

CHAPTER 11

ISRAEL

CHAPTER TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Households in Which a Member Visited Israel.....	11-2
Trips to Israel by Jewish Children.....	11-10
Cost Prevented Sending Jewish Children on a Trip to Israel.....	11-13
Emotional Attachment to Israel.....	11-16

Go to the land that I will show you. I will bless you and make your descendants into a great nation. You will become famous and be a blessing to others.

(GENESIS 12:1-2)

HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A MEMBER VISITED ISRAEL

Table 11-1 shows that 61% of Jewish households in Broward contain an adult or a Jewish child (*member*) who visited Israel. Two types of trips to Israel are defined in this study:

❶ **Jewish Trip:** A Jewish trip to Israel is a trip sponsored by a Jewish group, such as a Jewish Federation, 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 (excluding households containing Israelis) are reported as households in which a member visited Israel on a Jewish trip.

❷ **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 a household member visited Israel on his/her own. Households containing Israelis are reported as households in which a member visited Israel on a general trip. Israelis are included as having visited Israel on a general trip.

❸ The *Jewish Trip Market Share (market share)* is defined as the percentage of households in which a member who visited Israel visited on a Jewish trip.

25% of households contain a member who visited Israel on a Jewish trip and 36%, on a general trip. The market share is 37%.

✓ The 2% of households in which a member 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.

Community Comparisons. Table 11-2 shows that the 61% of households in which a member **visited Israel** is the third highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 71% in Miami, 61% in South Palm Beach, 59% in Houston, 55% in West Palm Beach, and 33% in Las Vegas. The 61% compares to 52% in 1997.

Table 11-3 shows that the 25% of households in which a member visited Israel on a **Jewish trip** is about average among about 35 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 31% in Houston, 28% in South Palm Beach, 26% in Miami, 25% in West Palm Beach, and 10% in Las Vegas. The 25% compares to 20% in 1997.

The 36% of households in which a member visited Israel on a **general trip** is the third highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 45% in Miami, 32% in South Palm Beach, 30% in West Palm Beach, 28% in Houston, and 22% in Las Vegas. The 36% compares to 32% in 1997.

The 41% **market share** is below average among about 35 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 52% in Houston, 47% in South Palm Beach, 46% in West Palm Beach, 37% in Miami, and 31% in Las Vegas. The 41% compares to 38% in 1997.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. Table 11-1 shows that, overall, 61% of households contain a member who visited Israel. The percentage is much higher in:

- households in the Southeast (79%)
- households earning an annual income of \$200,000 and over (84%)
- Orthodox households (92%) and Reform households (81%)
- in-married households (73%) and conversionary in-married households (74%)
- synagogue member households (81%), households who attended Chabad in the past year (81%), JCC member households (75%), and Jewish organization member households (83%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (79%)
- households who donated under \$100 (82%), \$500-\$1,000 (94%), and \$1,000 and over (94%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year

The percentage is much lower in:

- households in the North Central (50%)
- households earning an annual income under \$25,000 (40%) and \$25,000-\$50,000 (49%)
- intermarried households (25%)
- synagogue non-member households (51%)

TABLE 1 1-1					
HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A MEMBER VISITED ISRAEL					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Visited Israel			Not to Israel	Jewish Trip Market Share ③
	Total	Jewish Trip ①	General Trip ②		
All	61.1%	25.1%	36.0	38.9	41.1%
GEOGRAPHIC AREA					
Northwest	56.4%	19.9%	36.5	43.6	35.3%
North Central	49.7%	21.3%	28.4	50.3	42.9%
East	57.6%	18.8%	38.8	42.4	32.6%
West Central	53.7%	20.3%	33.4	46.3	37.8%
Southeast	79.1%	31.1%	48.0	20.9	39.3%
Southwest	65.7%	33.9%	31.8	34.3	51.6%
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE					
Household with Children	62.2%	28.4%	33.8	37.8	45.7%
Household with Only Adult Children	60.3%	28.1%	32.2	39.7	46.6%
Non-Elderly Couple	55.6%	25.6%	30.0	44.4	46.0%
Non-Elderly Single	64.3%	22.8%	41.5	35.7	35.5%
Elderly Couple	66.1%	23.4%	42.7	33.9	35.4%
Elderly Single	61.8%	26.8%	35.0	38.2	43.4%
HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
Under \$25,000	39.6%	8.7%	30.9	60.4	22.0%
\$25 - \$50,000	48.9%	21.6%	27.3	51.1	44.2%
\$50 - \$100,000	64.9%	19.7%	45.2	35.1	30.4%
\$100 - \$200,000	60.8%	34.3%	26.5	39.2	56.4%
\$200,000 and over	83.7%	38.3%	45.4	16.3	45.8%

TABLE 1 1-1 HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A MEMBER VISITED ISRAEL					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Visited Israel			Not to Israel	Jewish Trip Market Share Ⓔ
	Total	Jewish Trip Ⓐ	General Trip Ⓑ		
All	61.1%	25.1%	36.0	38.9	41.1%
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION					
Orthodox	92.2%	41.8%	50.4	7.8	45.3%
Conservative	69.4%	32.7%	36.7	30.6	47.1%
Reform	81.1%	55.2%	25.9	18.9	68.1%
Just Jewish	63.8%	28.9%	34.9	36.2	45.3%
TYPE OF MARRIAGE					
In-married	73.4%	31.1%	42.3	26.6	42.4%
Conversionary	73.8%	27.4%	46.4	26.2	37.1%
Intermarried	24.6%	13.4%	11.2	75.4	54.5%
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP					
Member	81.3%	42.8%	38.5	18.7	52.6%
Non-Member	50.7%	16.0%	34.7	49.3	31.6%
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR					
Attended	81.2%	32.4%	48.8	18.8	39.9%
Did Not Attend	55.1%	22.9%	32.2	44.9	41.6%
JCC MEMBERSHIP					
Member	75.0%	36.5%	38.5	25.0	48.7%
Non-Member	59.2%	23.5%	35.7	40.8	39.7%

TABLE 11-1 HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A MEMBER VISITED ISRAEL					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Visited Israel			Not to Israel	Jewish Trip Market Share ③
	Total	Jewish Trip ①	General Trip ②		
All	61.1%	25.1%	36.0	38.9	41.1%
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP					
Member	82.9%	38.6%	44.3	17.1	46.6%
Non-Member	55.8%	21.8%	34.0	44.2	39.1%
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR					
Donated to Federation	79.4%	36.4%	43.0	20.6	45.8%
Asked, Did Not Donate	61.2%	27.5%	33.7	38.8	44.9%
Not Asked	54.4%	20.1%	34.3	45.6	36.9%
DONATED TO THE JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR					
Nothing	55.2%	20.9%	34.3	44.8	37.9%
Under \$100	81.5%	30.9%	50.6	18.5	37.9%
\$100 - \$500	64.7%	31.5%	33.2	35.3	48.7%
\$500 - \$1,000	93.6%	46.6%	47.0	6.4	49.8%
\$1,000 and over	94.0%	58.1%	35.9	6.0	61.8%
Note: See page 11-2 for an explanation of ①, ②, and ③.					

**TABLE 11-2
HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A MEMBER VISITED ISRAEL
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Miami	2014	71%		Wilmington	1995	37%
Bergen	2001	62%		Richmond	1994	36%
BROWARD	2016	61%		Portland (ME)	2007	35%
S Palm Beach	2005	61%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	35%
Los Angeles	1997	60%		St. Petersburg	1994	35%
Houston	2016	59%		Orlando	1993	34%
Detroit	2005	57%		Las Vegas	2005	33%
Sarasota	2001	56%		York	1999	28%
W Palm Beach	2005	55%		BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS		
Middlesex	2008	54%		Baltimore	2010	55%
Minneapolis	2004	52%		Cincinnati	2008	52%
Broward	1997	52%		Chicago	2010	50%
Washington	2003	51%		New York	2011	49%
New Haven	2010	50%		Cleveland	2011	47%
St. Paul	2004	49%		Essex-Morris	1998	46%
Monmouth	1997	47%		Columbus	2013	45%
Buffalo	1995	46%		Pittsburgh	2002	44%
Lehigh Valley	2007	45%		St. Louis	2014	43%
Westport	2000	44%		Howard County	2010	42%
Milwaukee	1996	44%		Atlanta	2006	40%
Tucson	2002	43%		San Diego	2003	39%
Hartford	2000	43%		Phoenix	2002	39%
San Antonio	2007	42%		Denver	2007	34%
Atlantic County	2004	42%		NJPS ¹	2000	35%
Rochester	1999	42%		¹ Question asked whether <i>the respondent</i> visited Israel, not anyone in the household.		
Rhode Island	2002	41%				
Tidewater	2001	40%				
Harrisburg	1994	40%				
Charlotte	1997	38%				
Jacksonville	2002	37%				

**TABLE 1 1-3
TYPES OF TRIPS TO ISRAEL
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Visited Israel		Jewish Trip Market Share ③
		Jewish Trip ①	General Trip ②	
Houston	2016	31%	28%	52%
S Palm Beach	2005	28%	32%	47%
Detroit	2005	28%	29%	49%
Sarasota	2001	28%	28%	50%
Miami	2014	26%	45%	37%
Bergen	2001	26%	36%	42%
BROWARD	2016	25%	36%	41%
W Palm Beach	2005	25%	30%	46%
Minneapolis	2004	25%	27%	49%
Washington	2003	25%	26%	49%
Middlesex	2008	24%	29%	45%
St. Paul	2004	24%	25%	48%
Monmouth	1997	24%	24%	50%
Milwaukee	1996	24%	20%	55%
Hartford	2000	23%	20%	54%
Rochester	1999	23%	18%	56%
Lehigh Valley	2007	22%	23%	49%
Atlantic County	2004	22%	19%	54%
Tidewater	2001	22%	18%	55%
Broward	1997	20%	32%	38%
New Haven	2010	20%	30%	40%
San Antonio	2007	20%	22%	47%
Rhode Island	2002	20%	21%	49%

**TABLE 1 1-3
TYPES OF TRIPS TO ISRAEL
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	Visited Israel		Jewish Trip Market Share ③
		<i>Jewish Trip</i> ①	<i>General Trip</i> ②	
Harrisburg	1994	20%	20%	51%
Westport	2000	19%	25%	44%
Charlotte	1997	18%	20%	47%
Richmond	1994	18%	18%	50%
Tucson	2002	17%	26%	39%
Jacksonville	2002	17%	20%	47%
Los Angeles	1997	16%	44%	27%
Wilmington	1995	16%	21%	43%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	15%	20%	43%
St. Petersburg	1994	15%	20%	43%
Portland (ME)	2007	13%	22%	36%
York	1999	11%	18%	37%
Las Vegas	2005	10%	22%	31%

Note: See page 11-2 for an explanation of ①, ②, and ③.

TRIPS TO ISRAEL BY JEWISH CHILDREN

Table 11-4 shows that 22% of households with Jewish children age 6-17 in Broward have sent a Jewish child to Israel: 3% on a Jewish trip and 19%, on a general trip. The 19% includes 1% of households with Jewish children age 6-17 who have sent a Jewish child to Israel on both a Jewish trip and a general trip.

A total of 34% of households with Jewish children age 13-17 have sent a Jewish child to Israel: 5% on a Jewish trip and 29%, on a general trip.

Community Comparisons. Table 11-5 shows that the 22% of households with Jewish children age 6-17 who have sent a Jewish child on a **trip to Israel** is above average among about 40 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 46% in Miami, 16% in South Palm Beach, 14% in Las Vegas, 12% in Houston, 5% in West Palm Beach. The 22% compares to 21% in 1997.

The 3% who have sent a Jewish child to Israel on a **Jewish trip** is about average among about 35 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 12% in Miami, 5% in South Palm Beach, 2% in Las Vegas, and 1% in both Houston and West Palm Beach. The 3% compares to 3% in 1997.

The 19% who have sent a Jewish child to Israel on a **general trip** is the fourth highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 34% in Miami, 13% in Las Vegas, 11% in South Palm Beach, 10% in Houston, and 4% in West Palm Beach. The 19% compares to 18% in 1997.

TABLE 11-4		
HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A JEWISH CHILD VISITED ISRAEL		
BASE: HOUSEHOLDS WITH JEWISH CHILDREN		
Trip to Israel	Households with Jewish Children Age 6-17	Households with Jewish Teenagers Age 13-17
Sent a Child to Israel on a Jewish Trip ❶	2.9%	5.3%
Sent a Jewish Child to Israel on a General Trip ❷	19.4	28.5
Did Not Send a Jewish Child to Israel	77.7	66.2
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Total Who Sent a Jewish Child to Israel	34.0%	45.2%
Note: See page 11-2 for an explanation of ❶ and ❷.		

**TABLE 11-5
HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A JEWISH CHILD VISITED ISRAEL
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: HOUSEHOLDS WITH JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 6-17

Community	Year	Visited Israel		
		Jewish Trip ①	General Trip ②	Total
Miami	2014	12%	34	46%
Bergen	2001	10%	28	38%
New York	2011	NA	NA	35%
Cleveland	2011	NA	NA	30%
Baltimore	2010	NA	NA	26%
Detroit	2005	5%	21	25%
New Haven	2010	7%	17	24%
BROWARD	2016	3%	19	22%
Monmouth	1997	9%	13	22%
Harrisburg	1994	9%	13	22%
Middlesex	2008	7%	15	22%
Rhode Island	2002	6%	15	21%
Broward	1997	3%	18	21%
San Antonio	2007	7%	12	19%
Milwaukee	1996	9%	9	18%
Chicago	2010	NA	NA	18%
Cincinnati	2008	NA	NA	18%
St. Paul	2004	6%	11	17%
Minneapolis	2004	5%	12	17%
S Palm Beach	2005	5%	11	16%
Washington	2003	3%	13	16%
St. Louis	2014	NA	NA	16%
Tucson	2002	13%	2	15%

**TABLE 11-5
HOUSEHOLDS IN WHICH A JEWISH CHILD VISITED ISRAEL
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: HOUSEHOLDS WITH JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 6-17

Community	Year	Visited Israel		
		Jewish Trip ①	General Trip ②	Total
Richmond	1994	9%	6	15%
Rochester	1999	6%	9	15%
Tidewater	2001	10%	4	14%
Hartford	2000	8%	6	14%
Las Vegas	2005	2%	13	14%
York	1999	5%	8	13%
Houston	2016	1%	10	12%
Orlando	1993	NA	NA	11%
Jacksonville	2002	7%	3	10%
Lehigh Valley	2007	6%	4	10%
Portland (ME)	2007	6%	4	10%
Sarasota	2001	6%	5	10%
Pittsburgh	2002	NA	NA	10%
Westport	2000	4%	5	9%
Atlantic County	2004	3%	6	9%
St. Petersburg	1994	2%	6	8%
Charlotte	1997	1%	7	8%
Wilmington	1995	1%	7	8%
Howard County	2010	NA	NA	8%
Phoenix	2002	NA	NA	7%
Columbus	2013	NA	NA	6%
W Palm Beach	2005	1%	4	5%

Note: See page 11-2 for an explanation of ① and ②.

COST PREVENTED SENDING JEWISH CHILDREN ON A TRIP TO ISRAEL

Respondents in households with Jewish children age 6-17 in Broward (whose Jewish children have not visited Israel) were asked if cost ever prevented them from sending a Jewish child on a trip to Israel. **Table 11-6** shows that 33% (3,000 households) of households with Jewish children age 6-17 (whose Jewish children have not visited Israel) did not send a child on a trip to Israel because of cost.

Community Comparisons. The 33% of households with Jewish children age 6-17 (whose Jewish children have not visited Israel) were asked if cost ever prevented them from sending a Jewish child on a trip to Israel compares to 40% in Miami and 25% in Houston, the only other communities to ask this question.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. **Table 11-6** shows that, overall, 33% of respondents in households with Jewish children age 6-17 (whose Jewish children have not visited Israel) said cost prevented them from sending a child on a trip to Israel. The percentage is much higher for respondents in:

- households in West Central (44%)
- households who donated \$1,000 and over to the Jewish Federation in the past year (43%)

The percentage is much lower in respondents in:

- households in the North Central (14%) and the East (3%)
- households earning an annual income of \$200,000 and over (9%)
- Reform households (30%)
- in-married households (21%) and intermarried households (20%)
- households in which an adult visited Israel on a Jewish trip (23%)
- households who donated under \$100 to the Jewish Federation in the past year (2%)

TABLE 1 1-6	
COST PREVENTED SENDING JEWISH CHILDREN ON A TRIP TO ISRAEL	
BASE: RESPONDENTS IN HOUSEHOLDS WITH JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 6-17 WHO HAVE NOT SENT A CHILD ON A TRIP TO ISRAEL	
Population Subgroup	Cost Prevented Trip to Israel for Child Age 6-17
All	32.6%
GEOGRAPHIC AREA	
Northwest	28.9%
North Central	13.7%
East	2.7%
West Central	43.7%
Southeast	30.0%
Southwest	33.5%
AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	
35 - 49	25.0%
50 - 64	46.5%
HOUSEHOLD INCOME	
\$50 - \$100,000	38.1%
\$100 - \$200,000	20.9%
\$200,000 and over	9.3%
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION	
Conservative	40.3%
Reform	30.4%
Just Jewish	24.9%
TYPE OF MARRIAGE	
In-married	21.4%
Intermarried	19.9%

TABLE 1 1-6 COST PREVENTED SENDING JEWISH CHILDREN ON A TRIP TO ISRAEL	
BASE: RESPONDENTS IN HOUSEHOLDS WITH JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 6-17 WHO HAVE NOT SENT A CHILD ON A TRIP TO ISRAEL	
Population Subgroup	Cost Prevented Trip to Israel for Child Age 6-17
All	32.6%
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP	
Member	36.3%
Non-Member	29.5%
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR	
Attended	40.4%
Did Not Attend	29.6%
JCC MEMBERSHIP	
Member	30.9%
Non-Member	32.9%
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP	
Member	31.0%
Non-Member	32.8%
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL	
On Jewish Trip	22.3%
On General Trip	38.2%
No	35.6%
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR	
Donated to Federation	23.0%
Asked, Did Not Donate	30.4%
Not Asked	34.0%
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR	
Nothing	33.7%
Under \$100	2.1%
\$1,000 and over	42.9%

EMOTIONAL ATTACHMENT TO ISRAEL

Table 11-7 shows that 25% of Jewish respondents in Broward are extremely attached to Israel; 30%, very attached; 30%, somewhat attached; and 15%, not attached to Israel. In total, 55% of respondents are extremely/very attached to Israel.

Community Comparisons. Table 11-8 shows that the 55% who are **extremely/very attached** to Israel is the sixth highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 62% in Miami, 61% in South Palm Beach, 54% in West Palm Beach, 49% in Houston, and 36% in Las Vegas. The 55% compares to 42% in 1997.

The 15% who are **not attached** to Israel is about average among about 35 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 24% in Las Vegas, 13% in Houston, 11% in Miami, 9% in West Palm Beach, and 7% in South Palm Beach. The 15% compares to 17% in 1997.

Age of Respondent. Table 11-9 shows that the 52% of respondents **under age 35** who are extremely/very attached to Israel is the fourth highest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 65% in Miami, 56% in Houston, 35% in South Palm Beach, 32% in Las Vegas, and 25% in West Palm Beach. The 52% compares to 40% in 1997.

The 52% of respondents **age 35-49** who are extremely/very attached to Israel is the fifth highest among about 30 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 63% in Miami, 45% in South Palm Beach, 44% in Houston, 33% in West Palm Beach, and 31% in Las Vegas. The 52% compares to 39% in 1997.

The 54% of respondents **age 50-64** who are extremely/very attached to Israel is the fifth highest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 64% in Miami, 54% in South Palm Beach, 50% in West Palm Beach, 44% in Houston, and 37% in Las Vegas. The 54% compares to 31% in 1997.

The 53% of respondents **age 65-74** who are extremely/very attached to Israel is about average among about 30 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 64% in South Palm Beach, 61% in West Palm Beach, 56% in Miami, 55% in Houston, and 38% in Las Vegas. The 53% compares to 46% in 1997.

The 62% of respondents **age 75 and over** who are extremely/very attached to Israel is above average among about 30 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 66% in South Palm Beach, 64% in Miami, 61% in West Palm Beach, 52% in Houston, and 44% in Las Vegas. The 62% compares to 46% in 1997.

The 58% of respondents **age 65 and over** who are extremely/very attached to Israel is about average among about 30 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 65% in South Palm Beach, 61% in West Palm Beach, 60% in Miami, 49% in Houston, and 41% in Las Vegas. The 58% compares to 46% in 1997.

Jewish Identification. Table 11-10 shows that the 83% of **Orthodox** respondents who are extremely/very attached to Israel is about average among about 20 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 100% in West Palm Beach, 86% in Miami, 84% in South Palm Beach, 67% in Houston, and 62% in Las Vegas. The 83% compares to 75% in 1997.

The 65% of **Conservative** respondents who are extremely/very attached to Israel is about average among about 30 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 76% in both Miami and South Palm Beach, 69% in West Palm Beach, 63% in Houston, and 49% in Las Vegas. The 65% compares to 50% in 1997.

The 55% of **Reform** respondents who are extremely/very attached to Israel is the second highest of about 30 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 56% in South Palm Beach, 53% in Miami, 51% in West Palm Beach, 45% in Houston, and 36% in Las Vegas. The 55% compares to 40% in 1997.

The 42% of **Just Jewish** respondents who are extremely/very attached to Israel is above average among about 30 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 53% in Miami, 44% in South Palm Beach, 40% in Houston, 39% in West Palm Beach, and 27% in Las Vegas. The 42% compares to 31% in 1997.

Type of Marriage. Table 11-11 shows that the 61% of respondents in **in-married** households who are extremely/very attached to Israel is about average among about 35 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 71% in Miami, 66% in South Palm Beach, 62% in West Palm Beach, 61% in Houston, and 43% in Las Vegas. The 61% compares to 50% in 1997.

The 55% of respondents in **conversionary in-married** households who are extremely/very attached to Israel is well above average among about 25 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 60% in Miami, 54% in South Palm Beach, 44% in West Palm Beach, 43% in Las Vegas, and 35% in Houston. The 55% compares to 40% in 1997.

The 42% of respondents in **intermarried** households who are extremely/very attached to Israel is the fourth highest of about 35 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 49% in both Houston and Miami, 41% in South Palm Beach, 34% in Las Vegas, and 30% in West Palm Beach. The 42% compares to 30% in 1997.

Note that the Community Comparisons need to be examined in light of events occurring in Israel at the time of each study.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. Table 11-7 shows that, overall, 55% of respondents are extremely/very attached to Israel. The percentage is much higher for respondents in:

- households in the Southeast (72%)
- elderly couple households (69%)
- Orthodox households (83%), Conservative households (65%), and Just Jewish households (76%)
- synagogue member households (65%), households who attended Chabad in the past year (78%), and Jewish organization member households (70%)
- households in which the respondent participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (67%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (71%)
- households in which an adult visited Israel on general trip (68%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (67%)
- households who donated \$500-\$1,000 (87%) and \$1,000 and over (73%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year

The percentage is much lower for respondents in:

- households in the Northwest (40%)
- intermarried households (45%)
- households who asked but did not donate to the Jewish Federation in the past year (45%)

Note that 2.1% of respondents were not Jewish. In almost all of these cases, the respondent was the non-Jewish spouse, partner, or significant other of a Jewish adult. In these cases, the question reported on in this section was asked of the non-Jewish respondent on behalf of the Jewish household member (in a “proxy” fashion).

Non-Jewish household members were generally interviewed when the Jewish household member would not cooperate with our survey, but the non-Jewish household member would, or when the Jewish household member was unavailable.

TABLE 1 1-7					
EMOTIONAL ATTACHMENT TO ISRAEL					
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS					
Population Subgroup	Extremely + Very Attached	Extremely Attached	Very Attached	Somewhat Attached	Not Attached
All	54.7%	24.7%	30.0	30.2	15.1
GEOGRAPHIC AREA					
Northwest	40.0%	21.2%	18.8	43.3	16.7
North Central	48.7%	20.3%	28.4	27.8	23.5
East	58.2%	26.5%	31.7	24.2	17.6
West Central	53.6%	26.3%	27.3	33.2	13.2
Southeast	71.8%	31.6%	40.2	19.5	8.7
Southwest	53.8%	21.2%	32.6	29.7	16.5
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN BROWARD					
0 - 4 years	54.7%	16.5%	38.2	23.8	21.5
5 - 9 years	53.5%	36.3%	17.2	20.9	25.6
10 - 19 years	62.8%	25.5%	37.3	27.1	10.1
20 or more years	52.1%	23.7%	28.4	33.2	14.7
AGE OF RESPONDENT					
Under 35	51.8%	13.2%	38.6	43.6	4.6
35 - 49	51.5%	28.4%	23.1	31.9	16.6
50 - 64	53.5%	29.3%	24.2	29.5	17.0
65 - 74	52.6%	22.4%	30.2	30.9	16.5
75 and over	62.3%	22.0%	40.3	23.6	14.1
→ 65 and over	57.5%	22.1%	35.4	27.2	15.3
SEX OF RESPONDENT					
Male	54.8%	26.0%	28.8	27.9	17.3
Female	54.7%	23.9%	30.8	31.8	13.5

TABLE 1 1-7 EMOTIONAL ATTACHMENT TO ISRAEL					
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS					
Population Subgroup	Extremely + Very Attached	Extremely Attached	Very Attached	Somewhat Attached	Not Attached
All	54.7%	24.7%	30.0	30.2	15.1
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE					
Household with Children	52.2%	28.6%	23.6	31.4	16.4
Household with Only Adult Children	49.4%	21.2%	28.2	43.1	7.5
Non-Elderly Couple	60.0%	26.8%	33.2	29.8	10.2
Non-Elderly Single	52.4%	33.4%	19.0	28.4	19.2
Elderly Couple	69.0%	28.7%	40.3	16.5	14.5
Elderly Single	54.7%	19.1%	35.6	29.6	15.7
HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
Under \$25,000	59.7%	16.9%	42.8	14.7	25.6
\$25 - \$50,000	55.4%	22.8%	32.6	31.8	12.8
\$50 - \$100,000	50.2%	25.6%	24.6	34.6	15.2
\$100 - \$200,000	49.7%	15.9%	33.8	40.4	9.9
\$200,000 and over	62.5%	28.6%	33.9	27.7	9.8
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION					
Orthodox	82.9%	45.2%	37.7	14.5	2.6
Conservative	65.4%	37.9%	27.5	24.7	9.9
Reform	54.9%	19.1%	35.8	33.1	12.0
Just Jewish	42.0%	15.7%	26.3	34.3	23.7
TYPE OF MARRIAGE					
In-married	60.8%	28.3%	32.5	27.4	11.8
Conversionary	54.7%	28.0%	26.7	41.4	3.9
Intermarried	41.7%	22.4%	19.3	41.5	16.8

TABLE 11-7 EMOTIONAL ATTACHMENT TO ISRAEL					
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS					
Population Subgroup	Extremely + Very Attached	Extremely Attached	Very Attached	Somewhat Attached	Not Attached
All	54.7%	24.7%	30.0	30.2	15.1
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP					
Member	64.5%	27.8%	36.7	29.3	6.2
Non-Member	49.6%	23.2%	26.4	30.7	19.7
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR					
Member	77.8%	43.8%	34.0	16.7	5.5
Non-Member	47.9%	19.1%	28.8	34.2	17.9
JCC MEMBERSHIP					
Member	52.8%	27.5%	25.3	33.5	13.7
Non-Member	55.0%	24.4%	30.6	29.7	15.3
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP					
Member	69.9%	29.4%	40.5	24.1	6.0
Non-Member	51.0%	23.6%	27.4	31.7	17.3
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD					
To Jewish Day School	64.1%	29.9%	34.2	23.1	12.8
To Supplemental School	55.3%	24.0%	31.3	31.3	13.4
→ To Jewish Education	57.8%	26.5%	31.3	29.9	12.3
No	48.9%	18.9%	30.0	32.0	19.1
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD					
To Overnight Camp	59.1%	29.5%	29.6	31.2	9.7
No	54.4%	22.1%	32.3	28.6	17.0

TABLE 11-7 EMOTIONAL ATTACHMENT TO ISRAEL					
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS					
Population Subgroup	Extremely + Very Attached	Extremely Attached	Very Attached	Somewhat Attached	Not Attached
All	54.7%	24.7%	30.0	30.2	15.1
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER					
In Youth Group	66.8%	29.9%	36.9	23.1	10.1
No	48.1%	20.7%	27.4	34.1	17.8
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)					
Hillel/Chabad Participant	70.8%	31.9%	38.9	25.5	3.7
No	51.1%	21.9%	29.2	33.2	15.7
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL					
On Jewish Trip	63.0%	28.7%	34.3	31.1	5.9
On General Trip	68.4%	35.8%	32.6	24.4	7.2
No	36.5%	11.8%	24.7	35.0	28.5
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR					
Donated to Federation	66.7%	29.2%	37.5	29.4	3.9
Asked, Did Not Donate	44.6%	24.7%	19.9	48.0	7.4
Not Asked	51.4%	23.5%	27.9	28.6	20.0
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR					
Nothing	50.7%	23.7%	27.0	30.7	18.6
Under \$100	63.1%	27.4%	35.7	33.2	3.7
\$100 - \$500	61.2%	22.8%	38.4	34.6	4.2
\$500 - \$1,000	87.3%	38.3%	49.0	11.0	1.7
\$1,000 and over	72.8%	41.8%	31.0	20.8	6.4

**TABLE 11-8
EMOTIONAL ATTACHMENT TO ISRAEL
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	<i>Extremely/ Very</i>	Extremely Attached	Very Attached	Somewhat Attached	Not Attached
Miami	2014	62%	32%	30	27	11
S Palm Beach	2005	61%	24%	36	33	7
Middlesex	2008	58%	27%	31	32	10
Detroit	2005	56%	26%	29	32	12
Jacksonville	2002	56%	25%	31	33	11
Bergen	2001	55%	26%	29	33	12
BROWARD	2016	55%	25%	30	30	15
San Antonio	2007	55%	23%	32	33	12
Lehigh Valley	2007	54%	21%	32	36	10
W Palm Beach	2005	54%	19%	35	37	9
Rhode Island	2002	53%	22%	31	37	10
Minneapolis	2004	52%	21%	31	37	11
Atlantic County	2004	51%	19%	32	39	10
St. Paul	2004	50%	20%	30	35	16
Sarasota	2001	49%	22%	26	41	11
Houston	2016	49%	21%	28	38	13
Washington	2003	49%	20%	29	37	15
Tucson	2002	47%	18%	29	37	16
New Haven	2010	47%	17%	30	36	17
Los Angeles	1997	45%	17%	28	39	15
Milwaukee	1996	44%	15%	29	41	15
Broward	1997	42%	17%	25	41	17
Monmouth	1997	42%	16%	26	43	15
San Francisco	2004	42%	16%	26	32	26
Harrisburg	1994	42%	13%	29	42	16

**TABLE 11-8
EMOTIONAL ATTACHMENT TO ISRAEL
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	<i>Extremely/ Very</i>	Extremely Attached	Very Attached	Somewhat Attached	Not Attached
Westport	2000	41%	14%	28	44	15
Richmond	1994	41%	11%	30	41	18
Tidewater	2001	40%	14%	26	41	20
Hartford	2000	40%	12%	27	46	15
Wilmington	1995	38%	11%	27	43	19
Rochester	1999	37%	12%	25	45	17
St. Petersburg	1994	37%	11%	26	44	20
Las Vegas	2005	36%	14%	22	40	24
Charlotte	1997	35%	11%	24	48	18
Portland (ME)	2007	33%	12%	22	46	21
York	1999	32%	10%	22	47	21
Essex-Morris	1998	NA	30%	52		18
Alternative Response Categories						
Community	Year	<i>Very/ Somewhat</i>	Very Attached	Some- what Attached	Not Very Attached	Not at All Attached
Cleveland	2011	86%	44%	42	8	6
Baltimore	2010	84%	46%	38	9	7
Atlanta	2006	81%	40%	41	14	5
Philadelphia	2009	79%	42%	37	12	8
New York	2011	78%	46%	32	11	11
Chicago	2010	77%	41%	36	15	8
St. Louis	2014	74%	38%	36	17	9
Denver	2007	71%	34%	37	16	13
Howard County	2010	69%	33%	36	14	17
Columbus	2013	68%	26%	42	13	20

**TABLE 11-9
EXTREMELY/VERY EMOTIONALLY ATTACHED TO ISRAEL
BY AGE OF RESPONDENT
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+	65+	All
Miami	2014	65%	63%	64%	56%	64%	60%	62%
Bergen	2001	47%	56%	53%	58%	61%	59%	55%
San Antonio	2007	38%	55%	52%	62%	60%	61%	55%
Jacksonville	2002	47%	54%	52%	73%	63%	67%	56%
BROWARD	2016	52%	52%	54%	53%	62%	58%	55%
Detroit	2005	58%	51%	54%	63%	57%	59%	56%
Minneapolis	2004	33%	51%	46%	62%	68%	65%	52%
Middlesex	2008	58%	46%	52%	61%	68%	65%	58%
Washington	2003	48%	46%	52%	47%	53%	51%	49%
S Palm Beach	2005	35%	45%	54%	64%	66%	65%	61%
Houston	2016	56%	44%	44%	55%	52%	54%	49%
Rhode Island	2002	38%	44%	56%	70%	61%	64%	53%
Tucson	2002	47%	42%	43%	50%	59%	54%	47%
St. Paul	2004	44%	41%	57%	64%	54%	57%	50%
Broward	1997	40%	39%	31%	46%	46%	46%	42%
Lehigh Valley	2007	38%	39%	56%	60%	63%	62%	54%
Westport	2000	35%	39%	36%	47%	61%	55%	41%
Milwaukee	1996	32%	39%	48%	55%	51%	53%	44%
Harrisburg	1994	35%	37%	48%	54%	53%	54%	42%
Wilmington	1995	30%	37%	34%	59%	38%	50%	38%
Richmond	1994	28%	37%	51%	53%	54%	53%	41%
Monmouth	1997	32%	36%	43%	52%	52%	52%	42%
New Haven	2010	51%	35%	47%	49%	55%	53%	47%

**TABLE 11-9
EXTREMELY/VERY EMOTIONALLY ATTACHED TO ISRAEL
BY AGE OF RESPONDENT
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+	65+	All
Hartford	2000	23%	35%	40%	52%	44%	48%	40%
Tidewater	2001	31%	34%	43%	47%	56%	52%	40%
Charlotte	1997	27%	33%	33%	NA	NA	56%	35%
W Palm Beach	2005	25%	33%	50%	61%	61%	61%	54%
Las Vegas	2005	32%	31%	37%	38%	44%	41%	36%
St. Petersburg	1994	37%	30%	39%	47%	35%	41%	37%
Rochester	1999	29%	30%	36%	53%	45%	49%	37%
York	1999	9%	27%	37%	42%	48%	44%	32%
Atlantic County	2004	37%		48%	58%	60%	59%	51%
Sarasota	2001	27%		48%	56%	53%	55%	49%
Portland (ME)	2007	24%		35%	48%	48%	48%	33%

**TABLE 11-10
EXTREMELY/VERY EMOTIONALLY ATTACHED TO ISRAEL
BY JEWISH IDENTIFICATION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Orthodox	Conser- vative	Reform	<i>Just Jewish</i>	All ¹
Miami	2014	86%	76%	53%	53%	62%
Jacksonville	2002	NA	70%	41%	51%	56%
San Antonio	2007	89%	67%	52%	45%	55%
Middlesex	2008	92%	69%	51%	44%	58%
S Palm Beach	2005	84%	76%	56%	44%	61%
BROWARD	2016	83%	65%	55%	42%	55%
Minneapolis	2004	NA	68%	45%	41%	52%
St. Paul	2004	NA	65%	40%	41%	50%
Houston	2016	67%	63%	45%	40%	49%
Lehigh Valley	2007	NA	68%	46%	40%	54%
W Palm Beach	2005	100%	69%	51%	39%	54%
Bergen	2001	96%	65%	43%	39%	55%
Atlantic County	2004	NA	61%	52%	38%	51%
Tucson	2002	NA	64%	46%	37%	47%
Rhode Island	2002	85%	69%	52%	36%	53%
Sarasota	2001	NA	60%	53%	36%	49%
Wilmington	1995	64%	48%	28%	35%	38%
Milwaukee	1996	65%	63%	40%	33%	44%
Detroit	2005	94%	73%	46%	32%	56%
Washington	2003	96%	70%	42%	32%	49%
New Haven	2010	94%	62%	44%	31%	47%
Broward	1997	75%	50%	40%	31%	42%
Westport	2000	NA	58%	41%	29%	41%

**TABLE 11-10
EXTREMELY/VERY EMOTIONALLY ATTACHED TO ISRAEL
BY JEWISH IDENTIFICATION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Orthodox	Conser- vative	Reform	<i>Just Jewish</i>	All ¹
Hartford	2000	84%	55%	32%	28%	40%
Harrisburg	1994	75%	54%	33%	28%	42%
Las Vegas	2005	62%	49%	36%	27%	36%
Monmouth	1997	65%	56%	28%	27%	42%
Richmond	1994	69%	57%	31%	27%	41%
Tidewater	2001	NA	55%	30%	26%	40%
Portland (ME)	2007	NA	54%	35%	24%	33%
Charlotte	1997	NA	57%	26%	24%	35%
St. Petersburg	1994	NA	56%	36%	24%	37%
Rochester	1999	67%	60%	33%	19%	37%
York	1999	NA	46%	31%	17%	32%

¹ Includes Reconstructionist, which is not shown in the table due to small sample sizes.

TABLE 11-11				
EXTREMELY/VERY EMOTIONALLY ATTACHED TO ISRAEL				
BY TYPE OF MARRIAGE				
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS				
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS				
		In-Married		
Community	Year	2 Born/Raised Jews	Conversionary	<i>Intermarried</i>
San Antonio	2007	64%	49%	50%
Miami	2014	71%	60%	49%
Jacksonville	2002	67%	63%	46%
BROWARD	2016	61%	55%	42%
S Palm Beach	2005	66%	54%	41%
Rhode Island	2002	67%	30%	38%
Tucson	2002	55%	52%	38%
Middlesex	2008	64%	NA	36%
Houston	2016	61%	35%	49%
Atlantic County	2004	56%	NA	35%
San Francisco	2004	52%	NA	35%
Las Vegas	2005	43%	41%	34%
Lehigh Valley	2007	64%	56%	33%
Minneapolis	2004	66%	48%	32%
Westport	2000	51%	32%	32%
New Haven	2010	59%	46%	31%
W Palm Beach	2005	62%	44%	30%
Sarasota	2001	57%	NA	30%
Broward	1997	50%	40%	30%
Milwaukee	1996	53%	NA	30%
Washington	2003	61%	60%	29%
St. Paul	2004	64%	54%	28%

TABLE 1 1-1 1
EXTREMELY/VERY EMOTIONALLY ATTACHED TO ISRAEL
BY TYPE OF MARRIAGE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	In-Married		<i>Intermarried</i>
		2 Born/Raised Jews	Conversionary	
Wilmington	1995	45%	NA	27%
Portland (ME)	2007	45%	NA	26%
Richmond	1994	51%	38%	26%
Bergen	2001	65%	36%	25%
Detroit	2005	68%	43%	24%
Tidewater	2001	52%	45%	24%
Charlotte	1997	51%	32%	24%
Harrisburg	1994	61%	25%	24%
Monmouth	1997	45%	NA	21%
St. Petersburg	1994	48%	38%	20%
Hartford	2000	51%	15%	19%
York	1999	47%	26%	17%
Rochester	1999	52%	24%	10%