

2011

NATIONAL HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

THE JEWISH COMMUNITY OF TORONTO

PART 5
THE JEWISH FAMILY

PART 6
INTERMARRIAGE



**2011 National Household Survey Analysis
The Jewish Community of Toronto**

**Part 5
The Jewish Family**

**Part 6
Intermarriage**

**By
Charles Shahrar
&
Randal Schnoor**

Acknowledgments

Jewish Federations of Canada - UIA would like to thank Marc Pagé of Statistics Canada for his expertise and meticulous attention to detail. Without his assistance this report would not be possible.

The researchers would like to express appreciation to Daniel Held for his careful review of this document, and for contributing his knowledge and insights about the Toronto Jewish community.

Finally, a special acknowledgment is extended to Duy Bach Nguyen for his diligent work in the extraction and verification of statistical data.

All data in this report are adapted from:
Statistics Canada, special order tabulations for Jewish Federations of Canada - UIA, CO-1421.

Highlights of Part 5

- There are 83,120 Jewish households in Greater Toronto, comprising 4.2% of the total 1,989,700 households in this metropolitan area.
- Within the Jewish community, the current level of those living in family arrangements (84.8%) is about the same as in 1991 (84.2%).
- In 1991, there were 10,755 Toronto Jews living in single parent families. When compared to the 2011 figure of 15,830, this represents an increase of 47.2% in the last two decades.
- Slightly more than one in ten Jewish children (< 15 years) in Greater Toronto live in lone parent families (10.5%).
- Of 26,730 Jews who are unattached, 4,430 live with non-relatives, and 22,305 live alone. Persons living alone comprise 11.8% of the total Jewish population in this metropolitan area.
- While seniors represent 16.4% of all Greater Toronto's Jews, they account for 39.4% of all Jews who live alone.
- In the last decade, the fastest growing groups as far as marital status is concerned were those choosing to live in common law arrangements (+26.5%) and those who are divorced / separated (+23.9%).
- By the age of 25 years, 2.9% of Jews in this metropolitan area have married at least once. By the age of 45 years, 69.7% have married at least once. Finally, by 65 years, 92.2% have married at least once.
- Jews in young adulthood (18-26 years) are slightly less inclined to marry compared to non-Jews of that age group, and are also slightly less inclined to live in common law partnerships.

Highlights of Part 6

- 18% of Jewish spouses / partners are married to, or partnered with, non-Jews in the Toronto metropolitan area. This figure is considered to be the intermarriage rate for the Toronto Jewish community. In absolute terms, 16,155 of 89,895 Jewish spouses / partners are intermarried.
- Another way of determining the intermarriage rate is to look at the total number of Jews living in intermarried families, including children. There are 24,785 individuals who live in intermarried households, representing 17.3% of all persons living in couple arrangements.
- There has been an increase of 68.6% of Jews living in intermarried households in the last two decades. The number has climbed from 14,700 to 24,785 individuals between 1991-2011. As a proportion of the total Jewish population, the percentage of Jews living in intermarried households increased from 11.6% in 1991 to 17.3% in 2011.
- The geographic area with the largest proportion of Jews living in intermarried households is Danforth / Beaches (68.8%). In absolute terms, the largest number of intermarried Jews live in the miscellaneous area of "Rest of Toronto CMA" (6,080). These individuals are more geographically distant from Jewish centers and therefore represent a special challenge for community outreach and engagement efforts. There are 2,645 individuals living in intermarried arrangements in Vaughan.
- In cases where both spouses are less than 30 years of age, the level of intermarriage is 28.3%. It is 15.1% 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 (18.3%). More than one in five children under the age of 5 years live in intermarried families (20.6%).
- Regarding the youngest children of intermarried couples, almost a third (32.4%) are identified by their parents as Jews; about half (50.4%) are assigned no religious affiliation; and the rest (17.2%) are identified as having other religions. Whether it is the husband or the wife who is of the Jewish faith has a significant bearing on the religious orientation of their children.

Table of Contents

Part 5: The Jewish Family

Major Trends in Jewish Family Life.....	1
The Trends in Perspective.....	4
The Focus of the Present Study	5
Jewish Households: Their Number, Size and Type.....	7
Living Arrangements	9
Marital Status	17
Family Structure & Number of Children in Households	27
The Challenges Ahead	29

Part 6: Intermarriage

Levels of Intermarriage in the Toronto CMA.....	33
Where Do Individuals Living in Intermarried Households Reside?.....	37
The Characteristics of Intermarried Households	39
Who Intermarries?	45
The Affiliations of Children in Intermarried Families.....	49
The Challenges Ahead	53

Appendices

Appendix 1: Methodological Considerations	55
Appendix 2: The Revised Jewish Definition	59

Appendix 3: Geographic Borders	61
Appendix 4: Additional Data Tables	65

2011 National Household Survey Analysis

Part 5: The Jewish Family

The current study looks at two major and interrelated topics regarding Jewish life: the Jewish family and intermarriage. This report is part of a series of analyses derived from the 2011 National Household Survey that describe the demographic characteristics of the Jewish population in the Toronto metropolitan area.

In recent years the composition and dynamics of Jewish family life have changed considerably. These transformations can be understood in the context of social and economic changes in the greater society, which Jews more or less mirror as a group. Increasingly, there have been strains on the stability of the nuclear family, such that non-traditional living arrangements have become significant, not only in terms of their increasing numbers, but in the types of challenges they present to community workers and planners.

Most Jews continue to marry at some point in their lives, and to have one or more children, but they are increasingly choosing to remain single longer, to have fewer children than in previous generations, or to remain childless after marriage. Given the

shifting proportions of Jewish family types and the changed expectations of their members, new demands are increasingly put on the community to respond.

Wertheimer and Cohen note that on a pragmatic level, Jewish communal affiliation has been highly related to in-married couples that have children.¹ Jews who live in non-traditional family settings tend to manifest less participation in communal activities. A survey done of Toronto Jews found that divorced and single individuals showed among the lowest levels of affiliation of any demographic group in the community.²

Major Trends in Jewish Family Life:

To understand the transformations that have taken place in the structure and values of family life it is important to analyze certain demographic trends that have transpired in

¹ Wertheimer, J. and Cohen, S.M. The Pew Survey Reanalyzed: More Bad News, but a Glimmer of Hope. *Mosaic Magazine* (November 2, 2014).

² Shahar, C. & Rosenbaum, T. Jewish Life in Greater Toronto: A Survey of the Attitudes & Behaviours of Greater Toronto's Jewish Community. UJA Federation of Greater Toronto. February 2006.

the last 50 years. The following is a brief summary:

(1) There are growing numbers of single adults in the population: The proportion of singles has actually increased in the past 50 years, but particularly in the last three decades. The centrality of marriage has declined in general North American society, and this is reflected in the Jewish population. A recent study of one community in the United States, for example, found that in the last decade married Jewish adults have decreased from 57% to 52%.³ Singles are most common among young adults and the elderly, particularly older widows. There are increasingly large numbers of middle-aged singles as well.

Although most people marry by the beginning of middle age, increases in divorces leave large numbers of them single. They are also taking longer to re-marry, and some are returning to their parents due to financial concerns.

(2) The incidence of divorce is increasing: Many factors, such as shifting social mores, different expectations of marriage, and revamped divorce laws, have altered the role

of marriage in our society. Marriage has traditionally been perceived as something that binds people permanently, regardless of whether they remain happily or unhappily wed. Today, people disenchanted with their marriages are much more inclined to consider divorce. In one community in the United States, a recent study found that separation and divorce has increased from 9% to 11% in the last decade.⁴

The impact of divorce can be particularly difficult on children. Recent studies suggest that children of divorced parents have lower achievement rates, and are more likely to drop out of school, than children in intact families. The children's relationships with their parents can also be more strained.⁵ For women, divorce often entails economic hardships.

(3) There is a significant increase in the number of single parent families: The current divorce rates and changing societal norms have resulted in an increased number of single parent families. Beyond circumstances of divorce, more women and

³ See Cohen, S. Jewish Community Study of New York. UJA Federation of New York, 2011.

⁴ See Cohen, S. Jewish Community Study of New York. UJA Federation of New York, 2011.

⁵ See for example:

Kalmijn, M. Long-term effects of divorce on parent-child relationships: Within-family comparisons of fathers and mothers. *European Sociological Review* 29.5 (2013): 888-898.

Ham, B. The Effects of Divorce on the Academic Achievement of High School Seniors, *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 38.3/4, 2003, 167-185.

men are choosing to have children completely outside of marriage or a couple relationship. With a new ethos of individualism in society, more Jewish singles express a strong desire for children, but do not necessarily see a connection between this and forming a couple relationship. As Fishman reports, young Jewish women, in particular, are increasingly comfortable saying, “I can have a Jewish child on my own. I don’t need a man to create and raise a Jewish child.”⁶ This phenomenon is closely connected to the above-mentioned trend of extended singlehood.

(4) Families are having fewer children and remaining childless longer than before: As women increasingly entered the workforce in the late 1960s and 1970s, many made the decision to marry later and postponed having children. A number of North American studies have suggested that there is a strong relationship between educational level and the proportion of childless couples. As the level of education increases among women, the proportion with no children also rises.⁷ Indeed, the

trend among many women and men in general North American society is to first complete several years of post-secondary education, then become financially independent, and only afterwards consider marriage and children.

Fishman points to some concerns regarding the temporary postponement of childbearing, which she suggests ultimately has an impact on the size of the family. As women of child-bearing ages get older, the incidence of infertility increases. She estimates that 15% of Jewish couples who want children find it difficult or impossible to conceive.⁸

The recent Pew report on American Jews reports a fertility rate of 1.7 for non-Orthodox Jews.⁹ A stable population requires a birthrate of 2.1. This trend thus suggests a significant demographic decline.

(5) There is an increasing number of same-sex partnerships: This trend relates to changing societal attitudes regarding homosexual relationships, which has

⁶ See Fishman, S.B. Transformations in the Composition of American Jewish Households. American Jewish Committee, 2010.

⁷ See for example: Hartman, H. The Intersection of Gender and Religion in the Demography of Today’s American Jewish Families (Paper presented at the Brandeis University Seminar on Creating and Maintaining Jewish Families,

March 25, 2007). Rose, E. Education, Hypergamy and the “Success Gap”. Department of Economics, University of Washington, April 2006.

⁸ Fishman, S. The Larger Battle: The real fight facing American Jews is not against intermarriage but for marriage itself. *Mosaic Magazine* (Sept 1, 2013).

⁹ See Cooperman, A. et al. 2013 Pew Research Center Survey of U.S. Jews: A Portrait of Jewish Americans.

recently had implications for the legality of same-sex marriages. Same-sex marriage has been legal in Canada since 2005, and Canada is now one of several countries that has guaranteed full marriage rights to same sex couples.

Although the 2001 Census asked respondents (for the first time) to indicate if they were living in a same-sex arrangement, the information was significantly underestimated because follow-up studies suggested that many gay and lesbian couples did not acknowledge such arrangements. Taking non-disclosure and sampling errors into account, it is not clear whether the 2011 National Household Survey data is sufficiently reliable for an analysis of same-sex couples on the level of Jewish populations in metropolitan areas.

A 2011 study of the Jewish community of New York reported that 5% of all Jewish households include a same-sex couple.¹⁰ In all likelihood this is an underestimate as well.

The Trends in Perspective

Despite the changes in the structure of the family unit, and the rise of non-traditional families, there is no doubt that marriage

remains a popular institution among Jews and the general community alike.

According to the 2011 National Household Survey, 70.1% of Canadian Jews are likely to marry at least once by the time they reach 45 years of age. The figure is slightly lower for the total Canadian population: 69.1% will marry at least once by their 45th birthday.

In recent years some women have experienced what demographers call "the marriage squeeze". Since women often marry men somewhat older than themselves, women born in the later years of the Baby Boom have experienced a dearth of eligible mates.¹¹ Nonetheless, according to the 2011 National Household Survey, 91.5% of Canadian Jewish Baby Boomers between 45-64 years have married at least once.

In terms of non-traditional families, one trend which was not mentioned above is the increasing frequency of intermarriages: that is, Jews who choose to marry someone outside their faith. A description of this phenomenon and its implications for the Jewish community is discussed in the second part of this report.

¹⁰ See Cohen, S. Jewish Community Study of New York. UJA Federation of New York, 2011.

¹¹ Della Pergola, S. Jewish Out-Marriage: A Global Perspective. International Roundtable on Intermarriage – Brandeis University, December 18, 2003.

The Focus of the Present Study

The present study has a number of aims. Firstly, it seeks to describe the demographics related to the Jewish family in the Greater Toronto area. This includes statistical breakdowns for the Jewish population in the entire metropolitan area, as well as smaller municipalities and districts.

Another aim is to provide comparisons across a series of variables between the Toronto Jewish and non-Jewish populations. The analysis will show whether we are experiencing the same demographic characteristics evident in the community at large.

A further focus will be to provide an historical analysis related to the demographic trends described above. Is Toronto's Jewish population divorcing at higher levels than 10 or 20 years ago? Are fewer people living in married arrangements?

The data analyzed in this report was obtained from the 2011 National Household Survey. A major limitation of this survey is that, unlike vital statistics which are kept on a continuous basis, we cannot know how particular demographic characteristics change from year to year.

For instance, we cannot know how many people married in a given year. It is also not possible to determine how frequently people have married, at what age they first married, for how long they were married, or how long it took them to remarry. Through the National Household Survey we can only examine the number and proportion of people who were married at the time the survey was taken.

On the other hand, given that no extensive vital statistics are available on the Jewish community, say from municipal or hospital records, the National Household Survey represents a particularly valuable source of demographic information on Jewish family life, despite the limitations described above.

A number of important appendices are included in the back of this report. Appendix 1 is a discussion of methodological considerations related to the National Household Survey, and their implications for interpreting the data presented in this study.

A detailed explanation of the definition used to identify Jewishness in this report is presented in Appendix 2. A description of changes to the Jewish definition is also discussed here.

Table 1A
Household Type
Jewish, Non-Jewish & Total Households
Toronto CMA

	Total		Jewish Households		Non-Jewish Households	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Couples With Children	727,485	36.6	29,045	34.9	698,440	36.6
Couples Without Children	399,220	20.1	22,290	26.8	376,930	19.8
Lone Parents	229,675	11.5	5,885	7.1	223,790	11.7
Multiple-Family Households	82,855	4.2	1,240	1.5	81,615	4.3
Non-Family: One Person Only	469,760	23.6	22,305	26.8	447,455	23.5
Non-Family: Two Or More Persons	80,705	4.1	2,355	2.8	78,350	4.1
Total Households	1,989,700	100.0	83,120	100.0	1,906,580	100.0

Table 1B
Household Size
Jewish, Non-Jewish & Total Households
Toronto CMA

	Total		Jewish Households		Non-Jewish Households	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
One	469,755	23.6	22,305	26.8	447,455	23.5
Two	548,335	27.6	26,630	32.0	521,705	27.4
Three	352,350	17.7	11,740	14.1	340,605	17.9
Four	365,110	18.4	13,380	16.1	351,725	18.4
Five	155,310	7.8	5,760	6.9	149,550	7.8
Six	61,160	3.1	2,210	2.7	58,950	3.1
Seven or More	37,670	1.9	1,095	1.3	36,580	1.9
Total Households	1,989,690	100.0	83,120	100.0	1,906,570	100.0
Median Household Size	2.2	--	2.2	--	2.2	--

Appendix 3 is a description of the geographic boundaries that make up the various districts and municipalities presented in selected tables in this report. The reader may want to verify the parameters of these geographic units, particularly if their borders are not clearly implied simply through their label.

Finally, Appendix 4 presents additional data tables that provide more detailed breakdowns related to the Jewish family.

All mentions of “Toronto” in this presentation generally refer to the “Greater Toronto Area” or the “Toronto Census Metropolitan Area (CMA)”. This includes within its parameters not only the City of Toronto, but surrounding suburbs and municipalities such as York Region to the North; Pickering, Ajax and Uxbridge to the East; and Brampton, Mississauga, and Oakville to the West. Specific references to the “City of Toronto” are always indicated as such.

Finally, the reader should note that any minor discrepancies found when totaling columns or rows in the tables are due to random rounding of data. Such rounding up or down is built into the Statistics Canada

processing and cannot be avoided. These rounding errors are minor, with minimal impact on the overall interpretation and reliability of the data.

Jewish Households: Their Number, Size and Type

As Table 1A indicates, there are 83,120 Jewish households in the Toronto CMA. In this report, a Jewish household is defined as a unit in which at least one of the primary household maintainers is Jewish. This could be a spouse, a lone parent, or an unattached individual. Jewish households comprise 4.2% of 1,989,700 total households in the Toronto metropolitan area.

The largest proportion of Jewish households involves couples with children (34.9%), followed by single person households (26.8%), couples without children (26.8%), and lone parent arrangements (7.1%). Individuals living with non-relatives comprise 2.8% of all households, and multiple families comprise 1.5%.

Jewish households tend to have a higher percentage of couples without children than non-Jewish households (26.8% and 19.8% respectively). Jewish households also have a higher percentage of single person

Table 2A
Living Arrangement
Jewish, Non-Jewish & Total Populations
Toronto CMA

	Total		Jews		Non-Jews	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Couple Arrangement	3,998,840	72.4	144,095	76.4	3,854,745	72.3
Male Lone Parent	111,055	2.0	3,410	1.8	107,645	2.0
Female Lone-Parent	581,515	10.5	12,420	6.6	569,100	10.7
Living with Relatives	162,430	2.9	2,065	1.1	160,365	3.0
Living Alone or Non-Relatives	667,400	12.1	26,730	14.2	640,665	12.0
Total Individuals	5,521,240	100.0	188,720	100.0	5,332,520	100.0

Table 2B
Living Arrangement by Gender
Toronto Jewish Population

	Total		Males		Females	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Couple Arrangement	144,095	76.4	74,145	79.7	69,940	73.1
Male Lone Parent	3,410	1.8	2,615	2.8	790	0.8
Female Lone-Parent	12,420	6.6	3,995	4.3	8,420	8.8
Living with Relatives	2,065	1.1	750	0.8	1,310	1.4
Living Alone or Non-Relatives	26,730	14.2	11,490	12.4	15,245	15.9
Total Individuals	188,720	100.0	92,995	100.0	95,705	100.0

arrangements than non-Jewish households (26.8% and 23.5% respectively). On the other hand, non-Jewish households tend to have a higher percentage of lone parent arrangements than Jewish ones (11.7% and 7.1% respectively).

Table 1B examines the size of Jewish, non-Jewish and total households in the Toronto CMA. More than a quarter of Jewish households (26.8%) have a single resident, 32% have two residents, 14.1% have three residents, and 16.1% have four residents. The rest (10.9%) have at least five residents.

Jewish households have a higher percentage of single- and two-person units than non-Jewish households. The latter have a higher proportion for any size above two-person households, although the differences between the two distributions are not large.

Finally, both Jewish and non-Jewish households have identical median household sizes (2.2 persons).

Living Arrangements

Table 2A looks at the living arrangements of Toronto's Jewish, non-Jewish and total populations. About three-quarters (76.4%) of Jews live in couple arrangements, 6.6% live in female lone parent families, and 1.8%

live in male lone parent families. *In short, 84.8% of Jews live in families.* Moreover, 1.1% live with other relatives (such as a grandparent or sibling).

The percentage of Jews who live in families (84.8%) is slightly lower than the proportion in 2001 (85.4%). It is slightly higher than the percentage that lived in families in 1991 (84.2%).¹² *In short, the percentage of Jews living in families has fluctuated slightly in the last two decades, but peaked in 2001.*

The percentage of Toronto Jews living in single parent families (8.4%) is higher than in 2001 (7.5%). It was 6.6% in 1991. The figure has therefore increased in the last two decades.

In 2011, there were 15,830 individuals living in lone parent families, compared to 13,295 in 2001, an increase of 19.1%. In 1991, there were 10,755 Jews living in single parent families. *When compared to the 2011 figure, this represents an increase of 47.2% in the last twenty years.*

¹² All 1991 data in Part 5 of this report were derived from: Torczyner, J. et al. Rapid Growth and Transformation: Demographic Challenges Facing the Jewish Community of Greater Toronto. McGill Consortium for Ethnicity & Strategic Social Planning, 1995.

Table 2C
Living Arrangement by Age
Toronto Jewish Population

	0-14		15-24		25-44		45-64		65+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Couple Arrangement	30,565	89.4	19,325	78.4	33,430	73.9	41,285	76.9	19,480	62.9
Male Lone Parent	610	1.8	1,025	4.2	575	1.3	990	1.8	210	0.7
Female Lone-Parent	2,990	8.7	2,905	11.8	2,555	5.7	3,065	5.7	900	2.9
Living with Relatives	25	0.1	180	0.7	415	0.9	560	1.0	880	2.8
Living Alone or With Non-Relatives	0	0.0	1,200	4.9	8,240	18.2	7,805	14.5	9,490	30.7
Total Individuals	34,190	100.0	24,635	100.0	45,215	100.0	53,705	100.0	30,960	100.0

Table 2A also shows that 14.2% of all Jews are unattached (live alone or with non-relatives). In 2001, there was a lower proportion of unattached Jews (13.2%). The figure was 13.9% in 1991. The proportion of unattached Jews has therefore increased, although the difference between 1991 and 2011 is not significant.

In 2001 there were 23,680 unattached Jews in the Toronto CMA, compared to 26,730 in 2011, an increase of 12.9%. In 1991 there were 22,655 unattached individuals, compared to 26,730 in 2011. *The number of unattached Jews has therefore increased by 18% in the last two decades.*

Further calculations involving the 2011 National Household Survey reveal that of the 26,730 individuals who are unattached, 4,430 live with non-relatives, and 22,305 live alone. *Those living alone comprise 11.8% of the total Jewish population in this metropolitan area* (see Table 17A, Appendix 4).

In 2001, 11.2% of the Jewish population lived alone, compared to 11.8% in 2011. In 2001, there were 20,040 individuals living alone compared to 22,305 in 2011, an increase of 11.3% in ten years.

According to Table 2A, the percentage who live in couple arrangements is higher for Jews (76.4%) than non-Jews (72.3%).

There is a higher percentage of individuals who live in female lone parent families among non-Jews compared to Jews (10.7% and 6.6% respectively). Non-Jews are generally more inclined to live in a single parent family than Jews (12.7% and 8.4% respectively).

Finally, Jews are more likely than non-Jews to reside alone or with non-relatives (14.2% and 12% respectively). This might relate to the larger proportion of seniors in the Jewish population, and the fact that many of these seniors are widowed (see Table 2C).

According to Table 2B, Jewish males are more likely than females to reside in couple families (79.7% and 73.1% respectively). On the other hand, females are more likely to be living alone or with non-relatives than males (15.9% and 12.4% respectively).

Table 17B (Appendix 4) presents a more detailed breakdown of unattached Jews by gender. It can be seen that there is a similar percentage of those who live with non-

Table 2D
Living Arrangement by Primary Geographic Areas
Toronto Jewish Population: (Row %)

District	Couple Arrangement		Male Lone parent		Female Lone Parent		With Relatives		Living Alone or With Non-Relatives	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Downtown Core	3,650	46.4	55	0.7	220	2.8	150	1.9	3,790	48.2
Danforth / Beaches	2,945	66.9	160	3.6	495	11.2	30	0.7	775	17.6
Bloor / St. Clair	6,875	69.6	110	1.1	400	4.1	55	0.6	2,435	24.7
St. Clair / Eglinton	9,865	74.4	325	2.5	615	4.6	120	0.9	2,340	17.6
Eglinton / Lawrence	13,830	77.7	250	1.4	1,075	6.0	105	0.6	2,535	14.2
Lawrence / Wilson	9,820	80.8	125	1.0	580	4.8	90	0.7	1,545	12.7
Wilson / Sheppard (West)	3,865	81.1	35	0.7	225	4.7	25	0.5	615	12.9
Wilson / Sheppard (East)	6,790	81.7	80	1.0	435	5.2	60	0.7	945	11.4
Sheppard / Finch (West)	3,865	65.7	260	4.4	515	8.8	90	1.5	1,150	19.6
Sheppard / Finch (East)	3,030	69.3	80	1.8	330	7.5	60	1.4	875	20.0
Finch / Steeles (West)	4,680	65.5	195	2.7	785	11.0	70	1.0	1,420	19.9
Finch / Steeles (East)	4,720	69.1	90	1.3	610	8.9	155	2.3	1,260	18.4
Vaughan	40,275	85.4	810	1.7	2,915	6.2	545	1.2	2,595	5.5
Richmond Hill	9,685	82.6	300	2.6	950	8.1	150	1.3	640	5.5
Markham	6,660	83.7	85	1.1	545	6.9	100	1.3	565	7.1
Mississauga	1,860	72.0	45	1.7	275	10.6	45	1.7	360	13.9
Scarborough	945	67.3	25	1.8	110	7.8	20	1.4	305	21.7
Rest of Toronto CMA	10,735	70.6	370	2.4	1,325	8.7	195	1.3	2,585	17.0
Total Toronto CMA	144,095	76.4	3,410	1.8	12,420	6.6	2,065	1.1	26,730	14.2

relatives among genders. On the other hand, a significantly larger proportion of females are living alone than males (13.8% and 9.8% respectively). This is due to the fact that elderly women are more likely to be widowed than men, and hence represent a greater proportion of those who live alone.

Table 2C examines living arrangement by age. The great majority of children (under 15 years) live in couple arrangements (89.4%), whereas 8.7% live in female single parent families, 1.8% in male single parent families, and 0.1% in other arrangements. *In short, slightly more than one in ten Jewish children in the Toronto CMA live in lone parent families (10.5%).*

The percentage of individuals between 15-24 years who live in lone parent families is 16%. However, it should be noted that a small minority of these persons are likely the parents themselves. About three-quarters (78.4%) of individuals in this age group live in couple arrangements, whether as a spouse or child. Finally, 0.7% live with relatives and 4.9% are unattached.

In terms of adults 25-44 years, 73.9% live in couple arrangements, 7% in lone parent families, 0.9% are living with relatives, and

18.2% are unattached. Note that it is not possible to know in the case of lone parent families, whether the above number refers to parents or their children.

In terms of middle aged Jews (45-64 years), 76.9% live in couple arrangements, 7.5% in lone parent arrangements, 1% with other relatives, and 14.5% are unattached.

Finally, less than two-thirds of Jewish seniors (62.9%) live in couple arrangements, 3.6% in lone parent families, 2.8% with other relatives, and almost a third (30.7%) are unattached.

A closer examination of elderly who are unattached (Table 17C, Appendix 4) shows that 28.4% of Jewish seniors are in fact living alone, and 2.3% are living with non-relatives. While seniors represent 16.4% of all Jews, they account for 39.4% of all Jews who live alone.

Table 2D examines living arrangements for Jewish populations across primary geographic areas. The highest percentage of those living in couple arrangements is found in Vaughan (85.4%), followed by Markham (83.7%) and Richmond Hill (82.6%). The

Table 2E
Living Arrangement by Large Special Interest Geographic Areas
(Row %)

District	Couple Arrangement		Male Lone parent		Female Lone Parent		With Relatives		Living Alone or With Non-Relatives	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Downtown J. Community	15,085	61.0	345	1.4	1,305	5.3	260	1.1	7,715	31.2
Central J. Community	61,925	74.3	1,585	1.9	5,465	6.6	850	1.0	13,575	16.3
Northern J. Community*	59,405	84.5	1,290	1.8	4,660	6.6	805	1.1	4,105	5.8
Southern York Region	57,750	84.7	1,235	1.8	4,485	6.6	795	1.2	3,900	5.7
Peel Region	2,895	74.1	70	1.8	390	10.0	70	1.8	480	12.3
Halton Region	2,375	84.2	50	1.8	110	3.9	35	1.2	250	8.9
Durham Region	2,185	79.0	70	2.5	270	9.8	0	0.0	240	8.7
North York	43,675	74.8	1,020	1.7	3,945	6.8	650	1.1	9,080	15.6
Bathurst Corridor	99,190	77.9	2,365	1.9	7,795	6.1	1,340	1.1	16,705	13.1
Burlington	780	80.8	0	0.0	65	6.7	0	0.0	120	12.4

*Corresponds to York Region.

lowest percentage is in the Downtown Core (46.4%). In absolute terms, Vaughan has by far the largest number of individuals living in couple families (40,275).

The highest percentage of individuals residing in lone parent families is found in Danforth / Beaches (14.8%), followed by Finch / Steeles (West) (13.7%) and Sheppard / Finch (West) (13.2%). However, in absolute terms, the largest numbers of single parent families are located in Vaughan (3,725), "Rest of Toronto CMA" (1,695) Eglinton / Lawrence (1,325) and Richmond Hill (1,250).

The fact that so many lone parents reside in the miscellaneous area of "Rest of Toronto CMA", suggests they are not living in proximity to Jewish services and organizations and therefore may have less access to them.

In terms of unattached individuals (living alone or with non-relatives), by far the highest percentage is found in the Downtown Core (48.2%), followed by Bloor / St. Clair (24.7%). In terms of absolute numbers, the largest contingents of

unattached individuals are found in the Downtown Core (3,790), Vaughan (2,595), "Rest of Toronto CMA" (2,585), Eglinton / Lawrence (2,535), and Bloor / St. Clair (2,435).

Table 2E examines living arrangements 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 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 corresponds to York Region.

As Table 2E shows, the Northern Jewish Community has the highest percentage of people living in couple arrangements (84.5%), compared to the Central and Downtown Jewish communities (74.3% and 61% respectively). On the other hand, there

Table 2F
Living Arrangement by Small Special Interest Geographic Areas
(Row %)

District	Couple Arrangement		Male Lone parent		Female Lone Parent		With Relatives		Living Alone or With Non-Relatives	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Annex / Bloor W. / Yorkville	2,195	62.4	35	1.0	185	5.3	0	0.0	1,105	31.4
High Park / Junction	1,820	66.7	40	1.5	135	4.9	0	0.0	735	26.9
Forest Hill / Cedarvale	10,900	77.0	290	2.0	845	6.0	105	0.7	2,025	14.3
York Mills	5,260	87.9	30	0.5	340	5.7	45	0.8	310	5.2
Bathurst Manor	3,040	67.7	180	4.0	360	8.0	65	1.4	845	18.8
Bathurst Corridor- Sheppard/Steeles	12,450	66.4	555	3.0	1,795	9.6	315	1.7	3,635	19.4
Thornhill (Vaughan)	39,500	85.5	810	1.8	2,800	6.1	525	1.1	2,540	5.5
Thornhill (Markham)	6,020	83.8	85	1.2	505	7.0	75	1.0	500	7.0

are slightly more individuals living in couple families in the Central rather than Northern Jewish community (61,925 and 59,405 respectively).

The Central and Northern Jewish communities have similar proportions of persons living in lone parent families; although there are more such individuals residing in the Central rather than Northern Jewish Community (7,050 and 5,950 respectively).

The Downtown Jewish Community has a much larger proportion of unattached individuals (31.2%) than the Central or Northern Jewish communities (16.3% and 5.8% respectively). On the other hand, the Central Jewish Community has by far the largest number of such individuals (13,575).

Large numbers of persons living in couple arrangements are found in Southern York Region (57,750) and North York (43,675). North York has a particularly large contingent of unattached individuals (9,080).

Table 2F examines living arrangements across small special interest areas in the Toronto CMA. In comparison with other areas in this table, York Mills has a

particularly large proportion of people living in couple arrangements (87.9%). The Bathurst Corridor between Sheppard and Steeles has a particularly high percentage of individuals residing in lone parent families (12.6%). Finally, the Annex / Bloor W. / Yorkville area has a large proportion of unattached persons (31.4%). A significant proportion of individuals living in High Park / Junction are likewise unattached (26.9%).

Marital Status

Table 3A examines the marital status of Toronto's Jewish, non-Jewish and total populations. A significant proportion of the Jewish population is married (44.5%), followed by 40.8% who are single (never married). 6.6% of Toronto's Jews are divorced / separated, 4.4% are widowed, and 3.7% are living in common law arrangements.

The proportion of married individuals among Jews is greater than for non-Jews (44.5% and 42.3% respectively); but there is a slightly larger proportion of non-Jews who are involved in common law partnerships than Jews (4.5% and 3.7% respectively). Jews are therefore slightly less inclined to

Table 3A
Marital Status
Jewish, Non-Jewish & Total Populations of Toronto CMA

	Total		Jews		Non-Jews	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Now Married	2,341,940	42.4	83,905	44.5	2,258,030	42.3
Common Law	245,020	4.4	6,960	3.7	238,065	4.5
Single / Never Married	2,363,300	42.8	76,980	40.8	2,286,320	42.9
Divorced / Separated	362,490	6.6	12,525	6.6	349,965	6.6
Widowed	208,475	3.8	8,340	4.4	200,135	3.8
Total Individuals	5,521,225	100.0	188,710	100.0	5,332,515	100.0

Table 3B
Marital Status by Gender
Jewish Population of Toronto CMA

	Total		Males		Females	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Now Married	83,905	44.5	42,535	45.7	41,375	43.2
Common Law	6,960	3.7	3,450	3.7	3,510	3.7
Single / Never Married	76,980	40.8	40,695	43.8	36,290	37.9
Divorced / Separated	12,525	6.6	4,740	5.1	7,780	8.1
Widowed	8,340	4.4	1,585	1.7	6,755	7.1
Total Individuals	188,710	100.0	93,005	100.0	95,710	100.0

live with a partner out of wedlock than non-Jews. The second part of this report on intermarriage will address the issue of common law partnerships more extensively.

There is a slightly higher percentage of single (never married) individuals among non-Jews than Jews (42.9% and 40.8% respectively). The percentage of divorced / separated individuals is identical for both groups (6.6%). Finally, Jews have a higher percentage of widowed individuals (4.4%) than non-Jews (3.8%). All in all, the distributions of marital status among Jews and non-Jews in the Toronto CMA seem fairly similar.

Table 3B looks at marital status by gender among Toronto's Jews. Males are more likely to be married than females (45.7% and 43.2% respectively). Men and women have identical levels of common law relationships (both 3.7%). Males, however, are much more inclined to be single (never married) than females (43.8% and 37.9% respectively).

On the other hand, females are more likely to be divorced / separated than males (8.1% and 5.1% respectively). Females are also

more likely to be widowed than males (7.1% and 1.7%).

It is difficult to clearly understand marital status as a demographic variable without examining its relationship to age. Table 3C shows marital status across age cohorts for the Jewish population. Not surprisingly, the great majority of those between 15-24 years of age are single / never married (97.1%).

Further calculations reveal that 5% of Jews between 18-26 years of age are married and 3.4% are living in common law partnerships. This compares to 6.4% and 4.3% among non-Jews who are married and living out of wedlock, respectively.

The figures are thus quite comparable between Toronto's Jewish and non-Jewish populations. *Jews in young adulthood (< 27 years) are only slightly less inclined to marry compared to non-Jews, and only slightly less inclined to live in common law partnerships.*

Regarding the 25-44 age cohort, 56.5% of Jews are married, and 7.8% live in common law arrangements. Almost a third (30.3%) are single / never married, 5.1% are divorced / separated, and 0.3% are widowed.

Table 3C
Marital Status by Age
Toronto Jewish Population

	0-14		15-24		25-44		45-64		65+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Now Married	0	0.0	515	2.1	25,540	56.5	38,970	72.6	18,885	61.0
Common Law	0	0.0	195	0.8	3,530	7.8	2,340	4.4	890	2.9
Single / Never Married	34,185	100.0	23,915	97.1	13,715	30.3	4,185	7.8	980	3.2
Divorced / Separated	0	0.0	0	0.0	2,305	5.1	7,135	13.3	3,065	9.9
Widowed	0	0.0	0	0.0	135	0.3	1,070	2.0	7,135	23.0
Total Individuals	34,185	100.0	24,625	100.0	45,225	100.0	53,700	100.0	30,955	100.0

In terms of middle-aged adults between 45-64 years, almost three-quarters (72.6%) are married, and 4.4% live in common law arrangements. Only 7.8% are single / never married, 13.3% are divorced / separated, and 2% are widowed.

Finally, 61% of seniors are married, and 2.9% are living in common law arrangements. Only 3.2% are single / never married, and 9.9% are divorced / separated. Almost a quarter (23%) of Jewish elderly are widowed.

What can we conclude about the marital status of adult Jews (15+ years)? More than half (54.3%) are now married, 4.5% are living in common law arrangements, 27.7% are single (never married), 8.1% are divorced / separated, and 5.4% are widowed.

How do these figures compare to the 2001 adult Jewish population (15+ years)? In 2001, 55.8% were married, compared to 54.3% in 2011. There were 3.8% living in common law arrangements in 2001, compared to 4.5% in 2011.

In 2001, 7% of adult Jews (15+ years) were divorced / separated, compared to 8.1% in 2011. More than a quarter (26.9%) of adult

Jews were single (never married) in 2001, compared to 27.7% in 2011. Finally, 6.4% were widowed in 2001 compared to 5.4% in 2011.

In short, there has been a decrease in the percentage of those who are married or widowed. On the other hand, there have been increases among those living in common law arrangements, single, and divorced individuals in the last decade.

A clearer picture emerges when one examines these categories in terms of absolute numbers. For instance, in 2001 there were 80,270 Jewish adults who were married in the community compared to 83,905 in 2011, an increase of 4.5%. In 2001 there were 5,500 living in common law situations compared to 6,960 in 2011, an increase of 26.5%.

In 2001 there were 38,605 single individuals among Jewish adults compared to 42,795 in 2011, an increase of 10.9%. There were 10,110 divorced / separated individuals in 2001 compared to 12,525 in 2011, an increase of 23.9%. Finally, there were 9,240 widowed persons in 2001 compared to 8,340 in 2011, a decrease of 9.7%.

Table 3D
Marital Status by Primary Geographic Areas
Toronto Jewish Population
(Row %)

District	Now Married		Common Law		Single / Never Married		Divorced / Separated		Widowed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Downtown Core	1,845	23.5	1,100	14.0	4,080	51.9	660	8.4	180	2.3
Danforth / Beaches	1,485	33.8	405	9.2	2,100	47.7	365	8.3	45	1.0
Bloor / St. Clair	4,180	42.3	740	7.5	3,960	40.1	595	6.0	405	4.1
St. Clair / Eglinton	5,665	42.7	545	4.1	5,745	43.3	840	6.3	470	3.5
Eglinton / Lawrence	7,650	43.0	400	2.2	8,045	45.2	1,140	6.4	565	3.2
Lawrence / Wilson	5,375	44.2	200	1.6	5,220	42.9	610	5.0	755	6.2
Wilson / Sheppard (West)	2,080	43.7	60	1.3	2,060	43.2	240	5.0	325	6.8
Wilson / Sheppard (East)	3,955	47.6	310	3.7	3,205	38.6	450	5.4	390	4.7
Sheppard / Finch (West)	2,495	42.4	65	1.1	2,140	36.4	620	10.5	560	9.5
Sheppard / Finch (East)	2,170	49.6	160	3.7	1,330	30.4	375	8.6	340	7.8
Finch / Steeles (West)	3,255	45.4	250	3.5	1,995	27.8	730	10.2	935	13.0
Finch / Steeles (East)	3,520	51.5	155	2.3	1,770	25.9	635	9.3	755	11.0
Vaughan	22,505	47.7	780	1.7	20,195	42.8	2,190	4.6	1,475	3.1
Richmond Hill	5,665	48.3	340	2.9	4,725	40.3	720	6.1	285	2.4
Markham	4,395	55.2	135	1.7	2,700	33.9	495	6.2	235	3.0
Mississauga	1,085	42.2	135	5.3	1,025	39.9	230	8.9	95	3.7
Scarborough	505	35.9	90	6.4	545	38.8	200	14.2	65	4.6
Rest of Toronto CMA	6,075	39.9	1,110	7.3	6,145	40.4	1,435	9.4	455	3.0
Total Toronto CMA	83,905	44.5	6,960	3.7	76,980	40.8	12,525	6.6	8,340	4.4

Hence, in relative terms, the fastest growing groups as far as marital status is concerned are those choosing to live in common law arrangements (+26.5%) and those who are divorced / separated (+23.9%).

Unfortunately, detailed information on marital status is not available from the 1991 Census and therefore no comparisons can be made for statistics spanning the last two decades.

Another way of looking at marital status is to calculate the percentage of individuals who have been married at least once by the time they reach a certain age level. This involves totaling the figures for Jewish married, divorced, separated and widowed adults in the 2011 National Household Survey.

Thus, by the age of 25 years, only 2.9% of Jews have married at least once. By the age of 45 years, 69.7% have married at least once. Finally, by 65 years, 92.2% have married at least once.

In terms of non-Jews, 4.8% marry at least once by their 25th year, compared to 2.9% of Jews. More than two-thirds (69.1%) of non-Jews marry at least once by the age of 45

years, compared to 69.7% of Jews. Finally, 90.3% of non-Jews marry at least once by their 65th year, compared to 92.2% of Jews. In short, the differences between Jews and non-Jews are not pronounced as far as age of marriage is concerned.

All in all, Jews tend to marry later, but catch up to non-Jews in the older cohorts. Before their middle-aged years, Jews surpass non-Jews in terms of the percentage who have married at least once.

Table 3D examines marital status across primary geographic areas for Toronto's Jewish population. The largest proportions of married individuals are found in Markham (55.2%) and Finch / Steeles (East) (51.5%). In absolute terms, by far the largest number of married individuals is located in Vaughan (22,505), followed by Eglinton / Lawrence (7,650).

The highest level of Jews living in common law arrangements is found in the Downtown Core (14%). There are 1,100 such individuals living out of wedlock in the Downtown Core. Note that there are also 1,110 individuals living in common law arrangements in the miscellaneous area of "Rest of Toronto CMA".

Table 3E
Marital Status by Large Special Interest Geographic Areas
(Row %)

District	Now Married		Common Law		Single / Never Married		Divorced / Separated		Widowed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Downtown J. Community	8,280	33.5	2,570	10.4	11,320	45.8	1,850	7.5	685	2.8
Central J. Community	37,160	44.6	2,370	2.8	32,535	39.0	6,050	7.3	5,290	6.3
Northern J. Community*	34,035	48.4	1,400	2.0	29,110	41.4	3,675	5.2	2,055	2.9

Southern York Region	33,180	48.7	1,265	1.9	28,175	41.3	3,530	5.2	2,020	3.0
Peel Region	1,690	43.2	215	5.5	1,530	39.1	355	9.1	120	3.1
Halton Region	1,480	52.3	160	5.7	990	35.0	160	5.7	40	1.4
Durham Region	1,175	42.2	150	5.4	1,160	41.7	205	7.4	95	3.4
North York	26,550	45.5	1,380	2.4	21,740	37.2	4,165	7.1	4,535	7.8
Bathurst Corridor	56,650	44.5	3,615	2.8	53,315	41.8	7,730	6.1	6,095	4.8
Burlington	545	55.1	70	7.1	275	27.8	80	8.1	20	2.0

*Corresponds to York Region.

The highest percentage of Jewish singles is likewise found in the Downtown Core (51.9%). In short, more than half of Jews in this area are single (never married). However, in absolute terms, Vaughan has the largest number of single individuals (20,195). Most of these are children under the age of 15 years.

The highest percentages of divorced / separated individuals are found in Sheppard / Finch (West) (10.5%) and Finch / Steeles (West) (10.2%). However, in absolute terms, the largest numbers are found in Vaughan (2,190) and Eglinton / Lawrence (1,140).

Finally, the highest levels of widowed individuals are found in Finch / Steeles (West) (13%) and Finch / Steeles (East) (11%). However, Vaughan has the largest numbers of widowed Jews (1,475) in the Toronto CMA.

Table 3E shows the marital status of Jews across large special interest areas. As noted before, the first three regions are contiguous and can therefore be compared with one another.

The highest percentage of individuals living in common law arrangements is found in the

Downtown Jewish Community (10.4%). The Northern and Central Jewish Communities have significantly lower percentages of individuals living in common law partnerships (2% and 2.8% respectively). In absolute terms, the largest number of individuals living in common law arrangements is likewise in the Downtown Jewish Community (2,570).

Regarding single (never married) Jews, the highest percentage is found in the Downtown Jewish Community (45.8%), followed by the Northern Jewish Community (41.4%) and the Central Jewish Community (39%). The largest number of single persons, however, is in the Central Jewish Community (32,535).

The Downtown and Central Jewish communities have similar proportions of divorced / separated individuals (7.5% and 7.3% respectively). In terms of absolute numbers, the largest contingent of divorced / separated persons is found in the Central Jewish Community (6,050), followed by the Northern and Downtown Jewish Communities (3,675 and 1,850 respectively).

Table 3F
Marital Status by Small Special Interest Geographic Areas
(Row %)

District	Now Married		Common Law		Single / Never Married		Divorced / Separated		Widowed	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Annex / Bloor W. / Yorkville	1,345	38.3	300	8.5	1,530	43.5	195	5.5	145	4.1
High Park / Junction	845	30.8	350	12.8	1,315	47.9	185	6.7	50	1.8
Forest Hill / Cedarvale	6,440	45.4	350	2.5	5,835	41.2	1,005	7.1	540	3.8
York Mills	3,165	52.8	145	2.4	2,265	37.8	185	3.1	235	3.9
Bathurst Manor	1,935	43.1	35	0.8	1,595	35.6	440	9.8	480	10.7
Bathurst Corridor- Sheppard/Steeles	8,460	45.1	465	2.5	5,875	31.3	1,900	10.1	2,050	10.9
Thornhill (Vaughan)	22,055	47.8	725	1.6	19,810	42.9	2,125	4.6	1,460	3.2
Thornhill (Markham)	4,010	55.8	85	1.2	2,400	33.4	470	6.5	215	3.0

Finally, the highest percentage of widowed Jews is found in the Central Jewish Community (6.3%), where 5,290 such individuals reside. North York alone has a contingent of 4,535 widowed persons. The Northern and Downtown Jewish Communities have 2,055 and 685 widowed individuals respectively.

Table 3F examines the marital status of persons living in small special interest geographic areas. The areas with the largest proportions of married individuals are Thornhill (Markham) (55.8%) and York Mills (52.8%); although in absolute terms, Thornhill (Vaughan) has by far the largest number of married individuals of any area investigated in this table.

High Park / Junction has a high percentage of persons living in common law partnerships (12.8%), as well as single individuals (47.9%). However, Thornhill Vaughan has by far the largest number of single individuals of any of the small special interest areas (19,810).

Family Structure & Number of Children in Household

As Table 4 indicates, there are 59,170 Jewish families in the Toronto CMA. About

half (50.4%) of all Jewish families involve couples with children, 39.2% couples without children, and 10.4% are lone parent families. Note that this table does not include households with only a single person, or those living with extended relatives or non-relatives, because these are not considered to be family units in this breakdown.

Of 6,145 single parent families, 78.5% are headed by a female, and 21.5% by a male. In short, there are more than 3.5 times as many single parent families headed by a female than a male.

The percentage of lone parent families has been rising steadily. In 1991, single parent households comprised 7.9% of all Jewish families in the Toronto metropolitan area. This figure rose to 9.6% in 2001, and 10.4% in 2011. *It is quite likely that if these trends continue, by 2021 about one of nine Jewish families in this metropolitan area will have a single parent at its head.*

There is a slightly lower percentage of arrangements involving couples with children among Jewish families (50.4%),

Table 4
Family Structure
Jewish, Non-Jewish & Total Families of Toronto CMA

	Total		Jewish Families		Non-Jewish Families	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Couples: With Children	795,050	52.0	29,810	50.4	765,240	52.1
Couples: Without Children	464,205	30.4	23,215	39.2	440,990	30.0
Male Lone Parent	45,005	2.9	1,320	2.2	43,685	3.0
Female Lone Parent	224,740	14.7	4,825	8.2	219,915	15.0
Total Families	1,529,000	100.0	59,170	100.0	1,469,830	100.0

Table 5
Number of Children in Household
Jewish, Non-Jewish & Total Families of Toronto CMA

	Total		Jewish Families	
	#	%	#	%
None	464,200	30.4	23,215	39.2
One	452,370	29.6	13,765	23.3
Two	437,795	28.6	14,875	25.1
Three	136,025	8.9	5,335	9.0
Four	29,770	1.9	1,420	2.4
Five or More	8,840	0.6	560	0.9
Total Families	1,529,000	100.0	59,170	100.0

Median # of Children	1.7	1.5
-----------------------------	-----	-----

than non-Jewish families (52.1%). There is a much higher percentage of childless couples among Jewish families (39.2%) compared with non-Jewish families (30%). However, there is a significantly lower percentage of lone parent families among Jewish families (10.4%) compared with non-Jewish families (18%).

Table 5 examines the number of children in the households of Jewish and total families in the Toronto CMA. It should be noted that “number of children in the household” is not a measure of fertility, because children living outside the household are not considered in this breakdown.

There is a higher proportion of childless households among Jewish families than total families (39.2% and 30.4% respectively). There are also higher proportions of households with at least three children among Jewish families than total families (12.3% and 11.4% respectively). This latter discrepancy may be due to the representation of Ultra Orthodox families among Jewish households.

On the other hand, there is a higher proportion of single child families among total rather than Jewish families (29.6% and

23.3% respectively). There is also a higher percentage of two-children households among total rather than Jewish families (28.6% and 25.1% respectively).

The median number of children living at home is very similar between Jewish and total families: 1.5 and 1.7 children respectively. Note again that these are not measures of fertility.

In terms of Jewish families, further analysis of the National Household Survey reveals that the median number of children living at home in arrangements involving couples with children is 2.4, whereas it is 1.8 for female lone parent families, and 1.9 for male lone parent families (Table 18, Appendix 4).

The Challenges Ahead

Demographics, communal priorities and public policy are starting points in planning services for Toronto’s Jewish families. The changing Jewish family poses significant challenges as the community plans for the future. It is becoming increasingly more diverse: made up of two-parent and one-parent families, married and co-habiting couples, gay couples and straight couples,

blended families, adoptive families and childless families.

Understanding this, we need to examine the composition of the Jewish family, its challenges, and what role the organized Jewish community can assume in translating, advocating for, and responding to its needs.

The National Household Survey data indicate several key trends for the local Jewish population. The number of Jews living alone, or not with their families, is increasing. The number of divorced or separated individuals has also continued to grow. There is a significant rise in the number of single parent families, often resulting in households with less income and diminished support networks. And 12.9% of Jews live in poverty in the Toronto CMA.

These trends have been on the rise for many years, and we can project their continued upward movement. To a great degree, the Jewish community mirrors the broader society, so we must also consider the social impact of wider movements, such as the influence of the Baby Boomers as they enter their pension years, and continued and growing concerns about social and environmental security.

For our local community, a concern is also growing assimilation and intermarriage. To date, the debate has revolved around how to react to these trends. While strategies to counteract these trends can be important, another case can be made to accept the diversity of our community, and embrace a philosophy of inclusion.

Whereas issues of Jewish identity remain strictly in our domain, delivery of quality health and social services are much more dependent on public policy and its implementation. The organized Jewish community may enhance the efficacy of the social safety net, but cannot hope to replace it. With government downloading of health and social services onto the community, we are feeling the strain of filling the gaps. The Jewish community needs to focus its efforts on developing partnerships to advocate with local, provincial and federal governments for minimum wage and income standards, home care and education, housing and health care.

Jewish families continue to require various means of support, including interventions that are sometimes preventive in nature, such as counseling services, parenting classes, and support services for children

and youth. Through education, financial and other resource support, along with mechanisms to promote community involvement, the organized Jewish community can address the needs and enhance the strength of Jewish families. Similarly, due to their growing numbers,

adults living alone need venues to participate meaningfully in community institutions and organizations, to enhance their sense of communal belonging and ultimately contribute to the strength of the community as a whole.

Part 6: Inter-marriage

The 2011 National Household Survey can be used to analyze the incidence of intermarriage in the Greater Toronto Jewish community. Specifically, intermarriage in this report is defined as a situation where a person who falls under the Revised Jewish Definition (See Appendix 2) 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.

It is noteworthy that individuals who converted to Judaism are considered as Jewish according to the Revised Jewish 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 National Household Survey information alone, as those who have converted would have identified themselves as Jews.

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”.

Levels of Inter-marriage in the Toronto CMA

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 6A indicates that there are 73,740 Jews who are married / partnered to other Jews, and 16,155 Jews who are married / partnered to non-Jews. The total number of Jews who are married / partnered is therefore 89,895. *Hence, the 16,155 individuals married / partnered to non-Jews represent an intermarriage rate of 18%.*

Of 16,155 spouses / partners who live in intermarried arrangements, 8,635 (53.5%) live in situations where the husband is Jewish and the wife is non-Jewish; and 7,520 (46.5%) are living in arrangements

Table 6A
Intermarriage Breakdowns
Base Population: Jewish Spouses / Partners

	#	%
Husband Jewish / Wife Jewish	73,740	82.0
Intermarried: Husband Jewish / Wife Non-Jewish	8,635	9.6
Intermarried: Husband Non-Jewish / Wife Jewish	7,520	8.4
(Subtotal: Intermarried)	(16,155)	(18.0)
Total Spouses / Partners	89,895	100.0

Table 6B
Intermarriage Breakdowns
Base Population: Individuals Living in Couple Households

	#	%
Husband Jewish / Wife Jewish	118,420	82.7
Husband Jewish / Wife Non-Jewish	12,570	8.8
Husband Non-Jewish / Wife Jewish	12,215	8.5
(Subtotal: Living in Intermarried Households)	(24,785)	(17.3)
Total Individuals Living in Couple Households	143,205	100.0

Table 6C
Intermarriage Breakdowns
Historical Trends

Year	# Living in Intermarried Families	Intermarriage Rate
2011	24,785	17.3
2001	20,885	14.9
1991	14,700	11.6

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 Jewish population (18%) is among the lowest in Canada. Only the Montreal Jewish community has a lower level of intermarriage (16.7%). The rates of intermarriage across the country include 25.4% for Winnipeg, 40.4% for Ottawa, and 43.4% for the Vancouver Jewish community. The Canadian intermarriage rate is 26.3%, well above the figure for Toronto's Jewish population.

Another way of looking at intermarriage focuses on the total number of Jews living in intermarried families, including children. According to Table 6B, there are 24,785 individuals who live in intermarried households. This represents 17.3% of all individuals living in couple arrangements.

Not included in Table 6B are 890 Jewish children who 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.

The figures presented in Tables 6A and 6B represent different approaches to calculating the intermarriage rate: counting couples versus number of individuals. In the final calculations both figures turn out to be very similar (18% and 17.3% respectively). The figure based on individuals is usually lower because intermarried couples tend to have fewer children than intra-married ones, and are therefore more inclined to be under-represented using this approach. Depending on whether the focus is on the level of individuals or households, both figures will be used in future breakdowns and comparisons presented in this report.

Table 6C provides an historical perspective on intermarriage rates. In 2001, 20,885 out of 139,815 Jews who lived in couple arrangements were intermarried, yielding an intermarriage rate of 14.9%. In 1991, 14,700 Jews lived in intermarried partnerships out of a total 126,305 who lived in couple arrangements. The intermarriage rate was thus 11.6% in 1991.

Table 7A
Individuals Living in Intermarried Households
By Primary Geographic Areas
(Row %)

District	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Downtown Core	3,625	1,875	51.7	1,750	48.3
Danforth / Beaches	2,915	910	31.2	2,005	68.8
Bloor / St. Clair	6,810	5,040	74.0	1,770	26.0
St. Clair / Eglinton	9,825	8,180	83.3	1,645	16.7
Eglinton / Lawrence	13,820	12,640	91.5	1,180	8.5
Lawrence / Wilson	9,765	8,900	91.1	865	8.9
Wilson / Sheppard (West)	3,850	3,695	96.0	155	4.0
Wilson / Sheppard (East)	6,760	5,895	87.2	865	12.8
Sheppard / Finch (West)	3,860	3,610	93.5	250	6.5
Sheppard / Finch (East)	3,035	2,410	79.4	625	20.6
Finch / Steeles (West)	4,670	4,290	91.9	380	8.1
Finch / Steeles (East)	4,680	4,080	87.2	600	12.8
Vaughan	40,185	37,540	93.4	2,645	6.6
Richmond Hill	9,625	8,165	84.8	1,460	15.2
Markham	6,635	5,735	86.4	900	13.6
Mississauga	1,825	775	42.5	1,050	57.5
Scarborough	850	280	32.9	570	67.1
Rest of Toronto CMA	10,480	4,400	42.0	6,080	58.0
Total Toronto CMA	143,200	118,420	82.7	24,780	17.3

In short, in the last two decades, the intermarriage rate has increased from 11.6% in 1991 to 17.3% in 2011. The number of Jews living in intermarried families increased from 14,700 in 1991 to 24,785 in 2011. Although the proportional increase in the intermarriage rate was only 5.7%, the absolute number of Jews living in intermarried households increased by 68.6% in the last twenty years.

Where Do Individuals Living in Intermarried Households Reside?

Table 7A 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 (6,080). These individuals are therefore more geographically distant from the major Jewish centers, and likely living at the fringes of community life. They represent a special challenge for outreach and engagement.

Relatively large numbers of intermarried are also found in Vaughan (2,645), Danforth / Beaches (2,005), Bloor / St. Clair (1,770) and the Downtown Core (1,750).

In relative terms, the area with the largest proportion of those living in intermarried households is Danforth / Beaches. More than two-thirds (68.8%) of Jews residing in Danforth / Beaches live in such arrangements. Scarborough also has a high percentage of intermarried Jews (67.1%). More than half of Jewish residents in the "Rest of Toronto CMA" (58%) and Mississauga (57.5%) live in intermarried households.

The area with the lowest proportion of Jews living in intermarried households is Wilson / Sheppard (West), with 4%. There are also low percentages in Sheppard / Finch (West) (6.5%) and Vaughan (6.6%).

Table 7B looks at individuals living in intermarried households across large special interest areas within the Toronto CMA. As noted in the first part of this report, 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 (44.9%).

Table 7B
Individuals Living in Intermarried Households
By Large Special Interest Geographic Areas
(Row %)

District	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Downtown J. Community	14,935	8,225	55.1	6,710	44.9
Central J. Community	61,700	54,440	88.2	7,260	11.8
Northern J. Community*	59,170	52,890	89.4	6,280	10.6

Southern York Region	57,550	52,090	90.5	5,460	9.5
Peel Region	2,820	1,230	43.6	1,590	56.4
Halton Region	2,345	995	42.4	1,350	57.6
Durham Region	2,110	645	30.6	1,465	69.4
North York	43,530	39,280	90.2	4,250	9.8
Bathurst Corridor	98,850	89,340	90.4	9,510	9.6
Burlington	775	345	44.5	430	55.5

*Corresponds to York Region.

However, in absolute terms, the Central Jewish Community has the largest number of persons living in intermarried households (7,260).

There are 5,460 Jews living in intermarried arrangements in Southern York Region and 4,250 in North York. The high intermarriage rates in the Durham (69.4%), Halton (57.6%) and Peel (56.4%) regions are noteworthy. In fact, in all of these latter regions, more than half of Jews residing in couples families are living in intermarried arrangements.

Table 7C examines individuals living in intermarried arrangements across small special interest areas. High Park / Junction has a Jewish population with a high intermarriage rate (66.5%). The level of individuals residing in intermarried families is 22.8% in Annex / Bloor West / Yorkville.

The Characteristics of Intermarried Households

Table 8 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.¹³ This trend seems to be verified by the current National Household Survey data.

For instance, the intermarriage rate when both spouses are less than 30 years of age is 28.3%. It is 28.9% if only one spouse is between 30-39 years, 30.4% if there is only one spouse greater than 39 years, and 15.1% if both spouses are older than 39 years. *It seems that the intermarriage rate for younger couples (< 39 years) is significantly higher than for older ones. In fact, this higher rate of intermarriage for young adults in the Toronto Jewish community (from 28.3% to 30.4%, depending on the age combination used) is among the more noteworthy findings of this report.*

Interestingly, the intermarriage rate for households where both spouses were less than 30 years was 27% in 2001, slightly below the level for 2011 (28.3%). It was 11.7% if both spouses were older than 39 years in 2001, compared to 15.1% in 2011.

¹³ Dashefsy, A. & Heller, Z. Intermarriage and Jewish Journeys in the United States. The National Center for Jewish Policy Studies at Hebrew College, 2008.

Table 7C
Individuals Living in Intermarried Households
By Small Special Interest Geographic Areas
(Row %)

District	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Annex / Bloor W. / Yorkville	2,195	1,695	77.2	500	22.8
High Park / Junction	1,760	590	33.5	1,170	66.5
Forest Hill / Cedarvale	10,885	10,060	92.4	825	7.6
York Mills	5,255	4,700	89.4	555	10.6
Bathurst Manor	3,040	2,855	93.9	185	6.1
Bathurst Corridor- Sheppard/Steeles	12,400	11,125	89.7	1,275	10.3
Thornhill (Vaughan)	39,405	37,165	94.3	2,240	5.7
Thornhill (Markham)	5,990	5,510	92.0	480	8.0

Table 8
Intermarried Households
Age of Spouses / Partners
(Row %)

	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Both Spouses < 30 Years	3,360	2,410	71.7	950	28.3
Only One Spouse 30-39 Years	8,710	6,190	71.1	2,520	28.9
Only One Spouse > 39 Years	5,745	4,000	69.6	1,745	30.4
Both Spouses > 39 Years	66,230	56,220	84.9	10,010	15.1

Note: The age categories described above may overlap with one another.

Table 9
Individuals Living in Intermarried Households
Age Breakdowns
(Row %)

Age Cohort	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
0-14	30,200	24,665	81.7	5,535	18.3
15-24	18,935	16,210	85.6	2,725	14.4
25-44	33,310	25,770	77.4	7,540	22.6
45-64	41,280	34,160	82.8	7,120	17.2
65+	19,485	17,620	90.4	1,865	9.6
Total Individuals Living in Couple Households	143,210	118,425	82.7	24,785	17.3
0-4	10,940	8,690	79.4	2,250	20.6

Table 9 provides an interesting statistic. Almost one in five Jewish children under 15 years (18.3%), who reside with both parents, live in an intermarried arrangement. This represents 5,535 children.

A further analysis shows that 20.6% of children younger than 5 years, who reside with both parents, live in an intermarried arrangement. This involves 2,250 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 10 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 (1.5 and 1.1 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 1.1 children per household.

Arrangements in which both spouses are Jewish have a significantly higher percentage of households with at least three children living at home (15.8%), compared to intermarried arrangements (5.8%). Intermarried families are more likely to be childless than in-married households (47.5% and 42.2% respectively).

Table 11 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 (23.7% and 4.2% respectively). In short, almost a quarter of intermarried couples live in a common law situation.

Table 10
Number of Children in Intermarried Households

Number of Children	Total		Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
None	23,220	43.8	15,545	42.2	7,675	47.5
One	9,995	18.8	6,240	16.9	3,755	23.2
Two	13,070	24.6	9,270	25.1	3,800	23.5
Three	4,875	9.2	4,120	11.2	755	4.7
Four	1,345	2.5	1,205	3.3	140	0.9
Five or more	530	1.0	490	1.3	40	0.2
Total Couple Households	53,035	100.0	36,870	100.0	16,165	100.0
Mean Number	--		1.5		1.1	

Table 11
Family Structure in Intermarried Households

Family Structure	Total		Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Married couples	47,625	89.8	35,310	95.8	12,315	76.3
Common-law couples	5,395	10.2	1,560	4.2	3,835	23.7
Total Couple Households	53,020	100.0	36,870	100.0	16,150	100.0

The level of common law arrangements among the intermarried (23.7%) is even higher than those for the overall Toronto and Ontario populations (9.7% and 13% respectively).

It is also noteworthy that 55.1% of all common law arrangements (with at least one Jewish partner) involve an intermarried couple. Only 14.8% of married partnerships (with at least one Jewish partner) are intermarried.

Who Intermarries?

Table 12 looks at intermarriage by place of birth. Jews born in Canada have an intermarriage rate of 18.2%. In absolute terms, individuals who were born in this country represent by far the largest number of intermarried individuals (17,140).

Jews from South America (22%) and the United States (20.7%) have the highest levels of intermarriage among immigrants. The lowest incidence of intermarriage is found among those born in North Africa / Middle East (excl. Israel) (8.3%). There is also a low intermarriage level among Jews born in Israel (9.7%).

Interestingly, Jews originating from the Former Soviet Union (FSU) have an intermarriage level of 17.8%, which is similar to the average for the Jewish community as a whole. This figure is well below the intermarriage rate of 27.3% obtained for FSU Jews in Montreal, and 32.9% in Vancouver.

In absolute terms, individuals from the FSU have the largest number of intermarried persons of any Jewish immigrant group in the Toronto CMA (3,060).

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

According to Table 13, there does not seem to be a discernible relationship between intermarriage and year of immigration. The most recent immigrants who arrived between 2000-2011 (16.2%) have a similar intermarriage rate to those who arrived between 1990-1999 (16.3%), and 1970-1979 (17.9%). In fact, it is non-immigrants who have the highest intermarriage rates (18.3%) in this breakdown.

Table 12
Individuals Living in Intermarried Households
by Place of Birth
(Row %)

Place of Birth	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Canada	93,955	76,815	81.8	17,140	18.2
Israel	9,230	8,335	90.3	895	9.7
Eastern Europe (excl. FSU)	4,420	3,715	84.0	705	16.0
Former Soviet Union	17,220	14,160	82.2	3,060	17.8
Western Europe	4,305	3,470	80.6	835	19.4
North Africa / Middle East (excl. Israel)	1,980	1,815	91.7	165	8.3
United States	5,555	4,405	79.3	1,150	20.7
South America	1,225	955	78.0	270	22.0
Other	5,320	4,750	89.3	570	10.7
Total Individuals Living in Couple Households	143,210	118,420	82.7	24,790	17.3

Table 13
Individuals Living in Intermarried Households
by Year of Immigration
(Row %)

Year of Immigration	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Non-immigrants	94,745	77,435	81.7	17,310	18.3
Before 1960	4,250	3,690	86.8	560	13.2
1960 - 1969	4,000	3,450	86.3	550	13.8
1970 - 1979	5,790	4,755	82.1	1,035	17.9
1980 - 1989	7,260	6,330	87.2	930	12.8
1990 - 1999	12,070	10,105	83.7	1,965	16.3
2000 - 2011	13,910	11,650	83.8	2,260	16.2
Non-permanent residents	1,175	1,005	85.5	170	14.5
Total Individuals Living in Couple Households	143,200	118,420	82.7	24,780	17.3

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 only of immigrants arriving between 2000-2011. In absolute terms, of 2,260 individuals who arrived between 2000-2011, and who live in intermarried households, 1,300 were born in the Former Soviet Union, 320 in the United States and 230 in Israel. The remainder (410) originated in various other countries.

Intermarriage Rates of Jewish Immigrants Arriving Between 2000-2011 by Place of Birth

	#	%
Israel	230	7.0
Eastern Europe (excl. FSU)	80	40.0
Former Soviet Union	1,300	20.2
Western Europe	115	25.0
N. Africa / Mid East (excl. Israel)	20	12.9
United States	320	16.1
South America	80	17.6
Other	115	12.7
Total	2,260	16.2

Table 14 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 for the Greater Toronto Jewish community.

For instance, when both spouses have less than a university education, the intermarriage level is 18.6%. An intervening variable here might be age. Individuals older than 60 years are less likely to have a university degree and also less likely to intermarry.

If only one of the spouses has a university undergraduate degree the intermarriage rate rises to 19.9%. But if only one spouse has a university graduate degree the intermarriage level drops to 16.5%. Finally, when both spouses have university graduate degrees, such as MAs or PhDs, the intermarriage rate is likewise 16.5%. In short, there are not 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

Table 14
Intermarried Households
Education of Spouses / Partners
(Row %)

	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Both Spouses Less Than Univ. Education	19,665	16,010	81.4	3,655	18.6
Only One Spouse Univ. Undergraduate Degree	23,910	19,160	80.1	4,750	19.9
Only One Spouse Univ. Graduate Degree	25,610	21,390	83.5	4,220	16.5
Both Spouses University Graduate Degrees	14,335	11,970	83.5	2,365	16.5

Note: The age categories described above may overlap with one another.

university graduate degree.¹⁴ Cohen (1989) reports that among American men who never attended university, the intermarriage rate is over 40%; whereas of those with an undergraduate degree, only 18% are intermarried.¹⁵ These findings were not replicated in the current study.

As Table 15A shows, the relationship between intermarriage and income status is not straightforward. Intermarriage seems to be most prevalent among families earning \$100,000-\$149,999 per year (35.6%). But it is least prevalent among families earning \$150,000 or more (27%). Those earning less than \$25,000 have an intermarriage level of 32.4%, compared to 29.2% for those earning \$25,000--\$49,999, and 31.6% for those earning \$50,000-\$99,999. In short, there does not seem to be a discernible pattern of interaction between the variables of income and intermarriage.

Trends from the National Jewish Population Survey in the United States (2000-2001) were not necessarily 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 \$150,000.¹⁶ No such patterns were observed in the current breakdowns.

As Table 15B shows, the median income of intermarried couples (\$115,084) is lower than that of arrangements where both spouses are Jewish (\$122,096).

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 17.3%, and has risen steadily over the past 20 years, there is little doubt that the community

¹⁴ NJPS (2000-01) Report on Jewish Life: Variations in Intermarriage. See the United Jewish Communities Web Site: <http://www.ujc.org>

¹⁵ Cohen, S. Alternative Families in the Jewish Community. The American Jewish Committee, Institute of Human Relations (1989).

¹⁶ Special analysis done of NJPS 2000-2001 and personally communicated to the authors by J. Ament, Senior Project Director, Research Department, United Jewish Communities.

Table 15A
Intermarriage Breakdowns
Family Income

	Total	Both Spouses Jewish		Intermarried	
	#	#	%	#	%
Under \$25,000	2,720	1,840	67.6	880	32.4
\$25,000 - \$49,999	6,170	4,370	70.8	1,800	29.2
\$50,000 - \$99,999	12,835	8,780	68.4	4,055	31.6
\$100,000 - \$149,999	11,210	7,215	64.4	3,995	35.6
\$150,000 or more	20,090	14,665	73.0	5,425	27.0
Total Couple Households	53,025	36,870	69.5	16,155	30.5

Table 15B
Intermarriage Breakdowns
Median Family Income

	Median Income (\$)
Both Spouses Jewish	122,096
Intermarried	115,084

cannot afford to lose these families to the pressures of assimilation.

Table 16 is very revealing in this regard. As expected, among Jewish families, the great majority of the youngest children (93.9%) are identified by their parents as Jews, 5.9% are assigned no religious identification, and 0.3% 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 National Household Survey how these identifications translate into actual behaviors and attitudes.

Regarding the youngest children of intermarried couples, 32.4% (2,745) are identified by their parents as Jews by religion; a larger percentage, 50.4% (4,275) have no religious identification; and the rest, 17.2% (1,465), are identified as having other religions.

In other words, more than two-thirds (67.6%) 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 16 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, 22.1% of youngest children are identified as Jewish, 56.9% as having no religious affiliation, and 21.1% as having another religion. In short, 78% do not have the religious orientation of the Jewish father.

In cases where Jewish women intermarry, 44.1% of youngest children are identified as Jewish, 43.8% as having no religious identification, and 12.1% as having another religion. In short, more than half (55.9%) of youngest children in the household are not identified as being Jewish. Although the latter figure is still quite high, it is significantly lower than if the father marries outside of the faith (55.9% and 78% respectively).

Table 16
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	20,015	93.9	980	22.1	1,765	44.1	2,745	32.4
Catholic	40	0.2	465	10.5	260	6.5	730	8.6
Protestant	15	0.1	265	6.0	160	4.0	425	5.0
Christian Orthodox	0	0.0	205	4.6	65	1.6	265	3.1
Muslim	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Hindu, Buddhist, Sikh	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	25	0.3
Para-religious groups	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No religious affiliation	1,255	5.9	2,525	56.9	1,750	43.8	4,275	50.4
All other religions	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	0.2
Total Couple Households	21,325	100.0	4,440	100.0	4,000	100.0	8,485	100.0

The Challenges Ahead

A rise in the percentage of intermarried households in the Toronto metropolitan area 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 68.6% over the last two decades, although the proportional increase has only been by 5.7%.

Particularly noteworthy is that the younger the ages of the spouses, the higher the rate of intermarriage. If both spouses are below 30 years of age the likelihood of intermarriage is 28.3%, compared to 15.1% when both are at least 40 years of age.

What 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.

A recent study of the Toronto Jewish community found that the intermarried, as a group, demonstrate low levels of affiliation, participation and ritual adherence across all the measures investigated. The intermarried

have among the weakest levels of Jewish identity and the most tenuous links to mainstream Jewish life.¹⁷

On the other hand, even though that study showed that there were low figures of affiliation and observance among intermarried respondents, there were still sufficient levels to suggest that there was openness to Jewish exposure. For instance, more than a quarter of intermarried parents were providing a supplementary Jewish education for their children.

What types of programs can attract intermarried couples? There have been outreach initiatives across North America that provide intermarried families with opportunities to participate in communal life. These programs have been offered by an increasingly broad range of Jewish institutions, including synagogues, Jewish community centers, family services agencies, schools, camps, as well as by completely independent "grass-roots" initiatives that have taken up the challenge

¹⁷ Shahr, C. & Rosenbaum, T. Jewish Life in Greater Toronto: A Survey of the Attitudes & Behaviours of Greater Toronto's Jewish Community. UJA Federation of Greater Toronto. February 2006.

of reaching out to engage the intermarried in Jewish life.¹⁸

In our more “traditional” community of Toronto, a question arises as to the extent of acceptance of intermarried couples and their children into mainstream institutions such as schools and synagogues. As these trends continue to increase, such questions will become more important to address.

¹⁸ See for example the Jewish Outreach Institute's homepage: <http://joi.org/joplin/index.php>

Appendix 1

Methodological Considerations

The two major questions used in this report to define who is Jewish, namely religion and ethnicity, were located in what was previously known as the Long Form of the National Census. In 2011, this Long Form became voluntary rather than mandatory to fill out. Because the sample was self-selected, this instrument became a survey rather than a Census.

The National Household Survey (NHS) was distributed to a third of the households in Canada, compared to 20% of households for the Census Long Form. However, whereas the Census had an almost universal rate of response, the NHS had a 73.9% response rate across Canada, and 74.6% in the Toronto CMA.

It is not clear to what extent non-response biases played a role in the results. For instance, it is possible that certain socioeconomic groups, such as the poor, less educated individuals, and recent immigrants, were generally less inclined to answer the National Household Survey. Statistics Canada applied sophisticated treatments to deal with possible gaps in the data but the

change in methodology has meant that it is difficult to determine error ranges based on projections gleaned from the sample.

This change in methodology has also made it difficult to compare the results of the National Household Survey with those of previous Censuses. Although some tables in this report present side-by-side comparisons of 2011 NHS data with previous Censuses, these comparisons should be interpreted with caution.

A further issue is the fact that since the 2001 Census, the number of Jews identifying themselves by ethnicity has declined dramatically. This was evident in 2006 and again in 2011. All those who considered themselves as Jewish by religion were included as Jews according to the definition employed in this report; but some who said they had no religious affiliation might have “fallen through the cracks” because they did not identify themselves as Jewish by ethnicity.

There may be several reasons why there has been a decline in Jewish ethnic

identification, but only two will be considered here. First, since the 2001 Census, the label “Canadian” was the first on the list of ethnic sample choices. This has changed the dynamics of the question significantly. It is possible that some people wanted to tout their attachment to Canada by indicating they were only of Canadian ethnicity. This is not an issue if they also indicated they were Jewish by religion. But if they said they had no religious identification, they could not be identified as Jewish using the traditional definition.

Second, the order of sample choices is determined by how many people indicated a particular ethnicity in the previous Census (2006). As the number of individuals choosing Jewish as their ethnicity has diminished, the Jewish choice has fallen further down the list, and was therefore among the last sample choices in the 2011 NHS. This may have had an impact on the self-reported affiliation of people.

A final consideration has to do with the definition used to identify Jews for the purposes of this report. The “Jewish Standard Definition”, formulated by Jim Torczyner of McGill University, has been used since 1971. This definition employs a

combination of religious and ethnic identification.

However, given changes in how Jews have responded to the ethnicity question, it was felt that a broader definition should be used. Hence, elements of other questions were incorporated, including place of birth, five-year mobility and knowledge of non-official languages. This new definition was called the “Revised Jewish Definition”. A full description of this definition can be found in Appendix 2.

This new Jewish definition makes comparisons between the National Household Survey and previous Censuses even more difficult. Hence, these latter Censuses were re-analyzed along the lines of the revised definition, and whenever possible, these new figures are presented in this report. Again, all comparisons of the NHS with previous Censuses, and particularly the identification of demographic trends, should be interpreted with caution.

All in all, despite the changes in methodology outlined above, the 2011 National Household Survey provides an important opportunity to better understand

the demographic situation of the Toronto Jewish population, and to make use of this data for community planning and decision-making.

We are fortunate to have a national survey which includes questions related to religion

and ethnicity (the American Census does not). Also, the National Household Survey is one with a much larger scope than any Canadian Jewish community can implement on its own.

Appendix 2

The Revised Jewish Definition

Since 1971 all major analyses related to the Census have utilized 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 using a combination of religious and ethnic identification.

According to this criterion, a Jew was defined as anyone who specified that he or she was:

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

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

It is important to note that the category of “no religious affiliation” is broader than that of “no religion” because it includes those who consider themselves as agnostics, atheists and humanists, as well as having no

religion. Since it is possible to be Jewish and to have such affiliations, it was felt that an inclusive definition would better reflect the broad spectrum of Jewish adherence.

Given the marked decline in the number of Jews who identified themselves as ethnically Jewish since 2001, it was decided to expand the above definition of Jewishness. This “Revised Jewish Definition” incorporates more than just the religion and ethnicity variables in the National Household Survey.

According to this new criterion a Jew is defined as anyone who is:

- Jewish by religion and ethnicity.
- Jewish by religion and having another ethnicity.
- Having no religious affiliation and Jewish or Israeli by ethnicity.
- Having no religious affiliation and having knowledge of Hebrew or Yiddish as a “non-official” language.
- Having no religious affiliation and born in Israel.
- Having no religious affiliation and living in Israel in 2006.

A check was done to see whether the above criteria would erroneously include groups who should not be considered as Jews. For

instance, there are Arab Israelis who might have no religious affiliation. Since their mother tongue would be Arabic, and they would likely identify as having an Arab ethnicity, it was straightforward to determine that there were virtually no such individuals who were wrongly identified as Jews according to the Revised Jewish Definition.

All in all, the Revised Jewish Definition did not result in substantial increases in the Jewish populations of various metropolitan areas. The table below shows the differences

in numbers using the revised and standard definitions.

Finally, it is not possible to say how a person behaves “Jewishly” using any definition of Jewishness based on the NHS. For instance, we cannot know whether they adhere to traditions or attend synagogue on a regular basis. No questions of these types were asked in the National Household Survey. Despite this limitation, the fact that we can identify Jewish affiliation at all is critical for using the NHS as a tool for better understanding our community.

Jewish Populations Based on Standard & Revised Definitions 2011 National Household Survey

	Jewish Standard Definition	Revised Jewish Definition
Halifax CMA	2,080	2,120
Montréal CMA	89,665	90,780
Toronto CMA	186,010	188,715
Ottawa CMA	13,850	14,010
Hamilton CMA	5,055	5,110
Kitchener CMA	1,970	2,015
London CMA	2,610	2,675
Windsor CMA	1,475	1,520
Winnipeg CMA	13,260	13,690
Calgary CMA	8,210	8,340
Edmonton CMA	5,440	5,550
Vancouver CMA	25,740	26,255
Victoria CMA	2,630	2,740
Total Canada	385,345	391,665

Appendix 3

Geographic Borders

(Note: Boundaries are referential as geographic areas may be irregular.)

Primary Geographic Areas: East/West Split

Downtown Core:

South: Lake Ontario; North: Bloor St.; East: Don Valley Parkway; West: Dufferin St.

Danforth / Beaches:

South: Lake Ontario; North: Cosburn Ave.; East: Victoria Park Ave.; West: Don Valley Parkway

Bloor / St. Clair:

South: Bloor St.; North: St. Clair Ave.; East: Don River; West: Dufferin St.

St Clair / Eglinton:

South: St. Clair Ave.; North: Eglinton Ave.; East: Laird Dr.; West: Dufferin St.

Eglinton / Lawrence (West):

South: Eglinton Ave.; North: Lawrence Ave.; East: Bathurst St.; West: Dufferin St.

Eglinton / Lawrence (East):

South: Eglinton Ave.; North: Lawrence Ave.; East: Leslie St.; West: Bathurst St.

Lawrence / Wilson:

South: Lawrence Ave.; North: Hwy 401 / York Mills Rd.; East: Leslie St.; West: Dufferin St.

Wilson / Sheppard (West):

South: Hwy 401; North: Sheppard Ave.; East: Bathurst St.; West: William R. Allen Rd / Dufferin St.

Wilson / Sheppard (East):

South: Hwy 401/ York Mills Rd.; North: Sheppard Ave.; East: East Don River; West: Bathurst St.

Sheppard / Finch (West):

South: Sheppard Ave.; North: Finch Ave.; East: Bathurst St.; West: William R. Allen Rd.

Sheppard / Finch (East):

South: Sheppard Ave.; North: Finch Ave.; East: Victoria Park Ave.; West: Bathurst St.

Finch / Steeles (West):

South: Finch Ave.; North: Steeles Ave.; East: Bathurst St.; West: West Don River

Finch / Steeles (East):

South: Finch Ave.; North: Steeles Ave.; East: Victoria Park Ave.; West: Bathurst St.

Primary Geographic Areas: East/West Merged

Downtown Core:

South: Lake Ontario; North: Bloor St.; East: Don Valley Parkway; West: Dufferin St.

Danforth / Beaches:

South: Lake Ontario; North: Cosburn Ave.; East: Victoria Park Ave.; West: Don Valley Parkway

Bloor / St. Clair:

South: Bloor St.; North: St. Clair Ave.; East: Don River; West: Dufferin St.

St Clair / Eglinton:

South: St. Clair Ave.; North: Eglinton Ave.; East: Laird Dr.; West: Dufferin St.

Eglinton / Lawrence:

South: Eglinton Ave.; North: Lawrence Ave.; East: Leslie St.; West: Dufferin St.

Lawrence / Wilson:

South: Lawrence Ave.; North: Hwy 401 / York Mills Rd.; East: Leslie St.; West: Dufferin St.

Wilson / Sheppard:

South: Hwy 401 / York Mills Rd.; North: Sheppard Ave.; East: East Don River; West: William R. Allen Rd. / Dufferin St.

Sheppard / Finch:

South: Sheppard Ave.; North: Finch Ave.; East: Victoria Park Ave.; West: William R. Allen Rd.

Finch / Steeles:

South: Finch Ave.; North: Steeles Ave.; East: Victoria Park Ave.; West: West Don River

Large Special Interest Areas

Downtown Jewish Community:

South: Lake Ontario; North: St. Clair Ave.; East: Victoria Park Ave.; West: Humber River

Central Toronto Jewish Community:

South: St. Clair Ave.; North: Steeles Ave.; East: Victoria Park Ave.; West: Humber River

Northern Jewish Community:

York Region, Includes: Aurora, East Gwillimbury, Georgina, King, Markham, Newmarket, Richmond Hill, Vaughan, Whitchurch-Stouffville

Southern York Region:

Vaughan, Richmond Hill and Markham

North York:

South: Briar Hill Ave. & Lawrence Ave.; North: Steeles Avenue; East: Victoria Park Ave.; West: Humber River

Bathurst Corridor

South: Lake Ontario; North: To Aurora; East: Yonge St.; West: Dufferin St.

Small Special Interest Areas

Annex/ Bloor West/Yorkville:

South: Bloor St.; North: Dupont Ave.; East: Yonge St.; West: Christie St.

Bathurst Corridor - Sheppard/Steeles:

South: Sheppard Ave.; North: Steeles Ave.; East: Yonge St.; West: Dufferin St.

Thornhill (Markham):

South: Steeles Ave.; North: Hwy 7; East: Woodbine Ave.; West: Yonge St.

Thornhill (Vaughan)

South: Steeles Ave.; North: Hwy 7; East: Yonge; West: Dufferin St. / CN Railway Tracks

Appendix 4

Additional Data Tables

Table 17A
Living Arrangement
Jewish, Non-Jewish & Total Populations of Toronto CMA

	Total		Jews		Non-Jews	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Living in a Family	4,691,405	85.0	159,920	84.7	4,531,490	85.0
Living With Relatives	162,430	2.9	2,065	1.1	160,365	3.0
Living With Non-Relatives	197,640	3.6	4,430	2.3	193,210	3.6
Living Alone	469,755	8.5	22,305	11.8	447,450	8.4
Total Individuals	5,521,230	100.0	188,720	100.0	5,332,515	100.0

Table 17B
Living Arrangement by Gender
Toronto Jewish Population

	Total		Males		Females	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Living in a Family	159,920	84.7	80,760	86.8	79,160	82.7
Living With Relatives	2,065	1.1	750	0.8	1,315	1.4
Living With Non-Relatives	4,430	2.3	2,410	2.6	2,020	2.1
Living Alone	22,305	11.8	9,080	9.8	13,225	13.8
Total Individuals	188,720	100.0	93,000	100.0	95,720	100.0

Table 17C
Living Arrangement by Age
Toronto Jewish Population

	0-14		15-24		25-44		45-64		65+	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Living in a Family	34,160	99.9	23,260	94.4	36,565	80.9	45,345	84.4	20,595	66.5
Living With Relatives	25	0.1	185	0.8	420	0.9	555	1.0	880	2.8
Living With Non-Relatives	0	0.0	645	2.6	2,040	4.5	1,040	1.9	705	2.3
Living Alone	0	0.0	560	2.3	6,200	13.7	6,760	12.6	8,790	28.4
Total Individuals	34,185	100.0	24,650	100.0	45,225	100.0	53,700	100.0	30,970	100.0

Table 18
Family Structure by Number of Children in Household
Jewish Families of Toronto CMA
(Row %)

	0		1		2		3		4+		Median Number of Children
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Couples: With Children	0	0.0	10,005	33.6	13,065	43.8	4,870	16.3	1,875	6.3	2.4
Couples: Without Children	23,215	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Male Lone Parent	0	0.0	730	55.7	475	36.3	105	8.0	0	0	1.9
Female Lone Parent	0	0.0	3,035	62.8	1,340	27.7	365	7.6	90	1.9	1.8
Total Families	23,215	39.2	13,770	23.3	14,880	25.1	5,340	9.0	1,965	3.3	1.5

Table 19
Number of Children in Household by Primary Geographic Areas
Jewish Families of Toronto CMA
(Row %)

District	0		1		2		3		4+		Average Number of Children
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Downtown Core	1,575	69.7	400	17.7	245	10.8	40	1.8	0	0.0	0.7
Danforth / Beaches	675	38.2	610	34.6	440	24.9	40	2.3	0	0.0	1.4
Bloor / St. Clair	1,785	55.8	630	19.7	605	18.9	155	4.8	25	0.8	0.9
St. Clair / Eglinton	1,595	40.6	710	18.1	1,070	27.2	490	12.5	65	1.7	1.5
Eglinton / Lawrence	1,690	35.3	970	20.3	1,275	26.6	465	9.7	385	8.0	1.7
Lawrence / Wilson	1,120	33.9	635	19.2	930	28.2	420	12.7	195	5.9	1.8
Wilson / Sheppard (West)	320	26.3	295	24.3	305	25.1	160	13.2	135	11.1	2.0
Wilson / Sheppard (East)	1,095	42.9	485	19.0	555	21.7	340	13.3	80	3.1	1.4
Sheppard / Finch (West)	595	36.1	530	32.1	315	19.1	175	10.6	35	2.1	1.4
Sheppard / Finch (East)	850	56.1	330	21.8	295	19.5	40	2.6	0	0.0	0.9
Finch / Steeles (West)	1,115	50.0	635	28.5	365	16.4	115	5.2	0	0.0	1.0
Finch / Steeles (East)	1,345	58.1	570	24.6	290	12.5	85	3.7	25	1.1	0.9
Vaughan	3,770	27.4	3,145	22.9	4,420	32.1	1,880	13.7	545	4.0	2.0
Richmond Hill	1,190	30.7	990	25.5	1,275	32.9	345	8.9	75	1.9	1.8
Markham	1,205	43.7	695	25.2	635	23.0	185	6.7	40	1.4	1.3
Mississauga	410	37.6	350	32.1	260	23.9	45	4.1	25	2.3	1.4
Scarborough	285	55.9	105	20.6	95	18.6	25	4.9	0	0.0	0.9
Rest of Toronto CMA	2,585	41.2	1,695	27.0	1,505	24.0	325	5.2	165	2.6	1.3
Total Families	23,215	39.2	13,765	23.3	14,875	25.1	5,335	9.0	1,980	3.3	1.5