California Jews: Data from the Field Polls

As California goes—according to the common wisdom—so goes the rest of America. This is true not only in the cultural and political spheres but also in terms of demographic patterns. Such trends as decreased and delayed marriage, increased divorce and remarriage, childless marriage, high geographic mobility, and low institutional religious participation first became evident in California. It is natural to wonder how the sizeable Jewish population of that state fits into the picture. Are California Jews like other Californians—setting the pace for the rest of American Jewry in social-cultural and demographic developments?

According to the most recent estimates, the Jewish population of California numbers over 790,000, qualifying it to be the second-largest Jewish "state" in the country.[1] At present, one out of every seven Jews in the United States lives in California. Given the significant upswing in Jewish migration to the Sunbelt in recent years, that proportion is bound to increase.

The bulk of the Jewish population lives in southern California, primarily in metropolitan Los Angeles. With just over half a million Jews,[2] Los Angeles emerges as the second-largest Jewish community both in the United States and in the world. It is home to the second-largest Israeli population outside of Israel and one of the largest Russian-Jewish communities outside of the Soviet Union. While Jews constitute less than 4 percent of the state's population, they can significantly affect the outcome of statewide (and thus national) elections, and they have high visibility in the media.

Methods

The data selected for the present study come from Field Polls, which have been conducted statewide in California since 1947.[3] Use of the early polls (up to 1958)

Note: This project was aided by a Social and Behavioral Science Dean's Award, California State University Dominguez Hills, and a grant from the American Jewish Committee. Cooperation and help were extended by Mark DiCamillo of the Field Institute and Lynn Anderson of the Computer Center, CSUDH.

[1]AJYB, Vol. 85, 1985, p. 180.

[2]Ibid., p. 183.

[3]To study American Jews, social scientists have turned increasingly to the use of general survey data, such as that provided by the Gallup Poll or the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. General surveys are considered to produce more representative samples than studies directed solely at the Jewish population (which may overcount affiliated, and undercount nonaffiliated, Jews). However, the number of Jews even in a large national sample is too small to be useful. To overcome this difficulty, at least four separate investigators have employed the technique of aggregating responses across several studies in order to create

presents certain problems in that they were conducted infrequently, suffered from small sizes, and used an abbreviated, irregular list of demographic questions, which sometimes omitted religion. In the late 1950s the situation took a positive turn: sampling procedures were improved, the number of questions was increased, and the demographic items became more standardized. Since 1960, polling has been conducted four times a year during nonelection years and six times a year during election years, with minor deviations.

Like most major polls, Field uses primarily random-digit telephoning within geographical clusters (proportionate to telephone and population density), reaching a sample of about 1,150 (California) respondents 18 years of age and older. Recent research has been increasingly accepting of telephone polling, even though it does eliminate people without phones, as well as those who are homeless or in institutions.[4] Many of these individuals belong to the lower socioeconomic classes; in California, many are foreign born, particularly Hispanics. The resultant bias produces a telephone sample that has higher socioeconomic status, with more "Anglos" (including Jews), more American-born, and more citizens than the general population. (In election years, a few polls also screen out people who admit to not being registered to vote.)

The biases, however, are mitigated by several factors. First, census data are available to weight against. Second, the Field organization has incorporated adjustments into the sampling and weighting to ensure the fit of age, sex, and region within California. Last—and in the present context, most importantly—the distortions are much smaller for Jews than for other Californians because Jews have higher incomes, are better educated, and are more likely to be American-born citizens and registered to vote.

The data cited in this article are from 1958 through 1984. Data are either not available or are without religious identification (with up to one exception per year) for the years 1959, 1965–1968, and 1973. The total number of polls is 106, averaging 5 per year for those years in which data are available. The median Jewish subsample is 43, compared with a total median sample of 1,073 per poll. Since demographic change tends to be relatively slow, and the small subsample size is a critical issue, polls are generally aggregated over three-to-four-year periods, with some adjustments made to compensate for uneven subsample sizes and inaccessible polls. The

---

a respectable Jewish sample. These studies are, in chronological order: Bernard Lazerwitz, "A Comparison of Major United States Religious Groups," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Sept. 1961, pp. 568–579; John Shelton Reed, "Needles in Haystacks: Studying Rare Populations by Secondary Analysis of National Sample Surveys," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Winter 1975–76, pp. 514–522; Steven M. Cohen, "The American Jewish Family Today," AJYB, Vol. 82, 1982, pp. 136–154; Alan M. Fisher, "The National Gallup Polls and American Jewish Demography," AJYB, Vol. 83, 1983, pp. 111–126.

[4]Robert M. Groves and Robert L. Kahn, *Surveys by Telephone: A National Comparison with Personal Interviews* (New York, 1979) and James H. Frey, *Survey Research by Phone* (Beverly Hills, 1983).

aggregated Jewish samples of 550–950 yield an approximate error margin of ± 5.4 to ± 2.6 percentage points. (In comparison, the average Field Poll—like most major media polls—has an average error margin of approximately ± 3.3 percentage points.)[5]

Even though the error margin is relatively large for demographic studies—which means that the data can be regarded only as rough indicators—it needs to be stressed that the Field Polls provide a rich source of data on California Jews. The Field sampling methodology is superior to—less biased than—that of almost all Jewish community studies, most of which have also employed telephone interviews.[6] In addition, because the Field data allow for religious identification, it is possible to compare Jews with non-Jewish Californians as two mutually exclusive populations.

The sociodemographic findings covered here fall into four basic categories: place of residence; achieved status (education, income, occupation); marital status and family size; and ascribed status (race, gender, age). The first data section presents various comparisons of California Jews with Jews nationwide (the 1970–1971 National Jewish Population Study and Gallup Poll studies), as well as with New York Jews (the 1981 Greater New York Jewish Population Survey), in order to examine regional differences. The next section compares Jews and non-Jews in California in the early 1980s. A third section looks at trends in California over the last 20 years. Finally, there is a brief summary discussion of the data including projections for the immediate future.

Comparative Jewish Perspectives

Findings from the Field Poll have been specially aggregated for two separate time periods in order to compare them with the 1970–1971 National Jewish Population Study (NJPS) and the 1981 New York study; where appropriate and available, national Gallup Poll data about Jews have also been introduced.[7] Some of the differences among the four studies are attributable to differences in response categories. In Table 1, for example, the lower level of graduate education shown by Field

---

[5]The error margins, based on a significance level of .05, are only approximate, since they depend upon both exact proportions and sampling methods. The standard formula of s.e.$= 1.96\sqrt{p(1-p)/n}$ applies to purely random sampling and is minimized as the distribution moves from 50-50 to 100-0.

[6]For a review of communal studies, see Gary Tobin and Alvin Chenkin, "Recent Jewish Community Population Studies: A Roundup," AJYB, Vol. 85, 1985, pp. 154–178; Sidney Goldstein, "Jews in the United States: Perspectives from Demography," AJYB, Vol. 81, 1981, pp. 3–59; and Sidney Goldstein, "American Jewry, 1970: A Demographic Profile," AJYB, Vol. 72, 1971, pp. 3–88.

[7]NJPS data are from Fred Massarik and Alvin Chenkin, "United States National Jewish Population Study: A First Report," AJYB, Vol. 74, 1973, pp. 264–306; New York data from Paul Ritterband and Steven M. Cohen, "The Social Characteristics of the New York Area Jewish Community, 1981," AJYB, Vol. 84, 1984, pp. 128–163; Gallup data from Fisher, op. cit.

reflects the inclusion of a small number of respondents too young (18-20) to have finished advanced degrees.

ACHIEVED STATUS

In the period 1969–1972, California Jews were not dramatically different from Jews across the country in achievement: a slightly smaller percentage of California Jews had a high-school education or less and a smaller percentage had achieved graduate degrees (Table 1). On the other hand, a larger percentage of California Jews had some college, undoubtedly a reflection of the extensive statewide system of two-year community colleges.

By the early 1980s, California Jews had achieved significantly higher educational levels than Jews across the country (Table 2). Even if the data overstate education, it is clear that relatively few California Jews had less than a high-school degree, and the large majority (81 percent) had at least some college. At the highest level, postgraduate study, the distribution is similar to that of New York Jews.

TABLE 1. EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF JEWS IN CALIFORNIA (1969–1972) AND NATIONAL (1970–1971) POLLS (PERCENT)

Education	California[a]	NJPS[b,c]
Less than high school	16.0	15.9
High-school graduate[d]	24.1	30.6
Some college[d]	31.8	20.4
College graduate	15.3	14.5
M.A. and beyond[e]	12.8	18.6
Total[f]	100.0 (N=752)	100.0 (N=c.7,500)

Sources: California Field Polls; NJPS (recalculated), AJYB, Vol. 74, 1973, p. 278.
[a]Based on respondents 21 and older for 1969–70, and 18 and older for 1970–72.
[b]Based on respondents aged 25 and older.
[c]The category for no response eliminated and the numbers recalculated as a percentage of legitimate responses.
[d]The original NJPS category of "other" (1.6 percent) is divided in two and half (0.8) added here.
[e]The original NJPS category of professional degree (6.4 percent) is included here.
[f]Errors in column total due to rounding.

TABLE 2. EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF JEWS IN CALIFORNIA (1980–1982), NEW YORK (1981), AND NATIONAL (1979) POLLS (PERCENT)

Education	California	New York	Nation
High school graduates and lower	20	30	44
Some college	35	17	
College degree	23	32	56
Graduate degree	23	21	
Total[a]	100 (N=745)	100 (N=c. 4,500)	100 (N=991)

Sources: California Field Polls; Greater New York Jewish Population Study, AJYB, Vol. 84, 1984, p. 156; National Gallup Polls, AJYB, Vol. 83, 1983, p. 123.
[a]Errors in column total due to rounding.

Generally parallel findings occur for another measure of personal achievement, income. One must be careful, however, about aggregating income in the late 1970s and very early 1980s, because of high inflation rates and high unemployment, which made yearly differences greater than those in more stable periods. Other problems in the Field Poll findings are the lack of one standardized set of income categories and a change in minimum respondent age.

In 1970 the income of California Jews was only moderately larger than that of all American Jews in the Gallup data, and almost equal to that shown in the NJPS figures. By the early 1980s the Jews of California were remarkably similar in income to the Jews of New York and, according to Gallup data, were far ahead of Jews nationwide (Table 3). While individual community studies show Los Angeles Jews as not differing much from Jews in other large communities,[8] the Gallup data may well be the more accurate because not just Jews, but California and New York non-Hispanic whites overall, made more money than other Americans.

Differences in the incidence of poverty among New York and California Jews and those elsewhere in the country, as shown in Table 3, may be overstated, due both to the bias of telephone polling and variance in the cost of living. At the upper levels, however, the geographical differences likely reflect not only sampling differences and higher cost of living in the Los Angeles and New York areas but the greater job opportunities and related higher educational and occupational levels of Jews in those cities.

Comparable results obtain for occupation. California Jews in 1970 had higher occupational status—a greater percentage of professionals and a smaller percentage

[8]Tobin and Chenkin, op. cit., p. 169.

TABLE 3. HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF JEWS IN CALIFORNIA (1980–1982), NEW YORK (1981), AND NATIONAL (1979) POLLS (PERCENT)

Income	California	New York	Nation
Less than $10,000	12	11	25
$10,000–19,999	17	16	25
$20,000–29,999	19	20	49
$30,000+	52	53	
Total[a]	100 (N=664)	100 (N=c. 4,500)	100 (N=991)

Sources: California Field Polls; Greater New York Jewish Population Study, AJYB, Vol. 84, 1984, p. 158; National Gallup Polls, AJYB, Vol. 83, 1983, p. 125.
[a]Errors in column total due to rounding.

of salespeople/clerks—than did Jews in both the NJPS and Gallup studies, and the differences increased a little in the early 1980s.

MARITAL STATUS AND FAMILY SIZE

While the proportion of married California Jews in the early 1970s closely matched that of Jews in the national Gallup data, Jews in the NJPS were significantly more likely (79:68) to be married (Table 4).

Some of the difference undoubtedly results from the sampling strategy of the NJPS, which, by starting with known Jewish families, found an inflated proportion of marrieds. Much of the difference in marital rates is real, however, reflecting the fact that Californians were less likely than other Americans to be married at the time and more likely never to have married. (Examination of the combined categories of divorced/separated and widowed reveals no important differences.) A comparison of marital status among California and other Jews in 1981, using both the NJPS and New York data as standards, shows the differences persisting: a smaller percentage of California Jews were married and a larger percentage had never married.

Since California Jews were less likely to marry, they were more likely to live alone or with friends. Comparison of average family or household size across studies is made difficult by a lack of identical questions, the use of different categories, and the availability of only partially published data. However, taking all the difficulties into account, a comparison of figures indicates that household size for California Jewish families has been consistently smaller—smaller than for Jewish families nationwide in 1970 (NJPS); and smaller than for New York families in 1981, if the adjusted figure (2.78) based on similar categories is employed (Table 5).

TABLE 4. MARITAL STATUS OF JEWS IN CALIFORNIA (1970–1972) AND NATIONAL (1970–1973) POLLS (PERCENT)

Marital Status	California[a]	NJPS (1970–71)[b]	Nation (1973)[c]
Never married	16.7	6.2	19.9
Married	67.8	78.6	67.6
Separated/ divorced	0.7 4.2	5.1	0.3 12.2
Widowed	10.7	10.0	
Total[d]	100.0 (N=600)	100.0 (N=c. 7,500)	100.0 (N=571)

Sources: California Field Polls; NJPS (recalculated), AJYB, Vol. 74, 1973, p. 275; National Gallup Polls, AJYB, Vol. 83, 1983, p. 114.
[a]Based on respondents 18 and older (N=489) and 21 and older (N=111).
[b]Based on head of household. The category for "no response" (0.4 percent) eliminated and the figures recalculated as a percentage of legitimate responses.
[c]Based on respondents 18 and older.
[d]Errors in column total due to rounding.

TABLE 5. MEAN HOUSEHOLD SIZE OF NEW YORK JEWS (1981), CALIFORNIA JEWS, AND CALIFORNIA NON-JEWS (1980–1982)

Household Size	California Jews[a,b]	California Non-Jews[b]	New York Jews[c]	New York Jews[a]
	2.54 (N=648)	2.87 (N=15,662)	2.49 (N=c. 4,500)	2.78 (N=c. 4,500)

Sources: California Field Polls; Greater New York Jewish Population Study, AJYB, Vol. 84, 1984, p. 141.
[a]Both Jewish and non-Jewish household members counted for Jewish respondents. Calculation for New York estimated by 0.66K(J), where K is the proportion of households (including non-Jews/Jews only) found in the Washington, D.C. community study (2.7/2.3) and J is the mean size for New York households with only Jews.
[b]Families with more than 6 members counted as having 7.77 members.
[c]Only Jewish household members counted.

Confirmation of the California figure can be found in the 1979 community study of Los Angeles.[9]

ASCRIBED STATUS

Neither the NJPS nor the New York study provides information about race or Hispanic subethnicity. The Gallup Poll, which does include such information, shows a very low (about 0.5 percent) but consistent figure for nonwhite (primarily black) Jews, and this matches the Field Polls.

Gender produces fewer surprises. Because it is relatively easy to control for in sampling and weighting, the male-female ratio regularly hovers around 49–51 percent in all the major surveys.

Since the Field Polls provide no systematic accounting for people under 18 (under 21 before 1970), age distribution is shown for adults only (Table 6). Comparison with the NJPS is complicated by the use of different respondent categories, but in 1970 all three studies of Jews (NJPS, Gallup, and Field) showed a notably similar age distribution. By the 1980s, however, the relative age distribution had changed noticeably. A picture compiled from the Gallup Polls, New York data, and other recent community studies—as well as projections from earlier ones—shows that California (adult) Jews were younger: a larger percentage were under age 30 and a smaller percentage were over age 65. (This difference can be seen, also, in a comparison of the Los Angeles and other community studies.)[10] While Table 6

TABLE 6. AGES OF JEWS IN CALIFORNIA (1980–1982), NEW YORK (1981), AND NATIONAL (1979) POLLS (PERCENT)

Age	California	New York	Nation
18–29	27	24	22
30–49	39	31	34
Over 50	35	45	43
Total[a]	100 (N=743)	100 (N=c. 4,500)	100 (N=991)

Sources: California Field Polls; Greater New York Jewish Population Study, AJYB, Vol. 84, 1984, p. 149; National Gallup Polls, AJYB, Vol. 83, 1983, p. 120.
[a]Errors in column total due to rounding.

[9]Bruce A. Phillips, *Los Angeles Jewish Community Survey: Overview for Regional Planning* (Planning and Budgeting Department, Jewish Federation Council of Greater Los Angeles, Los Angeles, 1980).

[10]See Tobin and Chenkin, op.cit., and Goldstein, op. cit. (1971 and 1981), as well as individual community studies, especially that of Los Angeles—Phillips, op. cit., p. 7.

probably magnifies the differences at the extremes by 1 or 2 percentage points—because of the particular years selected—the differences are still significant. The explanation is probably related to migration dynamics, i.e., a relatively high movement of young people to California in the 1970s and 1980s.

Contemporary California: Jews and Non-Jews

PLACE OF RESIDENCE

Within California, the geographical distribution of Jews is heavily weighted toward two regions, Los Angeles–Orange counties and the San Francisco–Bay Area (Table 7). These two areas contain more than eight out of ten Jews in the state, six of whom live in the greater Los Angeles area.

The AJYB allocations for city and metropolitan areas, as shown in Table 7, have been redistributed according to the Field configuration. Because the Field Poll is broken down into so many (10) categories, each one contains a smaller number of people, thus increasing the margin of error. (In order to increase the sample size, this is the only table which includes data from 1985.) At the same time, for the AJYB there are questions about two subareas in the Los Angeles basin which may have been double counted.[11]

While both sources find overwhelming concentrations of Jews in Los Angeles–Orange counties and the San Francisco–Bay area, there are noticeable differences. The Field data report Jews slightly more dispersed, with more Jews in San Francisco and fewer in Los Angeles than in the AJYB estimates. The difference probably reflects both migration dynamics and sampling bias. Jews who move to largely non-Jewish areas tend to be more marginal than those moving to Jewishly identified regions, e.g., Los Angeles. Whereas the methods employed in community studies —organizational membership lists, personal references, and Jewish name indexes—make it easier to sample publicly identified and affiliated Jews in Jewish areas, the less stratified random-dialing techniques of the Field Poll are as likely to reach a Jew in a mountain cabin as one in the middle of the Fairfax ghetto—provided that each has one telephone number and neither denies being Jewish.

The AJYB updated several of its population counts in the mid-1980s, bringing them closer to the Field data than they had been in 1981. Based on a number of factors—too many to be analyzed here—it appears that the AJYB figures are more accurate, especially for Los Angeles–Orange counties. They are not exact, however, and where the Field data differ, correction needs to be made in the direction of the latter.

---

[11]For a comprehensive overview, see Jack Diamond, "A Reader in the Demography of American Jews," AJYB, Vol. 77, 1977, pp. 251–319.

TABLE 7. GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF CALIFORNIA JEWS AND NON-JEWS (1980–1985) (PERCENT)

Region[a]	Jews, 1980–85 (Field)	Jews, 1984 (AJYB)	Non-Jews, 1980–85 (Field)	State Population, 1980 (Census)
Oregon Border	0.2	0.0	0.7	1.0
Sacramento Valley	2.0	0.9	5.3	5.1
Northern Sierras	0.6	0.0	1.6	2.3
San Francisco–Bay Area	22.5	17.1	25.4	21.9
Monterey–Coast	1.3	0.4	3.1	2.8
San Joaquin Valley	1.1	0.6	7.0	8.7
Santa Barbara–Ventura	3.7	1.3	4.5	3.5
Los Angeles–Orange[b]	59.5	74.2	38.1	39.8
San Diego	6.1	4.3	8.1	7.9
Riverside–San Bernadino–Desert[b]	3.0	1.3	6.3	7.0
Total[c]	100.0 (N=1,220)	100.0	100.0 (N=31,923)	100.0

Sources: California Field Polls; AJYB, Vol. 85, 1985, p. 170; U. S. Census, *California: General Population Characteristics,* Part 6, pp. 17–18.

[a]Composition of the counties as spelled out in "California Field Poll Codebook," April 1984, p. 90.

[b]AJYB figure for the Pomona Valley (3,500) is divided into Los Angeles–Orange (2,900) and San Bernadino (600).

[c]Errors in column total due to rounding.

As the distribution makes clear, Jews were not scattered randomly throughout the state; nor did they live in rural regions. California Jews lived primarily in urban areas with sizeable Jewish populations.

On the related item of housing—not shown in the tables—the Field Polls indicate that California Jews were nearly as likely as non-Jews (61:63) to own their own homes. In the past, the gap had been larger—close to 8 percentage points.

ACHIEVED STATUS

In matters pertaining to personal achievement, the differences are consistently sharp, although the exact figures are distorted by the sampling procedure. In the early 1980s, only one out of five California Jews had no college experience, compared with one out of three non-Jews (Table 8). Jews were also significantly more likely than others to have extended their education beyond the four-year baccalaureate.

The high educational attainment of Jews makes it likely that they will be well represented among professionals and will enjoy relatively high income. This is borne

TABLE 8. EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF CALIFORNIA JEWS AND NON-JEWS (1981–1984) (PERCENT)

Education	Jews	Non-Jews
5th grade or less	0.8	2.4
Some high school	1.8	7.0
High-school graduate	16.1	24.5
Trade school	1.7	2.6
Some college	31.6	36.6
4-year-college graduate	17.4	12.8
Some graduate school	5.9	4.3
M.A.	12.7	5.7
More than M.A.	12.2	4.0
(More than B.A.)	(30.8)	(14.0)
Total[a]	100.0 (N=901)	100.0 (N=22,433)

Source: California Field Polls.
[a]Errors in column total due to rounding.

out, in fact, by the data (Table 9). By the early 1980s, about three-fifths of employed Jewish household heads worked primarily as professionals (44 percent) or as managers (17 percent). Combining all levels of labor and service jobs yields only about 12 percent of employed Jews (compared with 34 percent of non-Jews). Slightly more than one-third of employed Jewish household heads worked for themselves, double the figure for non-Jews (Table 10).

TABLE 9. OCCUPATIONS OF WORKING CALIFORNIA JEWS AND NON-JEWS (1981–1984) (PERCENT)

Occupation[a]	Jews	Non-Jews
Professional	44.1	29.5
Managerial	16.7	17.3
Clerical	7.6	10.4
Sales	19.2	9.3
Skilled labor	6.4	15.9
Semi-skilled labor	1.7	7.4
Service	2.7	7.3
Farm and unskilled labor	1.5	2.9
Total[b]	100.0 (N=657)	100.0 (N=15,795)

Source: California Field Polls.
[a]Based only on chief wage earner.
[b]Errors in column total due to rounding.

TABLE 10. SELF-EMPLOYMENT OF WORKING CALIFORNIA JEWS AND NON-JEWS (1981–1984) (PERCENT)

Employment Status[a]	Jews	Non-Jews
Self-employed	36.4	19.7
Work for other	63.6	80.3
Total	100.0 (N=662)	100.0 (N=15,915)

Source: California Field Polls.
[a]Based on chief wage earner.

In line with Jewish educational and occupational attainment, Jewish family income was significantly higher than that of other Californians (Table 11). The superior earning power of Jews was not a function of the presence of more wage earners per family. In the early 1980s a direct question on the number of wage earners produced the following results: Jewish households were slightly more likely than non-Jewish households to have one and particularly two breadwinners, but were less likely to have more than two—reflecting smaller Jewish household size. (See Table 18.)

Although there are no direct data on the subject of working women, related data indirectly suggest that Jewish women were more likely than non-Jewish women to be employed. Jewish households were smaller, and fewer of them consisted of married couples—yet more Jewish households had two working adults. This is most likely explained by a large proportion of working women, an inference that is further reinforced by the considerably higher educational levels of Jewish women compared with non-Jewish women.[12]

At the lower end of the income scale, relative differences between Jews and non-Jews were smaller than in the highest income category. About 10 percent of California Jewish households reported an income of $10,000 or less, compared with 14 percent of other Californians. However, since poor, foreign-language-speaking, and institutionalized individuals are all underrepresented in telephone surveys, the figures for both Jews and non-Jews should probably be increased by at least 3–4 percentage points.

TABLE 11. HOUSEHOLD INCOME OF CALIFORNIA JEWS AND NON-JEWS (1981–1984) (PERCENT)

Income	Jews	Non-Jews
Less than $7,000	5.3	6.6
$7,000–$9,999	4.9	7.8
$10,000–$14,999	5.7	9.7
$15,000–$19,999	8.6	13.3
$20,000–$29,999	20.8	23.8
More than $30,000	54.6	38.8
Total[a]	100.0 (N=853)	100.0 (N=21,383)

Source: California Field Polls.
[a]Errors in column total due to rounding.

[12]Alan M. Fisher and Curtis K. Tanaka, "Jewish Demography in California: The Use of Aggregated Survey Data," in *Papers in Jewish Demography 1985* (Jerusalem, forthcoming).

MARITAL STATUS AND FAMILY SIZE

Differences in marital status between Jews and non-Jews were small, although significant and in the same direction found in the Gallup studies: Jews were more likely never to have been married and slightly less likely to be currently married (Table 12). Since California Jews were not younger than other Californians, these differences cannot be attributed to age.

Rates for divorce, separation, and widowhood are similar. One-seventh of California adults were separated or divorced. (Since people who had been divorced and were currently married counted as married, the figures for "divorced" and "separated" are only partial indicators of the total incidence of divorce.)

The notion of widespread singledom in California has some basis in fact. Indeed, there were higher proportions of one-person households and single-parent families in California than in the rest of the nation. Still, among all Californians, married adults significantly outnumbered the unmarried. Among Jews, although a smaller percentage were married or had ever been married, the majority were in fact married.

In the early 1980s, about one-fifth of Jewish households consisted of only one person, variously defined as divorced, separated, widowed, but primarily never-married (Table 13). The addition of single parents raises the number of one-adult households to one-quarter of all Jewish households. (This figure is not shown in the table, in which "two persons" may be a parent and child or two adults.) Furthermore, almost six out of ten California Jewish households consisted of no more than one or two people—primarily couples (married and unmarried), but also single

TABLE 12. MARITAL STATUS OF ADULT CALIFORNIA JEWS AND NON-JEWS (1983–1984) (PERCENT)

Marital Status[a]	Jews	Non-Jews
Never married	25.4	21.1
Married	54.6	57.7
Separated/ divorced	14.0	13.8
Widowed	6.1	7.4
Total[b]	100.0 (N=394)	100.0 (N=9,876)

Source: California Field Polls.
[a]Based on respondents 18 and older.
[b]Errors in column total due to rounding.

TABLE 13. HOUSEHOLD SIZE OF CALIFORNIA JEWS AND NON-JEWS (1981–1984) (PERCENT)

Number of Persons per Household	Jews	Non-Jews
1	21.4	18.0
2	38.3	33.2
3	18.0	18.7
4	13.2	17.2
5	6.2	7.8
6	1.7	3.0
7 or more	1.1	2.1
Total[a]	100.0 (N=809)	100.0 (N=19,763)

Source: California Field Polls.
[a]Errors in column total due to rounding.

parents with one child and unrelated roommates. Not only were Jewish households significantly smaller overall than those of non-Jews, but the sampling bias against the poor and the foreign-born suggests that the real differences were even greater than they appear.

Married couples with at least one child at home—the traditional family—constituted a distinct minority, both among Jews and other Californians, and represented a smaller percentage than in the past. Although there is no single measure of the total number of children living at home, a partial picture can be obtained by looking at numbers of children in three age groupings: 0–5, 6–12, 13–17 (Table 14). For each age category, more than four-fifths of all California households (including Jews) showed no children at all. (An indirect measure of the declining Jewish birthrate is the fact that a slightly smaller percentage had very young children at home than had children aged 6–12, and a smaller percentage had 6–12-year-olds than had teenagers.) For all three age groups, Jews were more likely than non-Jews to have no children at home, and for those who did have children, Jews were more likely than others to have only one.

ASCRIBED STATUS

In matters of ascribed status, the Field findings are weighted for one measure (gender), are completely one-sided for a second (race), and are expected for the third (age).

TABLE 14. NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CALIFORNIA JEWISH AND NON-JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS, BY AGES OF CHILDREN (1981–1984) (PERCENT)

Number of Children	Children's Ages, Jewish Households		
	0–5	6–12	13–17
0	90.4	88.0	84.5
1	8.4	8.3	11.4
2	1.2	3.5	3.5
3	0.0	.2	.5
4	0.0	0.0	0.0
5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total[a]	100.0 (N=809)	100.0 (N=809)	100.0 (N=809)
Number of Children	Children's Ages, Non-Jewish Households		
	0–5	6–12	13–17
0	83.5	81.6	82.5
1	11.3	12.1	11.9
2	4.4	5.2	4.4
3	.7	.9	1.0
4	.1	.2	.2
5	0.0	.1	0.0
Total[a]	100.0 (N=19,714)	100.0 (N=19,683)	100.0 (N=19,614)

Source: California Field Polls.
[a]Errors in column total due to rounding.

The distribution of gender within the Jewish community is not apparently much different from the rest of the population, but this is one of the only variables for which the sampling-error margin precludes any confidence in the findings.

As is commonly known, almost all Jews are white—almost 98 percent, according to the polls of the early 1980s. Among California Jews, 0.4 percent were Asian, 0.6 percent black, and 1.2 percent "other." Since Eskimos and Native Americans are not plentiful in the Jewish community, "other" probably signifies primarily the offspring of interracial marriages. It is noteworthy that both the Field and Gallup Polls have found small but consistent traces of nonwhite Jews. Since California is one of the most racially heterogeneous states in the country, it is not surprising that the figures are higher there.

A separate question turns up a small proportion (3.4 percent) of California Jews who claim Latin descent, a larger number than in the past. This probably reflects the increased antisemitism and economic instability in some Latin American countries, leading to emigration.

For age, the California findings of the early 1980s duplicate the general pattern found across the country, but with more moderate differences: a smaller percentage of young (adult) Jews and a larger percentage of older ones than in the population at large (Table 15). In the middle of the age spectrum, differences are minimal. (See also Table 19.) This is explainable by the declining size of Jewish families, i.e., more people who have never married and fewer children for married couples, hence a smaller proportion of young people. This is partly balanced by an immigration weighted toward younger people.

TABLE 15. AGES OF ADULT CALIFORNIA JEWS AND NON-JEWS (1981–1984) (PERCENT)

Age[a]	Jews	Non-Jews
18–20	5.1	5.7
21–29	20.1	21.6
30–39	21.6	23.6
40–49	15.4	15.2
50–59	14.7	13.8
60–69	13.5	12.4
70+	9.4	7.8
(60+)	(22.9)	(20.2)
Total[b]	100.0	100.0
	(N=901)	(N=22,349)

Source: California Field Polls.
[a]Based only on population 18 and older.
[b]Errors in column total due to rounding.

Change Over Two Decades

ACHIEVED STATUS

How have California Jews and other Californians changed over the last quarter of a century? The most dramatic change has been in educational attainment. The proportion of California Jewish adults who were college graduates or higher doubled —from 24 percent in the 1958–1961 period to 48 percent in the early 1980s (Table 16). The percentage having at least some college experience rose from 49 to 79 in

TABLE 16. EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF CALIFORNIA JEWS (1958–1984) (PERCENT)

Education	1958–61	1962–64	1968–72	1974–77	1978–80[a]	1981–84[a]
Less than 8th grade	13.9	8.0	7.6	3.1	1.3	0.8
Some high school	11.5	6.6	8.2	5.6	2.5	1.8
High-school graduate	25.8	26.6	23.5	23.1	17.0	17.8
Some college	25.0	22.8	33.6	26.4	33.9	31.0
College graduate	15.3	23.2	13.7	23.1	16.9	17.4
Post-graduate work	8.3	12.8	13.4	18.8	28.5	30.7
Total[b]	100.0 (N=503)	100.0 (N=561)	100.0 (N=801)	100.0 (N=576)	100.0 (N=629)	100.0 (N=901)

Source: California Field Polls.
[a]Trade school included as high-school graduate.
[b]Errors in column total due to rounding.

the same time span. By 1982 the proportion of Jews going on to graduate school was greater than the proportion that had finished college 20 years earlier.

The proportion of non-Jewish adults in California with at least some college rose from 38 to 63 percent—almost proportional to the Jewish increase—and the proportion of college graduates increased from 15 to 27 percent.

Changes in occupation and income follow those in education. The proportion of Jews working as professionals rose from 25 percent (1958–1961) to 44 percent (1981–1984), with some leveling off between the late 1970s and the early 1980s. The most significant decreases were for managers and clerical workers, attributable largely to increasing education and a focus on the professions. There were few physical laborers in the early 1960s, and even fewer in the early 1980s. (See Table 9.)

For non-Jewish Californians, the pattern of change closely parallels that of Jews, including a rise in the proportion of professionals. For many years the proportion of non-Jews who were professionals was between 60 and 67 percent of the comparable figure for Jews. The fact that this proportion was higher in the 1980s than in the 1960s suggests a possible trend toward less differentiation.

The proportions of Jews working for others and those working for themselves remained generally stable. The proportion of self-employed individuals was about 37 percent from the early 1960s on. Among non-Jewish Californians, there was a

slight increase in the percentage of self-employed from the early 1970s to the early 1980s, but the figure (15–20 percent) always remained lower than that for Jews.

A noteworthy change that occurred among Jews between 1972 and 1982 was in the number of wage earners (Table 17). The proportion of households without any wage earner declined (from 23 to 16 percent), as did the proportion of households with only one wage earner (from 49 to 43 percent). There was a complementary increase in the number of households with two or more working people, from 28 to 42 percent. The wage-earner trend for other Californians was similar, though the percentage of non-Jewish families with no working member remained the same over the years.

The increasing number of working couples—combined with higher educational levels and a rise in vocational status—led to much higher levels of income. Although part of this increase obviously reflected inflation, real income rose strikingly. Whereas in the late 1960s about two-fifths of Jews had a family income of over $15,000, by the early 1980s more than one-half earned above $30,000.

A comparative study of income produces mixed findings. From 1969 to 1984 the proportion of Jews in the highest income category (which increases to $40,000 in 1981) was about double the proportion of other Californians, although there was a slight decline over time. Keeping the top category at $30,000 (see Table 11), however, the relative proportion decreases considerably, from 204 to 144 (with 100 as parity). At the lowest income levels the figures are much closer. According to Table 11, for example, the relative proportion of Jews making less than $7,000 per year was almost equal (0.80) to the comparable figure for non-Jews. The persistence over time of a poor Jewish element is linked to the relatively high (and growing) percentage of elderly within the community (though this percentage was lower in California for both Jews and non-Jews than elsewhere).

TABLE 17. NUMBER OF WAGE EARNERS IN CALIFORNIA JEWISH HOUSEHOLDS (1971–1984) (PERCENT)

Number of Wage Earners	1971–72	1974–77	1978–81	1982–84
0	22.8	18.8	14.2	15.8
1	49.0	54.4	49.1	42.6
2	25.1	24.4	32.2	34.5
3	3.1	2.4	4.6	7.1
Total[a]	100.0 (N=382)	100.0 (N=463)	100.0 (N=696)	100.0 (N=707)

Source: California Field Polls.

[a]Errors in column total due to rounding.

MARITAL STATUS AND FAMILY SIZE

The picture with regard to marital status is somewhat blurred; in the past the question appeared irregularly in the Field Poll, and the statewide findings for 1970 differ from the census by 5 percentage points. By contrast, in the 1980s the figures corresponded more closely.

Jews match and even slightly surpass other Californians in the percentage increase in those never-married as well as in the percentage decrease in those currently married. (Dramatic changes in Jewish marital rates can be seen by comparing Tables 4 and 12.) Rates for widows remain about the same, whereas those for the separated and divorced increase.

Changes in household or family size are harder to detect than changes in marital status because the ranges are narrow. Californians in general start at a low level, and the 1970 findings are biased by use of a minimum age of 21 rather than 18. Nevertheless, there was a small but noticeable diminution in the number of people living at home with family. In the 1969–1972 period, 35 percent of Jewish households had at least four family members, whereas ten years later the figure was 23 percent (Table 18). During the same period, the proportion of single-person families increased gradually from 17 to 21 percent. The modal two-person household climbed from 33 percent in 1969–1972 to a relatively stable 38 percent from 1975 onward.

The proportion of Jewish households with any child younger than six dropped from 13.2 percent in 1970–1972 to 9.6 percent in 1981–1984, while the proportion of those with more than one young child dropped from 4.9 to 1.2 percent. Jewish

TABLE 18. HOUSEHOLD SIZE OF CALIFORNIA JEWS (1969–1984) (PERCENT)

Number of Persons per Household	1969–72	1974–77	1978–80	1981–84
1	16.6	19.0	22.4	21.4
2	32.7	36.9	41.0	38.3
3	15.7	14.9	14.2	18.0
4	20.7	18.4	14.8	13.2
5	10.5	6.3	4.8	6.2
6	2.8	3.0	2.0	1.7
7	0.9	1.5	0.8	1.1
Total[a]	100.0 (N=667)	100.0 (N=463)	100.0 (N=393)	100.0 (N=809)

Source: California Field Polls.
[a]Errors in column total due to rounding.

families were not the only ones becoming smaller, however. Similar patterns obtain for California in general.

ASCRIBED STATUS

For the state as a whole—Jews excepted—dramatic changes in racial composition were brought about by the immigration of large groups of Koreans, Hong-Kong Chinese, and Vietnamese. The proportion of whites (including Latinos) in the Field statewide sample dropped from 95 percent in 1960 to 88 percent in the early 1980s, while for Jews it remained almost exactly the same—99 to 98 percent. There was no noticeable change with regard to gender for either group.

Changes in age distribution reflect the singular dynamics of California's population. According to census data for the United States as a whole, the proportion of adults (18+) aged 65 and over jumped from 13.7 to 16.0 percent between 1960 and 1984. In California, however, the increase was from 13.6 to 14.0 percent—one-sixth of the increase for the country as a whole.

The Field findings resemble census figures in that age is weighted against them and the error margin is narrowed. In order to facilitate observation over time, the initial (Field) age divisions have been kept, with 21 as the minimum and senior status set at age 60 and above. Fluctuations—which arise even in the three-year time periods—have been moderated by combining two such periods. Because the findings in the available polls from 1969 through 1976 present a disconcerting interruption in the flow from the earlier period to the mid-1980s, we treat the middle period as containing some minor sampling aberrations, although there are some consistent developments as well. The most striking change in age distribution is the increase in the percentage of people in their 20s (Table 19). Also noteworthy is the relatively modest increase in adults (21+) aged 60 and above—for Jews from 20.9 to 22.2 percent and for non-Jews from 19.9 to 20.9 percent. Like other Californians, Jews, as a group, have not appreciably aged. This is due primarily to migration of mostly younger people, from other parts of the United States and from overseas (including Israel, the Soviet Union, and Iran).

Future Trends

California is a trendsetter, a place where change starts and then spreads. While this has been less true in Jewish life, where New York City is still the pivot, the signs of change are there: New York is losing Jewish population, while California is gaining; New York Jews are becoming older and many of them poorer, while California Jews, on the whole, are maintaining their relative youthfulness and becoming wealthier.

For several of the demographic characteristics examined in this article, California Jews are more like other Jews than other Californians. They are more likely to live in cosmopolitan areas; are more highly educated, of higher vocational status, have

TABLE 19. AGES OF CALIFORNIA JEWS AND NON-JEWS (1958–1984) (PERCENT)

Age	Jews 1958–64	Jews 1969–76[a]	Jews 1977–84
21–29	16.5	19.9	22.4
30–39	24.6	17.5	25.2
40–49	22.1	19.2	15.4
50–59	15.9	18.0	14.7
60+	20.9	25.3	22.2
Total[b]	100.0 (N=1,314)	100.0 (N=1,628)	100.0 (N=1,477)
Age	**Non-Jews 1958–64**	**Non-Jews 1968–76[a]**	**Non-Jews 1977–84**
21–29	17.1	22.4	23.5
30–39	24.9	21.3	24.4
40–49	22.0	19.2	16.2
50–59	16.1	16.5	14.9
60+	19.9	20.7	20.9
Total[b]	100.0 (N=26,551)	100.0 (N=40,463)	100.0 (N=36,208)

Source: California Field Polls.
[a]Data for 1973 are missing.
[b]Errors in column totals due to rounding.

higher incomes, and are more likely to be self-employed; they are also more likely to be single or to have smaller families. Since these traits also characterize the Jews who are currently moving to California, they are likely to persist in the near future.

But the Jews do not live in a vacuum; demographically, they have not escaped the currents of California life. There is no single demographic trait for which Jews have moved in a direction different from other Californians. Thus, increasing educational levels result not only from an influx of educated migrants but also from a higher educational system that is open to all Californians. The same factors that have created stress for non-Jewish marriages have led to fewer successful Jewish marriages. Even in racial composition Jews have not been insulated from societal change, acquiring a small but growing number of black and Asian Jews, or some mixture thereof, as well as Hispanic Jews.

The future is likely to bring more of the same for both Jews and non-Jews in California. Immigration of Anglos, which had slowed in the late 1970s, will continue, especially for Jews, centering upon the young and upwardly mobile, but also including some of the elderly. Jews will continue to succeed in socioeconomic terms, being disproportionately represented among the most highly educated and economically comfortable segments of California society.

It may perhaps be that California has passed the peak of a demographic upheaval like that which occurred on the East Coast in the 30 years prior to 1920. When the process is finished, the California Jewish community will be more numerous and powerful than ever before. After that, the numbers will depend primarily on rates of birth and assimilation, and prosperity will continue to be tied to education and the general economic condition of the state.

ALAN M. FISHER
and
CURTIS K. TANAKA

Jewish Population in the United States, 1985

THE JEWISH POPULATION in the United States in 1985 is estimated to be 5.835 million. This figure is approximately the same as that reported for 1984, and reflects the absence of demographic factors making for population increase.

The basic population units are the fund-raising areas of local Jewish federations, which may represent one county or an aggregate of several counties. In Table 3, those communities shown with two asterisks have indicated changes in their Jewish populations in 1985; those with a single asterisk have submitted current estimates, but have indicated no changes in numbers. While less than a quarter of all communities have supplied population estimates for 1985, the total population of the responding communities accounts for more than 90 percent of the estimated total population of Jews in the United States in 1985.

The state and regional totals shown in Table 1 and Table 2 are derived by summing individual community estimates, shown in Table 3, and then making three adjustments. First, communities of less than 100 are added. Second, duplications within states are eliminated. Third, communities falling within two or more states (e.g., Washington, D.C., and Kansas City, Missouri) are distributed accordingly.

In almost every instance, local estimates refer to "Jewish households," i.e., households in which one or more Jews reside. As a consequence, non-Jews are included in the count, their percentage of the total being estimated (based on the 1970 National Jewish Population Study and a number of current studies) as between 6 and 7 percent. Assuming this proportion, the number of individuals in "Jewish households" who identify themselves as Jewish in 1985 would be approximately 5.425 million.

Based on recent studies, three communities reported significant changes from their 1984 estimates. Atlanta and Phoenix showed increases: Atlanta from 33,500 to 50,000; Phoenix from 35,000 to 50,000. Philadelphia lowered its estimate from 295,000 to 240,000. These changes, which are reflected in the state and regional totals, are part of the continuing trend toward geographical redistribution that has been evident over the past decade. The Jewish population in the Northeast is decreasing as a proportion of the total Jewish population, while the South's and the West's proportions are increasing.

ALVIN CHENKIN

APPENDIX

TABLE 1. JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1985

State	Estimated Jewish Population	Total Population*	Estimated Jewish Percent of Total
Alabama	9,400	3,990,000	0.2
Alaska	960	500,000	0.2
Arizona	68,285	3,053,000	2.2
Arkansas	2,975	2,349,000	0.1
California	793,065	25,622,000	3.1
Colorado	48,565	3,178,000	1.5
Connecticut	105,400	3,154,000	3.3
Delaware	9,500	613,000	1.6
District of Columbia	24,285	622,823	3.9
Florida	570,320	10,976,000	5.2
Georgia	58,570	5,837,000	1.0
Hawaii	5,550	1,039,000	0.5
Idaho	505	1,001,000	0.1
Illinois	262,710	11,511,000	2.3
Indiana	21,335	5,498,000	0.4
Iowa	5,570	2,910,000	0.2
Kansas	11,430	2,438,000	0.5
Kentucky	12,775	3,723,000	0.3
Louisiana	17,405	4,462,000	0.4
Maine	9,350	1,156,000	0.8
Maryland	199,415	4,439,000	4.5
Massachusetts	249,370	5,798,000	4.3
Michigan	86,125	9,075,000	0.9
Minnesota	32,240	4,162,000	0.8
Mississippi	3,130	2,598,000	0.1
Missouri	64,690	5,008,000	1.3
Montana	645	824,000	0.1
Nebraska	7,865	1,606,000	0.5
Nevada	18,200	911,000	2.0
New Hampshire	5,980	977,000	0.6
New Jersey	430,570	7,515,000	5.7
New Mexico	5,155	1,424,000	0.4
New York	1,915,145	17,735,000	10.8

State	Estimated Jewish Population	Total Population*	Estimated Jewish Percent of Total
North Carolina	14,990	6,165,000	0.2
North Dakota	1,085	686,000	0.2
Ohio	138,935	10,752,000	1.3
Oklahoma	6,885	3,298,000	0.2
Oregon	11,050	2,674,000	0.4
Pennsylvania	353,045	11,901,000	3.0
Rhode Island	22,000	962,000	2.3
South Carolina	8,095	3,300,000	0.2
South Dakota	635	706,000	0.1
Tennessee	19,445	4,717,000	0.4
Texas	78,655	15,989,000	0.5
Utah	2,850	1,652,000	0.2
Vermont	2,465	530,000	0.5
Virginia	60,185	5,636,000	1.1
Washington	22,085	4,149,000	0.5
West Virginia	4,265	1,952,000	0.2
Wisconsin	31,190	4,766,000	0.7
Wyoming	310	511,000	0.1
U.S. TOTAL	**5,834,655	236,031,000	2.5

N.B. Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

*Resident population, July 1, 1984, provisional. (Source: *Provisional Estimates of the Population of Counties: July 1984,* Bureau of the Census, series P-26, No. 84-52-C, March 1985.)

**Exclusive of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, which previously reported Jewish populations of 1,800 and 510, respectively.

TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF U.S. JEWISH POPULATION BY REGIONS, 1985

Region	*Total Population*	*Percent Distribution*	*Jewish Population*	*Percent Distribution*
Northeast:	49,728,000	21.1	3,093,330	53.0
New England	12,577,000	5.3	394,555	6.8
Middle Atlantic	37,151,000	15.7	2,698,760	46.3
North Central:	59,118,000	25.0	663,810	11.4
East North Central ..	41,602,000	17.6	540,300	9.3
West North Central..	17,516,000	7.4	123,515	2.1
South:	80,667,000	34.2	1,100,295	18.9
South Atlantic	39,541,000	16.8	949,625	16.3
East South Central...	15,028,000	6.4	44,750	0.8
West South Central ..	26,098,000	11.1	105,915	1.8
West:	46,538,000	19.7	977,220	16.8
Mountain.....	12,554,000	5.3	144,515	2.5
Pacific	33,984,000	14.4	832,710	14.3
TOTALS.....	236,031,000	100.0	5,834,655	100.0

N.B. Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

TABLE 3. COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE, 1985 (ESTIMATED)

State and City	Jewish Population
ALABAMA	
Anniston	100
*Birmingham	4,500
Dothan	205
Gadsden	180
Huntsville	550
*Mobile	1,250
**Montgomery	1,650
Selma	210
Tri-Cities[a]	150
Tuscaloosa	315
ALASKA	
Anchorage	600
Fairbanks	210
ARIZONA	
**Phoenix	50,000
*Tucson	18,000
ARKANSAS	
Fayetteville	120
Ft. Smith	160
Hot Springs (incl. in Little Rock)	
**Little Rock	1,400
Pine Bluff	175
Southeast Arkansas[b]	140
Wynne-Forest City	110
CALIFORNIA	
*Alameda & Contra Costa Counties	35,000
Antelope Valley	375
Bakersfield (incl. in Kern County)	
El Centro	125
Elsinore	250
Eureka	250
Fontana	165
*Fresno	2,000
Kern County	850
Lancaster (incl. in Antelope Valley)	
*Long Beach	13,500
*Los Angeles Metropolitan Area	500,870
Merced	100
Modesto	260
Monterey	1,500
Oakland (incl. in Alameda & Contra Costa Counties)	
Ontario (incl. in Pomona Valley)	
*Orange County	60,000
*Palm Springs	4,950
Pasadena (also incl. in Los Angeles Metropolitan Area)	2,000
Petaluma	800
Pomona Valley[c]	3,500
Riverside	1,200
**Sacramento	8,500
Salinas	350
San Bernardino	1,900
**San Diego	35,000
*San Francisco	80,000
*San Jose	18,000
San Luis Obispo	450
San Pedro	300
Santa Barbara	3,800
Santa Cruz	1,000
Santa Maria	200
Santa Monica	8,000
Santa Rosa	750
**Stockton	1,500
Sun City	800
Tulare & Kings County (incl. in Fresno)	
Vallejo	400
Ventura County	6,000
COLORADO	
Colorado Springs	1,000
**Denver	46,800
Pueblo	375
CONNECTICUT	
*Bridgeport	18,000
Bristol	250
Colchester	525
*Danbury (incl. New Milford)	3,500
**Greenwich	5,000
*Hartford (incl. New Britain)	26,000
Lebanon	175
Lower Middlesex County (incl. in New London)[d]	
Manchester (incl. in Hartford)	
Meriden	1,400
Middletown	1,300
Milford (incl. in New Haven)	
Moodus	150
*New Haven	22,000
New London	3,500
Newtown (incl. in Danbury)	
*Norwalk	4,000
Norwich	2,500
Putnam	110
Rockville (incl. in Hartford)	
*Stamford	12,000

State and City	Jewish Population
Torrington	450
Valley Area[e]	700
Wallingford	440
**Waterbury	2,700
Westport	2,800
Willimantic	400
Winsted	110
DELAWARE	
*Wilmington (incl. rest of state)	9,500
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
*Greater Washington[f]	157,335
FLORIDA	
*Boca Raton-Delray	40,000
Brevard County	2,250
*Daytona Beach	2,000
**Fort Lauderdale	110,000
Fort Pierce	270
Gainesville	1,000
*Hollywood	60,000
*Jacksonville	6,800
Key West	170
Lakeland	800
**Lee County (incl. Ft. Myers)	3,000
Lehigh Acres	125
*Miami	253,340
*Orlando	15,000
*Palm Beach County (excl. Boca Raton)	45,000
Pensacola	725
Port Charlotte	150
**Sarasota	8,500
St. Augustine	100
*St. Petersburg (incl. Clearwater)	9,500
Tallahassee	1,000
*Tampa	10,500
GEORGIA	
Albany	525
Athens	250
**Atlanta	50,000
*Augusta	1,500
Brunswick	120
*Columbus	1,000
Dalton	235
Fitzgerald-Cordele	125
Macon	900
*Savannah	2,600
Valdosta	145
HAWAII	
Hilo	100
Honolulu	5,000
Kona	150
Kuaii	100
Maui	200
IDAHO	
Boise	120
ILLINOIS	
Aurora	400
Bloomington	125
*Champaign-Urbana	2,000
*Chicago Metropolitan Area	248,000
Danville	240
Decatur	350
East St. Louis (incl. in So. Ill.)	
Elgin	830
Galesburg (incl. in Peoria)	
*Joliet	800
Kankakee	260
**Peoria	1,500
**Quad Cities[g]	1,750
Quincy	200
Rock Island (incl. in Quad Cities)	
*Rockford	975
**Southern Illinois[h]	900
*Springfield	1,100
Sterling-Dixon	110
Waukegan	1,200
INDIANA	
Anderson	105
Bloomington	300
Elkhart (incl. in South Bend)	
Evansville	1,200
**Ft. Wayne	1,170
Gary (incl. in Northwest Indiana-Calumet Region)	
**Indianapolis	11,000
*Lafayette	600
Marion	170
**Michigan City	450
Muncie	175
**Northwest Indiana-Calumet Region[i]	3,000
Richmond	110
Shelbyville	140
*South Bend	1,900
Terre Haute	450
IOWA	
Cedar Rapids	330
Council Bluffs	245
Davenport (incl. in Quad Cities, Ill.)	
**Des Moines	3,200
Dubuque	105
Fort Dodge	115
Iowa City	750
Mason City	110
Muscatine	120
Ottumwa	150

State and City	Jewish Population
**Sioux City	785
Waterloo	450
KANSAS	
Topeka	500
*Wichita	1,000
KENTUCKY	
**Lexington	2,000
*Louisville	9,200
Paducah	175
LOUISIANA	
Alexandria	700
**Baton Rouge	1,400
Lafayette	600
Lake Charles	250
**Monroe	425
*New Orleans	12,000
**Shreveport	1,200
MAINE	
Augusta	215
Bangor	1,300
Southern Maine (excl. Portland)	950
Calais	135
**Lewiston-Auburn	500
*Portland	5,500
Waterville	300
MARYLAND	
Annapolis	2,000
*Baltimore	92,000
Cumberland	265
Easton Park Area[j]	100
Frederick	400
Hagerstown	275
Hartford County	500
Howard County	4,000
Montgomery and Prince Georges County[f]	99,500
Salisbury	300
MASSACHUSETTS	
Amherst	750
Athol	110
Attleboro	200
Beverly	1,000
*Boston (incl. Brockton)	170,000
Fall River	1,780
Fitchburg	300
*Framingham	10,000
Gardner	100
Gloucester	400
Great Barrington	105
Greenfield	250
Haverhill	1,650
Holyoke	1,100
Hyannis	1,200
**Lawrence	3,600
*Leominster	750
Lowell	2,000
*Lynn (incl. Beverly, Peabody, and Salem)	19,000
Medway (incl. in Framingham)	
Milford (incl. in Framingham)	
Mills (incl. in Framingham)	
*New Bedford	2,700
Newburyport	280
North Berkshire	675
Northampton	700
Peabody	2,600
**Pittsfield (incl. all Berkshire County)	3,100
Plymouth	500
Salem	1,150
Southbridge	105
**Springfield	11,250
Taunton	1,200
Webster	125
*Worcester	10,000
MICHIGAN	
Ann Arbor (incl. all Washtenaw County)	3,000
Battle Creek	245
Bay City	650
Benton Harbor	650
*Detroit	70,000
**Flint	2,765
*Grand Rapids	1,500
Iron County	160
Iron Mountain	105
Jackson	375
Kalamazoo	1,000
**Lansing	2,100
Marquette County	175
Mt. Clemens	420
Mt. Pleasant	100
Muskegon	235
**Saginaw	400
South Haven	100
MINNESOTA	
Austin	125
*Duluth	1,100
Hibbing	155
**Minneapolis	23,000
Rochester	240
*St. Paul	7,500
Virginia	100
MISSISSIPPI	
Biloxi-Gulfport	100
Clarksdale	160
Cleveland	180
Greenville	500
Greenwood	100
Hattiesburg	180
**Jackson	700
Meridian	135
Natchez	140
Vicksburg	260

State and City	Jewish Population
MISSOURI	
Columbia	350
Joplin	115
**Kansas City	19,000
Kennett	110
Springfield	230
St. Joseph	343
*St. Louis	53,500
MONTANA	
Billings	160
NEBRASKA	
Lincoln	750
*Omaha	6,500
NEVADA	
*Las Vegas	17,000
Reno	1,200
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Claremont	130
Concord	350
Dover	425
Keene	105
Laconia	150
*Manchester	3,000
Nashua	450
Portsmouth	1,000
NEW JERSEY	
*Atlantic City (incl. Atlantic County)	12,000
Bayonne	4,500
*Bergen County[k]	100,000
Bridgeton	375
*Camden[l]	28,000
Carteret	300
Elizabeth (incl. in Union County)	
Englewood (incl. in Bergen County)	
*Essex County[m]	111,000
Flemington	875
Gloucester County[n]	165
Hoboken	350
**Jersey City	4,000
**Middlesex County[o]	39,350
Millville	240
*Monmouth County	33,600
Morris-Sussex Counties[p] (incl. in Essex County)	
Morristown (incl. in Morris County)	
Mt. Holly	300
Newark (incl. in Essex County)	
New Brunswick (incl. in Raritan Valley)	
North Hudson County[q]	7,000
*North Jersey[r]	32,500
**Ocean County	9,000
**Passaic-Clifton	7,800
Paterson (incl. in North Jersey)	
Perth Amboy (incl. in Middlesex County)	
Plainfield (incl. in Union County)	
Princeton	2,600
Salem	230
**Somerset County[s]	4,300
Somerville (incl. in Somerset County)	
Toms River (incl. in Ocean County)	
Trenton[t]	8,500
*Union County	32,000
**Vineland[u]	3,290
Wildwood	425
Willingboro (incl. in Camden)	
NEW MEXICO	
*Albuquerque	4,500
Las Cruces	100
Santa Fe	300
NEW YORK	
*Albany	12,000
Amenia	140
Amsterdam	595
Auburn	315
Batavia	165
Beacon	315
*Binghamton (incl. all Broome County)	3,000
Brewster (also incl. in Danbury, Ct.)	300
*Buffalo	18,500
Canandaigua	135
Catskill	200
Corning	125
Cortland	440
Dunkirk	150
Ellenville	1,450
*Elmira	1,100
Geneva	300
*Glens Falls	800
Gloversville	535
Herkimer	185
Highland Falls	105
Hudson	470
Ithaca	1,000
Jamestown	185
*Kingston	3,000
Liberty	2,100
Loch Sheldrake-Hurleyville	750
Monroe	400
Monticello	2,400
Mountaindale	150
*New York City Metropolitan Area	1,742,500
New Paltz	150

State and City	Jewish Population
Newark	220
**Newburgh-Middletown	8,950
**Niagara Falls	600
Norwich	120
Olean	140
Oneonta	175
Oswego	100
Parksville	140
Pawling	105
Plattsburg	275
Port Jervis	560
Potsdam	175
Poughkeepsie	4,900
*Rochester	19,600
**Rockland County	60,000
Rome	205
Saratoga Springs	500
Schenectady	5,400
Sharon Springs	165
South Fallsburg	1,100
*Syracuse	9,000
Troy	1,200
*Utica	2,100
Walden (incl. in Newburgh-Middletown)	
Warwick	100
Watertown	250
White Lake	425
Woodbourne	200
Woodridge	300
NORTH CAROLINA	
**Asheville	1,100
**Chapel Hill-Durham	2,400
*Charlotte	4,000
Fayetteville (incl. all Cumberland County)	500
Gastonia	220
Goldsboro	120
**Greensboro	2,500
Hendersonville	105
High Point	400
Raleigh	1,375
Rocky Mount	110
Whiteville Zone[c]	160
Wilmington	500
Winston-Salem	440
NORTH DAKOTA	
Fargo	500
Grand Forks	100
OHIO	
*Akron	6,000
**Canton	2,750
*Cincinnati	22,000
*Cleveland	70,000
*Columbus	15,000
*Dayton	6,000
East Liverpool	300
Elyria	275
Hamilton	560
Lima	168
Lorain	1,000
Mansfield	600
Marion	150
Middletown	140
New Philadelphia	140
Newark	105
Piqua	120
Portsmouth	120
Sandusky	150
Springfield	340
**Steubenville	200
*Toledo	6,300
Warren	500
Wooster	200
**Youngstown	5,000
Zanesville	350
OKLAHOMA	
Muskogee	120
**Oklahoma City	2,325
*Tulsa	2,900
OREGON	
Corvallis	140
Eugene	1,500
**Portland	8,950
Salem	200
PENNSYLVANIA	
Aliquippa	400
Allentown	4,980
*Altoona	580
Ambridge	250
Beaver (incl. in Pittsburgh)	
Beaver Falls	350
Berwick	120
Bethlehem	960
Braddock	250
Bradford	150
Brownville	150
Butler	300
Carbon County	125
Carnegie	100
Central Bucks County	400
Chambersburg	340
Chester	2,100
Coatesville	305
Connellsville	110
*Delaware Valley (Lower Bucks County)[w]	23,000
Donora	100
Easton	1,300
Ellwood City	110
**Erie	855
Farrell	150
Greensburg	300
*Harrisburg	6,500
Hazleton	481
Homestead	300
Indiana	135
*Johnstown	550
Kittanning	175

State and City	Jewish Population
Lancaster	1,800
Lebanon	425
Lock Haven	140
McKeesport	2,000
Monessen	100
Mt. Pleasant	120
New Castle	400
New Kensington	560
*Norristown	1,500
North Penn	200
Oil City	165
Oxford-Kennett Square	180
**Philadelphia Metropolitan Area	240,000
Phoenixville	340
**Pittsburgh	45,000
Pottstown	700
Pottsville	500
*Reading	2,800
Sayre	100
*Scranton	3,400
Sharon	330
State College	450
Stroudsburg	410
Sunbury	200
Uniontown	240
Upper Beaver	500
Washington (incl. in Pittsburgh)	
Wayne County	210
West Chester	300
**Wilkes-Barre	4,200
Williamsport	415
*York	1,600
RHODE ISLAND	
*Providence (incl. rest of state)	22,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	
*Charleston	3,500
**Columbia	2,000
Florence	350
Greenville	600
Orangeburg County	105
Spartanburg	295
Sumter	190
SOUTH DAKOTA	
**Sioux Falls	125
TENNESSEE	
*Chattanooga	2,000
Johnson City[x]	210
Knoxville	1,350
**Memphis	10,000
**Nashville	5,120
Oak Ridge	240
TEXAS	
Amarillo	300
**Austin	3,800
Baytown	300
Beaumont	400
Brownsville	160
*Corpus Christi	1,200
*Dallas	22,000
De Witt County[y]	150
**El Paso	4,700
*Ft. Worth	3,600
Galveston	630
*Houston	28,000
Laredo	420
Longview	185
Lubbock	350
McAllen	295
Odessa	150
Port Arthur	260
*San Antonio	9,000
Texarkana	100
Tyler	450
**Waco	385
Wharton	170
Wichita Falls	260
UTAH	
Ogden	100
**Salt Lake City	2,750
VERMONT	
Bennington	120
Burlington	1,800
Rutland	350
St. Johnsbury	100
VIRGINIA	
Alexandria (incl. Falls Church, Arlington County, and urban Fairfax County)	33,550
Arlington (incl. in Alexandria)	
Charlottesville	800
Danville	180
Fredericksburg	140
Hampton (incl. in Newport News)	
Harrisonburg	115
Hopewell	140
Lynchburg	275
Martinsville	135
*Newport News (incl. Hampton)	2,575
*Norfolk (incl. Virginia Beach)	11,000
Petersburg	600
*Portsmouth (incl. Suffolk)	1,100
*Richmond	8,000
**Roanoke	710
Williamsburg	120
Winchester	110
WASHINGTON	
Bellingham	120

State and City	Jewish Population
Bremerton (incl. in Seattle)	
*Seattle	19,500
*Spokane	1,000
Tacoma	750
WEST VIRGINIA	
Bluefield-Princeton	250
Charleston	1,075
Clarksburg	205
*Huntington	450
Morgantown	200
Parkersburg	155
Weirton	150
Wheeling	650
WISCONSIN	
Appleton	250
Beloit	120
Eau Clair	120
Fond du Lac	100
*Green Bay	280
**Kenosha	240
*Madison	4,500
Manitowoc	115
*Milwaukee	23,900
Oshkosh	150
**Racine	375
Sheboygan	250
Superior	165
Waukesha (incl. in Milwaukee)	
Wausau	155
WYOMING	
Cheyenne	255

*Denotes estimates submitted in current year.

**Estimates submitted in current year; represents change from previous estimate.

[a]Florence, Sheffield, Tuscumbia.

[b]Towns in Chicot, Desha, Drew Counties.

[c]Includes Alta Loma, Chino, Claremont, Cucamonga, La Verne, Montclair, Ontario, Pomona, San Dimas, Upland.

[d]Centerbrook, Chester, Clinton, Deep River, Essex, Killingworth, Old Lyme, Old Saybrook, Seabrook, Westbrook.

[e]Ansonia, Derby-Shelton, Oxford, Seymour.

[f]Greater Washington includes urbanized portions of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, in Maryland; Arlington County, Fairfax County (organized portion), Falls Church, Alexandria, in Virginia.

[g]Rock Island, Moline (Illinois); Davenport, Bettendorf (Iowa).

[h]Towns in Alexander, Bond, Clay, Clinton, Crawford, Edwards, Effingham, Fayette, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jackson, Jasper, Jefferson, Jersey, Johnson, Lawrence, Mascoupin, Madison, Marion, Massac, Montgomery, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Randolph, Richland, St. Clair, Saline, Union, Wabash, Washington, Wayne, White, Williamson Counties.

[i]Includes Crown Point, East Chicago, Gary, Hammond, Munster, Valparaiso, Whiting, and the Greater Calumet region.

[j]Towns in Caroline, Kent, Queen Annes, Talbot Counties.

[k]Allendale, Elmwood Park, Fair Lawn, Franklin Lakes, Oakland, Midland Park, Rochelle Park, Saddle Brook, Wykoff also included in North Jersey estimate.

[l]Includes Camden and Burlington Counties.

[m]Includes Morris & Sussex Counties & contiguous areas in Hudson, Somerset & Union Counties.

[n]Includes Clayton, Paulsboro, Woodbury. Excludes Newfield; see Vineland.
[o]Includes in Somerset County, Kendall Park, Somerset; in Mercer County, Hightstown.
[p]See footnote (m).
[q]Includes Guttenberg, Hudson Heights, North Bergen, North Hudson, Secaucus, Union City, Weehawken, West New York, Woodcliff.
[r]Includes Paterson, Wayne, Hawthorne in Passaic County, and nine towns in Bergen County. See footnote (k).
[s]Excludes Kendall Park and Somerset, which are included in Middlesex County.
[t]Includes Mercer County in New Jersey; and Lower Makefield, Morrisville, Newtown, and Yardley in Pennsylvania.
[u]Includes in Cumberland County, Norma, Rosenheim, Vineland; in Salem County, Elmer; in Gloucester County, Clayton, Newfield; in Cape May County, Woodbine.
[v]Elizabethtown, Fairmont, Jacksonville, Lumberton, Tabor City, Wallace, Warsaw, and Loris, S.C.
[w]Bensalem Township, Bristol, Langhorne, Levittown, New Hope, Newtown, Penndel, Warington, Yardley. Also includes communities listed in footnote (u).
[x]Includes Kingsport and Bristol (including the portion of Bristol in Virginia).
[y]Includes communities also in Colorado, Fayette, Gonzales, and La Vaca Counties.