



## **What Recent Studies Reveal About Interfaith Family Inclusion**

August 31, 2025

### **Introduction and Summary**

The Pew Research Center's 2013 [A Portrait of Jewish Americans](#) found that 72% of non-Orthodox Jews were intermarrying, as did its 2021 [Jewish Americans in 2020](#).<sup>1</sup> These national Jewish community studies, like local community studies before and since, regularly find that interfaith couples are relatively less Jewishly engaged than inmarried couples on traditional measures of Jewish behaviors and attitudes.

Given the high rate of interfaith marriage, the future growth and vitality of non-Orthodox Jewish life and communities depends on engaging more interfaith families. To effectively engage more interfaith families, the reasons why many do not engage need to be addressed.

One key finding in the 2013 Pew report suggested that not feeling belonging is an important factor in disengagement: while 89% of intermarried Jews were proud to be Jewish, only 59% had a strong sense of belonging to the Jewish people (51-2). The 2020 Pew report did not ask the “proud to be Jewish” question, but did find that only 27% of intermarrieds feel a sense of belonging to the Jewish people “a great deal,” compared to 72% of inmarrieds.<sup>2</sup> Engagement theorists agree that inclusion – the feeling of belonging – is necessary to support engagement in an organization or community.<sup>3</sup>

Between the first and second Pew reports, the Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University published eleven quantitative local community studies<sup>4</sup> as well as one national and three local qualitative studies of interfaith families.<sup>5</sup> The Center for Radically Inclusive Judaism reviewed that research in its December 2020 paper, [What We've Learned About Interfaith Family Inclusion Since the Pew Report](#); the paper considers the scope and extent of interfaith families not feeling belonging, the likely underlying reasons, and what might be done to help them feel belonging in Jewish settings.

This paper expands on the previous one, reviewing fifteen local community studies published by the Cohen Center since December 2020.<sup>6</sup> This paper also reviews [Parenting when Jewish and Something Else](#), the only new qualitative study of interfaith families since 2020, as well as [Santa Clara County 2024](#), a quantitative study conducted by Rosov Consulting that also includes focus groups and interviews.<sup>7</sup>

The Cohen Center's 2019 national study of interfaith families, [Beyond Welcoming: Engaging Intermarried Couples in Jewish Life](#), stated that "we have succeeded in making intermarried families feel welcome," and included a heading that "Barriers to Engagement with Jewish Life Have Been Largely Eliminated." We previously described these as "premature declarations of victory."<sup>8</sup>

Feeling welcome is important, especially in initial stages of potential involvement. But there is a distinction between welcoming, with one's presence appreciated as a guest, and inclusion – feeling belonging, like a valued part of a community.<sup>9</sup> Interfaith families may feel welcome, but still not feel a sense of belonging. A comment from the Boston qualitative study explains: "Some couples recounted being regularly welcomed when they attended activities at a synagogue but never really progressing to feel like they belonged in the community." (17)

The lessons from the research reviewed in this paper and the previous paper are:

- people in interfaith relationships do not feel very connected to or part of the Jewish people or their local Jewish community, and significantly less so than inmarrieds do;
- interfaith families, and partners from different faith backgrounds, want to feel like part of Jewish communities, but instead persistently feel othered and excluded;
- not having many Jewish friends or knowing many people in the Jewish community may contribute to not feeling belonging, and could be countered by extending personal invitations;
- policies that restrict participation contribute to not feeling belonging, and policies around diversity and inclusion being made explicit is a welcoming factor; and
- clear communication that interfaith families are a valued part of the Jewish community is needed to help move interfaith families from othering to belonging.

## **A. Quantitative Data on Belonging**

The data from the local community studies clearly demonstrates, consistently over the past twelve years, that people in interfaith relationships feel significantly less connected to or less a part of both the Jewish people and their local Jewish community than inmarrieds do. They do not feel that being Jewish is very much a matter of community, or feel connected to Israel, traditionally a measure of feeling part of the Jewish people.<sup>10</sup> Data from the 2020 Pew Report is consistent.

**Fewer people in interfaith relationships say being Jewish is very much a matter of community than those who are inmarried.** Only about half as many intermarrieds (27%) compared to inmarrieds (50%) said that being Jewish is very much a matter of community. (average across 16 communities; see Table 1)<sup>11</sup>

By comparison, in the 2020 Pew Report, only 12% of intermarrieds said that being part of a Jewish community is an essential part of what being Jewish means to them, compared to 51% of inmarrieds (66).

**People in interfaith relationships feel less connected with or less like part of the Jewish people or of a global or worldwide Jewish community than those who are inmarried.** Only about half as many intermarrieds (25%) as inmarrieds (47%) feel very much connected with or

like part of the Jewish people or of a global or worldwide Jewish community. (average across 24 communities; see Table 2)<sup>12</sup>

By comparison, in the 2020 Pew Report, only 27% of intermarrieds said they feel a great deal of belonging to the Jewish people, compared to 72% of inmarrieds (Pew Research Center data shared with the Center).

Looked at conversely, in the local studies about twice as many intermarrieds (38%) as inmarrieds (18%) feel not at all or a little connected. (average across 22 communities; see Table 2)<sup>13</sup>

**People in interfaith relationships feel less connected with or less like part of their local Jewish community than those who are inmarried.** Almost five times fewer intermarrieds (6%) than inmarrieds (26%) say that they feel very much of a connection with or very much like a part of their local Jewish community. (average across 25 communities; see Table 3)<sup>14</sup>

Looked at conversely, almost two and a half times more intermarrieds (44%) than inmarrieds (18%) feel not at all connected.<sup>15</sup> (average across 22 communities; see Table 3)

**People in interfaith relationships feel less connected to Israel, traditionally a measure of feeling part of the Jewish people, than inmarrieds.** Half as many intermarrieds (20%) as inmarrieds (40%) say they feel very much connected to Israel. (average across 26 communities; see Table 4)<sup>16</sup>

By comparison, in the 2020 Pew Report, only 11% of intermarrieds say they are very emotionally attached to Israel, compared to 38% of inmarrieds (Pew Research data shared with the Center).

Looked at conversely, almost two and a half times more intermarrieds (24%) than inmarrieds (10%) feel not at all connected. (average across 25 communities; see Table 4)<sup>17</sup>

## **B. Qualitative Studies of Interfaith Families**

Qualitative studies of interfaith families suggest that interfaith families do not feel a sense of belonging because they instead experience othering. The Cohen Center's Beyond Welcoming study noted that respondents in interfaith couples who did not feel completely welcome "emphasized their feelings of being 'other' and not fitting in." (42) The three other local studies of interfaith families analyzed in the previous paper include many similar statements of people in interfaith relationships saying they feel like "outcasts," "outsiders," "inferior option," or "undesirable," rather than as integral and valued members of the community.

[Parenting When Jewish and Something Else](#), a new qualitative study of Los Angeles interfaith couples by Tobin Belzer (with Leah Josephson), indicates that feelings of being other persist among interfaith couples.<sup>18</sup> Describing the Beyond Welcoming study as concluding that the "majority" of intermarried couples felt welcomed in Jewish community, the Parenting study says that "While many couples in this research had similarly positive interactions in Jewish communal contexts, several shared experiences that reflect the minority of respondents in that study: they described 'feelings of being 'other' and not fitting in.'" (23)

The study indicates that some couples carry past experiences with negative attitudes about interfaith marriage:

Jewish research participants articulated their understanding of how intermarriage has been implicitly and explicitly denigrated in Jewish culture. Several described their experience navigating their parents' perspectives about intermarriage. Their marriages to non-Jewish partners were seen a problem and a source of disappointment. About half of Jewish respondents mentioned experiencing familial pressure or conflict at some point related to their partner's non-Jewish background.

Most participants said their parents' initial discomfort and disapproval had dissipated. (11)

One commenter said that it "makes people feel excluded" when "that your partner's not Jewish" is "the first thing on anyone's mind." (11)

The section of the study titled "Barriers to Engagement" notes that while several couples were members of Conservative synagogues, others were wary of feeling excluded by the Conservative movement's policies restricting participation related to matrilineal descent and partners who are not Jewish. A partner from a different faith background, referring to a nearby Conservative synagogue, said:

*I wish it was a Reform synagogue. That would be awesome – it's just 5 minutes from our house. It would be great for our son to do his bar mitzvah there and I could participate. But I know that Conservative synagogues have a lot of restrictions and traditions I'm excluded from. I don't want my children feeling like I'm excluded. (23)*

The qualitative studies also suggest what interfaith families are looking for that would support a sense of belonging. Several of the comments in the Parenting study reflect the couples' desire for community. One partner from a different faith background, describing his experience of congregational life, said:

*I'm very happy to be a member of the temple, and I'm appreciative that I have this community as a place to raise my kid. Our temple does a family Shabbat and it's really great to be able to spend that time with my daughter. A lot of times I'm learning with her, which is interesting. The lessons align with my own beliefs and upbringing. I'm still not Jewish, and I still know very little, but I feel like part of the community. (21)*

In a section titled "Fostering Belonging," the study notes that participants were "asked to share examples of past moments when they felt a strong sense of connection and belonging.... Their recollections focused on positive encounters with others that enabled them to feel fully seen and accepted." (25)

One couple, where the Jewish partner grew up Reform, joined a Conservative synagogue where they felt "embraced" by the congregation. The partner from a different faith background said:

*The staff at the synagogue has been great: very welcoming. I've never felt like an outsider coming from a different religion. I don't feel excluded at all. When we were at*

*the bimah during my son's bar mitzvah, I couldn't say some of the words, but they didn't apply to me, so I felt fine about it. (20)*

One couple, where the Jewish partner grew up Conservative, joined a Reform synagogue because they and their child felt welcomed into the community. (21)

In discussing approaches to child raising, comments from couples who agreed to raise Jewish children, who had partners from different faith backgrounds who were “supportive and involved,” highlight the importance of inclusion. One said: *“My family is Jewish, but my husband is not. ... The rabbi has been complimentary of my husband's participation in our synagogue. We've been accepted by the community.”* (15)

Research participants offered suggestions about how to support their Jewish organizational engagement:

*Acceptance is huge. That means not questioning, not prying, not having ulterior motives, not pushing anybody toward conversion, or telling you how to raise your child.*

*I think first and foremost the goals should be fun and inclusivity.... People don't want to feel different. It's important to focus on similarities. (26)*

A few called attention to the importance of marketing language that clearly articulates who is welcome. (25)

The focus group discussions in [Santa Clara County 2024](#) “surfaced... important barriers” to connection and participation. “More than others, focus group participants in interfaith relationships or mixed heritage backgrounds cited feelings of not being ‘Jewish enough’ as keeping them from more fully participating in the community.” One teenager said, “Make people know that they're included. Because I don't feel very Jewish, I'm only partially Jewish, so I get worried that I won't be included in Jewish things because I'm not really the target audience.” (32)

In sum, the qualitative studies suggest that interfaith families, and partners from different faith backgrounds, don't want to feel different or excluded. They want to be fully seen and accepted, embraced, to have their participation encouraged and complimented, to feel like part of the community while still not Jewish. But, as the Santa Clara County report says, “diverse members ... may feel that personal experiences and communal spaces signal that they do not fully belong.” (24)

Consistent with the qualitative studies, responses to open-ended questions in the quantitative local studies include: “Since I am not Jewish, at certain events I have felt extremely excluded” (Chicago (200)); “I'm very worried that there won't be a community that welcomes my child's Jewish identity and my partner's non-Jewish identity” (Kansas City (97-98)); “intermarried families – we don't fit in anywhere. Because I am married to a non-Jew, despite trying to be involved in many Jewish organizations, I always feel like an outsider, like I'm less-than.” (St. Louis (154)) Appendix A to this paper includes these and other relevant open-ended responses.

### **C. Quantitative Data on Welcoming and Satisfaction**

**Feeling Unwelcome.** Most of the local studies ask whether feeling unwelcome is a reason for lack of connection, or a condition or barrier that limits involvement or participation.<sup>19</sup> The responses of intermarrieds and inmarrieds are not significantly different: only 17% of intermarrieds, compared to 14% of inmarrieds, select feeling unwelcome as a barrier or limitation. (average across 19 communities; see Table 8)<sup>20</sup>

In Santa Clara County, only 48% of interfaith respondents said Jewish communities in Santa Clara County are welcoming to them, and 53% report they feel comfortable in most Jewish organizational spaces in the county. The study says that “building a culture of welcoming to diverse identity groups is both a major challenge and an opportunity for the Santa Clara County Jewish community.” (38)<sup>21</sup>

**Satisfaction with Connection/Participation.** Seven of the local studies ask about satisfaction with connection to or participation in the local Jewish community. The responses of intermarrieds and inmarrieds are not significantly different: 14% of intermarrieds compared to 9% of inmarrieds are not at all satisfied; 22% of intermarrieds compared to 24% of inmarrieds are very much satisfied. (average across 7 communities; see Table 6)

The Metrowest study, however, makes an important observation: of those who “do not feel at all connected to a local Jewish community, 34% are not at all satisfied with that connection, suggesting this group may be open to more Jewish engagement.” (Comm Conn 13). This suggests that since intermarrieds feel less connected than inmarrieds, more intermarrieds than inmarrieds may be open to engagement. This appears to be so in Metrowest, where 53% of intermarrieds compared to 18% of inmarrieds say they feel not at all connected to the local Jewish community, and 26% of intermarrieds compared to 15% of inmarrieds are not at all satisfied with their connection to the local community.

The Kansas City report likewise notes (93) that 30% of intermarrieds are not at all or not too satisfied with their level of participation in the local Jewish community, compared to 18% of inmarrieds. The Washtenaw County report similarly notes that adults who were not at all or not too satisfied with their level of participation in the local Jewish community are “the group that may be seeking more connection.” There, 51% of intermarrieds were not at all or not too satisfied with their level of participation in the local Jewish community, compared to 33% of inmarrieds. (79-80)<sup>22</sup>

### **D. Quantitative Data on Friends, Knowing People and Personal Invitation**

The quantitative studies suggest that not having Jewish friends, not knowing many people in the Jewish community, and not being personally invited to participate, may be factors in interfaith families not feeling belonging. Having more Jewish friends who might be more engaged in the Jewish community, or just knowing more people in the Jewish community, might lead interfaith couples to more connection.

**People in interfaith relationships have fewer Jewish friends than inmarrieds.** Three and a half times fewer intermarried (12%) than inmarried (43%) people say that most or all of their friends are Jewish. (average across 22-23 communities; see Table 5)<sup>23</sup>

By comparison, in the 2020 Pew Report, only 7% of intermarrieds say that most or all of their close friends are Jewish, compared to 52% of intermarrieds (Pew Research data shared with the Center).

**More people in interfaith relationships say not knowing many people in the Jewish community is a barrier to involvement.** More intermarrieds (46%) than inmarrieds (32%) list “not knowing many people” as a barrier to involvement in the Jewish community. (average across 16 communities; see Table 7)<sup>24</sup>

Personal invitation could be a way to increase connection. The Washtenaw County report notes that “Personal connections are one of the main drivers of participation in Jewish activities.... Extending personal invitations to attend Jewish events appears to be particularly important.” (147) Three of the local studies ask whether being personally invited is a condition that makes people feel welcome and comfortable at Jewish programs; 58% of intermarrieds said it was (as did 61% of inmarrieds). (average across 3 communities; see Table 9)

The Washtenaw County report goes on to note that “One way for organizations to build connections to community members is to proactively reach out to them. Opportunities for outreach include inviting people to participate in a program or activity...” (66) But only 14% of intermarrieds were invited to participate in a program or activity, compared to 36% of inmarrieds. (67)<sup>25</sup>

Similarly, in Miami, only 33% of intermarrieds compared to 69% of inmarrieds said someone from a Jewish organization had personally reached out in the past year for a donation, to make an invitation, or to check on how the person was doing; 16% of intermarrieds compared to 43% of inmarrieds were invited to a program or activity. (166-67)

**E. Quantitative Data Related to Diversity and Inclusion Policies.** Three of the local studies ask whether policies around diversity and inclusion being made explicit make people feel welcome and comfortable at Jewish programs; 44% of intermarrieds, compared to 21% of inmarrieds, say that they did. (average across 3 communities; see Table 9)<sup>26</sup> Washtenaw County in particular notes (86) that “compared to those who are inmarried (24%), a larger share of those in intermarried relationships (67%) felt more welcome at Jewish events when policies around inclusion and diversity were made explicit.”<sup>27</sup>

## **F. Community Recognition of the Imperative To Engage Interfaith Families**

Chicago federation president Lonnie Nasatir, in the introduction to the Chicago study report, says, “Part of Jewish Chicago’s diversity is a growing number of interfaith families. Today, one-third of married and partnered adults are intermarried, up from 20% a decade ago. It is absolutely essential that JUF embraces these families and engages them with a wide menu of opportunities to connect to Jewish life.”

The Los Angeles study key findings include (23): “Among Los Angeles Jewish households with a married or partnered couple, the majority include a non-Jewish member. Developing a strategy to engage these intermarried households will be essential to ensuring a vibrant future for the community. Finding ways to deepen intermarried families’ engagement with Jewish education and Jewish institutions is essential, not only for the families involved, but also for maintaining the community’s overall strength.”

The comment about Jewish education is especially important. The local community studies data shows that only 25% of intermarrieds, compared to 51% of inmarrieds, provide any K-12 Jewish education for their children. (average across 14 communities; see Table 11)<sup>28</sup>

The local community studies typically end with recommendations for future action. The recommendations in three of the studies – Kansas City, Louisville and Delaware – include a section about reaching out to interfaith families. Kansas City (121) starts with “Almost no interfaith families in Greater Kansas City feel very connected to the local Jewish community.” Louisville (123) and Delaware (115) start with “Across the United States, as the intermarriage rate rises, it is increasingly important to Jewish communities, particularly those concerned about possible population loss, to promote cultures of welcome and inclusivity that encourage interfaith families to raise their children as Jews.”

All three studies mention the percentages of local interfaith children being raised as Jews, and say, “the single best predictor that [interfaith family children] will identify as Jews when they are grown is enrollment in high-quality Jewish educational programming – such as schools, camps, and youth groups – when they are children.” They then conclude:

Convincing intermarried parents to enroll their children in Jewish educational programs requires a strong investment in efforts to attract interfaith families to communal programs and events and **clear communication that these families are a valued part of the Jewish community.** (emphasis added)

One of the Maine recommendations (148) is:

**Be sensitive to differences of resources, backgrounds, and identities:** Several comments on the open-ended questions ... addressed experiences of discomfort in Jewish organizations based on having family members who were not Jewish, particularly spouses, or being non-white or having family members who were Persons of Color who felt they faced discrimination on the basis of race. The Jewish community of Maine cannot afford for its members to feel they are not welcome in Jewish spaces because of their resources, backgrounds, or identities, and must continue its efforts to ensure that all feel welcome.

Finally, the Santa Clara County report says (24): “there are ongoing opportunities to promote a culture of welcoming for diverse community members who may feel that personal experiences and communal spaces signal they do not fully belong.”

## Conclusion

A great deal of data in the Cohen Center's research, bolstered by the Parenting study and the Santa Clara County study, supports the view that people in interfaith relationships, in varying degrees in different communities, do not feel very included or a strong sense of belonging in Jewish communities, much less than inmarried people do, and that a significant segment of people in interfaith relationships experience a persistent feeling of being "other."

Their comments reveal that interfaith families want to feel like part of a community, to be embraced, to be fully seen and accepted; they don't want to feel excluded, like outsiders, to feel different, like they don't fit in, like they are "less than."

In sum, we need fewer intermarried Jews saying that "Because I am married to a non-Jew, ... I always feel like an outsider, like I'm less-than." We need more partners from different faith backgrounds saying, "I'm still not Jewish, ... but I feel like part of the community."

Some communities are recognizing that it is imperative that interfaith families be made to feel that they are "a valued part of the community." The Center for Radically Inclusive Judaism [maintains](#) that in order to feel belonging, interfaith families and partners from different faith backgrounds need to be thought of and treated as equals.

Comments from the qualitative studies support that view. In Toronto, a Jewish partner's family treated the partner from a different faith background "as if I'm Jewish" (31). In Boston, a participant said their congregation "treated [both partners] very equally as members of the community" and they are "both equally members of the congregation and that is really, really important to the fact that we feel at home here." (16) A participant in the Parenting study referred to synagogues that "have a lot of restrictions and traditions I'm excluded from. I don't want my children feeling like I'm excluded." (23)

The research suggests that adopting policies that encourage interfaith families' participation, making policies around diversity and inclusion explicit, and extending personal invitations to interfaith families to participate, could contribute to more of a sense of belonging. But most important of all is the call for "clear communication that [interfaith] families are a valued part of the Jewish community." Explicit messaging is important to express positive attitudes towards interfaith families that could help move them from othering to belonging.

## Tables

Citation format: A number, e.g. (48), is the page of the study report. Some studies published several topics reports, e.g., (Com Conn 9) is page 9 of Metrowest’s Community Connections report, “O” is Overview, “CJE” is “Children and Jewish Education” (also in Los Angeles). TA refers to Technical Appendices, CC refers to comparison charts. “Private” refers to data provided to the Center for Radically Inclusive Judaism by the study’s author. NA means not available. If a particular community is not listed, data is not available. Cincinnati data in all tables is for respondents with children.

**Table 1. Being Jewish is a matter of community**

|                                      | <b>Intermarried</b> |                  | <b>Inmarried</b> |                  |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                      | <b>A little</b>     | <b>Very much</b> | <b>A little</b>  | <b>Very much</b> |
| <b>Baltimore 2020</b> (TA 71)        | 19%                 | 28%              | 11%              | 51%              |
| <b>Sarasota 2019</b> (TA 37)         | 10%                 | 33%              | 3%               | 62%              |
| <b>Twin Cities 2019</b> (48)         | 33%                 | 27%              | 12%              | 57%              |
| <b>Cincinnati 2019</b> (84)          | 0%                  | 26%              | 0%               | 54%              |
| <b>Howard Cty 2019</b> (TA 45)       | 17%                 | 24%              | 19%              | 41%              |
| <b>Palm Beach Cty 2018</b> (TA 52)   | 20%                 | 18%              | 14%              | 54%              |
| <b>S Palm Beach Cty 2018</b> (TA 48) | 33%                 | 21%              | 9%               | 61%              |
| <b>Pittsburgh 2017</b> (TA 41)       | NA                  | 18%              | NA               | 43%              |
| <b>Boston 2015</b> (TA 53)           | NA                  | 30%              | NA               | 66%              |
| <b>Average</b>                       | <b>22%</b>          | <b>25%</b>       | <b>11%</b>       | <b>54%</b>       |

  

|                                       |            |            |            |            |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Metrowest NJ 2021</b> (CC 7)       | 28%        | 22%        | 10%        | 52%        |
| <b>Orlando 2021</b> (73)              | 20%        | 30%        | 19%        | 41%        |
| <b>Pioneer Valley 2019-20</b> (TA 51) | 15%        | 52%        | 3%         | 53%        |
| <b>Louisville 21-22</b> (CC 7)        | 8%         | 29%        | 16%        | 36%        |
| <b>Delaware 22</b> (CC 7)             | 11%        | 12%        | 15%        | 37%        |
| <b>Portland 22-23</b> (CC 7)          | 15%        | 29%        | 8%         | 46%        |
| <b>San Diego 22</b> (CC 2)            | 15%        | 25%        | 7%         | 53%        |
| <b>Average</b>                        | <b>16%</b> | <b>28%</b> | <b>11%</b> | <b>45%</b> |
|                                       |            |            |            |            |
| <b>Combined Average</b>               | <b>19%</b> | <b>27%</b> | <b>11%</b> | <b>50%</b> |

Louisville, Delaware, Portland and San Diego report “not much” (not “a little”) and “a great deal” (not “very much”).

**Table 2. Feeling of connection with/like part of Jewish people/global/worldwide Jewish community**

|                                       | Intermarried |            |            |            | Inmarried  |            |            |            |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
|                                       | Not at all   | A little   | Some -what | Very much  | Not at all | A little   | Some -what | Very much  |
| <b>Baltimore 2020</b> (TA 87)         | 18%          | 31%        | 38%        | 13%        | 5%         | 15%        | 35%        | 45%        |
| <b>Sarasota 2019</b> (TA 41)          | 11%          | 31%        | 28%        | 29%        | 3%         | 20%        | 39%        | 38%        |
| <b>Twin Cities 2019</b> (TA 56)       | 11%          | 51%        | 23%        | 15%        | 7%         | 18%        | 43%        | 32%        |
| <b>Cincinnati 2019</b> (TA 42)        | 12%          | 50%        | 30%        | 8%         | 1%         | 13%        | 22%        | 64%        |
| <b>Howard County 2019</b> (TA 53)     | 15%          | 45%        | 28%        | 12%        | 4%         | 30%        | 38%        | 28%        |
| <b>Palm Beach Cty 2018</b> (TA 54-5)  | 21%          | 30%        | 36%        | 14%        | 3%         | 14%        | 36%        | 47%        |
| <b>S Palm Beach Cty 2018</b> (TA 53)  | 3%           | 31%        | 44%        | 22%        | 6%         | 11%        | 37%        | 46%        |
| <b>Pittsburgh 2017</b> (TA 43)        | 22%          | [66%]      |            | 12%        | 5%         | [61%]      |            | 34%        |
| <b>Washington DC 2017</b> (TA 50)     | 11%          | 33%        | 35%        | 21%        | 5%         | 16%        | 35%        | 44%        |
| <b>Boston 2015</b> (TA 54)            | NA           | NA         | NA         | 19%        | NA         | NA         | NA         | 46%        |
| <b>Average</b>                        | <b>14%</b>   | <b>38%</b> | <b>33%</b> | <b>17%</b> | <b>4%</b>  | <b>17%</b> | <b>36%</b> | <b>42%</b> |
| <b>Chicago 2020</b> (CC 8)            | 20%          | 34%        | 29%        | 17%        | 6%         | 25%        | 33%        | 35%        |
| <b>Metrowest NJ 2021</b> (Com Conn 7) | 13%          | 36%        | 39%        | 12%        | 5%         | 20%        | 45%        | 30%        |
| <b>Kansas City 2021</b> (91, CC 7)    | 15%          | 17%        | 35%        | 33%        | <1%        | 2%         | 41%        | 57%        |
| <b>LA 2021</b> (CC 7)                 | 10%          | 15%        | 43%        | 32%        | 2%         | 5%         | 32%        | 60%        |
| <b>Orlando 2021</b> (75)              | 18%          | 30%        | 31%        | 21%        | 9%         | 23%        | 38%        | 29%        |
| <b>Pioneer Valley 2019-20</b> (TA 59) | 7%           | 50%        | 25%        | 18%        | 14%        | 23%        | 37%        | 26%        |
| <b>Louisville 21-22</b> (CC 7)        | 3%           | 3%         | 48%        | 46%        | 6%         | 14%        | 28%        | 52%        |
| <b>Delaware 22</b> (CC 7)             | 18%          | 7%         | 30%        | 45%        | 2%         | 21%        | 21%        | 55%        |
| <b>Portland 22-23</b> (CC 7)          | 5%           | 18%        | 45%        | 32%        | 2%         | 10%        | 33%        | 55%        |
| <b>Long Beach 21-22</b> (67)          | NA           | NA         | NA         | 32%        | NA         | NA         | NA         | 54%        |
| <b>Washtenaw Cty 22-3</b> (CC 6)      | 6%           | 16%        | 62%        | 17%        | <1%        | 8%         | 26%        | 66%        |
| <b>San Diego 22</b> (CC 6)            | 5%           | 20%        | 43%        | 32%        | 2%         | 5%         | 32%        | 62%        |
| <b>Miami 2024</b> (103, private)      | 4%           | 17%        | 43%        | 36%        | 3%         | 3%         | 17%        | 77%        |
| <b>Maine 2024</b> (CC 2)              | 4%           | 8%         | 27%        | 61%        | 1%         | 6%         | 44%        | 49%        |
| <b>Average</b>                        | <b>10%</b>   | <b>21%</b> | <b>38%</b> | <b>31%</b> | <b>4%</b>  | <b>13%</b> | <b>33%</b> | <b>51%</b> |
|                                       |              |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| <b>Combined Average</b>               | <b>11%</b>   | <b>27%</b> | <b>36%</b> | <b>25%</b> | <b>4%</b>  | <b>14%</b> | <b>34%</b> | <b>47%</b> |

Feel part of a worldwide Jewish community: Baltimore, Sarasota, Twin Cities, Cincinnati, Howard, Palm Beach, South Palm Beach, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Metrowest, Pioneer Valley. Feel part of or connection to a global Jewish community: DC, Boston, Orlando. Feel sense of belonging to “the Jewish people”: Kansas City, LA, Louisville, Delaware, Portland, Long Beach, Washtenaw, San Diego, Miami, Maine.

Boston only reports “very much.” Pittsburgh combines “a little” and “somewhat” so is not included in the averages. LA, Louisville, Delaware, Portland and San Diego report “not much” “some” and “a great deal.” Long Beach reports “any” and “a great deal,” Miami “any” and “very much,” only the latter is included for each.

**Table 3. Feeling of connection with/like part of local Jewish community.**

|                                       | Intermarried |            |            |           | Inmarried  |            |            |            |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
|                                       | Not at all   | A little   | Some -what | Very much | Not at all | A little   | Some -what | Very much  |
| <b>Baltimore 2020 (TA 89)</b>         | 47%          | 32%        | 14%        | 6%        | 12%        | 20%        | 27%        | 41%        |
| <b>Sarasota 2019 (TA 41)</b>          | 65%          | 23%        | 8%         | 4%        | 24%        | 25%        | 33%        | 19%        |
| <b>Twin Cities 2019 (TA 56)</b>       | 54%          | 26%        | 14%        | 6%        | 10%        | 29%        | 26%        | 35%        |
| <b>Cincinnati 2019 (TA 42)</b>        | 44%          | 39%        | 11%        | 6%        | 22%        | 17%        | 27%        | 33%        |
| <b>Howard County 19 (TA 54)</b>       | 57%          | 30%        | 9%         | 4%        | 22%        | 32%        | 34%        | 11%        |
| <b>Palm Beach Cty 2018 (TA 54)</b>    | 54%          | 17%        | 22%        | 7%        | 19%        | 24%        | 37%        | 20%        |
| <b>S Palm Beach Cty 2018 (TA 53)</b>  | 42%          | 34%        | 19%        | 4%        | 14%        | 25%        | 36%        | 26%        |
| <b>Pittsburgh 2017 (TA 43)</b>        | 37%          | [59%]      |            | 4%        | 17%        | [59%]      |            | 24%        |
| <b>Wash DC 2017 (TA 50)</b>           | 56%          | 26%        | 14%        | 4%        | 24%        | 22%        | 28%        | 26%        |
| <b>Boston 2015 (TA 54)</b>            | NA           | NA         | NA         | 10%       | NA         | NA         | NA         | 40%        |
| <b>Average</b>                        | <b>51%</b>   | <b>28%</b> | <b>14%</b> | <b>6%</b> | <b>18%</b> | <b>24%</b> | <b>31%</b> | <b>28%</b> |
| <b>Chicago 2020 (CC 8)</b>            | 42%          | 33%        | 20%        | 5%        | 18%        | 28%        | 31%        | 23%        |
| <b>Metrowest NJ 2021 (Com Conn 9)</b> | 53%          | 29%        | 14%        | 4%        | 18%        | 25%        | 29%        | 27%        |
| <b>Kansas City 2021 (91, CC 7)</b>    | 32%          | 25%        | 34%        | 10%       | 5%         | 22%        | 44%        | 29%        |
| <b>LA 2021 (CC 7)</b>                 | 33%          | 31%        | 27%        | 9%        | 12%        | 19%        | 41%        | 28%        |
| <b>Orlando 2021 (74)</b>              | 55%          | 32%        | 11%        | 3%        | 36%        | 29%        | 21%        | 13%        |
| <b>Pioneer Valley 19-20 (TA 60)</b>   | 27%          | 53%        | 14%        | 6%        | 13%        | 16%        | 35%        | 36%        |
| <b>Louisville 21-22 (CC 7)</b>        | 22%          | 37%        | 28%        | 13%       | 9%         | 38%        | 39%        | 14%        |
| <b>Delaware 22 (CC 7)</b>             | 41%          | 24%        | 29%        | 5%        | 43%        | 15%        | 22%        | 20%        |
| <b>Portland 22-23 (CC 7)</b>          | 54%          | 31%        | 12%        | 2%        | 20%        | 29%        | 39%        | 12%        |
| <b>Long Beach 21-22 (67)</b>          | NA           | NA         | NA         | 7%        | NA         | NA         | NA         | 54%        |
| <b>Washtenaw Cty 22-3 (CC 6)</b>      | 54%          | 22%        | 20%        | 4%        | 16%        | 38%        | 33%        | 13%        |
| <b>San Diego 22 (CC 2)</b>            | 39%          | 32%        | 25%        | 4%        | 16%        | 25%        | 37%        | 22%        |
| <b>St Louis 2024 (85)</b>             | NA           | NA         | NA         | 12%       | NA         | NA         | NA         | 35%        |
| <b>Miami 2024 (103, private)</b>      | 38%          | 28%        | 27%        | 8%        | 14%        | 23%        | 34%        | 29%        |
| <b>Maine 2024 (CC2)</b>               | 32%          | 33%        | 21%        | 14%       | 22%        | 28%        | 33%        | 17%        |
| <b>Average</b>                        | <b>40%</b>   | <b>32%</b> | <b>22%</b> | <b>7%</b> | <b>19%</b> | <b>26%</b> | <b>34%</b> | <b>25%</b> |
| <b>Combined Average</b>               | <b>44%</b>   | <b>30%</b> | <b>19%</b> | <b>6%</b> | <b>18%</b> | <b>25%</b> | <b>33%</b> | <b>26%</b> |

Feel part of local Jewish community – all communities except Boston, Metrowest and Orlando (feel connected to) and Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, Portland, Long Beach, Washtenaw, San Diego, Maine (feel sense of belonging to). St Louis asks about “a community where you live.” Boston only reports “very much.” Long Beach and St Louis report “any” not “a little,” that data is not included. Pittsburgh combines “a little” and “somewhat,” that data is not included. LA, Louisville, Delaware, Washtenaw and San Diego report “not much” instead of “a little” and “a great deal” instead of “very much.” The 2023 New York study found that 10% of intermarrieds compared to 54% of inmarrieds said they were connected to the New York Jewish community a lot; 30% compared to 5% said “not at all.” (UJFedNY data shared with the Center) The Santa Clara County study found that 7% of intermarrieds felt very connected to a local Jewish community compared to 29% of inmarrieds; 41% compared to 7% felt not at all connected. (Jewish Silicon Valley data shared with the Center)

**Table 4. Feeling of connection to Israel**

|                                           | Intermarried |            |            |            | Inmarried  |            |            |            |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
|                                           | Not at all   | A little   | Some -what | Very much  | Not at all | A little   | Some -what | Very much  |
| <b>Baltimore 2020</b> (TA 93)             | 33%          | 27%        | 26%        | 14%        | 13%        | 16%        | 27%        | 43%        |
| <b>Sarasota 2019</b> (TA 48)              | 18%          | 25%        | 31%        | 26%        | 4%         | 18%        | 25%        | 53%        |
| <b>Twin Cities 2019</b> (TA 84)           | 35%          | 29%        | 25%        | 11%        | 12%        | 20%        | 31%        | 37%        |
| <b>Cincinnati 2019</b> (TA 50)            | 30%          | 27%        | 24%        | 19%        | 6%         | 10%        | 34%        | 50%        |
| <b>Howard County 2019</b> (TA 56)         | 37%          | 29%        | 24%        | 10%        | 21%        | 18%        | 31%        | 30%        |
| <b>Denver 2018-19</b> (TA 62)             | 20%          | 32%        | 30%        | 18%        | 8%         | 19%        | 33%        | 40%        |
| <b>Palm Beach County 2018</b> (TA 76)     | 20%          | 32%        | 29%        | 20%        | 6%         | 14%        | 30%        | 51%        |
| <b>S Palm Beach County 2018</b> (TA 63-4) | 7%           | 39%        | 25%        | 30%        | 3%         | 11%        | 30%        | 56%        |
| <b>Pittsburgh 2017</b> (72)               | 39%          | 23%        | 23%        | 15%        | 12%        | 20%        | 32%        | 35%        |
| <b>Washington DC 2017</b> (TA 52)         | 21%          | 27%        | 29%        | 23%        | 9%         | 23%        | 26%        | 43%        |
| <b>Boston 2015</b> (TA 55)                | NA           | NA         | NA         | 16%        | NA         | NA         | NA         | 41%        |
| <b>Average</b>                            | <b>26%</b>   | <b>29%</b> | <b>27%</b> | <b>18%</b> | <b>9%</b>  | <b>17%</b> | <b>27%</b> | <b>44%</b> |

|                                     |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Chicago 2020</b> (CC 9)          | 26%        | 26%        | 31%        | 17%        | 7%         | 16%        | 35%        | 42%        |
| <b>Metrowest NJ 2021</b> (CC 7)     | 20%        | 28%        | 30%        | 21%        | 7%         | 18%        | 35%        | 40%        |
| <b>Kansas City 2021</b> (108, CC 9) | 26%        | 26%        | 34%        | 14%        | 5%         | 17%        | 46%        | 32%        |
| <b>LA 2021</b> (CC 8)               | 22%        | 27%        | 34%        | 17%        | 8%         | 16%        | 38%        | 38%        |
| <b>Orlando 2021</b> (83)            | 12%        | 35%        | 17%        | 36%        | 9%         | 22%        | 25%        | 44%        |
| <b>Pioneer Valley 2019-20</b> (63)  | 20%        | 25%        | 41%        | 14%        | 23%        | 23%        | 24%        | 31%        |
| <b>Louisville 21-22</b> (CC 9)      | 11%        | 29%        | 40%        | 21%        | 29%        | 16%        | 39%        | 17%        |
| <b>Delaware 22</b> (CC 9)           | 7%         | 31%        | 19%        | 42%        | 10%        | 14%        | 57%        | 18%        |
| <b>Portland 22-23</b> (CC 9)        | 38%        | 27%        | 25%        | 10%        | 16%        | 22%        | 32%        | 30%        |
| <b>Long Beach 21-22</b> (83)        | 35%        | 22%        | 32%        | 12%        | 14%        | 19%        | 37%        | 30%        |
| <b>Washtenaw Cty 22-3</b> (CC 7)    | 26%        | 21%        | 44%        | 9%         | 8%         | 23%        | 29%        | 39%        |
| <b>San Diego 22</b> (CC 7)          | 21%        | 24%        | 33%        | 22%        | 5%         | 17%        | 36%        | 41%        |
| <b>St Louis 2024</b> (101)          | 22%        | 15%        | 33%        | 31%        | 3%         | 13%        | 32%        | 52%        |
| <b>Miami 2024</b> (124)             | 24%        | 22%        | 31%        | 24%        | 6%         | 8%         | 19%        | 66%        |
| <b>Maine 2024</b> (94, CC 6)        | 19%        | 30%        | 29%        | 23%        | 18%        | 15%        | 35%        | 32%        |
| <b>Average</b>                      | <b>22%</b> | <b>26%</b> | <b>32%</b> | <b>21%</b> | <b>11%</b> | <b>17%</b> | <b>35%</b> | <b>37%</b> |
|                                     |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| <b>Combined Average</b>             | <b>24%</b> | <b>27%</b> | <b>30%</b> | <b>20%</b> | <b>10%</b> | <b>17%</b> | <b>33%</b> | <b>40%</b> |

Kansas City, LA, Louisville, Delaware, Long Beach, Washtenaw, San Diego, St Louis, Miami and Maine report “not too” not “a little.” Denver reports “not very” not “a little.”

Feel a connection: Baltimore, Sarasota, Twin Cities, Cincinnati, Howard, Denver, Palm Beach, S Palm Beach, DC, Metrowest, Orlando. Emotional connection: Pittsburgh. Attachment: Chicago. Emotional attachment: KC, LA, Pioneer, Louisville, Delaware, Portland, Long Beach, Washtenaw, San Diego, St Louis, Miami, Maine.

The Santa Clara County study found that 32% of intermarrieds felt very emotionally attached to Israel compared to 68% of inmarrieds; 70% compared to 30% felt not at all attached. (Jewish Silicon Valley data shared with the Center)

**Table 5. Jewish friends**

|                                         | Intermarried |            | Inmarried  |            |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|
|                                         | About half   | Most/all   | About half | Most/all   |
| <b>Baltimore 2020</b> (TA 79)           | 32%          | 7%         | 16%        | 60%        |
| <b>Sarasota 2019</b> (67)               | 12%          | 9%         | 19%        | 54%        |
| <b>Twin Cities 2019</b> (53)            | 16%          | 8%         | 21%        | 43%        |
| <b>Cincinnati 2019</b> (91)             | NA           | NA         | 21%        | 37%        |
| <b>Howard County 2019</b> (TA 49)       | 19%          | 4%         | 23%        | 28%        |
| <b>Denver 2018-19</b> (TA 44)           | NA           | 6%         | NA         | 41%        |
| <b>Palm Beach County 2018</b>           | NA           | NA         | NA         | NA         |
| <b>S Palm Beach County 2018</b> (TA 52) | 20%          | 33%        | 14%        | 75%        |
| <b>Pittsburgh 2017</b> (TA 41)          | NA           | 36%        | NA         | 37%        |
| <b>Washington DC 2017</b> (TA 49)       | NA           | 40%        | NA         | 37%        |
| <b>Boston 2015</b> (TA 52)              | NA           | 12%        | NA         | 47%        |
| <b>Average</b>                          | <b>20%</b>   | <b>17%</b> | <b>19%</b> | <b>46%</b> |

|                                        |            |            |            |            |
|----------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Chicago 2020</b> (TA 8)             | 26%        | 19%        | 24%        | 59%        |
| <b>Metrowest NJ 2021</b> (Com Conn 11) | 24%        | 12%        | 30%        | 49%        |
| <b>Kansas City 2021</b> (99, CC 7)     | 32%        | 7%         | 36%        | 51%        |
| <b>LA 2021</b> (TA 7)                  | 47%        | 19%        | 28%        | 61%        |
| <b>Orlando 2021</b> (76)               | 10%        | 4%         | 13%        | 25%        |
| <b>Pioneer Valley 2019-20</b> (TA 55)  | 14%        | 11%        | 39%        | 37%        |
| <b>Louisville 21-22</b> (CC 7)         | 30%        | 1%         | 25%        | 25%        |
| <b>Delaware 22</b> (CC 7)              | 9%         | 4%         | 43%        | 23%        |
| <b>Portland 22-23</b> (CC 7)           | 6%         | 2%         | 13%        | 27%        |
| <b>Washtenaw Cty 22-3</b> (79, CC 6)   | 48%        | 3%         | 46%        | 34%        |
| <b>San Diego 22</b> (83, CC 6)         | 31%        | 8%         | 26%        | 41%        |
| <b>Miami 2024</b> (104)                | NA         | 20%        | NA         | 76%        |
| <b>Maine 2024</b> (CC 5)               | NA         | 6%         | NA         | 25%        |
| <b>Average</b>                         | <b>25%</b> | <b>9%</b>  | <b>29%</b> | <b>41%</b> |
|                                        |            |            |            |            |
| <b>Combined Average</b>                | <b>24%</b> | <b>12%</b> | <b>26%</b> | <b>43%</b> |

“Most/all” compiled by the Center by adding two “most” and “all” categories; actual number may be slightly different due to rounding. Several communities report “some/half” without further breakdown so no data is included for “about half.”

Closest friends: Baltimore, Sarasota, Howard, S Palm Beach, Chicago, Pioneer. Close friends: Twin Cities, Denver, Pittsburgh, DC, Kansas City, Louisville, Delaware, Miami, LA, Maine. Friends: Cincinnati, Boston, Metrowest, Portland, Washtenaw, San Diego, Orlando.

The 2023 New York study found that the share of friends who are Jewish was most or all for 15% of intermarrieds compared to 63% of inmarrieds. (UJAFedNY data shared with the Center)

**Table 6. Satisfaction with connection to/participation in local Jewish community**

|                                    | Intermarried |            |            |            | Inmarried  |            |            |            |
|------------------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
|                                    | Not at all   | A little   | Some -what | Very much  | Not at all | A little   | Some -what | Very much  |
| <b>Chicago 2020 (CC 8)</b>         | 18%          | 27%        | 34%        | 21%        | 9%         | 27%        | 39%        | 25%        |
| <b>Metrowest NJ 2021 (CC 8)</b>    | 26%          | 25%        | 27%        | 22%        | 15%        | 27%        | 41%        | 17%        |
| <b>Kansas City 2021 (93, CC 7)</b> | 9%           | 21%        | 48%        | 22%        | 4%         | 14%        | 53%        | 29%        |
| <b>Louisville 21-22 (CC 7)</b>     | 19%          | 16%        | 49%        | 15%        | 4%         | 33%        | 37%        | 27%        |
| <b>Long Beach 21-22 (69)</b>       | 8%           | 24%        | 40%        | 27%        | 20%        | 15%        | 44%        | 21%        |
| <b>Washtenaw Cty 22-3 (CC 6)</b>   | 7%           | 44%        | 27%        | 21%        | 2%         | 31%        | 41%        | 26%        |
| <b>San Diego 22 (CC 6)</b>         | 9%           | 37%        | 27%        | 27%        | 12%        | 21%        | 43%        | 23%        |
| <b>Average</b>                     | <b>14%</b>   | <b>28%</b> | <b>36%</b> | <b>22%</b> | <b>9%</b>  | <b>24%</b> | <b>43%</b> | <b>24%</b> |

Question not asked in first eleven studies.

Connection: Chicago, Metrowest. Participation: Kansas City, Louisville, Long Beach, Washtenaw, San Diego.

“Not to” and “very” (not “a little” and “very much”): Kansas City, Louisville, Long Beach, Washtenaw, San Diego.

In Santa Clara County, 48% of intermarrieds were somewhat or very interested in being more connected to a local Jewish community, compared to 58% of inmarrieds. (Jewish Silicon Valley data shared with the Center)

**Table 7. Not knowing many people as barrier/limitation to involvement in community**

|                                     | <b>Intermarried</b> | <b>Inmarried</b> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|                                     |                     |                  |
| <b>Baltimore 2020 (83)</b>          | 47%                 | 39%              |
| <b>Twin Cities 2019 (61, TA 58)</b> | 42%                 | 27%              |
| <b>Cincinnati 2019 (89)</b>         | 70%                 | 60%              |
| <b>Howard County 2019 (54)</b>      | 55%                 | 41%              |
| <b>Average</b>                      | <b>54%</b>          | <b>42%</b>       |

|                                       |            |            |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Chicago 2020 (CC 8)</b>            | 33%        | 20%        |
| <b>Metrowest NJ 2021 (CC 8)</b>       | 22%        | 12%        |
| <b>Kansas City 2021 (95, CC 7)</b>    | 36%        | 17%        |
| <b>LA 2021 (CC 7)</b>                 | 21%        | 19%        |
| <b>Pioneer Valley 2019-20 (TA 56)</b> | 65%        | 42%        |
| <b>Louisville 21-22 (CC 7)</b>        | 49%        | 25%        |
| <b>Delaware 22 (CC 7)</b>             | 29%        | 19%        |
| <b>Long Beach 21-22 (74)</b>          | 52%        | 27%        |
| <b>Washtenaw Cty 22-3 (CC 6)</b>      | 57%        | 43%        |
| <b>San Diego 22 (CC 6)</b>            | 50%        | 36%        |
| <b>St Louis 2024 (62)</b>             | 32%        | 23%        |
| <b>Miami 2024 (111)</b>               | 37%        | 30%        |
| <b>Average</b>                        | <b>44%</b> | <b>28%</b> |
|                                       |            |            |
| <b>Combined Average</b>               | <b>46%</b> | <b>32%</b> |

A reason for lack of connection: Baltimore, Howard, Pioneer. A condition that limits involvement/participation: Cincinnati, Long Beach, Miami; and Twin Cities (somewhat or very much a limitation). A barrier to connection, of those not very satisfied with connection: Chicago, Kansas City, LA, Louisville, Delaware, Washtenaw, San Diego; and Metrowest (somewhat or very much a barrier). A condition that limits participation, of those interested in participation: St Louis.

**Table 8. Not welcoming/feel unwelcome as barrier/limitation to involvement in community**

|                                     | <b>Intermarried</b> | <b>Inmarried</b> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|                                     |                     |                  |
| <b>Baltimore 2020 (83)</b>          | 38%                 | 25%              |
| <b>Twin Cities 2019 (62, TA 61)</b> | 20%                 | 14%              |
| <b>Cincinnati 2019 (89)</b>         | 47%                 | 43%              |
| <b>Howard County 2019 (54)</b>      | 20%                 | 23%              |
| <b>Denver 2018-19 (23)</b>          | 13%                 | 13%              |
| <b>Average</b>                      | <b>28%</b>          | <b>24%</b>       |

|                                       |            |            |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Chicago 2020 (CC 8)</b>            | 7%         | 9%         |
| <b>Metrowest NJ 2021 (CC 8)</b>       | 16%        | 7%         |
| <b>Kansas City 2021 (96, CC 7)</b>    | 26%        | 16%        |
| <b>LA 2021 (CC 7)</b>                 | 12%        | 12%        |
| <b>Pioneer Valley 2019-20 (TA 56)</b> | 26%        | 13%        |
| <b>Louisville 21-22 (CC 7)</b>        | 12%        | 10%        |
| <b>Delaware 22 (CC 7)</b>             | 9%         | 10%        |
| <b>Portland 22-23 (CC 7)</b>          | 9%         | 5%         |
| <b>Long Beach 21-22 (76)</b>          | 12%        | 10%        |
| <b>Washtenaw Cty 22-3 (CC 6)</b>      | 21%        | 16%        |
| <b>San Diego 22 (CC 6)</b>            | 11%        | 8%         |
| <b>St Louis 2024 (62)</b>             | 3%         | 8%         |
| <b>Miami 2024 (112)</b>               | 13%        | 8%         |
| <b>Maine 2024 (CC 5)</b>              | 8%         | 14%        |
| <b>Average</b>                        | <b>13%</b> | <b>10%</b> |
|                                       |            |            |
| <b>Combined Average</b>               | <b>17%</b> | <b>14%</b> |

A reason for lack of connection: Baltimore, Howard, Pioneer; Denver (of those disconnected). A condition that limits involvement/participation: Cincinnati, Long Beach, Miami; and Twin Cities (somewhat or very much a limitation). A barrier to connection/participation, of those not very satisfied with connection/participation: Chicago, Kansas City, LA, Louisville, Delaware, Portland, Washtenaw, San Diego, Maine; and Metrowest (somewhat or very much a barrier). A condition that limits participation, of those interested in participation: St Louis. In the Santa Clara study, 14% of intermarried respondents said that Jewish communities are not welcoming enough to interfaith families. (Jewish Silicon Valley data shared with the Center)

**Table 9. Conditions that make people feel welcome and comfortable at Jewish programs**

**Know Other People There**

|                                  | <b>Intermarried</b> | <b>Inmarried</b> |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| <b>Long Beach 21-22 (71)</b>     | 69%                 | 77%              |
| <b>Washtenaw Cty 22-3 (CC 6)</b> | 81%                 | 92%              |
| <b>San Diego 22 (CC 6)</b>       | 70%                 | 77%              |
| <b>Average</b>                   | <b>73%</b>          | <b>82%</b>       |

**Personally Invited**

|                                  | <b>Intermarried</b> | <b>Inmarried</b> |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| <b>Long Beach 21-22 (70)</b>     | 64%                 | 48%              |
| <b>Washtenaw Cty 22-3 (CC 6)</b> | 54%                 | 65%              |
| <b>San Diego 22 (CC 6)</b>       | 64%                 | 60%              |
| <b>Average</b>                   | <b>61%</b>          | <b>58%</b>       |

**Reflected in People Who Attend**

|                                  | <b>Intermarried</b> | <b>Inmarried</b> |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| <b>Long Beach 21-22 (71)</b>     | 32%                 | 53%              |
| <b>Washtenaw Cty 22-3 (CC 6)</b> | 60%                 | 54%              |
| <b>San Diego 22 (CC 6)</b>       | 31%                 | 42%              |
| <b>Average</b>                   | <b>41%</b>          | <b>50%</b>       |

**Policies around Diversity and Inclusion Are Made Explicit**

|                                  | <b>Intermarried</b> | <b>Inmarried</b> |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| <b>Long Beach 21-22 (73)</b>     | 34%                 | 17%              |
| <b>Washtenaw Cty 22-3 (CC 6)</b> | 67%                 | 24%              |
| <b>San Diego 22 (CC 6)</b>       | 32%                 | 22%              |
| <b>Average</b>                   | <b>44%</b>          | <b>21%</b>       |

**Table 10. How Children Are Raised**

|                                        | <b>% of Jewish children<br/>who are Jews of<br/>Multiple Religions</b> | <b>% of children being raised<br/>Jewish and another religion<br/>by intermarried parents</b> |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Baltimore 2020</b> (18, 59)         | 8%                                                                     | 18%                                                                                           |
| <b>Sarasota 2019</b> (17, 47)          | 6%                                                                     | 12%                                                                                           |
| <b>Twin Cities 2019</b> (21, 71)       | 32%                                                                    | 34%                                                                                           |
| <b>Cincinnati 2019</b> (20, 50)        | 9%                                                                     | 10%                                                                                           |
| <b>Howard County 2019</b> (16, 38)     | 10%                                                                    | 18%                                                                                           |
| <b>Denver 2018-19</b> (40)             | NA                                                                     | 18%                                                                                           |
| <b>Palm Beach County 2018</b> (18, 46) | 25%                                                                    | 8%                                                                                            |
| <b>S Palm Beach County 2018</b> (16)   | 13%                                                                    | NA                                                                                            |
| <b>Pittsburgh 2017</b> (13, 33)        | 6%                                                                     | 11%                                                                                           |
| <b>Washington DC 2017</b> (15, 45)     | 10%                                                                    | 14%                                                                                           |
| <b>Boston 2015</b> (13, 34)            | 10%                                                                    | 12%                                                                                           |
| <b>Average</b>                         | <b>13%</b>                                                             | <b>16%</b>                                                                                    |

|                                       | <b>% of Jewish children<br/>who are Jews of<br/>Multiple Religions</b> | <b>% of children being raised<br/>Jewish and another religion<br/>by intermarried parents</b> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Chicago 2020</b> (11/66)           | 16%                                                                    | 21%                                                                                           |
| <b>Metrowest NJ 2021</b> (O6/CJE 8-9) | 24%                                                                    | 35%                                                                                           |
| <b>Kansas City 2021</b> (17/43)       | 14%                                                                    | 14%                                                                                           |
| <b>LA 2021</b> (CJE 3, 7)             | 12%                                                                    | 15%                                                                                           |
| <b>Orlando 2021</b> (19/52)           | 13%                                                                    | 19%                                                                                           |
| <b>Pioneer Valley 2019-20</b> (17/18) | 16%                                                                    | 46%                                                                                           |
| <b>Louisville 21-22</b> (48/50)       | 14%                                                                    | 27%                                                                                           |
| <b>Delaware 22</b> (17/42)            | 34%                                                                    | 15%                                                                                           |
| <b>Portland 22-23</b> (17/43-4)       | 23%                                                                    | 15%                                                                                           |
| <b>Long Beach 21-22</b> (9/34)        | 14%                                                                    | 14%                                                                                           |
| <b>Washtenaw Cty 22-3</b> (14/43)     | 26%                                                                    | 39%                                                                                           |
| <b>San Diego 22</b> (14/49)           | 23%                                                                    | 20%                                                                                           |
| <b>St Louis 2024</b> (13/43)          | 24%                                                                    | 29%                                                                                           |
| <b>Miami 2024</b> (72, 74)            | 5%                                                                     | 24%                                                                                           |
| <b>Maine 2024</b> (49, 51)            | 27%                                                                    | 30%                                                                                           |
| <b>Average</b>                        | <b>19%</b>                                                             | <b>24%</b>                                                                                    |
|                                       |                                                                        |                                                                                               |
| <b>Combined Average</b>               | <b>16%</b>                                                             | <b>21%</b>                                                                                    |

Pioneer Valley and Louisville JMR are of all children in Jewish households, not of Jewish children. Metrowest, LA, Portland, San Diego and Maine do not identify as JMR; data is the percentage, of Jewish children, of those who are Jewish and another religion.

**Table 11. Provide Any K-12 Education for Children**

|                                | <b>Intermarried</b> | <b>Inmarried</b> |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| <b>Baltimore 2020 (62)</b>     | 14%                 | 61%              |
| <b>Sarasota 2019</b>           | NA                  | NA               |
| <b>Twin Cities 2019 (74)</b>   | 16%                 | 48%              |
| <b>Cincinnati 2019 (53)</b>    | 9%                  | 30%              |
| <b>Howard County 2019 (39)</b> | 17%                 | 46%              |
| <b>Average</b>                 | <b>14%</b>          | <b>46%</b>       |

|                                       |            |            |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Chicago 2020 (CC 5)</b>            | 14%        | 42%        |
| <b>Metrowest NJ 2021 (CJE 12)</b>     | 13%        | 37%        |
| <b>Kansas City 2021 (CC 5)</b>        | 12%        | 54%        |
| <b>LA 2021 (CC 5)</b>                 | 48%        | 59%        |
| <b>Orlando 2021 (CC 5)</b>            | 4%         | 13%        |
| <b>Pioneer Valley 2019-20 (TA 39)</b> | 30%        | 44%        |
| <b>Louisville 21-22 (CC 5)</b>        | NA         | 64%        |
| <b>Portland 22-23 (CC 5)</b>          | 24%        | 73%        |
| <b>Long Beach 21-22</b>               | NA         | NA         |
| <b>Washtenaw Cty 22-3 (46)</b>        | 18%        | 47%        |
| <b>San Diego 22 (CC 3)</b>            | 48%        | 70%        |
| <b>Miami 2024 (78)</b>                | NA         | 61%        |
| <b>Maine 2024 (53, CC 3)</b>          | 41%        | 74%        |
| <b>Average</b>                        | <b>25%</b> | <b>53%</b> |
|                                       |            |            |
| <b>Combined Average</b>               | <b>22%</b> | <b>51%</b> |

Kansas City, LA, Louisville, San Diego, Maine: child enrolled in Jewish education.

The 2023 New York study found that 33% of intermarrieds compared to 67% of inmarrieds participated in any formal Jewish education. (UJAFedNY data shared with the Center)

The Santa Clara County study found that 19% of intermarrieds compared to 26% of inmarrieds had participated in part-time synagogue based religious school. (Jewish Silicon Valley data shared with the Center)

**Table 12. Get PJ Books**

|                                       | <b>Intermarried</b> | <b>Inmarried</b> |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|                                       |                     |                  |
| <b>Twin Cities 2019 (TA 39)</b>       | 16%                 | 33%              |
| <b>Cincinnati 2019 (TA 28)</b>        | NA                  | 71%              |
| <b>Palm Beach County 2018 (TA 38)</b> | 43%                 | 62%              |
| <b>Average</b>                        | <b>30%</b>          | <b>55%</b>       |

|                                       |            |            |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Chicago 2020 (CC 5)</b>            | 23%        | 60%        |
| <b>Metrowest NJ 2021 (CC 5)</b>       | 22%        | 39%        |
| <b>Kansas City 2021 (CC 5)</b>        | 41%        | 77%        |
| <b>LA 2021 (CC 5)</b>                 | 30%        | 29%        |
| <b>Pioneer Valley 2019-20 (TA 40)</b> | 41%        | 32%        |
| <b>Louisville 21-22 (CC 5)</b>        | 19%        | NA         |
| <b>Delaware 22 (CC 5)</b>             | NA         | 37%        |
| <b>Portland 22-23 (CC 5)</b>          | 18%        | 44%        |
| <b>San Diego 22 (CC 3)</b>            | 30%        | 60%        |
| <b>Maine 2024 (CC 3)</b>              | 25%        | 56%        |
| <b>Average</b>                        | <b>28%</b> | <b>48%</b> |
|                                       |            |            |
| <b>Combined Average</b>               | <b>28%</b> | <b>50%</b> |

In Santa Clara County, 43% of intermarrieds compared to 71% of inmarrieds had participated in PJ Library. (Jewish Silicon Valley data shared with the Center)

## Appendix

### Relevant Open-ended Responses and Comment from the Quantitative Studies

The local studies asked general open-ended questions soliciting comments from respondents; some of the comments reflect on interfaith family inclusion. (Five of the studies reviewed in the earlier paper invited comments about what prevented people in interfaith relationships from participating in Jewish life. That question was not asked in the studies reviewed in this paper.) Consistent with the qualitative studies, the open-ended comments reveal concerns about inclusion and feeling othered.

The Chicago study says, “Intermarried respondents described challenges in finding their place within Jewish organizations. Forty-one respondents discussed their perceptions of being excluded from the community.” (200) Comments include:

*Since I am not Jewish, at certain events I have felt extremely excluded...it's difficult to build interfaith relationships and alliances with other organizations if your Jewish community is so strongly against anyone perceived to be an “other.”*

*My [spouse] is Christian, and while I have worked most of my adult life for [a Jewish organization] in some capacity, I have never felt very welcomed by the mainstream community.*

*Would like to see a bigger push to include my adult children who have married non-Jewish spouses. Not enough inclusiveness for mixed marriages and their offspring, to keep them feeling Jewish.”*

A Kansas City respondent who said there were “other” reasons that limited their participation in the community said: (97-98):

*I am Jewish but my partner isn't. I'm very worried that there won't be a community that welcomes my child's Jewish identity and my partner's non-Jewish identity.*

The Orlando study says that some respondents said they believed certain groups, such as interfaith families, LGBTQ Jews, and Jews of color, felt specifically excluded from the community. (85) One comment was:

*Interfaith families, more openly LGBTQ, and Jews of color need to feel included.*

The Louisville study notes that sixty-three respondents “felt strongly that the Louisville Jewish community needs to focus on being more inclusive and welcoming in the coming years. Their collective concern is driven by a sense that the community has not been particularly welcoming to certain kinds of people, including interfaith families; young adults; newcomers to the community; Jews of Color; and Jews whose lack of knowledge of Jewish history, culture, tradition, or religion may already make them anxious about engaging in Jewish communal life.” (115-16) Comments include:

*Creating a welcoming feeling for mixed marriages, converts, and all those who wish to practice Judaic life to feel they can do (female, age 68, unmarried).*

*Continuing to build and support interfaith and interracial relationships (female, age 75, unmarried).*

*Building a community and expanding to include those who are new to the area, especially mixed religion couples (female, age 53, intermarried).*

One comment in Portland (110) was:

*I feel very disconnected. I want to be involved, but I have a lot of anxiety about it. My spouse is not Jewish, so I would be going to events alone.*

Comments from Long Beach (107–12) include:

*I live in a mixed religion home and find some lack of proactive inclusiveness to multi-religious families.*

*Early in my marriage, my wife attended a service at a local synagogue with me. She is not Jewish. A guest speaker spoke on how horrible it was for Jews to marry non-Jews. My wife fled in tears, and my hopes of being able to maintain a membership in a synagogue were dashed.*

The Washtenaw County study says (136): “Fifty-nine respondents highlighted the need for outreach to members of the community. There was a particular interest in making sure that all segments of the community feel welcome and included.” Comments include:

*Recognizing and welcoming interfaith families and their children.*

*Gaps [include] recognizing and welcoming interfaith families and their children. Allowing their diversity to strengthen the community. (133)*

One comment in St. Louis (154) was:

*Not nearly enough resources or connections or community for intermarried families—we don’t fit in anywhere. Because I am married to a non-Jew, despite trying to be involved in many Jewish organizations, I always feel like an outsider, like I’m less-than.*

One comment in Maine (133) was:

*We are in a “mixed” marriage. In spite of my Gentile wife’s efforts to contribute to synagogue life, there was not the feeling of inclusiveness that I wanted. We didn’t feel supported by the rabbi at the time and stopped our Jewish children’s religious education short of bar/bat mitzvah. Not necessarily a strength/weakness of the community, but our interpretation of attitudes.*

## Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup> Pew Research Center, “[What happens when Jews intermarry](#),” November 12, 2013; Pew Research Center, [Jewish Americans in 2020](#) (at 93).

<sup>2</sup> Pew Research Center data shared with the Center, not included in the published report.

<sup>3</sup> David Brubaker, “Beyond Hospitality to Inclusion,” 2017, <http://www.congregationalconsulting.org/beyond-hospitality-inclusion/>.

<sup>4</sup> These studies are: [2015 Boston](#); [2017 Pittsburgh](#); [2017 Washington DC](#); [2018 Palm Beach](#); [2018 South Palm Beach County](#); [2018-2019 Denver](#); [2019 Cincinnati](#); [2019 Howard County](#); [2019 Sarasota](#); [2019 Twin Cities](#); [2020 Baltimore](#).

<sup>5</sup> These studies are: [Beyond Welcoming: Engaging Intermarried Couples in Jewish Life](#) (national, 2019); [We'll Cross That Bridge When We Get to It](#), Boston 2019); [Points of Entry: Interfaith Families in Pittsburgh](#), 2019) and [Swimming Upstream: Interfaith Families in Toronto](#), 2020).

<sup>6</sup> These studies are: [Chicago 2020](#); [Greater Metrowest NJ 2021](#); [Kansas City 2021](#); [Los Angeles 2021](#); [Central Florida \(Orlando\) 2020-21](#); [Pioneer Valley \(MA\) 2019-20](#); [Louisville 2021-22](#); [Delaware and Brandywine Valley 2022](#); [Greater Portland \(OR\) 2022-23](#); [Long Beach Area \(CA\) 2021-22](#); [Washtenaw County Area \(MI\) 2022-23](#); [San Diego 2022](#); [Greater St. Louis 2024](#); [Miami 2024](#); and [Maine 2024](#).

A local community study not conducted by the Cohen Center, [New York 2023](#), generated some data relevant to belonging that is mentioned in Tables 3, 5 and 11 appended to this paper. The New York study is an outlier in the sense of a low rate of interfaith marriage (46% of non-Orthodox couples are intermarried compared to the 2020 Pew Report's 64%) and a low rate of intermarried families raising children either Jewish or Jewish and something else (21% compared to the 2020 Pew report's 69%) (NY Population Estimates & Demography, and Children & Jewish Education reports). Notably, 20% said they haven't decided on religion for their children, and 44% said they weren't raising them in any tradition; that 64% represents an opportunity for the Jewish community.

[Philadelphia 2019](#) and [Maricopa County \(AZ\) 2019](#), two local studies not conducted by the Cohen Center, do not include any data relevant to feeling belonging.

<sup>7</sup> We are grateful to Alicia Chandler of the Cohen Center, Tobin Belzer, and Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz of Rosov Consulting, for providing helpful comments on a draft of this paper. Of course, we are solely responsible for any errors in our review of the studies' data.

<sup>8</sup> Edmund Case, “[Beyond Welcoming? Not So Fast](#),” eJewishPhilanthropy, August 13, 2019.

<sup>9</sup> Brubaker, “Beyond Hospitality to Inclusion.”

<sup>10</sup> The tables appended to this paper compile data from the Cohen Center's 26 local community studies, with notes that mention data from other studies. Explanatory notes explain differences in questions and response categories. In some cases, this paper's tables include data that was not found or reported in the previous paper's tables, or correct errors in those tables.

---

<sup>11</sup> The tables appended to this paper show averages of the 11 studies reviewed in the December 2020 paper (referred to here as “earlier studies”), and of the 15 studies reviewed in this paper (“later studies”). Comparisons can be drawn between the two sets of studies, but describing clear trends is problematic when comparing different studies over different time periods. With that caveat, we note that there is not significant change between the earlier and more recent studies with respect to being Jewish as a matter of community:

- Earlier studies: intermarried 25%, inmarried 54% (average across 9 communities)
- Later studies: intermarried 28%, inmarried 45% (average across 7 communities)

<sup>12</sup> The gap has closed some in the more recent studies, with more intermarrieds (as well as inmarrieds) on average feeling very much connected/part of:

- Earlier studies: intermarrieds 17%, inmarrieds 42% (average across 10 communities)
- Later studies: intermarrieds 31%, inmarrieds 51% (average across 14 communities)

<sup>13</sup> This gap has also closed some in the more recent studies, with fewer intermarrieds on average feeling not at all or a little connected:

- Earlier studies: intermarrieds 52%, inmarrieds 21% (average across 9 communities)
- Later studies: intermarrieds 31%, inmarrieds 17% (average across 13 communities)

<sup>14</sup> There is almost no change between the earlier and more recent studies:

- Earlier studies: intermarrieds 6%, inmarrieds 28% (average across 10 communities)
- Later studies: intermarrieds 7%, inmarrieds 25% (average across 15 communities)

<sup>15</sup> Somewhat fewer intermarrieds on average feel not at all connected in the more recent studies:

- Earlier studies: intermarrieds 51%, inmarrieds 18% (average across 9 communities)
- Later studies: intermarrieds 40%, inmarrieds 19% (average across 13 communities)

In Denver, 4% of intermarrieds compared to 28% of inmarrieds said they were very connected to any kind of Jewish community; 36% of intermarrieds compared to 16% of inmarrieds said they were very disconnected. (TA 48)

<sup>16</sup> There is not significant change between the earlier and more recent studies:

- Earlier studies: intermarrieds 18%, inmarrieds 44% (average across 11 communities)
- Later studies: intermarrieds 21%, inmarrieds 37% (average across 15 communities)

<sup>17</sup> There is not significant change between the earlier and more recent studies.

- Earlier studies: intermarrieds 26%, inmarrieds 9% (average across 10 communities)
- Later studies: intermarrieds 22%, inmarrieds 11% (average across 15 communities)

**A Note on the Minimally Involved.** The Cohen Center’s local community studies typically describe four or five engagement groups, ranging from the least (“Minimally”) to the most (“Immersed”) involved. The Cohen Center did a reanalysis of the Los Angeles study that focused on intermarried households. (The reanalysis is not published but was shared with the Center by the Jewish Federation of Greater Los

---

Angeles.) Forty percent of intermarried Jews were in the Minimally Involved group, compared to 9% of inmarried Jews. (11)

The reanalysis found that Minimally Involved intermarrieds in LA were even less connected to the Jewish people, the local Jewish community, and Israel, than all intermarrieds in LA taken together:

- For all intermarrieds, 32% said they were very much connected to the Jewish people; for Minimally Involved intermarrieds, 12%. (11)
- For all intermarrieds, 33% said they felt not at all connected to the local Jewish community, for Minimally Involved intermarrieds, 50% (11)
- For all intermarrieds, 17% felt very much attached to Israel; for Minimally Involved intermarrieds, 0%. (14)

<sup>18</sup> The study was commissioned by the Jewish Federation of Greater Los Angeles to add nuance to the quantitative data gathered in the 2021 Study of Jewish Los Angeles. It is based on interviews of each partner from twenty couples who self-identified as interfaith and had children under the age of 13. These couples had indicated that being Jewish was an important part their family life to at least a slight extent and were raising their children Jewish in some way. (10)

<sup>19</sup> Some limit these questions to those who are disconnected or dissatisfied with their involvement or participation.

A number of the earlier Cohen Center local studies asked whether the community was welcoming to interfaith families, or “to people like you” (see Table 7 in the previous paper), but those questions have not been asked in the more recent studies.

<sup>20</sup> In the more recent studies, the percentage selecting feeling unwelcome decreased by a little more than half:

- Earlier studies: intermarrieds 28%, inmarrieds 24% (average across 5 communities)
- Later studies: intermarrieds 13%, inmarrieds 10% (average across 14 communities)

The Denver data is consistent – 37% of intermarrieds compared to 34% of inmarrieds said they felt disconnected from Jewish community because they feel they don’t belong. The Denver study makes an interesting observation – 22% of intermarrieds compared to 10% of inmarrieds said they felt disconnected because they don’t want to exclude their non-Jewish friends and partners. (TA 48)

In Miami, 8% of Jewish adults cite feeling unwelcome as a barrier to program participation, mentioning various reasons for feeling unwelcome including treatment toward Jews of color and LGBTQ Jews, without any mention of interfaith families. (109)

The Los Angeles reanalysis finds that almost half of intermarrieds in the Communal and Immersed engagement groups consider local organizations to be very welcoming to interfaith families, compared to just under 30% of the Holiday and Ritual engagement groups, which are defined by more personal and less communal activities. (13) Thus, fewer intermarrieds who are less communally involved say the community is very welcoming to them.

---

The 2020 Pew report asked questions about why people did not go to religious services. The report notes that 8% of intermarrieds say they don't feel welcome (85). According to Pew Research Center data shared with the Center, 10% of intermarrieds said "I feel pressured to do more or give more" and 4% said "people treat me like I don't really belong."

<sup>21</sup> In Santa Clara County, 38% of respondents said it was very important for the local Jewish community to fund programs for interfaith families. (20)

<sup>22</sup> The idea that more intermarrieds may be open to engagement is inconsistent with the Los Angeles reanalysis, which notes that "In the Minimally Involved group, inmarried adults report more barriers related to lack of interest and logistics. The fact that intermarried Jews are less likely to report these barriers suggests that they are simply not interested in Jewish life. In other words – there are no barriers that the Jewish community can address that would entice them to participate." (11) It is of course true that some number of intermarrieds are not interested in Jewish life; but there is much evidence in the research that many are. The LA reanalysis itself notes that othering may be a factor, when it refers to the "perception that as intermarried Jews they do not feel included." (12)

<sup>23</sup> The gap has widened some in the more recent studies:

- Earlier studies: intermarrieds 17%, inmarrieds 46% (average across 9-10 communities)
- Later studies: intermarrieds 9%, inmarrieds 41% (average across 13 communities)

<sup>24</sup> Fewer intermarrieds (and inmarrieds) report this in the more recent studies:

- Earlier studies: intermarrieds 54%, inmarrieds 42% (average across 4 communities)
- Later studies: intermarrieds 44%, inmarrieds 28% (average across 12 communities)

One indicator that interfaith families are not being reached by local Jewish communities: only 28% of intermarrieds, compared to 50% of inmarrieds, receive PJ Library books. (average across 11 communities; see Table 12)

<sup>25</sup> In Washtenaw County, 46% of intermarrieds said that someone from a Jewish organization personally reached out to them within the past year, compared to 64% of inmarrieds; 5% of intermarrieds were asked to serve on a committee and/or in a leadership role, compared to 17% of inmarrieds; 7% were asked how they were doing, compared to 25% of inmarrieds. (67)

<sup>26</sup> The LA reanalysis noted that "For the Communal and Ritual groups, intermarried Jews are more likely to desire diversity and inclusion. Perhaps this is a reflection of their perception that as intermarried Jews they do not feel included." (12) In the Communal group, 69% of intermarrieds said explicit inclusion policies was a welcoming factor, compared to 40% of inmarrieds; 59% said explaining rituals was a welcoming factor, compared to 33% of inmarrieds. (12)

<sup>27</sup> A related factor is the presence of diverse attendees: Washtenaw County notes (86) that "[a] larger share of those in intermarried relationships indicated that Jewish events that are attended by people with diverse backgrounds is a welcoming condition for them (78%), compared to those in inmarried relationships (39%)." In the Los Angeles reanalysis, in the Ritual group, 82% of intermarrieds said diverse attendees was a welcoming factor, compared to 46% of inmarrieds; 71% said being reflected in the people there was a welcoming factor, compared to 46% of inmarrieds. (12) In Santa Clara County,

---

60% of interfaith respondents said it is important to them to have a Jewish community with others who share their identities. (37)

<sup>28</sup> Data from the local community studies show that 16% of all Jewish children are Jews of Multiple Religion, meaning that their parents say they are being raised as Jewish and another religion, and that 21% of the children of *intermarried* parents are being raised Jewish and another religion. (average across 25 communities; see Table 10). One comment in the Parenting study was that “Acceptance is huge. That means... not telling you how to raise your child.”