

Children of Intermarriage: How “Jewish”?

Bruce Phillips

(HEBREW UNION COLLEGE — JEWISH INSTITUTE
OF RELIGION, LOS ANGELES)

Until the 1960s, American Jews were simultaneously concerned and not concerned about intermarriage. In the first half of the twentieth century, Jewish intermarriage was uncommonly low. Just after the turn of the century, Jules Drachsler studied marriage records in New York City and found that the 1 percent rate of intermarriage among New York Jews was only slightly higher than the rate of interracial marriages among blacks.¹ By mid-century, the statistics had not changed much. New Haven Jews studied in the late 1940s were the religious group least likely to be intermarried.² Gerold Heiss similarly found that the intermarriage rate among Jews in midtown Manhattan (18.4 percent) was significantly lower than among both Protestants (33.9 percent) and Catholics (21.4 percent).³ In their classic work, *Beyond the Melting Pot*, Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan described Jews as “the most endogamous of peoples.”⁴

The year 1963 marked the turning point for Jewish thinking about intermarriage.⁵ In 1963, the *American Jewish Year Book* published its first article on intermarriage: Erich Rosenthal’s “Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States.”⁶ This same year saw the publication of the first symposium on intermarriage sponsored by a major national Jewish organization.⁷ *Look* magazine also published a cover story on the “Vanishing American Jew,” which raised the specter of assimilation resulting from intermarriage.⁸

Jewish public interest in intermarriage was thus primed for the publication of the National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) of 1969–1970. Alvin Chenkin and Fred Massarik, who had conducted the first NJPS, astounded the Jewish world when they reported that intermarriage had risen from less than 6 percent prior to 1960 to 13.9 percent for the period 1961–1965, to 30.9 percent for the period 1966–1969.⁹

Over the next two decades an occasional debate took place about the meaning of this intermarriage rate for the Jewish future. The debate focused on the offspring of these marriages, and social scientists were divided about the probable impact. Massarik, the scientific director of the NJPS, was optimistic. He discounted the threat of intermarriage, reasoning that if half of the intermarried couples raised Jewish children, there would be no net loss to the Jewish community, and possibly even a small increase.¹⁰ Building on Massarik’s analysis, the influential Jewish essayist and editor of *Moment* magazine, Leonard Fein, argued that American Jews were unduly worried about intermarriage.¹¹

Others were more pessimistic. In a widely quoted and distributed *Midstream* article published in the year of the bicentennial, Harvard demographer Elihu Bergman predicted that “when the United States celebrates its Tercentennial in 2076, the American Jewish community is likely to number no more than 944,000 persons, and conceivably as few as 10,420.”¹² The Israeli demographers U.O. Schmelz and Sergio DellaPergola similarly concluded that the American Jewish population would sharply decline in the next century.¹³

In 1990, the second National Jewish Population Survey again focused national attention on intermarriage with the much-publicized finding that 52 percent of Jews who had married between 1985 and 1990 had married a non-Jew.¹⁴ The 1990 NJPS makes it possible to revisit the question of the ultimate impact of intermarriage on the next generation at two different levels. First, we can test Massarik’s conjecture by examining what indeed happened to the children of intermarriages formed during the 1960s and 1970s. Do they identify as Jews now, and if so, have they followed their Jewish parent’s example by choosing a non-Jewish spouse themselves? Second, we can revisit the question of how children are being raised in contemporary intermarriages.

The first section of this article addresses some key methodological issues. The second section profiles adults who are the offspring of intermarriages and assesses what impact intermarriage has already had on the Jewish community. The third section, focusing on intermarried families with children under the age of eighteen, addresses the future by examining the present. In what sort of Jewish environment are they growing up? The fourth section identifies those factors that increase the likelihood that a child in an intermarried home will be raised as Jewish.

Methodological Issues

This analysis is based on the 1990 NJPS along with two follow-up surveys specifically about intermarriage—the 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage and the 1995 Survey of Non-Jewish Spouses.¹⁵ The 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage consists of 580 reinterviews with currently and previously married respondents under the age of fifty from the 1990 NJPS. They were interviewed specifically about intermarriage, and these data were combined with the 1990 data.¹⁶ The 1995 Survey of Non-Jewish Spouses consists of 256 interviews with the non-Jewish spouses of intermarried Jews interviewed in 1993.

Steven M. Cohen has raised some much-publicized questions about the accuracy of the intermarriage rates in the NJPS. Because many of the points made in this article depend on the accuracy of the NJPS, I begin by addressing methodological questions about the accuracy of the 52 percent rate of intermarriage. Steven M. Cohen raised the first objection on the grounds that some of the younger persons in the NJPS were not raised as Jews and thus should not have been included in the survey. Their exclusion would reduce the rate of intermarriage to 41 percent.¹⁷ Cohen is both wrong and right about this. He is wrong in asserting that because these individuals were not raised as Jews, they should not be counted as Jews now. Although raised outside of Judaism, they had one Jewish parent and identify as Jews now. Those who were rein-

interviewed in 1993 reaffirmed their Jewish identification. He is right, however, in arguing that their inclusion inflates the overall rate of intermarriage. Rather than rejecting them altogether, as Cohen recommends, I treat them as a separate category.

Cohen's second objection is that the NJPS was inappropriately weighted to reflect the distribution of American households rather than the distribution of Jewish households. As a result, argues Cohen, areas of low Jewish density (where intermarrieds are more likely to be found) were overrepresented, thereby overrepresenting the mixed-married population:

Pollsters regularly weight, or over-count, groups known to avoid surveys, such as Southerners, blacks, the poor, and people who live in rural areas. The Jewish survey did this too, over-counting Southern, black, poor and rural Jews. But these Jews do not avoid pollsters. And they are less likely than others to marry Jews, join a synagogue or eat kosher. By over-counting them, the survey inflated the rate of intermarriage.¹⁸

However, as is shown in Appendix 1, this argument is not as intuitively obvious as Cohen and J.J. Goldberg would have the Jewish lay public believe.¹⁹ While the issue of a possible bias in the NJPS weighting scheme cannot be resolved in this article, neither can it be ignored. Rather than leaving the discussion to the theoretical questions dealt with in Appendix 1, the intermarriage rates in the 1990 NJPS were examined for external consistency with the 1969–1970 NJPS, and for internal consistency with a question in the 1990 NJPS about married adult children.

Consistency with the 1970 NJPS

The 1990 NJPS contained findings pertaining to 150 Jewish individuals whose current marriage took place in the period 1965–1970. Of these, 28 percent were intermarried (Table 1). This is close to the estimate of 31 percent for the comparable period reported in the NJPS of 1970.²⁰ However, the 20 percent rate for the 1960–1964 cohort in the 1990 NJPS is higher than the rate of 14 percent reported for the comparable period in the NJPS of 1970. Given the vast differences in sampling,²¹ it is hard to know what to make of these differences.

Table 1. Individual Rate of Intermarriage, by Year of Current/Most Recent Marriage

Year of current or most recent marriage	Rate of intermarriage (%)	Weighted N
1901–1949	11	559
1950–1954	15	161
1955–1959	22	129
1960–1964	20	129
1965–1969	28	150
1970–1974	38	217
1975–1979	47	246
1980–1984	45	352
1985–1990	52	457

Source: 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (hereafter: NJPS)

Internal Consistency

Because rising intermarriage rates had already been documented in numerous local Jewish population studies conducted during the 1980s,²² Barry Kosmin and Sidney Goldstein (who directed the 1990 NJPS) anticipated an increase in intermarriage over the 1970 NJPS and included a series of questions about adult children not living at home:

- Do you have any children twenty-one or over who do not live at home?
- How many are there?
- What are their names?
- Starting with the first, how old is (NAME)?
- Does (NAME) consider himself/herself Jewish?
- Is (NAME) married?
- Does (NAME)'s spouse consider him/herself Jewish?

This series of questions allows us to test Cohen's hypothesis about the weighting of the NJPS by comparing the rate of intermarriage as reported by the parents of adult children with the rates observed in the NJPS. The logic is as follows. Assume that all endogamous families live in Region A, and that all mixed-married families live in Region B. Assume further that the endogamous parents of adult children report a 25 percent rate of intermarriage among their offspring. Because all of the mixed-married individuals live in Region B, the one out of four mixed-married adult children would have moved to that region, whereas the three out of four endogamous adult children would have remained in Region A. This is an exaggerated example of the situation Cohen describes. If Cohen is correct in arguing that the NJPS weighted mixed-married couples too heavily, this should be reflected in the comparison between individual age cohort rates as reported by parents of adult children and the rates observed in the NJPS. Taking this hypothetical model further, let us assume that Region B was given twice the weight it should have been. This means that every mixed-married adult (all mixed-married adults live in Region B) is erroneously counted twice because Region B was assigned a weight of two, whereas Region A received a weight of only one. In this scenario, the intermarriage rate observed in the incorrectly weighted study would be 40 percent (that is, one intermarried individual in Region B counted as two individuals, and three endogamous individuals in Region A).

If Cohen is correct that mixed-married couples were erroneously weighted too heavily, the intermarriage rate observed in the NJPS for a given age cohort of adult children of endogamous marriages should be higher than that reported for the same group by their endogamous parents. This is because the rate of intermarriage as reported by the parents is weighted by the Region A weights from the hypothetical example above, whereas the intermarriage rates observed in the NJPS would be weighted by the Region B rates from the example above. If the NJPS of 1990 is internally consistent with regard to intermarriage, then the individual rate of intermarriage among the adult children of respondents (as reported by the respondents) should be consistent with the individual intermarriage rate for the same age cohort in the 1990 NJPS.

Table 2. Cohort Inter-marriage Rates for Jewish Members of Households, Compared with Adult Children of Respondents

Cohort	Individual Jews from endogamous families of origin (%)	Adult children of endogamous respondents (%)
21-29	34	29
30-39	37	38
40-49	26	27
50-67	17	20

Source: 1990 NJPS

The analysis here is limited to endogamous couples because Cohen argues that they were underrepresented. If Cohen is right, then the rate of inter-marriage they report for their own children should be lower than the 1990 NJPS rate for the same age cohorts, because the 1990 NJPS would have overrepresented localities of low Jewish density where the inter-marrieds are more likely to reside. Table 2 shows that the individual rate of inter-marriage among adults with endogamous parents is consistent with the rates of inter-marriage reported by endogamous respondents about their adult married children. If anything, Table 2 suggests that the NJPS may even have underestimated the rate of inter-marriage. Table 3 looks at the consistency question a different way, and one that is particularly important for the analysis presented here.²³ This table shows the percent of individual Jews²⁴ who came from inter-married parents.²⁵ If inter-married persons were not overrepresented, then this proportion ought to be consistent with the rate of inter-marriage for the age cohort of the parents.²⁶ Again, there is remarkable consistency, especially in the youngest cohort where children of inter-marriages are most plentiful. For example, 46 percent of individual Jewish household members aged twenty-one to twenty-nine come from an inter-marriage. The rate of inter-marriage for all respondents in the corresponding age cohort for the parents of twenty-one to twenty-nine year-olds is 47 percent.

Table 3. Family of Origin by Cohort, Compared with Rate of Inter-marriage for the Parental Cohort

Age of individual in 1990	Individuals from inter-married families of origin (%)	Rate of inter-marriage for parents' cohort (%)
21-29	46	47
30-39	34	38
40-49	29	22

Source: 1990 NJPS

Table 4. Current Religious Identification by Family of Origin, All Jewish Adult Household Members in the 1990 NJPS

Current religious identification	Family of origin was:	
	Intermarried (%)	Endogamous (%)
Jewish	8	92
Christian	24	1
Other religion or no religion	68	7
Total percentage	100	100
N =	945	2464

Adult Children of Intermarriage

Massarik's optimistic prognosis for the children of intermarriage is not supported by the results of the 1990 NJPS. Table 4 contrasts the current religious identification of all Jewish persons in the NJPS²⁷ by Jewish parentage. The vast majority of adults who come from endogamous families of origin identify as Jews by religion (92 percent), with the rest identifying as secular (7 percent). By contrast, Jewish adults who come from intermarried families of origin only rarely identify as Jews by religion (8 percent). Two out of three identify as ethnic Jews, but a quarter identified as Christian. A problem with this particular subject of inquiry is that the information was provided for all household members by the respondent. Because religious identification is subjective, there is a possibility that the respondent may have been guessing about other household members. For this reason, the subsequent discussion of adult children of intermarriage is restricted to the respondent and spouse (about whom an accurate answer is more likely than for other household members such as roommates or in-laws).

A second source of attrition among the adult children of intermarriage is the generational replication of intermarriage. The great majority of adult children from intermarried families of origin repeated the precedent of their Jewish parent by marrying a non-Jew (Table 5). In the 1985–1990 period, 69 percent of individuals from intermarried families of origin married non-Jews, as compared with 45 percent of the

Table 5. Individual Rates of Intermarriage, by Year of Marriage and Family of Origin

Year of marriage	Family of origin was	
	Intermarried (%)	Endogamous (%)
1900–1949	62	5
1950–1959	61	6
1960–1964	65	11
1965–1969	68	16
1970–1974	72	25
1975–1979	64	38
1980–1984	65	40
1985–1990	69	45

Table 6. Impact of "Return In-Marriage" on the Rate of Individual Inter-marriage in the Period 1985–1990

Parentage and type of marriage	Individual Jews who married in the period 1985–1990 (%)
In-married of endogamous parentage	34
In-married of mixed parentage	12
Inter-married of endogamous parentage	28
Inter-married of mixed parentage	27
Total percentage	100

adult children from endogamous families of origin. However, the statistic of those from inter-married families who have married Jews is equally important for assessing the impact of inter-marriage. Because they are so numerous in the younger age cohorts, they have lowered the overall rate of inter-marriage.

The phenomenon of adult children from inter-married families of origin who marry Jews can be termed "return in-marriage." Because Jews of mixed parentage account for 39 percent of all individual Jews who married during this period (Table 6), those who have "return in-married" have had a dramatic impact on the overall rate of individual inter-marriage. As a result of return in-marriage, the overall rate of inter-marriage is lower than it would have been had all the adult children of mixed parentage married non-Jews. Without return in-marriage, the overall rate of inter-marriage during the period 1985–1990 would have been 66 percent instead of 54 percent.²⁸

These findings raise two related questions:

- Why is inter-marriage so prevalent among Jews from inter-married families of origin?
- What explains the phenomenon of return in-marriage?

I approach both questions by profiling the adult Jews of mixed parentage. These data are derived from the 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage. The inter-marriage rates reported are considerably higher than those reported for the 1990 NJPS because the 1990 rates are reported for individuals, whereas the 1993 survey reports couple rates of inter-marriage. The couple rate is always higher than the individual rate because two individual Jews who marry each other form one marriage, whereas two individual Jews who marry non-Jews form two marriages. Thus, a 50 percent rate of *individual* inter-marriage produces a 67 percent rate of *couple* inter-marriage.

The Generational Replication of Inter-marriage

Adults of mixed parentage are overwhelmingly inter-married. In every decade since the 1950s, between 60–72 percent married non-Jews (Table 5). Inter-marriage thus leads to continued inter-marriage in the next generation and has a cumulative impact on the current rate of inter-marriage.

An inter-married Jew has children of "mixed parentage." Because inter-marriages tend to replicate themselves when the next generation reaches adulthood, rates of in-

Table 7. Individual Adult Jews with Two Jewish Parents, by Generation (1990)

Generation	Two Jewish parents (%) ^a
First–second	92
Second	90
Second–third	87
Third	88
Third–fourth	61
Fourth	38

^aSee Appendix 2

termarriage will result in higher proportions of children of mixed parentage in the Jewish population. The further from the immigrant (or first) generation, the greater the proportion of adult children of mixed parentage. By 1990, the majority of fourth-generation Jewish adults were of mixed parentage (Table 7).

Profile of Adult Jews of Mixed Parentage

Gender of Jewish Parent. Adults of mixed parentage are almost evenly split between Jewish fathers and Jewish mothers (Table 8). This finding contradicts the conventional wisdom that Jewish males were more likely to be intermarried than were Jewish females. If this were the case, there should be more Jewish fathers than Jewish mothers among the adult children of intermarriage. It is, however, consistent with the profile of contemporary intermarriages: men and women now intermarry at identical rates.²⁹ The gender of the Jewish parent does not explain return in-marriage—respondents whose mother was Jewish were as likely to be intermarried as were respondents whose father was Jewish (Table 9).³⁰

Affective Dimensions. From a psychological perspective, one might assume that intermarried Jewish parents would pass on some of their ambivalence about being Jewish to their adult children who, like them, would choose to marry a non-Jew. Overall, respondents of Jewish parentage reported their parents feeling more positive about being Jewish than did respondents of mixed parentage (Table 10). They also reported more positive memories of growing up Jewish (Table 11). Gender differences

Table 8. Jewish Parentage of Adult Children of Mixed Parentage

Which Parent is/was Jewish	(%)
Mother	53
Father	47
Total percentage	100

Source: 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage

N = 134

Table 9. Inter-marriage and Gender of Jewish Parent among Adult Children of Mixed Parentage

Which parent was Jewish	Inter-married children, 1993 (%)
Mother	92
Father	96

Source: 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage

in these two affective variables were not statistically significant. Respondents' parents' attitude toward being Jewish was not at all associated with return in-marriage (Table 12). Their memories of growing up Jewish were weakly associated with return in-marriage, but the differences were not statistically significant (Table 13).

Religion of Non-Jewish Parent. Protestants and Catholics were equally represented among non-Jewish fathers. Non-Jewish mothers were somewhat more likely to be Protestant (Table 14). The religion of the non-Jewish parent is related to return in-marriage (Table 15). Mixed-parentage respondents with a Protestant parent were almost entirely inter-married (99 percent). Respondents with a Catholic parent were also heavily inter-married but to a lesser extent (93 percent). Respondents whose non-Jewish parent was not a Christian were the least likely to be inter-married, although the majority of them (78 percent) were. Again, it should be noted that these are couple-level inter-marriage rates, and therefore higher than the individual rates shown in Tables 8–13.

Table 10. Attitude of Jewish Parents toward Being Jewish, by Number and Gender of Jewish Parent(s)

"Thinking back, how would you say your father/mother felt about being Jewish?"	Which parent was Jewish (%)		
	Mother (N = 74)	Father (N = 75)	Both ^a (N = 413)
Very negative	4	5	0
[Intermediate] ^a	n/a	n/a	1
Somewhat negative	12	10	1
[Intermediate]	n/a	n/a	1
Neither positive nor negative	14	6	4
[Intermediate]	n/a	n/a	2
Somewhat positive	26	25	17
[Intermediate]	n/a	n/a	19
Very positive	45	55	56
Total percentage	100	100	100

Source: 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage

p < .001

^aRespondents of Jewish parentage answered this question for *each* of their Jewish parents. An average of the father's and mother's scores are reported for respondents of Jewish parentage. If the father and mother were reported to have felt different about being Jewish, an intermediate score sometimes resulted.

Table 11. Jewish Memories, by Parentage

"Taken all together, are your Jewish memories of growing up . . ."	Which parent was Jewish		
	Mother (N = 74)	Father (N = 75)	Both (N = 413)
Very negative	3	0	1
Somewhat negative	7	3	6
Neither	19	15	2
Somewhat positive	39	49	44
Very positive	32	33	48
Total percentage	100	100	100

Source: 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage

$p < .001$

Table 12. Rate of Inter marriage by Feelings of Jewish Parent among Adult Children of Mixed Parentage

"Thinking back, how would you say your father/mother felt about being Jewish?"	Intermarried children 1993 (%)	N =
Less than very positive	93	75
Very positive	91	74

$p = .75$

Table 13. Rate of Inter marriage by Respondent's Jewish Memories among Adult Children of Mixed Parentage

"Taken all together, are your Jewish memories of growing up . . ."	Intermarried children 1993 (%)	N =
Less than very positive	94	101
Very positive	88	48

$p = .16$

Table 14. Religion of the Non-Jewish Parent, Adult Children of Mixed Parentage

"What, if any, religion did your mother/father identify with most of the time when you were growing up?"	Mother (%)	Father (%)
Catholic	30	37
Mainline Protestant	43	36
Evangelical Protestant	0	1
New Age	5	1
None	16	21
Don't know	6	5
Total percentage	100	100

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

Table 15. Inter-marriage Rate by Religion of the Non-Jewish Parent, Adult Children of Mixed Parentage

"What, if any, religion did your mother/father identify with most of the time when you were growing up?"	Inter-married children 1993 (%)
No religion, "New Age" religion	78
Catholic	93
Protestant	99

p < .05

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

Religious Socialization

Respondents of mixed parentage who had some kind of Jewish socialization were the most likely to be return in-married. Respondents of mixed parentage who reported that they were both born and raised Jewish were six times as likely to be in-married as were those who had not been raised Jewish (Table 16). Respondents who had received some formal Jewish education had the highest rate of return in-marriage (Table 17). The impact of formal Jewish education on return in-marriage reflects both that experience and the Jewish motivations of the Jewish parent who made sure a Jewish education was received.

Summary and Conclusion

Most adults of inter-marriage have themselves married non-Jews. Because there are now so many adult children of mixed parentage in the Jewish population, the minority who marry endogamously have dramatically lowered the rate of inter-marriage from what it might otherwise have been.

Return in-marriage results from the socialization that respondents of mixed parentage experienced. Having a secular non-Jewish parent, being raised as a Jew and receiving some formal Jewish education were the three factors most closely associated with return in-marriage. But these experiences can only limit the impact of having a non-Jewish parent. The rate of inter-marriage among respondents of Jewish parentage who were similarly socialized is much lower.³¹ For example, among respondents of Jewish parentage, between 50 percent and 70 percent of those who had received some

Table 16. Inter-marriage Rate by Religion in which Respondent was Raised, Adult Children of Mixed Parentage

"In what religion were you born?" "In what religion were you raised?"	In-married (%)	Inter-married (%)	N =
Respondent born and raised as a Jew	24	76	30
Respondent not raised as a Jew	4	96	116

p < .01

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

Table 17. Intermarriage Rate by Formal Jewish Education of Respondent, Adult Children of Mixed Parentage

“Did you ever receive any formal Jewish education when you were between 6 and 12 years of age?/ between 13 and 18 years of age?”	Intermarried children 1993 (%)	N =
Yes (to either)	70	28
No (to both)	100	39

$p < .01$

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

sort of formal Jewish education had married other Jews,³² as contrasted with 30 percent of respondents of mixed parentage.

Profile of Intermarried Families with Children

Who are the current intermarried families with children? What do they observe religiously? What are their connections to the Jewish community? Are they closer to the Jewish or the non-Jewish sides of their families? These questions are addressed by profiling the intermarried family with children in four contexts: religious, institutional, familial and social network.

A Typology of Intermarriage

Because of the size of this growing population, intermarried families can no longer be thought of as an undifferentiated group. In the previous section, intermarried Jews were differentiated according to family of origin. For the profile of families with children, intermarried families are differentiated according to the combined religious identification of the Jewish and Gentile parents. There are four categories to this typology.³³ A “Judaic” intermarriage consists of a Jew by religion married to a secular Gentile (“secular” here means that the Gentile partner identified with no religion).³⁴ This is the most “Jewish” of all the types, but it accounts for only 15 percent of all intermarried couples with children (Table 18). In the “secular” intermarriage, neither partner identifies with any religion. This is the smallest category, accounting for only nine percent of the intermarried families with children.

The “dual-religion” intermarriage is the second most common type of intermarried family, accounting for 32 percent of all intermarried families. It consists of a self-identified Jew and a self-identified Christian. The dual-religion family is a uniquely American intermarriage, combining a Jewish American “myth” with contemporary American values. The Jewish “myth” is the “Judeo-Christian tradition,” which emphasizes the common roots and shared value systems of these two historically antithetical religions. It was by way of the “Judeo-Christian tradition” that Jews became the “third faith” in America with just a few percent of the population.

In the year of qualitative research that preceded the 1993 Survey on Mixed

Table 18. Distribution of Inter married Families with Children

Type	%
Christian	44
Secular	9
Dual-religion	32
Judaic	15
Total percentage	100

N = 206

Marriage, those dual-religion couples who were interviewed emphasized the common values of their respective faiths. Respondents in dual-religion families were the most likely to agree that having two religions “gives the children the best of both worlds.” The two American values represented in the dual-religion family are diversity and religiosity. In post-civil rights America, “diversity” has become an end in itself and a public policy goal. The United States is a society that values religion in general. In accordance with the general value placed on religion in American society, dual-religion families believe that if one religion is good, then two religions are even better.

The largest category, accounting for 44 percent of intermarried families, is the “Christian” family, so named because it contains at least one identified Christian and no religiously identified Jew. It is made up of one of three possible combinations: (1) a “Jewish Christian” married to a Gentile Christian; (2) a secular Jew married to a Gentile Christian; or (3) a Jewish Christian married to a secular Gentile. The “Jewish Christians” identify as Christians by religion, and as Jews by ethnicity. In most cases they come from intermarried families of origin and were at least nominally raised as Christians.³⁵ Special questions included in the 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage confirmed that the Jewish Christians were Jewish by parentage and Christian by religion. Like the dual-religion family, the “Christian” intermarried family is a distinctly American phenomenon in that individuals feel free to create their own ethnic and religious identities. Under pressure from mixed race organizations, the United States Census Bureau, for example, has agreed to add a “mixed race” category for those who wish this to be a recognized racial category. The “Jewish Christian” identity, in which a Jew by ethnicity is a Christian by religion, reflects the favorable status of the Jew in American society. Individuals who were raised as and continue at least nominally to identify as Christians also wish to be identified as Jews. Jewish identification is not perceived as a liability. As will become evident, the “Christian” family also maintains some Jewish practices.

The Religious Context

The Winter Holidays. Christmas is an emotional season for intermarried families. The airwaves, department stores and public schools are filled with images of a warm family Christmas. The non-Jewish partner often has memories of or yearnings for the kind of Christmas pictured in popular culture and advertising. The Jewish partners of Jewish parentage have similar memories of lighting the Hanukkah menorah. For this

Table 19. Hanukah Candles versus Christmas Tree, by Type of Intermarried Family (with Children)

Type of family	Hanukah candles lit (%)	Christmas tree in home (%)	N =
Christian	21	92	91
Secular	50	100	19
Dual-religion	76	90	65
Judaic	92	68	31
Endogamous	99	4	126

$p < .001$.

reason, choosing which holiday to celebrate is often termed the “December dilemma.” The 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage asked whether Christmas and/or Hanukah was celebrated in any way, and specifically about two choices intermarried families must make: whether to light the Hanukah menorah, have a Christmas tree, or both, and whether to give the children Hanukah presents or Christmas presents, or both. The intermarriage typology would predict that the more Jewish the intermarriage, the more likely the family would be to celebrate the Jewish holidays instead of, or at least alongside of, the Christian holidays.

The celebration of Hanukah and Christmas conforms nicely to the typology, with some interesting surprises. Judaic intermarried families were the most likely to light the Hanukah menorah (92 percent) and did so almost to the same extent as did endogamous families (Table 19). However, two thirds of the Judaic families with children had a Christmas tree, as compared with only four percent of endogamous families. Dual-religion families also celebrated both holidays, with more of them celebrating Christmas (90 percent) than Hanukah (76 percent). The few secular families with children in the study also celebrated both, with a much heavier emphasis on Christmas (which was celebrated as a secular holiday). Christian intermarried families almost universally have a Christmas tree, as would be expected, because most of the parents were exposed to Christmas when they were growing up. Surprisingly, one out of five lit Hanukah candles, an important symbolic affirmation of Jewish identification.

Table 20 examines exclusive versus joint observance of Christmas and Hanukah. More than half (60 percent) of the Judaic families observed both, but they were four

Table 20. Joint Celebration of Hanukah and Christmas, by Type of Intermarried Family

Holidays celebrated	Type of intermarried family (%)			
	Christian (N = 89)	Secular (N = 19)	Dual-religion (N = 65)	Judaic (N = 31)
Both	18	50	66	60
Menorah only	4	0	10	32
Christmas tree only	76	50	24	8
Neither	2	0	0	0
Total percentage	100	100	100	100

$p < .001$

times as likely to celebrate Hanukah exclusively (32 percent) as to celebrate Christmas exclusively (8 percent). This reflects the Jewish orientation of the household. Unlike endogamous families, many children in Judaic intermarriages are exposed to Christmas, and thus a boundary between Jews and the larger society is not drawn.

One would expect the dual-religion family to observe both holidays, and almost two out of three did so. The remaining third were more likely to celebrate Christmas exclusively (24 percent) than Hanukah exclusively (10 percent). The secular families were split evenly between celebrating both holidays or Christmas only. Three out of four Christian families (76 percent) celebrate only Christmas, but oddly, four percent celebrated Hanukah only and 18 percent celebrated both. These would not be large percentages, were it not for the fact that there are no self-identified Jews by religion in these families. Having a menorah, even alongside a Christmas tree, is a positive identification with the Jewish people.

Giving presents to children is a second way to make a statement about the Jewish nature of the family. It is seemingly an easier statement to make than lighting Hanukah candles because only wrapping paper is needed (or even just the giving of a present on one of the nights of Hanukah). Judaic families are the only intermarried parents to give Hanukah presents exclusively (Table 21), but only one out of five do so (20 percent). They mostly give both kinds of presents (67 percent), and some give no Hanukah presents at all (13 percent). The majority of dual-religion families give both (61 percent), but almost a third (31 percent) give only Christmas presents. Most Christian intermarried families, as expected, give only Christmas presents, but surprisingly, one out four (25 percent) give both. Secular parents are split between Christmas presents only and both.

Judaic and dual-religion parents are similar in that they observe both Christmas and Hanukah. Judaic parents are more likely to observe Hanukah exclusively, while an unexpectedly large proportion of dual-religion families observe Christmas only. The meaning of Christmas in this context is not clear. For some parents, Christmas is merely a secular holiday that is celebrated by the society at large. While any observance of Christmas represents a failure to draw a boundary line between Jews and the larger culture, some intermarried parents would no doubt argue that the celebration of Christmas is not a religious activity at all, but simply an American seasonal observance. Indeed, many Christians complain that "we need to put Christ back into

Table 21. Giving of Hanukah versus Christmas Presents, by Type of Intermarried Family

Type of holiday presents given	Type of intermarried family (%)			
	Christian (N = 89)	Secular (N = 19)	Dual-religion (N = 65)	Judaic (N = 31)
Both	25	50	61	67
Hanukah only	3	0	8	20
Christmas only	72	50	31	13
Neither	1	0	0	0
Total percentage	100	100	100	100

Table 22. How Christmas Is Celebrated, by Type of Intermarried Family

How Christmas is celebrated	Type of intermarried family (%)			
	Christian (N = 91)	Secular (N = 19)	Dual-religion (N = 65)	Judaic (N = 31)
Not celebrated	2	0	2	7
Celebrated as a family and/or national holiday	44	93	60	80
Celebrated as religious	54	7	38	13
Total percentage	100	100	100	100

$p < .001$

Christmas.” To explore this matter further, respondents who celebrated Christmas in any way were asked: “How do you think of Christmas in your family, as a religious holiday, an American holiday, or a time to be together with family?” (Table 22). The choices were not mutually exclusive.

Secular parents thought of Christmas as secular, as did the vast majority of respondents in Judaic families (80 percent). The majority of dual-religion respondents thought of Christmas in secular terms (60 percent), but a significant minority thought of it as a religious holiday (38 percent). Respondents in Christian intermarried families were the most likely to think of Christmas as a religious holiday, but only a bare majority thought of it in this way (54 percent). Fully 44 percent of the respondents celebrated Christmas as a non-religious holiday.

Of course, this is the Jewish respondent answering on behalf of the Gentile spouse. Does the Gentile spouse agree? To find out, about half of the Gentile spouses were successfully contacted and interviewed in 1995. Their answers are compared with those of their spouses in Table 23. Agreement is highest among Judaic families, at 77 percent. It is lowest among dual-religion families, where half of the Gentile spouses indicated that they celebrated Christmas as a religious holiday, whereas their Jewish partners said Christmas was celebrated as a non-religious holiday. The Gentile partners in Christian intermarriages show a pattern that is at first puzzling. While more Gentile spouses agreed with their Jewish partners than disagreed (61 percent), almost two out of five (39 percent) disagreed. The disagreements were split between the Gentile saying “religious” and the Jew saying “secular,” and the Jew saying “religious” and the Gentile saying “secular.” This disagreement in part represents the differences in typology: Jewish Christian respondents married to secular Gentiles say Christmas is religious in nature whereas their spouses think it is secular. The difference between Jewish and Gentile respondents in dual-religion families, however, represents an inherent tension about the religious nature of the family. This tension is consistent with other evidence of tensions in dual-religion marriages. Dual-religion spouses, for example, are more likely to end up divorced than are those in other types of intermarriages, and they also disagree the most about the religion in which future children will be raised.³⁶

The Spring Holidays. Because they fall at the same time of year and are both major holidays in their respective religions, Passover and Easter represent another occasion when intermarried families must cope with two competitive religious tradi-

Table 23. Comparison of How Jews and Gentile Spouses Described the Family's Christmas Celebration, by Type of Inter married Family

Pattern of consistency	Type of inter married family (%)			
	Christian (N = 44)	Secular (N = 9)	Dual-religion (N = 38)	Judaic (N = 26)
Both spouses answered the same way	61	26	51	77
Jew says as non-religious, Gentile says as religious	22	15	49	14
Jew says as religious, Gentile says as non-religious	17	59	0	9
Total percentage	100	100	100	100

p < .001

tions. There is more inherent tension between Passover and Easter than between Hanukah and Christmas, because the former holidays are perceived as more clearly religious in nature. Moreover, some of the religious content of Easter is explicitly antisemitic (for example, the theme of the Jew as Christ-killer). Passover is less threatening to the Gentile than Easter is to the Jew; although it commemorates the covenant between God and Israel, it is also interpreted as a holiday of freedom. Moreover, because Passover is observed mainly in the home, the family determines the extent of the religious content. Thus, Easter observance should be less prevalent than Passover observance, but observance of both should conform to the inter marriage typology.

Respondents were asked if they had attended a seder during the previous year, and who (if anyone) in the household went to church on Easter Sunday. If any Jewish member of the household (respondent and/or child) had attended church on Easter, this was considered a "family observance" on the par of an entire family's attendance at a seder.

Judaic and dual-religion couples were almost equally as likely to have attended a seder the previous Passover, but both were much less likely to have attended one than were endogamous families (Table 24). The parity in seder attendance between Judaic and dual-religion families is not predicted by the typology,³⁷ and suggests that both Judaic and dual-religion couples experience some tension around these holidays: for Passover, it is interaction with a Jewish family, and for Easter, it is going into a church. As expected, dual-religion families were more likely than Judaic families to have gone to church on Easter: more than a third (36 percent) of the former versus none of the latter. Christian families were more than twice as likely to have gone to church as

Table 24. Seder Attendance/Easter Church Attendance, by Type of Inter married Family (with Children)

Type of family	Attended a seder (%)	Attended church on Easter (%)	N =
Christian	21	47	91
Secular	8	7	19
Dual-religion	58	36	65
Judaic	63	0	31
Endogamous	93	0	126

p < .001.

Table 25. Seder versus Easter Church Attendance, by Type of Intermarried Family

Pattern of observance, Easter versus Seder	Type of intermarried family			
	Christian (N = 91)	Secular (N = 19)	Dual-religion (N = 65)	Judaic (N = 31)
Both	15	0	21	0
Seder only	5	8	37	63
Easter Sunday only	32	7	15	0
Neither	47	85	27	37
Total percentage	100	100	100	100

$p < .001$

attend a seder (47 percent versus 21 percent). Of interest here is the large minority that attended a seder. Secular families did neither.

Table 25 compares the exclusive versus joint observance of Easter and Passover. Judaic couples either attended a seder (63 percent) or did nothing (37 percent). By contrast, three out of four of the Christian families who attended a seder also went to church.³⁸ Almost half, however, did neither. The overall pattern does conform to the typology, with the exception of Judaic families having a lower than expected seder attendance.

As with Christmas, respondents who celebrated Easter in any way were asked "How do you think about Easter in your family? Is it mostly . . . a religious holiday, an American holiday, a time to be together with family?" (Table 26). The choices were not mutually exclusive. Using this vague definition of Easter celebration, half the Judaic couples indicated that they did celebrate Easter, though not as a religious holiday, which is consistent with the fact that none of them went to church on Easter Sunday. Among dual-religion families, 37 percent celebrate Easter as a religious holiday (consistent with the 36 percent who went to church), and another 29 percent celebrated Easter as a non-religious holiday. Christian families are the most likely to celebrate Easter as a religious holiday, but only a bare majority (53 percent) did so.

The Gentile spouses were more likely than their Jewish partners to consider Easter a religious holiday (Table 27). Agreement is highest among Judaic couples (85 percent), followed by the few secular couples reinterviewed. Half the Gentile spouses in dual-religion families disagreed with their partner's characterization of Easter as a nonreligious holiday. The extent of this disagreement was almost as high in Christian

Table 26. How Easter is Celebrated, by Type of Intermarried Family

How Easter is celebrated	Type of intermarried family (%)			
	Christian (N = 91)	Secular (N = 19)	Dual-religion (N = 65)	Judaic (N = 31)
Not celebrated	35	84	34	48
Celebrated as a family and/or national holiday	12	6	29	52
Celebrated as religious	53	10	37	0
Total percentage	100	100	100	100

$p < .001$

Table 27. Comparison of How Jewish and Gentile Spouses Described How Easter Is Celebrated, by Type of Inter married Family

Pattern of consistency	Type of inter married family			
	Christian (N = 44)	Secular (N =9)	Dual-religion (N = 38)	Judaic (N = 26)
Both spouses answered the same	52	76	47	85
Jew says as non-religious, Gentile says as religious	40	24	48	15
Jew says as religious, Gentile says as non-religious	8	0	5	0
Total percentage	100	100	100	100

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

p < .05

families as in dual-religion families. Thus, among dual-religion families, and even among Christian families, there is some tension evident regarding the celebration of Easter.

The High Holidays. The high holidays (Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur) have no Christian counterpart, but they still provide some insight into the religious life of the inter married family. High holiday observance was measured in three ways: synagogue attendance, staying home from work on Yom Kippur if not attending synagogue, and going to a family dinner at any time during the high holidays (Table 28).

High holiday synagogue attendance follows the predicted pattern: it is extremely low for Christian and secular families and lower for dual-religion families than for Judaic families. However, only half as many Judaic families as endogamous families attended high holiday services.

High holiday observance usually entails some sort of affiliation with a synagogue (either directly or through the parents, who can purchase tickets for family members). Staying home from work on Yom Kippur is a passive way to observe the holiday.

Table 28 Three Kinds of High Holiday Observance, by Type of Inter married Family (with Children)

Type	High holiday synagogue ^a (%)	Stayed home Yom Kippur (%)	High holiday dinner ^b (%)	N =
Christian	4	14	7	91
Secular	5	18	5	19
Dual-religion	21	62	54	65
Judaic	39	44	52	31
Endogamous ^c	85		90	125

p < .001

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage.

^aThe question's wording from 1993 was: "Did you happen to go to synagogue or temple at any time during the High Holidays this past year?"

^bThe question's wording was: "Did you have a special dinner for the Jewish High Holidays in the past 12 months?"

^cTo hold down survey costs, not all questions in the 1993 follow-up survey were asked of in married respondents. The figure for high holiday attendance is derived from the 1990 NJPS, which used a different question wording.

Christian, secular and dual-religion parents are more likely to observe the high holidays passively by staying home from work on Yom Kippur than to take an active part by going to synagogue. Judaic parents were only slightly more likely to have stayed home on Yom Kippur than to have gone to synagogue during the high holidays. Why this pattern breaks down with the Judaic couple is not clear. Perhaps it is because Judaic parents who want to observe the holidays do so by going to synagogue.

A family dinner typically takes place either on the evening of the holiday or at the end of the following day.³⁹ If both days of Rosh Hashanah are observed, there are six opportunities for such a family dinner. Just over half of the dual-religion and Judaic respondents reported going to such a family dinner. Only seven percent and five percent of respondents in secular and Christian intermarriages reported doing so.

Talking with Children about Being Jewish. In addition to formal practices in the home (such as lighting Hanukah candles or attending church on Easter), children in intermarried families can have other experiences that convey to them the sense that they are Jewish. Intermarried respondents with children under the age of ten in the household were asked about three activities with children: reading or telling them stories that had Jewish content; talking to them about what Judaism teaches; and talking with them about the history of their family. The results are presented in Table 29. This is uncharted territory in the research on Jewish intermarriage, so the results must be viewed with caution.

Respondents in Judaic intermarriages were the most likely to report engaging in these activities, but more than half of the respondents in Christian and dual-religion families also answered in the affirmative. This may reflect a desire to give a "socially desirable" response in the context of a Jewish interview, but one pattern stands out in particular: Respondents in dual-religion families are no more likely than Christian families to talk to children about the teachings of Judaism. They are much more likely to tell them stories that have Jewish content. This may once again reflect the religious tensions inherent in the dual-religion family, where discussion of Jewish teachings could be perceived as "proselytizing" on the part of the Jewish parent.

Summary. This section began with a declaration that intermarried families should not be seen as an undifferentiated whole, and indeed, the various practices were found to conform to a continuum of religious identity for both Jewish and Gentile parents. At the same time, there is a common dimension that sets these families apart from en-

Table 29. Talking with Children under Age 10 about Being Jewish, by Type of Intermarried Family (with Children)

Type of family	Read or tell child Jewish stories* (%)	Talk to child about what Judaism teaches** (%)	Talk with child about family history (%)	N =
Christian	59	60	76	30
Secular	79	8	84	10
Dual-religion	74	57	76	52
Judaic	90	82	90	30

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

*p < .1 **p < .001

dogamous families: children in mixed families grow up in households that include elements of both religious traditions. Many of the most Jewish of the intermarried families included some Christian observances. By the same token, some of the most Christian intermarried families also included Jewish observances. The former finding is not surprising, but the latter is. Can it be believed? Why would Jewish Christians place any value on Judaism?

For one thing, Judaism is central to Christianity, and this, it appears, confers special status. Moreover, some degree of self-selection might overstate the Jewishness of the "Christian" family; the Jewish Christian respondents interviewed were the ones who agreed to be interviewed. Those with weaker Jewish affinities might have opted not to be included in the 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage. Nonetheless, even if its extent is overstated, the Jewishness of some of the Christian intermarried families suggests that being Jewish is an attractive identification in American society.

The Family Context

The family is a potential source of Jewish influence, particularly among intermarried families of Jewish parentage—where there are in theory equal numbers of Jewish and non-Jewish relatives. It is also a source of non-Jewish contacts, since most intermarried families will have first cousins who are not Jewish. Unless an uncle or aunt is intermarried, children of endogamous families have no first-degree non-Jewish relatives. Children in intermarried families of Jewish parentage will have at least two grandparents who are not Jewish, and children in intermarried families of mixed parentage will have at least three non-Jewish grandparents, along with uncles and aunts who are not Jewish.

Intermarried respondents report the same amount of contact with their parents as do endogamous respondents (Table 30). Intermarried respondents of Jewish parentage, however, reported much less contact with their non-Jewish in-laws (Table 31). To some degree this is a reporting bias. Endogamous respondents, too, reported more contact with their own parents than with their spouse's parents. Perhaps they are less aware of spousal contact with the in-laws, or possibly they interpreted the question as applying only to them individually and not to the family as a whole. The difference, however, is in the degree of disparity. The disparity in contact with the respondent's parents and spouse's parents is much larger in intermarried families of both types. It is not clear why there should be greater contact with the Jewish side of the family, but the pattern is evident.

Grandparents are passive objects of identification to the extent that their grandchildren identify with them emotionally. Children in intermarried families of Jewish parentage have more opportunities to spend time with a Jewish grandparent than do children in intermarried families of mixed parentage simply because they have an additional Jewish grandparent. Grandparents can also make active efforts to influence the ethnic and/or religious identification of the grandchildren. While these efforts could not be observed directly, respondents were asked: "Have your parents ever tried to influence you to raise your children as Jews?" and "Have your husband's/wife's parents tried to influence you to raise the children as Christians or in some other religion?"

Table 30. Contact with Respondent's Parents (Families with Children)

"How often do you see your parents in person or talk to them on the phone?"	In-married (%) (N = 131)	Intermarried of Jewish parentage (%) (N = 124)	Intermarried of mixed parentage (%) (N = 83)
Once a week or more	81	81	76
Less often than once a week, but at least once a month	14	15	18
Less often than once a month	5	4	6

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

$p < .01$

Intermarried families of Jewish parentage experience more efforts to have the children raised as Jews, whereas intermarried families of mixed parentage experience more efforts to have the children raised as Christians (Table 32, Table 33). Intermarried respondents of Jewish parentage reported that the Jewish grandparents were half again as likely as the Gentile grandparents to exert such an influence. Conversely, respondents of mixed parentage reported that the Gentile grandparents were twice as likely as the single Jewish grandparent to exert such an influence. Either the Jewish grandparents are less inclined to exert such an influence (since they themselves are intermarried), or else they feel outnumbered by the Gentile grandparents in the family (their own spouse plus the in-laws).

Intermarriage runs in families (Table 34). Only one out of four in-married respondents reported an intermarried sibling, compared with virtually all of the intermarried families of mixed parentage (97 percent). Further, most of the intermarried parents of mixed parentage had two or more intermarried siblings (81 percent). Intermarried families of Jewish parentage fell in the middle of these two patterns. Almost half of them (47 percent) came from families where all the (married) siblings had married non-Jews, but just over a third (35 percent) came from families in which they were the only intermarried sibling.

Thus, children in endogamous families have more Jewish grandparents, uncles,

Table 31. Spouse's Contact with Family as Reported by Respondent (Families with Children)

"How often does your husband/wife see his/her parents in person or talk to them on the phone?"	In-married (%) (N = 118)	Intermarried of Jewish parentage (%) (N = 115)	Intermarried of mixed parentage (%) (N = 77)
Once a week or more	76	51	54
Less often than once a week, but at least once a month	20	35	33
Less often than once a month	3	14	13
Don't know	1	1	0
	100	101	100

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

$p < .01$

Table 32. Efforts of Jewish Grandparents to Influence the Religious Upbringing of the Grandchildren as Jews

"Have your parents ever tried to influence you to raise your children as Jews?"	Intermarried of Jewish parentage (%) (N = 142)	Intermarried of mixed parentage (%) (N = 33)
Yes	32	11
No	68	90
Total Percentage	100	100

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

p < .01

Table 33. Efforts of Gentile Grandparents to Influence the Religious Upbringing of the Grandchildren as Christians

"Have your husband's/wife's parents ever tried to influence you to raise your children as Christians or in some other religion?"	Intermarried of Jewish parentage (%) (N = 142)	Intermarried of mixed parentage (%) (N = 33)
Yes, as Christians	19	19
No	81	81
Total percentage	100	100

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

p < .01

Table 34. Inter marriages of Married Siblings for Respondents with Children

Inter marriage pattern for married siblings	In-married (%) (N = 101)	Intermarried of Jewish parentage (%) (N = 92)	Intermarried of mixed parentage (%) (N = 69)
All siblings in-married	72	35	3
Some siblings intermarried	11	18	16
All siblings intermarried	18	47	81
Total percentage	100	100	100

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

p < .001

aunts and cousins than do children in intermarried families of Jewish parentage; these children in turn have more Jewish relatives than do children from intermarried families of mixed parentage.

The Social Context: Jewish Friends and Neighbors

Friends. In-married families have the most Jewish social network: more than three quarters of them (77 percent) mentioned Jews as being among their closest friends or people seen most often socially (Table 35), and 51 percent mentioned Jewish friends

Table 35. Social Network, by Type of Marriage (Families with Children)

"Thinking about the people you consider your closest friends or see most often socially, would you say they are mostly . . ."	In-married (%) (N = 145)	Intermarried of Jewish parentage (%) (N = 144)	Intermarried of mixed parentage (%) (N = 91)	Chi-square
Respondent mentions Jewish friends	77	24	17	p < .001
Respondent mentions interfaith couples	26	43	38	p < .01
Respondent mentions non-Jewish friends	38	67	70	p < .001

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

exclusively (Table 36). Thus, in-married families with children have social networks that are Jewishly dense without being Jewishly exclusive.

Both kinds of intermarried families include Jewish friends as part of their social network (Table 35), but their social networks include many more non-Jewish friends (67 percent for intermarried of Jewish parentage and 70 percent for intermarrieds of mixed parentage). Moreover, these social networks tend to be made up exclusively of non-Jewish friends (41 percent of intermarried families of Jewish parentage and 50 percent of intermarried families of mixed parentage) (Table 36).

Other intermarried couples figure prominently in the social networks of intermarried families (Table 35). This is notable because non-Jews are vastly more plentiful in the society than are other Jewish intermarried families. Between one fifth and one quarter of intermarried families mentioned other intermarried couples as close friends or social acquaintances exclusively (Table 36). Thus, just as endogamous couples seek out other endogamous couples as friends, intermarried couples seek out other intermarried couples, albeit to a lesser extent.

These findings are consistent with a comparable question in the 1990 NJPS, which determined that in-married families with children were far more likely than inter-

Table 36. Composition of Friendship Pattern, by Type of Marriage (Families with Children)

Composition of friendship pattern	In-married (%) (N = 144)	Intermarried of Jewish parentage (%) (N = 139)	Intermarried of mixed parentage (%) (N = 91)
Respondent mentions only non-Jewish friends	12	41	50
Respondent mentions only Jewish friends	51	5	4
Respondent mentions only intermarried friends	5	21	24
Respondent mentions Jewish friends and intermarried friends	6	5	2
Respondent mentions Jewish friends and non-Jewish friends	8	5	7
Respondent mentions intermarried and non-Jewish friends	5	13	9
Respondent mentions all three	14	10	5
Total percentage	100	100	100

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

p < .001

Table 37. Friendship Patterns Using the 1990 NJPS Wording, by Type of Inter marriage

"Among the people you consider your closest friends, would you say that . . ."	In-married (%)	Intermarried of Jewish parentage (%)	Intermarried of mixed parentage (%)
None are Jewish	2	12	23
Few are Jewish	5	25	30
Some are Jewish	32	54	43
Most are Jewish	39	7	4
All are Jewish	23	1	0
Total percentage	100	100	100

Source: 1990 NJPS

 $p < .001$

married families with children to have largely or exclusively Jewish social networks (Table 37).

Thus, in-married families have a densely Jewish social network, whereas the social network of intermarried families is more Jewishly thin. Intermarried families of Jewish parentage have more Jewish friends and fewer non-Jewish and interfaith friends than do intermarried families of mixed parentage.

Neighbors. The neighborhood is a second source of Jewish social exposure. Not all Jews who want Jewish neighborhoods are able to have them, either because they live in cities where they cannot find them or because they cannot afford to live in such neighborhoods. However, those who do have Jewish neighbors presumably wanted them.

Almost all endogamous families reported living in a neighborhood where there are at least some Jews (Table 38). Conversely, intermarried families only rarely reported living in predominantly Jewish neighborhoods. They did manage to find some Jews, though: about half of them reported living in neighborhoods with at least a few Jews. What is not clear, however, is to what extent they have Jewish neighbors as a matter of preference and to what extent this is a matter of happenstance resulting from the geographic dispersal of Jews in the community around them. Table 39 suggests that, for intermarried families of Jewish parentage, it is a mixture of both factors. For those in neighborhoods with few or no Jews, half would like more Jews and half either prefer the current configuration or do not care. Intermarried families of mixed parent-

Table 38. Jews in Neighborhood, by Type of Inter marriage

"What proportion of the people who live in your neighborhood would you say are Jewish?"	In-married (%) (N = 144)	Intermarried of Jewish parentage (%) (N = 144)	Intermarried of mixed parentage (%) (N = 91)
None	15	44	56
Some/a few	50	47	44
Half/Most/All	35	9	1
Total percentage	100	100	100

Table 39. Jews in Neighborhood, by Preference for Jewish Neighbors
(Intermarried Families with Children)

"Would you like there to be more Jewish people in your neighborhood, less, or is it about right the way it is now?"	What proportion of the people who live in your neighborhood would you say are Jewish?"				
	None or almost none (%) (N = 60; N = 46 ^a)	A few (%) (N = 36; N = 17)	Some (%) (N = 24; N = 20)	Half (%) (N = 10; N = 0)	All or almost all (%) (N = 2; N = 0)
Intermarried families of Jewish parentage **					
More	44	52	17	0	0
About right	29	24	72	100	100
It does not matter	27	24	11	0	0
Total percentage	100	100	100	100	100
Intermarried families of mixed parentage*					
More	34	7	35	0	0
About right	23	63	25	0	0
It does not matter	48	26	40	0	0
Total percentage	100	100	100	100	100

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

* $p < .10$ ** $p < .001$

^aThe first N value refers to the total in intermarried families of Jewish parentage; the second refers to the total in intermarried families of mixed parentage.

age, in contrast, live with few or no Jews either because they do not care or because this is their preference.

The Institutional Context

Informal ties express a desire for Jewish connection, and may even reinforce Jewish behaviors in the intermarried family. There is much to be gained from Jewish social ties, and little or no social "cost" for maintaining them. Synagogue membership, in contrast, requires a financial commitment. Synagogue membership is common (68 percent) among endogamous families, unusual (19 percent) among intermarried families of Jewish parentage, and extremely rare (3 percent) among intermarried families of mixed parentage. Church membership is more common than synagogue membership among intermarried families, and it is most common among intermarried families of mixed parentage (Table 40).

Conclusion

Thus, with the exception of a small core group of intermarried families, the only connection with the Jewish community is through informal ties such as friends, neighbors and family. Intermarried families have far fewer Jewish social or family ties than do endogamous families: the strongest Jewish ties of intermarried families are weaker

Table 40. Synagogue and Church Membership, by Type of Marriage
(Families with Children Only)

	In-married (%) (N = 144; N = n/a ^a)	Intermarried of Jewish parentage (%) (N = 144; N = 89)	Intermarried of mixed parentage (%) (N = 91; N = 70)
Are you or any member of your household currently a member of a synagogue or temple?"			
Yes	68	19	3
No	32	82	97
Total percentage	100	101	100
"Are you or any member of your household a member of a church or other non-Jewish religious group?"			
Yes	n/a	33	57
No	n/a	67	43
Total percentage	n/a	100	100

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

p < .001

than the weakest ones of endogamous families. Intermarried families of mixed parentage have many fewer social ties than do intermarried families of Jewish parentage, which suggests a severe attrition of Jewish social and familial connections over successive generations of intermarriage.

Looking to the Next Generation

Jewish communal concern about intermarriage focuses on what will happen to the children of those marriages. An indication of what is to come can be found in data concerning how the children of intermarriages are being raised and educated. The 1990 NJPS did not include a specific question on how children were being raised. Rather, the respondent provided the same three pieces of information about them as provided for all household members: the religion in which the individual was born, the religion in which the individual was raised, and the current religious identification. The 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage asked a question specifically worded for children in the household: "Starting with the oldest, please tell me how this child is being raised: as a Jew only, as a Christian only, as both a Jew and Christian, in some other religion only, or in no religion."

Despite the difference in question wording, the results from the 1990 NJPS and the 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage are strikingly similar (Table 41). According to the NJPS of 1990, 20 percent of the children under 18 in intermarriages are currently Jewish.⁴⁰ The figure from the 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage is 18 percent. The figures for children being raised as Christians are 32 percent and 34 percent respectively.

Table 41. How Children are Raised in Intermarriages, by Source of Data (Step-children Excluded)^a

1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage: "Starting with the oldest, please tell me how this child is being raised": (N = 404)		1990 NJPS: "What is _____ 's current religion?" (N = n/a)	
	(%)		(%)
As a Jew only	18	Jewish	20
As a Christian only	34	Christian	32
As both a Jew and Christian ^b	25		
In some other religion only/in no religion	24	Other/none	48
Total percentage	100		100

^aStep-children are excluded from this analysis because they represent no loss to the Jewish community.

^bIncluded here are the two percent of children being raised jointly as Jews and in some religion other than Christianity.

The 1990 NJPS did not include a category for two religions, and children being raised as both apparently fell into the "other" category in 1990. In the 1993 survey, "other" refers specifically to religions other than Judaism or Christianity. There were very few such children, however, and they were combined with children being raised in no religion.

Only 18 percent of the children of intermarriages were being raised exclusively as Jews in 1993 (Table 41). Twice as many children were being raised exclusively as Christians, and more children were being raised jointly as Jews and Christians rather than exclusively as Jews.

Compared with intermarried families of mixed parentage (Table 42), intermarried families of Jewish parentage are fourteen times more likely to raise their children exclusively as Jews (28 percent versus 2 percent) and twice as likely to raise their children jointly as Jews and Christians (31 percent versus 16 percent). Apparently this represents a kind of secondary commitment to raising children as Jews: at least they are "half Jewish." Intermarried families of mixed parentage are strongly inclined toward Christianity, but not entirely so: 55 percent of their children were being raised exclusively as Christians, followed by 27 percent who were being raised in no religion at all.

Children of intermarriage are much less likely than children of endogamous marriages to receive any formal Jewish education, and children of intermarried families

Table 42. How Children are Raised in Intermarriages, by Type of Intermarriage (Step-children Excluded)

"Starting with the oldest, please tell me how this child is being raised":	Intermarried of Jewish parentage (%)	Intermarried of mixed parentage (%)
	(N = 248)	(N = 138)
As a Jew only	28	2
As both a Jew and Christian	31	16
As a Christian only	19	55
In some other religion only/in no religion	21	27
	99	100

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

$p < .001$

Table 43. Religious Education of Children, Ages 6–12, by Type of Marriage (Step-children Excluded)

"Did [name of child] receive any formal Jewish education during the past year?" "In what type of school was/is [name of child] enrolled, or what was the major type of education?"	In-married (%) (N = 106)	Intermarried of Jewish parentage (%) (N = 89)	Intermarried of mixed parentage (%) (N = 52)
Jewish school only	84	31	3
Christian school only	0	11	19
Not receiving any education	16	58	78
Jewish and Christian school	0	0	0
Total percentage	100	100	100

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

p < .001

of mixed parentage receive almost none at all. Most children in the peak years for Jewish education (ages 6–12) in endogamous families received some formal Jewish education (84 percent). By contrast, only 31 percent of children aged 6–12 from intermarriages of Jewish parentage received some sort of formal Jewish education in 1993 (Table 43).

Children from intermarried families of mixed parentage generally do not receive any religious education (78 percent), but when they do it is a Christian religious education. Only three percent received any formal Jewish education, whereas 19 percent received some formal Christian education.

Factors Associated with Raising Jewish Children in Intermarriages

Why do some intermarried parents raise their children exclusively as Jews, while most do not? One important predictor has already been identified: only intermarried families of Jewish parentage (albeit only a minority of them) raise their children exclusively as Jews. Because intermarried families of mixed parentage almost never raise their children exclusively as Jews, we exclude them from the remaining analysis.

A previously published analysis of the 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage identified several factors that predicted mixed marriage.⁴¹ These are generation, family influences, friendship network, formal and informal Jewish education, secular educational attainment and Jewish parentage. Do these factors also predict which *intermarried* families will raise Jewish children?

The first factor has already been identified: the family of origin of the Jew. As noted, Jews from intermarried families of origin do not raise their children as Jews, and thus the remaining analysis involves only intermarried Jewish parents from endogamous families of origin.

Generation. Almost all intermarried Jews of Jewish parentage, if they are immigrants or had immigrant parents, raise their children as Jews (Table 44). First- and second-generation Jews only rarely intermarry to begin with,⁴² and when they do marry non-Jews, they predominantly raise their children as Jews. The impact of for-

Table 44. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Generation of Jewish Parent (Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage; Step-children Excluded)

Generation	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
First and second	74	60
Third	48	206
Fourth	33	113

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

$p < .001$

eign birth or immigrant parents in the family origin diminishes between the third and fourth generations among Jews of Jewish parentage.

Because so few first- and second-generation Jews were found to be intermarried at all, and because those who did intermarry raise their children as Jews, the remaining analysis is confined to third- and fourth-generation Jews of Jewish parentage.

Gender. Intermarried Jewish women are twice as likely as intermarried Jewish men to raise Jewish children (Table 45). One caution is in order, however. Converts to Judaism are predominantly female. The Jewish males most inclined to raise their children as Jews would be the ones married to converts. Because conversionary marriages are classified as endogamous marriages, the out-married Jewish men most likely to raise Jewish children fall outside this analysis.

Gender is predictive of how the children are raised because intermarried Jewish mothers are more likely than intermarried Jewish fathers to have primary responsibility for the religious upbringing of the children (Table 46). The parent responsible for religious upbringing raises the child in his/her religion (Table 47); hence, the children are most likely to be raised as Jews if the Jewish parent is responsible. Intermarried Jewish women are more likely than intermarried Jewish men to raise Jewish children because (1) women are more likely to be responsible for the religious upbringing of the child; and—possibly—because (2) out-married Jewish men who would be inclined to raise Jewish children would have encouraged their wives to convert and thus would have been classified as belonging to endogamous marriages.

Table 45. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Gender of Jewish Parent (Third- and Fourth-Generation Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage)

Gender of Jewish parent	Percent of children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
Male	17	47
Female	35	85

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

$p < .05$

Table 46. Responsibility for Religious Upbringing, by Gender of Jewish Parent (Third- and Fourth-Generation Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage)

"Who has primary responsibility for the religious upbringing of children?"	Father is the Jewish parent (%) (N = 27)	Mother is the Jewish parent (%) (N = 36)
Jewish parent	18	55
Non-Jewish parent	39	3
Both parents	14	19
Neither parent	29	23
Total percentage	100	100

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

$p < .001$

Religious Identification of Parents. The religious identification of the Jewish parent is strongly associated with raising Jewish children. Only those intermarried Jews who identified as Jewish by religion raised Jewish children in intermarriages; those who identified as secular or with some other religion did not raise Jewish children (Table 48).

The religion of non-Jewish fathers (but not non-Jewish mothers) in intermarriages also has an impact on how the children are raised. Catholic fathers are far more likely than Protestant fathers to raise Jewish children (Table 49). This was also true of the parents' generation, albeit not to such a great extent.

Education. Educational attainment has a profound influence on how children will be raised in intermarriages. A number of studies have shown that persons with higher educational attainment are less likely to be intermarried.⁴³ When they do marry non-Jews, Jews with higher educational attainment are also the most likely to raise Jewish children (Table 50). Children of respondents with graduate degrees were four times as likely to be raised as Jews as were children of respondents with only high school diplomas.

Formal and Informal Jewish Education and Denomination in Which the Respondent Was Raised. Formal Jewish education was previously found to be only

Table 47. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Responsibility for Religious Upbringing (Third- and Fourth-Generation Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage)

"Who has primary responsibility for the religious upbringing of children?"	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
Jewish parent	63	43
Non-Jewish parent	0	21
Shared/neither	19	47

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

$p < .001$

Table 48. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Religious Identification of Jewish Parent (Third- and Fourth-Generation Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage)

Religious identification of the Jewish parent	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
Jew by religion	41	93
Ethnic/secular	0	21
Christian/other religion	0	18

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

$p < .01$

Table 49. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Religious Identification of Parents (Third- and Fourth-Generation Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage)

Religious identification of the Gentile father	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
None	38	30
Catholic	52	29
Protestant	10	21

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

$p < .05$

Table 50. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Educational Attainment of Jewish Parent (Third- and Fourth-Generation Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage)

Educational attainment of Jewish parent	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
High school or some college	12	40
Graduated from college	27	52
Graduate degree	48	38

Source: 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage

$p < .001$

weakly associated with endogamy,⁴⁴ and it has minimal impact on how the children will be raised in intermarriages. Continuing a formal Jewish education beyond the age of bar mitzvah, which was associated with reduced rates of intermarriage, had no impact on how the children were raised in intermarriages (Table 51).

Informal Jewish education, however, which has been shown to be associated with endogamy was also associated with raising Jewish children in intermarriages (Table 52). Third- and fourth-generation intermarried Jews of Jewish parentage who had belonged to a youth group for at least two years were 1.6 times as likely to raise Jewish children as those who had not, and those who had gone to Jewish camps for at least

Table 51. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Formal Jewish Education of Jewish Parent (Third- and Fourth-Generation Inter married Families of Jewish Parentage)

Jewish education of Jewish parent	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
No Jewish education	32	28
Ended Jewish education before age 13	28	66
Continued Jewish education after age 13	29	36

Source: 1993 Survey on Mixed Marriage

two years were twice as likely to raise Jewish children as those who had not. A trip to Israel appears to have had the greatest impact on how children were raised, but this finding remains only suggestive since so few of the respondents had been to Israel as a teenager. In this regard, informal Jewish education is not merely a surrogate measure of the Jewish intensity of the family of origin, but has as well an independent effect.⁴⁵

The teenage peer socialization that often accompanies informal educational experiences is also associated with raising Jewish children in inter marriages. Respondents who reported that all or most of their high school friends were Jewish were twice as likely to raise Jewish children as those who reported that half or fewer of their high

Table 52. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Informal Jewish Education of Jewish Parent (Third and Fourth-Generation Inter married Families of Jewish Parentage)

	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
"When you were growing up did you ever belong to a Jewish youth group?"*		
No/one year of youth group experience	23	78
Two or more years of youth group experience	37	83
"When you were growing up did you ever go to a sleepaway camp with Jewish programming?"***		
No/one year or less of Jewish camp	24	107
Two or more years of Jewish camp	50	25
"When you were growing up did you ever go to Israel on a group program when you were a teenager?"**		
No	28	126
Yes	81	4

*p < .10

**p < .05

***p < .01

Table 53. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by High School Friendships of Jewish Parent (Third- and Fourth-Generation Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage)

“When you were in high school, what proportion of your friends would you say were Jewish: all or almost all, most, half, some, a few, none or almost none?”	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
Half or less	23	92
All or more	42	40

$p < .05$

school friends were Jewish (Table 53). This variable was also strongly linked with the probability of intermarriage. I speculate that these peer influences strengthened norms of endogamy among teenagers, and later influenced how those respondents who married non-Jews would raise their children.

The denomination in which the Jewish partner was raised appears to be weakly associated with how children are raised in intermarriages. However, the association was not even close to being statistically significant (Table 54).

Jewish Practice in the Family of Origin. Visible Jewish behaviors in the family of origin also influence how children are raised in intermarriages (Table 55). Respondents who came from a kosher home and/or one in which Hanukah was celebrated were much more likely to raise Jewish children in intermarriages than were respondents who did not have these influences. Parental activity in the Jewish community had an influence. Respondents whose parents volunteered for or held leadership positions in Jewish organizations were also more likely to raise Jewish children when they intermarried.

Family Influences. The Jewish kin of intermarried families of Jewish parentage influence how the children are raised. Efforts on the part of the Jewish grandparents to influence how the children are raised had no impact (Table 56). By contrast, the efforts of the non-Jewish grandparents to have the children raised as Christians reduced the proportion raised as Jews by almost half (Table 57).

Table 54. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Denomination in which Jewish Parent was Raised (Third- and Fourth-Generation Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage)

Denomination in which Jewish parent was raised	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
Orthodox	35	11
Conservative	32	55
Reform	28	52
Not raised in denomination	18	11

Table 55. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews by Jewish Behaviors in Family of Origin (Third- and Fourth-Generation Inter married Families of Jewish Parentage)

	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
Jewish behavior in family of origin*		
Parents used kosher meat		
Sometimes or never	28	197
Usually or always	42	33
Parents lit Hanukah candles**		
Usually/sometimes/never	16	63
Always	35	167
Parents volunteered for Jewish organization**		
No	25	132
Yes	36	98
Parents on board of synagogue**		
No	24	168
Yes	45	61

*p < .10

**p < .01

The intermarriages of siblings of intermarried Jews are moderately associated with how the children will be raised. When all their siblings are also intermarried, intermarried Jews are less likely to raise Jewish children than when some or all of the siblings are endogamously married (Table 58). The endogamous siblings might put active pressure on the Jewish sibling to raise the children as Jews, or they could simply be a source of support for an intermarried Jew desirous of raising Jewish children.

Friends. Having Jewish friends doubles the likelihood that intermarried Jews of Jewish parentage will raise their children as Jews (Table 59). Similarly, those who are friends with other intermarried couples are twice as likely to raise Jewish children as those who have no intermarried friends. Apparently these intermarried friends either influence them to raise their children as Jews or else support a predisposition to do so. Having non-Jewish friends does not dissuade intermarried couples from raising Jewish children (Table 59), but having exclusively non-Jewish friends does have this

Table 56. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Efforts of Jewish Grandparents to Influence Religious Upbringing (Third- and Fourth-Generation Inter married Families of Jewish Parentage)

"Have your parents ever tried to influence you to raise your children as Jews?"	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
No	31	42
Yes	28	87

Chi-square: not significant

Table 57. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Efforts of Non-Jewish Grandparents to Influence Religious Upbringing (Third- and Fourth-Generation Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage)

“Have your husband’s/wife’s parents ever tried to influence you to raise the children as Christians or in some other religion?”	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
No	33	27
Yes [as Christians]	17	102

One Tail T-test, $p < .05$

Table 58. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Sibling Marriages of Jewish Parent (Third- and Fourth-Generation Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage)

“How many of your <i>full</i> [i.e., not step-] brothers and sisters are married?” “How many of your <i>full</i> [i.e., not step-] brothers and sisters are married to Jews?”	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
All siblings in-married	45	27
Some siblings intermarried	44	17
All siblings intermarried	33	40

$p < .001$

Table 59. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Friendship Patterns of Jewish Parent (Third- and Fourth-Generation Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage)

“Thinking about the people you consider your closest friends or see most often socially, would you say they are mostly single Jewish persons, single non-Jewish persons, Jewish couples, non-Jewish couples, interfaith couples?” [Up to four mentions available]	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
Respondent mentions Jewish friends (single Jews or Jewish couples)**		
No	22	98
Yes	48	34
Respondent mentions interfaith couples**		
No	19	69
Yes	40	63
Respondent mentions non-Jewish friends (single non-Jews or non-Jewish couples)*		
No	32	42
Yes	28	89

*Chi-Square: not significant

** $p < .01$

Table 60. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Friendship Patterns of Jewish Parent (Third- and Fourth-Generation Inter married Families of Jewish Parentage)

"Thinking about the people you consider your closest friends or see most often socially, would you say they are mostly single Jewish persons, single non-Jewish persons, Jewish couples, non-Jewish couples, interfaith couples?" [Up to four mentions available]	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
Respondent mentions <i>only</i> non-Jewish friends	20	50
Respondent mentions other interfaith couples (Exclusively or with non-Jewish friends) but <i>does not mention</i> Jewish friends	27	43
Respondent mentions Jewish friends (Either exclusively or along with non-Jews or other interfaith couples)	48	34

p < .05

effect (Table 60). Having Jewish friends, even if they are intermarried, increases the likelihood of raising Jewish children. Those whose social network includes single Jews and/or Jewish couples (either exclusively or in combination with non-Jews and/or other intermarried couples) are the most likely to raise Jewish children (48 percent). In the middle are respondents who have intermarried friends, but no single or endogamous Jewish friends: twenty-seven percent of them were raising Jewish children as compared with only 20 percent of those who have non-Jewish friends exclusively (Table 60). Thus, the more Jewish friends, the greater likelihood of raising Jewish children, even if these Jewish friends are themselves intermarried.

Do these Jewish friends influence intermarried Jews of Jewish parentage to raise their children as Jews, or do respondents who were so inclined seek out Jewish friends? Probably both factors are at work, and they are reciprocal influences. That is, intermarried respondents who want to raise Jewish children find friends who will reinforce that inclination. Even if this inclination played no role in selecting the friends, it will still have an impact on raising Jewish children.

The mere presence of other Jews in the neighborhood does not appear to affect how the children are raised (Table 61). This is in part because so few of the intermarried families report living with other Jews. The desire to have more Jews in the

Table 61. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Proportion of Other Jews in the Neighborhood (Third- and Fourth-Generation Inter married Families of Jewish Parentage)

"What proportion of the people who live in your neighborhood would you say are Jewish?"	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
None or almost none	24	60
A few	26	36
Some	29	24
Half all or almost all	60	12

Chi-square: not significant

Table 62. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Desire for More Jews in the Neighborhood (Third- and Fourth-Generation Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage)

“Would you like there to be more Jewish people in your neighborhood, less or is it about right the way it is now?”	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
More	48	49
About right the way it is now	24	54
It doesn't matter	5	28

$p < .001$

neighborhood, by contrast, is strongly associated with raising Jewish children (Table 62). Respondents who want more Jews in the neighborhood are twice as likely to be raising Jewish children as those who say that they are satisfied. These in turn are five times as likely to be raising Jewish children as respondents who say that it does not matter to them how many Jews are in the neighborhood.

When the desire for more Jews in the neighborhood is considered along with the presence of other Jews in the neighborhood (Table 63), two patterns emerge. Among respondents who do not care about other Jews or are satisfied with only a few being there, the presence of even a few other Jews in the neighborhood causes the percentage of children raised as Jews to increase almost six-fold (from 3 percent to 17 percent). Having even more of an impact, however, is the desire for more Jews on the part of intermarried respondents who live in areas of low density: between 43 percent and 52 percent of these respondents are raising their children as Jews.

Sorting out the Relative Importance of the Predictor Variables

Based on the analysis so far, intermarried families raising Jewish children have the following profile:

- The Jewish parent is female
- The non-Jewish husband is either secular or Catholic
- The Jewish parent is a college graduate

Table 63. Children Raised Exclusively as Jews, by Proportion of and Desire for More Jews in the Neighborhood (Third- and Fourth-Generation Intermarried Families of Jewish Parentage)

“What proportion of the people who live in your neighborhood would you say are Jewish?”	“Would you like there to be more Jewish people in your neighborhood, less, or is it about right the way it is now?”	Children raised exclusively as Jews (%)	N =
None	About right/doesn't matter	3	34
Few/some	About right/doesn't matter	17	38
None	More	52	26
Few /some	More	43	24
Half/all	About right	58	12

$p < .01$

- The Jewish parent had informal Jewish education experiences as a teenager
- The Jewish parent has in-married siblings
- The Jewish parent has Jewish friends (including intermarried Jewish friends)
- The Jewish parent would like more Jewish neighbors
- The Jewish parent has two Jewish parents
- The Jewish parent had a strongly Jewish social network as a teenager
- The non-Jewish grandparents do not interfere in how the children are being raised
- Jewish influences were present in the family of origin
- The Jewish parent is foreign-born or the child of foreign-born parents
- The Jewish parent comes from an endogamous family of origin

Among all the factors identified above, which are the most important? Are some merely reflections of others? For example, is the association between informal Jewish education and raising Jewish children merely a reflection of the Jewishness of the family of origin?

A logistic regression model was used to sort out the relative influences identified in the foregoing discussion. Logistic regression is a statistical technique designed for the multivariate analysis of a dichotomous dependent variable—in this case, whether the child was being raised exclusively as Jewish. Because generation and Jewish parentage have already been identified as dominant variables, this analysis is confined to intermarriages involving third- and fourth-generation intermarried from an endogamous family of origin.

The following variables were included in the analysis as predictors:

- Jewish parent is responsible for religious upbringing
- Social network interaction effects (see Table 64)
- Family interaction effects
- Secular educational attainment of Jewish parent
- Religious typology interaction effects
- Gender of Jewish parent
- Contact with Jewish grandparents
- Informal Jewish education interaction effects

Table 64. Definition of Interaction Effects Used in Logistic Regressions

Informal	Belonged to Jewish youth group for at least two years Went to Jewish camp for at least two summers High school friends were all or mostly Jewish.
Parental home	No Christmas tree Parents served on board Parents volunteered/parents kept kosher home Parents always celebrated Hanukah
Family	One or more endogamous siblings Contact with Gentile in-laws (reversed)
Social network	Lives in or desires to live in Jewish neighborhood Has Jewish friends
Religious typology	Jew is Jew by religion Gentile is secular

Table 65. Logistic Regression Predicting How Children are Raised in Intermarriages Where Jewish Partner Is Third- or Fourth-Generation from an Endogamous Family of Origin

		Odds ratio
Jew is responsible for religious upbringing	.2823	8.3623
Social network interaction effects	.2146	5.0814
Family interaction effects	.1891	1.6028
Secular educational attainment of Jew	.1680	2.2201
Religious typology interaction effects	.1031	2.9000

- Attempts by Gentile grandparents to influence religion in which child is raised
- Jewish practice in family of origin

The logistic regression identified five variables as being the key predictors. The most important was that the Jewish parent is responsible for the religious upbringing of the child. This makes intuitive sense. The second most important predictor was the social network cluster consisting of Jewish friends and having or wanting Jewish neighbors. The family variable, consisting of having endogamous siblings combined with little or no contact with Gentile in-laws, was the third most important predictor, followed closely by the secular educational attainment of the Jewish parent. The religious typology combining the religious identification of the Jew and the Gentile was the least important of the five predictors.

The Jewish background variables were included in the analysis, but turned out not to be predictive of how the children were being raised when the other variables were controlled. This suggests that the social network of the intermarried family is more important for how the children are raised than is the Jewish background of the Jewish parent. Some of the causality is ambiguous here, however. Is the influence of Jewish neighbors merely self-selection on the part of the respondent? The most “Jewish” Jews will find Jewish neighbors. The desire for more Jewish neighbors (the second part of the neighborhood variable) probably tells us more about the desire of the respondent than it does about the impact of social environment on the respondent. At the same time, an argument can be made that the Jew who wants to raise Jewish children in an intermarriage seeks out Jewish friends to facilitate that process.

Either interpretation has important implications for outreach, because it suggests that the social network is an important and overlooked mechanism for connecting the intermarried family with the Jewish community.

Conclusion

What will be the impact of intermarriage on future generations of American Jewry? The analysis of both the adults of mixed parentage and the intermarried families with children share a common pattern: most of the children end up outside of or marginal to the mainstream Jewish community. The majority of adults of mixed parentage cur-

rently identify as Jews ethnically, but not religiously. The majority of children in current intermarriages, even if the Jewish parent is of Jewish parentage, are not being raised as Jews. Even fewer are being socialized as Jews outside the family (for example, through formal or informal Jewish education). If one accepts Cohen’s argument that the 1990 NJPS overrepresented the intermarried population, then the projected loss will be less than if one accepts the published rates of intermarriage based on the 1990 NJPS. Neither the higher nor the lower estimate of intermarriage affects the pattern within intermarriages reported here: only a minority of the children of intermarriages are being raised both ethnically and religiously as Jews.

This finding, however, does not justify despair. It has already been established that the relatively few adult children of mixed parentage who were raised Jewish have had an important impact on stabilizing Jewish continuity. While there may be legitimate disagreement about the size of this group and the extent of their impact on return intermarriage,⁴⁶ the main finding remains valid: those with Jewish socialization are more likely to end up Jewish than those without.

Thus, while Jewish communal policymakers have no cause for optimism neither should they write off all intermarriages. Those with Jewish ties will remain within the Jewish community. Moreover, some important predictors of which intermarried Jews will raise Jewish children have been identified. The richness of the respondent’s Jewish background was found to be an important factor, as would be expected. A more important factor, however, and one that has not been discussed previously, is the role of social networks.

Jewish social networks had predictive value in assessing who will marry endogamously, and they can also partially predict which intermarried families will raise Jewish children. There is a common pattern in this profile. Intermarried Jews who are raising Jewish children had extensive Jewish friendships as teenagers, and they have maintained and/or augmented those friendships as adults. Jewish friends are a source of informal support for raising Jewish children. Endogamous siblings also provide influence and support. The association between raising Jewish children and wanting more Jewish neighbors suggests a desire for more such support. Outreach efforts to the intermarried populations primarily have been “programmatically.” This research suggests that the utilization of social networks represents a more promising avenue.

Appendix 1

A random sample of Jews can only be obtained by screening a random sample of non-Jews. In random digit dialing (RDD) surveys such as the NJPS, the sample of computer-generated phone numbers is typically stratified according to the distribution of residential phone numbers in order to save on sampling costs. If half of all possible phone numbers beginning with the numbers 123 are residential phone numbers, as opposed to only ten percent of all possible phone numbers beginning with the numbers 789, it will take five times as many randomly generated phone numbers in the 789 dialing exchange to locate a residential household as it will in the 123 exchange. In order to save on sampling costs, more phone calls will be made to densely popu-

lated telephone exchanges (where fewer random phone numbers are needed to locate a residential phone number) than to sparsely populated exchanges, which are typically found in rural areas, new suburban housing developments (where large banks of telephone numbers have not yet been assigned) and downtown areas (where there are more business phone numbers than residential phone numbers). The bias introduced by this sampling stratification is offset by weighting according to the number of phone numbers generated for each exchange in the sample.⁴⁷ For example, if one thousand phone numbers were generated for the 123 exchange in a residential area, and one hundred phone numbers were generated for the 789 exchange in a rural area, a household in the 123 exchange would be ten times as likely to be included in the sample as a household in the 789 exchange. This bias is compensated for by giving the household in the 789 exchange a weight of ten, because ten households would have been interviewed in the 789 exchange if one thousand numbers had been in the sample instead of one hundred.

Since a random sample of Jewish households is located by taking a random sample of all households in a given community, the Jewish households are weighted according to the stratification of the larger sample from which they were screened. In local Jewish community surveys using RDD, each household is weighted according to the number of phone numbers originally generated for the telephone exchange in which it was located.⁴⁸ With the NJPS, this procedure is not quite so simple. Because of the size and national scope of the NJPS, it could not be weighted simply by the number of phone numbers generated for each area code and exchange in the United States. Instead, it was weighted so that “key demographic characteristics of the adult population of the total weighted sample of the 125,813 responding households [in the screening stage] matched the most current estimates of these demographic characteristics produced by the Census Bureau.”⁴⁹ Steven Cohen assumes that because Jews in general and endogamous Jews in particular are concentrated in different areas than the general population (that is, in big cities and in the Northeast), endogamous Jews are automatically underrepresented.

Cohen’s proposed solution, to abandon the weights altogether, is more problematic than the uncertainty he is trying to address. First of all, the “EXCEL” sample, like all RDD samples, is stratified to make the most calls to the most highly concentrated residential exchanges. To unweight the sample is to underrepresent those areas in which intermarried Jews are the most likely to be found.⁵⁰ Second, as Joseph Waksberg explains: “The weighting procedure automatically adjusted for noncooperating households, as well as for those who were not home when the interviewer telephoned and for households who did not have telephones or had multiple lines.”⁵¹ This last point is crucial. Households with multiple telephone numbers have a higher probability of being included in the sample than households with only one residential telephone. Multiple-telephone households tend to be more affluent. Because endogamous households are more affluent than intermarried households, abandoning the weights entirely will artificially lower the rate of mixed marriage. Even assuming that the weighting scheme used by the NJPS might have introduced some bias, abandoning the weights altogether simply introduces a different and possibly more drastic bias.

Appendix 2. How Jewish Parentage was Ascertained

Respondents

- a. If the respondent was included in Module 1 (N = 800 cases) then Q119I, which asked which parent was Jewish, was used.
- b. If the respondent was reinterviewed in 1993, then the data for that question were used to fill in the parentage of the respondent.
- c. Data from the 1993 Survey of Mixed Marriage and Q119I from Module 1 of the 1990 NJPS (described in steps 1 and 2 above) were used to identify the parentage of 1254 (or 68 percent) out of 1844 ever-married respondents. The parentage of the remaining 590 ever-married respondents was estimated using questions 19 and 20 ("born Jewish," "raised Jewish"). A respondent who was both born and raised Jewish was classified as having two Jewish parents. A respondent who was not both born and raised Jewish was classified as having only one Jewish parent (see Table A-1).
- d. What degree of error was thereby introduced? To find out, I took the respondents who were reinterviewed in 1993 and compared their Jewish parentage as reported in 1993 with how they were born and raised as reported in 1990. Overall the "born and raised" question was an accurate predictor of parentage: 94 percent of the respondents who reported in 1990 that they were both born and raised Jewish turned out to have had two Jewish parents as reported in 1993. Similarly, 98 percent of the respondents who reported in 1990 that they had been born and raised as Christians turned out to have only one Jewish parent as reported in 1993 (see Table A-2).
- e. There were two exceptions to this degree of accuracy: respondents who were raised but not born Jewish and respondents who were born but not raised Jewish. Their Jewish parentage was not well predicted by questions 19a and 20a, but there were only thirty-five such respondents whose Jewish parentage was not established by the 1993 study or Q119I. The Jewish parentage for these respondents was assigned at random in order to eliminate any bias.

Table A-1. How Respondent Reported Religion Born and Raised in 1990, Compared with Answers to Questions by Jewish Parents in 1993

Pattern of Q19 + Q20 in 1990 NJPs	Answer to parentage in 1993			N =
	One Jewish parent	Two Jewish parents	Total	
Born and raised Jewish	6.2	93.8	100.0	455
Born Jewish only	64.5	35.5	100.0	31
Raised Jewish only	40.0	60.0	100.0	5
Born and raised Christian	97.6	2.4	100.0	42
Born and raised other/none	94.3	5.7	100.0	35
Other combinations	100.0	0.0	100.0	12

Table A-2. How Jewish Parentage Was Corrected in the 1990 NJPS

Source of correction	One Jewish parent	Two Jewish parents
Data from the 1993 survey on mixed marriage	22	78
Data from Q119I in the 1990 NJPS	28	36
Data from both the 1993 Survey and Q119I	8	27
No data available-no correction made	51	84
Case was randomly assigned	4	2
Total	113	227

Spouses

The Jewish spouses in NJPS 1990 (N = 763) were included in the analysis to produce the individual rate of mixed marriage. Q119I did not apply to them, nor were they reinterviewed in 1993 (only respondents were reinterviewed). The parentage of the spouses was estimated using questions 19b and 20b (born Jewish, raised Jewish). A spouse who was both born and raised Jewish was classified as having two Jewish parents. A spouse who was not both born and raised Jewish was classified as having only one Jewish parent. The Jewish parentage for spouses who were born Jewish but not raised Jewish or raised Jewish but not born Jewish was assigned at random in order to eliminate any bias.

Impact on the Analysis

How certain can we be about the Jewish parentage of respondents and Jewish spouses in NJPS 1990? I focus here on those married in the period 1985–1990, which is the period under examination. Let us look at respondents first. There were 340 respondents in NJPS who had married in the period 1985–1990. Of these, the parentage of one hundred (29 percent) was known from the 1993 survey, and the parentage of sixty-four was known from Q119I. An additional 35 respondents were reinterviewed in 1993 and were included in Module 3. Thus, the parentage of 59 percent of the 340 respondents married in the period 1985–1990 was known either from Q119I, the 1993 survey, or both. There were 135 cases that were neither included in Module 1 nor reinterviewed in 1993. These respondents were both born and raised Jewish, or neither born nor raised Jewish. We know already that their Jewish parentage can be predicted with more than 90 percent accuracy from Q19 and Q20. Thus, out of 340 respondents who married in the period 1985–1990, there were only thirteen who were misclassified as to Jewish parentage.

Of the 105 Jewish spouses who married in this period, three were randomly assigned. The remaining 102 were classified according to the responses to Q19b and Q20b. Thus, no more than ten percent of them (ten persons) are known to have been misclassified. Of the 445 respondents and spouses who married in the period 1985–1990, twenty-three (ten spouses and thirteen respondents) would have been misclassified.

Thus, we can say with 95 percent certainty that in the period 1985–1990:

Table A-3. Distribution of Age of Adult Children over Age of Respondent

Age of respondent	Age of adult child		
	21-29	30-39	40-49
40-44	2	0	0
45-49	12	0	0
50-54	11	7	0
54-59	8	37	0
60-64	0	26	7
65-69	0	8	24
≥70	0	3	39

- One third of the adult children of mixed marriage were return in-marriages.
- One out of four in-married Jews had a non-Jewish parent.
- Without the phenomenon of return in-marriage, the current rate of mixed marriage would be 64 percent instead of 52 percent.

Appendix 3. Matching Parent and Respondent Cohorts

The validation of the rate of intermarriage using internal consistency measures was accomplished by linking the respondents' cohort with the age cohort of their parents. Because the NJPS did not include questions about the age of parents of respondents this was estimated indirectly by distributing the ages of the adult children of the respondent over the age of the respondent. This is shown in Table A-3. While there is some inevitable overlap, the age cohorts of the adult children of respondents line up quite directly with specific age cohorts for their parents: 69 percent of children of respondents aged twenty-one to twenty-nine had parents in the forty-five to fifty-four age cohort; 77 percent of the adult children in the thirty to thirty-nine age cohort had parents who were between fifty-four and sixty-four; and 90 percent of the adult children aged forty to forty-nine had parents who were sixty-five or older.

Notes

1. See Julius Drachsler, "Intermarriage in New York City," *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law* 213 (1921); Marshall Sklare, "Intermarriage and the Jewish Future," *Commentary* (April 1964), 46-52.

2. See Will Herberg, *Protestant-Catholic-Jew* (New York: 1955).

3. Cited in Joseph Maier, "Intermarriage: A Survey of Unresearched Problems," in W.J. Cahnman (ed.), *Intermarriage and Jewish Life: A Symposium* (New York: 1963), 101.

4. See Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians and Irish of New York City* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1963).

5. See Sklare, "Intermarriage and the Jewish Future"; and Mervin F. Verbit, "Intermarriage in the United States," in *Encyclopaedia Judaica Decennial Book, 1983-1992*, ed. Geoffrey Wigoder (Jerusalem: 1994), 56-64.

6. See Erich Rosenthal, "Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States," *American Jewish Year Book* 63 (New York and Philadelphia: 1963), 3–52.

7. See Cahnman (ed.), *Intermarriage and Jewish Life*.

8. See Verbit, "Intermarriage in the United States"; Sklare, "Intermarriage and the Jewish Future."

9. See Alvin A. Chenkin, Saul Kaplan and Fred Massarik, *Initial Findings of the National Jewish Population Survey* (New York: 1972), 15.

10. See Fred Massarik, "Rethinking the Intermarriage Crisis," *Moment* 3, no. 7 (1978), 29–33.

11. See Leonard Fine, "Vital Signs," *Moment* 4, no. 6 (1979), 11–14.

12. See Elihu Bergman, "The American Jewish Population Erosion," *Midstream* (Oct. 1977), 9–19.

13. See Uziel O. Schmelz and Sergio DellaPergola, "The Demographic Consequences of U.S. Jewish Population Trends," in *American Jewish Year Book* 83 (New York and Philadelphia: 1983); *idem*, "Some Basic Trends in the Demography of U.S. Jews," in *New Perspectives in American Jewish Sociology: Findings and Implications* (New York: 1986).

14. See Barry Kosmin, *Highlights of the Council of Jewish Federation's 1990 National Jewish Population Survey* (New York: 1991).

15. The primary funding for this research came from the Wilstein Institute for Jewish Policy Studies and the American Jewish Committee. Additional funding was provided by the Whizin Institute on the Jewish Family and the Levinson Foundation.

16. Respondents who were divorced in 1993, along with marginally Jewish respondents, were underrepresented in the 1993 survey. An extensive methodological analysis not included here has shown the overall nonresponse bias to be minimal, and in the direction of excluding respondents with the weakest Jewish attachments.

17. See Steven M. Cohen, "Why Intermarriage May Not Threaten Jewish Continuity," *Moment* (1994), 54–57, 89–90.

18. J.J. Goldberg, "Interfaith Marriage: The Real Story," *New York Times*, 3 Aug. 1997.

19. *Ibid.* Goldberg is here presenting an argument that was articulated by Steven M. Cohen.

20. See Chenkin, Kaplan and Massarik, *Initial Findings of the National Jewish Population Survey*.

21. The 1970 NJPS sample used a combination of area probability and list sampling, versus random digit dialing for the 1990 NJPS.

22. See Steven M. Cohen, "The Social Characteristics of the New York Area Jewish Community," in *American Jewish Year Book* 84 (New York and Philadelphia: 1984), 128–174; Calvin Goldscheider, *The American Jewish Community: Social Science Research and Policy Implications* (Providence: 1986); Peter Friedman and Bruce Phillips, "The 1990 Chicago Metropolitan Area Jewish Population Study," *Contemporary Jewry* 15 (1994), 39–66; Bruce Phillips, "Los Angeles Jewry: A Demographic Portrait," *American Jewish Year Book* 86 (New York and Philadelphia: 1986), 126–194; Bruce Phillips and Eleanor Judd, *The Denver Jewish Population Study* (Denver: 1982); Bruce Phillips and Eve Weinberg, *The Milwaukee Jewish Population: Report of a Survey* (Milwaukee: 1984); Gary A. Tobin, "Recent Jewish Community Population Studies: A Roundup," *American Jewish Year Book* 85 (New York and Philadelphia: 1985), *idem*, *Bay Area Jewish Community Study: Special Report on Jewish Identity and Community Involvement* (Waltham: 1988).

23. Specifically, I will argue in the next section that the adult children of mixed marriage have an important impact on the rate of in-marriage because they are so numerous in the younger age cohorts. It is important to demonstrate internal evidence that they are not over-represented.

24. Here I used married respondents and Jewish spouses. Other Jewish household members such as roommates were excluded because the accuracy of the data about their parentage is more open to error.

25. See Appendix 2.

26. Appendix 3 explains how the parental age cohort was identified.

27. For current religious identification, I combined religion born, religion raised and cur-

rent religious identification, which are recorded for every member of the household. I excluded individuals identified by Barry Kosmin as "Gentile," using a different variable, called the Jewish Identity Construct (JIC), which includes data gathered at the time of the original screening interviews. Using the JIC variable makes it possible to differentiate between Gentile Christians and Jews who were raised as or have become Christians.

28. See Kosmin et al., *Highlights of the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*, where a figure of 52 percent is given. The difference between this and my figure of 54 percent is explained by the different classification of Jews by religion married to Jews of mixed parentage who identify as Christians. Kosmin et al. used an ethnic criterion to classify these persons as Jews, whereas I classified them as non-Jews.

29. See Bruce A. Phillips, *Reexamining Inter marriage* (Los Angeles and Boston: 1997).

30. Although the adult children of Jewish mothers were slightly more likely to be endogamously married, the differences were not statistically significant.

31. See Phillips, *Reexamining Inter marriage*.

32. The range varies, depending on the generation and the type of Jewish education received. See *ibid.*, 16.

33. Barry Kosmin suggested categorizing the different kinds of families, as well as most of the specific names for the categories.

34. This category also includes a few people who identify with non-Western religions, because they were not numerous enough to create their own category and because their profile is similar to that of the religious "nones."

35. Eighty-five percent either had a Gentile parent or were raised outside of Judaism by two ethnically Jewish parents.

36. See Phillips, *Reexamining Inter marriage*.

37. Another possible explanation for the lack of attendance at a seder is based on geography: those couples who live far away from Jewish parents may have no nearby seder to which to be invited.

38. Of the total, 15 percent observed both Passover and Easter, and another five percent went to church only.

39. On Yom Kippur, for example, there may be a "break the fast" dinner.

40. My figure here is lower than Kosmin's estimate of about 25 percent. This is in part explained by a different wording of the question in the 1993 survey.

41. See Phillips, *Reexamining Inter marriage*.

42. *Ibid.*

43. See Egon Mayer, *Inter marriage Among American Jews: Consequences, Prospects, and Policies* (New York: 1979); and Cohen, "Why Inter marriage May Not Threaten Jewish Continuity."

44. See Phillips, *Reexamining Inter marriage*.

45. *Ibid.*

46. If inter marriage has been overestimated by the NJPS, there will be fewer adult children of mixed parentage and their impact on return in-marriage will be decreased proportionately.

47. See Joseph Waksberg, "Sampling Methods for Random Digit Dialing," *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 73 (March 1978).

48. See Bruce Phillips, "Sampling Strategies in Jewish Community Studies," in *Perspectives in Jewish Population Research*, ed. Steven M. Cohen, Jonathan S. Woocher and Bruce Phillips (Boulder: 1984).

49. See Joseph Waksberg, *Sampling Design of the 1990 NJPS* (New York: 1991).

50. See Phillips, "Sampling Strategies in Jewish Community Studies."

51. Waksberg, *Sampling Design of the 1990 NJPS*.