broward County plays a central role in Jewish fund raising, it is felt that there is potential for increased giving across the community. To help meet Jewish needs in Broward, Israel, and around the world, questions were designed to collect information helpful to financial resource development by the Jewish community.

---

<sup>3</sup> Barry A. Kosmin et al. (1991). *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*. New York: Council of Jewish Federations at [www.jewishdatabank.org](http://www.jewishdatabank.org) .

<sup>4</sup> Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz, Steven Cohen, Jonathan Ament, Vivian Klaff, Frank Mott, and Danyelle Peckerman (2003). *Strength, Challenge and Diversity in the American Jewish Population*. New York: United Jewish Communities at [www.jewishdatabank.org](http://www.jewishdatabank.org).

<sup>5</sup> Pew Research Center (2013). *A Portrait of Jewish Americans*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center at <http://www.pewforum.org>.

## DEFINITIONS OF THE STUDY AREA AND GEOGRAPHIC AREAS

**T**he study area includes all of Broward County, Florida. For purposes of geographical analysis, the study area is divided into 6 geographic areas. See the map on the next page.

### 1 Southeast Broward

- ☞ Includes zip codes 33004, 33009, 33019, 33020, 33021, 33023, and 33312
- ☞ Includes cities of Hallandale, Hollywood, Pembroke Park, and parts of Miramar
- ☞ Geographic Description: East of Florida's Turnpike and South of I-595

### 2 Southwest Broward

- ☞ Includes zip codes 33024, 33025, 33026, 33027, 33028, 33029, 33314, 33326, 33327, 33328, 33330, 33331, and 33332
- ☞ Includes cities of Bonaventure, Cooper City, Davie, Pembroke Pines (including condominium of Century Village), and Weston
- ☞ Geographic Description: West of Florida's Turnpike and South of I-595

### 3 West Central Broward

- ☞ Includes zip codes 33309, 33068, 33313, 33317, 33319, 33321, 33322, 33323, 33324, 33325, and 33351
- ☞ Includes cities of Lauderdale Lakes, North Lauderdale, Plantation, Sunrise, and Tamarac (including the condominium of Kings Point)
- ☞ Geographic Description: West of 441 (plus Lauderdale Lakes zip code), North of I-595, and South of Atlantic Boulevard

### 4 Northwest Broward

- ☞ Includes zip codes 33065, 33067, 33071, 33073, and 33076
- ☞ Includes cities of Coral Springs, northern Coconut Creek, and Parkland
- ☞ Geographic Description: North of Atlantic Boulevard in the West, North of Sample Road in the East, and West of Powerline Road

### 5 North Central Broward

- ☞ Includes zip codes 33063, 33066, 33069, and 33442
- ☞ Includes cities of Coconut Creek (excluding northern part) and Margate
- ☞ Includes condominiums of Century Village, Palm Aire, and Wynmoor Village

### 6 East Broward

- ☞ Includes zip codes 33060, 33062, 33064, 33301, 33304, 33305, 33306, 33308, 33311, 33315, 33316, 33334, and 33441
- ☞ Includes city of Fort Lauderdale
- ☞ Geographic Description: East of I-95 and North of State Road 84 to the Palm Beach County line

Place holder for map

## DEFINITIONS

**K**ey definitions of terms used throughout this report are provided below. Terms used only in certain chapters are defined within those chapters.

### • Jewish Person

A *Jewish person* is any person who currently considers himself/herself Jewish (or who is identified as such by the respondent) or who was born Jewish or raised Jewish and has not formally converted to another religion and does not regularly attend religious services of another religion (*irrespective* of formal conversion). Note that whether a person was born Jewish, was raised Jewish, or currently considers himself/herself Jewish is based on self-identification. A person who was born Jewish or raised Jewish (excluding any such person who has formally converted to another religion or who regularly attends religious services of another religion [*irrespective* of formal conversion]), but currently considers himself/herself to be secular, agnostic, atheist, non-practicing, non-religious, non-observant, nothing, no religion, or a non-Western religion is considered to be Jewish. Adults (but not children) who consider themselves *part Jewish* are considered to be Jewish. Children who are part Jewish (being raised both Jewish and in another religion) are *not* considered to be Jewish when examining Jewish educational issues, but are counted in the overall count of Jews. Persons who are Messianic are *not* considered to be Jewish. *Persons of Jewish background* who do not consider themselves to be Jewish are *not* considered to be Jewish.

### • Jewish Household

A *Jewish household* is any household containing a Jewish person. See the “Definition of an Eligible Household” section in Chapter 2 for a list of exclusions.

### • Persons in Jewish Households

*Persons in Jewish households* are any persons (both Jewish and non-Jewish) living in a Jewish household. Some results in this report are shown for persons in Jewish households, while other results are shown only for Jewish persons or only for non-Jewish persons in Jewish households. Children who are temporarily away at school are included as persons in Jewish households. Paid Jewish employees living in a Jewish household are included as persons in Jewish households. Paid non-Jewish employees living in a Jewish household are *not* included as persons in Jewish households.

### • Jew-by-Choice

For adults, a *Jew-by-Choice* is any person age 18 or over who was not born or raised Jewish but currently considers himself/herself Jewish (*irrespective* of formal conversion). For children, a *Jew-by-Choice* is any person age 0-17 who was not born Jewish but is being raised Jewish (*irrespective* of formal conversion). Children who were not born Jewish but are being raised both Jewish and in another religion (part Jewish) are *not* considered to be Jews-by-Choice.

- **Born or Raised Jewish Adult**

A *born or raised Jewish adult* is any Jewish person age 18 or over who was born or raised Jewish. Jews-by-Choice (since they were not born or raised Jewish) and persons of Jewish background who do not consider themselves to be Jewish (since they are not currently Jewish) are *not* considered to be born or raised Jewish adults.

- **Respondent**

The *respondent* is the person in a Jewish household who was queried in the Telephone Survey. Some questions were asked of the respondent only, while other questions were asked of the respondent about the household or about other persons in the household. Some results in this report are shown for respondents only. Some results are shown for all respondents (both Jewish and non-Jewish), while other results are shown only for Jewish respondents. See the “Definition of an Eligible Respondent” section in Chapter 2 for procedural considerations.

- **Head of Household**

In most cases, the respondent is the *head of household*. In cases in which the respondent is not Jewish, the Jewish spouse (or partner or significant other), Jewish parent, or other Jewish adult is generally designated as the head of household.

In households in which the respondent is an adult child, an elderly relative, or another member of the household who is clearly not the head of household, a Jewish head of household is designated at random from the husband and wife in the household or the single parent is designated as the head of household.

- **Age of Head of Household and Age of Respondent**

Data are shown for the *age of head of household* when examining questions in which the head of household is instrumental in making a household decision (such as synagogue membership or charitable donations). Data are shown for the *age of respondent* when examining questions in which the respondent is expressing an opinion (such as emotional attachment to Israel) and questions asked only of the respondent (such as volunteering).

- **Children in Jewish Households and Jewish Children**

*Children in Jewish households* are any persons age 0-17 (both Jewish and non-Jewish) living in a Jewish household. *Jewish children* are any persons age 0-17 living in a Jewish household who are identified by the respondent as being raised Jewish (*irrespective* of formal conversion). Children who are part Jewish (being raised both Jewish and in another religion) are *not* considered to be Jewish children, but are counted in the overall count of Jews. Some results in this report are shown for children in Jewish households or Jewish households with children, while other results are shown only for Jewish children or households with Jewish children. In a few cases, results are shown for Jewish and part Jewish children combined.

- **Part-Year and Full-Year Households**

*Part-year households* are Jewish households who live in the study area for 3-7 months of the year. *Full-year households* are Jewish households who live in the study area for 8-12 months of the year. *Visitor households* are Jewish households who live in the study area for less than three months of the year.

- **FSU Households**

*FSU households* are Jewish households in which an adult was born in one of the republics of the Former Soviet Union (FSU) or in which the respondent's location of residence prior to the study area was in the FSU.

- **Hispanic Households, Sephardic Households, and Israeli Households**

*Hispanic households* are Jewish households in which an adult considers himself/herself Hispanic. *Sephardic households* are Jewish households in which an adult considers himself/herself Sephardic. *Israeli households* are Jewish households in which an adult considers himself/herself Israeli.

- **Age Groups**

Except as otherwise specified in this report, *children* refers to persons age 0-17, *teenagers* refers to persons age 13-17, *adults* refers to persons age 18 and over, *non-elderly* refers to adults under age 65, and *elderly* refers to adults age 65 and over.

- **Household Structure**

*Household with children* refers to Jewish households containing children (both Jewish and non-Jewish) age 0-17 at home. *Household with only adult children* refers to Jewish households containing adult children (both Jewish and non-Jewish) age 18-29 (unless otherwise specified) at home and no children age 0-17 at home. *Non-elderly couple household* refers to two-person Jewish households containing a married couple in which the head of household is age 18-64. *Non-elderly single household* refers to one-person Jewish households containing a person age 18-64. *Elderly couple household* refers to two-person Jewish households containing a married couple in which the head of household is age 65 or over. *Elderly single household* refers to one-person Jewish households containing a person age 65 or over.

- **Jewish Identification**

With the exception of the data on the denomination of synagogue membership in Chapter 7, results reported for Orthodox, Conservative, Reconstructionist, Reform, and *Just Jewish* subgroups refer to the respondent's self-identification, not the denomination of synagogue membership. In cases in which the respondent is not Jewish, the Jewish identification is that of the Jewish spouse (or partner or significant other), Jewish parent, or other Jewish adult as reported by the non-Jewish respondent (in a *proxy* fashion). See the "Definition of an Eligible Respondent" section in Chapter 2 for more information on proxy responses.



### • Types of Marriage

① **In-marriage:** An *in-marriage* is a marriage in which both spouses were born or raised Jewish and currently consider themselves Jewish.

② **Conversionary In-marriage:** A *conversionary in-marriage* is a marriage in which one spouse was born or raised Jewish and currently considers himself/herself Jewish and the other spouse was not born or raised Jewish but currently considers himself/herself Jewish (*irrespective of formal conversion*).

③ **Intermarriage:** An *intermarriage* is a marriage in which one spouse currently considers himself/herself Jewish and the other spouse does not currently consider himself/herself Jewish.

### • Jewish Organization

A *Jewish organization* is a Jewish organization other than a synagogue or Jewish Community Center. In querying whether anyone in the household is currently a member of a Jewish organization, respondents were given the examples of B'nai B'rith and Hadassah.

### • Jewish and General Trips to Israel

① **Jewish Trip:** A *Jewish trip* to Israel is a trip sponsored by a Jewish group, such as a Jewish Federation, Birthright, Jewish agency, synagogue, or Jewish organization. Households containing members who lived or studied in Israel (excluding households containing Israelis) are reported as households in which a member visited Israel on a Jewish trip. Households containing members who visited Israel on both a Jewish trip and a general trip are reported as households in which a member visited Israel on a Jewish trip.

② **General Trip:** A *general trip* to Israel is either a trip sponsored by a non-Jewish group or commercial company or a trip in which the household member visited Israel on his/her own or with family. Households containing Israelis are reported as households in which a member visited Israel on a general trip.

### • Jewish Federation Market Segments in the Past Year

Respondents were asked whether their households donated to the Jewish Federation of Broward County (*Jewish Federation*) in the past year. If their households did not donate, the respondents were asked whether the Jewish Federation contacted them in the past year for the purpose of asking their households to donate. "Don't know" responses were treated as negative responses. From these two questions, three *Jewish Federation market segments* are developed:

① **Donated to Federation:** Includes households who reported that they donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year.

② **Asked, Did Not Donate:** Includes households who reported that the Jewish Federation asked them to donate in the past year but they did not donate.

❸ **Not Asked:** Includes households who reported that they did not donate to the Jewish Federation in the past year and were not asked to donate.

- **Donated to Jewish Federation in the Past Year**

The variable *Donated to Jewish Federation in the Past Year* refers only to households who donated to the Jewish Federation of Broward County. Households who donated only to Jewish Federations outside Broward are not included.

- **Median**

The *median* is a measure of the central tendency of a distribution. For example, if the median age is 40, then half of the population is under age 40 and half of the population is over age 40.

- **Base**

The *base* refers to the set of households or persons in a household about whom the results of each question on the Telephone Survey are reported. The base is the denominator used in calculating the percentages shown in the text and tables in this report. The base is shown either directly below the table title or in the column headings or row labels. Examples of bases used in this report include, among others, Jewish Households, Persons in Jewish Households, Respondents, Adults in Jewish Households, and Jewish Children Age 0-17.

## COMMUNITY COMPARISONS

**I**n many cases this report compares Broward with other American Jewish communities (Table 1-1). About 200 *Comparison with Other Communities* tables are presented in this report.<sup>6</sup>

**Reasons for Exercising Caution in Comparing Broward with Other Jewish Communities.** The comparisons of Broward with other Jewish communities should be treated with caution for the following major reasons:

❶ **Different Dates of the Studies.** The Jewish community studies included in the comparison tables were completed over a 23-year period. Differences between Place A in 1993 and Place B in 2016 may be due to the temporal differences in the community studies. For example, the intermarriage rate in Place A may be lower than in Place B simply because the community study in Place A was completed 21 years earlier, when

---

<sup>6</sup> Other comparison tables may be found in Ira M. Sheskin (2015). *Comparisons of Jewish Communities: A Compendium of Tables and Bar Charts* Storrs, CT: Mandell Berman Institute, Berman Jewish DataBank and The Jewish Federations of North America at [www.jewishdatabank.org](http://www.jewishdatabank.org). For older comparisons of Broward with other Jewish communities, see Ira M. Sheskin (2001). *How Jewish Communities Differ: Variations in the Findings of Local Jewish Demographic Studies*. New York: City University of New York, Berman Jewish DataBank at [www.jewishdatabank.org](http://www.jewishdatabank.org).

intermarriage rates generally were lower. Obviously, this is an extreme example since most comparisons are between studies completed closer in time than in this example.

② **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 as comparison Jewish communities. Different sampling methods may lead to differences in survey results. Thus, the intermarriage rate in Place A may be lower than in Place B because the community study in Place A used RDD and List samples, where the List sample included proportionately fewer intermarried households, while the community study in Place B used an RDD only sample. (See the “Telephone Survey” section in Chapter 2 for a further discussion of RDD and List sampling methods.) **Table 1-2** shows the sampling methods and sample sizes for each of the community studies included in the comparison tables.

③ **Different Questionnaires.** A variety of questionnaires have been used in Jewish community studies. 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.

④ **Small Sample Sizes.** In general, when comparing the overall results for Jewish households or persons in Jewish households among the comparison Jewish communities, the sample sizes used in the community studies are such that results which are at least five percentage points apart may be considered to be statistically significantly different. On the other hand, when comparing the results among the comparison Jewish communities for population subgroups (such as households with children or respondents under age 35), the sample sizes may be considerably smaller such that even differences of 10-15 percentage points may not be considered to be statistically significantly different.

In summary, while problems do exist in comparing the results among the comparison Jewish communities, this researcher has every confidence that despite these problems community comparisons help provide an important context for understanding the Broward Jewish community.

**Rules for Inclusion of Comparison Jewish Communities.** To be included in the comparison tables, a community study had to meet the following major criteria:

① A telephone survey using an RDD sample had to be used for at least part of the sample and for the greater part of the geographic area served by the community’s Jewish Federation.

② The study had to be completed since 1993, a 23-year period. If a community completed multiple studies during this period, only the results of the most recent study are shown.

- ③ A community had to have asked the questions addressed in the tables using wording similar to Broward and to have reported the results in a manner facilitating comparison. In some cases where the original results were not reported in a manner facilitating comparison, this researcher has obtained the original data and produced results that permit comparisons.
- ④ A community had to have asked the questions addressed in the tables of the same set of households or persons in a household (*base*) as Broward. For example, if the question in Broward was asked of all *persons in Jewish households*, then only other Jewish communities querying this set of persons could be included in the table. Minor differences in the set of 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 below a thick horizontal line at the end of the table, with the alternative base noted. This is done for informational purposes only, and these communities are not included in the discussion of community comparisons.
- ⑤ The community study report had to be made available to the Berman Jewish DataBank or this researcher.

**Order of Communities in the Comparison Tables.** Each comparison table is ordered based upon one particular data column (the *ordered column*), in descending order of magnitude of the data. Except for those comparison tables with only one data column, the ordered column has an *italicized* heading. The choice of ordered column is determined by the data thought to be most interesting. Thus, for example, the household size table is ordered by the percentage of single 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 the Jewish communities.

When two or more communities show the same percentage (or number) in the ordered 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 ordered column.

In some cases, when the ordered 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 comparison 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 ordered 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 the data are unavailable for the ordered column (but are available for other columns) are listed below a thick horizontal line.

**Particularly Instructive Comparison Jewish Communities.** It is believed that based on the recency of the study, geographic proximity of the community to Broward, similar size of the Jewish Federation Annual Campaign, or similar population size of the community, the following communities provide particularly instructive comparisons with Broward: Minneapolis,, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis (**Table 1-1**). These communities are shown in **boldface type** in the comparison tables.

**Ranking of Broward Compared to Other Jewish Communities.** For the data in the ordered column and such other data columns that are deemed to be most interesting in each comparison table, the text of the report indicates whether Broward is well below average, below average, about average, above average, or well above average compared to other Jewish communities. In some cases, Broward is identified as being among the highest or lowest of the comparison Jewish communities on a particular measure. These *rankings* are determined based upon the number of comparison Jewish communities, the relative magnitude of the values (usually a percentage) being compared, and the spread between the value for Broward and the median value for the data being compared. In general, if the value for Broward is within four percentage points of the median value, Broward is identified as about average. If the value for Broward is five to eight percentage points from the median value, Broward is identified as either above average or below average, or, if appropriate, as ranking among the highest or lowest of the comparison Jewish communities. If the value for Broward is more than eight percentage points from the median value, Broward is identified as either *well* above average or *well* below average, or, if appropriate, as ranking among the highest or lowest of the comparison Jewish communities.

**Other Notes.** The year for each community study reported in the comparison tables is the year in which the telephone survey was completed.

Comparative information for residents of Broward County (both Jewish and non-Jewish) and all Americans (both Jewish and non-Jewish) was generally obtained from the 2014

American Community Survey (ACS) at [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov). Note that the ACS data includes all persons in institutions while the data from the Telephone Survey excludes Jews in institutions without their own telephone number.

See [www.jewishdatabank.org](http://www.jewishdatabank.org) for copies of the questionnaires and community study reports for many of the comparison Jewish communities.

Most of the results for the comparison Jewish communities derive from the community study reports produced by this and other researchers. In some cases, as indicated above, the results for community studies not conducted by this researcher are based upon analysis of the data sets for these communities available at [www.jewishdatabank.org](http://www.jewishdatabank.org).

<b>TABLE 1-1 JEWISH POPULATION SIZE COMMUNITY COMPARISONS</b>				
<b>Community</b>	<b>Year of Study</b>	<b>Number of Jewish Households</b>	<b>Number of Persons in Jewish Households</b>	<b>Number of Jews <sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Atlanta</b>	2006	61,300	156,900	119,800
Atlantic County	2004	10,000	23,100	20,400
Baltimore	2010	42,500	108,100	93,400
Bergen	2001	28,400	78,000	71,700
Boston	2005	105,500	265,500	210,500
<b>Broward</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>133,000</b>	<b>269,100</b>	<b>241,000</b>
<b>BROWARD</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>72,000</b>	<b>174,000</b>	<b>149,000</b>
Buffalo	1995	11,520	31,600	26,400
Charlotte	1997	4,000	10,600	7,800
Chicago	2010	148,100	381,900	291,800
Cincinnati	2008	12,500	33,000	27,000
Cleveland	2011	38,300	98,300	80,800
Columbus	2013	14,200	37,000	25,500
Denver	2007	47,500	117,200	83,900
Detroit	2005	30,000	78,000	72,000
East Bay	2011	51,400	NA	100,700
Essex-Morris	1998	47,000	117,100	96,000
Harrisburg	1994	3,200	8,600	7,100
Hartford	2000	14,800	36,900	32,800
<b>Houston</b>	2016			
Howard County	2010	7,500	20,400	17,200
Jacksonville	2002	6,700	16,200	13,000
<b>Las Vegas</b>	2005	42,000	89,000	67,500
Lehigh Valley	2007	4,000	9,800	8,050

**TABLE 1-1  
JEWISH POPULATION SIZE  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

<i>Community</i>	<b>Year of Study</b>	<b>Number of Jewish Households</b>	<b>Number of Persons in Jewish Households</b>	<b>Number of Jews <sup>1</sup></b>
Los Angeles	1997	247,668	590,000	519,200
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	2,700	5,800	5,000
<b>Miami</b>	2014	55,700	129,700	123,200
Middlesex	2008	24,000	56,600	52,040
Milwaukee	1996	10,400	25,400	21,100
Minneapolis	2004	13,850	35,300	29,300
Monmouth	1997	26,000	72,500	65,700
New Haven	2010	11,000	27,800	23,000
New York	2011	694,000	1,769,000	1,538,000
Orlando	1993	9,044	23,400	19,200
Palm Springs	1998	7,850	15,850	13,850
Philadelphia	2009	116,700	251,400	214,600
Phoenix	2002	44,000	106,900	82,900
Pittsburgh	2002	20,900	54,200	42,200
Portland (ME)	2007	4,300	11,825	8,350
Rhode Island	2002	9,550	23,000	18,750
Richmond	1994	6,000	15,300	12,150
Rochester	1999	10,230	25,600	21,000
San Antonio	2007	4,500	11,200	9,170
San Diego	2003	46,000	118,000	89,000
San Francisco	2004	125,400	291,500	227,800 <sup>3</sup>
Sarasota	2001	8,800	17,500	15,500
Seattle	2000	22,490	53,500	37,200
<b>S Palm Beach</b>	2005	73,000	136,800	131,300



<b>TABLE 1-1 JEWISH POPULATION SIZE COMMUNITY COMPARISONS</b>				
<b>Community</b>	<b>Year of Study</b>	<b>Number of Jewish Households</b>	<b>Number of Persons in Jewish Households</b>	<b>Number of Jews <sup>1</sup></b>
St. Louis	2014	32,900	89,300	61,100
St. Paul	2004	5,150	13,400	10,940
St. Petersburg	1994	13,006	30,200	25,700
Tidewater	2001	5,400	13,800	10,950
Tucson	2002	13,400	28,600	22,400
Washington (DC)	2003	110,000	267,800	215,600
<b>W Palm Beach</b>	2005	69,000	137,300	124,250
Westport	2000	5,000	13,600	11,450
Wilmington <sup>4</sup>	1995	5,700	15,100	11,900
York	1999	925	2,400	1,800
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,789,983</b>	<b>6,639,875</b>	<b>5,482,250</b>
<i>American Jewish Year Book 2015</i> <sup>5</sup>	2015			6,829,980
NJPS <sup>6</sup>	2000	2,900,000	6,700,000	5,237,700
Brandeis University Meta-Analysis <sup>7</sup>	2013			6,800,000
Pew Research Center <sup>8</sup>	2013			6,700,000

**TABLE 1-1  
JEWISH POPULATION SIZE  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

<i>Community</i>	<b>Year of Study</b>	<b>Number of Jewish Households</b>	<b>Number of Persons in Jewish Households</b>	<b>Number of Jews <sup>1</sup></b>
------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------

<sup>1</sup> Includes number of Jews in institutions without their own telephone numbers where available. Estimates are for the year of the study. Current estimates may differ, see Ira Sheskin and Arnold Dashefsky (2015). "Jewish Population in the United States, 2015," in Arnold Dashefsky and Ira Sheskin (Editors) (2015) *American Jewish Year Book, 2015, Volume 115* (Dordrecht: Springer) pp. 163-260 at [www.jewishdatabank.org](http://www.jewishdatabank.org).

<sup>2</sup> As per report, includes about 100,000 persons who identify as Christian.

<sup>3</sup> As per report, includes almost all children in Jewish households with at least one Jewish parent.

<sup>4</sup> Population estimates are for New Castle County (Wilmington and Newark). In addition, the Jewish Federation of Delaware serves the remainder of the state with 2,200 Jewish households, 5,000 persons in Jewish households, and 3,200 Jews.

<sup>5</sup> Ira Sheskin and Arnold Dashefsky (2015). "Jewish Population in the United States, 2015," in Arnold Dashefsky and Ira Sheskin (Editors) (2015) *American Jewish Year Book, 2015, Volume 115* (Dordrecht: Springer) pp. 163-260 at [www.jewishdatabank.org](http://www.jewishdatabank.org).

<sup>6</sup> See Ira Sheskin and Arnold Dashefsky (2006). "Jewish Population of the United States, 2006," in David Singer and Lawrence Grossman (Editors) *American Jewish Year Book 2006, Volume 106* (New York: The American Jewish Committee) pp.133-193 for an explanation of the differences between the *American Jewish Year Book* and NJPS results. The NJPS results are at Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz et al. (2003). *Strength, Challenge and Diversity in the American Jewish Population*. (New York: United Jewish Communities) at [www.jfna.org/NJPS](http://www.jfna.org/NJPS).

<sup>7</sup> Elizabeth Tighe et al. (2014) *American Jewish Estimates: 2014* Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, Steinhardt Social Research Institute at [www.brandeis.edu/ssri](http://www.brandeis.edu/ssri).

<sup>8</sup> Pew Research Center (2013). *A Portrait of Jewish Americans* (Washington, DC: Pew Research Center) at [www.pewforum.org](http://www.pewforum.org)

**Notes:**

1) For a detailed description of the geographic extent of each community, consult the community study reports available at [www.jewishdatabank.org](http://www.jewishdatabank.org). All study areas correspond to the local Jewish Federation's service area. Study areas range in size from the better part of a county to multi-county areas.

2) Data are reported for the *Year of Study*. Current population estimates may differ.

3) Only Jewish community studies conducted since 1993 that used random digit dialing (RDD) sampling for at least part of the sample and for the greater part of the geographic area served by the community's Jewish Federation are listed.

**TABLE 1-2  
DATES, SAMPLING METHODS, AND SAMPLE SIZES  
OF LOCAL JEWISH COMMUNITY STUDIES  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

<i>Community</i>	Year of		Sampling Method and Sample Size of Most Recent Study			
	Last Previous Study	Most Recent Study	RDD	DJN	List <sup>1</sup>	Total
<b>Atlanta</b>	1996	2006	322	0	685	1,007
Atlantic County	1985	2004	212	412	0	624
Baltimore	1999	2010	193	49	971	1,213
Bergen	None	2001	1,003	0	0	1,003
Boston	1995	2005	401	0	1,365	1,766
<b>Broward</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1,023</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,023</b>
Broward	1997	2016				1,201
Buffalo	None	1995	582	0	483 <sup>2</sup>	1,065
Charlotte	None	1997	186	298	0	484
Chicago	2000	2010	152	204	1,637	1,993
Cincinnati	None	2008	228	0	684	912
Cleveland	1996	2011	114	36	894	1,044
Columbus	2001	2013	47	61	654	762
Denver	1997	2007	227	70	1,102	1,399
Detroit	1989	2005	403	871	0	1,274
East Bay	1986	2011	621	199	0	820
Essex-Morris	1986	1998	1,446	0	0	1,446
Harrisburg	None	1994	186	289	0	475
Hartford	1982	2000	216	547	0	763
Howard County	1999	2010	49	0	204	253
Jacksonville	None	2002	209	226	166	601

**TABLE 1-2  
DATES, SAMPLING METHODS, AND SAMPLE SIZES  
OF LOCAL JEWISH COMMUNITY STUDIES  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

<i>Community</i>	Year of		Sampling Method and Sample Size of Most Recent Study			
	Last Previous Study	Most Recent Study	RDD	DJN	List <sup>1</sup>	Total
<b>Las Vegas</b>	1995	2005	398	799	0	1,197
Lehigh Valley	None	2007	217	320	0	537
Los Angeles	1979	1997	1,080	0	1,560	2,640
Martin-St. Lucie	None	1999	23	180	0	203
<b>Miami</b>	2004	2014	590	0	1,430	2,020
Middlesex	None	2008	469	607	0	1,076
Milwaukee	1983	1996	308	531	0	839
<b>Minneapolis</b>	None	2004	208	538 *	0	746
Monmouth	None	1997	395	401 <sup>3</sup>	0	796
New Haven	None	2010	297	536	0	833
New York	2002	2011	3,377	451	2,165	5,993
Orlando	None	1993	204	467	0	671
Palm Springs	None	1998	77	0	325	402
Philadelphia	1997	2009	362	101	754	1,217
Phoenix	1983	2002	229	0	564	793
<b>Pittsburgh</b>	None	2002	341	0	972	1,313
Portland (ME)	None	2007	150	271	0	421
Rhode Island	1987	2002	306	523	0	829
Richmond	None	1994	191	432	0	623
Rochester	1986	1999	213	495	0	708
San Antonio	None	2007	290	385	0	675

**TABLE 1-2  
DATES, SAMPLING METHODS, AND SAMPLE SIZES  
OF LOCAL JEWISH COMMUNITY STUDIES  
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

<i>Community</i>	Year of		Sampling Method and Sample Size of Most Recent Study			
	Last Previous Study	Most Recent Study	RDD	DJN	List <sup>1</sup>	Total
San Diego	None	2003	531	0	549	1,080
San Francisco	1986	2004	500	0	1,121	1,621
Sarasota	1992	2001	189	427	0	616
Seattle	1990	2000	217	0	600	817
<b>South Palm Beach</b>	1995	2005	1,511	0	0	1,511
<b>St. Louis</b>	1995	2014	216	30	757	1,003
St. Paul	None	2004	203	291 *	0	494
St. Petersburg	None	1994	204	412	0	616
Tidewater	1988	2001	182	446	0	628
Tucson	None	2002	300	505	0	805
Washington	1983	2003	400	801	0	1,201
<b>West Palm Beach</b>	1999	2005	1,534	0	0	1,534
Westport	None	2000	202	422	0	624
Wilmington	None	1995	157	318	0	475
York	None	1999	23	90	283	396
<b>Total</b>			<b>23,914</b>	<b>14,041</b>	<b>19,925</b>	<b>59,081</b>

\* Distinctive Jewish Name (DJN) sampling was supplemented with Russian Jewish (First) Name (RJN) sampling.

<sup>1</sup> Except as noted, the list sample is drawn from the Jewish Federation mailing list, sometimes combined with sampling from synagogue and organizational mailing lists.

<sup>2</sup> List sample was drawn from synagogue member lists.

<sup>3</sup> Distinctive Jewish Name (DJN) sampling was supplemented with Distinctive Sephardic Name (DSN) sampling.

Note: Only Jewish community studies conducted since 1993 that used random digit dialing (RDD) sampling for at least part of the sample and for the greater part of the geographic area served by the community's Jewish Federation are listed.

## COMPARISONS WITH NJPS 2000-01

**M**any of the comparison tables include results from the 2000-01 National Jewish Population Survey (*NJPS 2000*). This researcher believes that community comparisons based upon local community studies are more instructive than comparisons with NJPS 2000.

The NJPS 2000 questionnaire was administered to 4,523 respondents who represent the 5.1 million American Jews estimated by the study who live in households. Of the 4,523 respondents, 4,220 respondents (representing 4.3 million *more Jewishly-connected* American Jews) received a longer 43-minute questionnaire. The other 303 respondents (representing 800,000 *less Jewishly-connected* American Jews who live in households) received a 21-minute questionnaire. The shorter questionnaire consisted of a subset of questions from the longer questionnaire, omitting many questions about Jewish identity. As a result, the NJPS 2000-01 results for most demographic measures presented in this report (Chapters 4-5) represent all 5.1 million American Jews who live in households, while the NJPS 2000-01 results for most Jewish identity measures presented in this report (Chapters 6-8 and 11-14) reflect only the 4.3 million more Jewishly-connected American Jews. Results on Jewish identity measures for the more Jewishly-connected sample are, in most cases, more positive than they would have been had these data been collected from all respondents representing the 5.1 million American Jews who live in households. An additional 100,000 Jews were estimated by the study to live in institutions for a total NJPS 2000-01 estimate of 5.2 million American Jews. See [www.jewishdatabank.org](http://www.jewishdatabank.org) for more information on the NJPS 2000-01 methodology.

In the comparison tables, NJPS 2000-01 results shown for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*, reflecting the 4.3 million American Jews, are footnoted.

## COMPARISONS AMONG POPULATION SUBGROUPS

**T**hroughout this report, in the tables showing selected crosstabulations by population subgroup, comparisons are made between the percentages for particular population subgroups, such as geographic area and age, and the *overall percentage* for Broward as a whole shown in the first row of each table.

In general, the percentage for a particular population subgroup in a particular table is identified as being *much higher* or *much lower* than the overall percentage if that percentage differs by at least ten percentage points from the overall percentage. For example, if the overall percentage of Jewish respondents who identify as Orthodox is 11% and 24% of respondents in synagogue member households identify as Orthodox, then the percentage of respondents in synagogue member households who identify as Orthodox be identified as being *much higher* than the overall percentage because 24% is at least ten percentage points higher than 11%.

An exception to this guideline is made when the sample size for a population subgroup is less than 50. In such cases, the percentage for a particular population subgroup in a particular table is identified as being *much higher* or *much lower* than the overall percentage if that percentage differs by at least 20 percentage points from the overall percentage.

A second exception to this guideline is made when the overall percentage is less than 10%. In such cases, subjective judgment is used in determining what constitutes *much higher* or *much lower*.

A third exception to this guideline is made in Chapter 5 of this report, where differences as large as ten percentage points are rare for many of the demographic measures reported therein. In such cases, subjective judgment is used in determining what constitutes *much higher* or *much lower*.

## READING THE TABLES

**P**ercentage distributions for each question in the Telephone Survey are shown in a table, along with selected crosstabulations by various *population subgroups* such as geographic area, length of residence, age, sex, household structure, household income, Jewish identification, type of marriage, synagogue membership, Jewish Community Center membership, Jewish organization membership, formal and informal Jewish education of respondents as children, and such other variables as are deemed relevant.

In some tables, “don’t know” responses are included in the computations, while in other tables they are excluded. The inclusion or exclusion of “don’t know” responses depends on whether the “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, “don’t know” responses are treated as negative responses. Missing responses are excluded from the tables.

Each table shows the **base** (set of households or persons queried), or denominator used in calculating the percentages (shown either directly below the table title or in the column headings or row labels).

When reading the tables, percentages and corresponding numbers **add down** when the percent signs appear across the top of the columns, and percentages and corresponding numbers **add across** when the percent signs appear down the first column.

In instances where a single percentage is shown in a table, this percentage is essentially the percentage of households (or persons, adults, children, married couples, etc.) about whom a question was answered in the affirmative. In instances where every percentage in a table is shown with a percent sign, it means that each percentage is calculated on an independent base. In instances where percent signs are shown in columns surrounded by thick vertical lines, it means that these percentages are summed or calculated based upon information in the other columns in the table.

Demographic data are easily misunderstood. The data in the text and tables in this report should be examined carefully. 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. As an example, note that this study reports that 12% of *Jewish respondents in North Dade* identify as Orthodox. Yet, 62% of *Jewish respondents who identify as Orthodox* live in North Dade. The base in each table is shown either directly below the table title or in the column headings or row labels.

Another common error is to interpret results in terms of the number of *households* when results are shown in terms of the number of *persons*, or vice versa. Also, some of the results in this report are shown for *persons in Jewish households* (both Jewish and non-Jewish), while other results are shown only for *Jewish persons* or only for *respondents*.

### Typographic Devices

✓ A check mark is used to indicate that information appears in the text which cannot be determined from the tables.

White numbers in black circles (❶, ❷, ❸, etc.) are used in the column headings or row labels of tables to indicate that definitions of the terms are provided in the text of that particular chapter.

→ An arrow is used in some tables to designate a row which is a combination of the rows just above it. For example, the row “65 and over” is a combination of the rows “65-74” and “75 and over.”

☞ A pointing finger is used to designate a row which is a subgroup of the row immediately above it. For example, the row “Intermarried with Jewish Children” is a subgroup of the row “Intermarried.”

**Boldface type** is used to draw the reader’s attention to particularly instructive comparison Jewish communities in the comparison tables.

*Italics* is used to indicate the column on which a comparison table is ordered.

## ROUNDING OF NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES

**T**he reader may notice small differences in the percentages and numbers of households and persons shown in various parts of this report 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.

Although most percentages for Broward presented in the tables are shown to the nearest tenth and most numbers are shown to the nearest integer, it should be noted that all percentages and numbers are estimates.