MS-831: Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Foundation Records, 1980–2008.
Series C: Council for Initiatives in Jewish Education (CIJE). 1988–2003.
Subseries 5: Communication, Publications, and Research Papers, 1991–2003.

Box	Folder
44	5

Lipset, Seymour Martin. "Education Findings from the Jewish Population Study", 1991.

3101 Clifton Ave, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220
513.487.3000
AmericanJewishArchives.org

MEMO TO: Shulamith Elster, Seymour Fox, Annette Hochstein, Stephen H. Hoffman, Morton L. Mandel, Henry L. Zucker

FROM: Virginia F. Levi Ginny

SUBJECT: Lipset Analysis of CJF Data

Attached is a preliminary report from Marty Lipset on the results of his analysis of the Jewish education findings gleaned from the CJF Population Study. He asked me to make clear that this is preliminary and is for our information only. He will continue to refine it in the coming weeks. This gives us some sense of what might be covered in a presentation by him at the January 16 annual meeting.

We're to get copies of SF/AH (Fed. exp.), ✓
SE ~~SHH~~ (mail), ✓
SHH ~~(via HLZ)~~, HLZ;
MLM ✓ + 1 for me.
You keep orig. I'll do cover notes (attached)

George Mason University

Seymour Martin Lipset
Hazel Chair in Public Policy
The Institute of Public Policy

(703) 993-2283
Fax: (703) 993-2284
Res: (703) 525-1357

Fairfax, Virginia 22030-4444

DEC 4 1991

George Mason University

The Institute of Public Policy
Krug Hall, Room 205
Fairfax, Virginia 22030-4444

~~(703) 323-2503~~ = = = New number: (703) 993-2280
~~Fax: (703) 323-2504~~ = New FAX: (703) 993-2284

MEMORANDUM

To: Virginia Levi
Mandel Associated Foundations

From: Nancy Craig
Assistant to Dr. Lipset

Date: November 27, 1991

Subject: Jewish Population Study

Please find enclosed the latest version of Dr. Lipset's "Education Findings from the Jewish Population Study." You will note that he has completed the "Education of the Young" section starting on page 31. The rest of the text has only had some minor changes.

This paper has been FAXed to Dr. Seymour Fox as per his request. It has also been mailed to Dr. Shulamith Elster as per her request.

Please distribute to the remaining steering committee members of the CIJE and ensure they note the continuation on page 31.

Thank you for your assistance.

Thanks!

cc: MLM
HL2
SHM
FILE

Education Findings from the Jewish Population Study

(Preliminary Incomplete Report. Please do not cite).

by Seymour Martin Lipset

There are a number of stereotypical observations about Jews which are confirmed by the data of the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS). These include the facts that Jews are more well-to-do by far than the population as a whole, but are more liberal politically. They are also the best educated of any ethno-religious group. They are less likely to marry than others with similar backgrounds; they have a smaller birthrate than other groups in the population; they have a higher divorce rate; and their rate of intermarriage is high and increasing steadily. These behavioral traits mean, immigration apart, the Jewish population in America is likely to steadily decline. At the extreme, there have been predictions by one demographer of near extinction in the not too distant future. The hope suggested by earlier studies focusing on intermarriage that such behavior might actually add to the population, given conversions and Jewish identification of intermarried families, does not seem to be born out by the 1990 survey. Only one-seventh of intermarried Jews have a spouse who has converted. The mates of the rest have remained Gentiles. Since 1985, the majority of marriages involving Jews have been between Jews and non-Jews (52 percent). This compares with an eight percent figure for weddings occurring before 1965, and 25 percent for those which took place between 1965 and 1974. As Kosmin et al note "since 1985, twice as many mixed couples (Born Jew with Gentile spouse) have been created as Jewish couples (Jewish with Jewish spouse)."

Beyond the problem posed for Jewish continuity by low fertility, is the fact that most children with at least one Jewish parent are not being raised as Jews religiously. The Kosmin preliminary report indicates that "Just under half of all children in the surveyed households are currently being raised with Judaism as their religion and another 16 percent qualify as secular Jews."

Education is obviously the principal mechanism to socialize succeeding generations to be Jewish, and to stimulate adult Jews and Gentile spouses to foster the religious and secular interests of the community. To a considerable degree, what the Jewish community of the future will look like occupationally, culturally, and Jewishly, will be a function of education, both non-Jewish and Jewish.

Educational achievement has been one of the great prides of American Jewry. The survey data indicate it is justified. Among those, adults 18 and over, who identify themselves as Jewish in religious terms, only 23 percent do not have any college education, 51 percent are college graduates, while close to one-third, 32 percent, have gone beyond college to some form of post-graduate education. Secular Jews, those who are not religious in any way, are even better educated than Jews by religion. Only 18 percent of them have not attended college while 35 percent have done post-graduate work. It is interesting to note that Jews who have converted out, support other denominations, are less well educated. Fully one-third (33 percent) have not studied beyond high school, while less than one-fifth (19 percent) have had any post-graduate training. The picture is somewhat similar for

persons who report Jewish parentage or Jewish descent, but were raised from birth in another religion. Strikingly, Gentiles living in a household with Jews are very much less educated than the Jewish population. Almost half of them (47 percent) have never been to college, while only 13 percent have done post-graduate studies.

Ironically, Jewish education achievements may be a major source of the long-term trends that are undermining Jewish continuity. As noted, attendance at higher education is well nigh universal among young people. Over three-quarters, 77 percent of those who are 18 to 24 years of age in the Population Survey have been to college. But as is well known, higher education, particularly that sector of it in which Jews tend to congregate, the leading liberal arts colleges and research universities, is the most universalistic institution in the country with respect to attitudes toward white ethnic particularism and religious identification and practice. A basic belief in this world is that students should not "discriminate" with respect to dating and mating, according to religious and ethnic criteria. This norm is strongest among the more politically liberal segment of the population, one which disproportionally includes Jews. It may be hypothesized, nay assumed, therefore, that a major source of the extremely high rate of intermarriage is the almost universal pattern of attendance by Jews at colleges and universities. Education makes for higher income and status, more culture, and greater influence, but it also is associated with intermarriage and ultimately, with disidentification with the Jewish community.

The justified concern for Jewish continuity focuses, therefore, on Jewish education as the major facility available to the community to stem the hemorrhaging out which is taking place. The 1990 Jewish Population Survey provides a large body of information on the subject since it gathered data on the educational background of American Jews as well as the current involvements of their children. It permits an examination of the relationship between different types of Jewish education and subsequent participation in and commitment to the community. The basic picture is clear and is presented in the preliminary report, Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey. Those who describe themselves as religious, whether as born Jews or converts, are overwhelmingly likely to report having had some form of Jewish education. Fully 78 percent of the males and 62 percent of the females do so. The figures, however, drop sharply for those born Jewish who describe themselves as irreligious. Only 28 percent of such men and 20 percent of the women say they have had a Jewish education. Curiously, people born and raised Jewish but who have converted out are somewhat more likely to have had Jewish education, 35 percent for the males and 25 percent for the females.

These findings present us with a classic chicken and egg problem in trying to explain the effects of religious education, i.e., to what extent is the strong linkage between having received some Jewish education and religious identification and community involvement influenced by a family religious background, or can education overcome the lack of commitment of the weakly identified? No definite conclusion is possible in absence of longitudinal data (information gathered over time from the same respondents), particularly

since the decision to educate or not reflects, in most cases, the degree of religiosity in the home. Still, the evidence is congruent with the assumption that education can make a difference. Not surprisingly, the group in the sample with the least educational accomplishments is composed of adults who report Jewish parentage or descent, but were raised from childhood in a religion other than Judaism. Although many still consider themselves Jewish by ethnicity, 90 percent failed to secure any Jewish education.

Turning to Jewish education, we may start with the finding that approximately 60 percent, or 1597, of the 2441 respondents in the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey, had, at some point, been exposed to formal Jewish education.[1] Participation in Jewish education has been measured in three different ways: whether ever enrolled in Jewish education programs, the type received, and the number of years completed. The survey differentiates the types of schooling according to the length of time in attendance, i.e., full time Jewish schools include day schools or *yeshivas*, part-time schools that meet more than once a week, mainly, afternoon schools, and Sunday school or other one day a week Jewish educational programs. Private tutoring is also classified as formal Jewish schooling. No effort was made to evaluate the quality of Jewish educational programs.

An examination of variations in type of schooling yields more comprehensive results than looking simply as to whether people have had any Jewish education or not. First, we may note that the most frequent type is part-time, largely afternoon, school attendance (34

[1] The 60 percent figure is a weighted result, not from the actual data.

percent), followed by Sunday school (18 percent), full-time day schools (7 percent) and private tutoring (5 percent).

This report attempts to understand the determinants and consequences of Jewish education. It would be a reasonable assumption that the more exposure to Jewish learning, the more the recipient would be involved in the Jewish life and community, and to pass the commitment onto his or her children. The sample will reflect, at the base level, two groups: those who have ever received Jewish training and those who have not. The formal Jewish education measures, e.g., types of schooling or years in different educational programs, are dependent variables when analyzing determinants and serve as independent ones when looking for consequences.

To repeat, three-fifths, 60 percent, of Jewish adults, 18 and over, at some time been enrolled in a formal program. Almost all spent some years at it. Only 2.5 percent attended less than a year. Twenty-nine percent had participated between one and five years. But 31 percent took part for longer periods, with 8 percent having been involved in formal Jewish training for 11 years or more. The content they were exposed to, however, may have not be too intensive. More than half, 52 percent, of those that had attended, or 34 percent of the whole sample, took part in part-time programs, followed in magnitude by those who had been to Sunday school, 18 percent. Significantly fewer, 7 percent and 5 percent, had participated in day schools or private tutoring.

Given the much greater emphasis in traditional Judaism on Synagogue observance and religious study by men than by women, it is not surprising, as noted above, that men are more likely than women to have had some Jewish education (75 to 57 percent). Close to two-thirds, 64 percent, of day schoolers and part-timers are male. The picture reverses sharply for Sunday School, the least stringent form of training and somewhat less for private tutoring. Only 39 percent and 48.5 percent respectively of Sunday schoolers and the privately tutored were male. Women clearly are less likely to enroll, and those who take part are most likely to be involved in programs that meet less frequently.

Table I: Form of Jewish Education by Gender (Percent)

	Male	Female	Total
Day School	9	5	7
Part-time/ Afternoon	45	24	34
Sunday School	15	22	18
Private Tutor	5	5	5
Never Attended	26	43	35*

* unweighted result N = 2441

Again, the same conclusions are reached when studying the quantity of education received. Men have more years of Jewish education than women. But the gender difference almost washes out among those with any Jewish education, as far as number of years participated is concerned. This is particularly true for younger adults, those aged 18 to 44 years.

In spite of evidence that assimilation, intermarriage for example, has increased over time, young Jews have not been much less exposed to Jewish education than their elders. The age groups under 40 show little variation. What there is of a relationship considering all age groups is, in fact, curvilinear. Older and younger people have had less exposure to Jewish education than those in the middle. Roughly 62 percent of the 18 to 19 year olds have been involved in some form, a figure which increases gradually to 70 percent for those in the 50 to 59 year old category, but then declines steadily to 60 percent for those that are 80 or over.

Table II: Number of Years of Formal Education by Age or Time Period (Percent)

Years Attended	1971-72 18-19	1960-70 20-29	1950-60 30-39	1940-50 40-49	1930-40 50-59	1920-30 60-69	1910-20 70-79	1900 or earlier 80+	Row Total
< 1 yr	2	2	3	2.5	3	2	3	3	2.5
1-5 yrs	21	25	28	31	32	35	29	21	29
6-10 yrs	21	26	21	24	22	21.5	18	11	22
11-15 yrs	9.5	7	10	7	7	4	4	6.5	7
> 15 yrs	2	1	1	1.5	2	0.4		2	1
Never Attended	38	37	36	31.5	30	32	38	40	35
Column Total	2	17	27	21	11	11	8	2.5	100
Cases	42	410	659	523	278	275	187	62	2441

Number of Missing Observations: 0

The time period when attendance took place appears to have had less effect on the type of schooling received. Across all age or time cohorts, about two-thirds of the respondents report having attended part-time schools. Day schools and private tutoring were least common.

Sunday school attendance is curiously curvilinear, greatest for those who were of school age during the fifties and sixties (e.g., now aged 40-59), but somewhat long for younger cohorts and least for the oldest ones, who partook during the 1930s or earlier. Presumably such schooling was less available then and somewhat disapproved of. The growth in the proportions so involved from 13 percent in the 1920s or earlier to 22 percent during the 1940s and 1950s may reflect assimilatory processes at work.

All age cohorts seem similar in the duration of their enrollment. Roughly a fifth of each decennial group had been schooled between six and ten years. The additional education measures help to confirm that the timing of the respondent's birth has relatively little effect on Jewish educational attainment, although the proportion who went to day school increases slightly over time, from five percent for the 70 plus to six percent for the 40-69 group, rising to eight for those under 39.

The linkage of Jewish to secular education also tends to be curvilinear, with the lowest level of Jewish attendance among those who have not completed high school. Less than 40 percent of them have had any Jewish education. Conversely, three-quarters of all college graduates with a bachelor's degree have had some Jewish training as have 80 percent of those who have some graduate education. The proportion, however, falls off again for those with more than a year of graduate education, down to 73 percent. Not surprisingly, the secular education related differences are similar when attained degrees are considered. Four-fifths of those with graduate degrees have had some Jewish education as compared to

slightly over 50 for those whose only diploma was from high school. Curiously, however, those with the least secular education (less than grade 12) report the highest percentage of day school attenders (13). But there is no relationship between the two forms of education for the rest of the respondents, high school graduates and above. The proportions going to day school are roughly the same for all groups from those with a high school diploma to persons with post-graduated training. Attendance at afternoon classes, however, increases steadily with secular education, moving up from 10 percent among high school dropouts to 22 percent among those with diplomas to 32 percent among those with some college education, 39 percent among those with a bachelor's degree, and 45 percent for those who went on to post-graduate work. Sunday school peaks among college graduates, but drops off among those who go on to graduate school. (This may reflect a difference between men and women which has to be checked out).

How does assimilation to American society affect Jewish education? One approach to dealing with this issue is length of family residence in America, whether respondents or their parents or grandparents were born in the United States. Every comparison indicates that native birth is inversely associated with exposure to Jewish education, but I hasten to add the differences between first and second generation status seem slight. The native born are a bit less likely to have had some Jewish education (63.5 percent) as compared to the foreign-born (66 percent). Just over two-thirds, 68 percent, of those with mothers born abroad, and just under two-thirds, 65 percent, of those whose mothers are native to America have some Jewish training. Paternal background appears somewhat more differentiating than maternal.

Seventy percent of those whose fathers immigrated to American have been exposed to Jewish education, as compared to 63.5 percent of those born in the U.S.

The relationship to national origin is greater among third or more generation Jews. Slightly over half of the respondents report no grandparents born in the United States. They are the most likely (74 percent) to have had a Jewish education. Those with only one native American grandparent, seven percent of the sample, are second highest at 69 percent. The fifth of the sample with two or three native-born grandfathers are next in line at 60 percent. And bringing up the rear are those with four born in this country (15.5 percent) who report the lowest rate of Jewish education, 46 percent. These findings, of course, suggest that assimilation processes are operative.

The interplay between generational background and type of training reinforce the assumption that Americanization works against Jewish education. The foreign born show the most propensity to have attended day school, a result which may also reflect the greater availability of such schooling in the old country. Assimilation processes appear to operate with respect to parental national origins. Those with immigrant parents are much more likely to have gone to day school (17 percent) than those with American born ones (four percent). The latter show much greater propensity to go to afternoon part-time school, Sunday school or even to have a private tutor. The scions of the foreign-born also were exposed to Jewish education for more years. The American born seemingly are more assimilated and/or less Orthodox. These conclusions are reinforced when we relate patterns

of school attendance to three generations, that is grand parents. Those with no grand parents born in the United States are the most likely to have attended day school. They also are more likely to have gone to part-time afternoon than to Sunday school, and are the least likely to report a private tutor, or to have no Jewish education, than those with three generation native American backgrounds.

Coming from an intermarried family or not, of course, is a more decisive variable. The likelihood of having had a Jewish education is greatest when both parents are Jewish, true for roughly two-thirds of the respondents. Four-fifths of them had gone to Jewish schools, compared to 29 percent of those of religiously mixed families. Although relatively few respondents had attended day schools, 81 percent of respondents who did were from fully Jewish families, while only 36 percent of those without exposure to any Jewish training came from such backgrounds. Two-fifths of respondents with two Jewish parents continued their studies for six or more years, compared to only one-fifth of the children of intermarried families.

For the intermarried, a Jewish mother appears somewhat more important for educational continuity than the father being Jewish. This finding may reflect the fact that Judaism is a matrilineal religion. But still, only 32 percent of the former were Jewishly educated, contrasted to 26 when the Jewish parent was male.

Table III: Intermarriage Effects on Jewish Education (Percent)			
Years Attended	Both Parents Jewish	Mother Jewish	Father Jewish
Never Attended	18.5	68	74
< 1 Yr	2	5	5
1-5 Yrs	36	13	14
6-10 Yrs	28.5	9	2.5
11-15 Yrs	9	4	5
15+ Yrs	2	--	--
Total	66	10	10
N	529	78	81

Denomination of family of origin is obviously important in affecting propensity for Jewish education, through less than might be anticipated. Those from Orthodox families show by far the highest commitment. Only 18 percent of them did not partake in any form of Jewish training. Over one-fifth attended day school, while 45 percent went to part-time afternoon classes. The same proportion, 45 percent, spent six or more years in a Hebrew based curriculum. Surprisingly, a larger proportion, 24 percent, of those from Conservative families, were never exposed to formal Jewish teaching than among those of Reform background (19 percent). Conservative offspring, however, were much more likely than scions of Reforms to have attended day school (17 percent) or afternoon classes (50 percent). The figures for the liberal group are 2.5 and 34 percent. Those from Reform families spent more years absorbing Jewish learning than the Conservatives. Over two-fifths, 42 percent of the former and 36 percent of the latter continued their education for six years or more. Those of mixed Jewish denominational background (two groups) were more likely to stay away from Jewish schooling, one-third never attended while a large majority of the marginal

ethnic secular background remained outside Jewish education. Again, we see the dysfunctional effects of intermarriage on Jewish continuity. Only two percent of the offspring of mixed marriage went beyond five years of Jewish schooling, which according to this measure, three quarters had no exposure.

Table IV: Denomination Raised and Years in Jewish Education (Percent)

Years Attended	Orthodox	Conservative	Reform	Mixed Jewish	Ethnic Secular	Jewish Other	Other Non-Jewish
< 1 Yr	2	1	13	4	4	5	6
1-5 Yrs	28	36	35	32	23	18	10
6-10 Yrs	30	27.5	30	22	4	2	2
11-15 Yrs	12	8	10.5	6	4	--	--
15+ Yrs	3	1	.5	--	--	--	1
Never Attended	18	24	19	32	65	75	80

If one compares denomination raised with current affiliation similar relationships emerge. Over 40 percent of today's Orthodox report having gone to a full-time day school as compared to less than 10 percent of the Conservatives, and only three percent of the Reform. Conservatives lead Reform in proportion who have gone to afternoon school, 48 percent to 36 percent. Conversely, however, those now affiliated with Reform are more likely to have been educated at Sunday school (31.5 percent) than Conservatives (13 percent) or Orthodox (21 percent). Those who have remained Orthodox are strikingly more likely to have had day school education than those who left, suggesting that latter's families were in effect much less Orthodox than the former's. Hence, the relationships to religious

denominations are clear, day school for the Orthodox, afternoon school for the Conservatives, Sunday school for the Reform.

The section of the country in which respondents were born has a clear relationship to religious teaching. Over half, 51 percent, of those from the western states and 50 percent of Southerners had never partaken of any form of formal Jewish learning, while 67 percent of Northeasterners and 65 percent of Midwesterners had. Those born in the Northeast, the oldest region of American Jewish settlement, also show the highest propensity for day and afternoon school. These results again are congruent with our impressions of the correlates of assimilation, most in the West, least in the Northeast. The foreign-born, it should be noted, were the most likely by far to have attended day school (28 percent) and the least (9 percent) to have been to Sunday School. And 37 percent of them had six or more years of formal education, more than the 32 percent among the native born.

Considering the different variables -- gender; denominational background; parental, religious, and communal origins; community of residence; and context of secular education -- a clear picture emerges of what sustains Jewish educational enrollment. The most likely candidate to have received formal Jewish education has the following profile: a male, having foreign born parents and grandparents, a born Jew of practicing non-intermarried parents who raised him in one of the three major denominations, preferably the Orthodox, and a secular educational achiever who lives in the Northeast. The more the indications of

Americanization the less chances of being trained for continuity. None of these is surprising, except possibly secular educational accomplishments.

The Consequences of Formal Jewish Education

In the previous section, measures of Jewish education, whether ever involved or not, type of school, number of years studied, serve as dependent variables, behavior to be related to or explained by independent factors, gender, generations in America, denomination of family, etc. Here we want to consider the educational items as the independent variables, to see the effect of education on various attitudes and activity. Looking at consequences, compared to determinants, permits the use of a greater range of variables. The following areas: philanthropy (especially Jewish), involvement in Jewish organizations, synagogue attendance, intermarriage, attachment to Israel, attitudes regarding Jewishness, children's Jewish education, adult Jewish learning, and Jewish identity can be studied as consequences of Jewish education.

Perhaps the best single indicator of commitment to the community is the question "How important is being a Jew for you?" Only 23 percent of those who had never been exposed to any form of Jewish education replied "very important." The same answer was given by 72 percent of those who went to day school, 56 percent of the privately tutored, 52 percent of the former students at part-time/afternoon classes, and 37 percent of respondents whose training was limited to Sunday school. And there is a strong relationship between

length of studies and responding "very important," from 46 percent for 5 years or less to 73 percent for more than 15 years.

Historically, Jewish life has centered around the synagogue. This, of course, has been increasingly less true in America. As of 1990, literally three quarters, 76 percent, of Jewish adults report that they have never belonged to one. Only seven percent attend weekly services, another 12 percent go a few times a month, 23 percent never partake, while 44.5 percent go from once to a few times a year, presumably on the High Holidays. Synagogue behavior, of course, correlates with religious education. The more involvement when young, the more participation as an adult.

Table V: Years of Education and Involvement in the Synagogue (Percent)

Years Educated	Member	Attended Once a Month or More
< 6 Yrs	31	18
6-10 Yrs	32.5	29
11+ Yrs	44	40
Never Attended	12	8
Total	24	19
N	398	461

Curiously or not, although the overwhelming majority of American Jews do not belong to or attend synagogue, almost half of them, 46 percent, report that they fast on Yom Kippur. Willingness to do so correlates strongly with type and length of religious training.

Most day and afternoon schoolers, and the privately tutored, 71, 60, and 67 percent respectively abstain from food. Less than half of those who attended Sunday school, 45 percent do so, while the great majority of those who never had any Jewish education eat. As expected, abstaining from food on Yom Kippur correlates strongly with amount of education from 42 percent for those who attended for one year or less to 76 percent for the more than 15 years group.

Looking at propensity to continue Jewish education into adulthood indicates that it is clearly tied to previous attendance in education programs as well as the type of former schooling. Even though only 14 percent of the respondents attend such programs, 80 percent who did so have had formal Jewish education. Almost all, 92 percent of those who did not have at least some Jewish educational experience are not involved in an adult program. Conversely, of the small group who had spent 15 or more years religious study, over half, 52 percent are continuing their education as adults, a figure which drops to 27 percent for those who were involved in Jewish education for 11-15 years, and to 12 percent for those with five years or less. Type of education, of course, also differentiates. If a respondent had attended day school in his/her youth, it is more likely for him/her to be involved in adult Jewish educational programs than for those involved in other forms of schooling. Up to 30 percent of former day schoolers, as compared to 15 and 13 percent of former part-timers and Sunday schoolers respectively, took part in Jewish educational programs in the year before they were interviewed.

The same pattern, though less strikingly, operates with respect to synagogue attendance, highest for those with the longest participation in religious learning, over half, 56 percent of those with 15 or more years behind them attend weekly, a proportion which drops off to 21 percent for the 11-15 years group, 6 percent for those with one to five years exposure, and 2.5 percent for persons who have no Jewish education in their background.

To further demonstrate the relationship, a scale was constructed of four identity items used in many studies of Jewish commitment. These are: candles at Hanukkah, Candle ceremonies on Friday nights, attendance at Passover seders, and using Kosher meats. The scale ranges from very high, observing all four rituals most of the time to very low, never observing any. Over two-fifths, 41 percent, of those who score in the very high category are former day school students. Conversely, only 2.5 percent in the very low group have the same background. Over half, 53 percent, of this group of extreme non-identifiers lack any Jewish education. Fully four-fifths of them fall in the two low identity categories. Those whose Jewish training is limited to Sunday school are the least likely of the religiously educated to be in the two high identity categories. Only seven percent do so, as compared to 40 percent of those who had been to day school.

Table VI: Type of Schooling and Ritual Observance (Scale) (Percent)								
		Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High	Row Total	Row Number
Day School	Row	10	29	21	11	29	7	171
	Column	2.5	5	7	13	41		
Part-time	Row	20	43	24	8	4	34	835
	Column	25	36	40	17	30		
Sunday School	Row	23	47	23	4	3	18	450
	Column	15	21	20.5	3	11		
Private tutor	Row	16	40	28	10	6	5	132
	Column	3	5	7	9	6.5		
Never Attended	Row	42	38	15	3	1.5	35	844
	Column	53	32	25	19	11		
Column Total		27	41	21	6	5	100	2441
Column Number		667	1000	503	148	123		

The results for the actual items in the scale is given in Table VI below. As can be seen, the longer one attends Jewish schooling, the more likely he or she is to follow each observance.

Table VII: Years of Jewish Education and Ritual Observance (Percent)								
Years Attended	Hanukkah Candles		Attend Seders		Friday Candles		Kosher Meat	
	Never	Most of the time	Never	Most of the time	Never	Most of the time	Never	Most of the time
Never	57	31	49	33	78	7	63	10
< 1 yr	37	48	30	43	60	18	55	13
1-5 Yrs	21	63	16	63	65	12	60	16
6-10 Yrs	14	72	9	78	58	21	52	18
11-15 Yrs	11	80	8	84	45	33	53	27
15+ Yrs	8	88	8	84	16	60	28	64

The decline of involvement in the Jewish religious community is paralleled by a fall off in intracommunal social relationships if the popular impression of how things were in the old country or areas of first generation immigrant settlement is accurate. Only one-third, 34 percent, report all or most of their closest friends are Jewish. A quarter, 25 percent, say none or few are, while two-fifths, 40 percent, respond "some." And as with the ritual indicators of Jewish commitment, informal ties are linked to religious training.

Table VIII: Education and Jewishness of Closest Friends (Percent)

Years Attended	None or Few	Most or All Jewish
< 1 Year	34	21
1-5 Years	27	32
6-10 Years	19.5	42
11-15 Years	18	49
15+ Years	12	72
Total	24.5	34

Education, of course, correlates with the Jewishness of the individual respondents. That is, whether they identify their religion as Jewish, describe themselves as ethnic secular Jews, or have taken on a new religious identity, including none, the more years they spent in Jewish learning, the more likely they are to describe themselves as religiously Jewish, and the less disposed they are to report they are secular or ethnic Jews, or that they are no longer Jewish.

Table IX: Education and Jewish Identity (Percent)				
School Attendance	Religion Jewish	Secular Ethnic Jew	Was Jewish	Total
Never	40	46	11	100
< 1 Year	43	27	10	100
1-5 Years	77	15	2	100
6-10 Years	90	8	1.5	100
11-15 Years	92	5	3	100
15+ Years	92	8	0	100

Nathan Glazer has noted that Israel has become the religion of the Jews, that is, it is the major source of Jewish identity or commitment. The population study included three measures of commitment to the Jewish state, the responses to the question: "How emotionally attached are you to Israel?" "How many times have you been to Israel?" and "Do you often talk about Israel to friends and relatives?" The findings challenge the often voiced assumption that Jews, regardless of their background, are deeply committed to the Jewish state.

Surprisingly, the responses to the first question do not confirm the impressions that most American Jews are strongly dedicated to the Jewish state. Only one-tenth said they are "extremely attached to Israel," another 19 percent answered "very attached." The most common response given by over two-fifths, 44 percent, was "somewhat," while over one quarter, 26 percent, replied they were "not attached." At first glance, the picture looks somewhat more positive with respect to talking about Israel with friends and relatives. Two-thirds, 68 percent, said they do so. But when the interviewer probed further inquiring, "How often would that be?" for those who reported talking, giving the choices of often,

sometimes, rarely, not at all, the interest seems less than implied by the affirmative answers. Only one-sixth, 17 percent, replied "often." Forty-three percent said "never" or "rarely," while two-fifths answered "sometimes."

Similar distributions of reactions to Israel are reflected with respect to visits to the Jewish state. Only one out of four adult Jewish Americans report ever travelling to the Jewish state. The proportion who have done so three or more times is a minuscule three percent.

These three measures of commitment to or interest in Israel clearly correlate with various indicators of Jewishness, such as type of religious involvement and adherence to Jewish ritual. Secular and intermarried Jews are less close to Israel. And as might be expected, such behavior may be related back to educational background. A good majority, 60 percent, of those who attended day school report themselves extremely (34.5 percent) or very (25.5 percent) attached to Israel. The small group who had private tutoring are a bad second in indicating being very or extremely attached, while the part-timers are third and the Sunday schoolers fourth. Almost half of those without any Jewish education, 47 percent, said they felt no attachment. Only 15 percent of them indicated a high degree of attachment.

Table X: Type of Schooling by Attachment to Israel (Percent)						
	Not Attached	Somewhat Attached	Very Attached	Extremely Attached	Total	N
Day School	13	27	25.5	34.5	8	55
Part-time	13	50	23	13	35	239
Sunday School	21.5	50	22	5	20	135
Private Tutor	12	45.5	30	9	5	33
Never Attended	47	37	10	5	32	219
Total	26	44	19	10	100	686
N	177	300	132	70		

Attachment may also be both gauged by behavior, how often Jews visit Israel, talk about the Jewish state, and contribute to the United Jewish Appeal, most of whose money winds up in Israel. As may be seen in Table XI below, the more years of education, the more likely a Jew will go.

Table XI: Years of Jewish Education and Visits to Israel (Percent)		
Years Attended	Visited Once	Visited Three or More Times
Never Attended	13	2
< 1 Year	22	2
1-5 Years	25	4
6-10 Years	35	8
11-15 Years	50	10
15+ Years	76	30

And not surprisingly, type of Jewish school attended is associated with propensity to engage in discussions about the Jewish state.

Table XII: Propensity to Talk About Israel and Type of Schooling (Percent)		
	Rarely or Never	Often
Day School	16	42
Part-time	38	20
Sunday School	34	13
Private Tutor	24	24
Never Attended	63	10
Total	43	17

Looking at sources of Jewish communal financial support and activity, Jewish education clearly matters. Approximately eighty percent of the respondents in households that contribute to Jewish charities had received formal Jewish schooling. If one, furthermore, examines the pool of former Jewish school pupils, it appears that close to 60 percent are in households that donate.

The recurrent pattern reported here occurs with respect to contributors to the UJA/Federation, as well as Jewish charities generally. The more education Jews were exposed to as young people the greater their propensity to give.

Table XIII: Household Contribution to Jewish Charities and UJA Federation		
	Jewish Charities	UJA
Never	29	16
< 1 Year	45	32
1-5 Years	56	35
6-10 Years	62	45
11-15 Years	66	41
15+ Years	88	48
All	49	31

N = 2441

And in a similar vein willingness to belong to and volunteer services to Jewish organizations correlates strongly with educational history. The more education they received, the more active Jews are in the community. The range reporting volunteering descends regularly from 52 percent for those with more than 15 years of study down to 17 percent for the less than five years group to 8.5 for those totally unschooled in Jewish learning. Similarly the more intensely educated, the more likely people are to subscribe to Jewish periodicals. The differences run from 10 percent for the uneducated to 24 percent for those with five years or less schooling, to a majority, 52 percent, for those with 15 years or more.

To sum up, the longer Jews were involved in Jewish education, the greater the commitment to the community, to some form of the religion and to Israel. The relations between type of school attended, attitudes, and behavior basically reinforces this conclusion. For all items presented above, those who went to day school were much more likely to give the prototypical Jewish response than respondents who attended part-time afternoon school.

The latter in turn exhibited a higher degree of Jewish commitment than those whose education was limited to Sunday school. Having been privately tutored, however, produced mixed or inconsistent responses. On some items, e.g., visiting Israel, they were the least likely of the four educational groups to do so. On the other hand, with respect to Jewish ritual observance, e.g., lighting Hanukkah candles, buying Kosher meat, this small group (5 percent of the sample) were more observant than those who had been to Sunday school or even on occasion part-time school. The inconsistency probably reflects the fact that personal tutoring may involved either an intense learning experience with a scholar or an effort to quick feed a young person for a Bar Mitzvah ceremony.

Looking at the Jewish experience in America generally and the data in the 1990 Population Survey points up the softening of Jewishness. As noted at the start of this paper, the combination of assimilating processes and a low birthrate have reduced the proportion of Jews in the national population significantly, and the stringency of the commitment to Jewishness. Among the 2,441 respondents, 401 report the denomination which they were raised as Orthodox, but only 111 identify their current affiliation the same way. Conservatives have declined slightly from 746 to 720, while Reform gained from 561 to 797. The number who report their family origin or themselves as irreligious, secular, or do not know, increased from 141 to 218, while the "just Jewish" category grew from 77 to 113. The rate of intermarriage has mounted in spectacular fashion. As noted a majority of current marriages involving a Jew are with a non-Jew.

Intermarriage, of course, is strongly associated with Jewish educational background. Three quarters of those who attended a day school are married to born Jews, a figure which falls off to 65 percent for persons educated in part-time school, 59.5 percent for Sunday schoolers and 57 percent for private tutorees. The majority, 37 percent, of interviewees who have no Jewish training married non-Jews. The full picture is in Table XIV below:

Table XIV: Type of Schooling and Intermarriage (Percent)

	Spouse (First Marriage if More Than One)					
School Type	Born Jewish	Converted	Catholic	Protestant	Other	None
Day School	75	3	6	3	3	9
Part-time	65	7.5	9	11	4	4
Sunday School	59.5	4	11.5	15	5	3
Private Tutor	57	2	13	19	6	--
Never Attended	37	2.5	20	21	9.5	7

The growth in the intermarriage rate reflects current attitudes dominant among adult Jews. The Population Survey inquired: "Hypothetically, if your child were considering marrying a non-Jewish person, would you: strongly support, support, accept or be neutral, oppose, or strongly oppose the marriage?" Only 16 percent would oppose, 6 percent strongly. One-third would support the child doing so, 47 percent would accept or be neutral. Depth of Jewish education acts as a barrier, but not strikingly so, except for those with more than 15 years of schooling, presumably largely dedicated Orthodox. For the rest, more school years reduces the willingness to accept or support intermarriage but still only minorities oppose, 31 percent in the 11-15 year group, 22.5 percent among the 6-10 years one, 14 percent for the 5 years less, and only 8 percent among those without any formal

Jewish education. The decline in concern for intermarriage is reflected in reports on the ethno-religious character of the neighborhoods in which most Jews live and their feelings about preferences in this area. Earlier I noted that the well nigh universal attendance of Jewish youth in colleges and universities strongly facilitates intermarriage. But whether to go or not is not viewed as a choice for Jewish parents. The character of the neighborhood in which they live, Jewish or not, maybe. And proximity to Jewish or Gentile neighbors should affect the probabilities for marrying in or out.

The majority of respondents report living in areas which are not Jewish, 36 percent, or little Jewish, 26 percent. Only eight percent reside in very Jewish districts. Presumably, many Jews do not have much of a choice, if their communities do not have distinctively Jewish neighborhoods. But the Population Survey inquired as to how important the Jewish character of the neighborhood is, and a majority, 54 percent, replied that it is not important, 30 percent, or not very important, 24 percent. Only 14 percent believe it is very important to reside in a predominantly Jewish district. Not surprisingly, such concerns strongly relate to extent and type of education much like the other behavioral and attitudinal items presented earlier. The longer and more intense the Jewish educational experience, the more people are interested in living among Jews, for among other reasons, facilitating dating and mating of their children with other Jews. But as we have seen this is not a major concern of most American Jews. These statistics suggests that the walls have been permanently breached, that even education will not maintain a birthright community that cannot successfully reach out to non-Jewish spouses.

A major exception to the generalization that the American experience consistently reduces Jewish commitment is the finding of a curvilinear relationship on a few items; particularly that the Jews who were of Bar Mitzvah age between the mid to late 1930s and the mid to late 1950s were more likely to have been involved in Jewish education than those younger or older than them. It is impossible to account for this pattern using the available data, but an interpretation may be suggested. Those generations who came to confirmation age during the years that included the coming to power of the Nazis, increased anti-Semitism in the United States, the Holocaust and the creation of the state of Israel were exposed to pressure to affirm their Judaism. These events had a positive effect on Jewish identity, on activating latent loyalties. And logically, they should have led more parents to send their children to Jewish schools, albeit disproportionately as it turns out to the weakest and least effective form, Sunday school. And it may be hypothesized further that as those events and experiences recede into history, the assimilatory forces regained their forward, or perhaps more accurately, retrogressive strength.

The behavior of adult Jews is, as we have seen, strongly correlated with education. The longer and more intense the exposure has been the more likely people are to identify as Jews, to practice their religion, to support Israel, and to be active in the community. It is impossible, however, to conclude from this analysis that a Jewish learning experience is the most important causal factor in this process. Obviously, the religious education a young person receives reflects his or her family orientation and the community within which he lives. Such backgrounds may influence him more than what goes on in the classroom. But

these factors are interactive, mutually supportive or negating. Clearly, the better, whatever this means, and more intense the training, the more likely young Jews are to continue in the faith and community.

The Education of the Young

The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey includes 1489 children under 18 in 825 households. A number of these, 129, are not children or adopted children of the respondents, and are excluded from the subsequent analysis. The analysis of the children is based, therefore, on 1360 living in 753 households. This sample comprises both school-aged ones (ages 6-17) and younger offspring (ages 0-5). The question dealing with education for those under 18 differs from those for adults, reported in the previous sections, in that the former inquired whether the children had received formal Jewish education in the past year, while adults were asked whether they had ever received some. Parents who did not report offspring enrollment, were then queried as to whether they expected to register their children in the future. As Table XV below indicates roughly one-fifth were in school, while another fifth, largely the parents of those under six, indicated they anticipated doing so. Close to

half the youth in Jewish households were not enrolled and were not expecting to be while the future status of the remaining tenth was uncertain.

Table XV: Children's Enrollment in Formal Jewish Education in the Past Year by Number of Households and Number of Children

Enrollment Status	Number of Households	Number of Children
Enrolled in past year	155 (21)	299 (22)
Not enrolled in past year, yet expect to enroll in future	143 (19)	283 (21)
Not enrolled in past year, and will not enroll in future	370 (49)	631 (46)
Do not know	85 (11)	147 (11)
Column Total	N=753	N=1360

Note: The sample selected households where children are offspring or have been adopted by the respondents. Column percentages are in parentheses.

Surprisingly, age of the children did not markedly differentiate attendance in the past year. Given the emphasis on being confirmed at age 13, the natural expectation is that enrollment peaks at age 12. It does in fact do so. Almost half, 47 percent, are receiving some sort of Jewish education, 12 percent more than among the 11 year old group and eight percent higher than the 13 year old cohort. But overall, the variations are not striking. They do not increase steadily among older cohorts. As expected, however, they do go down for those 14 and older.

At the other end of the age spectrum only two-fifths, 39 percent, of parents with children under 6 years of age said they expect to enroll their children in Jewish education.

Almost as many, 37 percent, said no, they would not send the children to Jewish schools, while the rest were uncertain.

Table XVIII: Parents' Intentions for Formal Jewish Education Enrollment Intentions for Children under 6 Years of Age (N=520) (Percent)				
Children's Ages	Expect to Enroll	Will Not Enroll	Do Not Know	Row Total
0 yrs	51	33	16	87
1 yrs	48	37	16	82
2 yrs	45	42	13	86
3 yrs	39	33	28	85
4 yrs	36	37	28	90
5 yrs	22	42	36	90
Column Total	207	194	119	N=520

Note: The percent total may be off due to rounding error. Again, this table includes children and adopted children of the respondents.

What is perhaps most striking is that at every age a majority are of young people not in households samples obtaining any form of Jewish training. And among those passed the Bar/Bat Mitzvah age, three quarters or more are outside the system.

Table XVI: Children's Ages by Formal Jewish Education Enrollment in the Past Year (N=840) (Percent)					
Children's Ages	Attended In Past Year	Expect to Enroll, Yet Did Not Attend	Did Not and Will Not Attend	Do Not Know	Row Total
6 yrs	36	22.5	36	6	89
7 yrs	41	4	40	5	95
8 yrs	39	10	46	5	80
9 yrs	41	14	40	7	78
10 yrs	41	7	49	3	73
11 yrs	35	5	54.5	5	77
12 yrs	47	5	45	3	64
13 yrs	39	5	55	1	75
14 yrs	29	4	65.5	2	55
15 yrs	23	5	72	0	61
16 yrs	16	4	80	0	51
17 yrs	26	2	71	0	42
Column Total	299	76	437	28	N=840

Note: The percent total may be off due to rounding error. Again, this table includes children and adopted children of the respondents.

The major factors associated with children's actual or planned attendance are as expected from our knowledge of the correlates of parental education. Family education background, denomination, Jewish identity, intermarriage, all are strongly associated with whether the children in the households canvassed by the Population Study are in or are intended to be sent for Jewish training.

Thus, where both parents have some formal education, fully three-quarters of the children are or will be involved also. The corresponding percentage for families in which only one parent was educated drops off to 41.5. For actual attendance, the proportions are 46 and 17 percent. And if neither parent had a Jewish education, only 4 percent of the children are enrolled, while another 9 percent are expected to attend. The differences are similar among single-parent households. If he or she is Jewish, 48 percent are attending or intend to go, as contrasted to but 20 percent if the single parent was not educated Jewishly.

Table XIX: Parents Ever Had Formal Jewish Education by Children's Attendance or Intentions for Formal Jewish Education (N=1339) (Percent)						
		Attended in Past Year	Expect to Enroll, yet Did Not Attend	Did Not and Will Not Attend	Do Not Know	Row Subtotal
Households with both parents						
Yes-Yes	*Row*	*46*	*28*	*13*	*13*	*378*
	Column	65	42.5	9	37.5	
Yes-No	*Row*	*17*	*24.4*	*48*	*11*	*463*
	Column	29	45	40	38	
No-No	*Row*	*4*	*7*	*79*	*8*	*369*
	Column	6	13	52	24	
Column Subtotal		269	252	561	128	*N=1210*
Single Parent Household						
Yes	*Row*	*29*	*18.5*	*35*	*17*	*65*
	Column	79	60	36	52	
No	*Row*	*8*	*12.5*	*64*	*16*	*64*
	Column	21	40	64	48	
Column Subtotal		24	20	64	21	*N=129*

Note: The percent total may be off due to rounding error. Again, this table includes children and children adopted of the respondents. N=1339 uses the child as the unit of analysis.

The depth of parental education has, as expected, a strong effect on the probabilities of the children's education. The more years a respondent spent in Jewish education, the more likely that his or her children are or plan to be in school. And the type of education a parent received affects what his children secure, except for those with a private tutor. Those of the 64 children of respondents now in day school, fully 49 had a parent with a similar background. And of the 110 enrolled in part-time afternoon classes, a majority, 55 percent, had a parent who did this. Similarly, 30 of the 49 Sunday schoolers had a parent whose

education was like his own. Only two of their children fall into this category. If they attended Jewish classes, most went to day or afternoon schools.

Table XX: Respondent's Type of Formal Jewish Education by Children's Type of Formal Jewish Education in the Past Year (N=246)

Parents' Type of Formal Jewish Education	Children's Type of Jewish Education in Past Year (actual number)			
	Day School	Part-time	Sunday School	Private Tutor
Day School	49	8	2	5
Part-time	18	60	25	7
Sunday School	4	15	30	0
Private	7	8	6	2

Note: Again, this table includes children and adopted children of the respondents. This table uses the child as the unit of analysis.

The denominational background of the children's household is obviously a major determinant of the probabilities that a child will have a Jewish education. A large majority of the Orthodox, 60 percent, either attended in the past year while another quarter, 25 percent, are expected to enroll. The proportion of young people among those of Conservative background attending school at the time of the interview is roughly one-third, while those from Reform families is insignificantly higher at 35 percent. Conservatives, however, were much more likely to in provide youth who do not or will not attend. Ethnic-Secular Jewish families provide even fewer students, 11 percent in attendance, 26 percent prospective.

The effects of intermarriage and out conversions may also be seen in Table XXI. Only four percent of the children of the intermarried attend Jewish schools, although 19.5 percent of the respondents from such families say their children will do so in the future. Fully 28 percent of the children reported in households as containing a Jew are the offspring of two non-Jewish parents. Whether their parents were once married to a Jew and are no longer, or are the relatives of Jews, cannot be determined from the survey. In any case, being in a household which fell into the Jewish population sample did not expose them to a Jewish education.

Table XXI: Denomination of Children's households by Children's Enrollment in Formal Jewish Education in the Past Year (N=1224) (Percent)

		Attended in Past Year	Expect to Enroll, Yet Did Not Attend	Did Not and Will Not Attend	Do Not Know	Row Subtotal
Orthodox	*Row*	*60*	*25*	*2*	*13*	*87*
	Column	18	8	0	8	
Conservative	*Row*	*33*	*26*	*33*	*8*	*273*
	Column	25	28	16	17	
Reform	*Row*	*35*	*33*	*20*	*12*	*341*
	Column	42	43	12	32	
Mixed Jewish	*Row*	*44*	*19*	*19*	*19*	*16*
	Column	2.5	1	.5	2	
Ethnic-Secular Jew	*Row*	*11*	*26*	*53*	*10*	*73*
	Column	3	7	7	5	
Jewish & Other	*Row*	*4*	*19.5*	*60*	*17*	*82*
	Column	1	6	9	11	
Other Religion	*Row*	*1*	*5*	*85*	*9*	*352*
	Column	1	6.5	55	24	
Column Total		283	261	548	132	*N=1224*

Note: The percent total may be off due to rounding error. Again, this table includes children and adopted children of the respondents.

The findings with respect to Jewish religious identity are particularly striking. The proportion attending is greatest by far when both parents are Jewish by religion. Among all young people, 74 percent, either attended in the past year or are expected to attend. Only 15 percent did not and will not attend. Among children aged 6 through 13, the proportion in these categories rises to an astronomical 90 percent, as reported in Table XXII. They are high also for single parent households, which are Jewish by religion.

As expected, the children least likely to receive a Jewish education or to be included in plans for one in the future come from families in which one or both of the parents are non-Jews. While almost all the children between 6 and 13 both of whose parents are religiously Jewish, attend (78 percent) Jewish schools or expect to enroll next year (12 percent), the proportion falls to 25 percent in school and 13 percent expected to do so next year for intermarried families in which the Jewish parent is religious. It declines much further for mixed marriages involving an ethnic secular Jew, down to five percent enrolled and an equal percentage expecting. The situation is only slightly better when one parent's identity is religious and the other is ethnic secular -- 15 percent enrolled and 20 percent planning. Having two ethnic secular Jewish parents produces a worse outcome than intermarriage between a religious Jew and a non-Jew, 14 percent and seven percent. Single parent religious households are more likely to educate their offspring that all other combinations of family backgrounds except for the two parent ones.

Table ??: Religious Composition of Parents for Children under Age 18 by Children's Attendance in Formal Jewish Education in the Past Year (N=1353) (Percent)

		Attended in Past Year	Expect to Enroll, yet Did Not Attend	Did Not and Will Not Attend	Do Not Know	Row Subtotal
Households with Both Parents						
Both Jews	*Row*	*44*	*30*	*15*	*11*	*521*
	Column	84	61	13.5	44	
Jewish and Ethnic Secular Jew	*Row*	*9*	*33*	*46.5*	*12*	*43*
	Column	1.5	5	3.5	4	
Jew and Non-Jew	*Row*	*11*	*24*	*48*	*18*	*258*
	Column	10	24	22	36	
Both Ethnic Secular Jews	*Row*	*7*	*13*	*67*	*13*	*30*
	Column	1	2	3.5	3	
Ethnic Secular Jew and Non-Jew	*Row*	*2*	*7*	*86*	*5.5*	*146*
	Column	1	4	22	7	
Both Non-Jew	*Row*	*3.5*	*5*	*88*	*4*	*228*
	Column	3	4	35.5	7	
Column Subtotal		275	258	564	129	*N=1226*
Single Parent Households						
Jew	*Row*	*35*	*80*	*29*	*12*	*66*
	Column	96	80	31	36	
Ethnic Secular Jew	*Row*	*0*	*4*	*58*	*38.5*	*26*
	Column	0	5	25	45.5	
Non-Jew	*Row*	*3*	*9*	*77*	*11*	*35*
	Column	4	15	44	18	
Column Subtotal		24	20	61	22	*N=127*

Note: The percent total may be off due to rounding error. This table includes children and adopted children of the respondents. N=1353 uses the child as the unit of analysis.

Table XXII: Religious Composition of Parents for Children between Age 6 through 13 Years by Children's Attendance in Formal Jewish Education in the Past Year (N=628)						
		Attended in Past Year	expect to Enroll, Yet Did Not Attend	Did Not and Will Not Attend	Do Not Know	*Row Subtotal*
Household with both Parents						
Both are Jews	*Row*	*78*	*12*	*8*	*1*	*240*
	Column	82	52	8	16	
Jew and Ethnic Secular Jew	*Row*	*15*	*20*	*60*	*5*	*20*
	Column	1	7	5	5	
Jew and Non-Jew	*Row*	*25*	*13*	*53*	*9*	*103*
	Column	11	23	21	47	
Both are Ethnic Secular Jews	*Row*	*14*	*7*	*64*	*14*	*14*
	Column	1	2	3.5	10.5	
Ethnic Secular Jew and Non-Jew	*Row*	*5*	*5*	*89*	*2*	*62*
	Column	1	5	21	5	
Both are Non-Jews	*Row*	*6*	*5*	*87*	*2.5*	*122*
	Column	3	11	41	16	
Column Subtotal		229	56	257	19	*N=561*
Single Parent Households						
Jew	*Row*	*49*	*17*	*24*	*10*	*41*
	Column	95	78	34.5	50	
Ethnic Secular Jew	*Row*	*0*	*0*	*50*	*50*	*8*
	Column	0	0	14	50	
Non-Jew	*Row*	*5*	*11*	*83*	*0*	*18*
	Column	4	22	52	0	
Column Subtotal		21	9	29	8	*N=67*

Note: The percent total may be off due to rounding error. Again, this table includes children and adopted children of the respondents. N=628 uses the child as the unit analysis.

Table XXIII: Religious Composition of Parents for Children between Age 14 through 17 Years by Children's Attendance in Formal Jewish Education in the Past Year (N=203)					
	Attended in Past Year	Expect to Enroll, Yet Did Not Attend	Did Not and Will Not Attend	Do Not Know	Row Subtotal
Households with Both Parents					
Both Jews	45	4	51	0	94
Jew and Ethnic Secular Jew	14	0	71	14	7
Jew and Non-Jew	8	4	88	0	25
Both Ethic Secular Jews	0	0	100	0	2
Ethnic Secular Jew and Non-Jew	0	7	93	0	15
Both Non-Jews	3	6	92	0	36
Column Subtotal	46	8	124	1	N=179
Single Parent Households					
Jew	30	0	70	0	10
Ethnic Secular Jew	0	0	100	0	7
Non-Jew	0	0	100	0	7
Column Subtotal	3	0	21	0	N=24

Note: The percent total may be off due to rounding error. Again, this table includes children and adopted children of the respondents. N=203 uses the child as the unit of analysis.

Conclusion

The preliminary and incomplete findings reported here point up both the weakness and power of Jewish education. The weakness refers to the fact that most youth in the sample are not exposed to any form of Jewish education, and even when those whose parents report plans to educate them in the future, the figures do not add up to a majority. And given the growing rates of intermarriage among young people and the extremely low proportion of the children of mixed marriages who are sent to Jewish schools, the proportions who are educated should be much lower a decade from now.

The power in the finding is that those who have been educated Jewishly seek to also involve their offspring in Judaism through formal education. The Achilles' heel in this latter finding is the growth in intermarriage and secularization.

There are two "solutions" to these developments. The first is to reduce the rate of intermarriage, an outcome which has a low probability. Better Jewish education and increased Hillel facilities at institutions of higher education may help. The second is increased efforts to convert non-Jewish spouses and the offspring of Jews who are not Jewish by *halacha*. Reach out programs to those with familial ties could rejuvenate the community. Thus far, however, the community is reluctant to engage in such endeavors.

(In addition to further analysis along the lines contained above, the final report will contain a multi-variate statistical analysis which seeks to estimate the contribution of the different variable to involvement in Jewish education).

Education Findings from the Jewish Population Study

Executive Summary

by Seymour Martin Lipset

The data of the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) suggest serious problems for the future of American Jews. They are less likely to marry than others with similar backgrounds; they have a smaller birthrate than other groups in the population; they have a higher divorce rate; and their rate of intermarriage is high and increasing steadily. These behavioral traits mean, immigration apart, the Jewish population in America is likely to steadily decline.

Education is obviously the principal mechanism to socialize succeeding generations to be Jewish, and to stimulate adult Jews and Gentile spouses to foster the religious and secular interests of the community. To a considerable degree, what the Jewish community of the future will look like occupationally, culturally, and Jewishly, will be a function of education, both non-Jewish and Jewish.

Educational achievement has been one of the great prides of American Jewry. The survey data indicate it is justified. Among those adults 18 and over who identify themselves as Jewish in religious terms, only 23 percent do not have any college education, 51 percent are college graduates, while close to one-third, 32 percent, have gone beyond college to some form of post-graduate education. Ironically, Jewish education achievements may be a major source of the long-term trends that are undermining Jewish continuity. A major source of the extremely high rate of intermarriage is the almost universal pattern of attendance by Jews at colleges and universities, with universalistic norms.

The NJPS data confirm the assumption that the more exposure to Jewish learning, the more likely the recipients are to be involved in the community, and to pass the commitment onto their children. The justified concern for Jewish continuity correctly focuses on Jewish education as the major facility available to the community to stem the hemorrhaging out which is taking place.

Approximately 60 percent of the 2441 respondents in the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey had, at some point, been involved in some formal Jewish education. The content most of these Jews were exposed to, however, was not intensive. More than half, 51 percent, of those that had attended, or 30 percent of the whole sample, took part in part-time programs, followed in magnitude by those who had been to Sunday school, 17 percent. Significantly fewer, 7 and 5 percent, had participated in day schools or private tutoring.

Given the much greater emphasis in traditional Judaism on Synagogue attendance and religious study by men than by women, it is not surprising that men are more likely than women to have had some Jewish education. Close to two-thirds, 64 percent, of day schoolers and part-timers are male. The gender picture reverses sharply, however, for Sunday School, the least stringent form of training.

Assimilation to American society affects Jewish education. Length of family residence in America indicates that temporal distance from immigrant background is inversely associated with exposure to Jewish education. The relationship to national origin is greatest among third or more generation Jews. Slightly over half of the respondents report no grandparents born in the United States. They are the most likely to have had a Jewish education. Those with four native-born report the lowest involvement by far.

Intermarriage is a more decisive variable. The likelihood of having had a Jewish education is greatest when both parents are Jewish, true for roughly two-thirds of the respondents. Four-fifths of these had gone to Jewish schools, compared to 29 percent of those from religiously mixed families.

Denomination of family of origin obviously affects propensity for Jewish education, though less than might be anticipated. Those from Orthodox families show by far the most intense and lengthiest exposure. Four-fifths had some Jewish education, over one-fifth in day school. Surprisingly, a larger proportion from Conservative families had never had any formal Jewish learning than among those of Reform background. Conservative offspring, however, were much more disposed than scions of Reform to have attended day school or afternoon classes. Close to two-thirds, 65 percent, of those of an ethnic secular background had no Jewish education.

Considering the different variables -- gender, denominational background, parental, religious, and communal origins, community of residence -- a clear picture emerges of the factors associated with Jewish educational enrollment. The most likely candidate has the following profile: a male, having foreign born parents and grandparents, a born Jew of practicing non-intermarried parents, raised in one of the three major denominations, preferably the Orthodox, who was born and presumably grew up in the Northeast.

The Consequences of Formal Jewish Education

In the previous section, measures of Jewish education, whether ever involved or not, type of school, number of years studied, serve as dependent variables, behavior to be related to or explained by independent factors, gender, generations in America, denomination of family, etc. The educational items may also be looked at as independent variables, that is, in relating Jewish education to various attitudes and activity. These indicate that the more education achieved, the more committed the respondents are with respect to a wide range of attitudes and behavior: philanthropy (especially Jewish), involvement in Jewish organizations, synagogue attendance, intermarriage, attachment to Israel, attitudes regarding Jewishness, children's Jewish education, and adult Jewish learning.

A good example of these relationships is furnished by the responses to the question "How important is being a Jew for you?" Only 23 percent of those who had never taken to any Jewish schooling replied "very important." The same answer was given by 72 percent of those who had been to day school, 56 percent of the privately tutored, 52 percent of the former students at part-time/afternoon classes, and 37 percent of respondents whose experience was limited to Sunday school.

The findings from the NJPS challenge the often voiced assumption that most Jews, regardless of their background, are deeply attached to the Jewish state. Only 29 percent said they are "extremely" or "very" attached. Measures of commitment to Israel correlate strongly, however, with intensity of Jewish educational background. Almost half of those without any Jewish education said they felt no attachment.

Depth of Jewish training acts as a barrier to intermarriage, but not strikingly so, except for those with more than 15 years of schooling, presumably largely dedicated

Orthodox. For the rest, more school years reduces their willingness to accept or support intermarriage by their children, but still only minorities are opposed, 31 percent in the 11-15 years of education group, 22.5 percent among the 6-10 years one, 14 percent for the 5 years less, and only 8 percent among those without any formal Jewish education.

The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey includes parental reports on children's education. The questions dealing with education for those under 18 differ from those for adults, reported in the previous sections, in that the former inquired whether the children had received formal Jewish education in the past year, while adults were asked whether their offspring had ever received some. Parents who did not report offspring enrollment were then queried as to whether they expected to register their children in the future.

Given the emphasis on bar/bat mitzvah at age 13, the natural expectation is that enrollment peaks at age 12. It does in fact do so. Almost half, 47 percent of the 12 year olds, are receiving some sort of Jewish education, 12 percent more than among the 11 year old group and eight percent higher than the 13 year old cohort.

What is perhaps most striking is that at every age from six to 13 a majority are not obtaining any form of Jewish training. Further, only two-fifths, 39 percent, of parents with children under 6 years of age said they expect to enroll their children. Almost as many, 37 percent, said no, they do not intend to not send the children to Jewish schools, while the rest were uncertain.

The major factors associated with children's actual or planned attendance are as expected from our knowledge of the correlates of parental education. Family Jewish education background, denomination, Jewish identity, intermarriage, all are strongly associated with whether the children in the households canvassed by the Population Study are involved, or are intended to be sent for, Jewish religious training.

The effects of intermarriage and the nature of Jewish identity are extreme. The proportion attending or intended for enrollment is greatest by far when both parents are Jewish by religion. Among children aged 6 through 13, it rises to an astronomical 90 percent. The percentage falls to 25 in school and 13 expected to be so next year for

intermarried families in which the Jewish parent is religious. They decline much further for mixed marriages involving an ethnic secular Jew, down to five percent enrolled and an equal percentage expecting. The situation is only slightly better when one parent's identity is religious and the other is ethnic secular -- 15 percent enrolled and 20 percent planning to do so. Having two ethnic secular Jewish parents produces a worse outcome than intermarriage between a religious Jew and a non-Jew, 14 percent and seven percent. Single parent Jewishly religious households are more likely to educate their offspring than all other combinations of family backgrounds except for the two Jewish parent ones.

How do the religiously identified explain non-attendance? The most common response by far is lack of interest, either by the parent (11 percent) or by the child (34 percent). Relatively few complain that Jewish schools are too expensive (four percent), too far away (eight percent), or of poor quality (one percent).

Reason analysis, however, is not best done through asking respondents why they do or do not do some things. It is more fruitful to compare indicators of behavior or position which logically may affect propensity for Jewish education. The survey permits examination of some relationships such as region of country lived in, geographic mobility and family income, which are rarely if ever mentioned by respondents. A preliminary analysis suggests recent mobility has a negative effect on enrollment. When the respondent has moved from another community since 1984, the children are less inclined to attend Jewish schools. Similarly to the parental generation, children living in the West and South are less likely to be enrolled than those in the Northeast and Midwest.

Finally, it may be noted, that the evidence indicates that in spite of what the respondents say, economic factors appear to play a role in determining parental behavior and plans with respect to their children's attendance at religious schools. Cost of Jewish education is rarely given as a reason for not sending children to a Jewish school, but more children attend at the higher income levels. Two-thirds of those with a family income of under $40,000 a year neither send nor expect to send their offspring for Jewish education. Conversely, three-fifths of those with annual incomes of $80,000 or more do. These findings hold up even when depth of Jewish identity or ritual commitment is held constant.

Conclusion

The preliminary findings reported here point up both the weakness and power of Jewish education. The weakness refers to the fact that most youth in the sample are not exposed to any form of Jewish education, and even when those whose parents report plans to educate them in the future are included, the figures still do not add up to a majority.

The power of education is reflected in the finding that those who have been trained Jewishly are disposed to seek to transmit their heritage through formal education of their children. The Achilles' heel in this latter generalization is the growth in rates of intermarriage and secularization. Ethnic secular parents appear to create almost as great a problem for Jewish continuity as the intermarried.

There are two "solutions" to these developments. The first is a reduction in the rate of intermarriage, an outcome which has a low probability. Better Jewish education, tuition grants and increased and improved Hillel facilities at institutions of higher education may help. The two most recent national surveys, however, indicate that the great majority of college and graduate students do not participate in Jewish communal or educational programs, facts which attest to their limits as barriers to intergroup dating and mating. The second "solution" is increased efforts to convert non-Jewish spouses and the offspring of Jews who are not Jewish according to *halacha*, as well as outreach programs for the ethnic seculars. Thus far, however, the community is reluctant to engage in large scale conversion efforts, devotes too little attention to college students and does not know how to stimulate the identity of the ethnic-seculars.

Education Findings from the Jewish Population Study

Executive Summary

by Seymour Martin Lipset

The data of the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS) suggest serious problems for the future of American Jews. They are less likely to marry than others with similar backgrounds; they have a smaller birthrate than other groups in the population; they have a higher divorce rate; and their rate of intermarriage is high and increasing steadily. These behavioral traits mean, immigration apart, the Jewish population in America is likely to steadily decline.

Education is obviously the principal mechanism to socialize succeeding generations to be Jewish, and to stimulate adult Jews and Gentile spouses to foster the religious and secular interests of the community. To a considerable degree, what the Jewish community of the future will look like occupationally, culturally, and Jewishly, will be a function of education, both non-Jewish and Jewish.

Educational achievement has been one of the great prides of American Jewry. The survey data indicate it is justified. Among those adults 18 and over who identify themselves as Jewish in religious terms, only 23 percent do not have any college education, 51 percent are college graduates, while close to one-third, 32 percent, have gone beyond college to some form of post-graduate education. Ironically, Jewish education achievements may be a major source of the long-term trends that are undermining Jewish continuity. A major source of the extremely high rate of intermarriage is the almost universal pattern of attendance by Jews at colleges and universities, with universalistic norms.

The NJPS data confirm the assumption that the more exposure to Jewish learning, the more likely the recipients are to be involved in the community, and to pass the commitment onto their children. The justified concern for Jewish continuity correctly focuses on Jewish education as the major facility available to the community to stem the hemorrhaging out which is taking place.

Approximately 60 percent of the 2441 respondents in the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey had, at some point, been involved in some formal Jewish education. The content most of these Jews were exposed to, however, was not intensive. More than half, 51 percent, of those that had attended, or 30 percent of the whole sample, took part in part-time programs, followed in magnitude by those who had been to Sunday school, 17 percent. Significantly fewer, 7 and 5 percent, had participated in day schools or private tutoring.

Given the much greater emphasis in traditional Judaism on Synagogue attendance and religious study by men than by women, it is not surprising that men are more likely than women to have had some Jewish education. Close to two-thirds, 64 percent, of day schoolers and part-timers are male. The gender picture reverses sharply, however, for Sunday School, the least stringent form of training.

Assimilation to American society affects Jewish education. Length of family residence in America indicates that temporal distance from immigrant background is inversely associated with exposure to Jewish education. The relationship to national origin is greatest among third or more generation Jews. Slightly over half of the respondents report no grandparents born in the United States. They are the most likely to have had a Jewish education. Those with four native-born report the lowest involvement by far.

Intermarriage is a more decisive variable. The likelihood of having had a Jewish education is greatest when both parents are Jewish, true for roughly two-thirds of the respondents. Four-fifths of these had gone to Jewish schools, compared to 29 percent of those from religiously mixed families.

Denomination of family of origin obviously affects propensity for Jewish education, though less than might be anticipated. Those from Orthodox families show by far the most intense and lengthiest exposure. Four-fifths had some Jewish education, over one-fifth in day school. Surprisingly, a larger proportion from Conservative families had never had any formal Jewish learning than among those of Reform background. Conservative offspring, however, were much more disposed than scions of Reform to have attended day school or afternoon classes. Close to two-thirds, 65 percent, of those of an ethnic secular background had no Jewish education.

Considering the different variables -- gender, denominational background, parental, religious, and communal origins, community of residence -- a clear picture emerges of the factors associated with Jewish educational enrollment. The most likely candidate has the following profile: a male, having foreign born parents and grandparents, a born Jew of practicing non-intermarried parents, raised in one of the three major denominations, preferably the Orthodox, who was born and presumably grew up in the Northeast.

The Consequences of Formal Jewish Education

In the previous section, measures of Jewish education, whether ever involved or not, type of school, number of years studied, serve as dependent variables, behavior to be related to or explained by independent factors, gender, generations in America, denomination of family, etc. The educational items may also be looked at as independent variables, that is, in relating Jewish education to various attitudes and activity. These indicate that the more education achieved, the more committed the respondents are with respect to a wide range of attitudes and behavior: philanthropy (especially Jewish), involvement in Jewish organizations, synagogue attendance, intermarriage, attachment to Israel, attitudes regarding Jewishness, children's Jewish education, and adult Jewish learning.

A good example of these relationships is furnished by the responses to the question "How important is being a Jew for you?" Only 23 percent of those who had never taken to any Jewish schooling replied "very important." The same answer was given by 72 percent of those who had been to day school, 56 percent of the privately tutored, 52 percent of the former students at part-time/afternoon classes, and 37 percent of respondents whose experience was limited to Sunday school.

The findings from the NJPS challenge the often voiced assumption that most Jews, regardless of their background, are deeply attached to the Jewish state. Only 29 percent said they are "extremely" or "very" attached. Measures of commitment to Israel correlate strongly, however, with intensity of Jewish educational background. Almost half of those without any Jewish education said they felt no attachment.

Depth of Jewish training acts as a barrier to intermarriage, but not strikingly so, except for those with more than 15 years of schooling, presumably largely dedicated

Orthodox. For the rest, more school years reduces their willingness to accept or support intermarriage by their children, but still only minorities are opposed, 31 percent in the 11-15 years of education group, 22.5 percent among the 6-10 years one, 14 percent for the 5 years less, and only 8 percent among those without any formal Jewish education.

The 1990 National Jewish Population Survey includes parental reports on children's education. The questions dealing with education for those under 18 differ from those for adults, reported in the previous sections, in that the former inquired whether the children had received formal Jewish education in the past year, while adults were asked whether their offspring had ever received some. Parents who did not report offspring enrollment were then queried as to whether they expected to register their children in the future.

Given the emphasis on bar/bat mitzvah at age 13, the natural expectation is that enrollment peaks at age 12. It does in fact do so. Almost half, 47 percent of the 12 year olds, are receiving some sort of Jewish education, 12 percent more than among the 11 year old group and eight percent higher than the 13 year old cohort.

What is perhaps most striking is that at every age from six to 13 a majority are not obtaining any form of Jewish training. Further, only two-fifths, 39 percent, of parents with children under 6 years of age said they expect to enroll their children. Almost as many, 37 percent, said no, they do not intend to not send the children to Jewish schools, while the rest were uncertain.

The major factors associated with children's actual or planned attendance are as expected from our knowledge of the correlates of parental education. Family Jewish education background, denomination, Jewish identity, intermarriage, all are strongly associated with whether the children in the households canvassed by the Population Study are involved, or are intended to be sent for, Jewish religious training.

The effects of intermarriage and the nature of Jewish identity are extreme. The proportion attending or intended for enrollment is greatest by far when both parents are Jewish by religion. Among children aged 6 through 13, it rises to an astronomical 90 percent. The percentage falls to 25 in school and 13 expected to be so next year for

intermarried families in which the Jewish parent is religious. They decline much further for mixed marriages involving an ethnic secular Jew, down to five percent enrolled and an equal percentage expecting. The situation is only slightly better when one parent's identity is religious and the other is ethnic secular -- 15 percent enrolled and 20 percent planning to do so. Having two ethnic secular Jewish parents produces a worse outcome than intermarriage between a religious Jew and a non-Jew, 14 percent and seven percent. Single parent Jewishly religious households are more likely to educate their offspring than all other combinations of family backgrounds except for the two Jewish parent ones.

How do the religiously identified explain non-attendance? The most common response by far is lack of interest, either by the parent (11 percent) or by the child (34 percent). Relatively few complain that Jewish schools are too expensive (four percent), too far away (eight percent), or of poor quality (one percent).

Reason analysis, however, is not best done through asking respondents why they do or do not do some things. It is more fruitful to compare indicators of behavior or position which logically may affect propensity for Jewish education. The survey permits examination of some relationships such as region of country lived in, geographic mobility and family income, which are rarely if ever mentioned by respondents. A preliminary analysis suggests recent mobility has a negative effect on enrollment. When the respondent has moved from another community since 1984, the children are less inclined to attend Jewish schools. Similarly to the parental generation, children living in the West and South are less likely to be enrolled than those in the Northeast and Midwest.

Finally, it may be noted, that the evidence indicates that in spite of what the respondents say, economic factors appear to play a role in determining parental behavior and plans with respect to their children's attendance at religious schools. Cost of Jewish education is rarely given as a reason for not sending children to a Jewish school, but more children attend at the higher income levels. Two-thirds of those with a family income of under $40,000 a year neither send nor expect to send their offspring for Jewish education. Conversely, three-fifths of those with annual incomes of $80,000 or more do. These findings hold up even when depth of Jewish identity or ritual commitment is held constant.

Conclusion

The preliminary findings reported here point up both the weakness and power of Jewish education. The weakness refers to the fact that most youth in the sample are not exposed to any form of Jewish education, and even when those whose parents report plans to educate them in the future are included, the figures still do not add up to a majority.

The power of education is reflected in the finding that those who have been trained Jewishly are disposed to seek to transmit their heritage through formal education of their children. The Achilles' heel in this latter generalization is the growth in rates of intermarriage and secularization. Ethnic secular parents appear to create almost as great a problem for Jewish continuity as the intermarried.

There are two "solutions" to these developments. The first is a reduction in the rate of intermarriage, an outcome which has a low probability. Better Jewish education, tuition grants and increased and improved Hillel facilities at institutions of higher education may help. The two most recent national surveys, however, indicate that the great majority of college and graduate students do not participate in Jewish communal or educational programs, facts which attest to their limits as barriers to intergroup dating and mating. The second "solution" is increased efforts to convert non-Jewish spouses and the offspring of Jews who are not Jewish according to *halacha*, as well as outreach programs for the ethnic seculars. Thus far, however, the community is reluctant to engage in large scale conversion efforts, devotes too little attention to college students and does not know how to stimulate the identity of the ethnic-seculars.