PSYCHOLOGY AND JEWISH IDENTITY EDUCATION

Jewish identity is both a great obsession and a great ambiguity of American Jewish life. The term "Jewish identity" has been part of the lexicon of American Jewry for many decades, but it remains an unclear and poorly defined concept. On a popular level, the term is used to describe positive Jewish feelings and affiliative behaviors, and the call for Jewish identity is a way of advocating a life-style more committed to Jewish activity and community. Generally, positive identity is considered important for the Jewish community in order to guarantee its collective survival and for the Jewish individual as a buttress against assimilation and intermarriage. Strong Jewish identity is somehow seen as a social armor against external forces that threaten to dissolve the community or diminish it. Whatever it may mean, in short, "Jewish identity" is widely regarded as important for the preservation of Judaism and the Jewish people.

Promoting positive Jewish identity, accordingly, is widely accepted as a major goal of Jewish education in the United States, where many Jews are unaffiliated with the Jewish community and there is great diversity of loyalties and involvements even among the affiliated. Many fear that American Jewish life will be further weakened unless Jewish education finds new and better initiatives and policies to strengthen the Jewish identity of its constituents. But there is little agreement on just what strengthening Jewish identity means and how Jewish education can strengthen it.

There are good reasons for confusion. The problems of the American Jewish community may be so different from those previously encountered in Jewish communal experience that it is not obvious how Jewish education can confront them. Population mobility weakens the influence of such traditional sources of experience and authority as family and neighborhood. Such powerful socializing influences as television, movies, and other media compete with school and home to affect mores and aspirations.

The complexities and special needs of Jews as a minority group in a pluralistic society also cause problems for Jewish education -- both in terms of its goals and of the relative roles of different educational mechanisms, such as formal and informal schooling, in promoting those goals.

Scholarly response to the topic of Jewish identity and Jewish education has been uneven over the years. Generally, the sociology of identity has been studied more than its psychology, and the acts and behaviors indicative of Jewish identification have received more attention than the values, attitudes, and meanings behind them. In those instances where the psychological dimensions of Jewish identity have been studied, inadequate attention has been paid to the developmental psychology of Jewish identity over the life cycle, to the social psychology of Jewish identity, and to the implications of theory and knowledge in these areas for Jewish education.[1]

It is no accident that studies of Jewish identity have been mostly the work of sociologists rather than psychologists, though both disciplines have many Jewish scholars interested in such matters. The sociological view focuses on cultural, historical, and current dimensions of society as a whole; psychologists are commonly more interested in individuals and in issues of prediction and control. "The psychological approach," as Egon Mayer rightly puts it, "lacks a sense of history." Jewish identity has been the province of sociology, in part, because it has always been true that "Jewishness is bestowed by the community."[2]

This essay focuses on the *psychology* of Jewish identity and its potential role in Jewish education. The psychology of Jewish identity is important to study, again to quote Professor Mayer, because "identity is highly *reflexive* today," that is, identity is largely a matter of what the individual thinks he or she is, not only what the community thinks. Understanding individuals is a proper business of psychology.

Psychology's concern with prediction and control, moreover, may be useful for identity education because many educational principles and strategies are influenced by the psychology of learning. The "bestowal" of Jewish identity, like any other group identity, works through the cognitive, emotional, and motivational sensibilities of individuals; attitudes, inclinations, and acts follow from them. From the vantage of the individual, the group is the vehicle for the experience and expression of personal identity.

We believe that the psychological perspective can contribute much to our understanding of how identity develops in the modern Jew and how we might improve education to have greater impact on identity formation. If understanding individuals is a proper business of psychology, changing individuals is a proper mission of education.

Our concern with the psychology of Jewish identity does not disregard or diminish the role of the social context in identity formation. Identity does not develop in a vacuum, whatever the details of its unfolding may be. It is not a random process, and some social institutions and educational practices are better than others at promoting it. Psychological models or schemes that try to schedule this unfolding and guide the formulation of educational policy must also be sensitive to the social and environmental settings in which identity develops.

The general idea that psychological understanding of Jewish identity can guide the practice of Jewish identity education does not, of course, tell us what or how to teach, nor does it guarantee results. Indeed, it does not even tell us what specific studies are needed, what resources should be spent on them, or what results should be expected. Most study of Jewish identity has been done without much explicit theory to direct it. Some scholars have noted that theory is not necessary to do useful work on identity and have warned against simplistic deductions of educational practice from psychological theory.[3]

Nevertheless, theory has its uses. It can help us to concentrate systematically on identity, ask probing questions about it, and avoid disjunctive and unfocused thinking. We shall concentrate on two types of psychological theory that might have valuable implications for Jewish identity education. The *developmental* approach to the psychology of identity focuses on the evolution of identity in the individual over the life cycle, but especially in childhood and youth. It is often linked with educational approaches that encourage individuation, questioning, and choice in the educational process. The *social comparison* approach, on the other hand, suggests that identity depends on the strength of the bonds people feel with their in-group. This theory can be interpreted to imply that Jewish identity education should try to enlarge in-group sympathies and emotional ties. Neither theory speaks to what kind or degree of identity is desirable from the point of view of individual mental health or of group survival, nor does either theory speak to the conflict of interest that may exist between those goals. Answers to such questions are essentially matters of *value,* for which policymakers and community leaders, not scholars, must be responsible. Even so, such theories can offer broad guidelines for research on how Jewish identity develops, how it is expressed, and how it can be maintained through practical strategies of education.

These theories have not been elaborated heretofore in writings on Jewish identity, and they may help us reflect on some practical approaches to Jewish identity education. A sound theoretical base does not absolve Jewish leaders and communities from confronting a host of value questions concerning the kinds of Jews and Jewish people they want to create. We shall use these theories, however, not to preach a specific Jewish ideology but to advance the discussion of Jewish identity and of strategies for its maintenance and growth in educational settings.

RESEARCH ON JEWISH IDENTITY

The topic of identity is a relative newcomer to the social and behavioral sciences. It received little attention early in this century, despite extensive discussions of anonymity and alienation reaching back to Max Weber, Emil Durkheim, and Karl Marx. Allen Wheelis's *The Quest for Identity* (1959) may have been the first psychiatric work to note that problems of personal identity were becoming important concerns of psychotherapy, replacing traditional neuroses as major reasons why people sought help.[4]

In the 1960s and 1970s, perhaps as a result of the proethnic revolution in some contemporary social thought, identity became a popular subject in American social science, and work on it has proliferated under the general heading of "ethnic identity."[5] The study of Jewish identity has been part of this trend.[6] Sociological studies have focused on the description and measurement of *acts of Jewish identification*, meaning the many diverse behaviors through which Jews today express their Jewish involvement. Such research has encompassed: studies of adult Jewish religious denomination and observance; organizational affiliation, membership, and communal involvement; trends in marriage, divorce, and education (Jewish and secular); social ties among Jews and between Jews and non-Jews; connection with Israel; doctrinal belief; conversion; penitents (*baalei tshuva*); and charity giving.[7]

The sociological research deals with questions of the continuity of the American Jewish community -- in numbers (demographics), in commitments and enactments (identification), and in the quality and intensity of its Jewishness (identity). The "framework of inquiry," as Nathan Glazer puts it, is a debate whose main issues are the future size of the community, the effects of intermarriage on it, the relationship of American Jews to Israel, the effects of socioeconomic success, and anti-Semitism.[8]

The conclusions from the various sociological studies do not prove either the "assimilationist" or "transformationist" view of what is happening to American Jews -- that is, either the view that American Jewry is in a pattern of gradual dissolution or the view that American Jewry is undergoing a period of creativity and renaissance. The former view underscores the fact that intermarriage rates have risen; the latter view emphasizes the fact that there may be no net loss of Jewish population. The assimilationist view notes that levels of religious observance have declined over the generations; the transformationists counter that some observance is almost universal among American Jews and that support for Israel remains strong. Glazer concludes, as Charles Liebman did years earlier,[9] that American Jewish identity is now maintained "by means of a much reduced norm of Jewish religious practices combined with fairly constant forms of communal involvement and commitment to Israel."[10] The results overall suggest to him that the community has the resources to perpetuate itself in the decades to come.

Dynamics of Development and Socialization

While contemporary research has told us much about the acts and behaviors of American Jews (Shabbat candles; Pesach seders; contributions to Israel; Russian Jewry protests), it has told us much less about the dynamics of Jewish identity development and about the effects of education on it. There are some overall conclusions which might be described as "the common sense" of current research.

Marriage and Family, Development and Socialization

Studies of marriage and family generally underscore the commonsense wisdom that Jewish marriage and childbearing involve people in Jewish life, and that this involvement peaks as the children approach bar and bat mitzvah. Young couples, childless couples, and single parents are less involved in Jewish life,[11] and money problems are a huge deterrent for single parents, especially mothers.[12]

The dynamics of how the family affects Jewish identity formation are less known, although common sense and experience, as well as psychological theory, agree that it is vital to identity formation. The family is the primary in-group; in Jewish life, it has traditionally been the principal conveyance of Jewish religious beliefs and practices. Most surveys, as expected, have found positive relationships between children's and parents' Jewish connections, but little is known about the socialization methods of Jewish parents, the effects of the general family environment, the influence of family members other than parents, or the effects of parents' divorcing or both working.[13]

Intermarriage rates were once understood to be highest among persons with doubtful or mixed feelings of Jewishness rather than lack of Jewish feeling,[14] but this may not be true now when intermarriage is more generally accepted. Apostasy in college students has also been correlated with poor parent-child relationships,[15] while positive religiosity in adolescents goes with their feeling that parents offer them both support and control.[16]

In addition to parents, peers and spouses much affect an individual's Jewishness. A spouse's premarital religious observance is the best predictor of family Jewish involvement.[17] A spouses's degree of Jewishness can also significantly change a person from the way he (more than she) was raised. Wives are a little more likely to influence husbands than vice versa.[18] When the spouse converts to Judaism, however, intermarriage often strengthens family ties and may heighten the family's Jewish identification.[19] A relatively early study observed that where peer and parental influences are contradictory, adolescent peers may have more influence on Jewish religious identity than do parents,[20] but this may not be equally the case today. One subsequent study, indeed, found parents more influential than peers.[21]

Studies of Jewish Education

Most Jewish children in North America receive at least one year of Jewish schooling.[22] As of 1976, the total years of Jewish schooling had actually increased with each generation since immigration, but the total time spent in classrooms had decreased.[23] Amount of schooling and adult Jewish identification are modestly correlated. There is conflicting evidence about whether schooling most affects those from more or less observant homes.[24]

There is also disagreement about the importance of sheer hours of Jewish schooling. Bock concluded that less than 500 to 1,000 classroom hours have no effect. Himmelfarb concluded from different data that 3,000 hours was the needed minimum. Cohen found flaws in both studies. His own more recent research shows plainly that more intensive Jewish schooling produces more identification, but he also concludes that, with all its deficiencies, part-time education may be modestly effective in specific areas of identity development such as ritual observance.[25] Much of the contemporary literature of Jewish education, however, raises serious doubts about the value of supplementary Jewish schooling.[26]

The Jewish community sponsors many educational alternatives to schools: weekend retreats, youth groups, summer camps, and trips to Israel. Most of them have not been formally evaluated, despite many favorable reports. Harold Himmelfarb has critically reviewed studies both of summer camp programs and of Israel tours through 1979.[27]

The trickle of studies of the impact of summer camps on subsequent Jewish identity that have been conducted since 1969 have been somewhat equivocal vis-a-vis the positive impact of these frameworks on subsequent Jewish identity. One study, for instance, showed that Ramah camps have a little more impact than others, but also that family and school background have more influence than camp experience. Jewish behavior learned in camp did not carry over to the city, in any case, unless the city environment reinforced it.[28] Certainly, camps may create an emotional attachment to Jewish ideas and friends, but it is not so clear that these feelings affect religious observance or community affiliation.

Reviews of Israel programs suggest that study tours tend to strengthen both Jewish and American identities of their participants; knowledge about Israel and Hebrew language; and positive attitudes toward Israel. Few participants, however, become interested in *aliyah*. Study tours have more effect than vacation tours, and pretrip preparations and posttrip study are important to maintain attitude changes.[29]

Needed Directions for Psychological and Educational Research

Despite the quality of much previous research, it is plain that the gaps in our knowledge of how Jewish identity is shaped and maintained far surpass what we know. We do not know enough about the main "customers" (children, adolescents, and families) nor about the main "vendors" (teachers, counselors, youth workers) of identity education, and we have inadequate information about educational practices that work and don't work in this area. We need to know more about child-rearing attitudes and behavior patterns; about the effects of family fragmentation and reconstitution; about gender roles and differences; about marginal and multiple identities; about the role of adolescence in shaping adult identity; and ultimately, we probably need life-cycle studies of the American Jewish experience. Finally, we still suffer from a lack of reliable, valid, and efficient measurement instruments for assessing all the above.

At the same time, we would like to suggest that the world simply doesn't need *more* studies; rather, we are in need of research that is rooted in some theoretical basis and guided by some rational research agenda. While it is true that research agendas and theoretical bases can often be constricting and limiting, at this moment in the study of Jewish identity they could help give a sense of direction and structure to a research world which is overly helter-skelter. There are some basic questions that need answers, and a research agenda could help us to systematically seek out what we need to know.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF IDENTITY

Social Identity and Personal Identity

The psychology of identity refers to the mental and interpersonal processes that motivate and shape the thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and actions that connect an individual to a reference group and give one the sense of having "a self." These processes are studied in personality and developmental psychology, social psychology, sociology, and anthropology, all of which have contributed to their understanding. No one discipline has a special claim on the theoretical or empirical turf of "identity."

Surprisingly, however, no one has produced a universally accepted definition of identity. As the late Harold Isaacs noted, even "Erik Erikson, who has taken out a kind of international copyright on the very word identity," never bothered defining it in much more than a "blur."[30] Social psychologist Roger Brown concedes: "Identity is a concept no one has defined with precision, but it seems we can move ahead anyway because everyone roughly understands what is meant."[31]

Despite the lack of precise definition, we can pretty well distinguish two kinds of identity that comprehend all the definitions in the scholarly literature. We may call these "social" and "personal" identity. The abundance of terms for social identity includes "social identity," "group identity," "reference-group identity," and "ethnic identity." Personal identity terms include "personal identity," "core identity," and combinations of the term "self" with such attributes as "existential-," "categorical-," private-," and "public-."

In general, "social identity" refers to the nature and extent of an individual's membership in some social group. It includes foods he likes, songs she sings, and values he or she holds that reflect the character of some ethnic, religious, or national group. Personal identity, on the other hand, comprises the constellation of values, attitudes, and behavior patterns that make up a person's sense of self. Used in this sense, identity is the notion one has of who he or she "really is" as an individual rather than as a member of a group.

The idea of personal identity can be confusing because it can be used in two senses. On the one hand, it can mean a person's *entire sense of self*, one's so-called "ego identity," which logically makes social identity a subtopic of personal identity (because "my self-as-group-member" is only a part of the total self I experience). It can also, however, be used to mean only the extreme self-perception in which the sense of self subjectively may seem like a near existential absolute -- where one feels as if his or her self exists all by itself, without reference to any *social* or other external source or object of expression. The late psychoanalyst Heinz Kohut would have called this self "an independent center of initiative, an independent recipient of impression."[32]

Throughout this paper, we use "personal identity" in the latter sense only to distinguish it from the social identity that chiefly concerns us. But the meaning of "ego identity" or total self subsumes all aspects of one's conscious self-awareness and implies, to borrow from Erikson, preconscious and unconscious components of great importance. Ultimately, one cannot fully fathom social identity, ethnic or other, without it.

Erikson believes that one's group background is fundamental to one's ego identity: "True identity," he says, ". . . depends on the support which the young individual receives from the collective sense of identity characterizing the social group significant to him: class, nation, culture."[33] He means that the psychology of the group from which the individual comes is a large determinant of individual ego identity. Even so, individuals subjectively experience their group or social identities as *components* of their ego identity, which is the broader concept. "Social," "group," "ethnic," or "role" identities, however labeled, are aspects of total ego identity, not separate or independent processes. When Jean Phinney studies the "self-identification," "self-labeling," and "self-definition" of children from different ethnic groups, or when Geneva Gay correlates psychological well-being with "post-encounter ethnic identity," they are exploring the place of group identity in ego identity.

Social or group identity, at all events, is the aspect of the subject most pertinent to Jewish identity and the one that has chiefly interested social scientists because it pertains directly to the study of social groups and their relationships, to ethnicity and ethnocentrism, and to intergroup and cross-cultural conflict. It is also easier to study empirically than is self-concept.

Group identity is "the point of intersection between the individual and other people."[34] It is a person's sense of self in relation to others or, one might say, the sense of oneself as simultaneously an individual and a member of a social group. People have a variety of social selves or group identities because they take a variety of social roles in life. But some are obviously more important and enduring than others.

"Ethnic identity," so called, is the kind of group identity most studied nowadays. Ethnicity is the sum of such shared qualities as common ancestry, language, values, customs, perceptions, behaviors, and rules of social interaction.[35] These binding qualities are not always directly visible or measurable, but are reflected in one's *acts of identification* with a group and one's verbal articulations about "who I am" and "how I see myself" in relation to one's own and other groups.[36]

Jewish identity is, of course, one (at least) case of social or reference-group identity. Simon Herman calls it a special case of ethnic identity which "needs to be studied within the framework of the study of ethnic identity in general," but which is peculiarly different from other ethnic identities in its "blend of religious (traditional) and national (peoplehood) components so inextricably interwoven that to pull them apart not only weakens but distorts the Jewish identity."[37] How Jewish identity actually differs psychologically from other ethnic identities in terms of its components, its formation, and the functions it serves in ego identity, however, is an empirically moot point.

It is worth noting, moreover, that all empirical study of identity is psychologically complicated by its dynamic qualities -- that is, by the fact that identity is multifaceted and fluid. Everyone has many identities, corresponding to the different personal and social roles they assume, or selves they experience in life -- gender, occupation, family position, religion, language, nationality, and so forth. Some identities are typically more important than others at different times of life, and the salience of any identity depends on the specific circumstances in which it is brought to mind. Your gender may be more important than your occupation most of the time, but if you lose your job, vocational identity may become more important than gender identity.

In addition, one's feelings of identity may be marginal or conflicted with respect to any role or reference group ("As a black, am I really a citizen?" "Can a real man be a homemaker?"); different people may or may not identify with a given role they take (compare "I am a cook" with "My job is cooking"); and my *experienced* identity (as, for instance, "a Jew for Jesus") may not correspond to the identity that the reference group (Jews) actually *ascribes* to me under the circumstances ("apostate" or "renegade").

The Nature and Development of Social Identity

Psychologists approach social identity from two perspectives, which we shall call respectively *developmental* and *social comparison* theory. Erik Erikson is the most prominent spokesperson of developmental identity theory, while Henri Tajfel and, subsequently, John Turner are the most prominent spokespersons of the social-comparison theory of identity. Simon Herman, who based his work on the "field" theory of Kurt Levin, and Herbert Kelman, who based his work on psychoanalytic theory, have developed variations of these approaches that they apply specifically to Jewish identity.

Erik Erikson's Theory

Erik Erikson is among the world's leading psychoanalytic students of human development and of identity development. He was a member of the psychoanalytic movement in Vienna, where he worked under Anna Freud (Sigmund's youngest child and herself an outstanding analyst and theorist). His career blossomed in the United States, where his prolific writing over more than half a century explored social theory and American and world history, as well as the psychology of child development, personality, and identity.[38]

Erikson's theory is especially pertinent to the connection between identity formation and Jewish education because it emphasizes the way such forces as family, society, and reference group interact to shape the individual. His theory also reflects a classical Jewish notion of education and personal change as lifelong processes.

Erikson describes identity as "a sense of being at one with oneself as one grows and develops; and . . ., at the same time, a sense of affinity with a community's sense of being at one with its future as well as its history -- or mythology."[39] For Erikson, one's self-concept includes belonging to a larger group. Identity starts to develop, he says, as young children seek models to emulate and realize that their individuality overlaps with the traits of a whole group.

Erikson's view of identity development is rooted in Freud's notion that the superego is forced on the child by the influence of critics (at first parents, later educators) and by "milieu" and "public opinion":

> Surrounded by such mighty disapproval, the child's original state of naive self-love is said to be compromised. He looks for models by which to measure himself, and seeks happiness in trying to resemble them. Where he succeeds he achieves *self-esteem* . . . .[40]
>
> . . . what is operating . . . is not only the personal qualities of these parents but also . . . the tastes and standards of the social class in which they live and the characteristics and traditions of the race from which they spring.[41]

Erikson summarizes: "Child training . . . is the method by which a group's basic ways of organizing experience (its group identity, as we called it) is transmitted . . . . The growing child must derive a vitalizing sense of reality from the awareness that his individual way of mastering experience . . . is a successful variant of a group identity and is in accord with its space-time and life plan."[42]

So, according to Erikson, the sense of identity is first transmitted to children by parents' approving the child's efforts to imitate the roles they model and disapproving the child's failure to comply. The parents' roles are themselves derived from the larger social group they belong to, so the roles seem "natural" to everyone. In the early-childhood years, the family is a form of minisociety in terms of its impact on the development of young identity. As the child grows older, however, other agencies of identity formation (school, community, information media, and street experience) also shape one's identity, and hence there is a need to confront, reconcile, integrate, and choose among diverse identity claims. Adolescence and youth may be the period of greatest identity struggle in a person's life, a period fraught with conflicts and crises, because it is the time when a child starts seriously trying out adult roles and testing conflicting values. And crises recur, just as identity continues to change, throughout adulthood. Identity integration is a lifelong process.

Henri Tajfel's and John Turner's Theory

The theory developed between 1971 and 1981 by the late Henri Tajfel of the University of Bristol approaches identity in a very different way. It is much more rooted in empirical research than Erikson's clinical model, and it is wholly *non*developmental. Tajfel was a Dutch Jew who survived the Holocaust and spent his adult years in England. His theory, developed in collaboration with John Turner and Michael Billig and often called the Tajfel-Turner theory, presents a strictly *social* perspective on the nature of identity but does not speak to its origins at all. The theory ties positive identity to group membership and to the invidious comparisons between one's own and other groups that result from the sense of belonging to an in-group.

Tajfel's theory says that when people are assigned to virtually any group that does not have negative connotations for them, the very act of belonging leads them to "immediately, automatically, and almost reflexively think of that group, an in-group for them, as better than the alternative, an out-group for them, and do so basically because they are motivated to achieve and maintain a positive self-image. . . ."[43]

This process almost inevitably leads to ethnocentrism, "the technical name for the view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything . . . nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts itself superior . . . and looks with contempt on outsiders."[44] Roger Brown suggests that "Ethnocentrism is universal and ineradicable. . . . it has been traced to its source in motives deeply rooted in individual psychology, and the source is the individual effort to achieve and maintain positive self-esteem. That is an urge so deeply human that we can hardly imagine its absence."[45]

The Tajfel-Turner social-comparison theory has been supported by dozens of experiments that demonstrate people's need to use in-group membership invidiously. Membership in virtually any unstigmatized group lends itself to ethnocentric sentiment, even if "membership" comes from mere random assignment to the "blue" or "red" team in the "color wars" at children's camps. The very fact of being labeled a member inspires people to invent positive stereotypes about their group and negative stereotypes about other groups. Brown sees this process as "a rather mysterious effect: a 'pull' or force to favor the in-group, without usually even knowing you are doing it."[46]

At the same time, ethnocentrism need not automatically make people hostile to the out-group, and it need not be seen only in its negative sense as rejection of the out-group. The need to be fair "has always had a significant effect, mitigating favoritism"[47] (though not producing generosity toward the out-group). The main point of the Tajfel-Turner theory, at all events, is its claim that the process of feeling positive toward one's group is a major factor in enhancing one's self-image and self-esteem, and that this effect is achieved *automatically* with membership. (The theory also addresses the problems of low self-esteem that results from negative views of one's own group, but those issues are outside the scope of this essay.) Strong group identity promotes a positive sense of self.

Herbert Kelman's Theory

Herbert Kelman has been professor of social ethics since 1968 in the Psychology Department at Harvard University, where his work has focused on the psychology of social issues and of personality. He applies his general theory of identity to Jewish identity and education.

Personal identity, says Kelman, is the enduring aspects of people's self-definitions, one's "personal core," created by the interaction of social influences and one's own basic personality traits. Social influences affect identity through three processes: *compliance*, accepting others' influence in order to elicit favorable reactions from them; *identification*, accepting their influence in order to try to emulate them; and *internalization*, accepting influence because it is congruent with one's own value system and, therefore, is rewarding.

Kelman says that the *stability*, *integration*, and *authenticity* of one's identity, all desirable qualities, are greater to the extent that identity is shaped by identification and internalization rather than by the more superficial process that produces compliance. *Stability* means the consistency of identity over time and situations. *Integration* refers to the communication between different parts of one's identity, that is, how much one recognizes inconsistencies in one's identity and how open one is to confronting them. *Authenticity* means how genuine is one's avowed identity. Kelman thinks it is not authentic to passively accept a transmitted identity when one can weigh and judge the value of what has been transmitted. Authentic identity is based largely on internalization. While compliance and identification play important roles in identity's development, individual authenticity rather than group identity is the desired state to achieve, according to Kelman -- and that state is attained largely via internalization.

Consequently, Kelman wants Jewish identity education to promote differences rather than similarities among individuals. To internalize a group's values, he argues, one must choose among the personally relevant elements, thus creating for oneself a new expression of the group identity. This identity and the commitments that flow from it will be more stable than others because it is internalized, but it will also be more differentiated and questioning (if not skeptical) -- which may diversify or undermine the group's solidarity and some of the norms that inspired the identity formation process in the first place. Jewish education must take this risk, in Kelman's opinion, and, accordingly, must develop curricula that support individualized orientations toward traditional Jewish values. His own words best summarize his complex and subtle view:

> In short, I am proposing an educational model that would aim to individualize Jewish identity rather than to maximize it. Obviously, such a model would not be acceptable to those who are committed to the unity and integrity of Jewish identity in its traditional form. What I would argue, however, is that -- given the complex, pluralistic, rapidly changing world in which we now live -- it is more conducive to the incorporation of Jewish identity into an authentic, integrated personal identity. By opening up the communication between Jewish values and other values, it may transform some of the Jewish values, but in doing so retain their validity. . . . These are very old issues, but perhaps the framework presented here may provide some new handles for dealing with them.[48]

Simon Herman's Theory

Simon Herman is professor emeritus in the Psychology Department and the Institute of Contemporary Jewry at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, where he has resided for some forty years. Born and raised in South Africa, he studied psychology at Harvard University and at the Research Center for Group Dynamics of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he worked under Kurt Lewin. Lewin was a committed Jew who was widely seen as one of the greatest psychologists of this century. His extension of "field theory" to psychology and his Jewish interests were important influences on Herman's work.

Herman was among the first to conduct empirical studies of the psychology of Jewish identity, and his instruments for identity measurement have been used in research on this topic around the world (including ours). His writings on identity are more a set of insightful notes and hypotheses than a formal theory. His undisguised goal is to use theory and research to shape an approach to education for strengthening Jewish identity, which he defines as "what being Jewish means, . . . what kind of Jew and what kind of Jewishness develop in the majority culture."[49]

According to Herman, identity is shaped by social interactions into objective and subjective public identity (how I appear to others and how I think I appear to others) and a private self-identity (how I look to myself). The feelings and values attached to these identity components fluctuate in relationships with one's own primary reference group and with the other groups in which that reference group is embedded. Defining group identity and educating children toward it is often problematic for minority groups, who are deeply and ambivalently influenced by the norms of the surrounding majority culture. Minority members *mark themselves off* from the majority and *align* themselves with their own group by feelings of *similarity* or *interdependence* with it. This view implies, but does not articulate, the self-esteem-building features of the social-comparison process that are central to the Tajfel-Turner theory.

Jewish life in America, says Herman, is permeated by the *adoption of the majority group's cultural norms*, which steadily weakens the base for Jewishness. Following Bell, Glazer and Moynihan, Tajfel, and others, he argues that the basis for Jewish distinctiveness has largely dissolved in American society: Knowledge of Jewish languages is minimal, and the general ethics of Americans are similar enough to Jewish ethics to make the latter less distinctive than they might be in some societies. Finally,

> . . . increasing secularization of the majority Christian culture facilitates the acceptance of its norms by the Jew. There is no ideology of assimilation in the United States . . . but there is a process of Jewish cultural attrition from generation to generation.[50]

Herman's argument is a particularist comment on the social-comparison view of identity. With the bases for marking off Jews from other Americans steadily diminishing, Herman argues that only intensive education can promote in-group alignments to halt absorption into the mainstream.

Conclusions from Identity Theories

Our purpose in this brief survey has been to look at some current identity theories and to consider their common implications for thinking about the psychology of Jewish identity. Two related lessons emerge, in our judgment, for methodically approaching identity research in relation to education.

The first is that we should study the psychology of Jewish identity in a developmental context which encompasses its origins and growth, its dynamics, and its evolution over the life span. Second, we should look at identity in its social context as part of a comparison process. The empirical evidence suggests that people experience identity as an implied comparison -- of self-in-relation-to- (other aspects of) self, of self-in-relation-to-group, and of in-group-in-relation-to-out-group, and this context of (chiefly) social comparison makes identity meaningful and important.

Other conclusions can doubtless be drawn, ideas tested, and measurements based on the details of identity theories. But the *developmental* and *social-comparison* aspects of identity are its central psychological features, and Jewish educational policy, despite its concern with identity, has not spoken systematically to either of them. In doing so, it should focus on two questions:

(1) How does identity develop in the life cycle of (American) Jews? How is Jewish experience segmented or phased? How salient are various educational forces in shaping identity? What are the issues of identity at each phase?

(2) What strategies of instruction and education can enhance the development and fortification of Jewish identity in American life?

The rest of this essay addresses those questions.

THE DEFINITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN JEWISH IDENTITY

What does psychological theory of identity imply for the understanding specifically of American Jewish identity? In this section, we shall discuss the meaning of "development," the possible unfolding of some traits that might be desirable components of an American Jewish identity, and a probable scenario of the sequence of identity's unfolding in the life course of American Jews. Our speculations on traits and sequence are not offered as conceptual certainties, still less as facts, but as a tentative intellectual scaffold on which theoretical and empirical study might usefully be built.

Stages and Principles of Development

Everyone knows that life develops in more or less regular patterns of continual change. Religion and literature have long celebrated "the seasons of a man's life," but psychologists and educators only began to study the notion of "human development" seriously in this century, particularly through the pioneering works of G. Stanley Hall in the 1920s and of Heinz Werner in 1948.[51]

The most influential theories of development, including Freud's, Erikson's, and Piaget's, have all agreed that it occurs in stages.[52] The idea comes from the biological model of mental growth as something that goes through distinct sequential phases, just as physical growth does.[53]

There are three governing principles that seem to be shared by all the theorists: First, development continues throughout life. Second, it does not occur at a constant rate; people vary in how fast they move through any phase, with change faster in childhood and youth than at other times and fastest in infancy and early adolescence. Third, there are "critical periods" when sensitivity to some kinds of learning or change is greatest. There are several periods in the developmental process that offer special "windows of opportunity" (and also of vulnerability, as Gardner puts it) for some kinds of learning, though in general what is learned earliest may endure longest for everyone.

These general principles of human development, we think, apply as well to learning and sustaining (Jewish) identity. All identity theorists would agree, but Erikson most clearly keeps us company. "Erikson . . . claims that psychosocial development proceeds by critical steps . . . turning points, moments of decision . . . choices and tests which are in some traditional way prescribed and prepared . . . by . . . society's structure. The child must learn 'to . . . integrate the timetable of the organism with the structure of social institutions.'"[54]

The course of identity development should parallel other aspects of psychological development. If, therefore, we could schedule the growth of American Jewish traits in different phases of life, we should see some of the identity issues and conflicts that typify each phase. But this in turn requires us to digress at some length to specify just what we mean by (American) Jewish traits and, therefore, to recognize the problems involved in defining just what Jewish identity

[illegible]fining Jewish Identity

Despite its popularity in everyday speech, the meaning of the term "Jewish identity" is [illegible]what ambiguous, as is the concept of identity itself.[55] It is most commonly used in such expressions as "So-and-so has a strong (or weak or marginal) Jewish identity" to refer to a person's felt degree or intensity of Jewishness. In this, as in most uses of the phrase "Jewish identity," the word "Jewish" does not refer to any agreed-upon or universal set of Jewish beliefs or behaviors, and the phrase does not imply what "Jewishness" itself means. In fact, "Jewishness" is such a fluid and multifaceted concept in contemporary American life that it is difficult to define precisely what its substantive contents and components are.

Consequently, social scientists prefer to address Jewish identity as a nonnormative idea, that is, without taking any position on the "authenticity" of one or another expression of Jewish identity. They study such qualities as the means by which people express Jewishness and the importance of that expression in their lives, and they deliberately avoid such questions, for instance, as whether religious observance, communal involvement, or support for Israel makes one a "better" or even a more "strongly identified" Jew.[56]

While the social scientist's approach is useful, it is not without problems. A totally nonnormative view of Jewish identity might argue that *anyone* who feels strongly Jewish may be regarded as such, regardless of their heritage, knowledge, beliefs, or practices in all other respects. By this standard, unaffiliated Jews, Lubavitcher Hasidim, and Jews for Jesus might claim equal Jewish identities, though most observers -- and most Jews -- would not agree. A normative view of Jewish identity, on the other hand, must face such questions, in the highly pluralistic world of American Jews, as what "authentic" Jewish identity means and what the comparative merits are, for instance, of membership in a Jewish organization, building a sukkah, eating blintzes, and speaking Hebrew. Custom and reason both seem to legislate against the a priori postulation of normative criteria of Jewish identity.

The contemporary study of Jewish identity leans toward the nonnormative approach and examines attitudes and behaviors that seem to be accepted as "Jewish" by large parts of the Jewish community and their meaning for individuals' lives. In so doing, however, it does seem that some attitudes, beliefs, and practices emerge as common denominators of American Jewish identity, particularly those that aim for the continuation of the Jewish people through ties of kinship, religion, and a common commitment to the welfare of Jewish people everywhere and to the State of Israel. Much of this is what Jonathan Woocher calls "the civil religion" of American Jews,[57] a consensus to which he thinks most American Jews subscribe. Thus it seems that we can talk about Jewish identity as a rough empirical conglomerate of some behavioral and emotional ties that bind Jews as individuals to the Jewish people as a group.

What Are Desired Jewish Traits?

What are those ties? What is the content of Jewish identity that the community approves, if not strives for, and that links the individual to the reference or kinship group? What values, traits, beliefs, and behavior patterns do American Jews wish to encourage and transmit, whenever and however they are introduced to the individual?

The list varies, of course, with who draws it up and what priorities they assign to what values. Our discussions, in any case, have elicited three categories of traits which seem to be associated with conceptions of strong or intense Jewish identity: We have labeled them: *kinship* traits; *cultural* or *religious* traits; and *Jewish ethnic apologia* or *self-justifying* traits.

Kinship Traits. By kinship traits, we mean feelings of belonging to the group and the attendant perceptions of safety and comfort, on the one hand, and of loyalty and obligation, on the other, which derive from them. The notion of perceived kinship is central to the social-comparison theory of identity, which would say that this tribal, in-group sentiment is the most fundamental of Jewish as of other ethnic-group identities. For American Jews, it seems divisible into four subsets:

(a) Kinship proper, that is, the sense of membership, of "our crowd," so to speak, which is first perceived as a familial event and then expanded to acquaintances, institutions, and the community as a whole. Kinship is probably the reminiscence most nostalgically connected with "being Jewish." It is expressed in trivial searches for tribal connection, such as "playing Jewish geography" ("You come from Omaha? Do you know the Goldsteins, Cohens, etc?"); trying obliquely to learn if someone is or is not Jewish; looking up Jewish names in the phone books of strange towns one travels through. Seeking out the Jews in the town one moves to and Jewish youngsters leaving small towns for urban centers with more Jews reflect the need for Jews as "family." Other indicators of kinship need are: gravitating to association with Jews in social settings; doing one's business with Jews; having more Jewish than non-Jewish friends or feeling closer to the Jewish friends; wanting to live in Jewish neighborhoods; taking special pride in the accomplishments of Jewish sports figures, politicians, artists, writers, performers, and scientists; counting Jewish Nobel laureates.

(b) Public loyalties are a corollary part of Jewish kinship. They are the associations and alignments of Jewish organizational life -- memberships in synagogue, Jewish community center, and other Jewish institutions. Even if membership seems superficial or peripheral, the act of joining and maintaining membership is a salient expression of belonging.

(c) The Israel "connection" is another corollary of Jewish in-group feeling that has become most pronounced since the Six-Day War of 1967. Indeed, some commentators, like Arthur Hertzberg, have suggested that Israel has become "the religion of American Jews." However overstated, expressions of Jewish affirmation and renewal upon or after visiting Israel -- "I just feel Jewish in Israel"; "It feels good to be with my people" -- are familiar experiences.

(d) Responsibility for Jewish welfare and defense throughout the world is a fourth expression of American Jewish kinship feeling. The idea is a classic value of Judaism -- "all Jews are guarantors of (responsible for) one another" -- somewhat distinct from the Israel connection, but probably no less strong.

Cultural and Religious Traits. The cultural and religious practices of Jews are those that best define them in Jewish lore and literature. They take at least three forms: performing Jewish rituals; expressing Jewish literacy; and subscribing to Jewish ideologies.

(a) Performing traditional rituals and observing religious holidays, at home or in public, identify Jews most clearly. There are also contemporary rituals of solidarity with Jewish experience, such as observing Israel Independence Day and Holocaust Memorial Day. Secular personal habits that identify one as Jewish include wearing a Star of David or mezuza necklace.

(b) Jewish literacy encompasses knowledge of Hebrew, Yiddish, or Ladino, of classical texts, and of Jewish history as well as reading contemporary Jewish books, newspapers, and periodicals.

(c) Commitment to Jewish religious or national ideologies is another significant identifier of a Jew.

Jewish Ethnic Apologia. This refers to the belief among Jews that Jewishness is profoundly associated with positive humanitarian values and that its maintenance as a distinct entity is of value to American society. Two themes characterize this view:

(a) Belief that religiously enjoined justice and humanitarianism are the bases for political liberalism, civil libertarianism, racial equality, fair play, and equal job and housing opportunity.

(b) Belief that Jewish ethnic continuity requires particularist Jewish affiliations, retaining and reinterpreting the doctrines of the Chosen People and the mission of Israel, and rejection of intermarriage without spousal conversion.

Multiple Identities

The fact that there may be some consensus on traits that mark American Jewish identity suggests that Jewish identity need not be defined solely as "whatever makes a person feel Jewish." It is not clear if some traits are more sustaining than others, but in the contemporary Jewish world, the alternative combinations and expressions of various traits may permit us to speak of characteristics of strongly identified Jews and of poorly identified Jews, even if we cannot establish what the ideal traits of a strongly identified Jew are.

There is no clear evidence about when, how, and how much various traits are transmitted to American Jewish children, but it is reasonable to believe both that the content of Jewish identity in pluralistic America is multifaceted and that many of the facets are shaped in the overall process of development. It is also reasonable, we believe, to argue that some hypothetical scheduling of major American Jewish experiences per developmental period is possible, and we now propose to explore that scheduling.

Developmental Periods of American Jewish Life

It is possible to divide the lives of modern Americans, especially in the middle socioeconomic stratum of which most American Jews are part, into several sequential segments or periods that may be conceptually useful for our purpose:

(1) early childhood (preschool)
(2) childhood (primary to middle school, grades 4-6)
(3) early adolescence (junior high, grades 6-8)
(4) late adolescence (high school, grades 9-12, junior college)
(5) young adulthood (college, university, career start)
(6) middle adult (career, marriage)
(7) adulthood, early parenting
(8) adult maturity, middle parenting
(9) adult maturity, early grandparenting
(10) old age, late grandparenting

Presumably, there are diverse kinds of learning, interpersonal, religious, and other experiences that are particularly salient at different times and probably across genders. A comprehensive educational program should be able to make the Jewish experience of each period (and gender) most meaningful and memorable at that time. Such systematic effort does not typify Jewish education in part because we lack systematic knowledge of the developmental psychology of American Jewish life. We do not know what "windows of opportunity" for positive identity and "windows of vulnerability" to negative identity exist for boys and for girls in Jewish family, school, or alternative educational experience at any age, let alone in education of the young.[58]

As a step in the direction of a developmental schedule of American Jewish experience, we have compiled a hypothetical sequence of events from reading, observation, and discussions with Jewish educators, community workers, and parents.

Jewish Experiences per Development Period

(1) Early childhood (preschool): Family warmth and adult nurturance is first connected to Jewish symbols, holiday treats, pleasures.[59]

(2) Childhood (primary grades to middle school, grades 4-6): Family activity, happy events, special memories. In school, skills achievement (e.g., learning Hebrew, which kids love in first classes, then start to dislike); the general positive identity pattern of becoming a school person, bringing home books and, by grade 5, studying.

(3) Early adolescence (junior high, grades 6-8): The central Jewish experience is bar and bat mitzvah. Themes of Jewish schooling: historical continuity of Jewish people; their sufferings; Holocaust; awareness of anti-Semitism; importance of Israel. Some exposure to classical texts, especially for bar/bat mitzvah.

(4) Late adolescence (high school, grades 9-12, junior college): Confronting issues of adult independence, ideology, and responsibility; first trip to Israel, with family or group or, rarely, alone; having to start making choices and commitments; questioning authority; part-time work; college and career choice concerns; social intimacy with peers; dating and sex relations; dating non-Jews. Attending Friday dances or ball games versus Shabbat dinner.

(5) Young adulthood (college, university, career start): Intensification of issues of previous period, largely by living away from home. New intellectual issues of rational beliefs, wars of ideas, discontents; emotional issues of love relationships, intermarriage, mixed loyalties to family and self; career commitments.

(6) Middling young adulthood (career, marriage, early parenting; overlaps with 5 and 7): Strong success needs; electing marital status; finding a mate (middle twenties through early thirties).

(7) Adulthood (parenting, divorce, affiliation): Creating a family; having children, delaying children; naming children; buying, decorating house; establishing family rituals; choosing symbolic acts related to family. Creating pace and flow of household: Evening TV or adult education courses? Live near parents? Accept job at great distance from family? Send kids to synagogue or to secular preschool, public school, Hebrew school? Jewish community center, synagogue membership, activity? Importance of Israel resurfaces, often as a vehicle to Jewishness absent religious obligations.

(8) Adult maturity (middle parenting): Long-term plans for children; recurrent crises of adolescents. Marital crises around Jewish and non-Jewish issues. Aging parents. Midcareer crisis: "making it" commercially, professionally; boredom; burnout. Concerns of aging: baldness, wrinkles, menopause, heart disease, jogging, health food.

(9) Adult maturity (early grandparenting): Intermarriage; naming grandchildren (what names and who gives names?); Passover seder. Preparing for retirement financially, psychologically. Deaths of friends and loved ones; intimations of mortality. Reevaluations of priorities.

(10) Old age (late grandparenting): Facing death; physical comfort; immortality; maybe resumed religious practice; reading news for Jewish items.

Problems of Jewish Developmental Schedules

All schedules of development are only rude sketches of complex interweaving events. Some developmental changes occur stepladder fashion; others as a tapestry of varied and recurrent themes and patterns. The very notion that there is developmental continuity in American Jewish life is somewhat presumptuous. There are large discontinuities in much American Jewish experience today from childhood to adulthood and in the socialization practices of adulthood. Mobility, divorce, and intermarriage have radically altered old patterns of Jewish experience and have not replaced them with clearly identifiable new ones.

Mapping American Jewish identity is further complicated, moreover, first because it is multidimensional and variably reached, even by strongly identified Jews, and second, because most American Jews are wholly unaffiliated with the community, so we know little about their Jewish experience.

Multiple Pathways

There are many experiential routes to the same identity, mostly achieved by routine and inconspicuous means. Ordinary socialization and education are enough to bind most people to their in-group and its needs and causes. For others, critical incidents dramatically alter identity, sometimes permanently. The history of religious conversions is full of such reports. Among Jews of our day, they are perhaps typified by *baalei tshuva* (penitents) who, with little Jewish background, are moved to intense religiosity by personal episodes of Jewish consciousness, God, or religion. A parallel may be unaffiliated Jews "converting" to intense Jewishness via emotional immersion in Israel's wars, with television news often serving as the critical catalyst.

For more and more American Jews, the routines of childhood socialization as Jews do not apply at all. Their path to Jewish identity is an adult experience, commonly through marriage to Jews and conversion to Judaism. Thus, while a developmental schedule may be useful, it is plain that much of American Jewish life does not follow such clear and ordered timetables. Identity has many experiential sources.

Windows of Opportunity

If the American Jewish experience is developmentally discontinuous, which its multifaceted character suggests may be the case, and if that identity is sometimes both vague in content and vaguely reached, why bother constructing developmental schedules of it and a developmental-psychology approach to understanding and educating for it? The answer is that this perspective allows us to see the problem of Jewish identity "whole" in its intellectual complexity and the difficult questions of educational policy and practice that ought to be addressed from such understanding.

The developmental dynamics of identity and the Jewish experiences that go with them might suggest different emphases appropriate to different periods. Kinship traits are important at all ages, perhaps, but they may be influenced more by family in childhood and by peer relationships in adolescence -- and they are probably more important to ethnic Jews than to converts to Judaism. Ethnic self-justifications are not important social comparisons to primary graders when they first develop ethnic awareness (before age 10 or so), but such apologias may be important to high-school students. And so on. Though we have barely touched on them here, the developmental-psychology literature and a research agenda that aims specifically at understanding the dynamics of identity can contribute significantly to the design of educational policy and practice.

We need to examine the various points in the life span, based on a firm understanding of the dynamics at play, to see where we can assume responsible opportunities to shape identity. These obviously go far beyond the period of conventional schooling, extending back at least to preschool, even to family practices, and forward to educational policies needed for the teen years, premarital education, and the child-rearing years.

The educational task is discovering "windows of opportunity" in the life cycle for different educational inputs. If Steven M. Cohen is correct in his belief that the vast majority of American Jews are actively if "marginally" affiliated with Jewish life at some points in the life cycle,[60] then there is a great "market" for knowledgeably derived and planned educational efforts, and the promise of enriching the identity of American Jews by education is a real one.

EDUCATING FOR JEWISH IDENTITY

Jewish identity education is part of the broader topic of character education. Character education concerns the molding of individual personality, including the sense of responsibility and conscience, as opposed to skills training and knowledge education.[61] Identity education is a form of character education that aims to affect one's basic attitudes, values, and beliefs toward one's sense of self in relation to others and to the world, especially as it is perceived to be socially organized. It begins in a person's early years, continues throughout one's lifetime, and may never be completed. Identity education extends beyond skills and information and well beyond the walls of the classroom. It may therefore differ in its methods of teaching (and evaluation) from other forms of education, and it may require teachers and teaching skills of a much different sort than skills or intellectual training does.

Jewish Identity in Traditional Jewish Education

Jewish identity education is a relatively new concept in the language of Jewish education. It entered the language of Jewish life late in the twentieth century under the influence of psychology and sociology, and it has become a central motif in American Jewish life, probably representing what most people now regard as the major goal of Jewish education.

Though many of the activities it involves have been associated with Jewish education through the ages, the term "Jewish identity" does not appear in classical Jewish educational discourse, where there were no such things as courses on Jewish identity, instructional units on "Jewishness," or Jewish identity games.[62] Traditional Jewish education may have been committed to developing a sense of Jewish self and linkage in the young, but schools taught the content and ideology of Torah, mitzvah, and halakhah rather than identity.

There was probably less need then than now for Jewish schools to be specifically concerned with identity. The Jewish school was only one of several agencies working to form a young person's Jewish life-style, and it was not mandated with specific responsibility for identity education.[63] Holiday observance was learned at home; prayer was learned in the *bet midrash*; such values as charity (*zedakah*) and hospitality (*hachnasaat orchim*) were learned in the community.

The main activity of the classical Jewish school, therefore, was sensibly devoted to the study of Jewish texts and the performance of Jewish behaviors, with the Jewishness of the students more assumed than directly promoted.[64] Bible, Talmud, and Siddur were major academic vehicles for the development of Jewish knowledge and life-style. Literacy in Jewish sources was not distinct from identity education. For most students, such study was not for intellectual virtuosity per se but was a prominent and immediate form of Jewish living -- that is, a mitzvah.

The life of the school and its leaders, moreover, exemplified the life-style to which the school aspired.[65] Teachers were assumed to lead pious lives, and their pedagogic abilities were commonly unquestioned.

Teaching Jewish Identity in Contemporary Jewish Education

The context of Jewish education differs dramatically in contemporary America.[66] For the bulk of American Jews, the home and neighborhood offer little opportunity for learning about Jewish traditions, the Jewish calendar, or religious ritual, and little opportunity, accordingly, for developing strong emotional attachments to them. The tightly knit and self-contained communities of the past are the antithesis of the open and individualized life-style of contemporary America.

In this setting, Jewish schools have been asked to "teach Jewish identity" in a few hours a week to children who have only passing interest in Jewish matters. They must do so, moreover, while maintaining a curriculum already loaded with responsibility for basic Jewish literacy (Hebrew language, Bible, and Jewish history) and bar/bat mitzvah training. Many new curricula, audiovisual programs, and methodologies have been developed for this purpose, but it is commonly acknowledged that the goal of promoting positive Jewish identity in face of the social and psychological realities of contemporary Jewish life will not be met by improvements in school curriculum alone.

Guidelines for Jewish Identity Education

To this end, there are five guidelines that we believe would be helpful in planning contemporary Jewish identity education:

(1) Jewish identity education should be seen as lifelong.
(2) It should be carefully "curricularized" and should recognize diverse paths to Jewish identity formation.
(3) Jewish identity should be understood as a synthesis of cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions.
(4) The group nature of Jewish identity education should be incorporated into planning it.
(5) The place of role modeling in Jewish identity education should be carefully attended to.

Jewish Identity Education as Lifelong Process

As we saw above, identity develops and changes over time. Erikson reminds us that life is a series of "ages" and that our being continues to emerge. Even the identity crises of adolescence and youth do not conclusively fix who we are. Accordingly, no predetermined outcome can define "the" goal of identity education.

There is no fixed outcome of Jewish identity education any more than there is a single definitive model of Jewish identity. In the context of American Jewish pluralism, as we have noted, the goal of identity education might better be seen as the development of a personal process of involvement and commitment to "things Jewish" rather than the realization of one kind of Jewishness. By the same token, since identity formation is a continuous process, education for it must address diverse age groups -- the very young, school-aged children, adolescents, young adults, the elderly. And it must speak to them in diverse settings -- classrooms, community centers, synagogues, summer camps, *havurot*, families, youth groups, and Israel trips. The continuity and plasticity of identity means that there are multiple and diverse opportunities for affecting it. People are susceptible to being touched Jewishly in many places and at many times. In adolescence, the [illegible]sions of the mind and body are particularly receptive to ideologies and identities. In the college [illegible], the pursuit of intellectual, vocational, and interpersonal self-identities intensify. During early [illegible]nting, young adults confront their continuity with their own past and consider what to transmit [illegible] their offspring. In later years, life concerns center more on what memories we will leave with thers than on what our personal careers will contain. Jewish identity education must address the xistential moment and setting of each of these ages.

Practically, this means an intensification of programs, materials, and personnel for Jewish identity education throughout the life cycle and in contexts that extend far beyond traditional institutions of education.

"Curricularization" and Diversity in Jewish Identity Education

The continuation of identity formation throughout the life span suggests the need for lifelong educational planning to suit different developmental patterns and periods. The very term "curriculum" implies such a course of educational planning.[67] While the term is popularly used to refer to fixed courses of study, it has implications beyond the classroom. The comprehensive curricularization of Jewish identity education should encompass different stages of development, diverse American Jewish identities, and multiple educational settings.

Several life-styles can fit the rubric of "positive Jewish identity" and an inclusive Jewish community must be sensitive to and tolerant of this diversity.

This diversity makes it difficult to reach consensus about educational goals. Questions of what a Jewish child should study and who is a Jewishly educated person are difficult to answer, especially outside of the world of Orthodox schools. Thus it will be necessary to pursue several curricular routes and to develop a broad spectrum of resources and methods for Jewish identity education. Some people will be moved by such Jewish experiences as a trip to the lower East Side, a Shabbat dinner, or an Israel visit; others will be touched by reading Jewish literature; still others will be affected by meeting intensely committed Jewish personalities.

A plethora of Jewish educational experiences, indeed a grand buffet (not unlike Dewey's notion of structuring diverse educational options), must be made available to invite many different sorts of people to dine at a Jewish meal, so to speak.

Identity as Synthesis of Cognition, Affect, and Behavior

Some psychological theories have regarded identity as an essentially affective phenomenon distinct from cognitive and behavioral spheres.[68] We believe, however, that identity is best promoted as an experience that integrates the cognitive, affective, and behavioral. This perspective rejects the common bifurcation of Jewish education into a "cultural literacy and cognitive development" branch versus an "identity and affect" part. The effort to pit education for Jewish identity against education for Jewish literacy is misleading and may have poor results in both respects. Jewish literacy training ought to be an important aspect of identity training, providing the content toward which the affects of identity are directed. Jewish education has to find means of harnessing literacy and identity education, not separating them or treating them as conflicting goals. The challenge that Jewish educators face is how to attend to both: to create nurturing and sensitive Jewish environments *and* enable children to develop Jewish literacy.

Group Processes in Identity Training

identity is one's sense of self with reference to a group, then identity education should the role of the group forces affecting identity. As implied in Tajfel and Turner's social-on theory, Jewish education should speak to youngsters' self-perceptions as members of a in-group, and it should maximize their positive in-group experiences. This is particularly strategy for Jewish education, given the great emphasis in Jewish religion and civilization on "belonging" to the Jewish community. In that sense, Jewish education should be particularly concerned with the use of ambience, emotional environment, and social context for identity education.

The Need for Identity Role Models

Traditional Jewish sources and contemporary psychological theories agree on the importance of identity models for the growth of Jewish personality. We form our selves largely by our experience of other selves. Whereas in some areas of education the personal values and beliefs of the teacher may not be essential to pedagogical success or failure, in Jewish identity education the personal characteristics of the teacher may be critical to success.

Does this mean that the Jewish educator, center worker, or federation professional must be an exemplar of Jewish behaviors and beliefs? Viewing a teacher's Jewish life-style as a prerequisite for teaching Jewish identity poses some threat to the liberal and pluralistic values widely shared among American Jews today. But it seems clear, on the other hand, that identity formation is abetted by models. Perhaps the model of a teacher who dynamically confronts identity issues would serve. There is little doubt, at all events, that the teacher may be as important a force in identity education as the programs and curricula in use. In that sense, the teacher may be as much a "text" of identity as is the word or the number in the teaching of other subjects.

The importance of the teacher's own Jewish identity has significant implications for the recruitment and professional training of "public" Jews (teachers, rabbis, Jewish community center staff, and federation professionals). This problem needs extensive discussion in the Jewish community.

Toward the Future

If American Jewry is serious about identity education, it must develop a multidimensional, group process-oriented approach to life-span Jewish identity education. It needs a broad curricular strategy around common goals of the American Jewish community, and it should devote much effort to deepening the Jewish knowledge and identity of professionals in all parts of Jewish community life.

Education for Jewish identity need not be haphazard, amateurish, or improvisatory. It is possible to develop thoughtful programs of Jewish identity education for North American Jewry over the next decade if three conditions are met: First, the American Jewish community must decide that Jewish identity is an area to which it wants to devote sustained attention. Second, such attention requires major human and financial investments, as well as tough policy decisions about educational priorities, training programs, and budget allocations. Third, this concern may require major changes in approaches to recruitment, training, and in-service growth of the professional leadership of American Jewry.

Whether foresight and will exist in the community to face this challenge is a major question confronting American Jewry as it prepares to enter the twenty-first century.

APPENDIX:
POLICY ISSUES IN JEWISH IDENTITY EDUCATION

Many specific policy issues flow from the psychological and educational discussion of Jewish entity presented above. This appendix catalogues some that Jewish lay and professional leaders ight want to confront.

Should Jewish education continue to concentrate on elementary and secondary schooling?

At the moment, most Jewish education in America focuses on children in either K-6 or K-2 (80 percent of all those who receive Jewish education in North America do so on the ementary-school level). It is chiefly entrusted to special agencies (schools, bureaus of Jewish ducation, departments of education) outside the family. The Jewish identity education we envision lters that model with respect both to the age cohorts to be addressed and the agencies to be sponsible for identity education. This raises questions of resource allocations for Jewish ducation.

Should we invest more heavily in preschool Jewish education? In the college years?

Given the apparently rich potential of the early years for creating a strong base of Jewish ntity in young children, large-scale investment in early-childhood Jewish education may be in er. A coordinated network of preschools could combine quality general education with a rich h program, perhaps even aiming to develop Hebrew and English bilingualism by this means.[69]

The same importance may attach to the college years for adult identity formation, and the question may therefore apply: Should the community significantly increase its efforts with this ation?

ould Jewish family-life education receive more attention and resources than it has?

If the family is as important a force in identity development as some psychological theory sts, then parents may be as important a target of identity education as children. Consonant this argument, many Jewish educators believe that the reconstruction of the Jewish family now to be the main priority of the American Jewish community.

e should Jewish education chiefly take place?

The school is generally assumed to be the main setting for Jewish education, but the lity of affecting Jewish identity through experiences at a Jewish community center, in a youth ent, in a summer camp, on an Israel trip, or at a national convention may be greater than classroom. Perhaps we should broaden our notion of what constitutes a "Jewish educational and allocate more resources to fund a broader range of agencies and activities.

we aim toward a small elite with high likelihood of impact or should we invest more in mass ?

the task of Jewish identity education is time-consuming and expensive, should we maximize returns on our investments by focusing on people who seem to be prime as potential leaders), or is it our responsibility to reach out to all Jews, even with se of success? Should large investments be made in small numbers or should they to masses? How does one mount a meaningful analysis of such a problem?

6. *By what means can identity education be made a priority in North American Jewish education?*

American Jewish education is a decentralized network of local and autonomous schools belonging to local congregations, parents, rabbis, and principals. It is influenced by a host of local, regional, national, and international agencies: bureaus of Jewish education; local Jewish federations; national departments of Jewish education of the religious denominations; JESNA; Jewish publishing houses; Israeli universities; departments of the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency; semiprivate and autonomous agencies; private foundations and initiatives.

Consequently, to move American Jewish education on a global level requires a sophisticated process of discussion, lobbying, coalition forming, and financial recruitment. How can one effectively influence American Jewish education so as to make the issue of Jewish identity a major priority?

7. *What new directions in professional training does Jewish identity education necessitate?*

Our approach implies that the training of Jewish educators may require much more emphasis on a person's training as a knowledgeable and identified Jew than as an administrator, programmer, educational technician, or transmitter of knowledge. Is the Jewish community willing to accept this shift in emphasis? And if so, how can it be implemented?

8. *What kinds of concrete projects might most directly serve identity education?*

Here are some practical projects that might be initiated to advance Jewish identity education:

(a) *A center for the study of Jewish identity.* It might be worthwhile creating an institute dedicated to studying Jewish identity and creating educational programs for promoting it. Such a center might sensibly be part of an existing university-based Jewish education or communal service program, or it might function as an autonomous research and development agency.

(b) *Training programs.* Short-term training programs for professionals whose work encompasses identity education could be developed or expanded. Modules on Jewish identity could be developed for use by existing programs of Jewish education and communal service, such as the Hornstein Program at Brandeis University and the Program in Jewish Communal Service at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in Los Angeles; rabbinical seminaries, cantorial programs, and Hebrew colleges and schools of Jewish education.

(c) *Miniseminars.* Miniseminars and workshops on Jewish identity could be developed for use in the conference programs of Jewish organizations, such as those of the General Assembly of Federations, the JWB Biennial, Hadassah, and American Jewish Committee and American Jewish Congress meetings.

(d) *Curriculum materials.* Investment is needed in the production of instructional and cational materials on Jewish identity for distinct developmental levels (including adults and r citizens) and for diverse educational settings (synagogues, community centers, summer camps, youth movements). A great Jewish books course, for instance, which ranged from classical ct matter, like the Bible, to contemporary Jewish writings might be one example.

(e) *The Israel experience.* The visit to Israel is a potentially strong tool for affecting people's ish identity. Many "summer-in-Israel" youth programs already serve that goal, and evaluation heir success is in process. The American Jewish community might decide to make the trip to ael a part of the Jewish education of all American Jews and to devote major resources to bringing ople to Israel and developing high-quality programs for them.

NOTES

. Some of the material presented here has been published in Perry London and Naava Frank, ewish Identity and Jewish Schooling," *Journal of Jewish Communal Affairs* 64 (Fall 1987): 4-13. sues discussed there include: definitions of identity and theories of its origin, development, and sychological function; definitions of Jewish identity and summary of research on it; the problem f Jewish schools doing identity training with limited resources, an ambiguous mandate from the ommunity, and a weak community social support network.

2. Remarks of Egon Mayer, in response to an early draft of this paper, to scholars assembled by the American Jewish Committee on Feb. 11, 1988.

3. Professor Reimer and Mr. Gavriel Horenczyk, Department of Education, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, took this position at the Feb. 11, 1988, AJC conference.

4. Alan Wheelis, *The Quest for Identity* (New York: Norton, 1959).

5. Cf. Daniel Bell, "Where Are We?" *Moment* 11 (May 1986): 15-22; Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan, eds., *Ethnicity, Theory and Experience* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975); Harold saacs, "Basic Group Identity: The Idols of the Tribe," *Ethnicity* 1 (1974): 15-41; Geneva Gay, "Implications of Selected Models of Ethnic Identity Development for Educators," *Journal of Negro Education* 54 (1985): 43-55; Drew Westin, *Self and Society: Narcissism, Collectivism, and the Development of Morals* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985). See especially Nathan Glazer, "The Problem of Ethnic Studies," in his *Ethnic Dilemmas: 1964-1982* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985).

In 1972, the American Jewish Committee created its Colloquium on Jewish Education and Jewish entity in response to recommendations of an AJC Task Force on the Future of the Jewish mmunity in America. It held five two-day conferences between 1972 and 1976 and produced five mphlets of scholarly discussions on these topics.

These have been well reviewed through 1981 in Harold Himmelfarb, "Research on American wish Identity and Identification: Progress, Pitfalls, and Prospects," in Marshall Sklare, ed., *nderstanding American Jewry* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1982). For publications nce then, see: Janet Aviad, *Return to Judaism: Religious Renewal in Israel* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983); Steven M. Cohen, *American Modernity and Jewish Identity* (New York: Tavistock, 1983); idem, *American Assimilation or Jewish Revival?* (Bloomington: Indiana University ress, 1988); Egon Mayer and Amy Avgar, *Conversion among the Intermarried: Choosing to Become wish* (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1987); Neil C. Sandberg, *Jewish Life in Los Angeles: Window to Tomorrow* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1986); Jonathan S. Woocher, *cred Survival* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986); Mark L. Winer, Sanford Seltzer, and teven J. Schwager, *Leaders of Reform Judaism: A Study of Jewish Identity, Religious Practices and eliefs, and Marriage Patterns* (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1987); Leonard Fein, *Where Are We?* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988).

8. Nathan Glazer, "New Perspectives in American Jewish Sociology," in *Facing the Future: Essays on Contemporary Jewish Life*, edited by Steven Bayme (New York: Ktav, 1989).

9. Charles Liebman, *The Ambivalent American Jew* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1973).

10. Glazer, *New Perspectives,* p. 17.

11. Himmelfarb, "Research on American Jewish Identity," p. 75.

12. Steven M. Cohen, "Outreach to the Marginally Affiliated: Evidence and Implications for Policymakers in Jewish Education," *Journal of Jewish Communal Service* 62 (Winter 1985): 147-157; Sylvia Barack Fishman, *Defining the Needs of New Jewish Families* (Waltham, Mass.: Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies, Brandeis University, 1988).

13. Himmelfarb, "Research on American Jewish Identity."

14. Fred Massarik and Alvin Chenkin, "Explorations in Intermarriage," *American Jewish Year Book 1973* (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1973), pp. 292-306.

15. David Caplovitz and Fred Sherrow, *The Religious Drop-Outs: Apostasy among College Graduates* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1977).

16. A. J. Weigart and D. L. Thomas, "Parental Support, Control, and Adolescent Religiosity," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 11 (December 1972): 389-393.

17. Himmelfarb, "Research on American Jewish Identity," p. 79.

18. Harold S. Himmelfarb, "The Interaction Effects of Parents, Spouse, and Schooling: Comparing the Impact of Jewish and Catholic Schools," *Sociological Quarterly* 18 (1977): 464-477.

19. Mayer and Avgar, *Conversion among the Intermarried*; Bernard Lazerwitz, "Jewish-Christian Marriages and Conversions," *Jewish Social Studies* 43 (Winter 1981): 31-46.

20. Bernard C. Rosen, *Adolescence and Religion* (Cambridge: Schenkman, 1965).

1. Arnold Dashefsky and Howard M. Shapiro, *Ethnic Identification among American Jews: cialization and Social Structure* (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1974).

Sylvia Barack Fishman, *Learning about Learning: Insights on Contemporary Jewish Education from ish Population Studies* (Waltham, Mass.: Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies, Brandeis iversity, 1987).

3. G. E. Bock, "The Jewish Schooling of American Jews: A Study of Non-cognitive Educational fects" (doctoral dissertation, Harvard University Graduate School of Education, 1976), *Dissertation stracts International* 37 (1976): 4628A.

Ibid.; Steven M. Cohen, "The Impact of Jewish Education on Religious Identification and tice," *Jewish Social Studies* 36 (1974): 316-326; idem, *American Modernity and Jewish Identity*; *American Assimilation or Jewish Revival?;* Himmelfarb, "Interaction Effects."

Harold S. Himmelfarb, "Study Tours of Israel," in *Empirical Research on Jewish Education: A cal Inventory*, forthcoming.

Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York, *Jewish Supplementary Schooling: An cational System in Need of Change* (New York: The Board, 1988).

27. Harold S. Himmelfarb, "Evaluating the Effects of Jewish Summer Camping in the United States," in U.O. Schmelz and Sergio DellaPergola, eds., *Papers in Jewish Demography 1985* (Jerusalem: Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Hebrew University, 1989).

28. S. A. Dorph, "A Model for Jewish Education in America: Guidelines for the Restructuring of Conservative Congregational Education," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1976.

29. Steven M. Cohen, *Jewish Travel to Israel: Incentives and Inhibitions among U.S. and Canadian Teenagers and Young Adults* (Jerusalem: Jewish Education Committee, 1986); Annette Hochstein, *The Israel Experience: Educational Programs in Israel* (Jerusalem: Nativ, 1986); Perry London et al., *The Impact of Summer in Israel Programs* (Montreal: CRB Foundation, 1988); Marc Schulman, *Israel Returnees Study: Interim Report* (New York: World Zionist Organization, 1988).

30. Isaacs, "Basic Group Identity," p. 19.

31. Roger Brown, *Social Psychology,* 2d ed. (New York: Free Press 1986), p. 551.

32. Heinz Kohut, *The Restoration of the Self* (New York: International Universities Press, 1977).

33. Erik H. Erikson, *Insight and Responsibility* (New York: Norton, 1964), p. 93.

34. B. R. Schlenker, "Identities, Identifications, and Relationships," in Valerian J. Derlega, ed., *Communication, Intimacy, and Close Relationships* (New York: Academic Press, 1984), p. 71.

35. Jean S. Phinney and Mary J. Rotheram, eds., *Children's Ethnic Socialization: Pluralism and Development* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1987).

36. Simon Herman, *Jewish Identity: A Social Psychological Perspective* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1989) emphasizes the distinction between studies of "identification" (the acts and processes of affiliation with a group) and "identity" (what it means to a person to belong to a group). This distinction is widely accepted in the social science literature, but it is not always made explicit.

37. Ibid., p. 107.

38. *Erik H. Erikson, A Way of Looking at Things: Selected Papers of Erik H. Erikson, 1930-1980*, ed. Stephen P. Schlein (New York: Norton, 1987); Paul Roazen, *Erik Erikson: The Power and Limits of a Vision* (New York: Free Press, 1976).

39. Erik H. Erikson, *Dimensions of a New Identity* (New York: Norton, 1974), pp. 27-28.

40. Erik H. Erikson, *Identity and the Life Cycle* (New York: Norton, 1980), p. 19, quoting Freud.

41. Ibid., p. 20, quoting Freud.

42. Ibid., pp. 20-21.

43. Brown, *Social Psychology*, p. 551.

44. Ibid., p. 533. Erikson uses "pseudospeciation" to mean the same thing as "ethnocentrism": ". . . all through history, groups of men have entertained systematic illusions regarding the God-

given superiority of their own kind . . . far from perceiving or accepting a human identity based on a common specieshood, different tribes and nations, creeds and classes (and, perchance, political parties) consider themselves to be the one chosen species . . ." (Erikson, *Dimensions of a New Identity*, pp. 27, 28).

45. Brown, *Social Psychology*, p. 534.

46. Ibid., p. 546.

47. Ibid., p. 548.

48. H. Kelman, "The Place of Jewish Identity in the Development of Personal Identity," in *Issues in Jewish Identity* (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1976), p. 22.

49. Herman, *Jewish Identity*, p. 28.

50. Ibid., p. 54.

51. Heinz Werner, *Comparative Psychology of Mental Development* (New York: Harper & Row, 1948).

52. David Henry Feldman, "How Development Works," in Iris Levin, ed., *Stage and Structure: Reopening the Debate* (New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corp., 1986), p. 289.

53. Howard Gardner, *Developmental Psychology*, 2d ed. (Boston, Little Brown, 1982), p. 258.

54. Roazen, *Erik Erikson*, pp. 109-110.

55. Isaacs, "Basic Group Identity."

56. Cohen, *American Assimilation or Jewish Revival?*; Calvin Goldscheider and Alan S. Zuckerman, *The Transformation of the Jews* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

57. Woocher, *Sacred Survival*, proposes that the "religion" of "civil Judaism" has seven major tenets; Liebman lists six "American Jewish principles."

58. The problem of gender differences in the formation and maintenance of identity is not treated in this paper, but it may be especially salient to Jewish education because of traditional cultural and religious differences in Jewish parental perceptions of gender and gender differences in adult familial, social, and religious roles.

59. Ruth Pinkenson Feldman, "The Impact of Jewish Day Care Experience on Parental Jewish Identity," in *A Conference on Jewish Day Care: Communal Policies and Priorities* (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1988).

[illegible] Outreach to the Marginally Affiliated."

[illegible] *Patterns of Educational Philosophy* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, [illegible] *Toward a Philosophy of Education* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston,

[illegible] Rabbinic Philosophy of Education," in Z. Dimitrovsky, ed., *Exploring*