

Factors Associated With Intermarriage in the Western United States

Bruce Phillips

Intermarriage is probably the most important challenge facing American Jewry today because of its potential impact on the composition of the Jewish population. As the rate of intermarriage increases, two kinds of population changes are potentially possible. First, to the extent that mixed-married Jews assimilate, the absolute size of the Jewish population will decrease. Second, to the extent that mixed-married Jews continue to identify themselves and their children as Jews, the Jewish community's traditional understanding of what constitutes the 'typical Jewish family' will change. The Jewish population of the next century may well contain a significant proportion of non-Jews as family members in Jewish households.

Sociological writing prior to the 1970s, particularly that of Marshall Sklare (1964, 1970), noted increasing intermarriage rates and the potential problems this would present. However, it was not until the National Jewish Population Study findings on intermarriage were published in the *American Jewish Year Book* (Massarik and Chenkin, 1973) that intermarriage emerged as an issue of popular Jewish concern (Silberman, 1985; Waxman, 1982).

Sklare (1970, p. 5) suggests that American Jews have difficulty confronting intermarriage because it presents a fundamental and bitter dilemma. While remaining committed to the values of Jewish continuity, Jews have pressed hard and long for full participation in American society. Intermarriage is the unexpected outcome of that full participation because... "such unions after all represent the logical culmination of the quest for full equality". Singer (1979, p. 48) has similarly commented that: "A non-Jew might well wonder, then, if American Jews are pleased or saddened by the recent Gallup Poll finding that fully 69% of Americans now approve of marriages between Jews and Christians".

Intermarriage has increased along with acceptance of Jews. As early as the 1960s, Stember (1966) noted a long term trend toward acceptance of Jews as marriage partners. It was during this same period that intermarriage began to increase at what is commonly called an 'alarming rate'.

This paper examines five factors associated with intermarriage in the United States: age and generation, migration, gender, remarriage and socioeconomic status. The analysis is based on population studies conducted in three communities in the Western United States (Denver, 1981; Los Angeles, 1979; and Phoenix, 1983), regions where intermarriage is highest. The three population studies were conducted identically using Random Digit Dialing (Phillips, 1984).

The Definition and Measurement of Inter-marriage

Defining Inter-marriage

There are two ways to define inter-marriage and two ways to measure it. The broadest definition of inter-marriage, to quote Gordon's (1964, p. 1) classic formulation, "... is generally applied to those married persons whose religious, racial or ethnic background is or was different from each other's, either prior to or after their marriage". A second way to define religious inter-marriage is by current status. This applies only to religious inter-marriage because religious identification can change while ethnic and racial status cannot.

The distinction between current and original religious status is not always made clear in the use of the term 'inter-marriage' which is typically used to describe both marriages with non-Jews by birth and marriages with non-Jews by current religion (Sherrow, 1971). This double usage of inter-marriage is confusing because a single term describes two very different situations. A person who converts to Judaism is both religiously and sociologically distinct from a person who does not. To avoid this confusion, this paper uses Charles Silberman's set of inter-marriage definitions which distinguishes among inter-marriages, mixed marriages, and conversionary marriages (1985, p. 288). Inter-marriage or out-marriage designates marriage to a non-Jew by birth. The term mixed marriage applies only where the spouse is not currently Jewish. Conversionary marriage is used to identify those out-marriages in which the spouse has converted.

Measuring Inter-marriage

Inter-marriage can be measured in two ways: as a percent of all married individuals or as a percent of all married couples. The couple rate is always higher than the individual rate because two Jews married to each other count as one couple, while two other Jews married to non-Jews count as two couples. The individual rate is better, then, because out-married and in-married Jews are counted equally. The availability of two measurement systems thus causes confusion as to what the 'rate' of inter-marriage means (Besanceney, 1965). Since most people think of inter-marriage as an individual phenomenon, they tend to think of the couple rate as the individual rate and are constantly doubly alarmed by the result. Sherrow (1971, pp. 17-18), for example, has commented that

The frequent dire conclusion about the growing 'danger' of inter-marriage among members of various groups and the derived implication that commitment to group membership is falling, are often greatly exaggerated because the rates referred to are based on couples and not on individuals.

To avoid both confusion and exaggeration, then, the individual rate is considered the preferred method for reporting inter-marriage. Four individual level rates are discussed in this chapter and are defined as follows:

1. In-marriage: The percent of all born Jews married to other born Jews.

2. Conversionary marriage: The percent of all born Jews married to converts.
3. Mixed marriage: Percent of all born Jews married to non-Jews (by current religion).
4. Intermarriage or out-marriage: Percent of all born Jews married to non-Jews by birth (i.e. religion of origin). The rate of out-marriage = the mixed marriage rate + the conversionary marriage rate.

Age and Generation

Age

A dramatic recent increase in the rates of both out-marriage and mixed marriage in the Western United States is evident from an examination of age-cohort rates. Longitudinal data from studies which have been replicated over time are the best source of information about change, but no such data are available from the West. Age cohort analysis can be used as an approximation of longitudinal trends. Younger age cohorts are taken to represent the most recent trends.

Table 1 reports the type of marriage of born Jews controlling for age. The discussion is divided into three sections: out-marriage, mixed marriage and conversion.

Out-marriage

Jews over the age of 40 are predominantly in-married. Between 82% and 92% (Phoenix) and about 90% (Denver and Los Angeles) of Jews were married to a person

TABLE 1. BORN JEWS, BY TYPE OF MARRIAGE AND AGE (PERCENT)

Type of marriage	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59
Los Angeles				
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
In-marriage	63.3	85.5	89.3	91.2
Out-marriage	36.7	14.5	10.6	8.8
Conversionary	(4.2)	(1.6)	(3.3)	(0.5)
Mixed marriage	(32.5)	(12.9)	(7.3)	(8.3)
Denver				
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
In-marriage	34.9	60.3	90.1	88.0
Out-marriage	65.2	39.6	10.0	12.0
Conversionary	(4.7)	(7.3)	(1.7)	(5.3)
Mixed marriage	(60.5)	(32.3)	(8.3)	(6.7)
Phoenix				
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
In-marriage	52.9	71.4	81.5	91.2
Out-marriage	47.2	28.7	18.5	8.8
Conversionary	(7.1)	(12.1)	(5.0)	(1.5)
Mixed marriage	(40.1)	(16.6)	(13.5)	(7.3)

Jewish by birth. Out-marriage is a phenomenon of the young, and thus it increases greatly for persons under 40, with the highest rates found among Jews under the age of 30. Thus, in Denver, 40% of Jews between 30 and 39 are out-married and 65% of Jews under 30 are out-married. In Phoenix 29% of Jews between 30 and 39 and 47% of Jews under 30 are out-married. In Denver and Phoenix the rate of out-marriage among Jews under the age of 30 is 1.5 times the rate among persons between 30 and 39. In Los Angeles the rate of out-marriage more than doubles from 15% of Jews between 30 and 39 to 37% of Jews under the age of 30.

Mixed Marriage

The rate of mixed marriage is a function of both out-marriage and conversion. While out-marriage may be stable, mixed marriage could increase if conversions were decreasing. In the Western United States, the rate of mixed marriage increases with younger age groups faster than does the rate of out-marriage.

As with out-marriage, the most dramatic increase of mixed marriage occurs under age 30. In all three communities the rate of mixed marriage among Jews under the age of 30 is at least double the rate among Jews between 30 and 39. In Denver 32% of Jews between 30 and 39 are mixed-married as compared with 61% of Jews under the age of 30. In Phoenix the mixed marriage rates are 17% for Jews aged 30 to 39 and 40% for those under 30. In Los Angeles, 13% of Jews between 30 and 39 are mixed-married vs. 33% under the age of 30.

Conversionary Marriage

Out-marriages which result in conversion are important because they represent a potential new source of Jewish population growth and because they soften the emotional impact of out-marriage on both the family and the community. We shall call the percentage of Jews married to converts the 'absolute' rate of conversion; it shows the increase or decrease in the proportions of Jews married to converts.

In Denver and Phoenix, for those under age 40, conversion is on the decrease. In Denver the percentage of Jews married to converts declines by a little more than a third from 7% of Jews between 30 and 39 to less than 5% of those under 30. The number of Jews married to converts in Phoenix declines by almost half from 12% of Jews between 30 and 39 to 7% of those under 30.

In Los Angeles, on the other hand, the proportion of Jews married to converts more than doubles from under 2% of Jews between 30 and 39 to just over 4% of Jews under 30. This can be assessed by looking at conversion as the percentage of all non-Jewish born spouses who convert to Judaism. The 'relative' rate of conversion refers specifically to the non-Jewish spouses, as opposed to the 'absolute' rate discussed above which refers to all married Jews. In Los Angeles, the relative rate of conversion is the same (11%) for the spouses of out-married Jews between 18 and 29 and for the spouses of out-married Jews between 30 and 39. Because the rate of out-marriage is higher for Jews under the age of 30 than for Jews between 30 and 39, a steady relative rate of conversion causes the absolute rate of converts to increase. In other words, the proportion of converts in Los Angeles doubles under the age of 30 not because there are more non-Jews converting, but because the rate of out-marriage doubles.

The relative rates of conversion in Denver and Phoenix decline even more sharply below age 30 than do the absolute conversion rates. The relative rates of conversion decrease 61% (from 18% to 7%) in Denver and 64% (from 42% to 15%) in Phoenix. Because the non-Jewish spouses of Jews under age 30 are half as likely to have converted as those of Jews over 30, the absolute rate of conversion decreases despite increasing out-marriage.

The rise in the absolute rate of conversionary marriages under 30 in Los Angeles is offset by the low rate of conversion in that city in comparison with Denver and Phoenix. Thus the relative rate of conversion is stable in Los Angeles where conversion is low, and decreasing in Denver and Phoenix where conversion is more prevalent.

Generational Patterns of Mixed Marriage

Mixed marriage is the result of a reciprocal inclination on the part of Jews and non-Jews to marry each other. This disposition to intermarry should be higher among third and fourth generation Jews because they are the more acculturated.¹ Similarly, non-Jews would be most inclined to marry third and fourth generation Jews because they would have the most in common with them culturally.

Table 2 shows that mixed marriage takes place largely in the third and fourth generations (only mixed marriage is discussed by generation). In Los Angeles the rate of mixed marriage jumps from 6% in the first and second generations to 15% in the third generation and 25% in the fourth (regardless of age). In Phoenix the rate of mixed marriage is less than 10% in the first and second generations, increasing to 17% and 26% in the third and fourth generations respectively. In Denver, the rate of mixed marriage is also below 10% in the first and second generations, but jumps to 27% and 48% in the third and fourth generations respectively.

TABLE 2. BORN JEWS, BY PERCENTAGE OF MIXED MARRIAGE, AGE AND GENERATION (PERCENT)

Generation	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	Total
Los Angeles						
First and second	3.5	7.2	10.0	5.7	4.2	5.9
Third	43.1	16.3	1.5	9.1	5.6	14.5
Fourth	45.5	13.4	18.6	12.5	22.0	24.8
Denver						
First and second	36.8	13.2	12.2	1.3	4.0	7.1
Third	53.7	38.5	6.9	14.3	15.4	27.4
Fourth	73.4	38.2	11.1	0.0	0.0	48.4
Phoenix						
First and second	41.1	4.5	12.9	6.3	6.4	8.2
Third	56.6	18.7	11.1	5.4	7.2	16.9
Fourth	31.7	22.8	21.6	26.0	37.4	26.3

Age and generation are related to each other. Fourth generation Jews tend to be younger than third generation Jews who in turn tend to be younger than second generation Jews. The higher rates of mixed marriage under the age of 30 are more a function of age than of generation. Differences in the rate of mixed marriage are greater among age groups within generation than among generation groups within age cohorts. In Phoenix, for example, the mixed marriage rate is higher among third generation Jews under 30 than among fourth generation Jews of the same age (57% and 32%). In Denver the mixed marriage rate is the same for third and fourth generation Jews aged between 30 and 39 (38%). Further, younger Jews have higher rates of mixed marriage within both the third and fourth generations in all three cities. Thus, much of the increase in mixed marriage in the fourth generation is explained more by their younger age structure than by their generational status.

The increase in mixed marriage under age 30, even when generation is controlled, suggests that mixed marriage is a newly emerging trend. Perhaps this is because of lower opposition or resistance to mixed marriage by Jewish parents increasingly resigned to it or because of a greater social acceptance of mixed marriage among Jews generally.

Intermarriage and Migration

Three Models

The 24% rate of out-marriage estimated by Silberman for American Jewry under the age of 30 or 35 in 1981 is considerably lower than the out-marriage rates found among Jews under 30 in Los Angeles, Phoenix and Denver. While the West differs from America in general, there are also major differences in the out-marriage and mixed marriage rates observed in the three Western communities studied here. Three conceptual models potentially explain the two patterns of difference in the rates of out-marriage and mixed marriage: propinquity, migration, and regional culture.

Propinquity affects the statistical likelihood of two Jews coming into contact with each other. The more Jews the greater the probability of finding another Jew with whom to form a romantic attachment. Propinquity may operate both for Jews who are strongly committed to the norm of endogamy as well as for those not strongly committed. Sklare (1971, p. 183) notes that "unless Jews seek each other out, or are brought together by special arrangements that allow the factor of propinquity to operate, very few marriages would occur between two Jewish individuals." Even when Jews do seek each other out, however, the ability of Jews to find each other is limited by their availability in the pool of potential partners. Thus, propinquity will also limit the ability of Jews committed to finding Jewish partners.

On the basis of propinquity, communities with smaller Jewish populations would be expected to have higher rates of out-marriage than communities with larger Jewish populations, and previous studies have demonstrated this relationship. For example, Sherrow (1971, p. 106) found that Jews in metropolitan areas with populations smaller than 100,000 were almost twice as likely to be mixed-married as Jews living in metropolitan areas of 500,000 and more: 17% vs. 9%. Since Jewish populations are

larger in larger metropolitan areas. Sherrow concluded that these differences demonstrate the effect of propinquity.

Previous studies have also suggested that migration is associated with intermarriage. Sherrow (1971, p. 229), for example, observed from the NORC data that "Catholic and Jewish intermarriers were more inclined to move away from the town in which they were raised than were their endogamous coreligionists". The differences were especially pronounced among the Jews: 39% of the in-married Jews stayed in their home town as compared with only 19% of the mixed-married. The Kansas City Jewish population survey of 1977 found that the out-marriage rate among Jews under 35 who stayed in Kansas City was lower than the out-marriage rate among Jews of the same age who had left.² The migration model hypothesizes that the relationship between migration and mixed marriage is due to the lack of roots among migrating mixed-marriers. The same lack of roots which leads Jews to mix-marry also takes them away from their home communities.

The relationship between behavior and migration has also been discussed by sociologists who seek to explain why migrants tend to be less religiously committed than non-migrants. Is this because migrants have weaker roots (as reflected by their lack of religious commitment) or are they simply adapting to a local regional culture with less emphasis on religious involvement?

Using data from eight NORC General Social Surveys conducted between 1973 and 1982, Stump (1984, pp. 292-301) compared the religious commitment of migrants and natives in various regions of the country. He found that "no migrant group differed significantly from their region of destination on either measure of religious commitment". Using geographic data, Newman and Halvorson (1984) observed that the large scale migrations which took place between 1952 and 1980 have not changed the distribution of denominational affiliation. They, too, concluded that migrants have been adapting to the religious norms of the local regional culture.

Applying this discussion to mixed marriage, Cohen (1979, p. 10) has suggested that regional culture could explain the higher rates of mixed marriage in the West, positing that "The West's subculture may place less emphasis or value upon traditional ascriptive categories such as ethnicity or religion".

In the next sections we will examine the relative power of propinquity, migration, and regional culture in explaining differences between the West and the rest of the United States as well as differences between Denver, Phoenix and Los Angeles.

Testing the Propinquity Model

According to the propinquity model, large Jewish communities should have lower rates of mixed marriage than smaller ones. Because a variety of sampling methodologies have been used in local Jewish community studies, differences in the rate of intermarriage might be explained solely or largely by methodological differences among studies (Phillips, 1986). A comparative discussion of intermarriage rates between the West and the rest of the country should be based on comparable studies. Two Midwestern cities, Milwaukee and Chicago, conducted Jewish population surveys using the same methodology and sampling strategy as the three Western communities, and can be used to examine the effects of both propinquity and regional culture. Los Ange-

les and Chicago each have a large Jewish population in terms of absolute numbers, but Los Angeles (503,000 in 1979) is more than twice as large as Chicago (248,000 in 1981). Similarly, Denver, Phoenix, and Milwaukee are relatively smaller communities, but Denver and Phoenix (45,000 Jews each) are twice as large as Milwaukee (20,000 Jews).

Table 3 shows the rank order of Los Angeles, Denver, Phoenix, Milwaukee, and Chicago by (a) size of Jewish population, (b) couple rate of mixed marriage under 30, (c) couple rate of mixed marriage between 30 and 39.³ If propinquity explains mixed marriage, then the rank order of mixed marriage should be the opposite of the rank order of Jewish population size. In other words, Los Angeles, with the largest Jewish population should have the lowest rate of mixed marriage.

TABLE 3. RANK ORDER OF JEWISH POPULATION SIZE AND MIXED MARRIAGE RATE OF COUPLES, BY AGE

Place	Year	Jewish population	Rank	Age 20-29		Age 30-39	
				Mixed marriage rate	Rank	Mixed marriage rate	Rank
Los Angeles	1979	503,000	1	50	3	20	5
Chicago	1981	248,000	2	28	5	30	2
Denver	1981	45,000	3	60	1	40	1
Phoenix	1983	45,000	3	60	1	24	4
Milwaukee	1983	20,000	5	38	4	29	3

There is no evidence for propinquity between ages 30 and 39. However, there is evidence for propinquity within the region under the age of 30. Denver and Phoenix have higher rates of mixed marriage than does Chicago. Further, all three Western Jewish communities have higher rates of mixed marriage under age 30 than does either Midwestern Jewish community. Thus, over age 30 there is evidence for neither propinquity nor regional culture. Under age 30 there is evidence for both, but evidence for propinquity exists only within the region.

Natives and Migrants in the West

Migration and regional culture are alternative models for explaining higher intermarriage rates among those under 30 in the West. Comparing the intermarriage patterns of natives and migrants to the West differentiates between the relative effects of migration and regional culture. Table 4 compares the intermarriage patterns of 'Western natives' (Jews both in the Pacific and Mountain states) and 'migrants' (Jews born in other regions of the United States).⁴

There is no consistent pattern of difference between Western natives and migrants in the rates of out-marriage, conversionary marriage, or mixed marriage. Western born natives in Los Angeles are slightly more likely than migrants to be both mixed-married and out-married, but they are more likely than migrants to be married to con-

TABLE 4. AMERICAN BORN-JEWS AGED 20-39, BY TYPE OF MARRIAGE AND REGION OF BIRTH (PERCENT)

Type of marriage	Denver		Phoenix		Los Angeles	
	Western born	Migrants	Western born	Migrants	Western born	Migrants
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
In-marriage	57.7	44.4	57.6	67.1	70.4	75.8
Out-marriage	42.3	55.6	42.5	32.9	29.6	24.2
Conversionary	(7.6)	(4.6)	(15.2)	(7.4)	(2.3)	(3.3)
Mixed marriage	(34.7)	(51.0)	(27.3)	(25.5)	(27.3)	(20.9)

verts. As a result, the difference in the rate of mixed marriage between migrants and Western natives is negligible. A completely different pattern exists in Denver where it is the migrants who are the most likely (1.5 times as likely as Western natives) to be mixed-married.

Thus, Western natives and migrants in Los Angeles out-marry and mix-marry at similar rates. Western natives in Phoenix are more likely to out-marry than migrants, but their spouses are more likely to convert so that there are only negligible differences in the rate of mixed marriage. In Denver, it is the migrants who are the most likely to be mixed-married which further contributes to the already high rate of mixed marriage in that community.

These analyses suggest a pattern of self-selection within the West which has not been previously discussed in the literature. Western-born natives in Phoenix are more likely than Western-born natives in Denver and Los Angeles to have spouses who convert. Similarly, migrants to Phoenix are more likely than migrants to Denver and Los Angeles to have spouses who convert. Western-born natives in Denver have a higher rate of mixed marriage than is found among Western-born natives in Los Angeles and Phoenix. Similarly, migrants to Denver have a higher rate of mixed marriage than migrants to Los Angeles and Phoenix.

Self-selection could work in one of three ways. First, the marriage precedes migration and the move is made to the community where the couple best fits in; second, the individual is influenced by the norms of the community after moving there; or third, the individual moves to a community which best fits his/her norms and finds a person with similar values.

Goldstein (1981, p. 162) has suggested that a number of factors can jointly influence the rate of intermarriage, including "the size, location, age and social cohesiveness of the particular community" His remarks are applicable here, as a number of conjoint influences are associated with the rates of out-marriage and mixed marriage in the West:

(a) The size of the community is associated with the rate of mixed marriage, but only within region under age 30.

(b) mixed marriage is higher in any of the three Western communities than in either of the two Midwestern communities.

(c) What Goldstein calls 'social cohesiveness' and what we call 'local culture' seems to be the most important factor explaining the differential rates of mixed marriage.

(d) There are no consistent differences between Western natives and migrants. Rather, the migrants end up in the city where natives have the most similar patterns of intermarriage.

(e) Finally, if the current trends continue, intermarriage will be more of an issue in the West overall, but the patterns specific to each community will vary.

Intermarriage and Gender

Because men in general have greater sexual freedom, Jewish men have had more opportunities to intermarry than Jewish women. Steven M. Cohen (1983) has affirmed that "historically, Jewish men have out-married something like twice as often as Jewish women". Sherrow (1971) found that men were more likely than women to out-marry among all religious groups and that 14% of Jewish men were out-married as compared with 10% of Jewish women. Similarly, 8% of Jewish men were mixed-married as compared with 5% of Jewish women.

As women continue to gain social equality and equal access to the society, they will also feel fewer pressures to act differently from Jewish men as regards dating. Working with national data, Goldstein (1981) as well as Schmelz and DellaPergola (1983) have observed a rise in the intermarriage rates among Jewish women.

This trend is also evident in the West (Table 5) where Jewish women have either

TABLE 5. RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES, BY TYPE OF MARRIAGE, AGE AND SEX (PERCENT)

Type of marriage	18-29		30-39		40-49	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Los Angeles						
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
In-marriage	70.4	60.2	82.8	88.5	90.1	88.7
Out-marriage	29.6	39.9	17.2	11.5	9.0	11.4
Conversionary	(3.4)	(4.6)	(2.7)	(0.7)	(6.1)	(0.9)
Mixed marriage	(26.2)	(35.3)	(14.5)	(10.8)	(2.9)	(10.5)
Denver						
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
In-marriage	39.9	47.3	57.6	71.1	86.6	95.9
Out-marriage	60.1	52.7	42.4	28.9	13.4	4.1
Conversionary	(8.2)	(1.1)	(15.4)	(1.2)	(3.3)	(0.9)
Mixed marriage	(51.9)	(51.6)	(27.0)	(27.7)	(10.1)	(4.1)
Phoenix						
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
In-marriage	41.6	52.3	65.6	80.9	74.4	87.5
Out-marriage	58.4	47.7	34.4	19.1	25.6	12.5
Conversionary	(15.6)	(3.2)	(17.3)	(1.9)	(11.8)	(1.1)
Mixed marriage	(42.8)	(44.5)	(17.1)	(17.2)	(13.8)	(11.4)

caught up to, or are in the process of catching up with Jewish men in both their rate of out-marriage and their rate of mixed marriage. Out-marriage, conversion, and mixed marriage are discussed separately below.

Out-marriage

In Los Angeles Jewish men over the age of 30 are more likely than Jewish women to be out-married. Jewish women under age 30 in Los Angeles have more than caught up with men. They out-marry close to one third more often: 40% of women vs. 30% of men out-marry under the age of 30.

In Denver and Phoenix Jewish women are out-married less often than Jewish men at all ages, but the difference between males and females in the 18–29 year old cohort is smaller than in the older cohorts. Compared with the 40–49 year old cohort the younger women are clearly catching up to their male counterparts. In Denver, Jewish men are out-married 3.3 times as often as Jewish women in the 40–49 age cohort, 1.5 times more often in the 30–39 cohort, and only 1.2 times more often under the age of 30.

Conversion

From the standpoint of Jewish law or halacha, conversion is required only of non-Jewish females because Jewish status of any offspring is determined by the mother. Denver and Phoenix are traditional in this regard because Jewish women are almost never married to converts. In any age cohort in Denver, less than 5% of all out-married women are married to converts as contrasted with rates between 14 and 45% of out-married Jewish men. Similarly, in Phoenix (where conversion rates are higher) no more than 10% of out-married Jewish women are married to converts as compared with rates of 27% to 50% of out-married Jewish men.

In Los Angeles, however, the situation is slightly different. Over the age of 30, men are still far more likely than women to have spouses who are converts (16% and 37% of the out-married men, as compared with 8% or less of the out-married women), but under age 30 out-married men and women are equally likely to have spouses who convert to Judaism.

Mixed Marriage

The rate of mixed marriage is the rate of out-marriage minus the rate of conversion. Although Jewish men are more likely than Jewish women to marry non-Jews by birth, female spouses are also more likely to convert than male spouses which has the effect of reducing differences between men and women in the rate of mixed marriage. In Denver and Phoenix, the rates of mixed marriage end up being very close for men and women (Table 5). Men and women under 40 have identical rates of mixed marriage. In Los Angeles, too, the mixed marriage rates of men and women are close, but

Jewish women under the age of 30 in Los Angeles have a higher rate of mixed marriage and of out-marriage than do Jewish men because, as noted above, they out-marry more often to unconverted males.

Intermarriage and Remarriage

The prevailing wisdom has long been that marriages between Jews and non-Jews are rarely successful (Sherrow, 1971; Herberg, 1960; Gordon, 1964; Berman, 1968). The threat of divorce has been the most widespread and acceptable argument against intermarriage given by Jewish parents caught between an aversion to mixed marriage and an equally strong aversion to sounding undemocratic or even bigoted (Sklare, 1970, p. 53). This point of view is not without substantiation. Schmelz and DellaPergola (1983) report that mixed couples have had higher rates of divorce than homogamous couples.

While intermarriage has traditionally been thought to lead to divorce, the opposite relationship has not been examined; that is, to what extent is intermarriage the result of remarriage? In the West, mixed and conversionary marriages are more likely to be second marriages than are in-marriages (Table 6). In Los Angeles, 90% of in-marriages are first marriages for both as compared with 74% of conversionary marriages and 65% of mixed marriages. In Denver 88% of in-marriages are first marriages for both partners as compared with 63% of conversionary marriages and 65% of mixed marriages. In Phoenix, 98% of in-marriages are first marriages for both partners as compared with 80% of conversionary marriages and 85% of mixed marriages.

TABLE 6. RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES, BY NUMBER OF TIMES MARRIED AND TYPE OF CURRENT MARRIAGE

Number of times married	Type of current marriage		
	In-marriage	Conversionary	Mixed marriage
Los Angeles			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
First for both	90.2	72.9	65.2
Remarriage for one only	6.4	5.2	25.6
Remarriage for both	3.4	21.9	9.2
	9.8	27.1	34.8
Denver			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
First for both	88.0	62.8	65.2
Remarriage for one only	12.0	24.1	21.7
Remarriage for both	0.0	13.1	13.1
	12.0	37.2	34.8
Phoenix			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
First for both	98.1	80.0	84.8
Remarriage for one only	1.9	20.0	12.1
Remarriage for both	0.0	0.0	3.0
	1.9	20.0	15.1

Although mixed marriages are most likely to be second marriages, there is no consistent pattern as to which partner was previously married (Table 7). In Los Angeles, mixed marriages are less likely to be the second marriage for the non-Jewish partner (15%) than for the Jewish partner (21%). In Denver, Jews and non-Jews are equally likely (25%) to be married for the second time. In Phoenix, however, the non-Jewish partner is more likely than the Jewish partner to be married for the second time (26% vs. 6%).

TABLE 7. RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES, AGED 18-39, BY NUMBER OF TIMES MARRIED, RELIGION AND TYPE OF CURRENT MARRIAGE (PERCENT)

Number of times married	Type of marriage				
	Born Jew married to:			Born non-Jew, currently:	
	Born Jew	Non-Jew	Convert	Non-Jew	Convert
Los Angeles					
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
First for both	93.7	78.8	72.4	85.4	70.8
Previously married	6.3	21.2	27.6	14.6	29.2
Denver					
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
First for both	94.5	75.0	88.5	75.2	63.0
Previously married	5.5	25.0	11.5	24.8	37.0
Phoenix					
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
First for both	95.9	94.1	81.8	74.0	72.0
Previously married	4.1	5.9	18.2	26.0	28.0

In conversionary marriages, however, it is the converts to Judaism who are the most likely to be married a second time. Even though the sample sizes for conversionary marriages are small, the patterns are strikingly consistent across the three communities. In Denver the converts are three times more likely than their spouses to be married more than once; in Phoenix they are 1.5 times more likely, and in Los Angeles converts are just slightly more likely than their spouses to be married more than once. Among all the types of marriages, born Jews married to born Jews are the least likely to have remarried.

Jews married to other Jews⁵ twice in a row – both in the previous and current match – and Jews married to non-Jews twice in a row make up the majority of second marriages (Table 8). In Denver, 56% of re-married Jews married either a Jew or a non-Jew twice in a row (17% married Jews both times and 39% married non-Jews both times). In Phoenix, 57% of remarried Jews married a Jew or a non-Jew twice in a row (about 28.5% married Jews both times and the same percentage married non-Jews both

times). Remarrying Jews who do not repeat the pattern of their previous marriage are four times as likely to marry a non-Jew after a Jew than the other way around. In Denver 35% of remarried Jews married a non-Jew after marrying a Jew as compared with only 10% who married a Jew after marriage to a non-Jew. In Phoenix, the corresponding figures were 34 and 9% respectively.

TABLE 8. BORN JEWS AGED 18-39, MARRIED MORE THAN ONCE, BY RELIGION OF PREVIOUS AND CURRENT SPOUSE (PERCENT)

Previous spouse	Current spouse	Denver	Phoenix
Total		100.0	100.0
Jew	Jew	17.3	28.6
Non-Jew	Non-Jew	38.5	28.6
Non-Jew	Jew	9.6	8.8
Jew	Non-Jew	34.6	33.9

The impact of remarriage on the rate of mixed marriage can be seen by comparing the rate of mixed marriage in first marriages⁶ with the rate of mixed marriage in second marriages. In Phoenix the mixed marriage rate nearly doubles from 37% of first marriages to 63% of second marriages. In Denver, it increases from 48% of first marriages to 73% of second marriages. Second marriages are primarily found among Jews in their 30s,⁷ which means that the difference in the rate of mixed first marriage between the 18-29 and 30-39 cohorts is even sharper than reflected in the analysis of current marriages. When the 30-year olds who have remarried were in their first marriages in their 20s, they were less likely to have been mixed-married than in their second marriages. Thus, if the mixed marriage rate of 20-year olds today were to be compared with that of the 30-year olds ten years before, the differences would be even greater than reflected in the age cohort analysis.

Intermarriage and Socioeconomic Status

Ethnic and socioeconomic status tend to be strongly associated with each other. In the case of the Jews, where there is a heavy concentration in the middle class, the downwardly mobile individual tends to be isolated from the group. Earlier demographic studies of communities have shown that intermarriage is associated either with high or low economic status. Berman (1968, p. 107) concludes from this that:

Intermarriage may have high instrumental value for a Jew who is strongly oriented toward either upward or downward mobility. Whoever feels 'out of step' with the Jewish group may seek affiliation through dating and marriage with a more congenial group.

Sherrow (1971, p. 109), too, found that intermarriage was associated with social class. Intermarriage rates were highest in families where the father was a professional or a blue collar worker.

An analysis of socioeconomic status and intermarriage is complicated by sex differences in occupation and education. Males can only be compared with males and females with females because the male is more likely to be the primary wage earner according to whom the status of the couple is usually determined. The following analysis is centered primarily around males because marriages between female born Jews and male converts are rare. Four groups will be examined: in-married males, mixed-married males, conversionary males, and mixed-married females. For the first three categories the analysis is direct; that is, the occupation and education of the male is used to measure the socioeconomic status of the couple. In order to include the mixed-married females in the analysis, the occupation and education of their non-Jewish spouses is used to measure the socioeconomic status of the couple. A comparison among in-married, out-married, and non-Jewish females is also made to check for consistency with the socioeconomic status conferred by the occupation and education of the males.

Education

In-married Jewish males under 40 are more educated than mixed-married Jewish males; and both of these are more educated than non-Jewish males (Table 9). In Los

TABLE 9. MARRIED PERSONS AGED 18-39, BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT, SEX, RELIGION AND TYPE OF MARRIAGE (PERCENT)

Educational attainment	Males			Females		
	Born Jew in-married	Born Jew mixed-married	Non-Jewish	Born Jew in-married	Born Jew mixed-married	Non-Jewish
Los Angeles						
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than HS grad.	1.6	0.0	5.0	1.2	0.0	7.0
HS graduate	8.5	0.0	29.2	21.1	19.3	20.7
Some college	17.6	33.8	37.1	20.9	40.0	28.7
College graduate	72.3	66.2	28.7	56.8	40.7	43.6
Denver						
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than HS grad.	0.0	2.3	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
HS graduate	1.7	0.9	4.4	7.1	1.0	5.3
Some college	13.9	15.9	25.0	41.8	22.5	25.0
College graduate	84.3	80.9	69.2	51.1	76.6	69.5
Phoenix						
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than HS grad.	1.0	1.8	4.0	1.4	3.9	0.0
HS graduate	10.9	5.3	19.9	8.7	7.5	18.0
Some college	9.7	33.6	44.9	28.4	47.1	40.0
College graduate	78.4	59.3	31.2	61.6	41.4	42.0

Angeles. 72% of in-married Jewish males are college graduates as compared with 66% of mixed-married Jewish males and only 28% of non-Jewish male spouses. In Phoenix 78% of in-married Jewish males are college graduates as compared with 59% of mixed-married Jewish males and 31% of non-Jewish spouses.

In Denver the pattern is different. The educational attainment of mixed-married Jewish males is only slightly lower than that of in-married Jewish males (84% vs. 81%). While the non-Jewish male spouses are less likely to have completed college than either group of Jewish males, their educational attainment is closer to that of in-married Jews than is the case in Los Angeles and Phoenix. In both Phoenix and Los Angeles in-married Jews are 2.5 times as likely to be college graduates as non-Jewish male spouses, while in Denver they are only 1.2 times as likely to be college graduates. Moreover, the non-Jewish male spouses in Denver are more than twice as likely to have a college degree than their counterparts in Los Angeles and Phoenix: 69% in Denver vs. 31% in Phoenix and 28% in Los Angeles.

The patterns found among women are similar to, but not as extreme as, those among men. Like their male counterparts, in-married Jewish women in Los Angeles and Phoenix are more likely to be college graduates than mixed-married Jewish women and non-Jewish female spouses. In Denver, however, the opposite is true: in-married Jewish women are less likely to be college graduates than mixed-married Jewish women and non-Jewish female spouses: 77% of mixed-married Jews and 70% of non-Jews vs. 59% of in-married Jews have graduated college.

To sum up, in-married males in Phoenix and Los Angeles are more likely than mixed-married males and much more likely than non-Jewish males to have completed college. The same pattern is true for women, but the differences are not as large. In Denver, the differences in educational attainment between in-married and mixed-married Jews are smaller than in Los Angeles and Phoenix. In-married males are only slightly more likely than their mixed-married counterparts to have completed college, and non-Jewish male spouses do not lag as far behind mixed marriage males as they do in Los Angeles and Phoenix. In fact, the non-Jewish male spouses in Denver are more likely to have completed college than their counterparts in the other two cities. Again unlike Los Angeles and Phoenix, in-married women in Denver are the least likely to have completed college.

Occupation

In order to examine the relationship between occupation and intermarriage, occupations were grouped into seven categories according to census standards: professionals, managers, self-employed retail managers and proprietors, sales, clerical, service, and blue-collar (Table 10).

(a) Professionals include architects, engineers, and scientists, teachers, health diagnosis occupations (i.e. physicians, optometrists, etc.), health assessment (i.e. nurses, pharmacists), elementary and secondary school teachers, college teachers and librarians, social, recreation and religious workers, and writers, artists and entertainers.

(b) Managers include public administrators (mostly employed by public utilities or the government), manufacturing managers (both self-employed and salaried), sala-

ried retail managers, other management categories, and management related occupations (for the most part accountants and other financial officers).

(c) Retail self-employment has traditionally been associated with Jews, and has been made a separate category here by combining two specific census categories: self-employed retail managers and 'supervisors, sales-retail: self-employed,' also identified as 'proprietors'.

(d) Sales includes sales representatives for financial services and commodities, cashiers, and sales clerks.

(e) Clerical ('administrative support') includes bookkeepers, secretaries, typists and data entry operators.

(f) Service workers are made up mostly of police and fire fighters, as well as personal and household service workers.

(g) Skilled, unskilled and semi-skilled occupations are grouped together (blue-collar). For the most part the workers in this category are skilled workers, particularly

TABLE 10. EMPLOYED MARRIED MALES AGED 18-39, BY OCCUPATION AND TYPE OF MARRIAGE (PERCENT)

Occupational category	Born Jew married to:			Male spouse currently	
	Born Jew	Non-Jew	Convert	Non-Jew	Convert
Los Angeles					
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professionals	39.1	7.3	73.7	39.9	28.9
Managers	22.8	22.7	13.2	3.2	0.0
Self-employed retail	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sales	19.1	24.1	0.0	21.2	71.1
Administrative support	3.1	16.3	0.0	2.5	0.0
Service	5.6	3.9	0.0	2.6	0.0
Skilled/unskilled	7.2	25.6	13.2	30.7	0.0
Denver					
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professionals	40.9	47.3	38.1	30.9	34.3
Managers	23.7	9.4	0.9	14.8	0.0
Self-employed retail	14.2	6.9	0.0	8.3	0.0
Sales	15.0	24.3	38.2	19.6	65.7
Administrative support	4.9	6.9	16.1	9.3	0.0
Service	0.0	0.6	0.0	4.4	0.0
Skilled/unskilled	1.3	4.5	6.7	12.7	0.0
Phoenix					
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professionals	36.6	20.0	11.1	26.5	18.8
Managers	32.6	22.7	28.5	22.1	49.4
Self-employed retail	13.6	7.1	18.7	6.1	0.0
Sales	12.1	24.8	27.9	16.9	31.8
Administrative support	1.5	4.7	0.0	3.7	0.0
Service	0.2	6.3	0.0	7.5	0.0
Skilled/unskilled	3.4	14.5	13.8	17.2	0.0

in the building trades (such as carpenters and plumbers) as well as in the factories (such as precision machine operators).

In order to simplify the analysis a single occupational score was created that corresponds to the seven occupational groupings (Table 11). A mean occupational prestige score was computed by assigning a score of 3 to professional occupations managerial, and self-employed business, a score of 2 to administrative support and sales occupations, and a score of 1 to skilled, semi-skilled, and service occupations. The mean occupational prestige score is crude, but easy to interpret: a score of 2.5 or higher indicates that the group is predominantly in managerial and professional occupations and a score below 2.5 indicates a leaning towards sales, clerical, and skilled occupations. The mean occupational prestige scores are compared for in-married, mixed-married and conversionary married Jews and non-Jewish spouses controlling for sex in Table 11.

TABLE 11. OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORES OF RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES, BY RELIGION, TYPE OF MARRIAGE AND SEX

Community	In-married Jew	Mixed-married Jew	Non-Jew
Males			
Los Angeles	2.5	2.0	2.1
Denver	2.8	2.6	2.4
Phoenix	2.8	2.3	2.3
Females			
Los Angeles	2.5	2.4	2.3
Denver	2.4	2.6	2.5
Phoenix	2.4	2.2	2.0

In all three cities the in-married males have higher occupational status than mixed-married males and non-Jewish male spouses. The mean occupational prestige score for in-married males in Los Angeles is 2.5 as against 2.0 for the mixed-married males and non-Jewish male spouses. In Phoenix the occupational status score for in-married males is 2.8 as against 2.3 for the mixed-married males and non-Jewish male spouses. Even though the occupational status score is higher in Phoenix than in Los Angeles, the in-married males in both cities have a mean occupational prestige score that is 0.5 higher than the mean scores of the mixed-married and non-Jewish males. In Denver the pattern is slightly different. In-married males still have the highest occupational status score (2.8), but the mixed-married males are not that far behind (2.6). As in Phoenix and Los Angeles, non-Jewish male spouses still have the lowest mean occupational status score (2.4).

Two traditional patterns are evident in all three cities among in-married males. They have the highest proportion of self-employed businessmen and the lowest proportion in skilled and clerical occupations. In all three cities, in-married males are twice as likely as mixed-married and non-Jewish males to be self-employed businessmen. That non-Jewish males are less likely to be self-employed retailers is not surprising since this has long been an occupational difference between Jews and non-Jews.

The low percentage for mixed-married males, on the other hand, is of interest because it suggests that 'Jewishly normative' marriage and occupational patterns are associated. In all three cities, the percentage of mixed-married and non-Jewish males in skilled and unskilled work is much higher than the percentage of in-married males so employed. In Los Angeles, 25% of mixed-married males and 31% of non-Jewish males are in skilled or unskilled occupations as compared with only 7% of in-married Jewish males. In Phoenix, 15% of mixed-married males and 17% of non-Jewish males are employed in skilled or unskilled work versus only 3% of in-married males. As was found in other contexts, the mixed-married males in Denver resemble the in-married males more than in other communities: 1% of in-married males are skilled or unskilled workers versus 5% of the mixed-married males and fully 13% of the non-Jewish males.

Although the mixed-married males and the non-Jewish males have the same mean occupational prestige score, there are large differences in the actual occupational distributions (Table 10). In Los Angeles, the non-Jewish male spouses are more likely than mixed-married males to be professionals (40% vs. 7%) while the mixed-married males are more likely to be salaried managers (23% vs. 3%). Mixed-married males are also more likely than non-Jewish male spouses to be employed in administrative-support occupations (16% vs. 3%). In Phoenix, the distribution of the mixed-married and non-Jewish males are much closer to each other.

The males of in-married couples in both Los Angeles and Phoenix are employed primarily in managerial, self-employed business, and professional occupations (65% in Los Angeles, 83% in Phoenix), followed by sales (19% in Los Angeles and 12% in Phoenix). Mixed-married couples, on the other hand, are divided between those with comparable and those with lower occupational status than in-married couples (as determined by occupation of male). In Los Angeles, 54% of the mixed-married Jewish males and 64% of the non-Jewish males are employed in one of the four top strata (professional through sales) as compared with 84% of in-married males. In Phoenix 75% of the mixed-married males and 72% of the non-Jewish males were in one of the top strata as compared with 95% of the in-married males.

The pattern in Denver is similar with one important difference. In-married males have the highest score (2.8) and non-Jewish males scored lower (2.4) as would be expected on the basis of Los Angeles and Phoenix, but in Denver mixed-married males fall in between (2.6). This is because mixed-married males in Denver have the highest proportion in professional occupations (47%) and a relatively low percentage in skilled and unskilled work (5%).

Differences in occupational status among females are smaller and the patterns less consistent than is the case among the males. In both Los Angeles and Phoenix, in-married females have the highest mean occupational scores (2.5 in Los Angeles and 2.4 in Phoenix), followed by mixed-married females (2.4 in Los Angeles and 2.2 in Phoenix), and non-Jewish females (2.3 in Los Angeles and 2.0 in Phoenix). The overall range of mean occupational scores among females in Los Angeles is smaller than in Phoenix (2.3 to 2.5 in Los Angeles vs. 2.0 to 2.4 in Phoenix).

In Denver, in-married women have the lowest score (2.4), mixed-married females the highest (2.6), and non-Jewish women are in the middle (2.5). The range is so small (2.4 to 2.6) that the similarities outweigh the differences.

Taking the male and female patterns together, in-married couples in Los Angeles have higher occupational status than mixed-married couples, and mixed-married cou-

ples where the female is Jewish tend to have slightly lower occupational status than those in which the male is Jewish. In Denver, in-married couples still have higher occupational status, but the differences are smaller.

Summary

(a) Mixed marriage is increasing, particularly under age 30, and re-marriage further increases the rate of mixed marriage, especially in the 30–39 cohort. Mixed marriage is less explained by differences between the third and fourth generation than by differences between Jews over and under 30. Taken together, these findings suggest that a sudden increase in the rate of mixed marriage has taken place very recently in the West.

(b) Conversion among non-Jews is not increasing with the rate of out-marriage. In Los Angeles it is stable, and in Denver and Phoenix it is decreasing.

(c) Mixed-married couples have lower occupational and educational attainment than in-married couples.

(d) Mixed marriage is higher in the West, but only under age 30.

(e) There are important communal differences in the various patterns of, and associated with, mixed marriage. There is strong evidence that self-selection among migrants to these three Western communities strengthens the inter-communal differences.

Notes

1. Because third and fourth generation Jews are more acculturated than first and second generation Jews.
2. Information about grown children who had left Kansas City was supplied by their parents. Charles Silberman brought this finding to my attention.
3. The couple rate is used because this is the only one available for Chicago.
4. Foreign born Jews are not included in the analysis because they are so heavily skewed toward in-marriage. Again, the analysis is limited to Jews under the age of 40.
5. The distinction between conversionary and in-marriages has been dropped for the purposes of this discussion.
6. Currently divorced Jews are included in the calculation of first and second mixed marriage rates.
7. First marriages occur after age 25, and thus second marriages take place around or after age 35.

References

- Bergman, E. (1977). "The American Jewish Population Erosion". *Midstream*, Vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 9–19.
- Berman, L. (1968). *Jews and Inter-marriage*. Thomas Yosselof, New York.
- Besanceny, P.H. (1965). "On Reporting Rates of Inter-marriage". *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 70, pp. 717–725.

- Bleich, J.D. (1978). "An Halachic Perspective on Mixed Marriage", in: Zimmerman, S. and Trainin, B. (eds.), *The Threat of Mixed Marriage: A Response: Proceedings of a Conference, December, 1976*. Commission on Synagogue Relations, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, New York.
- Cohen, S.M. (1979). "The Coming Shrinkage of American Jewry: A Review of Recent Research", in: Zimmerman, J. and Trainin, B. (eds.), *Renascence or Oblivion: Proceedings of a Conference on Jewish Population, 1978*. Commission on Synagogue Relations, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, New York.
- Cohen, S.M. (1983). *American Modernity and Jewish Identity*. Tavistock Publications, New York.
- Goldstein, S. (1981). "Jewish Fertility in Contemporary America". in: Ritterband, P. (ed.), *Modern Jewish Fertility*. E.J. Brill, Leiden.
- Gordon, A.I. (1964). *Intermarriage: Interfaith, Interracial, Interethnic*. Beacon Press, Boston.
- Herberg, W. (1960). *Protestant, Catholic, Jew*. Anchor, Garden City.
- Jewish Federation of Kansas City (1977). *The Jewish Population Study of the Greater Kansas City Area*.
- Leiberman, S.S. and Weinfeld, M. (1978). "Demographic Trends and Jewish Survival". *Midstream*, Vol. 24, no. 9. pp. 9–19.
- Massarik, F. (1978). "Rethinking the Intermarriage Crisis". *Moment*, Vol. 3, no. 7. pp. 29–31.
- Massarik, F. and Chenkin, A. (1973). "United States National Jewish Population Study: A First Report". *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 74. pp. 295–296.
- Newman, W.M. and Halvorson, P.L. (1984). "Religion and Regional Culture". *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol. 23, no. 3. pp. 304–314.
- Phillips, B.A. (1984). "Sampling Strategies in Jewish Community Studies". in: Cohen, S.M., Woocher, J.S. and Phillips, B.A. (eds.), *Perspectives in Jewish Population Research*. Westview, Boulder, Colo. pp. 67–79.
- Phillips, B.A. (1986). "DJN and List Samples in the Southwest: Addendum to Lazerwitz". *Contemporary Jewry*, Vol. 7. pp. 103–109.
- Schmelz, U.O. and DellaPergola, S. (1983). "The Demographic Consequences of U.S. Jewish Population Trends". *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 83. pp. 141–186.
- Sherrow, F.S. (1971). *Patterns of Religious Intermarriage in the United States*. Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York.
- Silberman, C. (1985). *A Certain People*. Summit Books, New York.
- Singer, D. (1979). "Living with Intermarriage". *Commentary*, Vol. 68, no. 1. pp. 48–53.
- Sklare, M. (1964). "Intermarriage and the Jewish Future". *Commentary*, Vol. 37, no. 4. pp. 46–52.

- Sklare, M. (1970). "Intermarriage and Jewish Survival". *Commentary* Vol. 49, no. 3. pp. 51–58.
- Sklare, M. (1971). *America's Jews*. Random House, New York.
- Stember, C.H. (1966). *Jews in the Mind of America*. Basic Books, New York.
- Stump, R.W. (1984). "Regional Migration and Religious Commitment in the United States". *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol. 23, no. 3. pp. 292–310.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census (March, 1957). *Tabulations of Data on the Social and Economic Characteristics of Major Religious Groups*. Table 6.
- Waxman, C.I. (1982). "The Family and the American Jewish Community on the Threshold of the 1980's: An Inventory for Research and Planning", in: Sklare, M. (ed.), *Understanding American Jewry*. Transaction Books, New Brunswick. pp. 163–185.