

A QUESTIONABLE CONNECTION: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND ATTITUDES TO INTERMARRIAGE OF YOUNG AMERICAN JEWS

Erik H. Cohen

Introduction

THE high, and rising, rate of marriage between American Jews and non-Jews is a major concern of American Jewry. In the 1920s, fewer than five per cent of American Jews married Gentiles.¹ The widely-quoted National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) of 1990 found that the proportion of American Jews married to non-Jews (that is, to those who did not convert to Judaism) had risen to 52 per cent.² The low levels of community involvement or affiliation of children of such marriages,³ have led to predictions about the 'vanishing American Jew'.⁴ 'Jewish continuity' has become a catchphrase used by educators and community leaders to refer to the preservation of the Jewish people at the most fundamental level: to ensure that subsequent generations of Jews will consider themselves Jewish, will remain attached to their religion, culture, and/or Israel and will intend to bring up their children as Jews.⁵

The social implications of intermarriage are deep and far-reaching, touching upon every facet of communal life. According to Feingold,⁶ intermarriage is

... part of a process of cultural dilution that is marked by a loss of communal memory. The tribe no longer knows who it is or why it should be.

A commitment to endogamy may be a theological issue, or it may be based on familial, social, or economic concerns.⁷ 'Effective fertility', the rate at which children are likely to be raised as members of the ethnic or religious community, falls as intermarriage rates climb.⁸ Endogamy is seen as a key component of ethnic identity and of an adaptable strategy to combat assimilation.⁹ It can be used as an

The Jewish Journal of Sociology, vol. 45, nos. 1 and 2, 2003

indicator of general levels of commitment to one's religion or ethnicity.¹⁰ At a personal level, conflict over religious issues may cause friction at home and affect marital stability.¹¹

People marry outside their religious or ethnic group for a variety of reasons. Several categories of individuals are likely to intermarry: rebels, nonconformists, adventurers, escapists who wish to improve their social standing; and those who are psychologically or socially unstable.¹² However, in an increasingly secular and integrated American society, religious background may simply not concern a young couple. That strongly reflects social change. Nowadays in American Jewry, families are seldom involved in the process of choosing a mate. As successive generations are born and raised, there is a tendency for groups to move into more integrated neighbourhoods which do not exert much social pressure and which provide greater opportunities to intermarry.¹³ In addition to the number of generations since immigrants first came to the United States, there is a factor of minority status in the home country and in the host country.¹⁴ The decline of antisemitism in the United States has led to a decline in opposition to intermarriage in both Jewish and Christian communities.

The high level of intermarriage makes it difficult to confront the issue: a very large majority of participants and counsellors involved in American Jewish youth organizations have at least one member of their close family who is married to a non-Jew. One needs to tread warily for fear of insulting or alienating people.¹⁵ In the circumstances, most Jews may believe it to be futile to cling to an ideal of endogamy, while many parents and grandparents are unwilling to distance themselves from the intermarried members of their family, especially in Conservative and Reform Jewry.¹⁶ The trend in those communities is for rabbis to officiate at inter-faith weddings and to attempt greater accommodation generally. Some families cope with the situation by way of '... an informal conversion to symbolic religiosity rather than a formal religious conversion',¹⁷ using religious symbols for religious practice as a means of identification. However, Orthodox Jewish communities — who are comparatively more isolated from general trends in American culture — maintain a more stringent opposition to intermarriage without the conversion of the non-Jewish spouse: rabbis insist on a supervised conversion before officiating at the ceremony of marriage.

The most common tactics for dealing with the issue indirectly are attempts to enhance the Jewish identity of adolescents and to provide opportunities for them to meet other young Jews — primarily through Jewish day schools, youth organizations, and tours to Israel.¹⁸ It is expected that young people who are active in the community and are more exposed to potential Jewish spouses will eventually

marry one of them. In fact, some studies have shown that Jews who attended day schools and had taken part in Jewish organizations or had gone on trips to Israel did marry a Jewish spouse at a rate significantly higher than that of the national average;¹⁹ while one survey found that those who were more involved were less likely to marry a non-Jewish spouse.²⁰

However, there is an underlying problem in using the surveys conducted by youth organizations to reach conclusions about the impact of community involvement on intermarriage. In such cases the survey population is compared to the national population, leading to difficulties in determining cause and effect. Other analyses have found that controlling for factors such as gender, family affiliation, number of generations in the United States, and intermarriage of parents yields significantly different results about the influence of Jewish education or participation in Jewish youth groups.²¹ The young persons who take part in such programmes and their families are much more strongly affiliated with the Jewish community than are the majority of American Jews.

The National Council of Synagogue Youth (NCSY), which had the lowest intermarriage rate, is an organization of primarily Orthodox youth, and their tendency to marry Jews may be unrelated to participation in the group's activities. In a survey of the North American Federation of Temple Youth (NFTY) — which is affiliated to the Reform movement — more than 40 per cent of the respondents said that they go out with non-Jews as well as with Jews.²² In a study of youth involved in activities at Jewish community centres, only 52 per cent stated that marrying someone Jewish was important to them — a proportion which is close to the endogamy rate of the general American-Jewish population.²³ In other words, intermarriage rates may be more dependent on denominational affiliation than on levels of participation. A more revealing comparison of intermarriage rates would be either between different organizations or between those who participate regularly and those who are only occasional participants.

In 1988, the Commission on Jewish Education in North America explored the question of whether Jewish education necessarily leads to positive Jewish identification.²⁴ The findings of that commission, and of other research, led to the recommendation that Jewish education must include informal education and involvement in a Jewish sub-culture such as youth groups, trips to Israel, and summer camps.²⁵ This issue should now be reconsidered to determine whether the time, energy, and money invested by the wider Jewish community are likely to have the desired effect. This paper attempts to discover whether there is in fact a significant correlation between community involvement and opposition to intermarriage. Further, if

there is such a correlation, does it vary along denominational lines? And can any recent trends or changes in attitudes towards intermarriage be discerned among Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox teenagers?

Methodology

Data collected during the ongoing survey of Israel Experience tours between 1993 and 2000 were analysed, chiefly using standard cross-tabulation and correlations. Owing to the escalating violence and danger of terrorism during the second *intifada*, participation in Israel Experience programmes has since dropped dramatically — as has tourism in Israel generally. The average participant in these tours is aged between 15 and 18 years and most of these young people are affiliated to a Jewish youth group or to a synagogue and have some Jewish educational background. Of course, they do not represent the majority of unaffiliated Jewish-American youth but they do range along the spectrum of religious observance and of Zionist beliefs. We asked them to define themselves as affiliated with one of the three major denominations, and we used their definitions in interpreting the data, rather than the affiliation of the group with which they toured. Only participants from the United States are included in this analysis. Similarly, only those participants who came to Israel under the auspices of the Department of Education of the Jewish Agency for Israel were considered. At the end of their trip to Israel (which may last from two to eight weeks), they are asked to complete a comprehensive questionnaire on the programme. In similar surveys, responses may be affected by the timing of the questionnaire — that is, whether at the beginning or at the end of the tour. In our case, as noted above, the questionnaires were always given at the end of the tour, so that any possible effect on the overall trend from year to year would not be significant. Data were collected from 19,321 American participants during the eight years of the survey. The response rate was approximately 85 per cent, so that we may consider the data to represent not a sample, but essentially the entire population.

The two survey questions which are of interest here are those concerning levels of community involvement and attitudes to intermarriage: 'How often do you participate in activities in your Jewish community?' and 'If a close member of your family expressed the intention of marrying a non-Jew, what would your reaction be?'

Results

Table 1 shows the response to community activity and Table 2 is about the attitudes to the intermarriage of a close relative. The

ATTITUDES TO INTERMARRIAGE

TABLE 1.
Frequency of participation in Jewish communal activity*

Year	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
Number of respondents	1806	2657	2025	2430	2597	2631	2358	2817	19321
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Never	6	6	6	6	6	7	8	6	6
Once or twice a year	19	20	19	19	20	21	18	22	20
Once a month or more	28	30	29	28	29	30	27	31	29
Once a week or more	46	44	46	47	44	43	47	42	45
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

* All percentages are rounded up, so that the total is not always 100% in Tables 1, 2, 4, 5, 6.

TABLE 2.
Reaction to intermarriage of a close family member

Year	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
Number of respondents	1758	2261	2019	2420	2618	2635	2366	2818	18895
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Nothing wrong with it	11	15	19	20	25	24	29	27	22
Ambivalent to this	9	11	12	16	17	14	14	16	14
Slightly opposed to it	41	42	40	35	32	33	28	31	35
Vehemently opposed to it	39	31	29	29	27	28	29	26	29
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Not all respondents answered both questions, hence the difference in the total number of participants in Tables 1 and 2.

cross-tabulations allow us to make several initial observations about the responses to these two questions. Overall, levels of participation have remained stable: three-quarters of the respondents were active in their communities at least once a week; the reasons for such participation may have changed over time, but the levels of involvement have not. On the other hand, the results concerning intermarriage are quite different: the proportion of the overall survey population who said that they saw nothing wrong with a member of their close family marrying a non-Jew increased annually, while the proportion of those who were 'vehemently opposed' dropped by 11 per cent over the eight years of the survey, and of those who were 'slightly opposed' dropped by 13 per cent. This rapid and dramatic change in attitude about such a fundamental issue as intermarriage — which is laden with many social implications — is highly unusual in a demographically stable population. It must be taken seriously and examined further for possible explanations. The various surveys which were cited in the earlier part of this paper tracked the current marital status of young adults, most of whom had been participants in Jewish organizations a decade or more earlier.²⁶

The change in attitude indicated by the data presented in this paper occurred very recently and very rapidly, in particular when considering the stability of other demographic and attitudinal find-

ings of the same survey.²⁷ When the data from Tables 1 and 2 are broken down by denomination, as shown in Table 3, we can see that the percentage of Orthodox participants involved in weekly communal activities has fluctuated somewhat and is lower now than when the survey began. Some of the participants defined themselves as Secular, Reconstructionist, Just Jewish, or Other. Here, only the three major denominations are considered.

Among the Conservative participants, there has been a slight but steady decline in involvement. In contrast, the number of Reform participants who are active in their communities on a weekly basis has increased by 15 per cent. The Orthodox participants demonstrate some annual fluctuations in the percentage who say that they are vehemently opposed to intermarrying, but overall an average of 75 per cent hold this opinion. The respondents' commitment to endogamy appears to be connected more to their denominational affiliation than to community participation, since even in the years which saw a drop in participation, opposition to intermarriage remained high. Those from the Conservative movement are consistently more moderate in their opposition to mixed marriages than those who defined themselves as Orthodox. Moreover, the Conservative data show a significant drop in the percentage of those who say that they are vehemently opposed.

At the other end of the spectrum from the Orthodox are the Reform participants, a mere 12 per cent of whom said that they are opposed to intermarriage within their close family. The Reform, like

TABLE 3.
Communal Participation and Attitudes to Intermarriage according to
Denomination (percentage of relevant answers)

Year	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
Orthodox									
Number of participants	94	100	143	180	227	239	385	429	1797
Involved in community once a week or more	62	66	58	50	48	50	54	47	52
Vehemently opposed to intermarriage	74	85	67	78	75	73	83	80	78
Conservative									
Number of participants	1020	1150	964	1035	1089	1148	887	1228	8521
Involved in community once a week or more	56	50	53	53	48	49	50	48	51
Vehemently opposed to intermarriage	48	46	38	40	36	35	31	24	37
Reform									
Number of participants	438	877	528	812	891	865	737	693	5841
Involved in community once a week or more	29	41	38	46	44	39	45	37	41
Vehemently opposed to intermarriage	23	15	13	12	9	11	9	5	11

ATTITUDES TO INTERMARRIAGE

the Conservative, show an 18 per cent decline in opposition since 1993. That may be the most important result of the survey in terms of examining the connection between community involvement and attitude to intermarriage. The decline in opposition among the Reform group mirrors their increased involvement in the community!

An interesting finding in Table 4 is that respondents from all three major denominations show a pattern of religiosity similar to that of their parents. In each case, more than half consider themselves 'as religious' as their parents, slightly less than a third consider themselves to be more religious; while 12-13 per cent see themselves as more religious. Only among those who define themselves as secular or 'just Jewish' is there a significant trend towards being less religious than the previous generation. That finding is significant because it refutes the tempting, but perhaps over-simplistic, explanation of rising intermarriage rates being the consequence of a diminishing religious belief. Even the Reform respondents, who are increasingly tolerant of intermarriage, consider themselves at least as religious as their parents. That phenomenon may be explained in one of two ways: either young American Jews do not think that endogamy is an important aspect of Judaism, or their parents were not particularly observant (and therefore the present generation is at least 'as religious') but believe that Jews marrying Jews is important for cultural or other reasons.

An examination of the data in Tables 5 and 6 distributed by gender once again calls into question the connection between community involvement and opposition to intermarriage. Each year, a slightly higher percentage of the females than of the males stated that they were involved in community activities at least once a week, while a slightly higher percentage of males than of females said that they would be vehemently opposed to a family member marrying a non-Jew. This finding demonstrates a shift in attitude, since conventional wisdom considers that women are more likely than men to oppose intermarriage. In order to explore further this relationship

TABLE 4.
Religiosity compared to respondents' parents, 1996 (in row percentage)

	More Religious	As Religious	Less Religious	Total	Number of respondents
Orthodox	30	57	13	100	545
Conservative	32	56	12	100	3200
Reform	30	57	13	100	2253
Just Jewish	26	47	28	100	589
Secular	12	46	42	100	207
Not Jewish	14	17	69	100	58
Total	30	54	16	100	7368

TABLE 5.
Attitude comparison between males and females: frequency of
participation in Jewish communal activities

Year	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
MALES									
N	699	1054	779	918	910	1100	1059	1180	7699
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Never	8	7	7	6	7	7	11	7	8
Once or twice a year	20	21	18	19	20	21	20	22	20
Once a month or more	29	31	31	31	30	31	25	30	30
Once a week or more	43	40	44	44	42	41	44	41	42
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
FEMALES									
N	1050	1424	1152	1364	1486	1413	1202	1427	10518
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Never	4	5	5	6	5	6	6	5	5
Once or twice a year	18	19	20	19	20	19	17	21	19
Once a month or more	29	28	28	26	28	29	28	32	29
Once a week or more	49	48	47	50	47	46	49	42	47
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 6.
Comparison of attitudes of males and females: attitudes towards a close
family member marrying a non-Jew

Year	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	Total
MALES									
Reaction to intermarriage of a close family member									
N	520	787	780	919	931	1103	1069	1182	7291
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Nothing wrong with it	11	14	20	20	25	24	31	26	23
Ambivalent to this	7	12	10	15	17	13	11	15	13
Slightly opposed to it	41	38	39	34	31	32	26	28	33
Vehemently opposed to it	42	36	31	31	28	30	32	31	32
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
FEMALES									
Reaction to intermarriage of a close family member									
N	809	1151	1145	1359	1488	1416	1202	1428	9998
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Nothing wrong with it	10	15	17	20	25	24	27	27	22
Ambivalent to this	11	11	12	17	17	14	15	17	15
Slightly opposed to it	40	45	42	36	32	34	30	32	36
Vehemently opposed to it	39	29	29	28	26	27	28	23	28
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

between community involvement and attitudes to intermarriage, the correlation between the responses to these two survey questions was modelled on computer. The traditional Pearson's correlation, a linear model, and the non-linear MONCO were used.²⁸ The correlation was determined for the total population as well as for each of the denominational sub-groups, using the data from all eight years.

ATTITUDES TO INTERMARRIAGE

TABLE 7.

MONCO and Pearson's correlations between community involvement and attitude towards intermarriage for the various denominations

	MONCO	Pearson's correlation
Whole population	38	22
Orthodox	43	20
Conservative	33	19
Reform	16	9

Since each of the matrices involves only two items and one correlation, the results are shown in table form: Table 7.

Discussion

The correlation between community involvement and opposition to intermarriage is much stronger amongst the Orthodox than it is among the Reform, with the Conservative falling in between. However, even among the Orthodox the correlation is moderate and certainly does not indicate that increasing the hours young people spend in Jewish schools and organizations would counteract the rising rates of intermarriage. Schools, even religious day schools, are mainly designed to transmit information and practical skills. They are less effective in instilling values, especially if these values are not reinforced at home. Moreover, the Conservative — and especially the Reform — movements give the children of intermarriages the opportunity to participate in Jewish organizations; this is particularly important for those who have a non-Jewish mother and who are not therefore considered to be Jewish according to Orthodox Jewish law (*halakha*).

The messages which young people receive at home are likely to have more impact than those from a youth group attended once a week. If the family signals are strong (that is, many relatives marrying non-Jews and being accepted into the family) and those from the Jewish institutions are subtle or ambiguous, it is not surprising that the latter would not have a significant effect. The participants can be divided into two camps: the Orthodox, firmly opposed to intermarriage despite slight annual fluctuations, and the Conservative-Reform who are steadily becoming more tolerant of family members marrying non-Jews, even as their level of community participation is increasing.

Historically, Jews made no distinction between religious and ethnic aspects, as evidenced by the words 'a holy people'²⁹ and this is still the case in the Orthodox community. But, according to Steven Cohen, American culture has created a separation between the

ethnic and the religious components of Judaism, and while the religious aspect is stable, the ethnic aspect (which includes endogamy) is in decline.³⁰ A similar phenomenon has been seen among British-Pakistani youth, who emphasize their religious identity over their Pakistani or 'Asian' ethnic identity.³¹ This is a topic of much study and discussion in the field of ethnic studies³² but it is beyond the scope of this paper to explore the implications of why groups emphasize one aspect of their identity more than another.

In Cohen's factor analysis on data concerning Jewish identity, commitment to endogamy and affiliation with Jewish institutions are not in the same cluster of items.³³ An increased involvement in Jewish organizations may not necessarily translate into opposition to intermarriage. As the more liberal movements reach out to intermarried families and avoid confronting the issue in order not to condemn or alienate members, the link between the two may become even weaker. Another study,³⁴ which examined the connection between formal Jewish education and intermarriage rates, called into question the effectiveness of participation in Jewish educational activities.

... Respondents who finished six or more years of day school are only 1.09 times as likely to intermarry as respondents with no Jewish education at all, (...) a rather modest endogamy gain considering the large input of Jewish education.

On the other hand, Jewish parentage has been found to have a significant influence. In the case of respondents with no formal Jewish education, 31.4 per cent of those with two Jewish parents married non-Jews; while 80.7 per cent of those who had only one Jewish parent married non-Jews who did not convert. Interestingly, while the intermarriage rate among children of mixed marriages has remained comparatively consistent over the past century (62 per cent of marriages in 1900–1949 and 69 per cent in 1985–1990), the trend toward intermarriage among children of two Jewish parents has increased dramatically from a mere five per cent in 1900–1949 to 45 per cent in 1985–1990.³⁵

Conclusion

The assumption that increasing the involvement of young Jews in the community will lead to a decrease in intermarriage needs to be re-examined. Such attitudes may be dependent less on the number of hours spent in Jewish institutions and more on the philosophical leanings of the movement to which one is affiliated and on the attitudes of one's family. In fact, an analysis of the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey found that family attitudes have much more importance than Jewish community educational programmes on the

values and beliefs of young people.³⁶ Notwithstanding the predictions of Talcott Parsons, it seems that the family is still the prime and most influential socializing institution.³⁷

Further research is needed to refine and shed light on the theoretical link between community involvement and endogamy. In our survey, participants were not asked whether they go out with non-Jews or whether they themselves would only consider marrying a Jew. Future studies which track intermarriage rates among Israel Experience alumni or active members of youth organizations would be particularly enlightening. It may be that involvement in Jewish groups which do not explicitly oppose intermarriage influences the dating and marriage choices of participants without necessarily leading them to 'vehemently oppose' the marriage of close family members to non-Jews. It is particularly important to learn about the dating habits of these teenagers because while adolescent dating patterns have been shown to be more reliable than stated opinions as an indicator of future marriage choices, teenagers have also been found to hold more lenient attitudes about going out with non-Jews than about marrying a non-Jew.³⁸ The 2000 National Jewish Population Survey is currently being analysed, and the data will be valuable in documenting more recent trends and changes in intermarriage rates among the younger generation of American Jews.

From initial findings, however, it seems that organizations may have to decide whether it is more important to reach out to unaffiliated youth, side-stepping the issue of intermarriage, than to take a clear position against intermarriage and risk alienating potential members. Programmes concerned primarily with providing a relaxed atmosphere and opportunities for involvement to all Jews may need to recognize that an indirect approach to the issue of intermarriage might no longer be effective. Perhaps programmes nowadays should take a more direct approach and consider promoting endogamy as one of their goals.

The rapid increase in acceptance of intermarriage among this study's highly-involved group of young American Jews indicates that affiliation with an ethnic or religious group may not have the same connotation today as it did a generation or two ago. Although, on the one hand, ethnicity seems to be making an unexpected resurgence in the post-modern world, it has also become increasingly common and acceptable for individuals to have multiple affiliations.³⁹ Moreover, although ethnic groups have not totally assimilated or become completely acculturated, as was once predicted, attitudes towards ethnicity have changed fundamentally. Today, ethnic groups in the United States may be described as communities of Faith, not communities of Fate. Affiliation is becoming a matter of choice. In societies where people do have the option of leaving the particular ethnic group into

which they were born, and joining another group, or if they do so means completely severing ties with one's family, the decision to marry out clearly has serious and usually irrevocable repercussions. Nowadays in many Western societies people may move freely between groups with few or no social repercussions. Just as Jews are free to be totally unaffiliated with any Jewish community, they are also free to marry a non-Jew and to continue playing an active part in synagogue life. Those who already juggle many, and often conflicting, identities may take it in their stride to be active in one's own Jewish community while being married to a Christian, a Muslim, or a Buddhist. That may also pose no problem for other members of their community. In many Reform and Conservative synagogues, a significant proportion of active members have non-Jewish spouses while their associated schools and camps tend to refrain from sending strong messages against intermarriage because of the sensitivity of the topic. In the absence of family pressure, community involvement alone provides no guarantees that a young person will decide to marry a Jew.

Acknowledgements

The Youth and Hechalutz Department of the World Zionist Organization (1993–1997) and The Department of Jewish Zionist Education of the Jewish Agency for Israel (1998–2000), commissioned the survey on Israel Experience Programs. This article is based on part of that survey. Allison Ofanansky and Tania Hershman gave me valuable editorial assistance. I am grateful to Professor Paul Ritterband and to Eynat Cohen for all their suggestions to improve and refine this paper.

NOTES

¹ E. Mayer, *Love and Tradition: Marriage Between Jews and Christians*, Plenum Press, New York, 1985.

² See B. A. Kosmin *et al.*, *Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*, Council of Jewish Federations, New York, 1991 and S. M. Cohen, 'Why Intermarriage May Not Threaten Jewish Continuity', *Moment*, December 1994, pp. 54–57, 89–90.

³ See L. M. Winer *et al.*, *Leaders of Reform Judaism*, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, New York, 1987; P. Y. Medding *et al.*, 'Jewish identity in conversionary and mixed marriages', *American Jewish Yearbook*, 1992, pp. 3–76; D. Mittelberg, *The Israel Visit and Jewish Identification*, The American Jewish Committee, New York, 1994; and S. M. Cohen, *Religious Stability and Ethnic Decline: Emerging Patterns of Jewish Identity in the United States*, The Melton Center for Jewish Education in the Diaspora, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1997.

⁴ A. M. Dershowitz, *The Vanishing American Jew*, Little, Brown, New York, 1997.

⁵ See B. Chazan, 'The Israel Trip as Jewish Education' in *The Israel Experience*, CRB Foundation, Jerusalem, 1992; R. Kafka *et al.*, 'The impact of "Summer in Israel" experiences on North American Jewish teenagers' in *ibid.*; and S. Fox and I. Scheffler, *Jewish Education and Jewish Continuity: Prospects and Limitations*, Mandel Foundation, Jerusalem, 2000.

⁶ H. Feingold, 'From commandment to persuasion: Probing the "hard secularism" of American Jewry' in S. Cohen and G. Horenczyk, eds., *National Variations in Jewish Identity: Implications for Jewish Education*, State University of New York Press, Albany, N.Y., 1999, p. 158.

⁷ J. A. Pike, *If Your Marry Outside Your Faith: Counsel on Mixed Marriages*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1954.

⁸ P. Ritterband, 'The fertility of the Jewish people: A contemporary overview' in S. DellaPergola and S. Cohen, eds., *World Jewish Population: Trends and Policies*, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1992, pp. 93-105.

⁹ W. A. Adams, 'Dispersed minorities in the Middle East: A comparison and a lesson' in G. P. Castile and G. Kushner, eds., *Persistent Peoples: Cultural Enclaves in Perspective*, University of Arizona Press, Tucson, 1981 and H. Gans, 'Symbolic ethnicity and symbolic religiosity: towards a comparison of ethnic and religious acculturation' in *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 17, no. 4, 1994, pp. 577-592.

¹⁰ M. Rimor and E. Katz, *Jewish Involvement of the Baby Boom Generation: Interrogating the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey*, the Louis Guttman Israel Institute of Applied Social Research, Jerusalem, 1993 and J. Reitz, *The Survival of Ethnic Groups*, McGraw-Hill, Toronto, 1980.

¹¹ J. G. Chinitz and R. A. Brown, 'Religious homogamy, marital conflict, and stability in same-faith and interfaith Jewish marriages' in *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, vol. 40, no. 4, 2001, pp. 722-733.

¹² D. Romano, *Intercultural Marriage: Promises and Pitfalls*, Intercultural Press, Yarmouth, Maine, 1988.

¹³ L. Greber *et al.*, *The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority*, Free Press, New York, 1970; A. Dashefsky and H. Shapiro, *Ethnic Identification Among American Jews: Socialization and Social Structure*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA, 1974; and P. Spickard, *Mixed Blood, Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in Twentieth-Century America*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wisconsin, 1989.

¹⁴ See F. Yang and H. R. Ebaugh, 'Religion and ethnicity among new immigrants. The impact of majority/minority status in home and host countries' in *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, vol. 40, no. 3, 2001, pp. 367-378.

¹⁵ Personal communication (1998) from Dan Krakow, Israel National Director of Young Judaea. See also J. Wertheimer, 'Surrendering to intermarriage' in *Commentary*, March 2001.

¹⁶ Wertheimer, *op. cit.* in note 15, pp. 25-32.

¹⁷ Gans, *op. cit.* in note 9, p. 587.

¹⁸ G. Bubis and L. Marks, *Changes in Jewish identification. A comparative study of a teenage Israel camping trip, a counselor-in-training program and a teenage service camp*, Florence G. Heller-JWB Research Center, 1975; S. B. Fishman and A. Goldstein, *When They Are Grown They Will Not Depart: Jewish Education and the Jewish Behavior of American Adults*, CNJS Research Report no. 8; Katz, *op.*

cit. in note 10; B. A. Phillips, 'Intermarriage and Jewish education. Is there a connection?' in *Journal of Jewish Education*, vol. 66, nos. 1–2, 2000, pp. 54–66; B. A. Phillips, *Re-examining Intermarriage: Trends, Textures and Strategies*, Susan and David Wilstein Institute of Jewish Policy Studies and the American Jewish Committee, New York, 1996; A. Ganapol and S. Cohen, *Building Jewish Identity: A Study of Young Judaea Alumni*, MarketQuest and Hadassah, New York, 1998.

¹⁹ L. L. Isaacs *et al.*, *The Alexander Muss High School: Impact Evaluation*, JESNA, North Miami, Florida, 1997; N. Friedman and P. Davis, *Faithful Youth: A Study of the National Conference of Synagogue Youth. Executive Highlights of Alumni Survey*, NCSY, New York, 1998; and Ganapol and Cohen, *op. cit.* in note 18.

²⁰ A. Ganapol, *Young Judaea 1993 Continuity Study*, MarketQuest, New York, 1994.

²¹ S. Cohen, *American Assimilation or Jewish Revival?*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1988; Fishman and Goldstein, *op. cit.* in note 18; and Phillips, *op. cit.* in note 18.

²² S. Seltzer, *Reform Jewish Teenagers: Attitudes, Beliefs and Family Backgrounds*, UAHC, Department of Youth Activities, New York, 1991.

²³ See, by A. Sales, a) *Jewish Youth Databook: Research on Adolescence and its Implications for Jewish Teen Programs*, 1996 and b) *Values and Concerns of American Jewish Youth: JCC Maccabi Teen Survey*, 1994. Both published by Brandeis University, Waltham, MA.

²⁴ In 1988, a group of educators, rabbis, scholars, community leaders, and heads of philanthropic foundations met under the auspices of the Mandel Associated Foundations, JCC Association, JESNA, and CJF; see M. Mandel, commission chair, *A Time to Act. Report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America*, University Press, of America, 1991.

²⁵ See Fox and Scheffler, *op. cit.* in note 5.

²⁶ See Kosmin, *op. cit.* in note 2; Ganapol, *op. cit.* in note 20; Isaacs, *op. cit.* in note 19; Ganapol and Cohen, *op. cit.* in note 18; and Friedman and Davis, *op. cit.* in note 19.

²⁷ See, all by E. H. Cohen: a) *Israel Experience Programs — Summers 1993–1997. Preliminary International Data*, published by the Youth and Hechalutz Department of the World Zionist Organization and the Joint Authority for Jewish Zionist Education, Jerusalem, 1993–1998; b) *Towards a Strategy of Excellence: the Israel Experience. Ongoing Survey & Evaluation*, 1994, same publishers; c) 'Informal Marketing of Israel Experience tours' in *Journal of Travel Research*, vol. 37, no. 3, 1999, pp. 238–243; d) 'Prior community involvement and "Israel Experience" educational tours' in *Evaluation and Research in Education*, vol. 13, no. 2, 1999, pp. 76–91; and e) *Israel Experience: A Sociological and Comparative Analysis*, The Birthright Foundation and the Department for Jewish Zionist Education, JAFL, Jerusalem, 1999.

²⁸ MONCO correlations take into account the similarity in direction of two variables — whether both are increasing or decreasing. 'Given two numerical variables x and y , the weak coefficient of monotonicity [m2] tells us how much the two variables vary in the same sense. In other words, when x increases, does y increase or not?' in R. Amar and S. Toledano, *HUDAP Manual with Mathematics*, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997, p. 115.

Because of the characteristics of the monotonicity, which is regression-free, the MONCO will always be stronger than the Pearson coefficient: 'When Pearson's correlation coefficient equals +1 or -1, the weak monotonicity coefficient [m₂] for the same data will have the same value. In other cases, the absolute value of [m₂] will be higher than of Pearson's coefficient' (ibid.).

²⁹ D. Elazar, 'Jewish religious, ethnic, and national identities: Convergence and conflicts' in S. Cohen and G. Horenczyk, eds., *National Variations in Jewish Identity: Implications for Jewish Education*, State University of New York Press, Albany, N.Y., 1999, pp. 35-52.

³⁰ Cohen, op. cit. in note 3.

³¹ J. Jacobson, 'Religion and Ethnicity: Dual and alternative sources of identity among young British Pakistanis', *Ethnic and Religious Studies*, vol. 20, no. 2, 1997, pp. 238-256.

³² Cohen and Horenczyk, eds., op. cit., in note 29, pp. 35-52.

³³ Steven Cohen's sample was selected from the Market Facts Consumer Mail Panel of Americans who agreed to take part in surveys on a wide range of topics. Only those who identified themselves as Jewish were used in this study.

³⁴ Phillips, op. cit. in note 18, p. 58.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 57.

³⁶ A. Goldstein and S. Barrack Fishman, 'Jewish Education in America Today' in *Bisdeh Hemed (Hebrew)*, vol. 37, nos. 9-10, 1994, pp. 5-15.

³⁷ T. Parsons, *Sociological Theory and Modern Society*, The Free Press, New York, 1967; and R. Boudon and F. Bourricaud, *Dictionnaire critique de la sociologie*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1982, p. 365.

³⁸ Phillips, op. cit. in note 18; Sales, op. cit. in note 23; and W. B. Helmerich, *The March of the Living: A Follow-up Study of its Long-range Impact and Effects*, 1994, unpublished work.

³⁹ H. Bertens, *The Idea of Postmodernity: A History*, Routledge, London, 1995; R. S. Suleiman, 'The politics of postmodernism after the Wall (Or, what do we do when the ethnic cleansing starts?)' in H. Bertens and D. Fokkema, eds., *International Postmodernism*, John Benjamin's Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1997; and Wertheimer, op. cit. in note 15.