

CHAPTER 6

RELIGIOUS PROFILE

CHAPTER TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Jewish Identification	6-2
Importance of Being Jewish	6-20
Being Jewish Is Mainly a Matter of.... ..	6-26
Proud to Be Jewish	6-27
Strong Sense of Belonging to the Jewish People.....	6-33
Have a Special Responsibility to Take Care of Jews in Need Around the World ..	6-34
Religious Practices	6-39
Practice	6-40
Have a Mezuzah on the Front Door.....	6-46
Participate in a Passover Seder	6-52
Light Chanukah Candles	6-60
Light Sabbath Candles	6-68
Keep Kosher	6-76
Refrain from Using Electricity on the Sabbath.....	6-85
Have a Christmas Tree	6-87
Synagogue Attendance	6-94
Types of Marriage	6-106
Religion of Children in Jewish Households	6-119
Persons in Jewish Households Who Are Jewish.....	6-127
Jews-by-Choice	6-129

For out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

(ISAIAH 2:3)

JEWISH IDENTIFICATION

Jewish respondents in Broward were asked whether they considered themselves to be Orthodox, Conservative, Reconstructionist, Reform, or *Just Jewish*. Jewish identification is a self-identification and is not necessarily based on (nor consistent with) synagogue membership, ideology, or religious practice. In fact, discrepancies between Jewish identification and practice are sometimes evident. For example, respondents may identify as Orthodox or Conservative, but report that they do not keep kosher. Respondents may identify as Reform, but report that they never attend synagogue services. **Table 6-1** shows that 4% (3,100 households) of respondents identify as Orthodox; 30% (21,600 households), Conservative; 1% (800 households), Reconstructionist; 28% (19,900 households), Reform; and 37% (26,600 households), Just Jewish.

✓ Included in Conservative are 1.0% (700 households) of respondents who volunteered that they identify as Traditional.

✓ Of the 3,100 households in which the respondent identifies as Orthodox, respondents in 43% (1,300 households) of households reported that they keep kosher in and out of the home as well as refrain from the use of electricity on the Sabbath.

✓ Of the Jewish children (excluding part Jewish children), 13% are being raised in households in which the respondent identifies as Orthodox; 33%, Conservative; 1%, Reconstructionist; 28%, Reform; and 25%, Just Jewish.

Table 6-1 shows that 5% of *persons in Jewish households* live in households in which the respondent identifies as Orthodox; 29%, Conservative; 1%, Reconstructionist; 28%, Reform; and 37%, Just Jewish. These percentages differ from the percentages reported above for respondents/households only due to differences in average household size among the Jewish identification groups.

Assuming that all *Jewish persons* in a household identify the same way as the respondent (for example, all Jewish persons in households in which the respondent identifies as Orthodox identify as Orthodox), then 6% (8,700 persons) of *Jewish persons* identify as Orthodox; 32% (47,900 persons), Conservative; 1% (1,900 persons), Reconstructionist; 29% (42,700 persons), Reform; and 32% (47,800 persons), Just Jewish. Note, however, that it is not necessarily true that all Jewish persons in a household identify the same way as the respondent. For example, we may have interviewed a respondent who identifies as Reform, whereas had we interviewed the spouse or another household member, the Jewish identification might have been Conservative or Just Jewish.

The number of Orthodox Jews decreased from 13,000 in 1997 to 8,700 in 2016 (-33%). The number of Conservative Jews decreased from 89,500 in 1997 to 47,900 in 2016 (-46%). The number of Reform Jews decreased from 61,800 in 1997 to 42,700 in 2016 (-31%). The number of Just Jewish decreased from 77,100 in 1997 to 47,800 in 2016 (-38%).

The remainder of this section discusses Jewish identification in terms of the percentage of *households, not persons*.

Note that for simplicity the other chapters of this report generally refer to Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and Just Jewish *households*, although technically all such references should read *households in which the respondent identifies as* Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, or Just Jewish.

Community Comparisons. Tables 6-5 to 6-9 compare Jewish identification in Broward with about 55 comparison Jewish communities. Table 6-5 shows the percentage Orthodox, Conservative, Reconstructionist, Reform, and Just Jewish, and the communities are ordered by the Just Jewish column. Tables 6-6 to 6-9 show the results separately for each Jewish identification group.

Table 6-6 shows that the 4% **Orthodox** is about average among about 55 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 11% in Miami, 10% in Atlanta, 4% in South Palm Beach, 3% in Las Vegas, and 2% in West Palm Beach. The 4% compares to 4% in 1997.

Table 6-7 shows that the 30% **Conservative** is about average among about 55 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 35% in South Palm Beach, 32% in West Palm Beach, 27% in Atlanta, 26% in Miami, and 23% in Las Vegas. The 30% compares to 37% in 1997.

Table 6-8 shows that the 28% **Reform** is below average among about 55 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 45% in Atlanta, 37% in West Palm Beach, 34% in South Palm Beach, 31% in Miami and 26% in Las Vegas. The 28% compares to 24% in 1997.

Table 6-9 shows that the 37% **Just Jewish** is the sixth highest of about 55 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 47% in Las Vegas, 33% in Miami, 29% in West Palm Beach, 26% in South Palm Beach, and 18% in Atlanta. The 37% compares to 34% in 1997.

Thus, from 1997-2016, the percentage Orthodox did not change significantly, the percentage Conservative decreased by 7 percentage points, and the percentage Reform and Just Jewish changed by about 3 percentage points each.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups.

Orthodox

Table 6-2 shows that, overall, 4% of respondents identify as **Orthodox**. The percentage is much higher for respondents in:

- households in the North Central (12%), and the Southeast (12%)
- synagogue member households (10%)
- JCC member households (21%)
- households in which the respondent attended a Jewish day school as a child (12%)

Conservative

Table 6-2 shows that, overall, 30% of respondents identify as **Conservative**. The percentage is much higher for respondents in:

- synagogue member households (40%), households who attended Chabad in the past year (41%), and Jewish organization member households
- households in which the respondent participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (40%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (44%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (40%)
- households who donated \$100-\$500 to the Jewish Federation in the past year (58%)

The percentage is much lower for respondents in:

- intermarried households (12%)

Reform

Table 6-2 shows that, overall, 28% of respondents identify as **Reform**. The percentage is much higher for respondents (in):

- age 65-74 (38%)
- elderly couple households (40%)
- households earning an annual income of \$200,000 and over (39%)
- households who donated \$1,000 and over to the Jewish Federation in the past year

Just Jewish

Table 6-2 shows that, overall, 37% of respondents identify as **Just Jewish**. The percentage is much higher for respondents (in):

- households in residence in Broward for 5-9 years (57%)
- under age 35 (49%)
- households earning an annual income under \$25,000 (49%)
- intermarried households (60%)
- synagogue non-member households (49%)
- who had no Jewish education as a child (47%)
- households in which no adult visited Israel (49%)

The percentage is much lower for respondents in:

- households in the Southwest (25%)
- elderly couple households (25%)
- households earning an annual income of \$200,000 and over (25%)
- in-married households (25%)
- synagogue member households (13%), households who attended Chabad in the past year (26%), and Jewish organization member households (16%)
- households in which the respondent participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (23%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (20%)
- households in which an adult visited Israel in the past year (20%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (19%)
- households who donated under \$100 (23%), \$100-\$500 (9%), and \$1,000 and over (16%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year

Note that 2.6% 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 6-1 A
HOUSEHOLDS AND PERSONS BY JEWISH IDENTIFICATION
2016

Jewish Identification	Jewish Households		Average Household Size	% Jewish	Persons in Jewish Households			
	%	Number			All	Number of Non-Jews	Number of Jews	% of Jews
Orthodox	4.3%	3,096	2.84	99.0%	8,793	88	8,705	5.8%
Conservative	30.0	21,600	2.36	93.9%	50,976	3,110	47,866	32.1%
Reconstructionist	1.1	792	2.48	98.9%	1,964	22	1,943	1.3%
Reform	27.7	19,944	2.42	88.5%	48,264	5,550	42,714	28.7%
Just Jewish	37.0	26,640	2.41	74.5%	64,202	16,372	47,831	32.1%
All	100.0%	72,000	2.42	85.6%	174,000	25,100	148,900	100.0%

TABLE 6-1 B
HOUSEHOLDS AND PERSONS BY JEWISH IDENTIFICATION
1997

Jewish Identification	Jewish Households		Average Household Size	% Jewish	Persons in Jewish Households			
	%	Number			All	Number of Non-Jews	Number of Jews	% of Jews
Orthodox	4.5%	5,985	2.19	98.9%	13,107	144	12,963	5.4%
Conservative	36.5	48,545	1.93	95.5%	93,692	4,216	89,476	37.2%
Reconstructionist	0.5	665	2.89	84.6%	1,922	296	1,626	0.7%
Reform	24.2	32,186	2.09	91.8%	67,269	5,516	61,753	25.7%
Just Jewish	34.3	45,619	2.05	82.4%	93,519	16,459	77,060	32.1%
All	100.0%	133,000	2.02	89.3%	269,059	28,682	240,377	100.0%

TABLE 6-2					
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION					
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS					
Population Subgroup	Orthodox	Conser- vative	Reconstruc- tionist	Reform	Just Jewish
All	4.2%	30.0	1.1	27.7	37.0
GEOGRAPHIC AREA					
Northwest	2.4%	22.6	0.5	32.3	42.2
North Central	12.1%	27.5	0.0	21.8	38.6
East	0.5%	23.5	0.4	35.6	40.0
West Central	1.5%	28.3	2.0	25.5	42.7
Southeast	12.2%	32.8	0.4	18.3	36.3
Southwest	1.0%	38.3	1.7	33.9	25.1
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN BROWARD					
0 - 4 years	5.6%	28.3	0.0	33.6	32.5
5 - 9 years	2.2%	33.1	0.5	7.3	56.9
10 - 19 years	7.9%	24.6	0.1	31.7	35.7
20 or more years	3.3%	31.5	1.6	28.6	35.0
AGE OF RESPONDENT					
Under 35	5.9%	25.7	0.0	19.9	48.5
35 - 49	5.2%	23.3	1.3	27.4	42.8
50 - 64	2.9%	32.8	1.1	25.5	37.7
65 - 74	3.0%	28.3	1.3	37.5	29.9
75 and over	6.3%	34.4	1.2	25.6	32.5
→ 65 and over	4.8%	31.5	1.2	31.3	31.2
SEX OF RESPONDENT					
Male	5.6%	28.2	1.4	25.5	39.3
Female	3.4%	31.2	0.9	29.3	35.2

TABLE 6-2					
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION					
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS					
Population Subgroup	Orthodox	Conser- vative	Reconstruc- tionist	Reform	Just Jewish
All	4.2%	30.0	1.1	27.7	37.0
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE					
Household with Children	6.4%	28.3	1.2	26.6	37.5
Household with Only Adult Children	2.4%	32.9	1.7	24.8	38.2
Non-Elderly Couple	2.7%	25.1	0.5	28.3	43.4
Non-Elderly Single	2.0%	28.1	0.5	23.0	46.4
Elderly Couple	4.2%	28.6	2.5	39.5	25.2
Elderly Single	7.1%	33.7	0.4	27.2	31.6
HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
Under \$25,000	5.9%	25.5	0.2	19.2	49.2
\$25 - \$50,000	2.5%	36.4	0.2	23.7	37.2
\$50 - \$100,000	4.2%	24.3	2.8	23.0	45.7
\$100 - \$200,000	4.2%	30.0	1.3	31.5	33.0
\$200,000 and over	3.3%	32.6	0.3	39.1	24.7
TYPE OF MARRIAGE					
In-married	6.9%	34.6	1.9	31.7	24.9
Conversionary	0.8%	30.9	1.4	27.8	39.1
Intermarried	0.9%	12.4	0.2	26.3	60.2
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP					
Member	10.4%	39.7	1.7	34.9	13.3
Non-Member	1.2%	24.9	0.8	24.0	49.1
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR					
Attended	9.2%	40.9	0.3	24.1	25.5
Did Not Attend	2.8%	26.7	1.3	28.8	40.4

TABLE 6-2					
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION					
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS					
Population Subgroup	Orthodox	Conser- vative	Reconstruc- tionist	Reform	Just Jewish
All	4.2%	30.0	1.1	27.7	37.0
JCC MEMBERSHIP					
Member	5.9%	36.2	1.0	26.8	30.1
Non-Member	4.1%	29.1	1.1	27.8	37.9
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP					
Member	6.4%	45.5	1.7	30.3	16.1
Non-Member	3.7%	26.2	0.9	27.1	42.1
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD					
To Jewish Day School	11.5%	37.9	1.1	20.8	28.7
To Supplemental School	3.2%	32.3	1.4	30.3	32.8
→To Jewish Education	4.7%	33.9	1.3	28.0	32.1
No	3.4%	21.6	0.5	27.1	47.4
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD					
To Overnight Camp	7.3%	34.9	0.5	24.1	33.2
No	2.9%	28.5	1.4	29.4	37.8
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER					
In Youth Group	7.4%	39.8	1.4	28.0	23.4
No	2.2%	23.9	0.9	27.3	45.7
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)					
Hillel/Chabad Participant	9.3%	44.1	1.8	24.7	20.1
No	2.2%	26.2	1.0	29.8	40.8

TABLE 6-2 JEWISH IDENTIFICATION					
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS					
Population Subgroup	Orthodox	Conser- vative	Reconstruc- tionist	Reform	Just Jewish
All	4.2%	30.0	1.1	27.7	37.0
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL					
On Jewish Trip	7.1%	39.1	2.4	31.9	19.5
On General Trip	6.0%	30.5	0.8	26.9	35.8
No	0.8%	23.6	0.6	25.7	49.3
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR					
Donated to Federation	3.5%	39.8	1.0	37.1	18.6
Asked, Did Not Donate	3.3%	24.0	0.6	31.7	40.4
Not Asked	4.1%	27.3	1.2	24.5	42.9
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR					
Nothing	4.2%	26.9	1.1	25.2	42.6
Under \$100	3.5%	30.1	1.1	42.3	23.0
\$100 - \$500	1.3%	58.4	1.0	30.6	8.7
\$500 - \$1,000	6.8%	31.2	0.0	32.3	29.7
\$1,000 and over	6.6%	37.6	1.6	38.2	16.0

Geographic Distribution of Jewish Identification Groups. As an example of the interpretation of **Table 6-3**, note that while **Table 6-2** shows that 23% of respondents who live in the Northwest identify as Conservative, **Table 6-3** shows that 11% of respondents who identify as Conservative live in the Northwest.

Table 6-3 shows that 49% of respondents who identify as Orthodox live in the Southeast and 27% in the North Central, compared to 1%-9% of respondents in the other Jewish identification groups. 29% of respondents who identify as Conservative live in the Southwest and 26% in the West Central. 27% of respondents who identify as Reform live in the Southwest and 25% in the West Central. 32% of respondents who identify as Just Jewish live in West Central.

Age Distribution of Jewish Identification Groups. As an example of the interpretation of **Table 6-4**, note that while **Table 6-2** shows that 49% of *respondents under age 35* identify as Just Jewish, **Table 6-4** shows that 12% of respondents who identify as Just Jewish are under age 35.

32% of Orthodox respondents are age 75 and over. compared to 19%-24% of respondents in the other Jewish identification groups; 33% of Just Jewish respondents are age 50-64.

TABLE 6-3A			
GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH IDENTIFICATION GROUPS			
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS			
Jewish Identification	Northwest	North Central	East
Orthodox	8.5%	27.1	1.0%
Conservative	10.9%	8.8	7.2%
Reform	16.9%	7.5	11.7%
Just Jewish	16.5%	10.0	9.9%
All ¹	14.6%	9.7	9.2%

¹ Includes Reconstructionist.

TABLE 6-3B				
GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH IDENTIFICATION GROUPS				
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS				
Jewish Identification	West Central	Southeast	Southwest	Total
Orthodox	9.3%	49.0	5.1	100.0%
Conservative	25.9%	18.7	28.5	100.0%
Reform	25.3%	11.3	27.3	100.0%
Just Jewish	31.7%	16.8	15.1	100.0%
All ¹	27.2%	17.2	22.2	

¹ Includes Reconstructionist.

TABLE 6-4
AGE DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH IDENTIFICATION GROUPS

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Jewish Identification	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+	Total	65+
Orthodox	12.8%	20.6	21.3	13.6	31.7	100.0%	45.3%
Conservative	8.0%	13.4	35.7	18.6	24.3	100.0%	42.9%
Reform	6.6%	17.1	30.0	26.7	19.6	100.0%	46.3%
Just Jewish	12.2%	20.0	33.2	16.0	18.6	100.0%	34.6%
All ¹	9.3%	17.2	32.6	19.7	21.2	100.0%	40.9%

¹ Includes Reconstructionist.

**TABLE 6-5
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Orthodox	Conser- vative	Recon- struc- tionist	Reform	<i>Just Jewish</i>
Portland (ME)	2007	2%	14	1	35	48
Las Vegas	2005	3%	23	1	26	47
East Bay	2011	3%	15	4	33	45
Tucson	2002	2%	21	2	32	44
San Francisco	2004	3%	17	2	38	40 ¹
BROWARD	2016	4%	30	1	28	37
New York	2011	20%	19	1	23	37
St. Paul	2004	2%	32	1	28	37
Sarasota	2001	2%	22	1	38	37
Jacksonville	2002	2%	38	1	24	36
St. Petersburg	1994	3%	23	0	39	36
New Haven	2010	4%	30	1	30	35
Minneapolis	2004	2%	31	0	32	35
Rhode Island	2002	6%	30	1	28	35
Seattle	2000	5%	19	NA	41	35
Westport	2000	2%	22	0	41	35
Orlando	1993	2%	33	0	30	35
Washington	2003	2%	30	3	31	34
Hartford	2000	4%	31	0	31	34
Broward	1997	4%	37	1	24	34
Milwaukee	1996	3%	24	1	39	34
Miami	2014	11%	26	1	31	33
Columbus	2013	5%	28	2	34	33
Wilmington	1995	6%	28	4	29	33

**TABLE 6-5
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Orthodox	Conser- vative	Recon- struc- tionist	Reform	<i>Just Jewish</i>
San Diego	2003	3%	22	3	40	32
Charlotte	1997	2%	26	0	40	32
Harrisburg	1994	10%	33	4	22	32
Denver ²	2007	2%	16	5	39	31 ³
Lehigh Valley	2007	4%	34	2	30	31
San Antonio	2007	4%	25	2	39	30
Bergen	2001	12%	31	1	25	30
Richmond	1994	4%	37	0	29	30
Middlesex	2008	7%	35	0	29	29
W Palm Beach	2005	2%	32	1	37	29
Atlantic County	2004	1%	32	1	37	29
Rochester	1999	6%	24	0	41	29
St. Louis	2014	6%	19	1	47	28
Phoenix	2002	3%	24	0	44	28
Tidewater	2001	3%	39	1	29	28
Monmouth	1997	9%	37	NA	26	28
S Palm Beach	2005	4%	35	1	34	26
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	1%	22	0	51	26
Howard County	2010	1%	30	12	32	25
York	1999	1%	24	1	49	25
Buffalo	1995	6%	31	5	35	23
Cincinnati	2008	5%	27	0	47	22
Detroit	2005	11%	28	3	36	22 ⁴
Los Angeles	1997	6%	29	2	41	22

TABLE 6-5
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Orthodox	Conser- vative	Recon- struc- tionist	Reform	<i>Just Jewish</i>
Baltimore ⁵	2010	21%	25	1	27	20
Essex-Morris	1998	3%	27	NA	51	20
Philadelphia	2009	6%	31	3	42	18
Atlanta	2006	10%	27	0	45	18
Boston ⁶	2005	4%	31	1	43	18
Pittsburgh	2002	7%	32	2	41	18
Cleveland	2011	10%	25	3	46	16
Chicago ⁷	2010	7%	22	4	45	14
Palm Springs ⁸	1998	6%	31	0	42	14
NJPS ⁹	2000	8%	25	2	35	30

¹ Includes 1% of respondents who identify as Jewish Renewal.

² 6% of respondents identify as Traditional.

³ Includes 3% of respondents who identify as Jewish Renewal.

⁴ Includes 3% of respondents who identify as Jewish Humanistic and 1% as Jewish Renewal.

⁵ 5% of respondents identify as Traditional.

⁶ 3% of respondents identify with another denomination.

⁷ 8% of respondents identify as Traditional.

⁸ 7% of respondents identify as Traditional.

⁹ NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.

Note: Respondents who identify as Sephardic are included in *Orthodox*.

**TABLE 6-6
ORTHODOX IDENTIFICATION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Baltimore ⁵	2010	21%		Richmond	1994	4%
New York	2011	20%		East Bay	2011	3%
Bergen	2001	12%		Las Vegas	2005	3%
Miami	2014	11%		San Francisco	2004	3%
Detroit	2005	11%		San Diego	2003	3%
Cleveland	2011	10%		Phoenix	2002	3%
Atlanta	2006	10%		Tidewater	2001	3%
Harrisburg	1994	10%		Essex-Morris	1998	3%
Monmouth	1997	9%		Milwaukee	1996	3%
Chicago ⁷	2010	7%		St. Petersburg	1994	3%
Middlesex	2008	7%		Denver ²	2007	2%
Pittsburgh	2002	7%		Portland (ME)	2007	2%
St. Louis	2014	6%		W Palm Beach	2005	2%
Philadelphia	2009	6%		Minneapolis	2004	2%
Rhode Island	2002	6%		St. Paul	2004	2%
Rochester	1999	6%		Washington	2003	2%
Palm Springs ⁸	1998	6%		Jacksonville	2002	2%
Los Angeles	1997	6%		Tucson	2002	2%
Buffalo	1995	6%		Sarasota	2001	2%
Wilmington	1995	6%		Westport	2000	2%
Columbus	2013	5%		Charlotte	1997	2%
Cincinnati	2008	5%		Orlando	1993	2%
Seattle	2000	5%		Howard County	2010	1%
BROWARD	2016	4%		Atlantic County	2004	1%
New Haven	2010	4%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	1%
Lehigh Valley	2007	4%		York	1999	1%
San Antonio	2007	4%		NJPS ⁹	2000	8%
Boston ⁶	2005	4%				
S Palm Beach	2005	4%				
Hartford	2000	4%				
Broward	1997	4%				

See footnotes on **Table 6-8.**

**TABLE 6-7
CONSERVATIVE IDENTIFICATION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Tidewater	2001	39%		Cincinnati	2008	27%
Jacksonville	2002	38%		Atlanta	2006	27%
Broward	1997	37%		Essex-Morris	1998	27%
Monmouth	1997	37%		Miami	2014	26%
Richmond	1994	37%		Charlotte	1997	26%
Middlesex	2008	35%		Cleveland	2011	25%
S Palm Beach	2005	35%		Baltimore ⁵	2010	25%
Lehigh Valley	2007	34%		San Antonio	2007	25%
Harrisburg	1994	33%		Phoenix	2002	24%
Orlando	1993	33%		Rochester	1999	24%
W Palm Beach	2005	32%		York	1999	24%
Atlantic County	2004	32%		Milwaukee	1996	24%
St. Paul	2004	32%		Las Vegas	2005	23%
Pittsburgh	2002	32%		St. Petersburg	1994	23%
Philadelphia	2009	31%		Chicago ⁷	2010	22%
Boston ⁶	2005	31%		San Diego	2003	22%
Minneapolis	2004	31%		Sarasota	2001	22%
Bergen	2001	31%		Westport	2000	22%
Hartford	2000	31%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	22%
Palm Springs ⁸	1998	31%		Tucson	2002	21%
Buffalo	1995	31%		St. Louis	2014	19%
BROWARD	2016	30%		New York	2011	19%
Howard County	2010	30%		Seattle	2000	19%
New Haven	2010	30%		San Francisco	2004	17%
Washington	2003	30%		Denver ²	2007	16%
Rhode Island	2002	30%		East Bay	2011	15%
Los Angeles	1997	29%		Portland (ME)	2007	14%
Columbus	2013	28%		NJPS ⁹	2000	25%
Detroit	2005	28%				
Wilmington	1995	28%				
				See footnotes on Table 6-8.		

**TABLE 6-8
REFORM IDENTIFICATION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	51%		Buffalo	1995	35%
Essex-Morris	1998	51%		Columbus	2013	34%
York	1999	49%		S Palm Beach	2005	34%
St. Louis	2014	47%		East Bay	2011	33%
Cincinnati	2008	47%		Howard County	2010	32%
Cleveland	2011	46%		Minneapolis	2004	32%
Chicago ⁷	2010	45%		Tucson	2002	32%
Atlanta	2006	45%		Miami	2014	31%
Phoenix	2002	44%		Washington	2003	31%
Boston ⁶	2005	43%		Hartford	2000	31%
Philadelphia	2009	42%		New Haven	2010	30%
Palm Springs ⁸	1998	42%		Lehigh Valley	2007	30%
Pittsburgh	2002	41%		Orlando	1993	30%
Seattle	2000	41%		Middlesex	2008	29%
Westport	2000	41%		Tidewater	2001	29%
Rochester	1999	41%		Wilmington	1995	29%
Los Angeles	1997	41%		Richmond	1994	29%
San Diego	2003	40%		BROWARD	2016	28%
Charlotte	1997	40%		St. Paul	2004	28%
Denver ²	2007	39%		Rhode Island	2002	28%
San Antonio	2007	39%		Baltimore ⁵	2010	27%
Milwaukee	1996	39%		Las Vegas	2005	26%
St. Petersburg	1994	39%		Monmouth	1997	26%
San Francisco	2004	38%		Bergen	2001	25%
Sarasota	2001	38%		Jacksonville	2002	24%
W Palm Beach	2005	37%		Broward	1997	24%
Atlantic County	2004	37%		New York	2011	23%
Detroit	2005	36%		Harrisburg	1994	22%
Portland (ME)	2007	35%		NJPS ⁹	2000	35%

See footnotes on **Table 6-8**.

**TABLE 6-9
JUST JEWISH IDENTIFICATION
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Portland (ME)	2007	48%		Richmond	1994	30%
Las Vegas	2005	47%		Middlesex	2008	29%
East Bay	2011	45%		W Palm Beach	2005	29%
Tucson	2002	44%		Atlantic County	2004	29%
San Francisco	2004	40% ¹		Rochester	1999	29%
BROWARD	2016	37%		St. Louis	2014	28%
New York	2011	37%		Phoenix	2002	28%
St. Paul	2004	37%		Tidewater	2001	28%
Sarasota	2001	37%		Monmouth	1997	28%
Jacksonville	2002	36%		S Palm Beach	2005	26%
St. Petersburg	1994	36%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	26%
New Haven	2010	35%		Howard County	2010	25%
Minneapolis	2004	35%		York	1999	25%
Rhode Island	2002	35%		Buffalo	1995	23%
Seattle	2000	35%		Cincinnati	2008	22%
Westport	2000	35%		Detroit	2005	22% ⁴
Orlando	1993	35%		Los Angeles	1997	22%
Washington	2003	34%		Baltimore ⁵	2010	20%
Hartford	2000	34%		Essex-Morris	1998	20%
Broward	1997	34%		Philadelphia	2009	18%
Milwaukee	1996	34%		Atlanta	2006	18%
Miami	2014	33%		Boston ⁶	2005	18%
Columbus	2013	33%		Pittsburgh	2002	18%
Wilmington	1995	33%		Cleveland	2011	16%
San Diego	2003	32%		Chicago ⁷	2010	14%
Charlotte	1997	32%		Palm Springs ⁸	1998	14%
Harrisburg	1994	32%		NJPS ⁹	2000	30%
Denver ²	2007	31% ³				
Lehigh Valley	2007	31%				
San Antonio	2007	30%				
Bergen	2001	30%				

See footnotes on **Table 6-8**.

IMPORTANCE OF BEING JEWISH

Table 6-10 shows that 66% of Jewish respondents in Jewish households in Broward feel that being Jewish is very important in their lives, 26%, somewhat important; 5% not too important; and 3%, not at all important.

Community Comparisons. Table 6-11 shows that the 66% who feel that being Jewish is very important is about average among about 25 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 74% in Miami, 56% in Atlanta, and 53% in Las Vegas. The 66% compares to 46% in the Pew study.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. Table 6-10 shows that, overall, 66% of respondents feel that being Jewish is very important in their lives. The percentage is much higher for respondents (in):

- age 75 and over (80%)
- elderly single households (78%)
- households earning an annual income of \$200,000 and over (80%)
- Orthodox households (94%) and Conservative households (82%)
- synagogue member households (84%), households who attended Chabad in the past year (86%), and Jewish organization member households (79%)
- households in which the respondent attended a Jewish day school as a child (79%)
- households in which the respondent participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (76%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (excluding High Holidays) (88%)
- households in which an adult visited Israel on a Jewish trip (79%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (81%)
- households who donated under \$100 (76%), \$100-\$500 (83%), \$500-\$1,000 (88%), and \$1,000 and over (86%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year

The percentage is much lower for respondents (in):

- households in the Northwest (53%)
- under age 35 (38%)
- non-elderly single households (56%)
- Just Jewish households (47%)
- intermarried households (45%)
- synagogue non-member households (56%)
- households in which no adult visited Israel (62%)
- households in which the respondent did not participate in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (56%)
- households in which no adult visited Israel (53%)

TABLE 6-10 IMPORTANCE OF BEING JEWISH				
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS				
Population Subgroup	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Too Important	Not At All Important
All	66.0%	25.9	4.9	3.2
GEOGRAPHIC AREA				
Northwest	53.4%	38.9	7.0	0.7
North Central	70.1%	9.9	10.1	9.9
East	59.3%	28.9	5.6	6.2
West Central	67.1%	25.1	6.4	1.4
Southeast	73.7%	21.9	1.2	3.2
Southwest	68.1%	27.0	2.1	2.8
AGE OF THE RESPONDENT				
Under 35	38.2%	50.0	6.3	5.5
35 - 49	58.4%	22.6	12.8	6.2
50 - 64	68.6%	26.8	2.6	2.0
65 - 74	66.0%	23.9	6.3	3.8
75 and over	79.9%	18.9	0.2	1.0
→ 65 and over	73.3%	21.3	3.1	2.3
SEX OF RESPONDENT				
Male	61.3%	27.8	5.8	5.1
Female	69.2%	24.6	4.3	1.9
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE				
Household with Children	65.4%	22.1	7.3	5.2
Household with Only Adult Children	57.6%	36.0	3.3	3.1
Non-Elderly Couple	64.4%	33.6	0.4	1.6
Non-Elderly Single	56.0%	27.6	10.5	5.9
Elderly Couple	67.8%	31.9	0.1	0.2
Elderly Single	78.4%	11.9	4.8	4.9

TABLE 6-10 IMPORTANCE OF BEING JEWISH				
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS				
Population Subgroup	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Too Important	Not At All Important
All	66.0%	25.9	4.9	3.2
HOUSEHOLD INCOME				
Under \$25,000	67.1%	23.4	6.4	3.1
\$25 - \$50,000	65.6%	25.0	7.9	1.5
\$50 - \$100,000	60.4%	31.5	3.3	4.8
\$100 - \$200,000	64.5%	29.8	3.1	2.6
\$200,000 and over	80.0%	13.1	1.9	5.0
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION				
Orthodox	93.9%	3.5	2.6	0.0
Conservative	81.7%	14.5	2.4	1.4
Reform	69.0%	26.6	4.4	0.0
Just Jewish	46.5%	38.0	7.8	7.7
TYPE OF MARRIAGE				
In-married	74.3%	25.4	0.1	0.2
Conversionary	61.9%	38.1	0.0	0.0
Intermarried	44.6%	34.3	11.5	9.6
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP				
Member	84.2%	14.6	0.0	1.2
Non-Member	56.4%	31.9	7.5	4.2
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR				
Attended	86.1%	13.6	0.3	0.0
Did Not Attend	60.0%	29.6	6.3	4.1
JCC MEMBERSHIP				
Member	71.6%	27.5	0.9	0.0
Non-Member	65.2%	25.7	5.5	3.6

TABLE 6-10 IMPORTANCE OF BEING JEWISH				
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS				
Population Subgroup	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Too Important	Not At All Important
All	66.0%	25.9	4.9	3.2
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP				
Member	78.7%	17.9	2.4	1.0
Non-Member	62.9%	27.9	5.5	3.7
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD				
To Jewish Day School	78.8%	14.7	3.7	2.8
To Supplemental School	67.6%	26.1	3.4	2.9
→ To Jewish Education	69.9%	23.5	4.0	2.6
No	59.2%	33.2	4.8	2.8
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD				
To Overnight Camp	72.9%	23.8	3.0	0.3
No	63.9%	27.1	5.0	4.0
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER				
In Youth Group	81.4%	16.4	2.2	0.0
No	56.2%	33.1	5.9	4.8
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)				
Hillel/Chabad Participant	87.6%	11.3	1.1	0.0
No	58.5%	32.7	5.1	3.7
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL				
On Jewish Trip	79.0%	17.3	1.3	2.4
On General Trip	70.8%	24.8	2.8	1.6
No	52.6%	32.8	9.4	5.2

TABLE 6-10 IMPORTANCE OF BEING JEWISH				
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS				
Population Subgroup	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Too Important	Not At All Important
All	66.0%	25.9	4.9	3.2
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR				
Donated to Federation	80.8%	17.9	0.4	0.9
Asked, Did Not Donate	62.8%	30.8	6.4	0.0
Not Asked	61.1%	28.1	6.4	4.4
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR				
Nothing	61.3%	28.4	6.4	3.9
Under \$100	75.7%	22.0	0.8	1.5
\$100 - \$500	83.0%	17.0	0.0	0.0
\$500 - \$1,000	88.4%	9.9	0.0	1.7
\$1,000 and over	86.2%	13.2	0.6	0.0

**TABLE 6-11
IMPORTANCE OF BEING JEWISH
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Very Important	Not at All Important
Palm Springs	1998	87%		13	
Cincinnati	2008	76%	21	2	1
Cleveland	2011	75%	20	3	2
Miami *	2014	74%	20	4	2
Baltimore	2010	74%	17	5	4
Chicago	2010	73%	23	4	1
Howard County	2010	70%	24	4	2
Philadelphia	2009	70%	23	6	
Pittsburgh	2002	67%	25	6	2
BROWARD	2016	66%	26	5	3
Essex-Morris	1998	65%	27	8	
San Diego	2003	64%	26	6	4
Phoenix	2002	63%	28	5	4
Sarasota	2001	62%	31	5	2
Denver	2007	61%	29	7	3
Wilmington	1995	61%	29	7	3
New York	2011	57%	27	9	7
Atlanta	2006	56%	35	5	4
St. Louis	2014	53%	31	12	5
Las Vegas	2005	53%	34	8	6
Columbus	2013	44%	31	11	14
East Bay	2011	42%	33	16	10
San Francisco	2004	41%	41	12	6
NJPS ¹	2000	52%	34	10	4

* Question was asked using the responses very important, somewhat important, not too important, not at all important.

¹ NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.

BEING JEWISH IS MAINLY A MATTER OF....

Table 6-12 shows that 11% of Jewish respondents in Broward feel that to them personally being Jewish is mainly a matter of religion; 18%, ancestry; 31%, culture; 0%, religion and ancestry; 2%, religion and culture; 5%, ancestry and culture; and 33%, all three. Cumulatively, 47% of respondents included religion in their responses; 56%, ancestry, and 70%, culture.

53% of respondents feel that being Jewish is mainly a matter of ancestry, culture, or both, thus excluding religion as a component.

The 11% who feel that being Jewish is mainly a matter of religion compares to 15% in the Pew study. The 53% who feel that being Jewish is mainly a matter of ancestry, culture, or both compares to 62% in the Pew study. The 33% who feel that being Jewish is mainly a matter of all three (ancestry, culture, and religion) compares to 23% in the Pew study.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups.

A Matter of Religion

Table 6-12 shows that, overall, 11% of respondents feel that to them being Jewish is mainly a matter of religion. The percentage is much higher for respondents in:

- Orthodox households (29%)
- conversionary in-married households (23%)

The percentage is much lower for respondents in:

- non-elderly couple households (1%)

A Matter of Ancestry

Table 6-12 shows that, overall, 18% of respondents feel that to them being Jewish is mainly a matter of ancestry. The percentage is much higher for respondents (in):

- intermarried households (47%)
- households in which the respondent did not attend Jewish education as a child (31%)
- households in which no adult visited Israel (31%)

The percentage is much lower for respondents (in):

- households with only adult children (2%)
- conversionary in-married households (4%)
- synagogue member households (7%), households who attended Chabad in the past year (8%), and JCC member households (4%)
- households in which the respondent attended Jewish day school as a child (5%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (3%)
- households in which an adult visited Israel on a Jewish trip (7%)

- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (7%)
- households who donated \$100-\$500 (6%), \$500-\$1,000 (94%), and \$1,000 and over (5%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year

A Matter of Ancestry

Table 6-12 shows that, overall, 31% of respondents feel that to them being Jewish is mainly a matter of ancestry. The percentage is much higher for respondents (in):

- under age 35 (46%) and age 65-74 (14%)
- households with only adult children (41%) and non-elderly couple households (44%)
- conversionary in-married households (4%)

The percentage is much lower for respondents (in):

- age 75 and over (17%)
- non-elderly single households (14%)
- Orthodox households (4%)

PROUD TO BE JEWISH

Jewish respondents in Broward were asked if they agree or disagree with the statement “I am proud to be Jewish.” 98% of respondents agreed, which compares to 94% in the Pew study.

TABLE 6-12 BEING JEWISH IS MAINLY A MATTER OF.....							
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS							
Population Subgroup	Religion	Ancestry	Culture	Religion and Ancestry	Religion and Culture	Ancestry and Culture	All Three
All	11.4%	18.0	30.7	0.2	1.7	4.6	33.4
GEOGRAPHIC AREA							
Northwest	13.2%	17.5	37.5	0.0	2.7	7.1	22.0
North Central	17.9%	16.7	31.1	0.0	0.0	6.0	28.3
East	17.5%	11.3	29.5	0.6	0.5	6.8	33.8
West Central	11.4%	24.2	30.7	0.4	2.7	2.3	28.3
Southeast	10.8%	15.6	23.2	0.0	0.6	5.8	44.0
Southwest	5.8%	16.0	32.4	0.0	1.9	3.4	40.5
AGE OF THE RESPONDENT							
Under 35	9.9%	9.8	45.7	0.6	0.8	9.6	23.6
35 - 49	12.8%	22.2	36.0	0.0	0.5	3.1	25.4
50 - 64	14.3%	15.7	26.0	0.3	1.3	2.3	40.1
65 - 74	9.0%	13.9	41.8	0.0	0.1	4.3	30.9
75 and over	8.9%	24.9	17.0	0.1	5.1	7.9	36.1
→ 65 and over	8.9%	19.7	28.8	0.1	2.7	6.2	33.6
SEX OF RESPONDENT							
Male	10.6%	17.6	30.8	0.1	1.7	4.0	35.2
Female	12.0%	18.3	30.6	0.2	1.7	5.0	32.2

TABLE 6-12 BEING JEWISH IS MAINLY A MATTER OF.....							
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS							
Population Subgroup	Religion	Ancestry	Culture	Religion and Ancestry	Religion and Culture	Ancestry and Culture	All Three
All	11.4%	18.0	30.7	0.2	1.7	4.6	33.4
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE							
Household with Children	16.1%	21.5	30.3	0.0	0.7	5.8	25.6
Household with Only Adult Children	19.2%	2.3	41.1	0.0	2.7	1.1	33.6
Non-Elderly Couple	0.7%	23.5	43.7	0.0	0.2	2.5	29.4
Non-Elderly Single	6.5%	16.2	14.2	1.4	0.0	6.6	55.1
Elderly Couple	11.8%	18.2	32.4	0.0	2.7	4.1	30.8
Elderly Single	8.8%	19.4	24.6	0.0	3.8	9.1	34.3
HOUSEHOLD INCOME							
Under \$25,000	14.7%	25.0	29.6	0.0	3.0	3.0	24.7
\$25 - \$50,000	13.5%	22.2	23.1	0.0	1.4	6.0	33.8
\$50 - \$100,000	12.5%	21.8	24.1	0.0	2.2	6.4	33.0
\$100-\$200,000	14.6%	12.1	36.6	0.8	0.1	4.1	31.7
\$200,000 and over	12.2%	13.2	39.1	0.0	0.0	4.4	31.1
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION							
Orthodox	28.9%	14.0	3.8	0.0	1.0	2.4	49.9
Conservative	15.2%	14.7	26.2	0.2	2.5	4.5	36.7
Reform	6.2%	11.7	35.9	0.0	1.0	4.6	40.6
Just Jewish	10.4%	27.2	34.2	0.3	1.2	4.6	22.1

TABLE 6-12 BEING JEWISH IS MAINLY A MATTER OF.....							
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS							
Population Subgroup	Religion	Ancestry	Culture	Religion and Ancestry	Religion and Culture	Ancestry and Culture	All Three
All	11.4%	18.0	30.7	0.2	1.7	4.6	33.4
TYPE OF MARRIAGE							
In-married	11.2%	11.0	37.3	0.0	1.3	3.3	35.9
Conversionary	23.0%	3.5	45.8	0.0	0.0	6.1	21.6
Intermarried	7.2%	47.0	23.6	0.0	4.2	1.2	16.8
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP							
Member	17.1%	7.0	25.0	0.2	1.9	5.2	43.6
Non	8.3%	24.3	33.9	0.1	1.6	4.2	27.6
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR							
Attended	15.9%	8.4	27.0	0.0	1.0	3.6	44.1
Did Not Attend	10.2%	21.0	31.8	0.2	1.9	4.9	30.0
JCC MEMBERSHIP							
Member	12.0%	3.7	34.8	0.0	0.1	7.6	41.8
Non Member	11.4%	20.0	30.1	0.2	1.9	4.2	32.2
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP							
Member	12.3%	8.5	32.1	0.0	3.5	5.0	38.6
Non-Member	11.3%	20.3	30.3	0.2	1.3	4.5	32.1

TABLE 6-12 BEING JEWISH IS MAINLY A MATTER OF.....							
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS							
Population Subgroup	Religion	Ancestry	Culture	Religion and Ancestry	Religion and Culture	Ancestry and Culture	All Three
All	11.4%	18.0	30.7	0.2	1.7	4.6	33.4
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD							
To Jewish Day School	15.4%	4.6	30.8	0.6	1.6	2.6	44.4
To Supplemental School	11.7%	13.8	32.4	0.1	2.0	4.8	35.2
→ To Jewish Education	11.8%	12.2	32.5	0.2	2.0	4.1	37.2
No	9.6%	31.0	23.9	0.1	0.9	5.2	29.3
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD							
To Overnight Camp	15.0%	12.9	31.3	0.0	2.1	4.3	34.4
No	9.5%	19.9	29.9	0.3	1.5	4.5	34.4
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER							
In Youth Group	10.0%	10.7	30.7	0.1	2.9	4.6	41.0
No	12.6%	22.9	30.1	0.2	0.8	4.3	29.1
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)							
Hillel/Chabad Participant	13.8%	3.2	24.5	0.3	3.9	4.4	49.9
No	10.8%	18.5	35.4	0.2	0.8	3.9	30.4

TABLE 6-12 BEING JEWISH IS MAINLY A MATTER OF.....							
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS							
Population Subgroup	Religion	Ancestry	Culture	Religion and Ancestry	Religion and Culture	Ancestry and Culture	All Three
All	11.4%	18.0	30.7	0.2	1.7	4.6	33.4
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL							
On Jewish Trip	12.9%	7.0	29.5	0.5	2.9	6.7	40.5
On General Trip	7.9%	12.3	33.9	0.1	0.8	2.9	42.1
No	14.2%	31.4	28.2	0.0	1.8	4.8	19.6
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR							
Donated to Federation	12.1%	7.3	31.5	0.2	0.3	5.0	43.6
Asked, Did Not Donate	7.1%	15.4	32.0	0.0	6.0	5.5	34.0
Not Asked	11.7%	22.3	30.6	0.2	1.7	3.7	29.8
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR							
Nothing	11.0%	21.6	30.8	0.2	2.2	3.9	30.3
Under \$100	11.2%	10.0	31.1	0.5	0.2	5.1	41.9
\$100 - \$500	14.6%	5.7	35.8	0.0	0.6	3.3	40.0
\$500 - \$1,000	2.7%	4.1	22.6	0.0	0.0	8.2	62.4
\$1,000 and over	17.9%	4.8	30.3	0.0	0.3	6.2	40.5

STRONG SENSE OF BELONGING TO THE JEWISH PEOPLE

Table 6-13 shows that 90% of Jewish respondents in Broward agree with the statement “I have a strong sense of belonging to the Jewish people.” The 90% compares to 75% in the Pew study.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. Table 6-13 shows that, overall, 90% of respondents agree with the statement “I have a strong sense of belonging to the Jewish people.” The percentage is much higher for respondents in:

- Orthodox households (98%) and Conservative households (98%)
- households who attended Chabad in the past year (98%), JCC member households (98%), and Jewish organization member households (99%)
- households in which the respondent participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (98%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (excluding High Holidays) (98%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (98%)
- households who donated \$500-\$1,000 (98%) and \$1,000 and over (99%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year

The percentage is much lower for respondents (in):

- households in the East (77%)
- age 35-49 (79%)
- non-elderly single households (80%)
- households earning an annual income under \$25,000 (78%)
- intermarried households (76%)

HAVE A SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY TO TAKE CARE OF JEWS IN NEED AROUND THE WORLD

Table 6-13 shows that 75% of Jewish respondents in Broward agree with the statement "I have a special responsibility to take care of Jews in need around the world." The 75% compares to 63% in the Pew study.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. Table 6-13 shows that, overall, 76% of respondents agree with the statement "I have a special responsibility to take care of Jews in need around the world." The percentage is much higher for respondents (in):

- households in the East (86%)
- under age 35 (89%)
- non-elderly couple households (87%)
- households earning an annual income of \$200,000 and over (89%)
- households who attended Chabad in the past year (93%) and Jewish organization member households (88%)
- households in which the respondent participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (86%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (excluding High Holidays) (89%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (94%)
- households who donated under \$100 (94%), \$100-\$500 (93%), \$500-\$1,000 (96%), and \$1,000 and over (95%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year

The percentage is much lower for respondents (in):

- age 65-74 (64%)
- households in which no adult visited Israel (65%)

TABLE 6-13 JEWISH IDENTITY ATTITUDES		
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS		
Population Subgroup	Strong Sense of Belonging to Jewish People	Special Responsibility To Take Care of Jews in Need Around the World
All	90.1%	75.9%
GEOGRAPHIC AREA		
Northwest	89.6%	72.1%
North Central	91.0%	66.6%
East	77.3%	76.4%
West Central	91.8%	73.8%
Southeast	89.9%	86.3%
Southwest	93.4%	77.0%
AGE OF THE RESPONDENT		
Under 35	87.9%	89.1%
35 - 49	78.6%	77.3%
50 - 64	91.3%	77.9%
65 - 74	93.8%	64.2%
75 and over	94.8%	76.6%
→ 65 and over	94.3%	70.6%
SEX OF RESPONDENT		
Male	88.9%	68.3%
Female	90.9%	81.1%

TABLE 6-13 JEWISH IDENTITY ATTITUDES		
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS		
Population Subgroup	Strong Sense of Belonging to Jewish People	Special Responsibility To Take Care of Jews in Need Around the World
All	90.1%	75.9%
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE		
Household with Children	84.1%	75.0%
Household with Only Adult Children	95.8%	77.9%
Non-Elderly Couple	90.7%	87.1%
Non-Elderly Single	79.6%	73.7%
Elderly Couple	93.8%	72.8%
Elderly Single	94.6%	77.2%
HOUSEHOLD INCOME		
Under \$25,000	78.3%	74.8%
\$25 - \$50,000	89.8%	71.4%
\$50 - \$100,000	90.0%	74.7%
\$100 - \$200,000	90.3%	70.7%
\$200,000 and over	93.1%	88.5%
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION		
Orthodox	97.8%	84.5%
Conservative	97.8%	83.9%
Reform	91.7%	78.1%
Just Jewish	81.3%	65.8%
TYPE OF MARRIAGE		
In-married	95.5%	83.7%
Conversionary	96.4%	70.0%
Intermarried	75.7%	55.3%

TABLE 6-13 JEWISH IDENTITY ATTITUDES		
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS		
Population Subgroup	Strong Sense of Belonging to Jewish People	Special Responsibility To Take Care of Jews in Need Around the World
All	90.1%	75.9%
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP		
Member	97.1%	84.8%
Non-Member	86.3%	71.1%
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR		
Attended	98.1%	93.1%
Did Not Attend	87.7%	70.8%
JCC MEMBERSHIP		
Member	97.6%	85.4%
Non-Member	89.0%	74.5%
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP		
Member	98.5%	88.4%
Non-Member	87.9%	72.7%
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD		
To Jewish Day School	93.3%	75.5%
To Supplemental School	92.3%	77.3%
→To Jewish Education	93.0%	76.7%
No	87.2%	74.9%
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD		
To Overnight Camp	95.9%	79.3%
No	88.8%	75.5%
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER		
In Youth Group	98.1%	85.7%
No	86.0%	70.3%

TABLE 6-13 JEWISH IDENTITY ATTITUDES		
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS		
Population Subgroup	Strong Sense of Belonging to Jewish People	Special Responsibility To Take Care of Jews in Need Around the World
All	90.1%	75.9%
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)		
Hillel/Chabad Participant	97.6%	88.9%
No	90.9%	74.6%
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL		
On Jewish Trip	97.3%	83.9%
On General Trip	93.4%	81.0%
No	81.7%	65.0%
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR		
Donated to Federation	98.4%	94.0%
Asked, Did Not Donate	92.0%	70.3%
Not Asked	86.7%	70.0%
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR		
Nothing	87.3%	70.1%
Under \$100	99.6%	93.6%
\$100 - \$500	96.3%	93.3%
\$500 - \$1,000	98.3%	96.2%
\$1,000 and over	99.1%	94.9%

RELIGIOUS PRACTICES

Table 6-14 summarizes the overall results on religious practices observed by Jewish households in Broward. Some questions were asked with the responses always, usually, sometimes, and never (participate in a Passover Seder, light Chanukah candles, light Sabbath candles, and have a Christmas tree). Other questions were asked with yes and no responses (have a mezuzah on the front door, keep a kosher home, keep kosher in and out of the home, and refrain from using electricity on the Sabbath). In examining these results, it should be noted that some respondents may overstate the level of observance of religious practices.

Having a mezuzah on the front door, a ritual that generally must be observed only when one moves into a new residence, is observed by 78% of households. Participating in a Passover Seder is always/usually observed by 79% of households and lighting Chanukah candles, by 77% (both annual rituals). Lighting Sabbath candles, a weekly ritual, is always/usually observed by 22% of households. Keeping a kosher home, an ongoing practice, is observed by 12% of households and keeping kosher in and out of the home, by 5% of respondents. 2% of respondents refrain from using electricity on the Sabbath, a weekly ritual. 15% of households always/usually have a Christmas tree in the home and 24% always/usually/sometimes have one.

Among the comparison Jewish communities, Broward has the sixth highest percentage of households with a mezuzah on the front door (78%). Broward is average for all other practices in **Table 6-14**

TABLE 6-14					
SUMMARY OF RESULTS ON RELIGIOUS PRACTICES					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Religious Practice	Always+ Usually or Yes	Always or Yes	Usually	Some- times	Never or No
Have a Mezuzah on the Front Door	78.2%	78.2%			21.8
Participate in a Passover Seder	78.7%	66.0%	12.7	14.2	7.1
Light Chanukah Candles	77.0%	67.0%	10.0	14.0	9.0
Light Sabbath Candles	21.7%	14.8%	6.9	32.4	45.9
Keep a Kosher Home	11.7%	11.7%			88.3
Keep Kosher In/Out of Home	5.0%	5.0%			95.0
Refrain from Using Electricity	97.6%	97.6%			2.4
Have a Christmas Tree	14.9%	12.6%	2.3	9.4	75.7

PRACTICE

Table 6-15 shows that 88% of Jewish respondents in Broward reported that someone in their household observes *at least one* of the following religious practices (*practice*):

- ❶ Participate in a Passover Seder (always/usually);
- ❷ Light Chanukah candles (always/usually);
- ❸ Light Sabbath candles (always/usually); or
- ❹ Keep a kosher home (yes).

Community Comparisons. Table 6-16 shows that the 88% who practice is about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 89% in South Palm Beach, 88% in West Palm Beach, 87% in both Miami and Atlanta, and 72% in Las Vegas. The 88% compares to 85% in 1997.

✓ If having a mezuzah on the front door is added to the list of religious practices, the XX% of households increases to 93%.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. Table 6-15 shows that, overall, 88% of households **practice**. The percentage is much higher in:

- Orthodox households (100%)
- households who attended Chabad in the past year (98%)
- households in which the respondent participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (98%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (44%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (98%)
- households who donated \$100-\$500 (100%), \$500-\$1,000 (100%), and \$1,000 and over (99%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year

The percentage is much lower for:

- households in the East (75%)
- Just Jewish households (78%)

TABLE 6-15 PRACTICE	
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS	
Population Subgroup	Practice
All	88.2%
GEOGRAPHIC AREA	
Northwest	96.3%
North Central	84.2%
East	74.8%
West Central	82.8%
Southeast	93.6%
Southwest	92.6%
AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	
Under 35	82.1%
35 - 49	83.8%
50 - 64	90.1%
65 - 74	89.6%
75 and over	89.2%
→ 65 and over	89.4%
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE	
Household with Children	86.8%
Household with Only Adult Children	87.8%
Non-Elderly Couple	90.0%
Non-Elderly Single	87.0%
Elderly Couple	95.2%
Elderly Single	87.6%

TABLE 6-15 PRACTICE	
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS	
Population Subgroup	Practice
All	88.2%
HOUSEHOLD INCOME	
Under \$25,000	82.9%
\$25 - \$50,000	93.5%
\$50 - \$100,000	84.5%
\$100 - \$200,000	90.3%
\$200,000 and over	93.8%
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION	
Orthodox	100.0%
Conservative	94.6%
Reform	93.1%
Just Jewish	77.6%
TYPE OF MARRIAGE	
In-married	96.0%
Conversionary	92.9%
Intermarried	80.6%
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP	
Member	97.3%
Non-Member	83.5%
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR	
Attended	97.6%
Did Not Attend	85.4%
JCC MEMBERSHIP	
Member	95.4%
Non-Member	87.2%

TABLE 6-15 PRACTICE	
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS	
Population Subgroup	Practice
All	88.2%
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP	
Member	95.2%
Non-Member	86.5%
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD	
To Jewish Day School	91.4%
To Supplemental School	92.2%
→ To Jewish Education	91.4%
No	85.0%
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD	
To Overnight Camp	90.2%
No	89.5%
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER	
In Youth Group	98.0%
No	83.7%
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)	
Hillel/Chabad Participant	93.3%
No	88.6%
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL	
On Jewish Trip	97.0%
On General Trip	90.2%
No	80.7%

TABLE 6-15 PRACTICE	
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS	
Population Subgroup	Practice
All	88.2%
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR	
Donated to Federation	97.9%
Asked, Did Not Donate	84.1%
Not Asked	85.2%
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR	
Nothing	85.1%
Under \$100	95.9%
\$100 - \$500	99.7%
\$500 - \$1,000	99.6%
\$1,000 and over	98.8%

Note to **Table 6-15**: A household is considered to “practice” if anyone in the household observes *at least one* of the following religious practices: ❶ Participate in a Passover Seder (always/usually); ❷ Light Chanukah candles (always/ usually); ❸ Light Sabbath candles (always/usually); or ❹ Keep a kosher home (yes).

**TABLE 6-16
PRACTICE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Monmouth	1997	93%		Washington	2003	84%
Howard County	2010	91%		Milwaukee	1996	84%
Middlesex	2008	91%		Pittsburgh	2002	83%
Bergen	2001	91%		Los Angeles	1997	83%
Cincinnati	2008	90%		Lehigh Valley	2007	82%
Detroit	2005	89%		Richmond	1994	82%
S Palm Beach	2005	89%		New York	2011	81%
BROWARD	2016	88%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	81%
Chicago	2010	88%		Charlotte	1997	81%
W Palm Beach	2005	88%		Orlando	1993	81%
Minneapolis	2004	88%		Cleveland	2011	80%
Rochester	1999	88%		Portland (ME)	2007	79%
Miami	2014	87%		San Antonio	2007	79%
Atlanta	2006	87%		Sarasota	2001	78%
Atlantic County	2004	87%		Tucson	2002	77%
Hartford	2000	87%		York	1999	77%
Westport	2000	87%		St. Petersburg	1994	76%
Tidewater	2001	86%		Denver	2007	75%
Harrisburg	1994	86%		Jacksonville	2002	75%
New Haven	2010	85%		Phoenix	2002	75%
St. Paul	2004	85%		St. Louis	2014	72%
Rhode Island	2002	85%		Las Vegas	2005	72%
Broward	1997	85%		Columbus	2013	68%
Wilmington	1995	85%				
Baltimore	2010	84%				
				See note on previous page.		

HAVE A MEZUZAH ON THE FRONT DOOR

Table 6-17 shows that 78% of Jewish households in Broward have a mezuzah on the front door.

Community Comparisons. Table 6-18 shows that the 78% who have a mezuzah on the front door is the sixth highest among about 40 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 87% in South Palm Beach, 83% in West Palm Beach, 80% in Miami, and 55% in Las Vegas. The 78% compares to 79% in 1997.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. Table 6-17 shows that, overall, 78% of households have a mezuzah on the front door. The percentage is much higher (in):

- age 65 and over (88%)
- elderly couple households (91%) and elderly single households (89%)
- Orthodox households (97%) and Conservative households (91%)
- in-married households (96%) and conversionary in-married households (91%)
- synagogue member households (94%), households who attended Chabad in the past year (89%), JCC member households (88%), and Jewish organization member households (96%)
- households in which the respondent attended a Jewish day school as a child (90%)
- households in which the respondent participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (92%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (91%)
- households in which an adult visited Israel on a Jewish trip (88%) or a general trip (88%) in the past year
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (95%)
- households who donated under \$100 (98%), \$100-\$500 (94%), and \$1,000 and over (96%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year

The percentage is much lower for:

- households in the East (59%)
- households who rent their home (60%)
- under age 35 (47%) and age 35-49 (61%)
- non-elderly single households (65%)
- households earning an annual income of \$25,000-\$50,000 (68%)
- Just Jewish households (62%)
- intermarried households (38%)
- households in which no adult visited Israel (63%)

TABLE 6-17 HAVE A MEZUZAH ON THE FRONT DOOR	
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS	
Population Subgroup	Have a Mezuzah on the Front Door
All	78.2%
GEOGRAPHIC AREA	
Northwest	79.8%
North Central	77.7%
East	59.4%
West Central	77.0%
Southeast	78.0%
Southwest	86.6%
HOME OWNERSHIP	
Own	82.0%
Rent	60.1%
AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	
Under 35	46.6%
35 - 49	60.8%
50 - 64	80.7%
65 - 74	83.4%
75 and over	92.2%
→ 65 and over	87.9%
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE	
Household with Children	69.0%
Household with Only Adult Children	76.3%
Non-Elderly Couple	81.8%
Non-Elderly Single	65.0%
Elderly Couple	91.4%
Elderly Single	88.7%

TABLE 6-17 HAVE A MEZUZAH ON THE FRONT DOOR	
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS	
Population Subgroup	Have a Mezuzah on the Front Door
All	78.2%
HOUSEHOLD INCOME	
Under \$25,000	76.9%
\$25 - \$50,000	68.0%
\$50 - \$100,000	76.4%
\$100 - \$200,000	73.2%
\$200,000 and over	82.2%
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION	
Orthodox	96.5%
Conservative	91.3%
Reform	82.4%
Just Jewish	61.8%
TYPE OF MARRIAGE	
In-married	95.9%
Conversionary	89.2%
Intermarried	37.6%
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP	
Member	93.6%
Non-Member	70.2%
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR	
Attended	89.3%
Did Not Attend	74.9%
JCC MEMBERSHIP	
Member	88.3%
Non-Member	76.8%

TABLE 6-17 HAVE A MEZUZAH ON THE FRONT DOOR	
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS	
Population Subgroup	Have a Mezuzah on the Front Door
All	78.2%
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP	
Member	96.3%
Non-Member	73.7%
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD	
To Jewish Day School	89.8%
To Supplemental School	83.0%
→ To Jewish Education	83.8%
No	74.1%
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD	
To Overnight Camp	83.7%
No	80.2%
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER	
In Youth Group	91.7%
No	73.8%
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)	
Hillel/Chabad Participant	90.5%
No	76.6%
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL	
On Jewish Trip	87.6%
On General Trip	88.2%
No	62.8%

TABLE 6-17	
HAVE A MEZUZAH ON THE FRONT DOOR	
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS	
Population Subgroup	Have a Mezuzah on the Front Door
All	78.2%
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR	
Donated to Federation	94.7%
Asked, Did Not Donate	72.4%
Not Asked	72.9%
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR	
Nothing	72.8%
Under \$100	98.1%
\$100 - \$500	94.0%
\$500 - \$1,000	82.2%
\$1,000 and over	95.8%

**TABLE 6-18
HAVE A MEZUZAH ON THE FRONT DOOR
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
S Palm Beach	2005	87%		Los Angeles	1997	63%
Middlesex	2008	83%		Westport	2000	62%
W Palm Beach	2005	83%		Milwaukee	1996	62%
Monmouth	1997	81%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	61%
Miami	2014	80%		Harrisburg	1994	61%
Broward	1997	79%		St. Petersburg	1994	61%
BROWARD	2016	78%		York	1999	60%
Detroit	2005	77%		Wilmington	1995	60%
Atlantic County	2004	77%		Orlando	1993	59%
Bergen	2001	76%		Tucson	2002	58%
Hartford	2000	72%		San Diego *	2003	57%
Sarasota	2001	69%		Charlotte	1997	57%
Lehigh Valley	2007	68%		Las Vegas	2005	55%
San Antonio	2007	68%		Washington	2003	55%
Tidewater	2001	68%		Phoenix *	2002	55%
Rochester	1999	68%		Portland (ME)	2007	50%
St. Paul	2004	67%		Seattle	2000	41%
Rhode Island	2002	67%		NJPS * ¹	2000	61%
New Haven	2010	65%		* Question was asked about a mezuzah on any door of the house.		
Minneapolis	2004	65%		¹ NJPS 2000 data are for the <i>more Jewishly-connected</i> sample.		
Jacksonville	2002	64%				
Richmond	1994	64%				

PARTICIPATE IN A PASSOVER SEDER

Table 6-19 shows that 66% of respondents in Jewish households in Broward reported that someone in their household always participates in a Passover Seder; 13%, usually; 14%, sometimes; and 7%, never. In total, 79% of households always/usually participate in a Seder.

Community Comparisons. Table 6-20 shows that the 79% who **always/usually** participate in a Seder is about average among about 55 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 81% in Miami, 80% in South Palm Beach, 79% in West Palm Beach, 62% in Atlanta, and 50% in Las Vegas. The 78% compares to 75% in 1997.

The 7% who **never** participate in a Seder is the seventh lowest of about 50 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 21% in Las Vegas, 19% in Atlanta, 7% in both South Palm Beach and West Palm Beach, and 6% in Miami. The 7% compares to 8% in 1997.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. Table 6-19 shows that, overall, 79% of households always/usually participate in a Seder. The percentage is much higher in:

- households in the Northwest (93%)
- households earning an annual income of \$200,000 and over (91%)
- Orthodox households (97%)
- synagogue member households (97%), households who attended Chabad in the past year (97%), JCC member households (92%), and Jewish organization member households (89%)
- households in which the respondent participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (95%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (excluding High Holidays) (92%)
- households in which an adult visited Israel on a Jewish trip (95%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (96%)
- households who donated under \$100 (93%), \$100-\$500 (98%), \$500-\$1,000 (98%), and \$1,000 and over to the Jewish Federation in the past year (98%)

The percentage is much lower for:

- households in the North Central (62%) and the East (59%)
- households earning an annual income under \$25,000 (64%)
- Just Jewish households (65%)
- intermarried households (61%)
- households in which no adult visited Israel (65%)

TABLE 6-19 PARTICIPATE IN A PASSOVER SEDER					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	78.7%	66.0%	12.7	14.2	7.1
GEOGRAPHIC AREA					
Northwest	92.6%	68.8%	23.8	6.5	0.9
North Central	61.9%	53.8%	8.1	33.3	4.8
East	59.0%	48.2%	10.8	16.5	24.5
West Central	71.6%	60.6%	11.0	17.2	11.2
Southeast	86.5%	72.1%	14.4	7.9	5.6
Southwest	87.8%	78.6%	9.2	10.9	1.3
AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD					
Under 35	76.3%	63.8%	12.5	6.3	17.4
35 - 49	81.6%	73.3%	8.3	5.7	12.7
50 - 64	82.1%	69.8%	12.3	14.7	3.2
65 - 74	74.1%	54.6%	19.5	17.8	8.1
75 and over	75.9%	65.4%	10.5	18.6	5.5
→ 65 and over	75.0%	60.0%	15.0	18.2	6.8
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE					
Household with Children	82.2%	73.9%	8.3	4.9	12.9
Household with Only Adult Children	78.8%	66.5%	12.3	9.2	12.0
Non-Elderly Couple	81.6%	74.8%	6.8	16.9	1.5
Non-Elderly Single	82.4%	63.3%	19.1	17.6	0.0
Elderly Couple	77.3%	67.2%	10.1	19.0	3.7
Elderly Single	76.9%	57.7%	19.2	15.3	7.8

TABLE 6-19 PARTICIPATE IN A PASSOVER SEDER					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	78.7%	66.0%	12.7	14.2	7.1
HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
Under \$25,000	64.1%	50.3%	13.8	17.7	18.2
\$25 - \$50,000	74.5%	55.1%	19.4	14.9	10.6
\$50 - \$100,000	76.0%	61.2%	14.8	18.1	5.9
\$100 - \$200,000	85.0%	73.2%	11.8	10.8	4.2
\$200,000 and over	90.7%	86.5%	4.2	4.2	5.1
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION					
Orthodox	97.4%	97.4%	0.0	0.0	2.6
Conservative	87.4%	76.7%	10.7	8.5	4.1
Reform	83.7%	70.7%	13.0	13.2	3.1
Just Jewish	65.2%	49.4%	15.8	21.5	13.3
TYPE OF MARRIAGE					
In-married	88.4%	79.3%	9.1	10.5	1.1
Conversionary	84.1%	72.7%	11.4	15.7	0.2
Intermarried	61.0%	51.3%	9.7	17.0	22.0
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP					
Member	95.5%	88.4%	7.1	3.3	1.2
Non-Member	70.0%	54.3%	15.7	19.8	10.2
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR					
Attended	96.7%	83.9%	12.8	1.8	1.5
Did Not Attend	73.4%	60.7%	12.7	17.8	8.8
JCC MEMBERSHIP					
Member	91.8%	87.6%	4.2	8.2	0.0
Non-Member	76.9%	63.0%	13.9	15.0	8.1

TABLE 6-19 PARTICIPATE IN A PASSOVER SEDER					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	78.7%	66.0%	12.7	14.2	7.1
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP					
Member	89.4%	79.8%	9.6	8.6	2.0
Non-Member	76.1%	62.6%	13.5	15.5	8.4
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD					
To Jewish Day School	87.5%	79.6%	7.9	7.1	5.4
To Supplemental School	84.4%	68.9%	15.5	12.0	3.6
→To Jewish Education	70.8%	55.9%	14.9	20.6	8.6
No	70.9%	56.5%	14.4	20.2	8.9
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD					
To Overnight Camp	82.6%	68.9%	13.7	11.8	5.6
No	79.3%	65.9%	13.4	14.5	6.2
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER					
In Youth Group	94.9%	85.4%	9.5	4.8	0.3
No	69.7%	53.1%	16.6	20.1	10.2
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)					
Hillel/Chabad Participant	92.3%	84.9%	7.4	5.6	2.1
No	80.1%	64.5%	15.6	13.5	6.4
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL					
On Jewish Trip	94.5%	86.2%	8.3	5.0	0.5
On General Trip	82.7%	66.9%	15.8	14.9	2.4
No	64.8%	52.0%	12.8	19.4	15.8

TABLE 6-19					
PARTICIPATE IN A PASSOVER SEDER					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	78.7%	66.0%	12.7	14.2	7.1
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR					
Donated to Federation	96.0%	84.3%	11.7	3.3	0.7
Asked, Did Not Donate	81.3%	70.3%	11.0	9.3	9.4
Not Asked	72.1%	58.7%	13.4	18.7	9.2
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR					
Nothing	73.1%	59.9%	13.2	17.7	9.2
Under \$100	93.1%	83.2%	9.9	5.8	1.1
\$100 - \$500	98.3%	82.6%	15.7	1.7	0.0
\$500 - \$1,000	99.6%	81.7%	17.9	0.4	0.0
\$1,000 and over	98.2%	95.2%	3.0	0.6	1.2

**TABLE 6-20
PARTICIPATE IN A PASSOVER SEDER
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	<i>Always/ Usually</i>	Always	Usually	Some- times	Never
Monmouth	1997	86%	77%	9	10	5
Bergen	2001	85%	76%	9	11	4
Essex-Morris	1998	84%	76%	8	9	7
Middlesex	2008	83%	74%	9	11	6
Detroit	2005	82%	75%	7	12	6
Howard County	2010	81%	73%	8	8	11
Miami	2014	81%	69%	11	13	6
S Palm Beach	2005	80%	68%	12	14	7
Westport	2000	79%	68%	11	13	8
W Palm Beach	2005	79%	66%	13	15	7
Rochester	1999	78%	70%	9	15	7
Hartford	2000	78%	69%	9	13	9
Minneapolis	2004	78%	68%	11	15	7
Chicago	2010	78%	68%	10	13	9
BROWARD	2016	78%	66%	13	14	7
Atlantic County	2004	78%	66%	12	15	6
Washington	2003	77%	65%	12	16	7
Milwaukee	1996	77%	65%	12	12	11
Baltimore	2010	76%	70%	6	11	13
St. Paul	2004	76%	68%	8	17	8
Cincinnati	2008	76%	65%	12	12	11
New Haven	2010	76%	64%	12	17	7
Philadelphia	2009	76%	76%		24	
Harrisburg	1994	75%	66%	9	13	12

**TABLE 6-20
PARTICIPATE IN A PASSOVER SEDER
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	<i>Always/ Usually</i>	Always	Usually	Some- times	Never
Pittsburgh	2002	75%	65%	10	13	13
Broward	1997	75%	64%	11	16	8
Tidewater	2001	75%	64%	11	15	10
Los Angeles	1997	74%	64%	10	14	12
Wilmington	1995	74%	64%	10	14	13
Richmond	1994	73%	63%	10	16	11
Rhode Island	2002	73%	61%	12	17	10
Boston	2005	72%	64%	8	20	8
Palm Springs	1998	72%	72%		17	12
Lehigh Valley	2007	70%	59%	11	19	11
Cleveland	2011	70%	58%	12	17	12
New York	2011	69%	60%	9	16	14
Charlotte	1997	69%	58%	11	20	11
Sarasota	2001	69%	57%	12	17	14
San Antonio	2007	69%	57%	11	20	11
Orlando	1993	67%	54%	12	20	14
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	66%	54%	12	16	18
St. Petersburg	1994	65%	56%	9	16	19
York	1999	64%	55%	9	20	16
San Diego	2003	64%	51%	13	20	16
Jacksonville	2002	63%	53%	10	22	15
Atlanta	2006	62%	53%	10	19	19
Phoenix	2002	62%	49%	13	26	12
Columbus	2013	61%	49%	12	11	29

**TABLE 6-20
PARTICIPATE IN A PASSOVER SEDER
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	<i>Always/ Usually</i>	Always	Usually	Some- times	Never
Tucson	2002	61%	49%	11	26	13
St. Louis	2014	60%	50%	11	16	23
Portland (ME)	2007	60%	47%	13	28	12
Denver	2007	57%	48%	9	25	18
San Francisco	2004	55%	55%		45	
Las Vegas	2005	50%	40%	11	28	21
Buffalo	1995	NA	91%			9

LIGHT CHANUKAH CANDLES

Table 6-21 shows that 67% of respondents in Jewish households in Broward reported that someone in their household always lights Chanukah candles; 10%, usually; 14%, sometimes; and 9%, never. In total, 77% of households always/usually light Chanukah candles.

Community Comparisons. Table 6-22 shows that the 77% who **always/usually** light Chanukah candles is about average among about 55 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 77% in South Palm Beach, 76% in both Miami and West Palm Beach, 74% in Atlanta, and 64% in Las Vegas. The 77% compares to 74% in 1997.

The 9% who **never** light Chanukah candles is the fourth lowest of about 50 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 20% in Las Vegas, 13% in both South Palm Beach and West Palm Beach, and 12% in both Miami and Atlanta. The 9% compares to 16% in 1997.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. Table 6-21 shows that, overall, 77% of households always/usually light Chanukah candles. The percentage is much higher in:

- households in the Southwest (89%)
- households earning an annual income of \$100,000-\$200,000 (88%)
- Orthodox households (99%)
- in-married households (90%)
- synagogue member households (91%), households who attended Chabad in the past year (92%), JCC member households (88%), and Jewish organization member households (87%)
- households in which the respondent participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (88%)
- households in which an adult visited Israel on a Jewish trip (88%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (87%)
- households who donated under \$100 (92%), \$100-\$500 (87%) and \$1,000 and over (89%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year

The percentage is much lower for:

- households in the East (55%)
- non-elderly single households (63%)
- households earning an annual income of \$50,000-\$100,000 (67%)
- Just Jewish households (61%)
- households in which no adult visited Israel (67%)
- households who donated \$500-\$1,000 to the Jewish Federation in the past year (65%)

TABLE 6-21 LIGHT CHANUKAH CANDLES					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	77.0%	67.0%	10.0	14.0	9.0
GEOGRAPHIC AREA					
Northwest	78.6%	66.6%	12.0	11.6	9.8
North Central	70.7%	62.5%	8.2	26.3	3.0
East	55.1%	48.5%	6.6	20.0	24.9
West Central	77.3%	69.2%	8.1	12.5	10.2
Southeast	75.2%	61.7%	13.5	19.4	5.4
Southwest	88.7%	78.2%	10.5	5.5	5.8
AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD					
Under 35	59.8%	58.4%	1.4	22.6	17.6
35 - 49	79.7%	76.2%	3.5	8.2	12.1
50 - 64	77.3%	65.1%	12.2	14.9	7.8
65 - 74	78.9%	70.8%	8.1	15.3	5.8
75 and over	78.1%	62.2%	15.9	12.8	9.1
→ 65 and over	78.5%	66.5%	12.0	14.0	7.5
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE					
Household with Children	86.2%	83.9%	2.3	5.9	7.9
Household with Only Adult Children	81.6%	67.2%	14.4	11.7	6.7
Non-Elderly Couple	74.7%	64.4%	10.3	17.2	8.1
Non-Elderly Single	62.6%	47.2%	15.4	21.3	16.1
Elderly Couple	86.4%	75.4%	11.0	7.6	6.0
Elderly Single	70.9%	57.7%	13.2	19.3	9.8

TABLE 6-21 LIGHT CHANUKAH CANDLES					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	77.0%	67.0%	10.0	14.0	9.0
HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
Under \$25,000	70.2%	66.0%	4.2	7.9	21.9
\$25 - \$50,000	83.2%	63.9%	19.3	16.4	0.4
\$50 - \$100,000	66.5%	56.2%	10.3	21.1	12.4
\$100 - \$200,000	88.1%	75.7%	12.4	7.9	4.0
\$200,000 and over	80.3%	75.2%	5.1	13.6	6.1
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION					
Orthodox	99.1%	97.6%	1.5	0.9	0.0
Conservative	84.8%	75.3%	9.5	12.9	2.3
Reform	85.7%	73.0%	12.7	10.9	3.4
Just Jewish	61.2%	51.6%	9.6	18.9	19.9
TYPE OF MARRIAGE					
In-married	90.0%	80.7%	9.3	6.3	3.7
Conversionary	73.5%	72.0%	1.5	26.0	0.5
Intermarried	75.8%	68.6%	7.2	9.7	14.5
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP					
Member	91.4%	84.1%	7.3	6.3	2.3
Non-Member	69.7%	58.3%	11.4	17.9	12.4
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR					
Attended	92.1%	81.5%	10.6	4.9	3.0
Did Not Attend	72.5%	62.7%	9.8	16.7	10.8
JCC MEMBERSHIP					
Member	88.4%	80.0%	8.4	10.1	1.5
Non-Member	75.5%	65.3%	10.2	14.5	10.0

TABLE 6-21 LIGHT CHANUKAH CANDLES					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	77.0%	67.0%	10.0	14.0	9.0
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP					
Member	87.4%	76.0%	11.4	10.2	2.4
Non-Member	74.5%	64.8%	9.7	14.9	10.6
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD					
To Jewish Day School	82.7%	73.1%	9.6	13.3	4.0
To Supplemental School	80.0%	69.5%	10.5	11.3	8.7
→To Jewish Education	80.7%	70.3%	10.4	11.4	7.9
No	71.4%	59.3%	12.1	15.6	13.0
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD					
To Overnight Camp	78.5%	68.0%	10.5	13.3	8.2
No	77.8%	67.3%	10.5	12.0	10.2
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER					
In Youth Group	87.5%	78.3%	9.2	8.5	4.0
No	71.0%	59.5%	11.5	15.4	13.6
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)					
Hillel/Chabad Participant	86.4%	78.9%	7.5	10.5	3.1
No	74.6%	63.2%	11.4	13.8	11.6
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL					
On Jewish Trip	87.5%	76.4%	11.1	10.3	2.2
On General Trip	80.6%	69.0%	11.6	13.7	5.7
No	67.0%	59.1%	7.9	16.6	16.4

TABLE 6-21 LIGHT CHANUKAH CANDLES					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	77.0%	67.0%	10.0	14.0	9.0
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR					
Donated to Federation	86.7%	76.9%	9.8	10.4	2.9
Asked, Did Not Donate	73.9%	66.6%	7.3	12.1	14.0
Not Asked	73.7%	63.3%	10.4	15.7	10.6
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR					
Nothing	73.7%	63.7%	10.0	15.3	11.0
Under \$100	91.9%	81.4%	10.5	7.2	0.9
\$100 - \$500	86.6%	80.9%	5.7	12.6	0.8
\$500 - \$1,000	64.7%	50.7%	14.0	20.3	15.0
\$1,000 and over	88.7%	75.9%	12.8	7.3	4.0

**TABLE 6-22
LIGHT CHANUKAH CANDLES
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	<i>Always/ Usually</i>	Always	Usually	Some- times	Never
Monmouth	1997	87%	82%	5	7	6
Middlesex	2008	84%	77%	7	10	7
Bergen	2001	83%	76%	7	8	9
Howard County	2010	81%	68%	14	8	11
Rochester	1999	80%	72%	8	9	11
Harrisburg	1994	80%	71%	9	5	15
Boston	2005	79%	68%	11	11	10
Hartford	2000	78%	71%	8	8	13
Westport	2000	78%	70%	8	9	14
Minneapolis	2004	78%	65%	13	14	8
Chicago	2010	78%	65%	12	12	10
Detroit	2005	77%	69%	8	10	13
Atlantic County	2004	77%	68%	10	10	12
S Palm Beach	2005	77%	68%	9	10	13
BROWARD	2016	77%	67%	10	14	9
Tidewater	2001	77%	67%	10	10	13
W Palm Beach	2005	76%	68%	9	11	13
Miami	2014	76%	67%	10	12	12
St. Paul	2004	76%	66%	10	14	10
Rhode Island	2002	76%	66%	10	11	13
Cincinnati	2008	76%	60%	16	14	10
New Haven	2010	75%	66%	9	14	11
Baltimore	2010	75%	65%	10	9	16
Broward	1997	74%	68%	6	10	16
Wilmington	1995	74%	67%	7	9	17

**TABLE 6-22
LIGHT CHANUKAH CANDLES
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	<i>Always/ Usually</i>	Always	Usually	Some- times	Never
Orlando	1993	74%	64%	10	10	16
Atlanta	2006	74%	61%	12	15	12
Essex-Morris	1998	74%	74%		26	
Charlotte	1997	73%	67%	6	10	17
Lehigh Valley	2007	73%	64%	10	14	13
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	73%	63%	10	9	17
York	1999	71%	65%	7	11	18
Richmond	1994	71%	64%	7	12	17
Los Angeles	1997	71%	61%	10	12	17
Philadelphia	2009	71%	71%		29	
Milwaukee	1996	70%	63%	7	11	19
Pittsburgh	2002	70%	60%	10	13	17
San Antonio	2007	70%	59%	11	17	13
Washington	2003	70%	59%	11	17	13
Portland (ME)	2007	70%	58%	12	15	16
Cleveland	2011	69%	54%	15	13	18
Jacksonville	2002	68%	61%	7	15	17
New York	2011	68%	60%	8	12	21
Tucson	2002	68%	57%	11	16	16
San Diego	2003	68%	56%	13	16	16
St. Petersburg	1994	67%	62%	5	10	23
Denver	2007	66%	54%	12	17	17
Palm Springs	1998	66%	66%		15	19
Sarasota	2001	65%	57%	8	13	22
Phoenix	2002	64%	53%	11	18	18

**TABLE 6-22
LIGHT CHANUKAH CANDLES
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	<i>Always/ Usually</i>	Always	Usually	Some- times	Never
Las Vegas	2005	64%	53%	11	16	20
Columbus	2013	62%	45%	17	10	28
St. Louis	2014	58%	47%	11	17	25
San Francisco	2004	57%	57%		43	

LIGHT SABBATH CANDLES

Table 6-23 shows that 15% of respondents in Jewish households in Broward reported that someone in their household always lights Sabbath candles; 7%, usually; 32%, sometimes; and 46%, never. In total, 22% of households always/usually light Sabbath candles. A significant decline is seen in the percentage of households who always/usually light Sabbath candles (22%) from the percentages for the three practices discussed previously (77%-79%).

Community Comparisons. Table 6-24 shows that the 22% who **always/usually** light Sabbath candles is about average among about 55 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 32% in Miami, 23% in Atlanta, 22% in South Palm Beach, 17% in West Palm Beach, and 11% in Las Vegas. The 22% compares to 21% in 1997.

The 46% who **never** light Sabbath candles is about average among about 55 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 67% in Las Vegas, 59% in West Palm Beach, 55% in South Palm Beach, 48% in Atlanta, and 46% in Miami. The 46% compares to 52% in 1997.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. Table 6-23 shows that, overall, 22% of households always/usually light Sabbath candles. The percentage is much higher in:

- households in the Southeast (37%)
- Orthodox households (77%)
- synagogue member households (38%), households who attended Chabad in the past year (38%), and Jewish organization member households (34%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (excluding High Holidays) (37%)
- households in which an adult visited Israel on a general trip (43%)
- households who donated \$100-\$500 (33%) and \$500-\$1,000 (35%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year

The percentage is much lower for:

- non-elderly single households (8%)
- intermarried households (8%)
- households in which no adult visited Israel (11%)
- households who were not asked to donate to the Jewish Federation in the past year (11%)

TABLE 6-23 LIGHT SABBATH CANDLES					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	21.7%	14.8%	6.9	32.4	45.9
GEOGRAPHIC AREA					
Northwest	13.7%	10.3%	3.4	35.3	51.0
North Central	15.1%	13.2%	1.9	32.8	52.1
East	21.0%	9.7%	11.3	23.9	55.1
West Central	15.8%	9.2%	6.6	29.1	55.1
Southeast	36.8%	25.5%	11.3	40.5	22.7
Southwest	25.3%	18.8%	6.5	31.8	42.9
AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD					
Under 35	16.9%	10.5%	6.4	30.2	52.9
35 - 49	23.3%	18.8%	4.5	30.3	46.4
50 - 64	22.0%	13.1%	8.9	34.6	43.4
65 - 74	16.5%	10.9%	5.6	30.8	52.7
75 and over	26.0%	19.3%	6.7	32.2	41.8
→ 65 and over	21.3%	15.2%	6.1	31.5	47.2
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE					
Household with Children	26.9%	18.1%	8.8	26.2	46.9
Household with Only Adult Children	26.9%	21.2%	5.7	28.1	45.0
Non-Elderly Couple	16.4%	12.1%	4.3	44.4	39.2
Non-Elderly Single	7.7%	5.0%	2.7	44.0	48.3
Elderly Couple	15.4%	10.6%	4.8	41.7	42.9
Elderly Single	27.2%	18.1%	9.1	28.9	43.9

TABLE 6-23 LIGHT SABBATH CANDLES					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	21.7%	14.8%	6.9	32.4	45.9
HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
Under \$25,000	27.8%	20.7%	7.1	18.9	53.3
\$25 - \$50,000	18.5%	11.9%	6.6	35.2	46.3
\$50 - \$100,000	24.0%	13.3%	10.7	26.9	49.1
\$100 - \$200,000	20.2%	16.4%	3.8	36.5	43.3
\$200,000 and over	25.6%	17.5%	8.1	44.4	30.0
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION					
Orthodox	77.0%	73.7%	3.3	18.3	4.7
Conservative	28.6%	21.9%	6.7	36.8	34.6
Reform	12.2%	6.9%	5.3	45.9	41.9
Just Jewish	16.2%	8.2%	8.0	20.0	63.8
TYPE OF MARRIAGE					
In-married	27.9%	20.2%	7.7	39.7	32.4
Conversionary	18.3%	14.3%	4.0	49.9	31.8
Intermarried	7.9%	3.4%	4.5	19.9	72.2
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP					
Member	33.5%	25.3%	8.2	40.6	25.9
Non-Member	15.5%	9.3%	6.2	28.2	56.3
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR					
Attended	38.0%	26.1%	11.9	42.2	19.8
Did Not Attend	16.8%	11.4%	5.4	29.5	53.7
JCC MEMBERSHIP					
Member	25.7%	15.1%	10.6	28.1	46.2
Non-Member	21.1%	14.7%	6.4	33.0	45.9

TABLE 6-23 LIGHT SABBATH CANDLES					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	21.7%	14.8%	6.9	32.4	45.9
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP					
Member	33.7%	25.8%	7.9	39.1	27.2
Non-Member	18.7%	12.1%	6.6	30.8	50.5
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD					
To Jewish Day School	29.7%	21.1%	8.6	29.8	40.5
To Supplemental School	21.2%	13.1%	8.1	37.6	41.2
→To Jewish Education	23.5%	15.5%	8.0	34.9	41.6
No	17.0%	13.6%	3.4	27.3	55.7
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD					
To Overnight Camp	23.6%	15.0%	8.6	36.1	40.3
No	21.2%	15.2%	6.0	31.4	47.4
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER					
In Youth Group	31.4%	20.3%	11.1	38.6	30.0
No	15.2%	11.4%	3.8	28.8	56.0
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)					
Hillel/Chabad Participant	37.1%	26.0%	11.1	35.5	27.4
No	16.6%	10.7%	5.9	32.2	51.2
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL					
On Jewish Trip	25.6%	18.5%	7.1	37.8	36.6
On General Trip	30.3%	18.2%	12.1	39.9	29.8
No	11.1%	9.2%	1.9	22.0	66.9

TABLE 6-23 LIGHT SABBATH CANDLES					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	21.7%	14.8%	6.9	32.4	45.9
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR					
Donated to Federation	30.8%	21.9%	8.9	37.2	32.0
Asked, Did Not Donate	11.0%	8.9%	2.1	33.8	55.2
Not Asked	19.6%	12.8%	6.8	30.4	50.0
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR					
Nothing	18.7%	12.4%	6.3	30.7	50.6
Under \$100	29.3%	22.4%	6.9	37.0	33.7
\$100 - \$500	32.6%	26.0%	6.6	37.1	30.3
\$500 - \$1,000	35.0%	12.1%	22.9	32.0	33.0
\$1,000 and over	28.3%	19.8%	8.5	42.6	29.1

**TABLE 6-24
LIGHT SABBATH CANDLES
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	<i>Always/ Usually</i>	Always	Usually	Some- times	Never
Baltimore	2010	36%	28%	8	21	43
New York	2011	33%	29%	4	17	50
Essex-Morris	1998	33%	26%	7	27	40
Bergen	2001	32%	26%	6	23	44
Miami	2014	32%	25%	7	22	46
Detroit	2005	29%	22%	7	31	40
Cincinnati	2008	29%	17%	13	30	41
Rochester	1999	28%	19%	9	30	42
Harrisburg	1994	27%	15%	12	28	46
Boston	2005	26%	18%	7	28	47
Minneapolis	2004	26%	15%	11	32	42
Middlesex	2008	25%	20%	5	24	51
Hartford	2000	25%	18%	8	27	48
Pittsburgh	2002	25%	17%	8	28	48
Los Angeles	1997	25%	17%	8	26	49
Monmouth	1997	25%	16%	9	29	46
St. Paul	2004	25%	15%	10	37	39
Jacksonville	2002	24%	16%	8	25	51
Milwaukee	1996	24%	15%	9	29	47
Cleveland	2011	23%	17%	7	27	50
Atlanta	2006	23%	17%	6	29	48
S Palm Beach	2005	22%	17%	5	22	55
BROWARD	2016	22%	15%	7	32	46
Lehigh Valley	2007	22%	14%	8	29	49
Chicago	2010	22%	14%	8	26	52
Tidewater	2001	22%	14%	8	25	54

**TABLE 6-24
LIGHT SABBATH CANDLES
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	<i>Always/ Usually</i>	Always	Usually	Some- times	Never
St. Petersburg	1994	22%	14%	7	28	51
Broward	1997	21%	15%	6	28	52
Rhode Island	2002	21%	13%	8	26	53
Palm Springs	1998	21%	21%		27	51
San Antonio	2007	20%	14%	6	32	48
San Diego	2003	20%	13%	8	26	54
New Haven	2010	20%	13%	7	24	56
Richmond	1994	20%	11%	9	31	49
San Francisco	2004	20%	20%		80	
Washington	2003	19%	13%	6	29	52
Wilmington	1995	19%	12%	7	25	56
Denver	2007	19%	11%	8	25	56
Howard County	2010	18%	11%	7	33	49
York	1999	18%	11%	7	30	52
Philadelphia	2009	18%	18%		82	
W Palm Beach	2005	17%	13%	4	24	59
Sarasota	2001	17%	12%	5	21	63
Tucson	2002	17%	11%	6	26	58
Westport	2000	17%	11%	6	25	58
Columbus	2013	17%	10%	7	27	56
St. Louis	2014	17%	10%	7	25	58
Charlotte	1997	17%	10%	6	27	56
Phoenix	2002	16%	11%	5	26	57
Orlando	1993	16%	9%	7	29	55

TABLE 6-24
LIGHT SABBATH CANDLES
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	<i>Always/ Usually</i>	Always	Usually	Some- times	Never
Atlantic County	2004	14%	10%	3	28	58
Seattle	2000	13%	11%	3	29	58
Portland (ME)	2007	13%	9%	4	26	61
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	13%	8%	5	28	59
Las Vegas	2005	11%	7%	4	22	67
Buffalo	1995	NA	56%			44
NJPS ¹	2000	23%	16%	7	26	51

¹ NJPS 2000 data are for the *more Jewishly-connected sample*.

KEEP KOSHER

Table 6-25 shows that 5% of respondents in Jewish households in Broward keep kosher in and out of the home and 7% keep kosher in the home only. In total, 12% (8,400 households) of households keep a kosher home and 22,000 persons live in a kosher home. The respondent defined “kosher” for himself/herself.

✓ If it is assumed that all persons in households in which the respondent keeps kosher in and out of the home also keep kosher in and out of the home, then 3,600 households with 10,000 persons keep kosher in and out of the home.

Community Comparisons. Table 6-26 shows that the 12% who **keep a kosher home** is about average among about 55 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 20% in Miami, 14% in South Palm Beach, 13% in Atlanta, 9% in West Palm Beach, and 5% in Las Vegas. The 12% compares to 16% in 1997.

The 5% who **keep kosher in and out of the home** is about average among about 35 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 13% in Miami, 5% in South Palm Beach, and 3% in both Las Vegas and West Palm Beach. The 5% compares to 5% in 1997.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups.

Keep a Kosher Home

Table 6-25 shows that, overall, 12% of households **keep a kosher home**. The percentage is much higher in:

- households in the Southeast (21%)
- Orthodox households (79%)
- synagogue member households (23%) and households who attended Chabad in the past year (26%)
- households in which the respondent attended a Jewish day school as a child (26%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (excluding High Holidays) (25%)
- households who donated \$500-\$1,000 to the Jewish Federation in the past year (32%)

The percentage is much lower for:

- non-elderly single households (4%)
- Reform households (3%)
- intermarried households (3%)
- households in which no adult visited Israel (5%)

Keep Kosher In and Out of the Home

Table 6-25 shows that, overall, 5% of respondents **keep kosher in and out of the home**. The percentage is much higher for respondents in:

- households in the Southeast (14%)
- Orthodox households (58%)
- synagogue member households (12%) and households who attended Chabad in the past year (11%)
- households in which the respondent attended a Jewish day school as a child (13%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (excluding High Holidays) (14%)

TABLE 6-25 KEEP KOSHER			
BASE: RESPONDENTS			
Population Subgroup	Total In Home	In Home Only	In and Out of Home
All	11.7%	6.7%	5.0
GEOGRAPHIC AREA			
Northwest	8.4%	4.9%	3.5
North Central	13.6%	4.8%	8.8
East	19.4%	13.6%	5.8
West Central	6.9%	5.5%	1.4
Southeast	21.2%	7.7%	13.5
Southwest	8.5%	6.4%	2.1
AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD			
Under 35	8.3%	1.5%	6.8
35 - 49	15.2%	8.4%	6.8
50 - 64	10.4%	6.1%	4.3
65 - 74	11.4%	8.2%	3.2
75 and over	12.4%	6.1%	6.3
→ 65 and over	11.9%	7.2%	4.7
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE			
Household with Children	13.3%	6.5%	6.8
Household with Only Adult Children	15.1%	10.9%	4.2
Non-Elderly Couple	5.9%	3.5%	2.4
Non-Elderly Single	4.4%	1.2%	3.2
Elderly Couple	8.7%	5.9%	2.8
Elderly Single	16.9%	9.0%	7.9

TABLE 6-25 KEEP KOSHER			
BASE: RESPONDENTS			
Population Subgroup	Total In Home	In Home Only	In and Out of Home
All	11.7%	6.7%	5.0
HOUSEHOLD INCOME			
Under \$25,000	13.5%	9.6%	3.9
\$25 - \$50,000	16.5%	7.2%	9.3
\$50 - \$100,000	9.8%	4.3%	5.5
\$100 - \$200,000	9.4%	3.4%	6.0
\$200,000 and over	14.3%	10.9%	3.4
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION			
Orthodox	79.2%	21.7%	57.5
Conservative	17.5%	11.1%	6.4
Reform	2.7%	2.6%	0.1
Just Jewish	5.9%	4.2%	1.7
TYPE OF MARRIAGE			
In-married	14.4%	8.0%	6.4
Conversionary	8.3%	6.2%	2.1
Intermarried	2.6%	2.6%	0.0
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP			
Member	23.2%	11.6%	11.6
Non-Member	5.8%	4.1%	1.7
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR			
Attended	26.0%	14.8%	11.2
Did Not Attend	7.4%	4.2%	3.2
JCC MEMBERSHIP			
Member	19.0%	13.4%	5.6
Non-Member	10.7%	5.7%	5.0

TABLE 6-25 KEEP KOSHER			
BASE: RESPONDENTS			
Population Subgroup	Total In Home	In Home Only	In and Out of Home
All	11.7%	6.7%	5.0
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP			
Member	16.9%	10.7%	6.2
Non-Member	10.4%	5.6%	4.8
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD			
To Jewish Day School	26.0%	12.8%	13.2
To Supplemental School	9.0%	4.7%	4.3
→ To Jewish Education	13.1%	6.6%	6.5
No	8.0%	5.6%	2.4
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD			
To Overnight Camp	15.5%	8.8%	6.7
No	9.8%	5.3%	4.5
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER			
In Youth Group	16.8%	8.6%	8.2
No	8.0%	4.9%	3.1
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)			
Hillel/Chabad Participant	25.0%	11.5%	13.5
No	6.7%	4.1%	2.6
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL			
On Jewish Trip	20.2%	10.7%	9.5
On General Trip	13.6%	8.2%	5.4
No	4.5%	2.6%	1.9

TABLE 6-25 KEEP KOSHER			
BASE: RESPONDENTS			
Population Subgroup	Total In Home	In Home Only	In and Out of Home
All	11.7%	6.7%	5.0
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR			
Donated to Federation	18.2%	12.5%	5.7
Asked, Did Not Donate	6.6%	1.5%	5.1
Not Asked	9.8%	5.3%	4.5
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR			
Nothing	9.5%	4.9%	4.6
Under \$100	18.6%	10.3%	8.3
\$100 - \$500	14.0%	11.6%	2.4
\$500 - \$1,000	31.6%	28.2%	3.4
\$1,000 and over	14.3%	7.2%	7.1

**TABLE 6-26
KEEP KOSHER
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	<i>Total In Home</i>	In Home Only	In and Out of Home
New York	2011	32%	NA	NA
Bergen	2001	29%	11%	18
Monmouth	1997	26%	15%	11
Baltimore ♣	2010	26%	NA	NA
Middlesex	2008	23%	11%	12
Harrisburg	1994	23%	15%	8
Detroit	2005	22%	8%	14
Rochester	1999	22%	13%	8
Essex-Morris ♣	1998	22%	NA	NA
Miami	2014	20%	6%	13
Cleveland ♣	2011	20%	NA	NA
Cincinnati ♣	2008	19%	NA	NA
Pittsburgh ♣	2002	19%	NA	NA
Hartford	2000	17%	11%	6
Buffalo ♣	1995	17%	NA	NA
Rhode Island	2002	16%	8%	8
Broward	1997	16%	11%	5
New Haven	2010	15%	8%	8
Chicago ♣	2010	15%	NA	NA
Philadelphia ♣	2009	15%	NA	NA
St. Paul	2004	14%	6%	9
S Palm Beach	2005	14%	9%	5
Minneapolis	2004	13%	7%	6
York	1999	13%	8%	6

**TABLE 6-26
KEEP KOSHER
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Total In Home	In Home Only	In and Out of Home
Milwaukee	1996	13%	8%	5
St. Louis	2014	13%	NA	NA
Denver ♣	2007	13%	NA	NA
Atlanta ♣	2006	13%	NA	NA
Palm Springs ♣	1998	13%	NA	NA
Washington	2003	12%	5%	7
BROWARD	2016	12%	7%	5
Wilmington	1995	12%	7%	5
Tucson	2002	11%	5%	6
Columbus	2013	11%	6%	5
Lehigh Valley	2007	11%	5%	5
Los Angeles ♣	1997	11%	NA	NA
San Antonio	2007	10%	4%	5
Jacksonville	2002	10%	5%	5
Tidewater	2001	10%	5%	5
Atlantic County	2004	10%	6%	4
St. Petersburg	1994	10%	6%	4
Richmond	1994	10%	6%	3
W Palm Beach	2005	9%	6%	3
Orlando	1993	9%	6%	3
Howard County ♣	2010	9%	NA	NA
Phoenix ♣	2002	9%	NA	NA
Charlotte	1997	8%	5%	3
San Diego ♣	2003	8%	NA	NA

**TABLE 6-26
KEEP KOSHER
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	<i>Total In Home</i>	In Home Only	In and Out of Home
Boston ¹	2005	7%	NA	NA
Sarasota	2001	6%	4%	3
Westport	2000	6%	4%	1
Las Vegas	2005	5%	3%	3
Seattle ♣	2000	5%	NA	NA
Portland (ME)	2007	3%	1%	3
NJPS ²	2000	17%	7%	10

♣ Question was only asked about *keeping kosher in the home*.

¹ Question was about *following Jewish dietary laws in the home*.

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

REFRAIN FROM USING ELECTRICITY ON THE SABBATH

Table 6-27 shows that 2% of respondents in Jewish households in Broward refrain from using electricity on the Sabbath.

Community Comparisons. Table 6-27 shows that the 2.4% who refrain from using electricity on the Sabbath is about average among about 30 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 7.4% in Miami, 2.1% in South Palm Beach, 1.3% in Las Vegas, and 0.8% in West Palm Beach. The 2.4% compares to 1.6% in 1997.

The percentage who refrain from using electricity on the Sabbath is 98% for the Southeast and 43% for Orthodox respondents.

TABLE 6-27
REFRAIN FROM USING ELECTRICITY ON THE SABBATH
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS

BASE: RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Bergen	2001	12.1%		Tidewater	2001	2.1%
Detroit	2005	9.5%		Milwaukee	1996	2.1%
Miami	2014	7.4%		Richmond	1994	1.9%
Middlesex	2008	6.1%		Broward	1997	1.6%
Monmouth	1997	5.5%		Tucson	2002	1.4%
Rhode Island	2002	4.4%		Portland (ME)	2007	1.3%
Harrisburg	1994	3.6%		Las Vegas	2005	1.3%
New Haven	2010	3.3%		Charlotte	1997	1.3%
Washington	2003	2.9%		Jacksonville	2002	1.1%
Rochester	1999	2.9%		Wilmington	1995	1.0%
Hartford	2000	2.7%		Atlantic County	2004	0.9%
Minneapolis	2004	2.5%		W Palm Beach	2005	0.8%
BROWARD	2016	2.4%		Sarasota	2001	0.8%
St. Paul	2004	2.4%		York	1999	0.7%
San Antonio	2007	2.3%		Westport	2000	0.3%
Lehigh Valley	2007	2.1%				
S Palm Beach	2005	2.1%				

HAVE A CHRISTMAS TREE

Table 6-28 shows that 13% of Jewish households in Broward always have a Christmas tree; 2%, usually; 9%, sometimes; and 76%, never. In total, 24% of households always/usually/sometimes have a Christmas tree.

Community Comparisons. Table 6-29 shows that the 24% who always/usually/sometimes have a Christmas tree is about average among about 40 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 34% in Las Vegas, 14% in West Palm Beach, 13% in Miami, and 8% in South Palm Beach. The 24% compares to 14% in 1997.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. Table 6-28 shows that, overall, 24% of households always/usually/sometimes have a Christmas tree. The percentage is much higher in:

- households under age 35 (44%) and age 35-49 (36%)
- households with children (39%)
- Just Jewish households (40%)
- conversionary in-married households (35%) and intermarried households (86%)
- households in which no adult visited Israel (43%)

The percentage is much lower for:

- households age 75 and over (12%)
- elderly single households (11%)
- Orthodox households (3%) and Conservative households (11%)
- in-married households (8%)
- synagogue member households (9%), households who participated in Chabad in the past year (11%), JCC member households (8%), and Jewish organization member households (6%)
- households in which the respondent participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (9%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (excluding High Holidays) (7%)
- households in which an adult visited Israel on a Jewish trip (9%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (7%)
- households who donated under \$100 (5%), \$100-\$500 (12%), \$500-\$1,000 (6%), and \$1,000 and over (6%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year (8%)

✓ Of households in which everyone was born or raised Jewish, 2% always have a Christmas tree; 1%, usually; 7%, sometimes; and 91%, never.

✓ Of households in which everyone is currently Jewish, 3% always have a Christmas tree; 1%, usually; 7%, sometimes; and 89%, never.

✓ Of households who always have a Christmas tree, 63% also always light Chanukah candles and 23% never do. Of households who always light Chanukah candles, 12% always have a Christmas tree and 79% never do.

✓ 8% of households always have a Christmas tree and always light Chanukah candles.
4% of households never have a Christmas tree and never light Chanukah candles.

✓ Of FSU households, 43% always, usually, or sometimes have a Christmas tree.

TABLE 6-28					
HAVE A CHRISTMAS TREE					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually + Sometimes	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	24.3%	12.6%	2.3	9.4	75.7
GEOGRAPHIC AREA					
Northwest	20.4%	13.1%	1.7	5.6	79.6
North Central	19.7%	6.3%	7.2	6.2	80.3
East	31.3%	16.8%	4.0	10.5	68.7
West Central	28.5%	17.2%	0.0	11.3	71.5
Southeast	26.9%	12.1%	4.0	10.8	73.1
Southwest	18.6%	7.8%	1.4	9.4	81.4
AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD					
Under 35	44.3%	30.2%	0.0	14.1	55.7
35 - 49	35.5%	23.9%	1.6	10.0	64.5
50 - 64	25.0%	12.0%	4.8	8.2	75.0
65 - 74	20.3%	10.9%	1.1	8.3	79.7
75 and over	11.7%	0.6%	0.4	10.7	88.3
→ 65 and over	16.0%	5.7%	0.8	9.5	84.0

TABLE 6-28 HAVE A CHRISTMAS TREE					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually + Sometimes	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	24.3%	12.6%	2.3	9.4	75.7
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE					
Household with Children	39.3%	25.8%	1.4	12.1	60.7
Household with Only Adult Children	25.3%	15.0%	1.9	8.4	74.7
Non-Elderly Couple	30.8%	17.0%	8.4	5.4	69.2
Non-Elderly Single	13.5%	0.5%	1.8	11.2	86.5
Elderly Couple	17.5%	9.9%	1.3	6.3	82.5
Elderly Single	10.5%	0.2%	0.0	10.3	89.5
HOUSEHOLD INCOME					
Under \$25,000	21.0%	8.6%	1.3	11.1	79.0
\$25 - \$50,000	31.9%	15.8%	0.6	15.5	68.1
\$50 - \$100,000	28.0%	12.3%	3.1	12.6	72.0
\$100 - \$200,000	29.4%	17.7%	2.8	8.9	70.6
\$200,000 and over	21.8%	14.2%	1.1	6.5	78.2
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION					
Orthodox	2.6%	2.6%	0.0	0.0	97.4
Conservative	11.0%	5.9%	0.2	4.9	89.0
Reform	22.5%	13.2%	3.9	5.4	77.5
Just Jewish	39.5%	19.0%	3.1	17.4	60.5
TYPE OF MARRIAGE					
In-married	7.8%	2.8%	0.5	4.5	92.2
Conversionary	34.9%	20.6%	3.4	10.9	65.1
Intermarried	85.6%	55.3%	9.7	20.6	14.4

TABLE 6-28 HAVE A CHRISTMAS TREE					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually + Sometimes	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	24.3%	12.6%	2.3	9.4	75.7
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP					
Member	9.2%	4.8%	0.7	3.7	90.8
Non-Member	32.0%	16.6%	3.1	12.3	68.0
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR					
Attended	11.0%	9.6%	0.5	0.9	89.0
Did Not Attend	28.2%	13.5%	2.8	11.9	71.8
JCC MEMBERSHIP					
Member	8.2%	1.5%	0.0	6.7	91.8
Non-Member	26.5%	14.1%	2.6	9.8	73.5
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP					
Member	6.2%	1.7%	0.1	4.4	93.8
Non-Member	28.7%	15.3%	2.8	10.6	71.3
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD					
To Jewish Day School	14.8%	10.3%	1.6	2.9	85.2
To Supplemental School	17.7%	7.8%	1.8	8.1	82.3
→To Jewish Education	18.9%	9.9%	1.7	7.3	81.1
No	32.6%	15.5%	3.5	13.6	67.4
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD					
To Overnight Camp	22.5%	14.2%	2.6	5.7	77.5
No	21.6%	9.4%	2.0	10.2	78.4
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER					
In Youth Group	9.2%	5.2%	1.4	2.6	90.8
No	31.4%	15.5%	2.8	13.1	68.6

TABLE 6-28 HAVE A CHRISTMAS TREE					
BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS					
Population Subgroup	Always + Usually + Sometimes	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
All	24.3%	12.6%	2.3	9.4	75.7
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)					
Hillel/Chabad Participant	7.3%	2.5%	0.0	4.8	92.7
No	27.1%	14.9%	2.5	9.7	72.9
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL					
On Jewish Trip	9.3%	7.9%	0.3	1.1	90.7
On General Trip	14.6%	4.6%	3.4	6.6	85.4
No	42.8%	22.9%	2.6	17.3	57.2
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR					
Donated to Federation	7.4%	3.3%	0.1	4.0	92.6
Asked, Did Not Donate	27.9%	21.4%	0.0	6.5	72.1
Not Asked	30.0%	14.9%	3.4	11.7	70.0
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR					
Nothing	29.8%	15.6%	3.0	11.2	70.2
Under \$100	5.1%	1.9%	0.2	3.0	94.9
\$100 - \$500	12.0%	5.1%	0.1	6.8	88.0
\$500 - \$1,000	5.8%	1.7%	0.0	4.1	94.2
\$1,000 and over	5.8%	5.2%	0.0	0.6	94.2

**TABLE 6-29
HAVE A CHRISTMAS TREE IN THE HOME
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	<i>Always/ Usually/ Sometimes</i>	Always	Usually	Some- times	Never
Portland (ME)	2007	48%	30%	6	12	52
Las Vegas	2005	34%	17%	4	13	66
York	1999	33%	24%	5	4	67
Orlando	1993	32%	18%	4	10	68
Charlotte	1997	31%	23%	4	5	69
Westport	2000	31%	18%	3	9	69
Harrisburg	1994	30%	21%	3	7	70
Tidewater	2001	30%	17%	6	8	70
Richmond	1994	29%	18%	3	8	71
Tucson	2002	28%	12%	6	11	72
Washington	2003	27%	14%	4	9	73
Wilmington	1995	26%	19%	2	4	74
Rhode Island	2002	26%	18%	4	5	74
Lehigh Valley	2007	26%	17%	3	5	74
St. Petersburg	1994	26%	16%	4	7	74
San Antonio	2007	26%	16%	2	8	74
New Haven	2010	25%	16%	3	6	75
St. Paul	2004	25%	16%	2	7	75
Jacksonville	2002	25%	15%	2	8	75
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	25%	13%	5	7	75
Atlantic County	2004	24%	13%	3	8	76
BROWARD	2016	24%	13%	2	9	76
Milwaukee	1996	23%	15%	3	6	77

**TABLE 6-29
HAVE A CHRISTMAS TREE IN THE HOME
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	<i>Always/ Usually/ Sometimes</i>	Always	Usually	Some- times	Never
Rochester	1999	23%	15%	1	7	77
Minneapolis	2004	23%	14%	2	7	77
Essex-Morris	1998	21%	13%	2	5	79
Hartford	2000	20%	14%	2	5	80
Los Angeles	1997	20%	10%	3	7	80
Bergen	2001	17%	11%	2	4	83
Sarasota	2001	17%	11%	1	5	83
Detroit	2005	15%	9%	2	4	85
Monmouth	1997	15%	9%	2	4	85
W Palm Beach	2005	14%	9%	1	4	86
Broward	1997	14%	9%	1	4	86
Miami *	2014	13%	6%	1	6	87
Middlesex	2008	10%	7%	1	3	90
S Palm Beach	2005	8%	4%	1	3	93

SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE

Table 6-30 shows that 28% of Jewish respondents in Broward never attend synagogue services (*attend services*) or attend services only for weddings, b'nai mitzvah ceremonies, and other such occasions (*special occasions*). 30% of respondents attend services only on the High Holidays; 22%, a few times per year; and 20%, once per month or more, including 9% who attend services once per week or more. Thus, 72% of respondents attend services at least once per year, other than for special occasions. The discussion below focuses on the percentage of respondents who attend services once per month or more and the percentage who never attend services. *Never attend services* includes respondents who never attend synagogue services and respondents who attend synagogue services only for special occasions ❶.

Community Comparisons. Table 6-31 shows that the 20% who **attend services once per month or more** is about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 22% in Miami, 20% in South Palm Beach, 16% in West Palm Beach, and 13% in Las Vegas. The 20% compares to 18% in 1997.

The 28% who **never attend services** is about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 44% in Las Vegas, 31% in West Palm Beach, and 28% in both Miami and South Palm Beach. The 28% compares to 32% in 1997.

Age of Respondent. Table 6-32 shows that the 10% of respondents **under age 35** who attend services once per month or more is the fourth lowest of about 40 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 27% in Miami, 20% in South Palm Beach, 13% in Las Vegas, and 9% in West Palm Beach. The 10% compares to 16% in 1997.

The 18% of respondents **age 35-49** who attend services once per month or more is the third lowest of about 40 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 27% in Miami, 24% in South Palm Beach, 16% in West Palm Beach, and 11% in Las Vegas. The 18% compares to 23% in 1997.

The 17% of respondents **age 50-64** who attend services once per month or more is about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 22% in Miami, 15% in both South Palm Beach and West Palm Beach, and 11% in Las Vegas. The 17% compares to 15% in 1997.

The 22% of respondents **age 65-74** who attend services once per month or more is about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 20% in Miami, 18% in South Palm Beach, 16% in West Palm Beach, and 14% in Las Vegas. The 22% compares to 18% in 1997.

The 27% of respondents **age 75 and over** who attend services once per month or more is about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 21% in South Palm Beach, 18% in West Palm Beach, 17% in Miami, and 16% in Las Vegas. The 27% compares to 18% in 1997.

The 25% of respondents **age 65 and over** who attend services once per month or more is about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 20% in South Palm Beach, 18% in Miami, 17% in West Palm Beach, and 15% in Las Vegas. The 25% compares to 18% in 1997.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups.

Attend Services Once per Month or More

Table 6-30 shows that, overall, 20% of respondents **attend services once per month or more**. The percentage is much higher for respondents in:

- households in the Southeast (31%)
- Orthodox households (64%) and Conservative households (30%)
- conversionary in-married households (37%)
- synagogue member households (49%), households who attended Chabad in the past year (3%), and Jewish organization member households (38%)
- households in which the respondent attended a Jewish day school as a child (35%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (excluding High Holidays) (37%)
- households in which an adult visited Israel on a Jewish trip (33%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (39%)
- households who donated \$100-\$500 (42%) and \$1,000 and over to the Jewish Federation in the past year (38%)

The percentage who attend services once per month or more is much lower for respondents (in):

- under age 35 (10%)
- non-elderly couple households (8%) and non-elderly single households (9%)
- Just Jewish households (5%)
- intermarried households (3%)
- synagogue non-member households (5%)

Never Attend Services

Table 6-30 shows that, overall, 28% of respondents **never attend services**. The percentage is much higher for respondents (in):

- households in the Northwest (43%)
- households in residence in Broward for 0-4 years (38%) and 5-9 years (38%)
- Just Jewish households (49%)
- intermarried households (61%)
- synagogue non-member households (40%)
- households in which no adult visited Israel (47%)

The percentage is much lower for respondents in:

- the Southeast (19%)
- households earning an annual income of \$200,000 and over (15%)
- Orthodox households (3%) and Conservative households (12%)
- in-married households (17%)
- synagogue member households (5%), households who attended Chabad in the past year (7%), JCC member households (8%), and Jewish organization member households (8%)
- households in which the respondent participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (15%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (excluding High Holidays) (13%)
- households in which an adult visited Israel on a Jewish trip (13%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (17%)
- households who donated under \$100 (15%), \$100-\$500 (16%), \$500-\$1,000 (5%), and \$1,000 and over (5%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year

Note that 2.6% 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 6-30							
SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE							
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS							
Population Subgroup	Never+ Special Occa- sions ①	Only on High Holidays	A Few Times per Year	About Once per Month	A Few Times per Month	Once per Week or More	Once per Month or More
All	28.2%	30.4	21.8	5.8	4.9	8.9	19.6%
GEOGRAPHIC AREA							
Northwest	43.0%	22.3	17.9	8.8	2.6	5.4	23.1%
North Central	27.8%	45.6	11.0	0.5	6.1	9.0	15.6%
East	31.7%	22.2	30.2	3.8	2.1	10.0	15.9%
West Central	33.4%	33.0	19.0	4.0	5.5	5.1	14.6%
Southeast	17.6%	26.3	25.6	9.3	3.4	17.8	30.5%
Southwest	19.1%	32.5	25.8	6.6	7.6	8.4	22.6%
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN BROWARD							
0 - 4 years	37.6%	22.4	15.2	12.5	6.5	5.8	24.8%
5 - 9 years	37.8%	35.9	15.4	2.9	5.5	2.5	10.9%
10 - 19 years	19.4%	29.6	25.2	10.3	4.0	11.5	25.8%
20 or more years	28.9%	30.8	22.1	4.0	5.0	9.2	18.2%
AGE OF RESPONDENT							
Under 35	40.2%	32.3	17.3	5.0	1.0	4.2	10.2%
35 - 49	33.0%	31.5	17.6	7.5	4.4	6.0	17.9%
50 - 64	24.7%	34.4	24.0	4.3	5.1	7.5	16.9%
65 - 74	31.1%	22.2	24.4	5.8	5.3	11.2	22.3%
75 and over	21.8%	30.6	21.0	6.9	6.5	13.2	26.6%
→ 65 and over	26.3%	26.6	22.6	6.4	5.9	12.2	24.5%
SEX OF RESPONDENT							
Male	24.3%	28.7	26.3	6.2	5.2	9.3	20.7%
Female	30.9%	31.7	18.5	5.6	4.7	8.6	18.9%

TABLE 6-30							
SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE							
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS							
Population Subgroup	Never+ Special Occa- sions ①	Only on High Holidays	A Few Times per Year	About Once per Month	A Few Times per Month	Once per Week or More	Once per Month or More
All	28.2%	30.4	21.8	5.8	4.9	8.9	19.6%
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE							
Household with Children	31.7%	26.8	19.3	7.4	6.6	8.2	22.2%
Household with Only Adult Children	33.4%	29.3	17.6	5.6	7.1	7.0	19.7%
Non-Elderly Couple	28.0%	37.0	26.8	2.6	2.1	3.5	8.2%
Non-Elderly Single	19.0%	48.4	23.5	4.7	0.8	3.6	9.1%
Elderly Couple	24.6%	33.6	14.6	8.7	3.1	15.4	27.2%
Elderly Single	21.3%	24.8	29.3	6.6	5.8	12.2	24.6%
HOUSEHOLD INCOME							
Under \$25,000	31.3%	27.6	22.7	0.7	3.8	13.9	18.4%
\$25 - \$50,000	26.4%	24.3	27.5	8.0	4.0	9.8	21.8%
\$50 - \$100,000	31.4%	31.8	19.5	3.5	4.8	9.0	17.3%
\$100 - \$200,000	28.3%	34.4	12.0	11.2	6.0	8.1	25.3%
\$200,000 and over	15.2%	34.1	27.2	8.0	7.1	8.4	23.5%
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION							
Orthodox	2.9%	18.9	14.5	3.7	9.3	50.7	63.7%
Conservative	11.8%	32.9	25.3	7.8	8.4	13.8	30.0%
Reform	22.5%	29.0	28.2	9.7	5.8	4.8	20.3%
Just Jewish	49.2%	31.2	14.7	1.2	0.7	3.0	4.9%
TYPE OF MARRIAGE							
In-married	16.7%	35.1	21.7	8.4	8.1	10.0	26.5%
Conversionary	37.5%	9.2	16.4	10.0	4.0	22.9	36.9%
Intermarried	61.4%	21.3	14.4	0.7	0.9	1.3	2.9%

TABLE 6-30 SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE							
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS							
Population Subgroup	Never+ Special Occa- sions ①	Only on High Holidays	A Few Times per Year	About Once per Month	A Few Times per Month	Once per Week or More	Once per Month or More
All	28.2%	30.4	21.8	5.8	4.9	8.9	19.6%
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP							
Member	5.4%	18.9	27.0	14.3	13.0	21.4	48.7%
Non-Member	39.9%	36.4	19.1	1.5	0.7	2.4	4.6%
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR							
Attended	7.0%	36.3	26.1	6.4	7.4	16.8	30.6%
Did Not Attend	34.4%	28.7	20.5	5.7	4.2	6.5	16.4%
JCC MEMBERSHIP							
Member	7.5%	39.6	25.5	5.5	9.1	12.8	27.4%
Non-Member	31.1%	29.2	21.2	5.9	4.3	8.3	18.5%
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP							
Member	13.7%	23.0	25.2	11.7	11.0	15.4	38.1%
Non-Member	31.7%	32.3	20.9	4.4	3.4	7.3	15.1%
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD							
To Jewish Day School	11.2%	28.5	24.9	7.6	9.1	18.7	35.4%
To Supplemental School	23.0%	34.2	23.4	6.9	5.4	7.1	19.4%
→ To Jewish Education	22.7%	31.4	23.5	6.6	6.6	9.2	22.4%
No	42.2%	25.6	20.8	3.5	0.6	7.3	11.4%
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD							
To Overnight Camp	23.4%	33.7	22.8	6.3	4.5	9.3	20.1%
No	29.8%	28.3	22.6	5.5	5.3	8.5	19.3%
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER							
In Youth Group	15.1%	29.7	26.4	7.4	8.4	13.0	28.8%
No	36.7%	30.5	20.0	4.7	2.5	5.6	12.8%

TABLE 6-30 SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE							
BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS							
Population Subgroup	Never+ Special Occa- sions ❶	Only on High Holidays	A Few Times per Year	About Once per Month	A Few Times per Month	Once per Week or More	Once per Month or More
All	28.2%	30.4	21.8	5.8	4.9	8.9	19.6%
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)							
Hillel/Chabad Participant	13.0%	23.3	26.7	9.3	6.0	21.7	37.0%
No	31.0%	32.1	21.4	5.7	4.8	5.0	15.5%
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL							
On Jewish Trip	11.2%	31.4	24.6	8.7	8.4	15.7	32.8%
On General Trip	19.4%	39.5	22.7	8.1	3.8	6.5	18.4%
No	47.4%	21.4	19.0	1.8	3.7	6.7	12.2%
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR							
Donated to Federation	12.7%	32.4	25.6	8.4	6.4	14.5	29.3%
Asked, Did Not Donate	31.9%	23.2	25.3	10.3	5.0	4.3	19.6%
Not Asked	33.3%	30.5	19.9	4.5	4.5	7.3	16.3%
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR							
Nothing	33.2%	29.7	20.5	5.1	4.5	7.0	16.6%
Under \$100	15.1%	42.1	21.5	6.1	4.8	10.4	21.3%
\$100 - \$500	15.7%	20.6	21.9	8.4	10.3	23.1	41.8%
\$500 - \$1,000	4.7%	36.0	40.7	10.7	2.7	5.2	18.6%
\$1,000 and over	4.8%	22.9	34.7	14.2	6.3	17.1	37.6%
Note: See page 6-94 for an explanation of ❶.							

**TABLE 6-31
SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Never/ Special Occasions ¹	Only on High Holidays	A Few Times per Year	Once per Month or More
Pittsburgh	2002	23%	17	27	33
Boston	2005	68%			32
Cleveland *	2011	32%	14	23	31
New York *	2011	35%	12	24	29
Harrisburg	1994	27%	21	22	30
Bergen	2001	23%	27	21	29
St. Louis	2014	40%	12	19	29
Tidewater	2001	21%	22	29	28
Detroit	2005	22%	24	26	28
St. Paul	2004	23%	24	26	28
St. Petersburg	1994	32%	17	23	28
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	41%	16	15	28
Buffalo	1995	72%			28
Hartford	2000	27%	21	25	27
Rochester	1999	24%	24	27	26
Jacksonville	2002	31%	23	20	26
San Antonio	2007	25%	22	28	25
York	1999	28%	20	27	25
Charlotte	1997	25%	25	26	25
Milwaukee	1996	26%	24	26	25
Los Angeles	1997	29%	23	23	25
Sarasota	2001	32%	21	22	25
New Haven	2010	32%	24	20	25
San Diego *	2003	40%	13	23	24

**TABLE 6-31
SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Never/ Special Occasions ¹	Only on High Holidays	A Few Times per Year	Once per Month or More
Monmouth	1997	23%	32	21	24
Columbus	2013	55%	8	13	24
Lehigh Valley	2007	29%	25	23	23
Westport	2000	29%	29	19	23
Minneapolis	2004	23%	23	33	22
Washington	2003	31%	17	30	22
Richmond	1994	25%	30	23	22
Middlesex	2008	25%	31	22	22
Miami	2014	28%	33	18	22
Wilmington	1995	29%	23	27	21
Orlando	1993	34%	20	26	21
Philadelphia *	2009	39%	15	25	21
Rhode Island	2002	29%	29	22	21
Tucson	2002	38%	21	20	21
BROWARD	2016	28%	30	22	20
S Palm Beach	2005	28%	31	21	20
Palm Springs	1998	80%			20
East Bay	2011	81%			19
Atlantic County	2004	29%	28	25	18
Phoenix	2002	37%	20	25	18
Broward	1997	32%	31	20	18
W Palm Beach	2005	31%	31	21	16
Portland (ME)	2007	45%	22	17	15
Las Vegas	2005	44%	25	18	13

**TABLE 6-31
SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Never/ Special Occasions ¹	Only on High Holidays	A Few Times per Year	Once per Month or More
Essex-Morris	1998	28%	30	42	
NJPS * ²	2000	40%	18	19	24

* Question was asked about synagogue attendance *in the past year*.

¹ *Never/Special Occasions* includes respondents who never attend synagogue services and respondents who attend synagogue services only for special occasions, such as weddings/b'nai mitzvah.

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

**TABLE 6-32
SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE ONCE PER MONTH OR MORE
BY AGE OF RESPONDENT
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+	65+	All
Hartford	2000	16%	36%	26%	23%	27%	25%	27%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	NA	36%	21%	36%	20%	30%	28%
Pittsburgh	2002	23%	34%	33%	32%	39%	36%	33%
Jacksonville	2002	12%	34%	21%	30%	33%	32%	26%
Detroit	2005	43%	33%	27%	31%	20%	24%	28%
New York	2011	41%	33%	29%	21%	26%	24%	30%
Bergen	2001	35%	33%	23%	26%	29%	27%	29%
Tidewater	2001	16%	33%	25%	35%	36%	36%	28%
San Antonio	2007	24%	32%	25%	21%	25%	23%	25%
York	1999	23%	30%	24%	18%	19%	18%	25%
New Haven	2010	27%	29%	23%	21%	25%	23%	25%
San Diego ¹	2003	18%	29%	13%	18%	22%	20%	24%
Harrisburg	1994	18%	29%	35%	43%	38%	41%	29%
St. Petersburg	1994	25%	28%	24%	28%	30%	29%	28%
Monmouth	1997	19%	28%	20%	23%	29%	25%	24%
Westport	2000	16%	28%	21%	12%	33%	21%	23%
Charlotte	1997	15%	28%	26%	29%	37%	33%	25%
St. Paul	2004	12%	28%	35%	27%	29%	29%	28%
Washington	2003	12%	28%	23%	26%	20%	22%	22%
Miami	2014	27%	27%	22%	20%	17%	18%	22%
Atlantic County	2004	NA	27%	10%	16%	26%	21%	18%
Cleveland	2011	43%	26%	32%	27%	29%	28%	31%
Rochester	1999	22%	26%	27%	23%	29%	26%	26%
Orlando	1993	12%	26%	12%	38%	23%	33%	21%
Middlesex	2008	35%	25%	20%	18%	21%	20%	22%

**TABLE 6-32
SYNAGOGUE ATTENDANCE ONCE PER MONTH OR MORE
BY AGE OF RESPONDENT
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Community	Year	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+	65+	All
Richmond	1994	12%	25%	29%	23%	24%	23%	22%
Lehigh Valley	2007	28%	24%	22%	26%	18%	21%	23%
Columbus	2013	25%	24%	22%	21%	28%	24%	24%
St. Louis	2014	24%	24%	29%	29%	47%	38%	29%
S Palm Beach	2005	20%	24%	15%	18%	21%	20%	20%
Tucson	2002	16%	24%	18%	27%	23%	24%	21%
Milwaukee	1996	15%	24%	22%	35%	31%	33%	25%
Phoenix	2002	4%	24%	17%	26%	18%	21%	18%
Rhode Island	2002	23%	23%	18%	21%	22%	21%	21%
East Bay	2011	22%	23%	17%	15%	13%	15%	19%
Broward	1997	16%	23%	15%	18%	18%	18%	18%
Minneapolis	2004	8%	22%	19%	26%	28%	28%	22%
Wilmington	1995	15%	21%	21%	19%	35%	26%	21%
Portland (ME)	2007	NA	21%	14%	18%	13%	15%	15%
BROWARD	2016	10%	18%	17%	22%	27%	25%	20%
Sarasota	2001	NA	18%	25%	31%	25%	27%	25%
W Palm Beach	2005	9%	16%	15%	16%	18%	17%	16%
Las Vegas	2005	13%	11%	11%	14%	16%	15%	13%
NJPS ^{1,2}	2000	18%	29%	24%	22%	26%	24%	24%

¹ Question was asked about synagogue attendance *in the past year*.

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

TYPES OF MARRIAGE

Intermarriage has developed into one of the most important issues for the Jewish community and has clearly reached significant proportions in most American Jewish communities. As a result, intermarriage must be taken into account in local Jewish community planning. Although some intermarried couples are contributing significantly to the Jewish community, it is also clear that when measures of “Jewishness” for intermarried and in-married couples are compared in this and other community studies, intermarriage is affecting Jewish continuity.

Definitions

Three different types of marriage are defined in this study:

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

❷ **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 (no question about formal conversion was asked).

❸ **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.

An additional measure is calculated from the last two types of marriage defined above:

❹ **Couples Conversion Rate:** The *couples conversion rate* is calculated by dividing the percentage of conversionary in-married couples (❷) by the total percentage of married couples involving marriages between Jewish persons and persons not born or raised Jewish (conversionary in-married couples (❷) and intermarried couples (❸)).

Note that an adult is defined in this study as born or raised Jewish if he/she considers himself/herself to have been born or raised Jewish. No question was asked about whether a formal conversion occurred. Note as well that while *Halakhah* (Jewish law) makes no distinction between in-marriages between two persons born or raised Jewish and conversionary in-marriages in which formal conversion has occurred, social scientists make this distinction to study several aspects of marital choice and its influence on Jewish behaviors.

Various Types of Intermarriage Rates

Intermarriage rates may be reported based on *married couples* or *individuals*. As an illustration, imagine that two weddings occur. In wedding one, Moshe (a Jew) marries Rachel (also a Jew). In wedding two, Abraham (a Jew) marries Christine (a non-Jew). Thus, there are two married couples, one of whom is intermarried. In this illustration, the *couples intermarriage rate* is 50%. Another method of calculating an intermarriage rate, however, is to note that there are three Jews (Moshe, Rachel, and Abraham) and one of

the three (Abraham) is married to a non-Jew (Christine). In this illustration, the *individual intermarriage rate* is 33%.

The intermarriage rates most frequently reported in local Jewish community studies are based on persons who currently consider themselves Jewish. Persons born or raised Jewish who have converted to another religion or attend services of another religion on a regular basis (irrespective of formal conversion), are normally not interviewed as Jews in most Jewish community studies. Thus, all intermarriage rates are based on persons *currently* Jewish, not all persons *born or raised* Jewish.

Note as well that the rates reported in this section are for *all existing* married couples, not for marriages that have *occurred recently* (in the past five years, for example) as sometimes reported in other studies.

Intermarriage by Age

Broward Jewish households contain 38,200 married couples. **Table 6-33** shows that 68% (25,900 married couples) of married couples involve in-marriages between two persons born or raised Jewish, 9% (3,400 married couples) involve conversionary in-marriages, and 23% (8,900 married couples) involve intermarriages.

The couples intermarriage rate decreases from 25% in households age 35-49 to 25% in households age 50-64, 17% in households age 65-74, and 10% in households age 75 and over. The intermarriage rate of 47% is found for couples under age 35, but this is based on a sample size of only 33.

Row A shows that the **couples conversion rate** is 28% ($9\% / (9\% + 23\%)$), where 9% is the percentage of conversionary in-married couples and 23% is the percentage of intermarried couples. Note that no question was asked about whether a formal conversion occurred. No consistent relationship is seen between the conversion rate and the age of the head of the household.

Row B shows that 19% of *married born or raised Jewish persons* (rather than *married couples*) are married to **persons not born or raised Jewish**. 18% of married born or raised Jewish persons in households age 35-49 and 20% of married born or raised Jewish persons in households age 50-74 are married to persons not born or raised Jewish, compared to 7% of married born or raised Jewish persons in households age 75 and over.

Note that while, overall, 23% of *married couples* are intermarried and 9% are conversionary in-married, 19% of *married born or raised Jewish persons* are married to persons not born or raised Jewish.

Row C shows that 13% of *married Jewish persons* (rather than *married couples*) are married to **persons not currently Jewish, that is, are intermarried**. 18% of married Jews in households age 35-49 are intermarried, compared to 14% of married Jews in households age 50-64, 9% of married Jews in households age 65-74, and 6% of married Jews in households age 75 and over.

Note that while, overall, 32% of *married couples* involve marriages between persons born or raised Jewish and persons not born or raised Jewish, 23% of *married couples* are intermarried, 13% of *married Jewish persons* are intermarried. Thus, the *couples intermarriage rate* in Broward is 23% and the *individual intermarriage rate* is 13%.

Since 56% of Jewish adults are married (Chapter 5) and 13% of married Jews are intermarried, 7% of *all Jewish adults* (both married and single) in Broward are intermarried.

Row D shows that 5% of *married born or raised Jewish persons* (rather than *married couples*) are married to **Jews-by-Choice**. Note that while, overall, 9% of married couples involve conversionary in-marriages, 5% of married Jewish persons are married to Jews-by-Choice.

Community Comparisons. Table 6-35 shows that the 23% **couples intermarriage rate** is well below average among about 55 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 50% in Atlanta, 48% in Las Vegas, 16% in both Miami and West Palm Beach, and 9% in South Palm Beach. The 23% compares to 18% in 1997. The 23% compares to 61% in the Pew Research Center's *Survey of Jewish Americans* (www.pewforum.org)

The 28% **couples conversion rate** is well above average among about 50 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 37% in Miami, 24% in South Palm Beach, 22% in West Palm Beach, 17% in Atlanta, and 12% in Las Vegas. The 28% compares to 19% in 1997.

Age of Head of Household. Table 6-36 shows that the 31% of married couples in households **age 35-49** who are intermarried is well below average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 71% in Las Vegas, 51% in Atlanta, 45% in West Palm Beach, 26% in South Palm Beach, and 25% in Miami. The 31% compares 36% in 1997.

The 25% of married couples in households **age 50-64** who are intermarried is below average among about 50 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 47% in Las Vegas, 42% in Atlanta, 24% in West Palm Beach, 15% in Miami, and 14% in South Palm Beach. The 25% compares to 20% in 1997.

The 17% of married couples in households **age 65-74** who are intermarried is about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 64% in Atlanta, 32% in Las Vegas, 13% in Miami, 6% in West Palm Beach, and 5% in South Palm Beach. The 17% compares to 4% in 1997.

The 10% of married couples in households **age 75 and over** who are intermarried is about average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 40% in Atlanta, 28% in Las Vegas, 8% in Miami, 5% in West Palm Beach, and 4% in South Palm Beach. The 10% compares to 3% in 1997.

The 14% of married couples in households **age 65 and over** who are intermarried is about average among about 50 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 55% in Atlanta, 31% in Las Vegas, 11% in Miami, 6% in West Palm Beach, and 4% in South Palm Beach. The 14% compares to 3% in 1997.

Comparisons Among Population Subgroups. Table 6-34 shows that, overall, 16% of married couples are intermarried. The percentage is much higher for married couples in:

- households in the East (43%)
- households with children (32%)
- Just Jewish households (41%)
- synagogue non-member households (33%)
- households in which no adult visited Israel (46%)

The percentage is much lower for married couples in:

- households in the Southeast (9%)
- elderly couple households (11%)
- Orthodox households (4%) and Conservative households (10%)
- synagogue member households (10%), households in which a member participated in Chabad in the past year (7%), JCC member households (7%), and Jewish organization member households (4%)
- households in which the respondent attended a Jewish day school as a child (13%)
- households in which the respondent participated in a Jewish youth group as a teenager (9%)
- households in which the respondent participated in Hillel/Chabad while in college (excluding High Holidays) (6%)
- households in which an adult visited Israel on a Jewish trip (12%) and a general trip (7%)
- households who donated to the Jewish Federation in the past year (8%)
- households who donated under \$100 (6%), \$100-\$500 (12%), \$500-\$1,000 (10%), and \$1,000 and over (3%) to the Jewish Federation in the past year

TABLE 6-33
TYPES OF MARRIAGE BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD

BASE: MARRIED COUPLES IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS
(BASE ROWS B AND D: MARRIED BORN OR RAISED JEWISH PERSONS
IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS)
(BASE ROW C: MARRIED JEWISH PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS)

Type of Marriage	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+	65+	All
❶ In-married (2 Born or Raised Jews)	62.3%	66.1%	67.5%	87.5%	75.4%	67.8%
❷ Conversionary In-married	6.9	9.3	16.0	2.1	10.5	9.0
❸ Intermarried	30.8	24.6	16.5	10.4	14.1	23.2
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Row A: ❹ Couples Conversion Rate	18.3%	27.4%	49.2%	16.8%	42.7%	28.0%
Row B: Percentage of <i>married born or raised Jewish persons</i> married to persons <i>not born or raised Jewish</i>	23.2%	20.4%	19.4%	6.7%	14.0%	19.2%
Row C: Individual Intermarriage Rate: Percentage of <i>married Jewish persons</i> married to persons <i>not currently Jewish</i>	18.2%	14.0%	9.0%	5.5%	7.6%	13.1%
Row D: Percentage of <i>married born or raised Jewish persons</i> married to <i>Jews-by-Choice</i>	4.3%	5.6%	9.6%	1.1%	6.0%	5.4%

Note: See page 6-106 for an explanation of ❶, ❷, ❸, and ❹.

TABLE 6-34			
TYPES OF MARRIAGE			
BASE: MARRIED JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS			
	In-married		
Population Subgroup	2 Born/ Raised Jews ①	Conversionary ②	Intermarried ③
All	67.8%	9.0	23.2
GEOGRAPHIC AREA			
Northwest	70.8%	5.8	23.4
East	39.3%	17.6	43.1
West Central	62.3%	7.5	30.2
Southeast	71.4%	19.2	9.4
Southwest	76.4%	7.1	16.5
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN BROWARD			
0 - 9 years	65.1%	18.7	16.2
10 - 19 years	70.4%	7.4	22.2
20 or more years	67.4%	7.6	25.0
HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE			
Household with Children	60.6%	7.6	31.8
Household with Only Adult Children	68.1%	11.6	20.3
Non-Elderly Couple	63.0%	8.1	28.9
Elderly Couple	78.5%	10.8	10.7
HOUSEHOLD INCOME			
Under \$50,000	65.4%	8.4	26.2
\$50 - \$100,000	63.3%	16.6	20.1
\$100 - \$200,000	67.2%	4.7	28.1
\$200,000 and over	66.0%	15.9	18.1

TABLE 6-34			
TYPES OF MARRIAGE			
BASE: MARRIED JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS			
	In-married		
Population Subgroup	2 Born/ Raised Jews ①	Conversionary ②	Intermarried ③
All	67.8%	9.0	23.2
JEWISH IDENTIFICATION			
Orthodox	94.3%	1.5	4.2
Conservative	80.5%	9.6	9.9
Reform	71.4%	8.3	20.3
Just Jewish	49.1%	10.2	40.7
SYNAGOGUE MEMBERSHIP			
Member	79.9%	10.5	9.6
Non-Member	58.8%	7.8	33.4
ATTENDED CHABAD IN THE PAST YEAR			
Attended	82.4%	10.5	7.1
Did Not Attend	62.8%	8.5	28.7
JCC MEMBERSHIP			
Member	87.3%	5.9	6.8
Non-Member	65.0%	9.4	25.6
JEWISH ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP			
Member	92.8%	3.3	3.9
Non-Member	61.1%	10.5	28.4
RESPONDENT ATTENDED JEWISH EDUCATION AS A CHILD			
To Jewish Day School	76.7%	10.1	13.2
To Supplemental School	78.1%	5.5	16.4
→To Jewish Education	74.2%	7.1	18.7
No	64.3%	6.8	28.9

TABLE 6-34			
TYPES OF MARRIAGE			
BASE: MARRIED JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS			
	In-married		
Population Subgroup	2 Born/ Raised Jews ①	Conversionary ②	Intermarried ③
All	67.8%	9.0	23.2
RESPONDENT ATTENDED OR WORKED AT JEWISH OVERNIGHT CAMP AS A CHILD			
To Overnight Camp	73.4%	7.4	19.2
No	72.9%	6.9	20.2
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN JEWISH YOUTH GROUP AS A TEENAGER			
Youth Group Participant	86.4%	5.1	8.5
No	61.8%	8.8	29.4
RESPONDENT PARTICIPATED IN HILLEL/CHABAD WHILE IN COLLEGE (EXCLUDING HIGH HOLIDAYS)			
Hillel/Chabad Participant	89.4%	4.8	5.8
No	67.6%	8.6	23.8
ANY ADULT VISITED ISRAEL			
On Jewish Trip	79.0%	9.3	11.7
On General Trip	80.8%	11.8	7.4
No	47.6%	6.2	46.2
JEWISH FEDERATION MARKET SEGMENTS IN THE PAST YEAR			
Donated to Federation	83.9%	8.0	8.1
Asked, Did Not Donate	61.7%	13.8	24.5
Not Asked	61.5%	8.9	29.6
DONATED TO JEWISH FEDERATION IN THE PAST YEAR			
Nothing	61.6%	9.4	29.0
Under \$100	87.5%	6.3	6.2
\$100 - \$500	74.4%	13.5	12.1
\$500 - \$1,000	87.6%	2.7	9.7
\$1,000 and over	91.4%	5.4	3.2
Note: See page 6-106 for an explanation of ①, ②, and ③.			

**TABLE 6-35
INTERMARRIAGE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

Community	Year	Individual Rate: Percentage of Married Jews Who Are Married to Non-Jews	Couples Rate: Percentage of Married Couples Who Are:			Couples Conversion Rate ^④
			Inter-married ^③	In-married		
				2 Born/Raised Jews ^①	Conversionary ^②	
Portland (ME)	2007	44%	61%	33	6	9%
East Bay	2011	44%	61%	39		NA
Seattle	2000	38%	55%	35	10	15%
San Francisco	2004	38%	55%	40	5	8%
Denver	2007	36%	53%	33	14	21%
Columbus	2013	35%	52%	48		NA
Atlanta	2006	33%	50%	40	10	17%
Las Vegas	2005	32%	48%	46	6	12%
St. Louis	2014	32%	48%	52		NA
Charlotte	1997	30%	47%	44	10	18%
York	1999	29%	46%	41	14	24%
Tucson	2002	30%	46%	46	8	15%
Boston	2005	30%	46%	50	4	9%
San Diego	2003	28%	44%	45	11	20%
Jacksonville	2002	28%	44%	45	11	20%
Tidewater	2001	28%	43%	45	12	22%
Washington	2003	26%	41%	52	6	13%
Phoenix	2002	25%	40%	51	9	18%
St. Paul	2004	25%	39%	49	12	24%
Cleveland	2011	23%	38%	62		NA
San Antonio	2007	23%	37%	50	13	25%

**TABLE 6-35
INTERMARRIAGE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

Community	Year	Individual Rate: Percentage of Married Jews Who Are Married to Non-Jews	Couples Rate: Percentage of Married Couples Who Are:			Couples Conversion Rate ^④
			Inter-married ^③	In-married		
				2 Born/Raised Jews ^①	Conversionary ^②	
Pittsburgh	2002	22%	36%	51	13	27%
Lehigh Valley	2007	22%	36%	55	9	21%
Cincinnati	2008	20%	34%	53	13	27%
Richmond	1994	21%	34%	56	10	23%
Rhode Island	2002	21%	34%	59	7	18%
New Haven	2010	21%	34%	60	6	16%
Harrisburg	1994	20%	33%	56	11	26%
Chicago	2010	20%	33%	57	10	23%
Minneapolis	2004	20%	33%	59	8	20%
Wilmington	1995	19%	33%	60	7	18%
Westport	2000	20%	33%	61	6	16%
Orlando	1993	19%	32%	59	9	22%
Rochester	1999	17%	30%	62	8	22%
Howard County	2010	17%	29%	52	19	40%
St. Petersburg	1994	17%	29%	58	14	32%
Milwaukee	1996	16%	28%	68	4	12%
Philadelphia	2009	16%	28%	72		NA
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	15%	27%	62	12	30%
Atlantic County	2004	15%	26%	68	6	19%
Buffalo	1995	15%	26%	71	3	10%
BROWARD	2016	13%	23%	68	9	28%

**TABLE 6-35
INTERMARRIAGE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

Community	Year	Individual Rate: Percentage of Married Jews Who Are Married to Non-Jews	Couples Rate: Percentage of Married Couples Who Are:			Couples Conversion Rate ④
			Inter-married ③	In-married		
				2 Born/ Raised Jews ①	Conver- sionary ②	
Hartford	2000	13%	23%	69	8	27%
Los Angeles	1997	13%	23%	71	6	20%
New York	2011	12%	22%	72	6	23%
Baltimore	2010	11%	20%	71	9	31%
Sarasota	2001	11%	20%	76	4	17%
Palm Springs	1998	10%	19%	81		NA
Broward	1997	10%	18%	78	4	19%
Bergen	2001	10%	17%	78	5	23%
Monmouth	1997	9%	17%	81	3	15%
Miami	2014	9%	16%	74	9	37%
Detroit	2005	9%	16%	76	8	33%
W Palm Beach	2005	9%	16%	79	5	22%
Middlesex	2008	7%	14%	84	2	14%
S Palm Beach	2005	5%	9%	88	3	24%
NJPS	2000	31%	48%	52		NA

Note: See page 6-106 for an explanation of ①, ②, ③, and ④.

TABLE 6-36								
COUPLES INTERMARRIAGE RATE BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD								
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS								
BASE: MARRIED COUPLES IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS								
Community	Year	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+	65+	All
Columbus	2013	NA	76%	45%	33%	17%	30%	52%
Las Vegas	2005	33%	71%	47%	32%	28%	31%	48%
East Bay	2011	78%	67%	56%	58%	36%	50%	61%
Portland (ME)	2007	NA	65%	64%	32%	30%	31%	61%
Tucson	2002	44%	63%	51%	23%	20%	21%	46%
Denver	2007	70%	62%	47%	41%	14%	34%	53%
Charlotte	1997	43%	62%	27%	14%	NA	16%	47%
St. Louis	2014	66%	60%	52%	34%	9%	24%	48%
Phoenix	2002	34%	60%	42%	22%	17%	19%	40%
San Diego	2003	51%	59%	37%	34%	9%	22%	44%
York	1999	74%	56%	28%	14%	43%	29%	46%
Sarasota	2001	NA	55%	24%	8%	10%	9%	20%
Chicago	2010	24%	54%	29%	11%	18%	14%	33%
Atlanta	2006	62%	51%	42%	64%	40%	55%	50%
St. Paul	2004	48%	51%	34%	12%	14%	13%	39%
Jacksonville	2002	44%	51%	49%	34%	24%	29%	44%
Washington	2003	53%	49%	32%	27%	37%	32%	41%
Pittsburgh	2002	59%	48%	33%	12%	12%	12%	36%
Rhode Island	2002	40%	48%	37%	17%	13%	15%	34%
Rochester	1999	36%	48%	22%	6%	11%	7%	30%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	NA	48%	35%	18%	7%	15%	27%
Cincinnati	2008	42%	45%	31%	39%	9%	28%	34%
W Palm Beach	2005	42%	45%	24%	6%	5%	6%	16%
New Haven	2010	NA	45%	39%	25%	13%	19%	34%
Minneapolis	2004	52%	43%	26%	20%	7%	14%	33%

TABLE 6-36								
COUPLES INTERMARRIAGE RATE BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD								
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS								
BASE: MARRIED COUPLES IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS								
Community	Year	Under 35	35-49	50-64	65-74	75+	65+	All
Cleveland	2011	NA	42%	40%	52%	14%	36%	38%
Lehigh Valley	2007	56%	41%	37%	25%	21%	23%	36%
Wilmington	1995	54%	41%	18%	10%	6%	7%	33%
Atlantic County	2004	NA	41%	27%	23%	0%	14%	26%
Richmond	1994	63%	40%	20%	6%	14%	10%	34%
Tidewater	2001	93%	37%	42%	11%	6%	8%	43%
Harrisburg	1994	51%	37%	30%	10%	3%	8%	33%
Milwaukee	1996	36%	37%	27%	7%	21%	11%	28%
Broward	1997	57%	36%	20%	4%	3%	3%	18%
St. Petersburg	1994	47%	36%	31%	16%	9%	14%	29%
San Antonio	2007	33%	35%	43%	36%	26%	32%	37%
Westport	2000	50%	32%	35%	33%	6%	23%	33%
BROWARD	2016	NA	31%	25%	17%	10%	14%	23%
Orlando	1993	58%	31%	33%	NA	NA	13%	32%
Hartford	2000	43%	29%	23%	10%	12%	11%	23%
New York	2011	14%	29%	24%	19%	12%	15%	22%
Howard County	2010	NA	29%	33%	NA	NA	18%	29%
Middlesex	2008	26%	27%	15%	7%	3%	5%	14%
S Palm Beach	2005	42%	26%	14%	5%	4%	4%	9%
Baltimore	2010	15%	26%	27%	13%	7%	11%	20%
Miami	2014	19%	25%	15%	13%	8%	11%	16%
Bergen	2001	25%	24%	12%	11%	11%	11%	17%
Monmouth	1997	32%	22%	10%	7%	10%	8%	17%
Detroit	2005	22%	18%	19%	10%	10%	10%	16%
Palm Springs	1998	53%		25%	4%	NA	4%	19%
NJPS	2000	59%	58%	46%	24%	19%	NA	48%

RELIGION OF CHILDREN IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Table 6-37 shows that 46% of *children age 0-17 in intermarried households* in Broward are being raised Jewish only; 21%, part Jewish; and 33%, non-Jewish. Note that respondents identified each child in their household as being raised Jewish, part Jewish, or non-Jewish.

Table 6-38 shows that 76% of *Jewish children age 0-17 in married households* are being raised in in-married households; 8%, in conversionary in-married households; and 16%, in intermarried households. Note that while part Jewish children are included as Jewish in many sections of this report, **Table 6-38** reports the results for children being raised Jewish only so as to be comparable to the other communities.

Table 6-39 shows that 68% of *children age 0-17 in Jewish households* are being raised Jewish. Again, to be comparable to other communities, the 68% refers only to children being raised as Jewish only.

Community Comparisons. **Table 6-37** shows that the 46% of **children in intermarried households who are being raised Jewish** is above average among about 50 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 75% in South Palm Beach, 46% in Miami, 42% in Las Vegas, 39% in Atlanta, and 34% in West Palm Beach. The 46% compares to 43% in 1997.

Table 6-38 shows that the 16% of **Jewish children in married households who are being raised in intermarried households** is below average among about 50 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 46% in Las Vegas, 27% in West Palm Beach, 25% in Atlanta, 19% in South Palm Beach, and 9% in Miami. The 16% compares to 23% in 1997.

The 8% of **Jewish children in married households who are being raised in conversionary in-married households** is below average among about 45 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 16% in West Palm Beach, 15% in Atlanta, 11% in both Miami and Las Vegas, and 9% in South Palm Beach. The 8% compares to 10% in 1997.

Table 6-39 shows that the 76% of **children in Jewish households who are being raised Jewish** is about average among about 50 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 93% in Miami, 92% in South Palm Beach, 74% in Atlanta, 67% in West Palm Beach, and 56% in Las Vegas. The 76% compares to 77% in 1997.

The community comparisons should be treated with caution due to differences in how the information about the religion of children in Jewish households is queried among the various communities. Some communities include “no religion,” “undecided,” and “part Jewish” as possible responses while others do not, which affects the comparability of the results. In some cases these possible responses are read to the respondent, while in other cases they are not read to the respondent and are reported only if the respondent volunteers the information.

TABLE 6-37					
RELIGION OF CHILDREN BEING RAISED IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS					
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS					
BASE: CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS					
Community	Year	Jewish	Part Jewish	Non-Jewish	Other Responses ¹
S Palm Beach	2005	75%	11	14	
Sarasota	2001	74%	9	17	
Howard County	2010	62%	17	4	17% Undecided
Atlantic County	2004	60%	17	23	
Cincinnati	2008	60%	7	11	18% No Religion 4% Undecided
Boston	2005	60%	4	8	28% No Religion
Hartford	2000	59%	15	26	
Bergen	2001	59%	8	33	
Harrisburg	1994	57%	43		
Westport	2000	56%	10	34	
Chicago	2010	49%	26	9	15% No Religion 1% Undecided
Jacksonville	2002	49%	11	40	
Portland (ME)	2007	47%	26	27	
BROWARD	2016	46%	21	33	
Miami	2014	46%	30	24	
Tucson	2002	45%	26	29	
Washington	2003	45%	14	41	
Tidewater	2001	45%	9	46	
New Haven	2010	43%	22	35	
Broward	1997	43%	14	43	
York	1999	43%	10	47	
Los Angeles	1997	43%	57		
Las Vegas	2005	42%	12	46	

TABLE 6-37					
RELIGION OF CHILDREN BEING RAISED IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS					
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS					
BASE: CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS					
Community	Year	Jewish	Part Jewish	Non-Jewish	Other Responses ¹
San Antonio	2007	39%	25	36	
Atlanta	2006	39%	15	28	4% No Religion 14% Undecided
Orlando	1993	39%	61		
San Francisco	2004	38%	12	14	36% No Religion
St. Paul	2004	37%	28	35	
Lehigh Valley	2007	36%	27	37	
Pittsburgh	2002	36%	11	39	14% Undecided
Milwaukee	1996	36%	64		
Wilmington	1995	36%	64		
Richmond	1994	36%	64		
Rhode Island	2002	35%	24	41	
W Palm Beach	2005	34%	31	35	
Charlotte	1997	34%	20	46	
Middlesex	2008	33%	34	33	
Cleveland	2011	33%	22	7	23% No religion 14% Undecided
Rochester	1999	32%	20	48	
Monmouth	1997	31%	18	51	
New York	2011	31%	11	46	13% Undecided
Detroit	2005	31%	7	62	
Minneapolis	2004	30%	33	37	
Baltimore	2010	30%	18	10	17% No Religion 25% Undecided
St. Petersburg	1994	29%	71		

TABLE 6-37					
RELIGION OF CHILDREN BEING RAISED IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS					
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS					
BASE: CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN INTERMARRIED HOUSEHOLDS					
Community	Year	Jewish	Part Jewish	Non-Jewish	Other Responses ¹
St. Louis	2014	27%	18	18	26% No Religion 8% Undecided 4% Don't Know
Phoenix	2002	26%	18	50	6% Undecided
San Diego	2003	21%	29	39	11% Undecided
Palm Springs	1998	19%	19	62	
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	18%	47	35	
Denver	2007	18%	11	48	23% Undecided
Columbus	2013	11%	27	8	21% No Religion 33% Undecided
NJPS	2000	NA		67%	NA

¹ Communities have queried this information in different ways. Some communities include "No Religion" and "Undecided" as possible responses, while others do not. This significantly affects the comparability of the data and as such the comparisons should be treated with caution.

TABLE 6-38				
JEWISH CHILDREN BEING RAISED WITHIN EACH TYPE OF MARRIAGE				
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS				
BASE: JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS				
		In-married		
Community	Year	2 Born/Raised Jews ①	Conversionary ②	Intermarried ③
Columbus	2013	32%		68
Las Vegas	2005	43%	11	46
Portland (ME)	2007	46%	11	43
St. Louis	2014	57%		43
Tucson	2002	44%	15	42
Sarasota	2001	44%	16	40
Boston	2005	62%		38
York	1999	40%	24	36
Atlantic County	2004	48%	17	35
Jacksonville	2002	47%	22	31
Tidewater	2001	50%	19	31
San Francisco	2004	71%		29
Howard County	2010	48%	24	28
W Palm Beach	2005	58%	16	27
Washington	2003	64%	10	27
Cincinnati	2008	56%	19	25
Atlanta	2006	60%	15	25
Chicago	2010	63%	13	24
Harrisburg	1994	61%	16	23
Broward	1997	67%	10	23
Pittsburgh	2002	56%	22	22
Wilmington	1995	65%	13	22
Phoenix	2002	44%	35	21
Lehigh Valley	2007	65%	14	21

TABLE 6-38				
JEWISH CHILDREN BEING RAISED WITHIN EACH TYPE OF MARRIAGE				
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS				
BASE: JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS				
		In-married		
Community	Year	2 Born/Raised Jews ①	Conversionary ②	Intermarried ③
New Haven	2010	68%	11	21
St. Paul	2004	50%	30	20
Hartford	2000	66%	14	20
Rhode Island	2002	67%	13	20
Westport	2000	73%	7	20
San Diego	2003	59%	22	19
Richmond	1994	65%	16	19
Rochester	1999	65%	15	19
S Palm Beach	2005	72%	9	19
Denver	2007	53%	30	17
San Antonio	2007	57%	26	17
Charlotte	1997	68%	15	17
Orlando	1993	72%	11	17
Milwaukee	1996	75%	8	17
BROWARD	2016	76%	8	16
Minneapolis	2004	69%	15	16
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	31%	55	13
Cleveland	2011	87%		13
St. Petersburg	1994	59%	30	11
Bergen	2001	81%	8	11
Miami	2014	80%	11	9
Middlesex	2008	87%	4	9
Baltimore	2010	81%	11	8
Monmouth	1997	89%	4	7

TABLE 6-38 JEWISH CHILDREN BEING RAISED WITHIN EACH TYPE OF MARRIAGE COMMUNITY COMPARISONS				
BASE: JEWISH CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS				
		In-married		
Community	Year	2 Born/Raised Jews ①	Conversionary ②	Intermarried ③
Detroit	2005	86%	8	6
New York	2011	90%	4	5

Note: See page 6-106 for an explanation of ①, ②, and ③.

TABLE 6-39						
CHILDREN IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WHO ARE BEING RAISED JEWISH						
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS						
BASED: CHILDREN AGE 0-17 IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS						
Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
Miami	2014	93%		Tidewater	2001	74%
S Palm Beach	2005	92%		Minneapolis	2004	73%
Bergen	2001	92%		Richmond	1994	73%
Detroit	2005	88%		Lehigh Valley	2007	72%
Hartford	2000	87%		Rhode Island	2002	71%
Sarasota	2001	85%		Wilmington	1995	71%
Westport	2000	85%		Martin-St. Lucie	1999	70%
Monmouth	1997	85%		Rochester	1999	70%
Middlesex	2008	84%		Philadelphia	2009	69%
New York	2011	81%		BROWARD	2016	68%
Cincinnati	2008	81%		Tucson	2002	68%
Atlantic County	2004	81%		W Palm Beach	2005	67%
Harrisburg	1994	81%		Pittsburgh	2002	67%
New Haven	2010	79%		York	1999	67%
Baltimore	2010	78%		Charlotte	1997	66%
San Antonio	2007	78%		Portland (ME)	2007	65%
Buffalo	1995	78%		San Francisco	2004	65%
Broward	1997	77%		Phoenix	2002	60%
St. Petersburg	1994	77%		Seattle	2000	59%
Orlando	1993	77%		San Diego	2003	57%
Howard County	2010	76%		Denver	2007	56%
Washington	2003	76%		Las Vegas	2005	56%
Cleveland	2011	75%		St. Louis	2014	52%
Chicago	2010	75%		Columbus	2013	34%
St. Paul	2004	75%		Los Angeles *	1997	81%
Jacksonville	2002	75%		Boston *	2005	77%
Milwaukee	1996	75%		NJPS	2000	64%
Atlanta	2006	74%				

* May include children who are part Jewish.

PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WHO ARE JEWISH

Table 6-40 shows that 86% of persons in Jewish households in Broward consider themselves to be Jewish, or are identified as Jewish by the respondent, or, in the case of children, are being raised Jewish. Note that respondents identified themselves and the other persons in their household as Jewish, part Jewish, or non-Jewish. Not all persons who consider themselves to be Jewish were born or raised Jewish nor underwent a formal conversion. Part Jewish children and adults are included as Jews in this section.

Community Comparisons. Table 6-40 shows that the 86% who consider themselves to be Jewish is about average among about 55 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 96% in South Palm Beach, 94% in Miami, 90% in West Palm Beach, and 76% in both Atlanta and Las Vegas. The 86% compares to 89% in 1997.

**TABLE 6-40
PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS WHO ARE JEWISH
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
S Palm Beach	2005	96%		San Antonio	2007	81%
Miami	2014	94%		St. Paul	2004	81%
Middlesex	2008	92%		Rochester	1999	81%
Detroit	2005	92%		Orlando	1993	81%
Bergen	2001	92%		Washington	2003	80%
W Palm Beach	2005	90%		Jacksonville	2002	80%
Monmouth	1997	90%		Rhode Island	2002	80%
Sarasota	2001	89%		Boston	2005	79%
Broward	1997	89%		Tidewater	2001	79%
Hartford	2000	88%		Wilmington	1995	79%
Los Angeles	1997	88%		Richmond	1994	79%
New York	2011	87%		Phoenix	2002	78%
Atlantic County	2004	87%		Pittsburgh	2002	78%
Palm Springs	1998	87%		Tucson	2002	78%
BROWARD	2016	86%		Chicago	2010	76%
Baltimore	2010	86%		Atlanta	2006	76%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	86%		Las Vegas	2005	76%
Philadelphia	2009	85%		York	1999	76%
Howard County	2010	84%		San Diego	2003	75%
Westport	2000	84%		San Francisco	2004	73%
Buffalo	1995	84%		Charlotte	1997	73%
New Haven	2010	83%		Denver	2007	72%
Milwaukee	1996	83%		Portland (ME)	2007	71%
St. Petersburg	1994	83%		Seattle	2000	70%
Cleveland	2011	82%		Columbus	2013	69%
Cincinnati	2008	82%		St. Louis	2014	68%
Lehigh Valley	2007	82%		NJPS	2000	78%
Minneapolis	2004	82%				
Harrisburg	1994	82%				

JEW-S-BY-CHOICE

Table 6-41 shows that 4.5% (6,700 persons) of Jewish persons in Jewish households in Broward are Jews-by-Choice. A Jew-by-Choice is defined in this study as any adult (age 18 or over) who was not born or raised Jewish but currently considers himself/herself Jewish or any child (age 0-17) who was not born Jewish but is being raised Jewish (*irrespective* of formal conversion). Note that respondents identified themselves and the other persons in their household as born, raised, and currently Jewish or non-Jewish.

Community Comparisons. Table 6-41 shows that the 4.5% Jews-by-Choice is about average among about 35 comparison Jewish communities and compares to 4.8% in Las Vegas, 3.8% in Miami, 2.0% in West Palm Beach, and 1.3% in South Palm Beach. The 4.5% compares to 1.4% in 1997.

**TABLE 6-41
JEWS WHO ARE JEWS-BY-CHOICE
COMMUNITY COMPARISONS**

BASE: JEWISH PERSONS IN JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS

Community	Year	%		Community	Year	%
York	1999	9.7%		Portland (ME)	2007	3.5%
St. Paul	2004	8.0%		New Haven	2010	3.4%
Jacksonville	2002	7.2%		Los Angeles	1997	3.3%
San Antonio	2007	6.9%		Hartford	2000	3.1%
Harrisburg	1994	6.4%		Detroit	2005	3.0%
Martin-St. Lucie	1999	6.0%		Wilmington	1995	2.8%
Charlotte	1997	5.9%		Atlantic County	2004	2.7%
Washington	2003	5.8%		Westport	2000	2.7%
Tidewater	2001	5.8%		Bergen	2001	2.6%
St. Petersburg	1994	5.4%		Sarasota	2001	2.3%
Richmond	1994	5.3%		Milwaukee	1996	2.3%
Las Vegas	2005	4.8%		W Palm Beach	2005	2.0%
Minneapolis	2004	4.8%		Middlesex	2008	1.4%
BROWARD	2016	4.5%		Broward	1997	1.4%
Tucson	2002	4.3%		Monmouth	1997	1.4%
Rhode Island	2002	4.1%		S Palm Beach	2005	1.3%
Rochester	1999	4.1%		San Francisco ¹	2004	7.0%
Orlando	1993	4.1%				
Lehigh Valley	2007	4.0%				
Miami	2014	3.8%				
Buffalo	1995	3.8%				

¹ Results are based on *adults only*, not all Jewish persons.

Table 6-1A: Households and Persons by Jewish Identification, 2016	6-6
Table 6-1B: Households and Persons by Jewish Identification, 1997	6-6
Table 6-2: Jewish Identification	6-7
Table 6-3A: Geographic Distribution of Jewish Identification Groups	6-11
Table 6-3B: Geographic Distribution of Jewish Identification Groups	6-11
Table 6-4: Age Distribution of Jewish Identification Groups	6-12
Table 6-5: Jewish Identification, Community Comparisons	6-13
Table 6-6: Orthodox Identification, Community Comparisons	6-16
Table 6-7: Conservative Identification, Community Comparisons	6-17
Table 6-8: Reform Identification, Community Comparisons	6-18
Table 6-9: Just Jewish Identification, Community Comparisons	6-19
Table 6-10: Importance of Being Jewish	6-21
Table 6-11: Importance of Being Jewish, Community Comparisons	6-25
Table 6-12: Being Jewish Is Mainly a Matter of.....	6-28
Table 6-13: Jewish Identity Attitudes	6-35
Table 6-14: Summary of Results on Religious Practices.	6-39
Table 6-15: Practice	6-41
Table 6-16: Practice, Community Comparisons	6-45
Table 6-17: Have a Mezuzah on the Front Door	6-47
Table 6-18: Have a Mezuzah on the Front Door, Community Comparisons	6-51
Table 6-19: Participate in a Passover Seder	6-53
Table 6-20: Participate in a Passover Seder	6-57
Table 6-21: Light Chanukah Candles	6-61
Table 6-22: Light Chanukah Candles	6-65
Table 6-23: Light Sabbath Candles	6-69
Table 6-24: Light Sabbath Candles	6-73
Table 6-25: Keep Kosher.	6-78
Table 6-26: Keep Kosher Community Comparisons	6-82
Table 6-27: Refrain from Using Electricity on the Sabbath Community Comparisons	6-86
Table 6-28: Have a Christmas Tree.	6-88
Table 6-29: Have a Christmas Tree in the Home, Community Comparisons	6-92
Table 6-30: Synagogue Attendance	6-97
Table 6-31: Synagogue Attendance, Community Comparisons	6-101
Table 6-32: Synagogue Attendance Once per Month or More by Age of Respondent, Community Comparisons	6-104
Table 6-33: Types of Marriage by Age of Head of Household.	6-110
Table 6-34: Types of Marriage	6-111
Table 6-35: Intermarriage, Community Comparisons	6-114
Table 6-36: Couples Intermarriage Rate by Age of Head of Household Community Comparisons	6-117
Table 6-37: Religion of Children Being Raised in Intermarried Households Community Comparisons	6-120
Table 6-38: Jewish Children Being Raised Within Each Type of Marriage Community Comparisons	6-123
Table 6-39: Children in Jewish Households Who Are Being Raised Jewish Community Comparisons	6-126
Table 6-40: Persons in Jewish Households Who Are Jewish Community Comparisons	6-128
Table 6-41: Jews Who Are Jews-by-Choice Community Comparisons	6-130

