

THIS PUBLICATION IS PROVIDED BY THE NORTH AMERICAN JEWISH DATA BANK WITH PERMISSION FROM THE STUDY AUTHORS.

THE NORTH AMERICAN JEWISH DATA BANK IS A COLLABORATIVE PROJECT OF THE JEWISH FEDERATIONS OF NORTH AMERICA AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT'S CENTER FOR JUDAIC STUDIES AND CONTEMPORARY JEWISH LIFE AND ROPER CENTER FOR PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH. OUR MISSION IS TO:

PROVIDE EMPIRICAL SURVEY DATASETS ABOUT THE NORTH AMERICAN JEWISH COMMUNITY FROM NATIONAL AND LOCAL SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC STUDIES AS WELL AS OTHER TYPES OF CONTEMPORARY AND HISTORICAL SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH.

MAKE AVAILABLE SUBSTANTIVE AND METHODOLOGICAL REPORTS ON THE JEWISH COMMUNITY, IN PARTICULAR, REPORTS BASED ON DATASETS THAT ARE PART OF THE ARCHIVE.

PROMOTE THE DATA BANK TO JEWISH FEDERATIONS, COMMUNAL ORGANIZATIONS, FOUNDATIONS AND OTHER GROUPS INTERESTED IN RESEARCH CONCERNING JEWISH LIFE IN NORTH AMERICA.

ENCOURAGE ACADEMICIANS, STUDENTS, COMMUNAL PROFESSIONALS AND OTHERS TO UTILIZE DATA BANK HOLDINGS AND TO SUBMIT THEIR STUDIES TO THE ARCHIVE.

SPONSOR SEMINARS AND PROVIDE OTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESEARCHERS AND PLANNERS TO DISCUSS ISSUES, IMPROVE METHODOLOGIES AND EXCHANGE IDEAS BASED ON QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH.

PREPARE PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER FORMS OF INFORMATION DISSEMINATION CONCERNING SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ABOUT NORTH AMERICAN JEWRY.


PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND ADVICE TO JEWISH FEDERATIONS, RESEARCHERS, COMMUNAL PROFESSIONALS, JOURNALISTS AND OTHERS INTERESTED IN RESEARCH ON THE JEWISH COMMUNITY.

PLEASE NOTE THAT OUR DATASETS AND REPORTS ARE PROVIDED FOR NON-COMMERCIAL USE ONLY.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE VISIT OUR WEBSITE AT
[HTTP://WWW.JEWISHDATABANK.ORG](http://www.jewishdatabank.org)

2001 Census Analysis Series **THE JEWISH COMMUNITY OF TORONTO**

Part VI
Issues of Jewish Identity



By Charles Shahar &
Tina Rosenbaum
February 2006



**2001 Census Analysis
The Jewish Community of Toronto**

**Part 6
Issues of Jewish Identity**

**By
Charles Shahr
&
Tina Rosenbaum**

UIA Federations Canada would like to thank the following members of the 2001 Census Analysis “Professional Advisory Committee” for their expert assistance throughout this project.

Dr. Jonathan Berkowitz, Vancouver, BC

Dr. Jay Brodbar, Toronto, ON

Prof. Leo Davids, Toronto, ON

Mr. Colin Geitzler, Aylmer, QC

Ms. Jean Gerber, Vancouver, BC

Dr. Gustave Goldmann, Ottawa, ON

Dr. Jack Jedwab, Montreal, QC

Prof. Marty Lockshin, Toronto, ON

Mr. Greg Mason, Winnipeg, MB

Dr. Sheva Medjuck, Halifax, NS

Prof. Allan Moscovitch, Ottawa, ON

Prof. Morton Weinfeld, Montreal, QC

Dr. Morty Yalovsky, Montreal, QC

UIA Federations Canada would also like to thank Réal Lortie and Marc Pagé of Statistics Canada for their expertise and meticulous attention to detail.

UIA Federations Canada would also like to express its appreciation to Howard English, Joyce Levine, Ed Segalowitz, Yael Seliger and Gary Siepser of UJA Federation for contributing their knowledge and insights.

Finally, acknowledgment is extended to Lioudmila Medvedtchenko for her diligent work in the extraction and verification of statistical data.

All data in this report are adapted from:
Statistics Canada, special order tabulations for UIA Federations Canada.

Highlights of Results

- A large majority of Jews in the Toronto metropolitan area, 135,670, consider themselves as Jewish by both religion and ethnicity. A further 28,840 respondents say they are Jewish by religion, but indicate another ethnic affiliation; whereas 14,585 people say they are Jews by ethnicity but report no religion. Finally, 10,955 identify as ethnic Jews but indicate another religion. The latter group was not included in this report's definition of Jewishness.
- Using a combination of Census responses related to religion and ethnicity to look at Jewish identification, it was found that the great majority of Toronto Jews identify by religion (91.9%). Only 8.1% of Jews identify by ethnicity only and have no religious affiliation.
- Just over one-fifth (21.5%) of individuals who identify by ethnicity only (and have no religious affiliation) live in the "Rest of Toronto CMA", in areas outside the sphere of Jewish neighborhoods.
- 15.6% of Jewish spouses / partners are married to, or partnered with, non-Jews. *This figure is considered the intermarriage rate for Jews residing in the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area, and includes common law and same-sex arrangements.* In absolute terms, 13,300 of 85,210 Jewish spouses / partners are intermarried.
- There are 20,795 Jews (including children) who live in intermarried arrangements, or 14.9% of all Jews living in couple arrangements in the Toronto metropolitan area.
- There has been an increase of 41.4% of Jews living in intermarried households in the last decade. The number has climbed from 14,710 to 20,795 individuals between 1991-2001. As a proportion of the total Jewish population, the percent of Jews living in intermarried households increased from 9% in 1991 to 11.6% in 2001.
- The geographic area with the highest proportion of Jews living in intermarried households is High Park / Junction (71.9%), followed by Danforth / Beaches (64.6%). The level of Jewish individuals living in intermarried households is 4.3% in Vaughan and 16.3% in the City of Toronto. Within the Downtown Jewish Community 46.6% of individuals live in intermarried arrangements, far greater

than the percentage in the Central Jewish Community (9.8%) or the Northern Jewish Community (8.9%).

- In cases where both spouses are less than 30 years of age, the level of intermarriage is 27%. It is 11.7% when both spouses are at least 40 years old.
- About one in six Jewish children under 15 years of age (living in couple families) reside in intermarried arrangements (16.9%). More than one in five children under 5 years live in intermarried families (20.4%).
- The percentage of common law arrangements among intermarried households is markedly higher than among those where both spouses were identified as Jewish (22.9% and 3.4%, respectively).
- Jews from South America (29.3%) have the highest levels of intermarriage, whereas those born in Israel have the lowest levels of intermarriage (6.6%). Jews born in Canada have an intermarriage rate of 15.8%
- Families earning between \$50K - \$99.9K have the highest intermarriage level (31.5%). The intermarriage levels are lower in the extremes of the income distribution.
- Regarding the youngest children of intermarried couples, just over a third (33.6%) are identified by their parents as Jews; a larger percentage (41.6%) are assigned no religious affiliation; and the rest (24.8%) are identified as having other religions. Whether it is the husband or the wife who intermarries has a significant bearing on the religious orientation of their children.
- 30.8% of Jewish children residing in Greater Toronto are registered in Jewish day schools. The figures are 35.6% for elementary schools and 21.8% for high schools.
- When supplementary schooling is factored in, 50.2% of Jewish children have some exposure to education with a Jewish content.

Table of Contents

Comparisons of Jewish Identification.....	2
Self-Perceptions of Jewishness.....	5
A Closer Look at Jewish Identification	7
Levels of Inter-marriage in the Toronto CMA.....	11
Where Do Individuals Living in Inter-married Households Reside?.....	15
The Characteristics of Inter-married Households	17
Who Inter-marries?	23
The Affiliations of Children in Inter-married Families.....	29
Enrolment in Jewish Day Schools	30
The Challenges Ahead	33
Appendix 1: The Jewish Standard Definition.....	37
Appendix 2: The Reliability of the Census.....	39

Census Analysis Series

Issues of Jewish Identity

This report examines issues related to Jewish identity based on figures from the 2001 Census. Specifically, three subjects are addressed: self-perceptions of Jewishness as specified in the Census; the levels and characteristics of intermarriage; and the percentage of Jewish school-aged children attending Jewish day schools in the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area (CMA).

What defines someone as a Jew? According to Halachic law, a Jew is anyone whose mother was born as such, or who has converted to Judaism. This definition is straightforward, and does not rely on issues of beliefs, values or levels of ritual observances.

However, it is in the expression of one's Jewishness, in the strength of their Jewish identity, that self-perception does play a role. The Jewish experience can relate to religious, cultural or nationalistic aspects that represent a wide spectrum of attitudes and beliefs.

In North America there has been increasing concern about the ability of the Jewish

community to withstand the pressures of assimilation, and these worries have implications for the future of Jewry in the Diaspora as a whole. A recent population survey in the United States, for instance, suggested that since 1996, only slightly more than half (53%) of Jewish marriages involved two partners who were born Jewish.¹ In 2001, more than 185,000 Americans who said they were raised exclusively Jewish, indicated they practiced another religion.²

The lower degree of assimilation in Canada has likely been influenced by the fact that Canadian Jews are more of an immigrant community than Americans. The Jewish communities in the United States are generally historically older than Canadian ones. Approximately 85% of American Jewish adults were born in that country.³

¹ The National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) 2000-01: Strength, Challenge and Diversity in the American Jewish Population. United Jewish Communities, September 2003.

² Special analysis done of NJPS 2000-2001 and personally communicated to the authors by J. Ament, Senior Project Director, Research Department, United Jewish Communities.

³ Ament, J. Jewish Immigrants in the United States. United Jewish Communities: Report Series on the

About 40% of adult Jews were not born in Canada, and this may account for a stronger cultural and religious identity, although recent Jewish immigrants from the Former Soviet Union have not necessarily demonstrated strong religious affiliation in either country.

Comparisons of Jewish Identification

Studies done in the United States and Canada show that there are important differences in the way these communities express their Jewishness. Traditional measurements of identity and involvement have revolved around questions of ritual observance, synagogue attendance, intermarriage levels, Jewish education, ties to Israel, as well as Jewish social and communal affiliation.

Unfortunately, the last opportunity for comparing national surveys in the United States and Canada was in 1991.⁴ Although these findings were presented 15 years ago, their implications were very suggestive.

For instance, Cohen (1991) found that Canadian Jews observed more ritual practices than American Jews: 54% of Canadian Jews lit Sabbath candles, compared to 26% of Americans. In terms of keeping separate meat and dairy dishes, 44% of Canadian Jews did so; whereas the figure was 18% for American Jews.

Comparisons also suggested that Canadian Jews were more close-knit, and substantially more Jewishly philanthropic than American Jews. For instance, about 41% of Canadian Jews donated at least \$100 to their Federation's campaign, whereas only 21% of American Jews did so. Almost 80% of Canadian Jews said most of their friends were Jewish, compared to 51% of American Jews.

Finally, when compared with American Jews, Canadian Jews were more in touch with Israel and Israelis, more knowledgeable about Israel, and more actively pro-Israel. Almost forty percent of Canadian Jews had visited Israel twice or more, compared to 17% in the United States. Forty-two percent of Canadian Jews considered themselves to be Zionists, compared to 25% in the U.S.

National Jewish Population Survey 2000-01, October 2004.

⁴ Cohen, S. *Jewish Identity in Canada: National Character, Regional Diversity, and Emerging Trends* (1991).

The 1991 Canadian Population Survey also suggested considerable variations in the Jewish identification of people living in various localities across Canada. For instance, British Columbian Jewry fell below the national average in several measures of ritual observance and institutional affiliation. On the whole, the Toronto community was somewhat less involved in many aspects of Jewish life than those in Montreal, but more involved than most Jews elsewhere in Canada.

A more recent local study has also been instructive. According to a report by Shahar and Rosenbaum (2006) entitled “Jewish Life in Greater Toronto: A Survey of the Attitudes & Behaviors of Greater Toronto’s Jewish Community”, Toronto Jews are more inclined to fast on Yom Kippur (71.7%) compared to American Jews generally (46%). About 74% of local adult Jews have been to Israel at least once, compared to 35% of American Jewish adults. Lastly, 25.2% of Toronto Jews say they had attended Jewish day schools, whereas the American level is 12%.⁵

⁵ Shahar, C. & Rosenbaum, T. Jewish Life in Greater Toronto: A Survey of the Attitudes & Behaviours of Greater Toronto’s Jewish Community (Abridged Edition). UJA Federation of Greater Toronto. February 2006.

All the above findings underscore the differences between communities both within Canada and across its borders. Cohen suggests that the prevailing view among Jewish community leaders is that Canadian Jewry is actually "one generation behind" the United States in the "assimilation" process. It is therefore assumed that we have more time to adjust, and perhaps that we can learn from the mistakes and successes of the American efforts. Whatever the validity of these arguments, more data is needed to study the effects of assimilation generally in Canada.

Unfortunately, the Canadian Census does not allow for analyses related to Jewish attitudes and beliefs, or adherence to Jewish customs. This is an important limitation, since most factors related to Jewish identity cannot be examined using the Census. On the other hand, there are certain variables that allow for the measurement of some aspects of Jewish identity. These include the type of identification (religious or ethnic) among Jews, the level of intermarriage and its correlates, and the percentage of children attending Jewish day schools.

The following monograph will take an in-depth look at these issues, as they pertain to

Table 1
Religious & Ethnicity Affiliations
Toronto Jewish Population

	#	%
Religion Jewish / Ethnicity Jewish	135,670	71.4
Religion Jewish / Ethnicity Not Jewish	28,840	15.2
Religion None / Ethnicity Single: Jewish	4,845	2.5
Religion None / Ethnicity Jewish & Other	9,740	5.1
Religion Other / Ethnicity Jewish	10,955	5.8
Total Having Any Jewish Affiliation	190,050	100.0

Table 2
Jewish Identification
Based on Religion & Ethnicity Responses
Toronto Jewish Population

	#	%
Jewish Identification by Religion	164,510	91.9
Jewish Identification by Ethnicity with No Religious Affiliation	14,585	8.1
Total	179,095	100.0

the Greater Toronto Jewish community specifically.

Self-Perceptions of Jewishness

The 2001 Census asked two questions related to one's Jewishness. The first looked at the respondent's religion. The other asked about the person's ethnic origin. Whereas the religious criterion is straightforward, the question of ethnicity is more ambiguous. Ethnicity could include implications of culture, nationality and race. It is therefore more prone to idiosyncrasies of interpretation. For instance, some respondents who identified themselves as Jewish by religion, claimed that their ethnicity was "Canadian" or "Israeli".

Respondents were allowed more than one choice for ethnicity, and a maximum of four choices. Thus, a person could say that they were ethnically Jewish and Polish. There was no way of knowing the strength of one's identification regarding a particular ethnic category; but if only one choice was made, then it could be assumed it represented the dominant affiliation.

Jewish identity, as defined by the Census, is unique, because it can be classified as both a

religious and ethnic affiliation. One can also say something about Jewish identification by looking at different combinations using these two criteria. Thus, a person who said he or she was ethnically Jewish but had no religion may have a different self-perception as a Jew than one who claimed both religious and ethnic affiliations.

Given the Census parameters, a Jew in this report was defined as someone who indicated he or she was (a) Jewish by religion and ethnicity, (b) Jewish by religion with another ethnicity, or (c) Jewish by ethnicity with no religion. This is the Jewish Standard Definition (JSD), which was formulated in 1981 by Jim Torczyner of McGill University. It was devised because this definition was more inclusive than if religion or ethnicity were considered separately.

A category that was not included in this definition related to respondents who said they were ethnically Jewish, but claimed another religious affiliation (e.g. Roman Catholic or Buddhist). These people may have converted to another religion, or they may simply have had an ancestor (e.g. a grandparent) who was Jewish. In either case, it was assumed that they have a very minimal

Table 3
Census Metropolitan Areas by Jewish Identification
(Row %)

Census Metropolitan Area	Total	Jewish Identification by Religion		Jewish Identification by Ethnicity with No Religious Affiliation	
	#	#	%	#	%
Toronto	179,095	164,510	91.9	14,585	8.1
Montreal	92,970	88,765	95.5	4,205	4.5
Ottawa / Gatineau	13,445	11,325	84.2	2,120	15.8
Winnipeg	14,775	12,765	86.4	2,010	13.6
Calgary	7,945	6,530	82.2	1,415	17.8
Vancouver	22,595	17,275	76.5	5,320	23.5
Canada	370,520	329,995	89.1	40,525	10.9

identification with Judaism, and were therefore not included as Jews, even though they are halachically Jewish if they have a Jewish mother.

Table 1 shows a breakdown of Toronto's Jewish population by category of identification. A large majority of Jews in Toronto, 135,670, consider themselves as Jewish by both religion and ethnicity. A further 28,840 respondents say they are Jewish by religion, but have another ethnic identification.

It is interesting that 14,585 people say they are Jews by ethnicity but have no religion. These may be secular Jews, who don't follow religious customs, some of whom may consider themselves as atheists or agnostics. They may identify more with Judaism on a cultural level. Together, these three categories comprise 179,095 individuals, which is the Jewish population of the Toronto CMA according to the Jewish Standard Definition (JSD) as applied to the 2001 Census.

There are 10,955 persons in the category that was not included in the JSD (ethnic Jews indicating another religion). A further

analysis reveals that 39.6% of these individuals say they are Protestant, 36.7% say Catholic, 10.3% Christian Orthodox, 9.4% Christian (unspecified), 1.5% Buddhist, 0.8% Muslim, and 1.7% report various other religions.

A Closer Look at Jewish Identification

In the following analyses, those who indicated they were Jewish by religion were compared with those who indicated they were Jewish by ethnicity but claimed no religious affiliation (Jewish or other).

As Table 2 suggests, the great majority of Toronto Jews identified as being Jewish by religion (91.9%). Just 8.1% identified as Jewish by ethnicity and having no religious affiliation.

There is a similar proportion of Jews who identified by religion in Toronto (91.9%) compared to Canada as a whole (89.1%) (Table 3). In terms of other major Canadian Jewish communities, Montreal has 95.5% who identified by religion, Vancouver has 76.5%, and Winnipeg has 86.4%. Vancouver has the largest proportion of those who

Table 4
Age by Jewish Identification
(Row %)

Age Cohort	Total	Jewish Identification by Religion		Jewish Identification by Ethnicity with No Religious Affiliation	
	#	#	%	#	%
0-14	35,235	31,400	89.1	3,835	10.9
15-24	23,215	21,140	91.1	2,075	8.9
25-44	46,365	42,125	90.9	4,240	9.1
45-64	46,805	43,735	93.4	3,070	6.6
65+	27,495	26,115	95.0	1,380	5.0
Total Toronto CMA	179,115	164,515	91.8	14,600	8.2

identified by ethnicity and had no religious affiliation (23.5%).

According to Table 4, Jewish identification by religion is clearly related to age. The older segments seem to have higher levels of those who identify by religion. In fact, 95% of seniors identify by religion. The 0–14 age group has the lowest level of identification by religion (89.1%).

There are 3,835 children listed by their parents as having no religious identity, but who are still counted as Jews using the Jewish Standard Definition (JSD), as their parents identified them as Jewish by ethnicity. They are children who may be getting little exposure to Jewish customs or traditions, and they represent an interesting challenge: how to encourage a life-long connection to the community.

Table 5A examines identification across primary geographic areas. According to this table, many of those with an ethnic Jewish identification (and no religious affiliation) live in the "Rest of Toronto CMA", which includes a number of disparate areas not located in traditional Jewish neighborhoods.

In fact, the "Rest of Toronto CMA" has 3,545 individuals with an ethnic Jewish identification (with no religious affiliation), or 21.5% of the total in this category within the Toronto metropolitan area. All other areas with the exception of the Downtown Core and Danforth/Beaches have much lower percentages of Jewish ethnic identification (with no religious affiliation).

It should be noted, however, that there are also 12,975 who identify themselves as Jewish by religion in the "Rest of Toronto CMA".

Aside from the "Rest of Toronto CMA", other areas with significant numbers of individuals who identify by ethnicity (with no religious affiliation) include Vaughan (1,225), Finch / Steeles (West) (1,190) and Danforth / Beaches (1,145). Ethnically identified Jews in Finch / Steeles (West) likely include a large proportion of recent immigrants among them.

Table 5B examines identification across large special interest areas in the Toronto CMA. Note that the first three regions of Downtown, Central and Northern Jewish Communities are contiguous, and represent

Table 5A
Jewish Identification by Primary Geographic Areas
(Row %)

District	Total	Jewish Identification by Religion		Jewish Identification by Ethnicity with No Religious Affiliation	
	#	#	%	#	%
Downtown Core	5,890	4,805	81.6	1,085	18.4
Danforth / Beaches	3,905	2,760	70.7	1,145	29.3
Bloor / St. Clair	8,300	7,295	87.9	1,005	12.1
St. Clair / Eglinton	12,965	12,225	94.3	740	5.7
Eglinton / Lawrence (West)	7,960	7,685	96.5	275	3.5
Eglinton / Lawrence (East)	10,075	9,505	94.3	570	5.7
Lawrence / Wilson	11,830	11,525	97.4	305	2.6
Wilson / Sheppard (West)	5,100	4,980	97.6	120	2.4
Wilson / Sheppard (East)	8,220	7,830	95.3	390	4.7
Sheppard / Finch (West)	7,735	7,185	92.9	550	7.1
Sheppard / Finch (East)	4,590	4,200	91.5	390	8.5
Finch / Steeles (West)	9,665	8,475	87.7	1,190	12.3
Finch / Steeles (East)	9,735	8,900	91.4	835	8.6
Vaughan	34,310	33,085	96.4	1,225	3.6
Richmond Hill	10,905	10,135	92.9	770	7.1
Markham	11,400	10,940	96.0	460	4.0
Rest of Toronto CMA	16,520	12,975	78.5	3,545	21.5
Total Toronto CMA	179,105	164,505	91.8	14,600	8.2

distinct areas of Jewish population. They can therefore be compared to one another. They also represent approximately the three major axes of Jewish life in Toronto.

The Downtown Jewish Community stretches from Lake Ontario to St. Clair. The Central Jewish Community spans the area from St. Clair to Steeles. Finally, the Northern Jewish Community includes all of York Region.

According to Table 5B, the Downtown Jewish community has a large relative percentage of ethnically identified individuals with no religious affiliation (19%). The levels of ethnically identified persons in the Central and Northern Communities are comparable (6.4% and 4.8%, respectively).

The great majority of Jews in the Bathurst Corridor (93.8%) are religiously identified. This is not surprising given that this region is considered the hub of the Jewish community in the Toronto CMA.

The geographic areas described in Table 5C represent small special interest districts within the Toronto CMA. Relatively large percentages of ethnically identified

individuals with no religious affiliation (30.8%) are found in High Park / Junction. There is also a relatively large proportion of ethnically identified Jews (15.6%) in Annex / Bloor West / Yorkville.

Forest Hill / Cedarvale has among the highest percentage of religiously identified Jews (97.3%) of any district or region under consideration in these tables. Bathurst Manor likewise has a high percentage of religiously identified Jews (95%), likely because of the large number of elderly residing there.

Levels of Intermarriage in the Toronto CMA

The Census can be used to analyze the incidence of intermarriage in the Jewish community. Specifically, in this report intermarriage is defined as a situation where a person who falls under the Jewish Standard Definition (JSD) marries someone who is not included under this criterion. It is then possible to cross-tabulate intermarriage with a number of other variables to profile those who are most likely to marry outside their faith.

Table 5B
Jewish Identification by Large Special Interest Geographic Areas (Row %)

District	Total	Jewish Identification by Religion		Jewish Identification by Ethnicity with No Religious Affiliation	
	#	#	%	#	%
Downtown J. Community	20,055	16,245	81.0	3,810	19.0
Central J. Community	90,470	84,715	93.6	5,755	6.4
Northern J. Community	59,350	56,480	95.2	2,870	4.8
North York	65,080	60,810	93.4	4,270	6.6
Bathurst Corridor	119,280	111,880	93.8	7,400	6.2
Toronto (City of)	113,790	103,495	91.0	10,295	9.0

Table 5C
Jewish Identification by Small Special Interest Geographic Areas (Row %)

District	Total	Jewish Identification by Religion		Jewish Identification by Ethnicity with No Religious Affiliation	
	#	#	%	#	%
Annex / Bloor W. / Yorkville	2,885	2,435	84.4	450	15.6
High Park / Junction	1,950	1,350	69.2	600	30.8
Forest Hill / Cedarvale	16,005	15,575	97.3	430	2.7
Bathurst Manor	5,520	5,245	95.0	275	5.0
Bathurst Corridor- Sheppard/Steeles	24,115	21,545	89.3	2,570	10.7

Note that individuals who converted to Judaism are considered as Jewish according to the Jewish Standard Definition. Thus, intermarriage as described in this report only examines couples where the non-Jewish spouse did not convert to Judaism. It is not possible to identify conversionary marriages using the Census information alone.

It is also important to mention that common law unions are included in the following statistics on intermarriage, as are same-sex arrangements. In this report, common law and same-sex arrangements refer to a union between “partners”, whereas individuals who are married are referred to as “spouses”.

What is the level of intermarriage among Toronto’s Jews? In other words, what percentage of currently married / partnered Jews have a non-Jewish spouse / partner? Table 6 indicates that there are 71,910 Jews who are married / partnered to other Jews and there are 13,300 Jews who are married / partnered to non-Jews. The total number of Jews who are married / partnered is therefore 85,210. Hence, the 13,300 individuals married / partnered to non-Jews represent an intermarriage rate of 15.6%. *This figure is*

considered the intermarriage level for the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area.

Of 13,300 spouses / partners who live in intermarried arrangements, 7,330 (55.1%) live in situations where the husband is Jewish and the wife is non-Jewish; and 5,970 (44.9%) are living in arrangements where the husband is non-Jewish and the wife is Jewish. In other words, Jewish men are more inclined to intermarry than Jewish women.

The intermarriage rate among Greater Toronto’s Jews (15.6%) is among the lowest in the country. Only the Montreal Jewish community has a lower level of intermarriage (13.1%). The rates of intermarriage include 23.3% for Winnipeg, 31.8% for Ottawa, 34.3% for Calgary, and 41.3% for the Vancouver Jewish community. The Canadian intermarriage rate is 21.7%.

What is the total number of Jews living in intermarried families, including children? According to Table 7, there are 20,795 individuals who live in intermarried arrangements. This represents 14.9% of all individuals living in couple arrangements.

Table 6
Intermarriage Breakdowns
Base Population: Jewish Spouses / Partners

	#	%
Husband Jewish / Wife Jewish	71,910	84.4
Intermarried: Husband Jewish / Wife Non-Jewish	7,330	8.6
Intermarried: Husband Non-Jewish / Wife Jewish	5,970	7.0
(Subtotal: Intermarried)	(13,300)	(15.6)
Total Jewish Spouses / Partners	85,210	100.0

Table 7
Intermarriage Breakdowns
Base Population: Individuals Living in Couple Households

	#	%
Husband Jewish / Wife Jewish	117,815	84.5
Husband Jewish / Wife Non-Jewish	10,975	7.9
Husband Non-Jewish / Wife Jewish	9,820	7.0
(Subtotal: Living in Intermarried Households)	(20,795)	(14.9)
Husband Non-Jewish / Wife Non-Jewish	750	0.5
Total Individuals Living in Couple Households	139,360	100.0

Also according to Table 7, 750 Jewish children are living in situations where neither parent is Jewish. They may be products of mixed marriages, where the non-Jewish partner has divorced and then married someone outside the faith while retaining custody of the children, who are nonetheless considered Jewish.

How does the 2001 level of intermarriage compare to statistics available from previous decades? Unfortunately, previous Census analyses did not examine the intermarriage rate on the basis of spouses / partners, only in terms of total individuals (including children) living in intermarried families. Also, there are small discrepancies between the Jewish Standard Definition used in the present Census, compared to previous definitions of Jewishness (see Appendix 2).

Notwithstanding these caveats, in 1991 14,710 Jews (including children) lived in intermarried arrangements out of a total Jewish population of 163,050. They represented 9% of the Jewish population. This compares to 20,795 Jews out of a total population of 179,100 in 2001 representing 11.6% of the Jewish population. Although the absolute number of Jews living in inter-

married households increased by 41.4%, the proportional increase was only 2.6%.

Where Do Individuals Living in Intermarried Households Reside?

Table 8A looks at the geographic distribution of individuals (including children) living in different couple arrangements. The "Rest of Toronto CMA" has the largest number of Jews living in intermarried households (6,595). Relatively large numbers also reside in Danforth / Beaches (1,755), Bloor / St. Clair (1,685) and St. Clair / Eglinton (1,585).

In relative terms, the area with the largest proportion of those living in intermarried households is Danforth / Beaches. Almost two-thirds (64.6%) of Jews residing in Danforth / Beaches live in such arrangements. More than half (55.2%) of Jewish residents in the "Rest of Toronto CMA" live in intermarried households.

The area with the lowest proportion of Jews living in intermarried households is Wilson / Sheppard (West), with 3.3%. There are also low percentages in Vaughan (4.3%) and Eglinton / Lawrence (West) (5.6%).

Table 8A
Individuals Living in Intermarried Households
By Primary Geographic Areas
(Row %)

District	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Downtown Core	2,680	1,450	54.1	1,230	45.9
Danforth / Beaches	2,715	960	35.4	1,755	64.6
Bloor / St. Clair	5,330	3,645	68.4	1,685	31.6
St. Clair / Eglinton	9,725	8,140	83.7	1,585	16.3
Eglinton / Lawrence (West)	6,140	5,795	94.4	345	5.6
Eglinton / Lawrence (East)	7,445	6,695	89.9	750	10.1
Lawrence / Wilson	8,930	8,165	91.4	765	8.6
Wilson / Sheppard (West)	3,935	3,805	96.7	130	3.3
Wilson / Sheppard (East)	7,040	6,515	92.5	525	7.5
Sheppard / Finch (West)	5,355	5,040	94.1	315	5.9
Sheppard / Finch (East)	3,140	2,695	85.8	445	14.2
Finch / Steeles (West)	6,890	6,355	92.2	535	7.8
Finch / Steeles (East)	7,455	6,840	91.8	615	8.2
Vaughan	30,315	29,010	95.7	1,305	4.3
Richmond Hill	9,655	8,370	86.7	1,285	13.3
Markham	9,920	8,975	90.5	945	9.5
Rest of Toronto CMA	11,955	5,360	44.8	6,595	55.2
Total Toronto CMA	138,625	117,815	85.0	20,810	15.0

Table 8B looks at individuals living in intermarried households across large special interest areas within the Toronto CMA. As noted before, the first three regions are contiguous and can therefore be compared with one another.

The Downtown Jewish Community (which includes the area of Danforth / Beaches) has by far the largest percentage of individuals living in intermarried arrangements (46.6%). However, in absolute terms, the Central Jewish Community has the largest number of persons living in intermarried households (6,610).

There are 3,900 Jews living in intermarried arrangements in North York, 7,950 in the Bathurst Corridor, and 13,290 in the City of Toronto.

Table 8C examines individuals living in intermarried arrangements across small special interest areas. High Park / Junction has among the highest levels of intermarriage of any district or region described in this report (71.9%). In other words, almost three-quarters of Jews living in High Park / Junction reside in intermarried households.

There is also a relatively high level of persons residing in intermarried households in Annex / Bloor West / Yorkville (34.7%).

The percentage of individuals residing in intermarried arrangements in Bathurst Manor is very low (4.6%), likely because of the large number of seniors living there.

The Characteristics of Intermarried Households

Table 9 looks at the ages of Jewish spouses / partners living in intermarried arrangements. Note that the age categories represented in this table may overlap with one another. American studies have shown that younger adults are more inclined to intermarry than their older counterparts. This trend seems to be verified by the current Census data.

For instance, the intermarriage rate when both spouses are less than 30 years of age is 27%. It is 24.7% if at least one spouse is between 30-39 years, 13.3% if there is at least one spouse greater than 39 years, and 11.7% if both spouses are older than 39 years. It seems that the intermarriage rate for younger couples is significantly higher than for older ones.

Table 8B
Individuals Living in Intermarried Households
By Large Special Interest Geographic Areas
(Row %)

District	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Downtown J. Community	11,960	6,385	53.4	5,575	46.6
Central J. Community	67,705	61,095	90.2	6,610	9.8
Northern J. Community	52,295	47,645	91.1	4,650	8.9
North York	49,030	45,130	92.0	3,900	8.0
Bathurst Corridor	92,590	84,640	91.4	7,950	8.6
Toronto (City of)	81,605	68,315	83.7	13,290	16.3

Table 8C
Individuals Living in Intermarried Households
By Small Special Interest Geographic Areas
(Row %)

District	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Annex / Bloor W. / Yorkville	1,730	1,130	65.3	600	34.7
High Park / Junction	1,210	340	28.1	870	71.9
Forest Hill / Cedarvale	12,300	11,455	93.1	845	6.9
Bathurst Manor	3,910	3,730	95.4	180	4.6
Bathurst Corridor- Sheppard/Steeles	17,175	15,840	92.2	1,335	7.8

Table 9
Intermarried Households
Age of Spouses / Partners
(Row %)

	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Both Spouses < 30 Years	3,220	2,350	73.0	870	27.0
At Least One Spouse 30-39 Years	21,180	15,940	75.3	5,240	24.7
At Least One Spouse > 39 Years	67,830	58,840	86.7	8,990	13.3
Both Spouses > 39 Years	60,525	53,450	88.3	7,075	11.7

Note: The age categories described above may overlap with one another. For example, two spouses aged 35 and 40 years would be included in both the second and third categories. Hence, the totals of the columns represent more than 100% of the households in question.

Table 10
Individuals Living in Intermarried Households
by Age Breakdowns
(Row %)

Age Cohort	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
0-14	31,375	26,070	83.1	5,305	16.9
15-24	18,585	16,460	88.6	2,125	11.4
25-44	34,970	27,775	79.4	7,195	20.6
45-64	37,135	31,920	86.0	5,215	14.0
65+	16,545	15,585	94.2	960	5.8
Total Individuals Living in Couple Households	138,610	117,810	85.0	20,800	15.0
0-4	9,830	7,820	79.6	2,010	20.4

Table 10 provides an interesting statistic. About one in six Jewish children under 15 years (16.9%), who reside with both parents, live in an intermarried arrangement. This represents 5,305 children.

A further analysis shows that 20.4% of children younger than 5 years, who reside with both parents, live in an intermarried arrangement. This involves 2,010 children.

It should be noted that the above statistics likely underestimate the number of children residing in intermarried families, since only those identified as being Jewish by their parents are included in this count. Later data presented in this report will show that a significant percentage of younger children in intermarried families are not considered to be Jewish by their parents.

Table 11 shows the number of children living at home by various couple arrangements. When both spouses are Jewish, the mean number of children living at home is higher than in intermarried situations (1.3 and 1.0 children, respectively). Although both figures appear low, the reader should note that these are not measures of fertility, because they do

not take into account children living outside the home.

Further analysis reveals that whether the wife or husband intermarries makes no difference in terms of the number of children living at home. Both arrangements register a mean of one child per household.

Arrangements in which both spouses are Jewish have a significantly higher percentage of households with at least three children living at home (16.1%), compared to intermarried arrangements (7.8%).

Table 12 looks at family structure by couple arrangements. It can be seen that the percentage of common law arrangements among intermarried households is significantly higher than among those where both spouses are Jewish (22.9% and 3.4%, respectively). In short, almost a quarter of intermarried couples live in common law situations.

The level of common law arrangements among the intermarried (22.9%) is even higher than that for the overall Toronto and Ontario populations respectively (9% and 11%).

Table 11
Number of Children in Intermarried Households

Number of Children	Total		Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
None	19,800	40.2	13,895	38.6	5,905	44.4
One	9,460	19.2	6,570	18.3	2,890	21.7
Two	13,155	26.7	9,700	27.0	3,455	26.0
Three	5,080	10.3	4,200	11.7	880	6.6
Four	1,120	2.3	970	2.7	150	1.1
Five or more	630	1.3	620	1.7	10	0.1
Total Couple Households	49,245	100.0	35,955	100.0	13,290	100.0
Mean Number	--		1.3		1.0	

Table 12
Family Structure in Intermarried Households

Family Structure	Total		Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Married couples	44,975	91.3	34,725	96.6	10,250	77.1
Common-law couples	4,270	8.7	1,225	3.4	3,045	22.9
Total Couple Households	49,245	100.0	35,950	100.0	13,295	100.0

Who Intermarries?

Table 13 looks at intermarriage by place of birth. Jews born in Canada have an intermarriage rate of 15.8%.

Jews from South America (29.3%) and the United States (20.4%) have the highest levels of intermarriage among immigrants. The lowest incidence of intermarriage is found among those born in Israel (6.6%). There are also low intermarriage levels among Jews born in North Africa / Middle East (excl. Israel) (10.7%) and Eastern Europe (12.1%).

Interestingly, Jews from the Former Soviet Union (FSU) have an intermarriage level of 13.6%, which is below the average for the Jewish community as a whole. This figure is well below the intermarriage rate of 24.1% obtained for FSU Jews in Montreal, and 23% in Vancouver.

Unfortunately, regarding statistics related to intermarriage and year of immigration, it is not possible using the Census data alone to determine whether individuals had intermarried in this country, or had arrived here with their non-Jewish spouse.

Regarding intermarriage by year of immigration (Table 14), recent immigrants (1990-2001) have the highest level of intermarriage of any landed immigrant group (15.9%). However, this level is identical to the intermarriage rates of non-immigrants. The lowest intermarriage rates are found among those who immigrated before 1960 (8.8%).

A more detailed analysis of intermarriage levels involving year of immigration and place of birth is shown in the table below. This breakdown examines the intermarriage rates of immigrant groups arriving between 1990-2001. It is clear that large percentages of immigrant Jews arriving from South America (37%) and Eastern Europe (29.1%) live in intermarried households.

In absolute terms, of 2,540 individuals who arrived between 1990-2001, and who live in intermarried households, 1,565 were born in the Former Soviet Union, 230 in Eastern Europe and 220 in the United States. The remainder (525) originated in various other regions.

Table 13
Individuals Living in Intermarried Households
by Place of Birth
(Row %)

Place of Birth	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Canada	90,985	76,600	84.2	14,385	15.8
Israel	6,790	6,340	93.4	450	6.6
Eastern Europe (excl. FSU)	7,805	6,860	87.9	945	12.1
Former Soviet Union	14,840	12,825	86.4	2,015	13.6
Western Europe	4,720	3,885	82.3	835	17.7
North Africa / Middle East (excl. Israel)	2,390	2,135	89.3	255	10.7
United States	5,190	4,130	79.6	1,060	20.4
South America	920	650	70.7	270	29.3
Other	4,975	4,390	88.2	585	11.8
Total Individuals Living in Couple Households	138,615	117,815	85.0	20,800	15.0

Table 14
Individuals Living in Intermarried Households
by Year of Immigration
(Row %)

Year of Immigration	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Non-immigrants	91,610	77,075	84.1	14,535	15.9
Before 1960	7,655	6,980	91.2	675	8.8
1960 - 1969	4,675	4,020	86.0	655	14.0
1970 - 1979	7,550	6,390	84.6	1,160	15.4
1980 - 1989	9,950	8,955	90.0	995	10.0
1990 - 2001	16,010	13,470	84.1	2,540	15.9

Table 15
Intermarried Households
Education of Spouses / Partners
(Row %)

	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Both Spouses Less Than Univ. Education	27,350	23,260	85.0	4,090	15.0
At Least One Spouse Univ. Undergraduate Degree	37,315	31,280	83.8	6,035	16.2
At Least One Spouse Univ. Graduate Degree	32,885	27,990	85.1	4,895	14.9
Both Spouses University Graduate Degrees	10,965	9,100	83.0	1,865	17.0

Note: The education categories described above may overlap with one another. For example, a couple who both have university graduate degrees would be included in the third and fourth categories. Hence, the totals of the columns represent more than 100% of the households in question.

Table 16A
Intermarriage Breakdowns
Family Income
(Row %)

	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Under \$25,000	3,455	2,660	77.0	795	23.0
\$25,000 - \$49,999	6,725	4,880	72.6	1,845	27.4
\$50,000 - \$99,999	15,780	10,805	68.5	4,975	31.5
\$100,000 - \$149,999	9,800	7,045	71.9	2,755	28.1
\$150,000 or more	13,505	10,570	78.3	2,935	21.7
Total Couple Households	49,265	35,960	73.0	13,305	27.0

Table 16B
Intermarriage Breakdowns
Median Family Income

	Median Income (\$)
Both Spouses Jewish	97,856
Intermarried	88,630

Intermarriage Rates of Jewish Immigrants Arriving Between 1990-2001 by Place of Birth

	%
Israel	6.1
Eastern Europe (excl. FSU)	29.1
Former Soviet Union	16.8
Western Europe	16.3
N. Africa / Middle East (excl. Israel)	26.9
United States	21.3
South America	37.0
Other	8.3
Total	15.8

Table 15 examines the relationship between level of education and intermarriage. Note that some education categories described in this table overlap with one another. The findings suggest that there is not a clear relationship between education and intermarriage, at least in the Greater Toronto Jewish community.

For instance, when both spouses have less than a university education, the intermarriage level is 15%. An intervening variable here might be age. Individuals older than 50 years are less likely to have a university degree and also less likely to intermarry.

If at least one of the spouses has a university undergraduate degree the intermarriage rate

risers to 16.2%. But if at least one spouse has a university graduate degree the intermarriage level drops to 14.9%. Finally, the highest rate of intermarriage is found when both spouses have university graduate degrees, such as MAs or PhDs (17%). In short, there are no large differences between intermarriage rates across educational categories.

It is interesting that studies in the United States suggest an inverse link between level of education and intermarriage. The National Jewish Population Survey (2000-2001) found that 34% of those with a high school education or less were intermarried, compared to 31% with a university undergraduate degree, and 27% with a university graduate degree.⁶ Cohen (1989) reports that among American men who never attended university, the intermarriage rate is over 40%; of those with an undergraduate degree, only 18% are intermarried.⁷

As Table 16A shows, the relationship between intermarriage and income status is

⁶ NJPS (2000-01) Report on Jewish Life: Variations in Intermarriage. See the United Jewish Communities Web Site: <http://www.ujc.org>

⁷ Cohen, S. *Alternative Families in the Jewish Community*. The American Jewish Committee, Institute of Human Relations (1989).

Table 17
Religion of Youngest Child in Intermarried Households

Religion of Youngest Child	Both Spouses Jewish		Husband Jewish / Wife Non-Jewish		Husband Non-Jewish / Wife Jewish		Total Intermarried	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Jewish	21,045	95.4	850	20.8	1,640	49.5	2,490	33.6
Catholic	45	0.2	580	14.2	315	9.5	895	12.1
Protestant	30	0.1	360	8.8	175	5.3	535	7.2
Christian Orthodox	30	0.1	180	4.4	55	1.7	235	3.2
Muslim	10	0.0	15	0.4	10	0.3	25	0.3
Hindu, Buddhist, Sikh	0	0.0	10	0.2	15	0.5	25	0.3
Para-religious groups	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No religious affiliation	885	4.0	2,000	49.0	1,080	32.6	3,080	41.6
All other religions	10	0.0	90	2.2	25	0.8	115	1.6
Total Couple Households	22,055	100.0	4,085	100.0	3,315	100.0	7,400	100.0

also complex. Intermarriage seems to be more prevalent among middle-income families as far as income ranges are concerned. Those families earning between \$50K - \$99.9K have the highest intermarriage levels (31.5%).

The intermarriage levels are lower in the extremes of the income distribution. For instance, the rates are 23% among families earning under \$25,000 per year, and 21.7% among families earning \$150,000 or more.

As Table 16B shows, the median income of intermarried couples (\$88,630) is lower than that of arrangements where both spouses are Jewish (\$97,856).

Trends from the National Jewish Population Survey in the United States (2000-2001) are compatible with the current findings. The American study found that intermarriage levels peaked in the middle of the income distribution, and were less pronounced in the extremes. For instance, 38% of households earning between \$50,000-\$99,999 were intermarried, compared to 32% of households

earning less than \$25,000, and 28% of households earning more than \$150,000.⁸

The Affiliations of Children in Intermarried Families

How children are being brought up in intermarried families has profound implications for the issue of Jewish continuity. Since the intermarriage level among Greater Toronto's Jews is 15.6% there is little doubt that the community cannot afford to lose these families to the pressures of assimilation.

Table 17 is very revealing in this regard. As expected, among Jewish families, the great majority of the youngest children (95.4%) are identified by their parents as Jews, 4% are assigned no religious identification, and 0.6% are identified as having other religions. Note, however, that despite the fact that the great majority are identified as Jews, it is impossible to determine their level of exposure to Jewish customs and rituals. There is also no way to know from the Census how these identifications translate into actual behaviors and attitudes.

⁸ Special analysis done of NJPS 2000-2001 and personally communicated to the authors by J. Ament, Senior Project Director, Research Department, United Jewish Communities.

Regarding the youngest children of intermarried couples, 33.6% (2,490) are identified by their parents as Jews by religion; a larger percentage, 41.6% (3,080) have no religious identification; and the rest, 24.8% (1,830), are identified as having other religions.

In other words, almost two-thirds (66.4%) of these children in intermarried families are not identified as belonging to the religious orientation of the Jewish spouse. It is difficult to say whether they are having either minimal or no exposure to Judaism, but the findings are suggestive nonetheless.

Table 17 also shows that whether a Jewish man or woman intermarries is a critical factor in the identification of the youngest child. For instance, in cases where Jewish men intermarry, 20.8% of youngest children are identified as Jewish, 49% as having no religious affiliation, and 30.2% as having another religion. In short, 79.2% do not have the religious orientation of the Jewish father.

In cases where Jewish women intermarry, 49.5% are identified as Jewish, 32.6% as having no religious identification, and 17.9% as having another religion. In short, about

half (50.5%) of youngest children in the household are not identified as being Jewish.

Enrolment in Jewish Schools

A basic foundation of Jewish life is the education that children are given during their formative years. A sound Jewish education instills the values and beliefs that form essential ingredients of one's "Jewishness". This perspective can best be promoted if the child gets sufficient exposure to Jewish history and customs, in an environment that benefits from the encouragement of educators and peers.

Some studies have shown that a full-time Jewish education, although not a guarantee of high levels of Jewish identification and affiliation, does greatly influence these factors. Studies in the United States and Canada suggest that a Jewish education positively impacts on a person's adherence to Jewish customs, their level of involvement with Jewish organizations, raising one's own children Jewishly, the level of in-marriage and supporting Israel in a variety of ways.⁹

⁹ Fishman, S.B. & Goldstein, A. When They Are Grown They Will Not Depart: Jewish Education and the Jewish Behavior of American Adults. Cohen

In the Greater Toronto community, there is a long-standing tradition of helping children whose parents are unable to afford fees for a Jewish education. According to the UJA Federation Board of Jewish Education, parents of about 33% of students enrolled in the Jewish day school system received direct tuition subsidies in 2001, by funds raised in the UJA Federation annual campaign. The total amount of tuition subsidies allocated that year by UJA Federation was almost \$6.5 million. The community recognizes the need to make Jewish education more affordable and accessible for all eligible children whose parents want them to pursue such an education.

The level of Jewish school (including pre-school, day and supplementary) enrolment

Center for Modern Jewish Studies, Brandeis University, 1993.

Schiff, A. I. And Schneider, M. *The Jewishness Quotient of Jewish day School Graduates: Studying the Effects of Jewish Education on Adult Jewish Behavior*. New York, David J. Azrieli Graduate Institute, Report 1, 1994.

Shahar, C. *The Jewish High School Experience: Its Implications for the Evolution of Jewish Identity in Young Adults*. The Jewish Education Council of Montreal, Montreal, 1998.

Cohen, S.M. & Kotler-Berkowitz, L. *The Impact of Childhood Jewish Education on Adults' Jewish Identity*. Report Series on the National Jewish Population Survey 2000-2001. United Jewish Communities, July 2004.

had been rising steadily in the three decades preceding the last Census. In 1971, total enrolment in the system was 9,253. In 1981, the figure was 11,930, an increase of 28.9%. Enrolment also increased to 15,507 in 1991, a rise of 30%. Finally, total enrolment in the Jewish school system increased by 10.5% between 1991 and 2001 to 17,142.

More recently, however, there has been a small decrease in enrolment figures. Between 2001 and 2005 enrolment in the Jewish school system dipped from 17,142 to 16,496, a decrease of about 4%. This small decline in total enrolment was noted in the diminishing numbers in pre-schools within the Jewish day schools and in supplementary school attendance.

It is important to note that according to the Census the number of students available to enter the Jewish school system has been decreasing. While the absolute number of students has decreased slightly, the percentage of students both entering the Jewish day school system and remaining in the system has been increasing. In 1991, 39% of students eligible for grade 1 entered the Jewish school system; in 2001 the corresponding figure was 41%. Data

Table 18A
Percent Enrolled in Jewish Day Schools (Grades 1-12)
(2001)

	2001 Census Base Population	Enrolled in Jewish Day Schools	Percent of Base Enrolled	Total in Non-Jewish Schools
Elementary School (1-8)	19,805	7,059	35.6	12,746
High School (9-12)	10,560	2,305	21.8	8,255
Total	30,365	9,364	30.8	21,001

Table 18B
Percent Having Exposure to Jewish Instruction
(Includes Supplementary School Enrolment)
(2001)

	2001 Census Base Population	Enrolled in Jewish Day Schools	Enrolled in Supplement. Schools	Total With Jewish Instruction	Percent With Jewish Instruction	Total With No Jewish Instruction
Total (1-12)	30,365	9,364	5,874	15,238	50.2	15,127

available for 2005 demonstrate that 45% entered the system. Similarly, if we examine data for all grades 1 – 8, in 2001 35.6% of eligible students were enrolled and in 2005 that figure was 38%.

It is also important to note that this analysis, in fact, represents a relatively refined estimate because discrete age groups of Jews (i.e. numbers of individuals of each age for those 0 – 19) are available from the Census data.

Table 18A presents levels of enrolment for Jewish elementary day schools, high schools and totals. The first column relates to the base population of school-aged children as reflected in the 2001 Census statistics. The second column shows total enrolment in the Jewish day school system. The percentages of Jewish children enrolled in Jewish day schools are featured in the third column.

According to Table 18A, 35.6% of Jewish children in grades 1 – 8 are registered in Jewish elementary day schools, and 21.8% of children in grades 9 – 12 are registered in Jewish high schools. In absolute terms, 7,059 children are attending Jewish elementary schools and 12,746 are attending non-Jewish

elementary schools. Moreover, 2,305 are attending Jewish high schools, whereas 8,255 are attending non-Jewish high schools. In total, 30.8% of students in grades 1 – 12 are attending Jewish schools.

Finally, Table 18B examines the total number of children in grades 1 – 12 who have either a day school or supplementary school Jewish education. According to the results, 50.2% of Jewish children have some exposure to formal education with a Jewish content. However, this table does not take into account children who are receiving Jewish instruction from private teachers, tutors, or family members, or informal settings such as Jewish summer camps, youth movements, Israel trips etc. The impact of these latter forms of experiential Jewish education can also be quite enduring.

The Challenges Ahead

Jews have long relied on the commitment and participation of their fellow members to help lead and shape the community in which they live. Toronto enjoys an especially high quality of Jewish life within North America, and to ensure this continues, some of the questions raised in this report will require

serious consideration by community leaders and planners.

The Census figures suggest that a significant group identify as Jews not in terms of the religious aspects of the faith, but rather from an ethnic perspective only. Some of these individuals, who may be less likely to be active within a Jewish milieu, require opportunities for community connection that are welcoming and consistent with this form of identification.

The organized Jewish community must create more avenues for participation among those who identify by ethnicity generally.

The percentage of intermarried households in Toronto is not unexpected given current intermarriage trends across North America. Of note, however, is the fact that the number of individuals living in such arrangements has increased by more than 40% over the last decade, although the proportional increase was 2.6%. Of particular importance, the percentage of intermarriage increases significantly the younger the ages of the two spouses.

What type of initiatives can be undertaken to address the issue of intermarriage? One approach is to provide more educational and social opportunities, for youth and young adults that will encourage marriages between Jews.

The figures indicate that more than one half of Toronto's Jewish children have exposure to education with a Jewish content. This is an important finding for the long-term strength of the community, as a Jewish education is positively associated with fostering a strong Jewish identity, and ultimately choices that support a Jewish lifestyle. It should be noted however, that less than a third of children are registered in a Jewish day school where they would have the most intensive exposure to Jewish education. The high cost of a day school education makes this option difficult for many families who cannot afford the financial commitment and do not qualify for substantial subsidies.

Options to consider include increased support for supplementary programs, informal experiential forms of Jewish education and family education as well as support for parents, who may not have had formal Jewish training, in order that they will be better able

to provide a Jewish home environment. Other options include increased support for programs such as youth groups, summer camps, JCC programs and other informal educational settings.

Another approach relates to accommodation and education: providing programs specifically designed to be inclusive and that enable intermarried families to comfortably participate in community life; explaining Jewish customs and traditions to the non-Jewish spouse; and exposing the children of intermarried couples to Jewish values and traditions. This approach involves giving intermarried families a “taste” of Judaism, so that they may be more inclined to choose Jewish options for their children.

The importance of Jewish education, outreach to those with a lesser identification, and the impact of intermarriage raise important questions about setting strategic directions to address the issue of continuity within the Toronto Jewish community. Community leaders and planners have, and continue to debate, how to allocate limited resources in the most effective way possible.

Should the community direct its attention and resources primarily to those who are strongly identified yet require support in order to maintain this connection, or should greater attention be directed at strengthening the identification of less identified Jews and / or those that have intermarried?

The former direction suggests measures to make Jewish day and supplementary programs more accessible for parents who are not now considering them as alternatives, as well as further support for Jewish camps, for JCC membership, university campus programming and youth movements. The latter suggests that more emphasis be placed on outreach, informal education, and social and cultural initiatives that will attract individuals that may be marginally identified.

Key to this debate is the recognition that the Jewish community is diverse in its expression and that the trend towards assimilation and intermarriage is ongoing and growing. In our efforts to preserve the continuity of the community we must consider ways to best strengthen identification not only for those who already have a strong foundation, but also, for those who do not. Within this context, the debate concerning the issue of

community continuity will undoubtedly include serious discussion regarding what, in fact, is the appropriate balance required to

ultimately ensure the greatest benefit to the community.

Appendix 1

The Jewish Standard Definition

This report uses what is known as the “Jewish Standard Definition” to distinguish who is Jewish from the rest of the population. Jim Torczyner of McGill University and the Jewish Federation of Montreal formulated this definition in 1981, using a combination of religious and ethnic identification.

According to this criterion, a Jew is defined as anyone who specified that they were:

- Jewish by religion and ethnicity.
- Jewish by religion and having another ethnicity.
- Jewish by ethnicity with no religious affiliation.

Anyone who specified another religion (Catholic, Muslim, etc.) and a Jewish ethnicity were excluded in the above definition.

Using this criterion, it is not possible to say how a person behaves “Jewishly”: for instance, whether they adhere to traditions or attend synagogue on a regular basis. However, despite this limitation, the fact

that we can identify Jewish affiliation at all is critical for using the Census as a tool to better understand our community. The Jewish Standard Definition is meant to be as inclusive as possible, reflecting the varied expressions that comprise the richness of the Jewish experience.

It is important to note that a significant change to the “Jewish Standard Definition” was implemented in the current analysis of Census data. The category of those who had “no religion and a Jewish ethnicity” was expanded to include those with “no religious affiliation and a Jewish ethnicity”.

The category of “no religious affiliation” is broader than that of “no religion” because it includes those who consider themselves agnostics, atheists and humanists, as well as those having no religion. Since it is possible to be Jewish and have such affiliations, it was felt that this change would better reflect the broad spectrum of Jewish affiliation. Data from previous Censuses have been re-analyzed to ensure compatibility with the current criterion.

Appendix 2

The Reliability of the Census

The Census is a massive and complex undertaking, and although high standards are applied throughout the process, a certain level of error still characterizes the endeavor. Such errors can arise at virtually any point in the Census process, from the preparation of materials to the collection of data and the processing of information.

There are a number of principal types of errors that impact on the Census. In coverage errors, dwellings or individuals are missed, incorrectly enumerated or counted more than once. Regarding non-response errors, responses to the Census cannot be obtained from a certain number of households and/or individuals because of extended absence or extenuating circumstances.

In response errors, the respondent misunderstands a Census question and answers incorrectly or uses the wrong response box. Processing errors occur during the coding and inputting of data.

Finally, sampling errors apply only to the long-form. Statistics based on this form are

projected from a 20% sample of households. The responses to long-form questions, when projected to represent the whole population inevitably differ from the responses that would have been obtained if these questions were asked of all households.

Statistics Canada has a number of quality control measures that ensure Census data are as reliable as possible. Representatives edit the questionnaires when they are returned, and follow up on missing information. There are also quality control measures in place during the coding and data entry stages.

Despite these controls, a number of errors and response-biases can nonetheless impact data obtained from the Jewish population. For instance, certain segments of the Jewish community may be reticent to answer Census questions fully or accurately.

Recent immigrant populations, who are suspicious of government-sponsored projects and are wary of being identified as Jewish, may avoid indicating such an affiliation, or may answer certain questions more cautiously.

Members of the Chassidic and Ultra-Orthodox communities may be more reluctant to participate fully in the Census effort, due to specific Biblical injunctions that prohibit Jews from “being counted.” It is unclear whether such restrictions have had an impact on their responses, but anecdotal evidence suggests that these communities respond adequately. For instance, the Tosh Chasidic community of Montreal, which is fairly isolated geographically from the rest of the Jewish population, has had significant representation in previous Censuses, although it is unclear as to what extent their enumeration was complete.

Finally, since both the religion and ethnicity questions are only included in the long-form of the Census, sampling error arising from projections based on a 20% sampling of households is a factor in all Census analyses related to the Jewish community.

The level of sampling error inherent in any cell of a data table can be precisely calculated. Statistics Canada provides a table that measures these errors, and they are summarized below. Obviously, for large cell values, the potential error due to sampling will be proportionally smaller than for smaller ones.

When using the table, the reader should consider the right column as reflective of the average level of error expected for a given cell size. Of course, some cells may reflect errors smaller or larger than the average. About ninety percent of errors will fall between \pm the average error specified below. Ten percent of errors are expected to fall outside this range.

Cell Value	Average Error
50 or less	15
100	20
200	30
500	45
1,000	65
2,000	90
5,000	140
10,000	200
20,000	280
50,000	450
100,000	630

Source for Appendix 2: 2001 Census Dictionary Reference Guide (pg. 275). Published by Statistics Canada, August 2002. Catalogue No. 92-378-XPE.

