

What We Know About... The Effects of Jewish Education on Jewish Identification

Arnold Dashefsky

Does a child's continued involvement in Jewish study produce an adult commitment to Jewish behavior and identity? Stated differently, how does the Jewish education of a child contribute to the creating of a self-identifying adult Jew? This core question is the focus of Dr. Dashefsky's article. He currently serves as Professor of Sociology at the University of Connecticut in Storrs, where he is also the Director of the Center for Judaic Studies and Contemporary Jewish Life.

A WELL-RESPECTED BUSINESSMAN, ACCORDING TO AN APOCRYPHAL STORY, REGISTERED HIS SON IN A well-known western university. As the father examined the bulletin of courses describing the requirements, he began to shake his head dubiously. He turned to the dean and asked her, "Does my son have to take all of these classes? Can't you make it shorter? He wants to get through quickly."

"Certainly he can take a shorter course," replied the dean, "but it depends on what he wants to make of himself. To grow a redwood takes hundreds of years, but it takes much less than one hundred days to grow a cucumber!"

The lesson of the dean's remark is that the more energy invested in one's education, the stronger and more powerful will be the outcome. In general, redwoods are more durable than cucumbers and, I suppose, most people would like to think of themselves as redwoods rather than cucumbers. Does this analogy, however, apply to Jewish education? Does a child's continued involvement in Jewish study produce an adult commitment to Jewish behavior and identity?

Shaping Jewish Identification

In order to assess the effects of Jewish education on Jewish identification, I conducted a systematic search of the recent social science literature.¹ A few early studies based on research carried out in the 1960's did not attribute much independent effect to Jewish education in shaping Jewish

identification (Sanua, 1964; Rosen, 1965 and Goldlust, 1970). Only Lazerwitz (1973) found some independent effect of Jewish education on Jewish identification as part of a larger analysis of religious identification, but it was not as powerful as the family factors.

The Home and the School (Cohen, 1974)

Among more recent studies, one of the first to examine the impact of Jewish education on religious identification and practice was conducted by Cohen (1974), who sought to examine the relative contribution of the home and religious school in the development of Jewish identification. A sample of 626 Jewish undergraduates studying at Columbia and Barnard in 1969 returned questionnaires, which covered a variety of dimensions including parental religiosity as well as respondent Jewish education, ritual orientation, and other attitudes toward Jewish life. Four conclusions emerged from cross-tabular analysis:

1. When we control for parental religiousness, there is little difference in the frequency of strong Jewish identification between those who attended some form of part-time religious school and those who reported only Sunday school or no formal religious training.
2. Those who have attended a yeshiva or a day school consistently score higher on Jewish identification measures than those who have not. This relationship is maintained even when we control for parental religiousness.
3. The effect of full-time religious education is most pronounced among those respondents whose parents are the most observant.
4. Though the effect of yeshivas and day schools is substantial for all identification variables, the greatest increment over the part-time respondents is in knowledge of Hebrew — the one cognitive variable measured in this study (Cohen, 1974, p. 325).

As Cohen noted, the first three findings were consistent with those in an earlier widely cited 1966 study of the education of Catholic Americans by Greeley and Rossi. Cohen concluded that religious schools can be as successful (or unsuccessful) as their secular counterparts in imparting knowledge but are less effective in shaping beliefs, which seem to be formed at home.

Jewish Education and Identification (Shapiro and Dashefsky, 1974)

Just about the same time Cohen was conducting his study among college students in New York, Howard M. Shapiro and Arnold Dashefsky (1974) were examining the relative effects of Jewish education on identification among a sample of young adult Jewish men living in metropolitan St. Paul, Minnesota, in 1969. In this study, 183 respondents returned questionnaires which included items on Jewish education, in addition to measures of religious attitudes and behaviors of both the respondents and their parents. Shapiro and Dashefsky started with a premise similar to Cohen's. This premise was based on the suggestion of B.C. Rosen (1965), that Jewish education might have no

independent effect on Jewish identification. Nevertheless, Shapiro and Dashefsky, on the basis of correlational analysis, found a significant relationship between Jewish education and Jewish identification.

Four other variables relating to the respondents' childhood and adolescence also were examined: Jewish activities with parents, Jewish activities at home, father's religiosity and Jewish familial expectations for participation in Jewish activities. None of these variables revealed a significant relationship with Jewish education although each was correlated with Jewish identification. The authors concluded: "In sum, our data indicate that Jewish education is one childhood and adolescent experience that is a significant factor in Jewish identification independent of other socialization variables" (Shapiro and Dashefsky, 1974, p. 97). In a lengthier study, they further stated:

Thus, it seems that the importance of Jewish education does not rest in the fact that it is an extension of parental power or peer pressure, but that, through intellectual content and interpersonal relationships, it influences what a Jew should know, feel, and do. This would be particularly true when Jewish education extends well into adolescence, a key stage in the formation of the attitudes which constitute Jewish identification (Dashefsky and Shapiro, 1974, p.62).²

Given the fact that there is an observed relationship between Jewish education and identification, are there any factors that significantly affect this relationship? In probing this area, one finding by Shapiro and Dashefsky (1974) appears particularly interesting. They found some dramatic differences when examining this relationship for three different levels of secular education. Most notable was the finding that for those individuals with advanced degrees, a characteristic which is more common among Jews than the general population, the overall correlation for all cases doubled (from .23 to .49). They argued:

The further a person has pursued a formal academic career, the stronger the relationship between the principal variables under investigation. Perhaps, differences in secular education specify varying weights to the intellectual basis of ethnic identification. Subjects who have gone on to higher academic attainment may rely more on formal learning (in this case Jewish education) for the formation of their attitudes (i.e., toward the Jewish community). Despite the higher mean amount of Jewish education and the stronger correlation with Jewish identification, those with advanced degrees scored lowest on our scale measuring identification. Thus, formal secular education may erode other sources of Jewish identification even while raising the salience of Jewish education (Shapiro and Dashefsky, 1974, p. 98).³

This finding was similar to that which Goldstein and Goldscheider reported in their demographic study of the Providence Jewish community. They stated:

Two factors may thus be operating: (1) religious and secular education go together in terms of proportion and length of exposure, and (2) Jewish education may be one of the major forces preventing the post-college and college trained from rejecting their Judaism and Jewish identification (Goldstein and Goldscheider, 1968, p. 224).

Finally, Dashefsky and Shapiro, in comparing the generation of younger men⁴ to the generation of their fathers, found that Jewish education and identification were significantly correlated but could not find support for those effects being independent of the home among the older men:

This is probably because in the older generation a formalized system of Jewish education was not extensive...(but) the decline in the pervasiveness of the Jewish subculture as part of the pattern of acculturation in the generation of younger men has led to Jewish education having a significant independent effect on Jewish identification (Dashefsky and Shapiro, 1974, pp. 85-86).

Adolescence and Identification (Sigal, August and Beltempo, 1981)

While the research by Dashefsky and Shapiro found a significant relationship between Jewish education and identification, they could say nothing about the type of education received. Several years later in a study of 73 Jewish high-school students in Montreal, Sigal, August, and Beltempo (1981) sought support for the hypothesis "that full-time Jewish education, extending into adolescence, may have an impact on Jewish identification, which has not been noted for elementary school Jewish education" (1981, p. 230). Indeed, the authors, in comparing two groups of eleventh grade students and controlling for parental level of Jewish identification, found that full-time day school education can positively affect Jewish identification. For students not in the day school, the home is the predominant influence.

Time (Himmelfarb, 1974)

While the previous study confirmed a positive effect of Jewish education on identification for day school students, the question remained whether this effect could be extended to supplemental schools. During the 1970's at least two Jewish community agencies commissioned reports on Jewish education based on research carried out by social scientists on the effects of Jewish education on Jewish identification. One study, originally conducted by Himmelfarb (1974) and based on a sample of 1009 Jewish adults in Chicago, was published by the Institute for Jewish Policy Planning and Research of the Synagogue Council of America. He reported that "at least 3000 hours of religious instruction are needed before Jewish schooling has any lasting impact" (1975, p. 3). Since very few students actually receive that much schooling, Himmelfarb concluded "in terms of the long range consequences for Jewish identity, these data indicate that the type of Jewish education

received by over 80% of these American Jews who have received any Jewish education has been a waste of time" (1975, p. 3).

In other words, Jewish education can effectively influence Jewish identification even in the supplemental school, if children are exposed to it for a sufficient period of time, which of necessity would be well into their adolescence or approximately twelve years of schooling. Since most children do not study for such a lengthy period of time, they are "culturally deprived" according to Himmelfarb.

In a more technical paper, Himmelfarb demonstrated that Jewish education accentuated parental influences. But in two areas of Jewish identification, "devotional and intellectual aesthetic religious involvement, Jewish schools seem to have a conversion effect on a small, but not negligible, number of respondents" (Himmelfarb, 1977, p. 472). Thus, Jewish education, under certain conditions, can have a positive effect on Jewish identification in the devotional area of ritual observance or in the intellectual-aesthetic domain of reading, studying, and accumulating Jewish books, art, and music.

Thus far, the four studies described have demonstrated that Jewish education, under certain conditions, can have a positive effect on identification. Each study had a limited sample of respondents: 1) college students in New York City, 2) young adult males in their twenties in St. Paul, 3) high school students in Montreal, and 4) a sample of Jewish adults in Chicago. It remained to be seen whether a national sample of American Jews might yield similar findings.

Time (Bock, 1976)

Geoffrey Bock (1977) prepared a report for the American Jewish Committee Colloquium on Jewish Education and Jewish Identity based on his earlier research (1976) using data from the National Jewish Population Survey. In the study Bock found that the independent effect of Jewish education on identification was first observed at the threshold of 1000 hours and peaked at 4000 hours. Like Himmelfarb, the maximal effects of Jewish education were observed at three to four times the typical level of Jewish education attained by the typical students who drop out of school at the time of their Bar or Bat Mitzvah after attending four or five years. As Bock stated:

Generally, 'hours of Jewish instruction' is the best predicting measure of most conceptions of Jewish identification; All other factors being equal, those people who have spent 'more hours' in Jewish classrooms are more religious, more involved in informal social networks with other Jews, feel more knowledgeable about Jewish culture and are stronger supporters of Israel. They have either 'learned more' or have been 'better socialized' by their classroom experiences (Bock, 1977, p. 4).

The author further noted a distinction in the effects of Jewish education on personal and public Jewishness:

Personal Jewishness (such as personal religious observances, Jewish self-esteem, participation in informal social networks and cultural perceptions) is

mainly influenced by Jewishness of home background. To the extent that Jewish schooling is important, home background is 1.3 to 2.4 times more important. . . . Public Jewishness (such behaviors and activities as attendance at services, participation in secular synagogue affairs, participation in secular organizational activities, support for Israel and attitudes about American political issues) are a different matter. Jewish schooling is often as important as Jewish home background (Bock 1977, p. 5).

In Sum

A small number of studies published largely during the 1970's did not support the claim made in the 1960's that Jewish education did not influence Jewish identification independent of the family effect at home. Nevertheless, these studies suggested that to reach the fullest effect the number of hours of Jewish education had to be substantial and continue through the high school years. Furthermore, Jewish education was generally not as powerful as family influences, but neither was it simply an extension of the home. Finally, Jewish education was relatively more independent of the home environment in certain areas of influence. Thus, for example, in one study the public dimensions of Jewish identification, such as attendance at religious services, participation in secular synagogue affairs, participation in secular organization activities, support for Israel, and attitudes about American political issues, were about as important as home backgrounds (Bock 1977). In another study, Jewish education had a positive independent effect on ritual observance and the intellectual-aesthetic domain relating to books, art, and music (Himmelfarb, 1975).⁵

This substantial body of research cited above is in agreement that for Jewish education to be effective it has to be substantial in duration, thereby tending to minimize the contribution of part-time education. This is where the debate rested in the 1970's until recently when Steven M. Cohen (1988) added a new dimension to this discussion.⁶ Based on a large representative sample of 4505 respondents in the metropolitan New York Jewish community, Cohen analyzed separately male and female Jewish school attendance. The dimension of gender has largely been ignored by other researchers despite the differential exposure that boys and girls traditionally received with the former more likely to gain a Jewish education than the latter. Cohen (1988, pp. 94) reported:

When men and women were grouped and analyzed together—as they were in previous studies—afternoon school students hardly differed on measures of Jewish identification from those with no schooling. However, when men and women were statistically separated, afternoon school alumni generally outscored those with no schooling from comparable parental backgrounds.

Thus, Cohen argued that contrary to many earlier analyses which tended to minimize the role of part-time education, it may be modestly effective. It is necessary, therefore, to seek to replicate this finding in other communities and studies to assess its implications.

For Further Investigation

There is an assumption implicit in much of social scientific research that is useful in two ways: First, it is helpful in its own right in expanding the map of knowledge by explaining phenomena hitherto not fully understood. Second, such research may be helpful in formulating policy that may liberate people from the bondage of past practices which are hurtful to them personally or harmful to the goals they seek to achieve as a community. Nevertheless, as Aron has noted “research is important in its own right” (1988, p. 39). Towards that end, the following directions for additional research are suggested:

1. *Develop one or more theoretical frameworks within which an examination of the relationship between Jewish education and identification can be more fruitfully explored.* In the research Howard M. Shapiro and I conducted, we adopted the symbolic interactionist approach, which views the shaping of religioethnic (or Jewish) identification as part of a process of interpersonal relationships and social interaction in the family, peer group, school, synagogue, etc. Alternatively, Aron (1988) alluded to the possibility of adopting a theoretical frame of reference associated with the “critical school” (intellectual disciples of Karl Marx in the Frankfurt School), in which educational institutions are viewed as a conservative force maintaining the status quo rather than liberating students from the narrow confines of their existence. Of course, other contemporary social scientific theoretical approaches may also be valuable paradigms by which the relationship between Jewish education and identification might better be understood.
2. *Apply “triangulation” to the problem of the relationship between Jewish education and identification.* Triangulation, in navigation and surveying, refers to the taking of different measurements of the same objects by constructing triangles in which lines of known length aid in estimating those of unknown length. Likewise in research, a variety of methods applied to the same problem may provide a more coherent explanation of the phenomenon being studied than does any one approach. If the decade corresponding approximately to the 1970’s produced several quantitative analyses of Jewish education, then the subsequent decade was dominated by a small number of qualitative studies, such as those by Heilman (1984), Press (1982) and Schoem (1979). Perhaps the 1990’s will give rise to research focusing on the relationship between Jewish education and identification applying the principle of triangulation. These aforementioned latter studies did not analyze the effect of Jewish education on identification, but rather provided a rich description of the Hebrew school context of that education.
3. *Clarify the most effective and efficient ways to deliver the positive effect of Jewish schooling on identification.* For example, is it more effective to deliver hours of instruction in one subject area or another? Is it more efficient to expose teens to study several hours a week for two or three sessions or a large number of hours, equivalent to several weeks of typical study, crammed into one weekend? As a corollary question, is there an optimal mix

of formal classroom and informal experiential learning that can be blended together to provide a more powerful synergistic effect than each approach pursued separately?

Three Recommendations

The type of social science research I have reviewed provides a way to understand and explain social reality and, on that basis, to plan policies for implementation, in this case, presumably to strengthen the existing relationship. Indeed, the findings of social scientists have provided the basis of a variety of social policy formulations (Bock, 1977; Dashefsky, 1970; 1985; and Himmelfarb, 1975).

As a starting point, the three consensus recommendations that emerged from the Colloquium on Jewish Education and Jewish Identity (1976, pp. 23-31) must be highlighted. This panel was sponsored by the American Jewish Committee and involved over thirty academicians, educators and community professionals who met over a period of several years. While these suggestions were published more than a decade ago, the need to broaden their reach still remains:

1. *Expand the opportunities for Jewish education for high school age students with an emphasis on diversity and excellence.* Strategies might include: integration of formal classroom study with informal experiential activities; provision of college credit to high school juniors and seniors for formal Jewish study; inclusion of a study trip to Israel; consolidation of high schools into one or more regional centers.
2. *Enhance educational opportunities for college-age students at both the informal and formal levels.* At the formal level, such collegiate opportunities require communal support for Jewish studies, which serve an academic need for a balanced curriculum, and at the informal level, these opportunities might include the reinstatement of successful ideologically oriented youth movements.
3. *Embark on a variety of family education programs.* These, too, are worthy of community support.

Conclusion

We may ask what effect Jewish education has on Jewish identification.

There are those who claim that Jewish education in the United States provides no demonstrable influence in the development of Jewish identification. There is no doubt that it is possible to introduce improvements in the Jewish educational system in the United States, in methods and curriculum as well as in the administrative structure and the teaching faculty, but to conclude that there is no relationship between Jewish education and Jewish identification is untenable (Dashefsky and Shapiro, 1978, p. 90).

The above was written more than a decade ago and, in general, these words still ring true. Even the primary consumers of Jewish education, elementary-age school children, agree. As a more recent study noted, quoting the words of one student: "If there wasn't Hebrew School, then what would be the point of being Jewish? Your religion wouldn't be the same. You wouldn't even believe in your religion" (Press, 1984). Most agree today that, under certain conditions, Jewish education can be a positive and independent influence on Jewish identification. Indeed, one approach that could highlight a communal commitment to the importance of Jewish education in shaping identification would be to establish the requirement of some credentials of prior Jewish education or current continued study for leadership positions in the Jewish community. As one expert has suggested, if the community cannot find sufficient "learned leaders," then at least it should seek out "learning leaders" as exemplars of achievement for the younger generation. The task remains to further develop strategies that would most likely maximize the effect of Jewish education on Jewish identification and to continue to monitor the possible outcomes.⁷

Bibliography

- ★ Aron, I. (1988). The Relationship Between Research and Practice in Jewish Education. *Jewish Education*, 56, 34-41.
- ★ Bock, G. (1976). The Jewish Schooling of American Jews: A Study of Non-cognitive Educational Effects. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Harvard University, Cambridge, MA. e1
- W Bock, G. (1977). *Does Jewish Schooling Matter?* New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Cohen, S.M. (1974). The Impact of Jewish Education on Religious Identification and Practice. *Jewish Social Studies*, 36, 316-326.
- Cohen, S.M. (1988). *American Assimilation or Jewish Revival?* Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press.
- Colloquium on Jewish Education and Jewish Identity. (1976). *Summary Report and Recommendations*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Dashefsky, A. (1970). A Sociological Perspective on Jewish Identity. In A.L. Peller (Ed.), *Jewish Identity in the 70's*. Philadelphia: Board of Jewish Education. אבות אבות
- Dashefsky, A. (1985). Jewish Education—For What and For Whom? *Jewish Education*, 53, 44-47. —
- Dashefsky, A., DeAmicis, B., Lazerwitz, B., & Tabory, E. (1992). *Americans Abroad: A Comparative Study of Emigrants from the United States*. New York: Plenum.
- Dashefsky, A. & Shapiro, H.M. (1974). *Ethnic Identification Among American Jews*. Lexington, MA.: Lexington Books.
- Dashefsky, A. & Shapiro, H.M. (1978). "Hinukh Yehudi V'hizdahut Yehudit B'artzot Habrit" ("Jewish Education and Jewish Identification in the United States. "). *B'tfutzot Hagolah*, 19 (Summer), 90-94.
- Goldlust, J. (1970). Jewish Education and Ethnic Identification: A Study of Jewish Adolescents in Australia. *Jewish Education*, 40, 49-59.
- Goldstein, S. and Goldscheider, C. (1968). *Jewish Americans*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Greeley, A.M. and Rossi, P. (1966). *The Education of Catholic Americans*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Heilman, S. (1984). *Inside the Jewish School: A Study of the Cultural Setting for Jewish Education*. New York: American Jewish Committee.
- Himmelfarb, H. (1974). *The Impact of Religious Schooling: The Effects of Jewish Education upon Adult Religious Involvement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Himmelfarb, H. (1975). Jewish Education for Naught: Educating the Culturally Deprived Child. *Analysis*, 51, 1-12.
- Himmelfarb, H. (1977). The Interaction Effects of Parents, Spouse, and Schooling: Comparing the Impact of Jewish and Catholic Schools. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 18, 464-477.
- Lazerwitz, B. (1973). Religious Identification and its Ethnic Correlates: A Multivariate Model. *Social Forces*, 52, 204-220.
- Press, J. (1982). *An Ethnographic and Phenomenological Study of Students' Perceptions About Hebrew School*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Press, J. (1984). Hebrew School. *Jewish Spectator*, 49, 25-28.
- Rosen, B.C. (1965). *Adolescence and Religion*. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.
- Sanua, V. (1964). The Relationship Between Jewish Education and Jewish Identification. *Jewish Education*, 35, 37-50.
- Schoem, D. (1979). *Ethnic Survival In America: An Ethnography of a Jewish Afternoon School*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Berkeley.
- Shapiro, H.M. and Dashefsky, A. (1984). Religious Education and Ethnic Identification: Implications for Ethnic Pluralism. *Review of Religious Research*, 15, 93-102.
- Sigal, J., August, D., and Beltempo, J. (1981). Impact of Jewish Education on Jewish Identification in a Group of Adolescents. *Jewish Social Studies*, 44, 283-290.

Footnotes

¹To carry out this search, I used SOCIOFILE, a computer assisted reference file covering the period 1974-1988, which yielded only three relevant articles with which to begin this analysis.

²Of six significant socialization factors which explained 28% of the variance (out of a maximum of 100%) in Jewish identification, Jewish education ranked third after father's religiosity and friends' expectations. The remaining three factors were Jewish activities with parents, presence of an older brother, and family expectations for Jewish activities. In sum, family factors were 4.5 times as powerful and peer influence only 1.5 times as great as the influence of Jewish education, a fact revealed by regression analysis.

³In St. Paul, at the time of the study, the community supported one central school system, the Talmud Torah.

⁴In their analysis of the younger generation, Dashevsky and Shapiro (1974) also introduced measures of contemporaneous social characteristics, in addition to the prior socialization experiences, into their regression analysis. Still, Jewish education ranked fourth in importance out of eight factors. These eight variables explained only 40% of the total (100%) variance. In fact, a comparison of three socialization factors shows the family to be only three times as powerful as Jewish education and the latter actually is 1.5 times more important than peers in explaining Jewish identification when contemporaneous contextual effects, e.g., religious organizational involvement and socio-economic status are included.

⁵A study currently in press also shows for Americans that Jewish education is associated with aliyah, or emigration to Israel (Dashefsky, DeAmicis, Lazerwitz and Tabor, 1992 forthcoming).

⁶Throughout much of the 1980's little research has appeared in the journals on this topic. Cohen's book length study (1988) is all the more exceptional.

⁷I wish to thank the academics and educators, practitioners and policymakers, family and friends, with whom I have debated and discussed this topic for two decades. In addition; I am very grateful to Sandy Waldman Dashefsky and J. Alan Winter and, of course, Stuart Kelman for their careful reading of earlier versions of this paper and their many helpful comments.

Highlights

- * When parent religiousness is controlled, there is little difference in the frequency of strong Jewish identification between those who attended some form of part-time religious school and those who reported only Sunday-school or even no formal religious training.
- * Those who attended a yeshiva or day school consistently score higher on Jewish identification measures than those who did not.
- * The effect of full-time religious education is most pronounced among those whose parents are most observant.
- * Though the effect of yeshivas and day schools is substantial for all identification variables, the greatest increment over part-time respondents is knowledge of Hebrew.
- * Jewish education is one childhood and adolescent experience that is a significant factor in Jewish identification independent of other socialization variables
- * Through intellectual content and interpersonal relationships, Jewish education influences what a Jew knows, feels, and does. This is particularly true when participation extends into adolescence.
- * For students not in day school, the home is the predominant influence on Jewish identity.
- * All other factors being equal, those people who have spent more hours in Jewish classrooms are more religious, more involved in informal social networks with other Jews, feel more knowledgeable about Jewish culture and are stronger supporters of Israel.
- * A small number of studies published largely during the 1970's contradicted the claim made in the 1960's that Jewish education failed to influence Jewish identification independent of the family effect. To the contrary, these newer studies suggested that to reach the fullest effect, the number of hours of Jewish education had to be substantial and continue through the high school years.
- * Jewish education is generally not as powerful as family influences, but neither is it simply an extension of the home. In certain areas of influence, Jewish education has an impact independent of the home environment.

The Larger Context

Jewish identification is complicated. While many variables affect future Jewish identity, time spent in studying seems to be central. Yet it is not true that because of the hours available, the day school is the only solution. The impact of the home and parents and non-formal and Israel experiences suggest that supplementary schools may be an alternate route to strong adult identification—providing the student remains through the high school years.