

INTRODUCTION

Jewish education, the subject of perennial interest and debate, is now under intense scrutiny from the Jewish community.¹ Some assert that assimilation and intermarriage may be irresistible in an open society.² Others suggest that American Jewish education may have failed in its mandate to inoculate young Jews against the tides of change.³ This report presents evidence which shows that assimilation and intermarriage do not occur on a random basis. The extent and type of formal Jewish education are clearly related to levels of Jewish affiliation and activism, even after other influences, such as age, branch of Judaism in which a person was raised, and generations during which the family has been in America, are factored out.

This is the first installment in a two-part report on Jewish education. Part I focuses on the relationship between Jewish education and Jewish attitudes and lifestyles among adults; Part II will explore current levels of formal and informal Jewish education among American Jewish children in diverse types of households.

Data from the 1990 National Jewish Population Study⁴ have aroused anxiety about Jewish continuity. Observers of the American Jewish community worry not merely about the physical survival of the biological descendants of Jews but about the continuity of Judaism as a culture, as a peoplehood, and as a religion.⁵

Early reports drawn from the 1990 NJPS vividly illustrate the magnitude of change currently experienced within the American Jewish community. Jewish households often do not fit the image of the normative Jewish family: American Jews today marry later and have their children later and divorce more often. The Jewish institutional profiles of younger American Jews appear to be weaker than those of their elders: they join and attend synagogues less frequently and belong to fewer Jewish organizations. Socially, younger American Jews are far more integrated into American society, living and working in environments in which the majority of co-workers and neighbors are not Jewish. Home-based ritual observance continues to decline.

Perhaps most disturbing, the Jewish identification of many American Jews seems to be compromised. A substantial proportion of persons descended from at least one Jewish parent say they do not identify as "Jewish by religion," and about half of all those American Jews who married since 1985 did so with someone who is not Jewish. Persons who say they are Jewish but not by religion have dramatically lower levels of connection with Jewish institutions, customs, and people.

Yet, much in the picture is very positive. Most American Jews rejoice in the opportunities and lack of discrimination which they and their children encounter. America's open society, with all of its educational, occupational, and social opportunities, together with diminishing levels of overt prejudice against Jews, have worked to give Jews entry into most schools, places of employment, neighborhoods, and recreational facilities. Jews are no longer forced to "stick

together." At the same time, each successive generation of Jews is increasingly distant from the often intensive Jewish lifestyles of European, Sephardic, and immigrant Jewish life. American Jews grow more and more like other white, middle and upper-middle class Americans.

Moreover, even if they wished to influence individual choice, Jewish lay and professional leaders and planners have little control over the neighborhoods in which Jews live or whom they prefer as friends and spouses; these areas of life are out of the hands of the Jewish community.

In the area of Jewish education, however, Jewish communities can have substantial impact on individuals and their families. Unlike some other areas of contemporary life, Jewish communities do influence the availability, accessibility, affordability, and attractiveness of different types of formal and informal Jewish education. This is an area in which communities can make decisions and shape the future.

Were cost not a factor, Jewish communities might provide a profusion of Jewish educational experiences for the broadest possible spectrum of American Jews. However, the costs of Jewish education are substantial: nearly a billion and a half dollars are spent on Jewish education in the United States each year.⁶ Jewish institutions, agencies, synagogues, and communities make hard choices about what types of education--supplementary schools, one-day-a-week schools, day schools, Jewish camps, Israel trips, etc.--should be offered, to whom, and at what price. In addition to other concerns and considerations, communities are limited by the size and density of their Jewish populations as to the types of Jewish education they can offer. Both funding and transportation issues can affect the viability of Jewish educational systems. In general, communities with a small and scattered Jewish population may not be able to offer a full range of formal and informal educational options. When funding is limited, the apparent "zero sum" nature of these difficult choices, in which the financial gain of one type of Jewish education seemingly means reduced resources for others, produces a kind of "PAC" system, in which advocates of differing types of Jewish education argue strongly for the educational mode of their choice. *

To complicate matters, today some argue for cutting community funds spent on formal Jewish education, asserting that Jewish education is not an effective bulwark against assimilation. If Jewish education were "working," they often imply, today's American Jewish community would be more highly identified, clearly defined, and vibrant. Instead of spending huge sums of money on Jewish education, some argue, Jewish communal leaders should simply accept the fact that sweeping rates of assimilation and intermarriage are inevitable in our open society. They should accept the fact that every American Jew is a Jew by choice, that "interfaith marriage cannot be stopped," and that allocations committees should expend resources to proselytize among non-Jews and weakly identified Jews.⁷ They argue that monies should be devoted to more effective media presentations of Judaism, depicting Judaism as a public religion (rather than the yoke of a chosen few), as well-publicized and attractive as possible to large groups of people.⁸

This report indicates that Jewish education is one of the most effective tools for producing Jewishly identified adults. It demonstrates that more extensive forms of Jewish education are closely associated with greater Jewish identification, especially among younger American Jewish

adults, ages 25 to 44. American Jewish adults under age 45 who have received substantial Jewish education (more than six years of supplementary school or day school) are more likely than those who receive minimal or no Jewish education to be married to a Jew, to prefer living in a Jewish neighborhood, to volunteer time for and give money to Jewish organizations, to join and attend synagogue, and to perform Jewish rituals in their homes. These trends hold true even when statistical analysis adjusts for intervening influences.

In undertaking this evaluation of Jewish education, we fully recognize that Jewish education may, in fact, represent a constellation of family characteristics and individual experiences that affect Jewish identification and commitment. Lack of detailed data in NJPS on the home background of the respondents and on their informal Jewish educational experiences make such a more complete assessment impossible. We have no way of deriving from the data the specific impact of quality of Jewish education received, including details about comparative curricula. Nonetheless, the relation of formal Jewish education to the indicators used here is strong and consistent enough to suggest that Jewish education in itself is an important factor in determining attitudes and behavior.

METHODOLOGY

This report on Jewish education and adult behavior is based on the findings of the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey (NJPS), conducted under the auspices of the Council of Jewish Federations. NJPS involved initial screening of some 125,800 randomly selected adults to determine 1) whether the respondent was Jewish by religion. If not, the survey asked whether any one in the household 2) considered her/himself to be Jewish, 3) was raised as a Jew, or 4) had a Jewish parent. The screening process determined that 5,146 households could be identified as "Jewish" by one of the four criteria.⁹

Subsequent recontacts with the "Jewish" households reviewed their qualifications; some were dropped because of changes in household composition or previous misinformation about their religious identification. In the final stage of the survey, with a goal of interviewing 2,500 households, 2,441 households were identified for complete interviews. All screening and interviews were conducted by ICR Survey Research Group.

The interviews collected information about every member of the household; 6,514 persons were covered. Appropriate weights indicated that the surveyed households represent about 8.1 million Americans, some of whom are not Jews but are living in households containing at least one Jew by the broad definition employed by the study.

The questionnaire covered a very wide range of personal characteristics, attitudes, and practices. Of particular interest to our study are the questions asked about Jewish education. Respondents were asked about the number of years and type of their own education. They also reported on the number of years of Jewish education that other adults in the household had received. For children age 6-18, information was collected about the years and type of formal education they

had received, and whether they had participated in Jewish camp or youth group activities during the year before the survey. If a child had received no Jewish education, the respondent was asked to indicate if future enrollment was anticipated and, if not, why not.

This report focuses on the Jewish education received by adults and the impact of that Jewish education on their identification and life styles. It relies on the information obtained about the respondents. Furthermore, because Jewish education in the United States is primarily obtained in childhood, only those respondents who were either born or raised Jewish are included. Excluded are those who converted as adults, and those who were born or raised in another religion even though they considered themselves Jews at the time of the survey, and any non-Jews who served as respondents. All the findings reported here are based on the weighted statistics. Our sample represents some 4,360,000 adults. In order to make this report as accessible as possible, not all statistical materials are included in either text or tables. For further statistical information, the authors may be contacted.

PROFILES: AMERICAN JEWISH ADULTS AND JEWISH EDUCATION

The Jewish education received by American Jews varies widely. Because there are significant differences between groups of Jews, a meaningful profile of Jewish education needs to draw distinctions between groups. Very broad generalizations are not only useless, but they are often misleading, because a blended picture of all ages, genders, and backgrounds is not an accurate picture of anyone. For our analysis, we have developed an index of Jewish education that combines information on number of years of Jewish education received with type of schooling, that is, Sunday school, supplementary school, or day school. The index ranges from no Jewish education to six or more years of day school. For some analyses, the index has been collapsed into four categories; 1) No Jewish education; 2) Minimal Jewish education -- less than three years in any school, or 3 to 5 years of Sunday school; 3) Moderate level of Jewish education - 3 to 5 years of supplementary or day school, or 6 or more years of Sunday school; 4) Substantial Jewish education -- 6 or more years of supplementary or day school education. These categories were developed on the basis of time spent in Jewish schools, and not on the basis of quality of Jewish education, which was not measured in the survey.

Among adults, a substantial gender gap in Jewish education is evident. (Table 1.) Women over age 24 are more than twice as likely as men not to have received any Jewish education. For example, only 14% of men ages 25 to 44, compared to 34% of women in the same age group, said they received no Jewish education. The gender gap narrows somewhat among the youngest adults: 19% of men and 28% of women ages 18 to 24 had received no Jewish education.

Changes in the gender gap also vary by educational level. For example, about one out of four men ages 25 and over received three to five years of supplementary school, compared to one out of ten women. However, among young adults (ages 18 to 24) that difference has almost disappeared. Levels of Jewish education for younger women also draw closer to levels for men

at the more extensive levels of schooling: For men receiving six or more years of supplementary school, the percentages are relatively constant under age 65, at 25-29%; for women, the figures rise from 16% of those ages 45 to 64, to 17% of those ages 25 to 44, up to 20% of those ages 18 to 24. Among the day school population as well, the smallest differences in gender characterize the youngest adults: 9% of men ages 25 and over have received six or more years of day school, as have 13% of those age 18 to 24; the percentage of women with six or more years of day school rises from just over 1% to 2% at ages 45 and over, to 6% for ages 25 to 44, and 10% for ages 18 to 24.

The intensity (type and years) of formal Jewish education received is associated with the ways in which Jewish adults define themselves. Persons who called themselves "Secular Jews" were more likely than those who said they were "Jewish by religion" never to have received Jewish education (35% compared to 24%). (Data not in tables.) Secular Jews were much less likely to have received more than six years of supplementary school or day school--than Jews by religion.

These differences are also mirrored in the data showing the intensity of Jewish education by the branch of Judaism in which the respondent was raised. The percentage receiving no Jewish education rises steadily from a low of 16% of the Orthodox-raised to 60% of those raised as just Jewish. Conversely, only among the Orthodox did a large percentage receive 6 or more years of day school education; for others the proportion fell below 10%.

When the data are disaggregated by age and gender (Table 2) the patterns are somewhat less clear because of the overall changes that have taken place in women's Jewish education and in shifts over time to more intensive forms of Jewish education. Nonetheless, for any given age and gender, those who were raised as just Jewish consistently had a higher percentage with no education than did any other branch of Judaism. All three specific branches showed strong increases in substantial education especially among women, with the Orthodox consistently having the highest percentage, followed by the Conservative and Reform. Somewhat surprising, a higher percentage of young (18-24) Reform men and women had no Jewish education than was true of older Reform cohorts.

Within particular branches, some interesting patterns emerge with respect to the intensity of Jewish education by age and gender. Both Orthodox- and Conservative-raised women report a dramatically lower percentage having received no education among those age 18-24 compared to older groups. The reverse pattern by age was reported by those women raised Reform, although the differences are not as sharp. Equally striking are the higher proportions of women in all three branches receiving substantial education.

By contrast, the youngest age groups of Conservative- and Reform-raised men show a higher percentage with no Jewish education than do older men. At the same time, there has also been an increase in the percentage among these younger groups with substantial Jewish education. Especially notable is the decline in the gender gap for each branch among those who received substantial or moderate amounts of schooling.

This change can be partially explained by the increased prevalence of the Bat Mitzvah ceremony for girls. For decades, providing a boy with an impressive Bar Mitzvah ceremony was one of the primary motivations for enrolling a child in supplementary school. Among the older population, Bat Mitzvah was an unusual occurrence. It was not uncommon in some families to send the boys to supplementary school and to provide the girls with Sunday school only or no Jewish education. As the Bat Mitzvah gained in popularity, these differences in educating boys and girls decreased. The narrowing of the gender gap due to Bat Mitzvah occurred first in the Conservative population, which was the first branch to popularize the ceremony. Reform congregations had often replaced even the Bar Mitzvah with a co-ed Confirmation ceremony, and it was only as the Bar Mitzvah became ubiquitous in Reform congregations that Bat Mitzvah gained a hold as well. Within the Orthodox population, providing girls with an intensive Jewish education seems to have been tied to the growth of co-ed and girls' day schools, rather than to Bat Mitzvah per se, although many Orthodox girls today do celebrate the Bat Mitzvah in some way.

As the number of day schools has increased around the United States, the number of students enrolled in these schools, including students from all branches of Judaism, has increased as well. The NJPS-1990 data on the adult population reflect the beginnings of the impact of day school, best seen in the youngest population who were receiving Jewish schooling as the day school movement expanded. This change is most apparent for those raised Orthodox or Conservative. Although the Reform movement has also established some day schools, the number of adults raised in Reform homes who attended day schools is still rather small.

It seems likely that the extent and type of formal Jewish education which the respondents received as children was also a reflection of the norms of the community in which they lived, the type of Jewish education available, and, to an extent not possible to measure with our data, the level of commitment to Judaism and the Jewish people which they may have observed in their parental households. For a variety of reasons, Orthodox households were the most likely to send their children to day school where one was available for at least the elementary and possibly the high school years as well. Conservative families were more likely to send their children to supplementary school starting several years before Bar/Bat Mitzvah and possibly continuing through graduation/confirmation ceremonies during the teen years; and fully committed Reform families sent their children to the most intensive program offered by their temple, either many years of Sunday School or a supplementary school program. The conjunction of family influence and formal schooling implied by this pattern illustrates the difficulty of unraveling the influences of informal, home-based education and formal classroom teaching of Judaism. More formal education may have been supplemented for some by more informal activities, including youth group, camping, or trips to Israel. Unfortunately, NJPS did not ask about these activities for adults.

BEHAVIORS ASSOCIATED WITH JEWISH EDUCATION

American Jews have clearly had a wide range of Jewish educational experiences, with many factors contributing to the length and kinds of education obtained. What relation does extent of Jewish education have to an individual's commitment to and identification with the Jewish community? Does Jewish education, in fact, make a difference? NJPS data emphatically show that Jewish education is strongly related to American Jews' positive interaction with the Jewish community. Intensity of Jewish education is directly related to levels of Jewish identification as expressed in behavior and attitudes for a variety of indicators, including ritual behavior, membership in Jewish organizations, giving to Jewish charitable causes, and homogamy in marriage.

Ritual Practices Index

Perhaps the most traditional expression of Jewishness is through the rituals Jews perform or in which they participate. Some observers have argued that although some of these practices are weakening, others are practiced much more widely. As a result, ritual practice continues as a meaningful component of individual expressions of Jewishness. Other observers see an overall diminution of ritual practice as part of a general weakening of Jewish identity. NJPS shows a lessening of those rituals that require daily or weekly observance but some increase in participation in annual events. Jewish education has a strong positive relation to ritual practice, even when denomination is controlled.

An index of ritual practices was developed as a weighted composite of lighting Shabbat candles, lighting Hanukah candles, attending Seder, Kashrut (separate dishes and kosher meat), and fasting on Yom Kippur. (See Appendix A.) Practices requiring daily or weekly adherence were scored higher than those occurring only once a year. Scores could range from a low of 0 to a high of 16; a high score was defined as being in the 9 to 16 range.

All respondents combined scored an average of 6 on the index, with 17 percent scoring high on the index (Table 3). Intensive ritual practice is clearly not a hallmark of American Jewry. When controlled for the index of Jewish education, however, strong differences emerge, especially among persons below age 45. For these younger adults, minimal Jewish education correlated with very low percentages (10 percent or less) scoring high on the ritual index; six or more years of day school education showed a particularly strong relation, with 60 percent or more having high scores on the ritual index. Among older adults, the range in percentages scoring high on the ritual index was much narrower, from 10-20 percent for those with few years of Jewish education to about one-third of those with 3 or more years of supplementary or day school education.

This age difference has serious implications about the effectiveness of Jewish education in influencing observance of Jewish rituals. Among younger adults, Jewish education at the more intensive levels is clearly associated with enhanced ritual observance, yet this strong relation does not characterize the older population, nor do those with minimal or moderate levels of

Jewish education show high levels of ritual observance. The Jewish environment supplied by years of day school may have more effect than mere classroom time on ritual behavior. Moreover, the correlation between education and ritual observance may be mitigated by many other factors related to home environment, which cannot be determined from these data. For example, different Jewish religious communities have differing norms *vis a vis* Jewish ritual observance in the home. What is clear, however, is that only the most extensive forms of Jewish education are notably related to maintaining ritual observances.

As noted, some of the observed differentials may be the result of other factors, especially the denomination raised. In order to control for this background characteristic, as well as age and sex, a multiple classification analysis was undertaken. (Table 4.) The results indicate that persons who had six or more years of supplementary or day school education scored significantly higher on the ritual index than did persons having less intensive Jewish education. Clearly, although Jewish education alone cannot account for the intensity of ritual behavior, it is strongly related to this area of Jewish identification.

Organizational Membership, Voluntarism and Synagogue Membership

Past research has indicated that membership in Jewish organizations and voluntarism in Jewish causes is particularly related to factors affecting Jewish identification, including years of Jewish education, intensity of ritual practice, and synagogue attendance.¹⁰ Women are also more likely than men to belong to Jewish organizations, and the number of memberships increases with age. Denomination raised also plays an important role in levels of voluntarism and membership. In addition, the data show that intensive Jewish education is clearly related to levels of voluntarism and more memberships in Jewish organizations and synagogues.

Levels of voluntarism are closely related both to branch of Judaism in which the respondent was raised and the intensity of Jewish education. For example, among men who were raised Orthodox, overall just one-quarter volunteered, but this was true of one-third of those with 6 or more years of Jewish education in day or supplementary schools. Among the Conservative-raised, about 20 percent overall volunteered, compared to one-third of those with substantial Jewish education. The differences for the Reform-raised are not as great and the level of voluntarism is quite low -- only about 10 percent. Very similar patterns characterize women, but the level of voluntarism is generally higher.

Further analysis of the relation between intensity of Jewish education (as measured by the Jewish education index) initially takes age and sex into account; subsequently, we consider other factors through multivariate analysis.

The NJPS data show clear relations among the Jewish education index, age, and whether an individual belongs to any Jewish organizations. (Table 5.) For persons age 25-44, 3 or more years of day school education or 6 or more years of supplementary schooling raises the percentage belonging to one or more Jewish organizations to about one-third, although the percentage is higher among women than men. Curiously, persons with 3-5 years of Sunday

school education also have a similar level of membership, although 6 or more years of Sunday school does not have the same relation. For persons age 45-64, levels of membership are generally higher and the patterns are not as clear, although 3 or more years of supplementary or day school training is associated with generally higher levels of membership. Gender differences continue, with women at each level of Jewish education showing higher percentages of membership.

Since belonging to Jewish organizations (and, indeed, to any organization) may be as much a social expression as an indicator of Jewish identification, multivariate analysis was used to explore whether Jewish education continued to be strongly related to the number of Jewish organizational memberships even when social factors as well as age and sex are controlled. The analyses indicated that foreign-born status, marital status, and region of residence had no significant impact on membership. On the other hand, education and age were directly related; being female, raised in a more traditional branch of Judaism, and having most or all of one's friends Jewish is strongly correlated with the number of memberships; being a member of a mixed household (with some members Jewish, others non-Jewish) had a negative relationship to membership. With all of these factors controlled, intensity of Jewish education continued to have a positive relationship to number of memberships. Persons with 6 or more years of day school education are on average likely to hold 0.7 more memberships than those with no Jewish education at all.

Like organizational membership, synagogue membership is also correlated with age and gender, as well as with intensity of Jewish education. (Table 6.) In general, older persons (ages 45-64) have higher levels of membership than those age 25-44. The only exception is for those with 6 or more years of day school; in the day school population, 56 percent of those age 45-64 are synagogue members, compared to 60 percent among persons age 25-44. The patterns by gender are mixed, although women more often have higher levels of synagogue membership than men.

Again, intensity of Jewish education relates more strongly to synagogue membership for younger persons than it does for those age 45-64. Among women age 25-44, those with supplementary or day school education beyond 5 years have markedly higher levels of membership; for men, any day school education is related to higher membership levels, as are 6 or more years of supplementary education. At older ages, the relationship between the index of Jewish education and synagogue membership is not as clear, although 6 or more years of day school is related to higher levels of synagogue membership.

Contributions to Jewish Causes

Of major interest to those concerned with the financial viability of the Jewish community are the factors that are associated with contributions to Jewish causes. NJPS indicated that just over half of all respondents born or raised Jewish reported making some contribution to Jewish charities. What motivates such giving? Again, the data show that the greater the intensity of Jewish education, the more likely an individual is to give to Jewish causes (not in tables).

When the socio-demographic factors are considered, age, being female, and greater secular education are positively related to giving; and those who are married or widowed are more likely to give than the single or divorced/separated. In addition, having some or most of one's friends Jewish is related to the likelihood of giving, while being raised as "just Jewish" or non-Jewish is related to lower levels of giving.

With all of these factors controlled, intensity of Jewish education has a significant positive association with likelihood of giving. Those with 6 or more years of supplementary or day school education are about 20 percent more likely to make contributions to Jewish causes than those with no Jewish education at all. They are about 15 percent more likely to give than those with less than 3 years of any kind of schooling or 3-5 years of Sunday school only. Our data suggest that Jewish education above the primary level may be effective in inculcating strong positive values about giving to Jewish causes. This finding has important implications for the Jewish community in deciding the allocation of scarce resources. If Jewish education is associated with greater giving, then allocating significant funds to Jewish education may be a desirable way to educate future generation as to the desirability of Jewish giving, as well as other Jewish values.

Jewish Milieu

A number of students of the changing American Jewish scene have pointed to the increasing importance of Jewish social networks among friends, in neighborhoods, and at work in strengthening Jewish identity and bonds to the community. Since NJPS asked questions about the extent of the respondent's interaction with other Jews, it is possible to calculate a simple index of "Jewish milieu" (Appendix B) and to measure its relation to Jewish education. As for the other indicators of strength of Jewish identification, Jewish education again is positive effectly related to the importance of a Jewish milieu to the individual Jews.

As we have seen, having Jewish friends was a significant factor in membership in Jewish organizations and in giving to Jewish causes, even while intensity of Jewish education also had a significant positive impact. A strong relationship also exists between Jewish milieu and Jewish education. Even when socio-demographic background characteristics are controlled, as are denomination raised and type of household, a strong positive relation exists between Jewish milieu and intensity of Jewish education. With the Jewish milieu index ranging between 0 and 6, each level on the Index of Jewish Education adds .06 to the score. That is, with all other factors controlled, someone who has had no Jewish education on average scores 3.5 on the index; someone with 6 or more years of day school education on average will score about 4.0. Intensive Jewish education is thus associated with lifestyles which strengthen bonds to the Jewish community both directly, through enhancing active participation in a variety of spheres, and indirectly, through fostering informal contacts and networks.

Intermarriage¹¹

In concerns about Jewish continuity, intermarriage has been considered a major factor.¹² The findings of NJPS, showing that half of all marriages contracted in the five years preceding the survey involved intermarriage, have been considered particularly alarming. At the same time, attitudes toward intermarriage have also become much more accepting of non-Jewish partners. Fully one-third of those who identify themselves as Jewish by religion would support or strongly support the marriage of their child to a non-Jewish person; only 22 percent would oppose such a marriage. These trends are often seen as inevitable in an open society where Jews are free to interact on most levels with non-Jews; the Jewish community is therefore seen as able to have little direct impact on attitudes toward and levels of intermarriage. Yet our statistics indicate that Jewish education is directly associated with these areas of behavior.

Among those respondents with less than three years of any kind of Jewish education or six or more years of Sunday school, only 11-12 percent would oppose the intermarriage of their child. With increasing levels of Jewish education, the percentage opposed rises to half of those with six or more years of day school. These percentages vary somewhat by age and gender, but the patterns are quite consistent. In all cases, more intensive Jewish education is associated with stronger attitudes against intermarriage. At the same time, we must recognize that, even controlling for denomination raised, a substantial percentage of Jews are not opposed to intermarriage among their children.

Marriage behavior itself also is closely related to intensity of Jewish education. Although the levels vary somewhat by age, the percentage of respondents who were married to born Jews generally rises with increasing intensity of Jewish education (Table 7). Among those age 25-44, for example, only three out of ten of those with no Jewish education are in-married, in contrast to about four out of ten of those with 3-5 years of Sunday or supplementary school, in further contrast to eight out of ten of those with 6 or more years of day school training. When denomination raised is controlled a similar relation is found, although it is not as direct. [It should be noted that in this discussion, since data refer to respondents only, the intermarriage statistics indicate the number of marriages that are homogamous or mixed, not the number of individuals who are involved in different types of marriages. The percentages are therefore different from the individual data reported for all Jews in Kosmin et al., 1991. See footnote #4 for full citation.

Finally, if the likelihood of intermarriage is explored through regression analysis, extensive Jewish education has a significant relationship with inmarriage, even when background characteristics such as age, gender, and denomination raised are controlled. For each step increase in the index of Jewish education, the likelihood of intermarriage is reduced 2.5 percent. Compared to those with no Jewish education, therefore, persons who have 6 or more years of a day school education are 17.5 percent less likely to intermarry, all other characteristics being held constant.

CONCLUSION

The 1990 NJPS data show us the strong correlation of Jewish education and enhanced Jewish identification. The mere fact of having received some Jewish education in childhood has little impact on Jewish attitudes and behaviors during the adult years. However, extensive Jewish education is definitively associated with higher measures of adult Jewish identification. Its impact is demonstrated in almost every area of public and private Jewish life. Even after adjusting for denomination of Judaism in which a person was raised, extensive Jewish education is related to a greater ritual observance, greater likelihood of belonging to and attending synagogues, greater levels of voluntarism for Jewish causes, and greater chances of marrying a Jew and being opposed to intermarriage among one's children. Moreover, the associational effect of extensive formal Jewish education and heightened Jewish identification is more dramatic among younger American Jews, ages 18 to 44, than among older groups. Indeed, research which does not divide the group studied by age is likely to blur the strength of the association between extensive Jewish education and extensive Jewish identification.

Among younger American Jews, extensive ritual observance characterizes 6 out of 10 who have 6 or more years of Jewish education, but only about one-third of older respondents.

Involvement in organizations and synagogue membership rises with increasing intensity of Jewish education, especially for those with the most substantial levels. For both aspects of Jewish commitment, older persons at almost each level of education are characterized by higher percentages of belonging.

Extensive Jewish education is dramatically associated with the likelihood of inmarriage. Intermarriage rates, even when controlling for denomination, were far higher among those with minimal Jewish education than among those with 6 or more years of Jewish education.

Similarly, although a substantial percentage of Jews are not opposed to intermarriage, more extensive Jewish education is consistently associated with a pattern of greater opposition to their children's marrying out.

Although these patterns are clear and strong, a host of questions remains. Foremost is the issue of the degree to which Jewish educational levels are associated with other, particularly family-related, factors that enhance Jewish identification and commitment. Most likely, those respondents who received either day school education or went beyond the Bar/Bat Mitzvah years also came from families that placed high value on their Judaism and were active participants in the Jewish community. It is impossible to disentangle these relations with the data available to us here. Jewish education may well be an indicator of strong parental attitudes towards Jewish involvement. Nonetheless, since the relation between level of Jewish education and identificational factors holds even when branch of Judaism in which the respondents were raised or with which they currently identify are controlled, our data suggest an independent effect of education, which should be further explored and verified.

Other questions raised by these data include the role of informal education, including Jewish youth groups, trips to Israel, and other Jewish-sponsored activities through agencies such as Jewish community centers. To what extent were the specifics of curriculum a factor in Jewish enculturation? What external forces encourage continuing Jewish education, and how have these changed over time?

Broad spectrum survey research provides us with important outlines of indications, but it leaves many questions unanswered. Each of the elements that forms a component of Jewish identification is not only complementary to all the others, but together they may well yield an impact that is greater than the sum of the parts.

The fact that so many questions remain should not detract, however, from the striking policy implications which emerge from the data. There is no panacea for the challenges which confront the contemporary American Jewish community. No magic formula can guarantee that today's Jewish children will become tomorrow's committed American Jews. However, substantial Jewish education is clearly associated with patterns of Jewish identification among American Jewish adults. As the effects of immigration and dense Jewish neighborhoods become less salient, extensive formal Jewish education become increasingly important in shaping the attitudes and behaviors of American Jews.

Appendix A

CONSTRUCTION OF RITUAL INDEX

The Ritual Practices Index is a composite of five practices: Seder attendance, lighting Hanukah candles, lighting Shabbat candles, maintaining kashrut (defined as having separate dishes and buying kosher meat), and fasting on Yom Kippur. Since these practices vary in intensity, from once a year to daily observance, they were weighted differentially in the construction of the index.

*Seder attendance, lighting Hanukah candles, and fasting on Yom Kippur received a weight of 2 if performed always or usually, 1 if performed sometimes, and 0 if never performed.

*Lighting Shabbat candles was weighted 4 for always/usually, 2 for sometimes, and 0 for never.

*Kashrut was given a weight of 6 if respondent reported always/usually and 0 otherwise.

The index had a range of 16 to 0.

When tested through cross-tabulation by the denomination of respondent, the pattern was consistently in the expected direction. Orthodox respondents scored the highest, with two-thirds scoring in the 9 to 16 range. Those reporting themselves to be just Jewish had the highest proportions scoring either 0 or 1 through 4.

We recognize that the elements used in the construction of this Ritual Index combine both household and individual forms of behavior. It is not possible from the data set to disaggregate which ritual the respondent personally performs and which is performed by others in the household. Nor does it seem necessary to do so since correlations between pairs of rituals fall within a relatively narrow range (about .4000 and .6000), indicating that the individual-level ritual (fasting on Yom Kippur) is not differentially related to other rituals.

The one exception is Kashrut, which has lower correlation values (between .1600 and .3000, except for a higher correlation with lighting Shabbat candles). It is nonetheless included in this study because Kashrut is an important form of normative behavior in Judaism despite the fact that it is not standard practice among Reform Jews. Even when the Ritual Index is constructed without Kashrut as one of its components and its scale is reduced to a range of 0 to 10, with 8-10 being a high score, the relation of the Ritual Index to both denomination raised and the index of Jewish education holds. If anything, the relations are strengthened: The percentage scoring high on the Ritual Index rises with intensity of Jewish education, from 14 percent of those with no Jewish education to 69 percent of those with 6 or more years of day school.

Appendix B

CONSTRUCTION OF THE JEWISH MILIEU INDEX

The Jewish Milieu Index combines variables on number of Jewish friends, Jewishness of neighborhood, and importance of Jewishness of neighborhood. Each variable was given a score of 0 to 2:

*No Jewish friends equalled 0, some friends equalled 1, and most or all Jewish friends equalled 2.

*A neighborhood rated as not at all Jewish scored 0, somewhat Jewish rated 1, and very Jewish rated 2.

*If the Jewishness of the neighborhood was deemed not at all important by the respondent, it was coded 0; if somewhat important, 1; if very important, 2.

The index was constructed to equal the sum of the scores, and has a range of 0 to 6.

Endnotes

1. Explorations of the implications and potential of Jewish education have been wide ranging. One group of analysts come out of the world of Jewish education. They include Isa Aron, "Instruction and Enculturation in Jewish Education" (New York: Paper presented to the Conference on Research in Jewish Education: 1987); Joshua Elkin, "Lay-Professional Relations in the Jewish Day School," in Daniel Margolis and E.S. Schoenberg (Eds.), Curriculum, Community and Commitment: Views on the American Jewish Day School in memory of Bennett L. Solomon (1990); Alvin Schiff, Jewish Supplementary Schooling: An Educational System in Need of a Change (New York: The Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York: 1988).

A second group of analysts are based in the world of quantitative and/or qualitative social science. They include Geoffrey Bock, Does Jewish Schooling Matter? (New York: American Jewish Committee:1977); Commission on Jewish Education in North America, A Time to Act: The Report of the Commission on Jewish Education in North America (Lanham: MD.:University Press of America:1990); Allie E. Dubb and Sergio DellaPergola, First Census of Jewish Schools in the Diaspora, 1981/82-1982/83: United States of America, Research Report No. 4, Project for Educational Statistics. (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, and New York: Jewish Educational Service of North America: 1986); Calvin Goldscheider and Frances Goldscheider, The Transition to Jewish Adulthood: Education, Marriage and Fertility (Jerusalem: Paper presented at Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies: 1989); Harold Himmelfarb, "Jewish Education for Naught: Educating the Culturally Deprived Child," Analysis, 51, 1-12 (1975); Harold Himmelfarb and Sergio DellaPergola, Jewish Education Worldwide: Cross Cultural Perspectives (New York: University Press of America: 1989); Perry London and Barry Chazan, Psychology and Jewish Identity Education (New York: American Jewish Committee: 1990); David Sidorsky, "Summary Report and Recommendations: Colloquium on Jewish Education and Jewish Identity," In Jewish Education and Jewish Identity (New York: American Jewish Committee:1977).

In addition to formal studies, numerous "think pieces" about Jewish education have appeared. Some of these are: Ruth Wisse, "The Guilt for Jewish Ignorance," Broward Jewish World, December 25-31; Gary Rosenblatt, "Starting from Aleph: Baltimore Tries a New Approach to Revitalize Family Education," Baltimore Jewish Times, Nov. 13, 1992; and Horlene Winnick Appelman, "Family Education Can Lead Us Out of Our Jewish Morass," Detroit Jewish News, Nov. 13, 1992.

2. As Barry Kosmin, "The Permeable Boundaries of Being Jewish in America," Moment, August 1992, pp. 30-33, 51-52, p. 33, eloquently states: "In an individualistic, free society, where ethnicity and religion are voluntary, the authority of tradition, family, kinship and community has decreasing force and validity. Anybody is Jewish if he or she wants to be and usually on individualistic terms. In practice, everyone is a 'Jew by Choice.'"

3. Joshua O. Haberman, "The New Exodus Out of Judaism," Moment, August 1992, pp. 34-37,

51-52, p. 52, for example, suggests that "3.5 million unaffiliated and largely alienated Jews" lack "the inspiration and education missed in their youth."

4. The first national study of American Jews undertaken since 1970, the 1990 NJPS, conducted by the Council of Jewish Federations, studied some 6500 individuals in 2440 Jewish households, which were found after extensive screening through random digit dialing techniques. These households represent Jews across the country living in communities of diverse sizes and composition. A summary of the findings is provided by Barry A. Kosmin, Sidney Goldstein, Joseph Waksberg, Nava Lerer, Ariella Keysar and Jeffrey Scheckner, Highlights of the CJF National Jewish Population Survey, Council of Jewish Federations, 1991.

5. See, for example, Suzanne Singer, "A Critical Mass of Judaism May Prevent Inter-marriage," Moment, October 1991, p. 4, and Steven Bayme, "Resisting Inter-marriage Starts with Strong Jewish Identity," Broward Jewish World, October 25-31, 1992, p. 9a.

6. Dr. Jonathan Woocher, executive vice-president of the Jewish Educational Service of North America, estimates that a billion and a half dollars are spent on Jewish education in the United States each year. Naomi Liebman, "Federations Allocations to Jewish Education," Document Prepared for CJF, 1991, indicates that Jewish Federations' allocations committees throughout the United States set aside \$63,335,132 for Jewish education in 1991. While the percentage of money devoted to Jewish education, at 24 percent of total allocations, was slightly lower than in 1986 (27 percent), the actual dollar amount devoted to Jewish education has risen substantially.

7. Egon Mayer, "Why Not Judaism," Moment, October 1991, pp. 28-42, discusses "outreach" as a "delicate blend" of "evangelism, marketing, and social work." He argues that parents "want their leaders to mirror in communal policies the emotional acceptance that most express for their children's marriage choice."

8. Egon Mayer urges that rather than concentrating on prevention efforts, which are fruitless, the Jewish community should be "as open and welcoming to our own interfaith families as America has been open and welcoming to us ... And this requires us to be as respectful of the philosophical and life style choices of interfaith families as we would want them to be of more traditional Jewish choices." Egon Mayer, "Inter-marriage: Beyond the Gloom and Doom," San Diego Jewish Press, November 13, 1992.

9. A fuller discussion of the methodology of NJPS can be found in Barry Kosmin et al, Highlights of the CJF 1990 National Jewish Population Survey, Council of Jewish Federations, 1991, or in Sidney Goldstein, "Profile of American Jewry: Insights from the 1990 National Jewish Population Survey," American Jewish Year Book, (Philadelphia and New York: Jewish Publication Society and the American Jewish Committee, 1992).

10. Alice Goldstein, "New Roles, New Commitments? Jewish Women's Involvement in the Community's Organizational Structure," Contemporary Jewry (1990), pp. 49-76; Alice Goldstein, "Dimensions of Giving: Volunteer Activities and Contributions of the Jewish Women of Rhode Island," in Contemporary Jewish Philanthropy in America, Barry Kosmin and Paul Ritterband, eds. (Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1991), pp. 93-115.
11. In this report intermarriage is defined dichotomously as those born Jews married to current non-Jews versus those married to other born Jews or converted Jews.
12. See Peter Y. Medding, Gary A. Tobin, Sylvia Barack Fishman, and Mordechai Rimor, "Jewish Identity in Conversionary and Mixed Marriages," American Jewish Year Book, 1992, pp. 1-74; Sylvia Barack Fishman, Mordechai Rimor, Gary A. Tobin, and Peter Y. Medding, "Intermarriage and American Jews Today: New Findings and Policy Implications. A Summary Report" (Maurice and Marilyn Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies, Brandeis University, 1990).

**JEWISH EDUCATION AND THE JEWISH BEHAVIOR
OF AMERICAN ADULTS**

TABLES

TABLE 1
Index of Jewish Education by Age and Gender

Index	Both Sexes				
	18 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 64	65+	All Ages
None	23.6	24.3	20.9	36.5	26.0
Less than 3 years	4.7	8.1	9.6	12.5	9.1
3-5 Sunday School	5.3	7.6	8.8	4.1	6.9
6+ Sunday School	7.0	12.9	14.4	6.9	11.5
3-5 Supplementary	17.2	17.9	17.7	18.2	17.9
3-5 Day School	5.7	1.1	1.7	1.6	1.8
6+ Supplementary	24.7	20.7	21.5	15.2	20.0
6+ Day School	11.9	7.3	5.5	5.0	6.8
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Index	18 - 24		25 - 44		45 - 64		65+		All Ages	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
None	28.3	19.2	34.2	13.5	30.1	11.8	51.6	21.9	36.3	15.5
Less than 3 years	4.1	5.2	8.2	8.0	9.0	10.2	7.6	17.2	7.9	10.3
3-5 Sunday School	5.9	4.9	9.1	5.9	10.3	7.4	6.3	2.0	8.5	5.3
6+ Sunday School	6.7	7.2	14.6	11.2	21.6	7.2	9.1	4.9	14.4	8.5
3-5 Supplementary	15.5	18.7	10.1	26.5	11.2	24.0	10.4	25.7	10.9	25.0
3-5 Day School	9.2	2.3	0.9	1.4	-	3.3	1.1	2.1	1.4	2.1
6+ Supplementary	20.0	29.1	17.2	24.5	15.7	27.1	12.9	17.4	16.2	24.0
6+ Day School	10.3	13.4	5.7	9.0	2.0	8.9	1.1	8.8	4.3	9.3
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		

Note: Data in this and subsequent tables are based on NJPS respondents who were born or raised Jewish.

TABLE 2: Intensity of Jewish Education* by Denomination Raised, by Age and Gender

	Women					Men				
	18-24	25-44	45-64	65+	All Ages	18-24	25-44	45-64	65+	All Ages
Orthodox										
None	**	29.7	34.6	41.1	34.4	**	8.0	2.6	10.0	7.9
Minimal	**	7.6	12.3	12.7	10.6	**	10.0	6.8	8.5	8.0
Moderate	**	9.8	29.4	19.9	20.0	**	21.3	32.9	36.2	30.6
Substantial	**	52.8	23.7	26.3	35.0	**	60.7	57.7	45.3	53.5
Total %	**	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	**	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Conservative										
None	19.6	33.1	27.1	61.9	35.7	24.3	10.9	17.5	19.2	15.2
Minimal	7.0	12.5	21.6	16.4	14.9	2.4	9.5	16.8	22.2	12.0
Moderate	31.9	28.6	33.3	16.3	27.8	24.6	39.5	35.6	47.7	37.9
Substantial	41.6	25.7	17.9	5.3	21.5	48.7	40.1	30.2	10.9	35.0
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Reform										
None	37.1	29.6	17.5	60.9	31.4	10.3	8.6	2.5	38.2	10.2
Minimal	11.6	27.6	23.6	10.4	23.6	20.7	19.0	27.9	23.5	21.3
Moderate	36.8	32.8	48.5	28.6	35.6	39.8	48.8	40.3	32.7	44.8
Substantial	14.4	10.0	10.3	-	9.5	29.1	23.5	29.4	5.6	23.7
Total %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Just Jewish										
None	**	56.0	53.5	70.4	61.3	**	79.1	24.6	53.3	60.8
Minimal	**	7.8	32.1	9.6	12.5	**	7.4	34.6	33.6	20.9
Moderate	**	6.7	6.7	20.0	11.0	**	7.3	32.8	7.0	12.0
Substantial	**	29.6	7.7	-	15.2	**	6.2	8.0	6.1	6.4
Total %	**	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	**	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

* Intensity of Jewish Education level: High includes six or more years of supplementary or day school; Medium includes 3-5 years of supplementary or day school and six or more years of Sunday school; Low includes 3-5 years of Sunday school and less than 3 years in any type of formal Jewish education.

** Fewer than 10 unweighted cases in the age/gender/denomination category.

TABLE 3					
Percent Scoring High on the Ritual Practices Index, By Index of Jewish Education and Age					
	Age Group				
Index	18 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 64	65+	All Ages
None	8.4	6.2	12.6	14.6	10.0
Less than 3 years	12.7	5.8	10.2	20.6	11.1
3-5 Sunday School	22.6	9.8	2.1	15.6	8.9
6+ Sunday School	5.5	10.4	10.2	12.6	10.4
3-5 Supplementary	10.5	7.3	20.3	23.2	14.0
3-5 Day School	0.0	28.3	14.0	35.9	17.7
6+ Supplementary	30.8	18.9	32.2	36.6	26.3
6+ Day School	73.5	60.0	36.5	37.6	55.4
Total	21.2	14.0	18.1	21.1	17.0

TABLE 4
Intensity of Jewish Education and Ritual Practices
(Multiple Classification Analysis controlling for age,
gender, and denomination raised)

Intensity of Jewish Education*	Ritual Practices Index
None	3.99
Minimal	5.35
Moderate	5.39
Substantial	7.01
Grand Mean	5.35

* Intensity of Jewish Education level: Substantial includes six or more years of supplementary or day school; Moderate includes 3-5 years of supplementary or day school and six or more years of Sunday school; Minimal includes 3-5 years of Sunday school and less than 3 years in any type of formal Jewish education; None indicates no Jewish education. Scores range from a low of zero to a high of 16. A high score was defined as being in the 9 to 16 range.

TABLE 5
Percent Who Belong to Any Jewish Organization
by Index of Jewish Education, Age, and Gender

Index	Age Group 25 - 44			Age Group 45 - 64		
	Total	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men
None	14.8	14.8	14.6	29.1	33.5	17.9
Less than 3 years	13.2	16.9	9.1	24.4	35.7	13.6
3-5 Sunday School	30.2	28.4	33.4	26.2	35.4	13.7
6+ Sunday School	17.1	16.6	17.8	20.0	23.1	10.9
3-5 Supplementary	18.9	24.3	16.7	37.1	53.0	29.7
3-5 Day School	32.6	35.3	30.0	19.2	-	19.2
6+ Supplementary	33.5	43.0	26.3	40.8	65.7	26.6
6+ Day School	39.9	55.0	29.4	42.8	64.6	38.0

TABLE 6
Percent Who Are Synagogue Members
by Index of Jewish Education, Age, and Gender

Index	Age Group 25 - 44			Age Group 45 - 64		
	Total	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men
None	20.0	23.4	11.4	30.4	27.7	37.2
Less than 3 years	10.0	6.8	13.4	24.9	34.5	15.7
3-5 Sunday School	25.9	25.2	27.3	31.7	43.4	15.7
6+ Sunday School	28.1	30.1	25.2	33.6	32.4	37.1
3-5 Supplementary	21.5	29.4	18.2	43.8	58.8	36.8
3-5 Day School	31.0	6.2	55.3	36.6	-	36.6
6+ Supplementary	43.5	49.3	39.1	53.1	63.0	47.5
6+ Day School	59.2	46.3	69.1	55.9	85.4	49.5

TABLE 7 Percent Married to Born Jews, by Index of Jewish Education and Age			
Index	Age Group		
	25 - 44	45 - 64	65 + over
None	34.0	58.0	88.0
Less than 3 years	41.7	58.2	71.4
3-5 Sunday School	39.5	41.1	*
6+ Sunday School	44.6	59.3	81.2
3-5 Supplementary	38.0	81.9	87.2
3-5 Day School	*	*	*
6+ Supplementary	51.3	64.8	84.8
6+ Day School	79.6	79.0	*

* Fewer than 10 unweighted cases.

TABLE 8
Results of Regression Analysis for Selected Variables

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables					
	Ritual Index	No. Jewish Orgs.	Contribute Jewish Causes	Jewish Milieu	Attitude to Intermarriage	Intermarriage Status
Index of Jewish Educ.	*	*	*	*	*	*
Age	*	*	*	0	0	*
Education	*	*	*	0	0	0
Gender(D)	*	*	*	*	*	0
Marital Status(D)	*	0	*	*	*	-
Foreign Birth(D)	*	0	0	*	*	-
Denomination Raised(D)	*	*	*	*	*	*
Jewish Friends(D)	*	*	*	-	*	-
Jewishness of Home	*	*	*	*	*	-
Region of Residence	*	0	0	*	*	-

R² .412 .167 .306 .234 .160 .146

Key:

(D).....Dummy Variable

*.....Significant at < .05

0.....Not Significant

-.....Not in Model

1. Dummy variable with more than two components; if any one of the components was significant in relation to the reference group, we have given that variable an *.

2. Refers to whether all household members were Jewish.

Note: For ease of presentation and interpretation, we have not provided all the regression coefficients in this table. They are available from the authors on request.

The regression equations on the range of dependent variables shown at the top of each column in Table 8 include a mix of continuous and categorical variables. For the continuous variables, such as the index of Jewish education and age, each value of the variable is meaningful as a step in a continuum. For example, in the Jewish Milieu index, each level of Jewish education adds another .06 to the numerical score. Thus, points on the index are incremental. The index of Jewish Education builds upon the previous level, so that the regression coefficient has a cumulative effect with increased level of Jewish education. In contrast, for variables such as gender or marital status, the categories are discrete and do not form a continuum (e.g. Male or Female). These are treated as "dummy" variables; for each variable one of the categories was chosen as the reference group, to which the remaining categories in the variable refer. For example, for marital status, married was used as the reference group and single, divorced and widowed are compared to the married. For the categorical (dummy) variables, the signs of the coefficients were not always the same for each value, and the level of significance also varied.

In this table, an asterisk (*) denotes that at least one of the categories of the dummy variables had a significant relation to the reference group. The table does not indicate the direction of the relation; this is discussed in the text. Table 8 is intended merely to serve as a summary table to indicate the significance of the relation of the variables to each other and to point out that of the variables used in our analyses, index of Jewish education was among the few that consistently had a significant relation to the dependent variables under discussion.